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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Background of the Problem

Counseling, consultation, and coordination are the three classifications into which the major responsibilities of the elementary school counselor are generally grouped. Of the three classifications, the most confusion surrounds consultation. Faust, a leading proponent of the consultation role, says that "in the literature on consultation, it is common to find that a definition has either been altogether neglected or that consultation as a role is used interchangeably with counseling." (1968a, 39)

Faust, however, makes an operational differentiation between the counseling and consultation roles.

The most frequent focus of the consultant is on units external to the consultee. Such units may include instructional methods, classroom climate, child development data, etc. This is decidedly different from counseling, in which the person of the counselee receives greater attention . . . . While in consultation the focus is largely on external units, it should be reemphasized that the person, or self, of the consultee is at times the object of interest. These times are relatively infrequent, however, and do not stimulate, prod, or in other ways seduce the consultee to move away from the consultation relationship into counseling. (1968a, 39)

The consultation role can involve counselor interaction with students, teachers, administrators, parents, or any combination of
these subgroups. However, the focus of this investigation was related
to the role of the elementary counselor as a consultant to teachers.
The term "counselor" was used by the investigator as the generic term
to describe a person who performs counseling, consultation, and coor-
dination functions.

The impetus for the consultation role came in the middle 1960's
(Faust, 1968b) as an outgrowth of a trend in developmental counseling
which placed heavy emphasis on counselor involvement in the learning
climate of the school.

The learning-climate emphasis brought with it more interaction
between the counselor and the teacher. Statements like the following
began to appear in counselor education literature:

The elementary counselor education program is more central
to what is traditionally called the curriculum core of the school,
where the essence of learning, of cognition, occur. It is less
periphery, less an adjunct to the central stream of the educative
process. (Faust, 1965, 21)

Consultation . . . deals more in consulting with significant
others [those individuals who influence the lives of children]
in an attempt to provide learning opportunities congruent with the
overall purpose of the school. (Kaczowski, 1967, 103)

The preliminary statement of the joint Association for Coun-
selor Education and Supervision-American School Counselor Association
(ACES-ASCA) Committee on the Elementary School Counselor, issued in
1966, placed "counselor" in italics; stated that he had three major
responsibilities which included counseling, consultation, and coo-
dination; and envisioned him as "a professional person, educationally
oriented, highly knowledgeable in the area of child growth and develop-
ment, with a broadly based multi-disciplinary background in the
behavioral sciences, and a high degree of competence in human relations."
(ACES-ASCA, 1966, 2)

In 1967 Dinkmeyer, writing on counselor-teacher interaction, noted that

The counselor should arrange to do some classroom observation to evaluate, diagnose, and plan for reorientation. Meaningful observation of the teacher's handling of the child and the child's response will make clear the 'psychological movement' in the social setting. Here the counselor considers the child, the teacher, the group, the learning atmosphere, and the specific learning task. (1967, 297)

Faust's more recent thinking on the counselor-consultant role is posited on the basic assumption that the counselor-consultant is one who collaborates with the teacher in both classroom activities and curriculum development. In speaking of a course for counselors-in-training which would prepare them to assume the counselor-consultant role, Faust states that

The course should not give the counselor-in-training better preparation to be a teacher or a curriculum supervisor; it should instead be designed to make it possible for him to examine reading and other course areas in light of what personality and learning theory, particularly, have to say. Personality, learning theory, physiology, culture, and a variety of other such areas possess implications for content selection, instructional methods, and other curriculum foci that must be brought to the attention of teachers. (1968b, 64)

Faust is careful to delineate some of the differences in the role of the teacher and the role of the counselor-consultant.

The counselor as a consultant exercises special efforts to avoid presenting an image of an authority on reading or mathematics or other content areas. No matter how much teaching experience he may have had, his major time and energy are generally spent keeping up with journals and textbooks in human behavior, with content and instructional methods in the classroom also receiving some attention but probably not enough to qualify him as a current expert. This is, of course, the teacher's preference. The teacher prefers to be at least somewhat of an expert in this
area and to perceive the counselor as the expert in human behavior
dynamics that might be related to the curriculum. (1968b, 65)

McGehearty also differentiates between the role of the teacher
and the role of the counselor-consultant.

The consultant is a professional who comes into the school with
a body of knowledge differing from that of the teacher or admin-
istrator. His role is to act as a resource, supplementing the
knowledge of the educator with his own expertise in the behavioral
sciences. The relationship is established with mutual respect for
the different areas of competence each contributes and that can be
pooled to aid the child. (1969, 156-57)

Wide differences presently exist among counselors and counselor
educators in reference to time spent by the counselor in consultation
of teachers. Although agreement has not been reached on the priority
of the consultation role in the work of the elementary school counselor,
consultation is a part of most elementary counselors' repertoire of duties.

The emergence of the consultation role has reactivated two
problems which are old in the history of counselor education but which
are intensified by the emphasis placed on the close working relationship
between the elementary counselor and the elementary teacher:

1. Should teaching experience be a prerequisite for
   certification of elementary counselors?

2. How can teacher-counselor interpersonal relations be
   improved?

Both of these questions have implications for the topic which was under
investigation in this study.

In past attempts to answer these two questions, patterns in the
research undertaken can be discerned. Most of the research on teaching
experience for counselors has been of the survey type. Counselor
educators, counselors, school administrators, and teachers have been surveyed in regard to their opinions as to whether teaching experience should be required for counselors. Cohen (1961) feels that the position taken by the individuals who have been surveyed represent opinions formed on the basis of untested assumptions rather than on empirical data. Williamson (1939) and Barry and Wolf (1957) have emphasized that to date there is not enough empirical research to demonstrate the necessity of prior teaching experience for successful counseling.

Rochester and Cottingham in a 1964 survey of counselor educators listed the following reasons which were cited by counselor educators for favoring teaching experience for counselors:

1. Communication and relationships with teachers and administrators are more easily established if the counselor has taught; he is more likely to be "accepted" and morale problems involving status are reduced.

2. Teaching enriches the background of the counselor, giving him a first-hand awareness, and knowledge of classroom problems of pupils and teachers; this tends to prevent any aloofness or lack of confidence which might reduce effectiveness.

3. Teaching experience in the classroom is the best way to obtain an orientation and understanding of the total school as a social institution, this experiential model provides a realistic basis for working with all school personnel in a counseling capacity.

4. The counselor often helps students through non-counseling contacts, his broader function in the school community is more easily perceived and accomplished if he has taught.

5. Counselors need the practical experience of teaching to fully understand adolescents, their parents, and the community implications of school situations; this experience tends to keep their counseling from being too theoretically based.
6. Teaching experience provides a good opportunity to determine genuine identification with education as well as a chance to develop greater self-understanding and maturity.

7. An inexperienced person is not equipped to help teachers effectively; coming from other disciplines, counselors do not understand group behavior as it relates to classroom situations.

8. A teaching background gives a counselor a greater appreciation for the team approach in working with administrators and teachers; the independent specialist concept is unlikely to develop.

9. Since counseling is primarily a function to further the academic experience, teaching is the best way to provide an understanding of this adjunct role.

10. It is undesirable to dichotomize teaching and counseling; this takes away the guidance function of the classroom teacher.

11. To drop the experience requirement is to weaken the place of teaching and education in our society; administrators prefer experienced teachers if filling new positions in administration and counseling.

12. Teaching experience is required for state certification in guidance.

13. Teaching has proven to be a good source of counselors to date; potential counselors can be identified from the ranks of good teachers through observation and evaluation.

An important idea that can be gained from an examination of the thirteen statements favoring teaching experience for counselors is that several of the statements are predicated on a basic assumption that counselors who have taught can interact more readily with the teacher than counselors who have not taught.

This assumption that counselor teaching experience facilitates counselor-teacher interaction is tied to the second problem which is
related to the consultation role—"How can teacher-counselor interpersonal relations be improved?"

The recent publication of a book of case studies, *Discord in Teacher-Counselor Relations* by Kushel (1967) is indicative of a current need for research which focuses on the causes of teacher-counselor breakdowns in communication. In 1967 Nelson and Fredrickson surveyed six hundred secondary school counselors in Colorado and Massachusetts and asked "What specific questions would you like to have research 'answer' that would assist you in improving your performance as a school counselor?" From the responses received, "staff relationships" ranked third out of ten ranking with "counselor role" ranked first and "college placement" ranked second.

**Theoretical Framework**

It can be concluded from the discussion presented thus far that there is a movement under way in counselor education which places emphasis on the role of the elementary guidance counselor as a consultant to teachers. In this process of helping teachers create an optimum learning environment for each child, certain problems related to the interaction of counselor and teacher begin to arise.

Although many studies have been undertaken to ascertain teachers' perceptions of the counselor's role, the guidance and counseling literature is void of research relating to the counselor's beliefs about the teaching process.

Yet, counselor educators like McGehearty (1969) are continuing to place emphasis on counselor understanding of the teacher's viewpoint.
If he [the counselor-consultant] can see the world as the con­su­ltee [the teacher] sees it, think as the consu­ltee thinks, feel as the consu­ltee feels, he can—to some extent, at least--understand the problem better . . . . As he genu­inely attempts to see the world as it is perceived by each of the teachers with whom he is working he is aided in two major aspects. First he is better able to control his own professional and emotional reactions to possible destructive behavior on the part of the teacher. Second, the consultant begins to gain insight into how he can present new ideas to a particular consu­ltee in ways that will be heard from the individual's perceptual frame of reference. (1969, 218)

Aubrey (1967), in writing about the work of Lortie (1967), a leading sociologist interested in education from a sociological context, says that

One of the more cogent ob­ser­va­tions Lortie makes concerns what might be considered the sine quâ non of teaching, itself. If a teacher feels that the greatest reward in teaching comes from her effective communication with students, which in turn produces what she defines as learning (transitive-intrinsic rewards), might this not be true of counselors also? Is it not possible that counselors and teachers both receive maximum gratification through similar processes, but in different contexts? If so, then, might con­flict between teacher and counselor be traced to two sources?

First, teachers and counselors may disagree over criteria of success in learning . . . . Whereas teachers are mainly concerned with the mastery of subject-matter, knowledge of external bodies of information, counselors are primarily concerned with information about the self, knowledge of the internal, integrative processes that individuals work out in the context of their own unique life experiences.

A second source of conflict between teachers and counselors stems from the supposed intrusion of counselors upon the right of teachers to monitor their own work. (1967, 1018)

It is the first source of conflict outlined by Aubrey and based on the research of Lortie (to be discussed in Chapter II) along with the assumption projected by McGehearty that counselor understanding of the teacher's viewpoint enhances interpersonal relations between the counselor and the teacher which formed the theoretical base for this investigation.
Do counselors who have had teaching experience view the teaching process in the same light as teachers? Do counselors see the world as teachers see it? Do they think as teachers think? Feel as teachers feel? Are counselors and teachers in agreement about the emphasis placed on subject matter? Should subject matter be organized around student interests and needs? Is teacher control or student autonomy the first order of importance? Should a certain social distance be maintained between the teacher and the students? Are teacher warmth and personal support important to the teaching process? Should a high degree of order and decorum be present in the classroom? Should students constantly be challenged by tasks that are beyond their easy grasp? Should emphasis on meaning and understanding be considered more important than the acquisition of facts?

Statement of the Problem

Do counselors who are functioning in an elementary school setting and who have had teaching experience in the elementary school have the same beliefs about the teaching process as elementary teachers?

Definitions of Terms

Terms which were used in the investigation are defined below.

1. Elementary School Counselor--A person having professional preparation in elementary guidance and counseling, who has at least one year of elementary school teaching experience and who devotes full time to the counseling, consulting, and coordinating functions associated with an elementary school program serving children in grades K-6.
2. **Elementary School Teacher**--A person performing full-time instructional activities in a K-6 self-contained classroom.

3. **Beliefs**--Views about the teaching process which are held by elementary school counselors and teachers.

4. **Teaching Process**--Activities performed by the classroom teacher and which are operationally defined as the eight dimensions of the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument.

5. **Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument**--Instrument which measures the eight dimensions (defined below) of views of activities performed by the classroom teacher.

6. **Classroom Order Dimension of the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument**--Dimension which measures counselors' and teachers' beliefs about conducting the class according to established rules and procedures; quick punishment for those who depart from the rules; and the elimination of nonsense, noise, and distractions.

7. **Consideration of Student Viewpoint Dimension of the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument**--Dimension which measures counselors' and teachers' beliefs about empathy as an instructional strategy.

8. **Emotional Disengagement Dimension of the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument**--Dimension which measures counselors' and teachers' beliefs about the social distance between the teacher and the students.

9. **Integrative Learning Dimension of the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument**--Dimension which measures counselors' and teachers' beliefs about learning as the acquisition of meaning vs. the acquisition of facts.
10. **Personal Adjustment Ideology Dimension of the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument**—Dimension which measures counselors' and teachers' beliefs about whether the instructional process should be organized around student interests and needs in order to contribute to social and emotional development.

11. **Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Control Dimension of the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument**—Dimension which measures counselors' and teachers' beliefs about whether the locus of control over the classroom learning process lies with the teacher or with the students.

12. **Student Challenge Dimension of the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument**—Dimension which measures counselors' and teachers' beliefs about whether learning only occurs when students are working and working hard.

13. **Subject-Matter Emphasis Dimension of the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument**—Dimension which measures counselors' and teachers' beliefs about whether the subject-matter content of the course—the facts and information, skills, principles, and disciplines of thought—has educational value in and of itself.

**Hypotheses**

Each of the nine hypotheses tested in this study were analyzed in terms of the following counselor and teacher characteristics:

1. Years of elementary school classroom teaching experience of the counselor.

2. Years of elementary school counseling experience of the counselor.
3. Years of elementary school classroom teaching experience of the teacher.

The following hypotheses were tested in this study.

\(H_1\): There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Classroom Order Dimension of the teaching process.

\(H_2\): There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Consideration of Student Viewpoint Dimension of the teaching process.

\(H_3\): There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Emotional Disengagement Dimension of the teaching process.

\(H_4\): There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Integrative Learning Dimension of the teaching process.

\(H_5\): There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Personal Adjustment Ideology Dimension of the teaching process.

\(H_6\): There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience
and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the 
Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimension of the 
teaching process.

H7: There is no significant difference between elementary school 
counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience 
and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the 
Student Challenge Dimension of the teaching process.

H8: There is no significant difference between elementary school 
counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience 
and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the 
Subject-Matter Emphasis Dimension of the teaching process.

H9: There is no significant difference between elementary school 
counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience 
and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the 
teaching process.

Objectives

If the elementary school counselor is to be involved in the 
consultation of teachers as well as the counseling of students and if 
he is to become directly involved in the central stream of curriculum 
development, inevitably the counselor's duties will consist of translating 
human behavior principles into instructional methods, course content, 
and program design. Staff relationships, as evidenced by the research 
of Nelson and Fredrickson (1967) which was cited earlier, are already 
a major concern of the secondary school counselor. With the success 
of the elementary school counselor becoming more and more contingent 
upon effective working relationships with elementary teachers, research
needs to be undertaken which may give some clues and direction to communications barriers which may exist between the counselor and teacher as they both work to improve the learning climate for elementary school children.

The objectives of this study were:

1. To provide elementary teachers, elementary school counselors, pupil personnel services administrators, school administrators, counselor educators, and teacher educators with information on how elementary counselors and teachers view the learning climate of the classroom through an assessment of elementary counselors' and teachers' beliefs about the teaching process.

2. To provide data for making recommendations for content to be included in courses designed to help counselors-in-training understand the psychology-of-learning viewpoints manifested by classroom teachers.

3. To provide researchers with ideas for other research which should be conducted in relation to the role of the counselor as a consultant to teachers.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations were inherent in the study.

1. The Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument is a relatively new instrument. To date, few studies have been conducted which have used the instrument.

2. The response set of the test taker may have influenced the beliefs measured by the instrument.
3. Beliefs expressed on a paper and pencil instrument may not be an expression of how the teacher performs in a classroom situation.

4. The study was limited to twenty-nine elementary counselors and twenty elementary teachers in the Columbus, Ohio, Public Schools.

5. The teachers who participated in the study were randomly selected from schools employing elementary counselors.

**Summary**

The work of the elementary school counselor includes working directly with children in a counseling relationship and consulting with significant others in an attempt to provide an optimum learning climate for each child. Although the consulting role can involve counselor interaction with students, teachers, administrators, parents, or any combination of these subgroups, the focus of this investigation was related to the role of the elementary counselor as a consultant to teachers.

When the teacher and the counselor establish a consulting relationship it is often for the purpose of removing blocks to learning which may be present in the classroom. However, teachers and counselors may disagree over what constitutes an effective learning climate. It has generally been assumed that teachers are mainly concerned with the mastery of subject matter—knowledge of external bodies of information; whereas, counselors are primarily concerned with information about the self—knowledge of the internal, integrative processes that individuals work
out in the context of their own unique life experience.

This study tested the assumption that teachers and counselors have different criteria for effective classroom learning climate. An instrument designed to measure eight dimensions of beliefs about the teaching process was used to compare elementary counselors' and elementary teachers' views about the learning climate of the classroom.

In Chapter II a review of the literature related to this study is presented. Chapter III contains a discussion of the procedures used in: (1) selection of the samples from the counselor and teacher populations, (2) selection and administration of the data collection instruments, and (3) analysis and organization of the data. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter IV and Chapter V contains conclusions and recommendations based on the findings presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of the literature related to this study is organized according to the following topics:

1. The reward systems of teachers as these systems relate to counselors, and
2. Attitudes toward teaching
   a. As reflected by counselors, teachers, and administrators
   b. As a correlate of the nature of the subject matter taught
   c. As a correlate of the age, sex, training, and experience of teachers
   d. As evidenced in learner-centered and teacher-centered classrooms.

The Reward Systems of Teachers as These Systems Relate to Counselors

Lortie's (1967) research on the reward systems of teachers was based on the assumption that any type of work lends itself to three patterns of rewards: (1) extrinsic rewards--those rewards that are part of a given role and automatically transfer to the occupant of the role;
examples include prestige, money, and power; (2) ancillary rewards—those rewards which are also affixed to a given role and are relatively constant through time; examples include security, working conditions, and vacation periods; and (3) intrinsic rewards—those rewards which are subjective and which differ from one individual to another.

Aubrey (1967) says that teachers tend to take the ancillary rewards for granted; that lack of a hierarchical structure in both teaching and counseling makes extrinsic rewards equally meaningless unless the teacher or counselor is inclined toward an administrative post; and that the rewards of money, power, and prestige also readily evaporate once time and seniority equalize teachers and counselors. What remains is the intrinsic reward of teaching itself.

Aubrey's analysis of the rewards of teaching are substantiated by the research of Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) in which they indicated that enjoyment of work, pride in accomplishment, and fulfillment through an occupation, regardless of external recognition, still rank quite high among man's values.

Lortie's 1964 study of teachers in Dade County, Florida indicated that the area of intrinsic reward is selected by teachers as their main source of satisfaction in teaching. In the Dade County study it was found that the most important intrinsic reward centered around the transitive aspect of the teaching role. This transitive aspect was defined as "that intrinsic reward which arises when effective teacher interaction with students brings about student response that the teacher defines as learning." (Lortie, 1964, 20)
Asking the right question is as important to the research process as the gathering and analyzing of research data. Aubrey (1967) surveyed Lortie's Dade County findings and asked:

How does all of this affect counselors? . . . Is it inevitable that friction between teachers and counselors will arise whenever counselors intervene on behalf of students, evaluating pupils from a different frame of reference, questioning the competency of teachers, and perhaps, thwarting the intrinsic reward pattern held so dearly by teachers? Particularly in regard to the increased emphasis on elementary school counseling, do these issues seem in need of resolution. (Aubrey, 1967, 1019)

Out of this analysis Aubrey concluded that teachers' estimates of learning may be quite different from those of counselors.

In a study designed to determine whether the elementary counselor has a positive effect on teacher-pupil relations, an area which according to Lortie is important to teachers, Mayer, Kranzler, and Matthes (1967) concluded that:

The results of this study seem to indicate that an elementary school counselor who does counseling enhances teacher-pupil relations in "indirective" type of classrooms, while having little apparent effect on teacher-pupil relations in "directive" classrooms. In other words, the counselor's effect in teacher-pupil relations appears to depend on the type of classroom environment from which his counselees come. Replication of similar studies are needed to verify these findings. (Mayer, (Kranzler, and Matthes, 1967, 9)

**Attitudes Toward Teaching**

Although the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) measures more affectively-oriented dimensions of teacher views about the teaching process than the dimensions of teacher and counselor beliefs under investigation in this study, several past research studies involving the MTAI are relevant to this research study and have been included in this section.
Attitudes Toward Teaching Reflected by Counselors, Teachers, and Administrators

Beamer and Ledbetter (1957) examined the MTAI scores of various types of educational personnel. The subjects were 212 students enrolled in graduate courses at North Texas State College, subdivided into male and female, elementary and secondary school teachers, guidance workers, administrators, and inexperienced education majors. The higher the score on the MTAI the more the subject viewed the educative process as one in which a state of harmonious relations with pupils is maintained and the teacher-pupil relationship is characterized by mutual affection and sympathetic understanding.

Of the experienced personnel, Beamer and Ledbetter found that guidance workers (N=27) had the highest mean scores (84), and administrators the lowest (56). The inexperienced education majors (N=48) had a higher mean score than experienced teachers (N=164) -- 90 versus 70; female teachers (N=104) a higher mean score than male teachers (N=60) -- 76 versus 61; elementary teachers (N=87) a higher score than secondary teachers (N=54) -- 74 versus 70.

Attitudes Toward Teaching as a Correlate of the Nature of the Subject Matter Taught

Kearney and Rocchio (1955) studied the differences in MTAI scores between 587 elementary school teachers who taught all subjects to the same pupils (self-contained classrooms) and 52 teachers who taught different pupils in art, home economics, industrial arts, music, and physical education (specialist classrooms). The respective MTAI
scores for the two groups were 41 and 28, differing significantly at the 
.01 level. The investigators explained the findings as follows:

Teachers who have pupils for longer periods during the day are interested not only in the pupil's acquisition of subject matter, but also are concerned with the pupil's whole personality which demands knowledge of the pupil's home background, his physical and mental health, and his outside activities. On the other hand, teachers of "special" subjects think in terms of the subject matter to be covered rather than the development of a self-directing personality in their pupils. (Kearney and Rocchio, 1955, 359)

Ryans (1960) found that secondary teachers as a group tended to express educational viewpoints more toward the traditional, academic end of a scale and elementary teachers more toward the child-centered, permissive pole. This trend toward greater academic emphasis in the higher grades was observable even within the elementary school, Grade 7-8 teachers having the most traditional educational viewpoints and Grade 2 teachers having the most permissive viewpoints. In the secondary school, business education, mathematics, and physical science teachers tended to be more traditional in educational beliefs and values, while English and social studies teachers leaned toward liberal, permissive viewpoints. (Ryans, 1960, 152)

Callis (1950) examined the teacher-attitude scores of education juniors and seniors when the students were classified into three major curricular groupings: (1) early childhood education majors--nursery to elementary; (2) academic field majors; (3) special field majors--art, home economics, industrial, music, and physical education. He found significant differences among the three groups, with the early childhood education majors scoring highest and the special field majors scoring lowest in about the same magnitude both at the junior and senior levels.
Cook, Kearney, Rocchio, and Thompson (1956) conducted a study which investigated the relationship between MTAI scores and the amount of education of teachers. They reported that elementary school teachers with two years of college education (N-238) obtained a mean MTAI score of 21, those with four years (N-291) obtained a mean MTAI score of 51, those with five or more years (N-73) obtained a mean of 66; secondary school teachers with four years (N-287) obtained a mean of 52. Several interpretations of the results were offered, among which were: (1) the teachers with only two years of college may have realized they did not have teaching aptitude and discontinued their preparation; or (2) they may have been subjected to less comprehensive training in such things as child growth and development; or (3) teachers who acquire more college education may be a superior group to begin with; or (4) the superiority of the MTAI scores was directly affected by the increased richness of a full college education.

Beamer and Ledbetter (1957), in the same study cited earlier, reported MTAI data for elementary and secondary school teachers subdivided by years of teaching experience. In the elementary school group, teachers with over 15 years' experience (N-14) had the highest mean score (81), teachers with 2 to 5 years' experience (N-32) the lowest (69); in the secondary school group, teachers with one year of experience (N-10) had the highest mean score (69), teachers with from 2 to 5 years' experience (N-28) the lowest (60). Size of the system in which teachers work had no effect on MTAI scores. Number of hour credits in child development courses had no effect on Inventory scores.

Ryans (1960), however, produced findings which seem to be in
direct conflict with the results reported by Beamer and Ledbetter. Ryans found that elementary teachers with smaller amounts of teaching experience (up to four or five years) tended to express more permissive educational viewpoints, and those with ten years or more of teaching experience more traditional. On the secondary school level there was a definite tendency for teachers with experience beyond fifteen years to be more traditional in educational viewpoints. (Ryans, 1960, 152)

In the same study, Ryans found that there appeared to be no significant sex differences among teachers within the elementary school, men and women indicating viewpoints about equally inclined toward the permissive end of the continuum. At the secondary level, men teachers manifested more traditional educational viewpoints than did women teachers.

Ryans found that from the standpoint of age, teachers under 30 years of age, in both the elementary and secondary schools, appeared to be more liberal in their educational beliefs, and teachers over 45 years of age, at all levels, seemed to be the most traditional. (Ryans, 1960, 152)

Rocchio and Kearney (1956) also conducted a study which dealt with attitude change as a correlate of teacher training and experience. They asked the question, "Does a course in mental hygiene affect MTAI scores?" The subjects were 1,175 elementary and secondary school teachers representing 92 per cent of the personnel of a public school system in a large midwestern city. Each teacher completed the MTAI and indicated whether he had completed a recent course in mental hygiene. A statistically significant difference beyond the .01 level in MTAI
means was obtained between both elementary and secondary school teachers having the course and those not having the course.

However, when the upper 25 per cent of the MTAI distributions of the two groups were compared, no significant difference was found. That is, when the highest fourth of the MTAI distribution of teachers having a mental hygiene course and the highest fourth of the MTAI distribution of teachers not having a mental hygiene course were considered, the means were essentially the same.

**Attitudes Toward Teaching as Evidenced in Learner-Centered and Teacher-Centered Classrooms**

Anderson (1963), through an exhaustive review of the literature has compiled a resume of the authoritarian-democratic (teacher-centered versus learner-centered classroom climate) studies which were conducted in classroom settings. After completing the review he concluded that

Teacher-centered and learner-centered methods have been repetitiously investigated not because there were well conceived ideas as to how one would lead to superior learning, but merely to find out if one style was superior to the other. We were not fortunate enough to find that one method is consistently better than or even consistently different from the other; thus, we are now forced to explore new avenues. In short, the authoritarian-democratic construct, as far as education is concerned at least, has far outlived its usefulness either as a guide to research or as an interpretation of leadership behavior. (Anderson, 1963, 160)

In addition to Anderson's criticism of teacher-centered and learner-centered research studies, it might also be pointed out that often the criterion measures in these studies have been poorly defined. Generally, the criterion measure has been achievement scores on instrument items involving memorization and recall. "Types" of learning have
been given little consideration and often no differentiation has been made between cognitively and affectively oriented learning.

Anderson's resume indicates that some researchers claim superior learning for learner-centered groups (Allport, 1950; Bovard, 1952; Brandwein, 1955; Faw, 1949; Flanders, 1951; Neuman, 1957; Perkins, 1951; Peters, 1948; Sheldon and Landsman, 1950; Thompson, 1957; Zeleny, 1940).

In one of the early investigations, Zeleny (1940) conducted a series of five small experiments with college classes in sociology and found a slight advantage for learner-centered groups in each case. Faw (1949) showed that college students in non-directive groups learned more about psychology than did students in directive groups. Similarly, Allport (1950) reported that students in a college social relations course believed they learned more in permissive than in directive sections.

Perkins, (1951) recognized that "types" of learning as they related to teacher-versus learner-centered climate needed to be examined. He concluded that there was a close relationship between nearly all of the kinds of learning which were studied. His research involved six in-service teacher groups participating in an established program of child study. Teachers who ranked highest in expressions of child development concepts tended also to support their statements more fully and to show more real insight and sounder qualities of reasoning in the interpretation of behavior. An analysis of selected group meetings revealed that changes in group climate paralleled to a marked degree changes in group learning. It was found that drops in the level of group-centered climate was accompanied by corresponding drops in expression of child development concepts and in qualities of statement substantiation, insights, and
sound reasoning. Perkins concluded that

These findings emphasize conclusively that an individual's learning and development cannot be treated as a series of discrete and unrelated experiences. It is evident that the changes in the learner influence and are affected by the total experience. The part played by teacher-pupil relations is extremely significant, for to a greater extent these relations shape the climate of the classroom. Climate appears to be a key ingredient in interpersonal experience, for it will in a large measure determine the learning and satisfaction of emotional needs of groups, outcomes which provide a realization of some of the broader objectives of education. (Perkins, 1951, 119)

Flanders (1951) found that pupils taught by a learner-centered teacher showed superiority over the students of an autocratic teacher in the acquisition and retention of four principles of human relations. After observing three science classes under autocratic, laissez faire, and democratic conditions, Brandwein (1955) felt that students in the democratic situation learned more. A study of "non-directive" group therapy with students in academic difficulty (Sheldon and Landsman, 1950) shows marked superiority for the non-directive over the directive method. In the same vein, Neuman (1957) found that students who learned lists of words using their own techniques showed better recall than students directed to use a learning technique developed by a group of psychologists familiar with verbal learning research.

Bovard, employing carefully controlled experiments involving group and leader-centered processes, concluded that "the social interaction in the classroom will influence the individual student's perception, feelings, and interpersonal relations, and even his personality development." (Bovard, 1952, 539) This conclusion contrasts with some of the available experimental evidence that indicates where cognitively oriented variables such as learning of objective content are involved, a teacher-
versus learner-centered classroom climate has no discriminable effect.

Anderson pointed out that a number of investigations have found no difference between learner-centered and teacher-centered methods (Bills, 1952; Deignan, 1956; Eglash, 1954; Farquhar, 1955; Haigh and Schmidt, 1956; Landsman, 1950; McKeachie, 1951; Ostlund, 1956; Rasmussen, 1956; Rehage, 1951; Slomowitz, 1955; Smith and Johnson, 1952; Wispe, 1951). In a typical study, Wispe found no overall difference between groups on the objective part of a final examination in an introductory college course in social relations, but did find that students of low ability did better if taught by teacher-centered methods.

In Anderson's review he found eleven studies which reported greater learning for learner-centered groups, thirteen which showed no significant difference in learning between teacher-centered and learner-centered groups, and eight which found teacher-centered methods superior to learner-centered. Anderson pointed out that

Some writers, such as Bills, argue that despite—or because of—the failure to find a striking difference in regard to learning, we should prefer the learner-centered method because of its greater association with high morale and psychological well-being. (Anderson, 1963, 158)

Jenkins has espoused a theory which perhaps has great significance for counselors who are involved in helping teachers understand their own personal needs as these needs affect classroom climate. Jenkins has hypothesized that "both teachers and students contribute to classroom processes in proportion to the amount they are able to get their needs satisfied in the classroom situation." (Jenkins, 1951, 139)

Jenkins feels that the primary responsibility for seeing that the emotional needs in the classroom are dealt with is likely to fall on the
shoulders of the teacher. It may be largely up to him to see that the individual needs of the students are met. The teacher must also take major responsibility to see that the needs which he brings to the class are met or dealt with by the class. It will be largely up to the teacher to arrange his relationship with the class in such a manner that he can gain the desired satisfaction from it. In this type of classroom atmosphere the teacher would make his emotional needs known to the class so that they could be more effective in meeting his needs. Jenkins states that little is done to prepare students to deal with the needs of the teacher.

We attempt to train our teachers to become aware of the needs of the class as a working unit. And we occasionally attempt to help them learn how to meet these needs. But so far we almost totally deny the pupils in the classroom any training or insight into the necessity of making some attempt to meet the emotional needs of the teacher if they want to establish a good working relationship with him. Yet we put this requirement on our pupils beginning before the sixth year, and extend it as long as they remain in the classroom. (Jenkins, 1951, 140)

How the grading system is treated often can influence classroom climate. Rocchio and Kearney (1956) examined the relationship between the MTAT score and the rate at which teachers gave failing grades to pupils, using as subjects 395 secondary school teachers in a large midwestern city. Failure rates were found not to be significantly different for teachers within the academic (English, mathematics, science, social studies) or non-academic (arts and crafts, commercial, industrial arts and homemaking, music, physical education) classification of subject-matter fields. Nor was there a significant difference in mean failure rate by age within the academic and nonacademic categories, or for male and female teachers within each subject-matter classification.
When the teachers were separated into academic and nonacademic categories, and relationships between MTAI scores and failure rates analyzed, the correlation coefficients were found to be -.38 for the academic group and -.23 for the nonacademic group, both significant at the .01 level. Further, an examination of the correlation in each of the nine subjects for both male and female teachers shows that even though they are not all significant in the statistical sense, 15 of the 18 coefficients were in the same direction, i.e., there was a negative relationship between the MTAI score and the failure rate of the teachers.

The investigators concluded:

The high school teacher with undesirable teacher-pupil relations, who creates an atmosphere of fear and tension, and thinks in terms of the subject matter to be covered rather than in terms of what the pupils need, feel, know, and can do, is more likely to fail pupils than a teacher who is able to maintain harmonious relations with his pupils and who is interested in pupils as pupils. (Rocchio and Kearney, 1956, 252)

Deutsch designed a study which bears on the controversy over the relative merits and demerits of the cooperative and competitive grading systems.

Our results suggest that the inter-communication of ideas, the coordination of efforts, the friendliness and pride in one's group which are basic to group harmony and effectiveness appear to be disrupted when students see themselves to be competing for mutually exclusive goals. There is some indication that competitiveness produces greater personal insecurity (expectations of hostility from others) than does cooperation. In addition, it is evident that greater group productivity will result when members of a group are cooperative rather than competitive in their interrelationships. However, our study reveals no evidence to indicate that either the cooperative or competitive grading systems produces greater student interest or involvement in his work. Nor is there any evidence in this study that one rather than the other grading system results in greater learning. (Deutsch, 1951, 152)
Summary

Wehling (1969), the developer of the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument which was used in this study, recognized when he began developing the instrument that

It is not as though we were totally ignorant of teachers' views of the educative process. There is a long tradition of research on teacher attitudes, motivation, behavioral styles, and role perceptions that necessarily reveal something about the substance of belief systems. (Wehling, 1969, 7)

The research which has been cited relative to attitudes toward teaching is the research which relates most directly to the topic under investigation in this study. The few studies cited which included counselors is perhaps indicative of the fact that until recently the role of the counselor has not included direct involvement with the teaching process.

Directors of one of the few studies which investigated what kind of effect the elementary counselor has on teacher-pupil relations concluded that the counselor's effect on teacher-pupil relations appears to depend on the type of classroom environment from which his counselee comes. The school counselor enhances teacher-pupil relations in "indirective" type of classrooms, while having little effect on teacher-pupil relations in "directive" type classrooms.

When the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was administered to various education personnel it was found that counselors scored highest in the belief that the teacher-pupil relationship should be characterized by mutual affection and sympathetic understanding—inexperienced education majors, experienced teachers, and school administrators followed in rank order.
Elementary teachers who teach in self-contained classrooms seem to score higher on the MTAI than special subject matter elementary teachers. There is some evidence to show that secondary teachers as a group tend to express educational viewpoints which are toward the traditional, academic end of a scale with elementary teachers gravitating more toward the child-centered, permissive pole. This trend toward academic emphasis in the higher grades was also evident in the elementary school with Grade 7-8 teachers having the most traditional education viewpoints and Grade 2 teachers having the most permissive viewpoints.

There is conflicting evidence regarding length of teaching experience and teacher permissiveness. However, some studies reveal that both elementary and secondary teachers under thirty years of age appear more liberal in their educational beliefs and teachers over 45 hold more traditional viewpoints.

At the elementary school level the research evidence cited indicated that there is no significant difference between men and women teachers in their educational viewpoints. Both are inclined toward the permissive end of a permissive-academic-orientation continuum.

It cannot be said with any certainty that either teacher-centered or learner-centered methods are associated with greater learning. One reviewer discovered eleven studies which reported greater learning for learner-centered groups, thirteen studies which showed no significant difference in learning between teacher-centered and learner-centered groups, and eight which found teacher-centered methods superior to learner-centered. Some writers have indicated that the learner-
centered climate should be preferred because of its greater association with high morale and psychological well-being. After reading such recommendations one questions the worth of past research studies which have not considered affective outcomes as part of the total learning experiences of school children.

A discussion of the procedures used in: (1) selection of the samples from the counselor and teacher populations, (2) selection and administration of the data collection instruments, and (3) analysis and organization of the data, will be presented in Chapter III.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

The procedures used in this study will be discussed in terms of:

1. Population--Selection of the teacher and counselor samples and descriptive data on teacher and counselor samples.

2. Instruments and Their Administration--Development of the instruments, response format and scoring, and administration of the instruments.

3. Analysis and Organization of the Data--Selection of the statistical test, selection of the levels of significance, and the organization plan for data analysis.

Population

Sample Selection

Inherent in the selection of samples from the elementary school counselor population and the elementary classroom teacher population of the Columbus, Ohio, Public Schools was the problem that there was a larger population of teachers than counselors.

Because of the small population of counselors it was important that each of them was surveyed so that enough data could be obtained for
statistical analysis. According to Sax, "At times it may be reasonable and desirable to 'oversample' some element from one or more strata if that element occurs infrequently in the population." (Sax, 1968, 138) Such is the case with elementary counselors. Thus, the elementary school counselor population was oversampled because all 35 counselors in the Columbus Public Schools were included in the survey.

However, to have surveyed the entire population of elementary teachers would have been costly, time consuming, and unnecessary when an unbiased, random sample of the population could be selected. Teachers participating in this study were randomly selected from a list of all full-time Columbus Public Schools' elementary teachers who were teaching in schools where elementary counselors were employed. This random selection of teachers allowed for an unbiased sample of the elementary teacher population and according to Sax, "unbiased statistics neither underestimate nor overestimate parameters." (Sax, 1968, 131)

It was anticipated that a larger percentage of counselors than teachers would choose to participate in the study so instruments were mailed to a larger sample of teachers (40) than counselors (35). This projection that a larger percentage of counselors than teachers would return the instruments was hypothesized because three appeals were made to counselors which may have caused them to feel a professional obligation to participate in the study:

1. The cover letter attached to those instruments which were mailed to counselors (See Appendix E) contained the following statement: "You are probably aware that the supply of elementary school counselors is limited. Thus
your assistance is very important to the success of the research we are conducting."

2. Names of two Ohio State University counselor educators who were well known to the majority of counselors were used in the cover letters which were sent to teachers and counselors.

3. Respondents were requested to return the instruments to The Ohio State University Guidance and Counseling Office.

Twenty-nine of the 35 counselors and 24 of the 40 teachers who were surveyed returned the completed instruments. All of the instruments which were returned by counselors were usable but four of the instruments returned by teachers had to be removed from the sample because some item responses had been omitted. The rate of usable returns from among those who were surveyed was 82.9% for counselors and 50% for teachers.

Descriptive Data on Counselor and Teacher Samples

Tables 1, 2, and 3 contain data which further describe the counselors and teachers who participated in the study. Data in Tables 1 and 2 are presented for the total N of counselors and teachers. Table 3 contains data on six subgroups--2 subgroups of teachers and 4 subgroups of counselors. These 6 subgroups were formed on the basis of counseling and teaching experience:

1. Less than 5 years of teaching experience/No counseling experience (N = 13)

2. 5 or more years of teaching experience/No counseling experience (N = 7)
3. Less than 5 years of teaching experience/Less than 1 year of counseling experience (N = 7)

4. 5 or more years of teaching experience/Less than 1 year of counseling experience (N = 7)

5. Less than 5 years of teaching experience/1 or more years of counseling experience (N = 7)

6. 5 or more years of teaching experience/1 or more years of counseling experience (N = 8)

The data in Table 1 reveals that the mean age of counselors was 34.6 years and the mean age of teachers was 30.0. The median age of counselors was 33.0 and the median age of teachers was 25.0. An examination of the percentage of counselors and the percentage of teachers under 30 years of age shows that 80% of the teachers and 34.5% of the counselors were less than 30. The data on mean age, median age, and percent of respondents under 30 years of age reveals that greater extremes in age existed in the sample of teachers than in the sample of counselors.

Counselors attended a greater number of academic institutions (2.3) than teachers (1.6) and 89.7% of the counselors versus 5.0% of the teachers had obtained a Master's Degree. Perhaps the high percentage of counselors who had Master's Degrees was a reflection of counselor certification requirements. A high percentage of both counselors and teachers (79.3% versus 60.0%) had attended The Ohio State University and 65.5% of the counselors and 45.0% of the teachers had an earned degree from Ohio State.
TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF
DESCRIPTIVE DATA ON COUNSELORS' AND TEACHERS' AGE AND ACADEMIC PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Counselors</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=29</td>
<td>N=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents under 30 years of age (%)</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of academic institutions attended</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents having attended The Ohio State University (%)</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents having received a degree from The Ohio State University (%)</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of degrees completed</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents having a Master's Degree (%)</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean quarter hours of guidance and counseling courses completed by teachers</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers who have taken one or more guidance and counseling courses (%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers had completed a mean of 1.3 quarter hours of guidance and counseling courses with 40.0% of the teachers having completed one or more guidance and counseling courses. None of the teachers had completed more than 5 quarter hours of guidance and counseling courses.

Data in Table 2 reveals that counselors and teachers were nearly equal in amount of teaching experience. Counselors had taught a mean of 6.2 years and teachers had taught a mean of 6.6. The mean grade level currently being taught by teachers was 3.3. Forty per cent of the teachers were teaching in grades K - 3 and 60.0% were teaching in grades 4 - 6.

Sixty-five per cent of the teachers had less than 5 years of teaching experience and no counseling experience and 35% of the teachers had 5 or more years of teaching experience and no counseling experience.

Of the 20 counselors surveyed, 24.2% had less than 5 years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience and 24.2% had 5 or more years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience. This indicates that approximately one-half of the counselors were in their first year of counseling. The remaining counselors in the sample had 1 or more years of counseling experience and were fairly evenly divided between the categories of less than 5 years of teaching experience (24.2%) and 5 or more years of teaching experience (27.4%).

Table 3 contains the descriptive data on the 6 subgroups of teachers and counselors. Only that data in Table 3 which shows important similarities or differences among the subgroups and which was not presented in the analysis of Tables 1 and 2 data will be discussed.
### TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF
DESCRIPTIVE DATA ON COUNSELORS' AND TEACHERS' COUNSELING AND TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Counselors N=29</th>
<th>Teachers N=20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of teaching experience</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of counseling experience</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean grade level currently being taught</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents teaching in grades K-3 (%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents teaching in grades 4-6 (%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years of teaching experience and no counseling experience</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or more of teaching experience and no counseling experience</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years of more of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or more of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or more of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less 5 yrs.</td>
<td>5 yrs. or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teach. No.</td>
<td>teach./No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N=13</strong></td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N=7</strong></td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Age</strong></td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents under 30 yrs.</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Respondents under 30 yrs.)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean no. of academic inst.</strong></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attended</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents attended Univ.</strong></td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio State University (%)</strong></td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents received degree</strong></td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>from Ohio State Univ. (%)</strong></td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean number of degrees completed (%)</strong></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents with a Master's Degree (%)</strong></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean quarter hours of guidance and counseling courses completed by teachers</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers who have taken one or more guidance and counsel. courses (%)</strong></td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean years of teaching experience</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean years of counseling experience</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean grade level currently teaching</strong></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents teach. in grades K-3 (%)</strong></td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents teach. in grades 4-6 (%)</strong></td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean age of teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience and the mean age of counselors with 5 or more years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience (the category of teachers and the category of counselors which represent the most years of school employment) was the same—41.6 years.

In 2 of the 4 counselor subgroups, the subgroups with 1 or more years of counseling experience, 100% of the respondents had a Master's Degree. Only 55.6% of the counselors with less than 5 years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience and 85.6% of the counselors with 5 or more years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience had completed a Master's Degree.

When the teacher and counselor subgroups which indicate less than 5 years of teaching experience are examined, the data indicate that teachers had a mean of 1.2 years and counselors had a mean of 3.1 years of teaching experience.

The subgroup of teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience and the subgroup of teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience had approximately the same percentage of teachers who taught in grades K-3—30.8% versus 28.6%. The remaining teachers in each subgroup taught in grades 4-6. The mean grade level currently being taught by teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience was 2.5. Teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience were teaching at a mean grade level of 3.7.
Instruments and Their Administration

Development of Instruments

Two types of instruments were used in this study: (1) Investigator-designed personal data sheets were used to collect data on each of the counselors and teachers participating in the study (See Appendices A and B), and (2) the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument (See Appendix C) designed by Leslie J. Wehling was used to measure counselor and teacher beliefs about the teaching process.

Oral permission to use the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument (BATPI) was received from Dr. Wehling.

The BATPI was developed by Wehling as part of his doctoral studies at Washington University. His interest was directed toward isolating dimensions of beliefs about the educative process. Wehling and Charters (1969) in writing about the BATPI noted that while the domain tapped by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) is similar to the one tapped by the BATPI, the design of the BATPI departs from the MTAI in three important ways.

First, the MTAI stresses the affective or evaluative components of teacher attitudes, whereas item construction here sought to emphasize cognitive aspects. Second, the MTAI measures a dimension thought to distinguish effective from ineffective teachers, or good teaching from poor teaching. The present investigators did not attempt to formulate dimensions within the framework of their relevance for teacher effectiveness. The third lies in the departure from the notion that the maximum explanatory power is attained from variations along a single continuum—autocratic versus democratic, pupil-centered versus teacher-centered, and the like. The findings of this investigation indicate that conceptual systems are complex organizations of beliefs, consisting of several discrete sets of inter-related concepts. (Wehling and Charters, 1969, 8)
The eight dimensions which Wehling isolated evolved from a succession of studies which entailed cycles of questionnaire administration, factor analyses, item revision and writing, and re-administration of questionnaires. Wehling began work on the instrument in 1962 and completed his work in 1964. Except for the very first questionnaire containing forced-choice items, all items had a Likert-type format with either five or six response alternatives ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree."

Wehling reported that analyses of the responses were made according to the following procedures:

For purposes of the factor analyses, intercorrelation matrices were obtained by assigning cardinal numbers to the response alternatives of the items and computing product-moment correlations between them. Factoring followed computer-programmed principal axis analyses, and factor matrices were rotated either orthogonally (Varimax) or obliquely (Oblimax) and sometimes both ways. (Wehling and Charters, 1969, 9)

Eight tryouts and revisions of the instrument were conducted. For the most part the respondents were classroom teachers recruited from school systems in the central midwest, although some administrators and persons engaged in apprentice teaching were included in some populations.

A special effort was made in the January, 1964, study to obtain wide diversity among the 291 respondents with regard to such characteristics as age and sex, teaching level, private vs. urban location of the school, and so on, following the principal that heterogeneity is a more critical population feature for factor analytic studies than representativeness. (Wehling and Charters, 1969, 10)

When Wehling completed his work on the instrument he had isolated 8 dimensions which measure Beliefs About the Teaching Process: Classroom
Order, Consideration of Student Viewpoint, Emotional Disengagement, Integrative Learning, Personal Adjustment, Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction, Student Challenge, and Subject Matter Emphasis.

Response Format and Scoring

The instrument used in this study had a Likert-type answer format with 5 response alternatives. The respondents were asked to choose 1 of 5 answers for each item: (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Undecided, (4) Disagree, and (5) Strongly Disagree. A directional answer was established for each item. The criteria for selecting the directional answer were based on whether the "Strongly Agree" or whether the "Strongly Disagree" answer was the more student centered. The more student-centered response was given a weight of 5. The two examples shown below illustrate how the items were scored once the directional answer was established. The directional answer for each item is underscored.

Item 9. In the interest of good discipline pupils who repeatedly disrupt the class must be severely punished.

1 2 3 4 5
SA A U D SD

Item 23. Children learn best in an atmosphere filled with love and emotional support.

5 4 3 2 1
SA A U D SD

Appendix C contains the directional answer for each instrument item.

Administration of the Instruments

On December 3, 1969 the data collection instruments were mailed to participants along with a cover letter which requested that the completed instruments be returned to The Ohio State University Guidance and Counseling
Office by December 15, 1969. Two cover letters—one for teachers and one for counselors—were used. These cover letter are found in Appendices E and F.

Analysis and Organization of the Data

The Fisher Exact Probability Test was used to test each of the 9 hypotheses listed in Chapter 1. The total N of teachers was compared with the total N of counselors in order to test the hypotheses. In addition, 15 subgroup comparisons were made on each hypothesis. The subgroup comparisons which were made are listed in Figure 1.

Siegel (1956) has aptly described the function of the Fisher Exact Probability Test.

The Fisher exact probability test is an extremely useful nonparametric technique for analyzing discrete data (either nominal or ordinal) when the two independent samples are small in size. It is used when the scores from two independent random samples all fall into one or the other of two mutually exclusive classes. In other words, every subject in both groups obtains one of two possible scores. The scores are represented by frequencies in a 2 x 2 contingency table, like the one shown below. Groups I and II might be any two independent groups, such as experimental and controls . . . The column headings, here arbitrarily indicated as plus and minus, may be any two classifications: above and below the median, passed and failed . . . The test determines whether the two groups differ in the proportion with which they fall into the two classifications. For the data in the table shown below (where A, B, C, and D stand for frequencies) it would determine whether Group I and Group II differ significantly in the proportion of pluses and minuses attributed to them.

2 x 2 Contingency Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A + B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C + D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>A + C</td>
<td>B + D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Siegel, 1956, 96-97)
### FIGURE 1

**SUBGROUPS WHICH WERE COMPARED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup Code</th>
<th>Comparisons Made (By Subgroup Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 5 years of teaching experience/No counseling experience (N=13)</td>
<td>1 with 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5 or more years of teaching experience/No counseling experience (N=7)</td>
<td>1 with 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Less than 5 years of teaching experience/ Less than 1 year of counseling experience (N=7)</td>
<td>1 with 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 5 or more years of teaching experience/ Less than 1 year of counseling experience (N=7)</td>
<td>2 with 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Less than 5 years of teaching experience/ 1 or more years of counseling experience (N=7)</td>
<td>2 with 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 5 or more years of teaching experience/ 1 or more years of counseling experience (N=8)</td>
<td>3 with 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 with 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 with 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 with 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 and 2 with 3, 4, 5, and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 with 3 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 with 4 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 with 4 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 with 3 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 and 5 with 4 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 and 4 with 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contingency tables like the one illustrated above were established for each of the comparisons that were made in this study. However, figures in the first column in each of the contingency tables represented the number of scores which fell below the range mean for the groups being compared.

The Fisher test was used in this study because all of the conditions for using the test as outlined by Siegel (independent samples, ordinal data, small samples, etc.) were present in this study. Some of the frequencies in the $2 \times 2$ contingency table cells were less than 5 and Siegel stresses that the Fisher test rather than Chi Square should be used when this occurs. (Siegel, 1956, 110)

**Levels of Significance**

The .01 and .05 levels of significance were used for the Fisher test. The significance of an observed set of values in the $2 \times 2$ contingency tables was determined by consulting "Table I. Table of Critical Values of D (or C) in the Fisher Test" found in Siegel's *Non-Parametric Statistics.* (1956, 266-270)

Sax says that

For research purposes, it is necessary to specify the level of significance that the investigator is willing to accept to incorrectly reject the null hypotheses. If he should adopt the .05 level of significance, then 5 times out of 100 he will incorrectly reject the null hypothesis when in fact the observations come from a single universe. Incorrectly rejecting the null hypothesis is called a Type I error. The risk of making this type of error can be reduced by specifying a more stringent level of significance (such as the .01 level). (Sax, 1968, 419)

The problem is that by reducing Type I errors, the probability of committing a Type II error (not rejecting the null hypothesis when,
in fact, observations do come from different populations) is increased. Therefore, the investigator, following the current practices of educational researchers, reported findings at both the .01 and .05 levels of significance.

**Organization of the Data**

The total N of teachers and the total N of counselors were compared in order to determine whether each of the 9 hypotheses should be rejected or should not be rejected. Fifteen subgroup comparisons as shown in Figure 1 were then made on each hypothesis to determine whether any identifiable subgroups of the counselor and teacher population differed significantly.

**Summary**

An instrument designed to measure beliefs about the teaching process was mailed to 35 elementary school counselors, the entire population of elementary school counselors in the Columbus, Ohio, Public Schools, and 40 teachers who were selected at random from a list of all full-time elementary school teachers in the Columbus Schools who were teaching in schools where elementary counselors were employed. Useable instruments were returned by 82.9% of the counselors and 50% of the teachers.

The Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument, the instrument used in the study, was developed by Leslie J. Wehling as part of his doctoral work at Washington University. The instrument measures 8 dimensions of beliefs about the teaching process: Classroom Order, Consideration of Student Viewpoint, Emotional Disengagement, Integrative Learning, Personal Adjustment, Student Autonomy, Student Challenge, and Subject Matter Emphasis.
Six subgroups--2 subgroups of teachers and 4 subgroups of counselors--were formed on the basis of counseling and teaching experience. Comparisons of various combinations of these subgroups were made on each instrument dimension and on a composite instrument score to determine whether counselors and teachers differed in their beliefs about the teaching process. The Fisher Exact Probability Test was used on each comparison to determine whether the groups being compared differed at the .01 and .05 levels of significance.

The findings of the study will be presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The findings related to the 9 hypotheses of the study are presented in this chapter. Counselors and teachers were compared on their beliefs about the teaching process as measured by the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument (BATPI). The BATPI measured 8 dimensions of beliefs: Classroom Order, Consideration of Student Viewpoint, Emotional Disengagement, Integrative Learning, Personal Adjustment, Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction, Student Challenge, and Subject Matter Emphasis.

Sixteen comparisons involving various combinations of teacher and counselor groups were made on the 8 dimensions and on a composite score for all 8 dimensions. The 9 hypotheses of the study paralleled the 8 dimensions and the composite score on all 8 dimensions.

One of the 16 comparisons involved the comparing of the total N of teachers with the total N of counselors. It was this comparison which formed the basis for rejecting or not rejecting the 9 hypotheses. However, in order to determine whether any identifiable subgroups of the counselor and teacher population differed significantly, 15 subgroup comparisons were made. The subgroups involved in the 15 comparisons
were all formed on the basis of counseling and teaching experience.

This chapter is organized so that the comparison involving the total N of teachers with the total N of counselors will be presented first. The 9 hypotheses will be stated and the findings related to each hypothesis will be presented. Each hypothesis will be rejected or not rejected on the basis of the total N of teachers and total N of counselors comparison.

After the findings have been presented for the comparison of total N of teachers with the total N of counselors, the findings will then be presented for the 15 subgroup comparisons.

The Fisher Exact Probability Test was used to test each hypothesis. In order to apply the Fisher Exact Probability Test, contingency tables were established for each comparison. Figures in the first column of the contingency tables represented the number of scores which fell below the range mean for the groups being compared. Figures in the second column represented the number of scores which fell above the range mean for the groups being compared. All necessary data for constructing the contingency tables are found in Appendix G.

For example, data needed to construct the contingency table on the Classroom Order Dimension for comparing teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience and no counseling experience with counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience (L5T/NC with L5T/1MC) are found in Table 5 of Appendix G:
Significance was determined by consulting "Table I. Table of Critical Values of D (or C) in the Fisher Test" found in Siegel's Non-Parametric Statistics. (1956, 266-270)

When two or more groups were combined in order to make a comparison, the entries in the contingency table were determined by adding entries from the appropriate table in Appendix G for the groups which were combined. For example, the contingency table on the Classroom Order Dimension for comparing teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience and no counseling experience with counselors who had 5 years or less of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience and counselors who have had less than 5 years of teaching experience and more than 1 year of counseling experience (L5T/NC with L5T/L1C and L5T/1MC) is illustrated by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N &lt; \bar{x}</th>
<th>N &gt; \bar{x}</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C &amp; L5T/1MC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12   15   27

Table 4 contains data on all the comparisons which were used to test the hypotheses of the study. Data in Table 4 are reported at the .01 and .05 levels of significance. A dash (- -) following each
comparison indicates that no significant differences existed at the .01 or .05 levels.

Figure 2 explains the symbols used in Table 4 for the 6 counselor and teacher groups.

Hypotheses of the Study

H$_1$: There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Classroom Order Dimension of the teaching process. This dimension measured counselors' and teachers' beliefs about conducting the class according to established rules and procedures; quick punishment for those who depart from the rules; and the elimination of nonsense, noise, and distractions.

When all teachers were compared with all counselors (L5T/NC and 5MT/NC with L5T/L1C, 5MT/L1C, L5T/1MC, and 5MT/1MC) there was a significant difference between teachers and counselors at the .01 level with counselors scoring higher than teachers.$^1$ Thus, H$_1$ was rejected.

H$_2$: There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Consideration of Student Viewpoint Dimension of the teaching process. This dimension measured counselors' and teachers' beliefs about empathy as an instructional strategy.

When all teachers were compared with all counselors (L5T/NC and 5MT/NC with L5T/L1C, 5MT/L1C, L5T/1MC, and 5MT/1MC) there was no

$^1$The higher the score the more student centered the belief.
FIGURE 2
SYMBOLS USED FOR SIX COUNSELOR AND TEACHER SUBGROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC:</td>
<td>Less than 5 years of teaching experience/No counseling experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC:</td>
<td>5 or more years of teaching experience/No counseling experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C:</td>
<td>Less than 5 years of teaching experience/Less than 1 year of counseling experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/L1C:</td>
<td>5 or more years of teaching experience/Less than 1 year of counseling experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/1MC:</td>
<td>Less than 5 years of teaching experience/1 or more years of counseling experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/1MC:</td>
<td>5 or more years of teaching experience/1 or more years of counseling experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 4**

FISHER EXACT PROBABILITY TEST OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS' AND COUNSELORS' BELIEFS ABOUT THE TEACHING PROCESS ANALYZED BY DIMENSION AND COMPOSITE SCORE ON ALL DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC with 5MT/NC</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC with L5T/L1C</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC with L5T/1MC</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC with 5MT/L1C</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC with 5MT/1MC</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C with 5MT/L1C</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C with L5T/1MC</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/L1C with 5MT/1MC</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/1MC with 5MT/1MC</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC with 5MT/L1C &amp; 5MT/1MC</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC with L5T/L1C &amp; L5T/1MC</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC with L5T/L1C &amp; L5T/1MC</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC with 5MT/L1C and 5MT/1MC</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C and L5T/1MC with</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/L1C and 5MT/1MC</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C and 5MT/L1C with</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/1MC and 5MT/1MC</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC and 5MT/NC with L5T/L1C, 5MT/L1C, L5T/1MC, &amp; 5MT/1MC</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significant difference at the .01 or .05 levels. Both counselors and teachers scored low on the Consideration of Student Viewpoint Dimension. Thus $H_2$ could not be rejected.

$H_3$: There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Emotional Disengagement Dimension of the teaching process. This dimension measured counselors' and teachers' beliefs about the social distance between the teacher and the students.

When all teachers were compared with all counselors (L5T/NC and 5MT/NC with L5T/L1C, 5MT/L1C, L5T/1MC, and 5MT/1MC) there was no significant difference at the .01 or .05 levels. Both counselors and teachers scored high on the Emotional Disengagement Dimension. Thus $H_3$ could not be rejected.

$H_4$: There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Integrative Learning Dimension of the teaching process. This dimension measured counselors' and teachers' beliefs about learning as the acquisition of meaning vs. the acquisition of facts.

When all teachers were compared with all counselors (L5T/NC and 5MT/NC with L5T/L1C, L5T/1MC, and 5MT/1MC) there was no significant difference at the .01 or .05 levels. Both counselors and teachers scored low on the Integrative Learning Dimension. Thus $H_4$ could not be rejected.
H₅: There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Personal Adjustment Ideology Dimension of the teaching process. This dimension measured counselors' and teachers' beliefs about whether the instructional process should be organized around student interests and needs in order to contribute to social and emotional development.

When all teachers were compared with all counselors (L5T/NC and 5MT/NC with L5T/L1C, 5MT/L1C, L5T/1MC, and 5MT/1MC) there was no significant difference at the .01 or .05 levels. Both counselors and teachers scored low on the Personal Adjustment Dimension. Thus H₅ could not be rejected.

H₆: There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimension of the teaching process. This dimension measured counselors' and teachers' beliefs about whether the locus of control over the classroom learning process lies with the teacher or with the student.

When all teachers were compared with all counselors (L5T/NC and 5MT/NC with L5T/L1C, 5MT/L1C, L5T/1MC, and 5MT/1MC) there was a significant difference between teachers and counselors at the .01 level with counselors scoring higher than teachers. Thus H₆ was rejected.
H7: There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Student Challenge Dimension of the teaching process. This dimension measured counselors' and teachers' beliefs about whether learning only occurs when students are working and working hard.

When all teachers were compared with all counselors (L5T/NC and 5MT/NC with L5T/L1C, 5MT/L1C, L5T/1MC, and 5MT/1MC) there was no significant difference at the .01 or .05 levels. Both counselors and teachers scored low on the Student Challenge Dimension. Thus H7 could not be rejected.

H8: There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the Subject Matter Emphasis Dimension of the teaching process. This dimension measured counselors' and teachers' beliefs about whether the subject matter content of the course--the facts and information, skills, principles, and disciplines of thought--has educational value in and of itself.

When all teachers were compared with all counselors (L5T/NC and 5MT/NC with L5T/L1C, 5MT/L1C, L5T/1MC, and 5MT/1MC) there was a significant difference between teachers and counselors at the .01 level with counselors scoring higher than teachers. Thus H8 was rejected.

H9: There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the teaching process.
When the composite score on all 8 dimensions for all teachers was compared with the composite score on all 8 dimensions for all counselors (L5T/NC and 5MT/NC with L5T/L1C, 5MT/L1C, L5T/LMC, and 5MT/LMC) there was a significant difference between teachers and counselors at the .01 level with counselors scoring higher than teachers. Thus H9 was rejected.

Summary

When all of the teachers were compared with all of the counselors significant differences at the .01 level occurred on the following dimensions:

Classroom Order (H1)
Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction (H6)
Subject Matter Emphasis (H8)

Hypotheses 1, 6, and 8 were thus rejected. Counselors scored higher than teachers on each of these 3 dimensions.

When all of the teachers were compared with all of the counselors no significant differences occurred on the following dimensions:

Consideration of Student Viewpoint (H2)
Emotional Disengagement (H3)
Integrative Learning (H4)
Personal Adjustment (H5)
Student Challenge (H7)

Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 could not be rejected.

When the composite scores on all 8 dimensions for all teachers were compared with the composite scores on all 8 dimensions for all
counselors there was a significant difference between teachers and counselors at the .01 level with counselors scoring higher than teachers. Thus $H_9$ which stated that there was no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the teaching process was rejected.

Analysis of Hypotheses by Counselor and Teacher Subgroups

Fifteen comparisons involving various combinations of subgroups of counselors and teachers were made on each hypothesis. Subgroups were formed on the basis of counseling and teaching experience. This analysis by subgroups was done in order to determine whether any identifiable subgroups of the counselor and teacher population differed significantly.

Subgroup Comparisons

Comparison 1. Teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience and no counseling experience with teachers who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and no counseling experience (L5T/NC with 5MT/NC).

There were no significant differences between these subgroups on any of the dimensions or on the composite score. This finding indicates that when teachers were compared on the basis of teaching experience no significant differences occurred.

Comparison 2. Teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience and no counseling experience with counselors who had less
than 5 years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience (L5T/NC with L5T/L1C).

There was a significant difference between Comparison 2 subgroups at the .05 level on the Classroom Order Dimension and at the .01 level on the Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimension. When the composite scores on all 8 dimensions were compared, there was a significant difference between the Comparison 2 subgroups at the .05 level. In each case, counselors scored higher than teachers.¹

These findings indicate that beginning counselors (those with less than 1 year of counseling experience) who have had less than 5 years of teaching experience differ with teachers who have had less than 5 years of teaching experience in their beliefs about classroom order and student autonomy vs. teacher direction.

Comparison 3 will give added insight to differences which exist between counselors and teachers who have less than 5 years of teaching experience.

There were no significant differences between Comparison 2 subgroups on the Consideration of Student Viewpoint, Emotional Disengagement, Integrative Learning, Personal Adjustment, Student Challenge, and Subject Matter Emphasis Dimensions.

Comparison 3. Teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience and no counseling experience with counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience (L5T/NC with L5T/LMC).

¹Throughout the subgroup comparisons, when significant differences appeared, counselors scored higher than teachers.
There was a significant difference between Comparison 3 subgroups at the .05 level on the Classroom Order Dimension and the Subject Matter Emphasis Dimension and at the .01 level on the Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimension. When the composite scores on all 8 dimensions were compared, there was a significant difference between Comparison 3 subgroups at the .05 level. In each case, counselors scored higher than teachers.

The differences which appeared in Comparison 2 when beginning counselors with less than 5 years of teaching experience were compared with teachers who had less than 5 years of teaching experience appeared again in Comparison 3 when counselors who had 1 or more years of counseling experience and less than 5 years of teaching experience were compared with teachers who had less than 5 years of teaching experience. This indicates that on the Classroom Order Dimension and Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimensions significant differences occurred between teachers who had less than 5 years of teaching experience and counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience—regardless of length of counseling experience.

On Comparison 2 no significant differences occurred on the Subject Matter Emphasis Dimension when beginning counselors with less than 5 years of teaching experience were compared with teachers who had less than 5 years of teaching experience. However, on Comparison 3 when counselors who had 1 or more years of counseling experience and less than 5 years of teaching experience were compared on the Subject Matter Emphasis Dimension, a significant difference at the .05 level appeared. Thus, when teaching experience was equated but counseling
experience was increased, less emphasis was placed on subject matter as having value in and of itself.

There were no significant differences between Comparison 3 subgroups on the Consideration of Student Viewpoint, Emotional Disengagement, Integrative Learning, Personal Adjustment, and Student Challenge Dimensions.

Comparison 4. Teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience and no counseling experience with counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience (5MT/NC with 5MT/L1C).

There was a significant difference between Comparison 4 subgroups at the .05 level on the Emotional Disengagement Dimension. There were no significant differences between Comparison 4 subgroups on the other 8 dimensions or on the composite score for all 8 dimensions.

The significant difference which occurred on the Emotional Disengagement Dimension will be discussed in the analysis of Comparison 5.

Comparison 5. Teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience and no counseling experience with counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience. (5MT/NC with 5MT/1MC)

There were no significant differences between Comparison 5 subgroups on any of the 8 dimensions but there was a significant difference at the .01 level on the composite scores for all 8 dimensions.

On Comparison 4 when beginning counselors with 5 or more years of teaching experience were compared with teachers who had 5 or more years of teaching experience a significant difference occurred on the
Emotional Disengagement Dimension at the .05 level. However, on Comparison 5 when counselors with 1 or more years of counseling experience and 5 or more years of teaching experience were compared with teachers who had 5 or more years of teaching experience, no significant differences occurred.

This finding simply says that when the beginning counselors with 5 or more years of teaching experience were compared with teachers who had 5 or more years of teaching experience the beginning counselors were less likely to feel that social distance from students must be maintained. Even though there was no significant difference when counselors with 1 or more years of counseling experience and 5 or more years of teaching experience were compared with teachers who had 5 or more years of teaching experience it cannot be said that counseling experience affects beliefs about social distance from students. Comparison 8, a comparison of counselors with less than 1 year of counseling experience and 5 or more years of teaching experience with counselors who had 1 or more years of counseling experience and 5 or more years of teaching experience, revealed no significant differences between these groups and thus illustrates the fact that counseling experience is not significantly related to the Emotional Disengagement Dimension.

Comparison 6. Counselors with less than 5 years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience with counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience (L5T/L1C with 5MT/L1C).

There were no significant differences between Comparison 6 subgroups on any of the 8 dimensions or on the composite scores for all 8 dimensions.
Comparison 7. Counselors with less than 5 years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience with counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience (L5T/L1C with L5T/1MC).

There were no significant differences between Comparison 7 subgroups on any of the 8 dimensions or on the composite scores for all 8 dimensions.

Comparison 8. Counselors with 5 or more years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience with counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience (5MT/L1C with 5MT/1MC).

There were no significant differences between Comparison 8 subgroups on any of the 8 dimensions or on the composite scores for all 8 dimensions.

Comparison 9. Counselors with less than 5 years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience with counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience (L5T/1MC with 5MT/1MC).

There were no significant differences between Comparison 9 subgroups on any of the 8 dimensions or on the composite scores for all 8 dimensions.

Comparison 10. Teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience and no counseling experience with counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience and counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience (L5T/NC with L5T/L1C and L5T/1MC).
There were significant differences between Comparison 10 subgroups at the .01 level on the Classroom Order and Student Autonomy Dimensions and at the .05 level on the Emotional Disengagement and Subject Matter Emphasis Dimensions. When the composite scores on all 8 dimensions were compared, there was a significant difference between the Comparison 10 subgroups at the .01 level. In each case, counselors scored higher than teachers.

The above findings indicate that teachers who had less than 5 years of teaching experience differed significantly with counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience—regardless of length of counseling experience.

There were no significant differences between Comparison 10 subgroups on the Consideration of Student Viewpoint, Integrative Learning, Personal Adjustment, and Student Challenge Dimensions.

Comparison 11. Teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience and no counseling experience with counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience and counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience (L5T/NC with 5MT/L1C and 5MT/1MC).

There was a significant difference between Comparison 11 subgroups at the .01 level on the Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimension and at the .05 level on the Classroom Order, Student Challenge, and Subject Matter Emphasis Dimensions.

When the composite scores on all 8 dimensions were compared, there was a significant difference between the Comparison 11 subgroups at the .01 level.
The above findings indicate that teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience differed significantly with counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience—regardless of the length of counseling experience.

There were no significant differences between Comparison 11 subgroups on the Consideration of Student Viewpoint, Emotional Disengagement, Integrative Learning, and Personal Adjustment Dimensions.

Comparison 12. Teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience and no counseling experience with counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience and counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience (5MT/NC with 5MT/L1C and 5MT/1MC).

There were no significant differences between Comparison 12 subgroups on any of the 8 dimensions. However, there was a significant difference at the .05 level between the Comparison 12 subgroups on the composite score for all 8 dimensions. This difference was between teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience and counselors with 5 or more years of teaching experience—regardless of length of counseling experience.

Comparison 13. Teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience and no counseling experience with counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience and counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience (5MT/NC with L5T/L1C and L5T/1MC).
There were significant differences between Comparison 13 subgroups at the .01 level on the Emotional Disengagement and Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimensions and at the .05 level on the Classroom Order Dimension.

When the composite scores on all 8 dimensions were compared, there was a significant difference between the Comparison 13 subgroups at the .01 level.

The above findings indicate that teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience differed significantly with counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience—regardless of the length of counseling experience.

There were no significant differences between Comparison 13 subgroups on the Consideration of Student Viewpoint, Integrative Learning, Personal Adjustment, Student Challenge, and Subject Matter Emphasis Dimensions.

Comparison 14. Counselors with less than 5 years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience and counselors with less than 5 years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience with counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience and counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and 1 year or more of counseling experience. (L5T/L1C and L5T/1MC with 5MT/L1C and 5MT/1MC).

There were no significant differences between Comparison 14 subgroups on any of the 8 dimensions or on the composite scores for all 8 dimensions. This indicates that there were no significant differences between all counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience
and all counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience—regardless of length of counseling experience.

Comparison 15. Counselors with less than 5 years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience and counselors with 5 or more years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience with counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience and counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience (L5T/L1C and 5MT/L1C with L5T/1MC and 5MT/1MC).

The only significant difference which occurred between Comparison 15 subgroups was on the Consideration of Student Viewpoint Dimension. Differences on this dimension were significant at the .05 level.

This finding indicates that length of counselor counseling experience but not length of counselor teaching experience affects counselor beliefs about using empathy as an instructional strategy. Counselors with more counseling experience, regardless of length of their teaching experience, scored higher on this dimension.

Summary

The findings presented in this chapter involved the comparing of counselors and teachers on their beliefs about the teaching process as measured by the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument (BATPI). The BATPI measured 8 dimensions of beliefs: Classroom Order, Consideration of Student Viewpoint, Emotional Disengagement, Integrative
Learning, Personal Adjustment, Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction, Student Challenge, and Subject Matter Emphasis.

Sixteen comparisons involving various combinations of teacher and counselor groups were made on the 8 dimensions and on a composite score for all 8 dimensions. The 9 hypotheses of the study paralleled the 8 dimensions and the composite score on all 8 dimensions. In essence, these 9 hypotheses stated that "There is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the teaching process as measured by each of the 8 dimensions and the composite score for all 8 dimensions."

The comparison of the total N of teachers with the total N of counselors formed the basis for rejecting or not rejecting the 9 hypotheses. However, in order to determine whether any identifiable subgroups of the counselor and teacher population differed significantly, 15 subgroup comparisons were made. The subgroups involved in the 15 comparisons were all formed on the basis of counseling and teaching experience.

Total N of Teachers Compared with Total N of Counselors

When all of the teachers were compared with all of the counselors the following findings resulted:

$H_1$: There was a significant difference at the .01 level on the Classroom Order Dimension when the total N of teachers was compared with the total N of counselors.

Thus $H_1$ was rejected.
$H_2$: There was no significant difference on the Consideration of Student Viewpoint Dimension when the total N of teachers was compared with the total N of counselors. Thus $H_2$ could not be rejected.

$H_3$: There was no significant difference on the Emotional Disengagement Dimension when the total N of teachers was compared with the total N of counselors. Thus $H_3$ could not be rejected.

$H_4$: There was no significant difference on the Integrative Learning Dimension when the total N of teachers was compared with the total N of counselors. Thus $H_4$ could not be rejected.

$H_5$: There was no significant difference on the Personal Adjustment Dimension when the total N of teachers was compared with the total N of counselors. Thus $H_5$ could not be rejected.

$H_6$: There was a significant difference at the .01 level on the Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimension when the total N of teachers was compared with the total N of counselors. Thus $H_6$ was rejected.

$H_7$: There was no significant difference on the Student Challenge Dimension when the total N of teachers was compared with the total N of counselors. Thus $H_7$ could not be rejected.

$H_8$: There was a significant difference at the .01 level on the Subject Matter Emphasis Dimension when the
total N of teachers was compared with the total N of counselors. Thus H₈ was rejected.

H₉: There was a significant difference at the .01 level on the composite score for all 8 dimensions when the total N of teachers was compared with the total N of counselors. Thus H₉ was rejected.

In each instance where a significant difference occurred, counselors scored higher than teachers. This indicated that counselors were more student centered in their beliefs.

Subgroup Comparisons on the Dimensions

Analysis of the 15 subgroups on each of the 8 dimensions revealed several isolated differences between subgroups. However, some consistent differences occurred.

The total N of counselors differed significantly with the total N of teachers on the Classroom Order, Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction, and Subject Matter Emphasis Dimensions and on the composite score for all 8 dimensions. Five subgroup comparisons also differed significantly on the Classroom Order and Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimensions and 3 subgroup comparisons differed significantly on the Subject Matter Emphasis Dimension.

The 5 subgroup comparisons which showed significant differences on the Classroom Order and Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimensions revealed the following findings:

1. Teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience differed significantly with counselors--regardless of counselor teaching or counseling experience.
2. Teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience differed significantly with counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience--regardless of length of counseling experience.

3. Teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience did not differ significantly with counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience--regardless of length of counseling experience.

The 3 subgroup comparisons which showed significant differences on the Subject Matter Emphasis Dimension revealed the following findings:

Teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience differed significantly with counselors--regardless of the length of counselor teaching or counseling experience.

Even though the above subgroup comparisons differed significantly when the total N of teachers and the total N of counselors also differed significantly, it cannot be said that these subgroup comparisons caused the significant differences which occurred when the total N of teachers and the total N of counselors were compared. It is possible that some or all of the other subgroup comparisons may have been close to being significant. When these other comparisons are combined, they could generate enough collective power to help cause a significant difference between the total N of teachers and the total N of counselors. It is also possible that significant differences could have occurred on all 15 subgroup comparisons; yet, when the total N of teachers was compared with the total N of counselors a significant difference may not have occurred.
Further analysis of the 15 subgroups on each of the 8 dimensions revealed that:

1. No significant differences occurred between the groups of teachers when they were compared on the basis of teaching experience.

2. Only 1 significant difference occurred between the groups of counselors when they were compared on the basis of teaching and counseling experience. There was a significant difference at the .05 level on the Consideration of Student Viewpoint Dimension when counselors with less than 5 years of teaching experience were compared with counselors with 5 or more years of teaching experience.

3. There were no significant differences on any of the 13 subgroup comparisons on the Integrative Learning and Personal Adjustment Dimensions.

In each instance where a significant difference occurred, counselors scored higher than teachers. This indicated that counselors were more student centered in their beliefs.

**Subgroup Comparisons on Composite Scores**

Analysis of subgroup comparisons on composite scores for all 8 dimensions revealed the following findings:

1. There was a significant difference at the .05 level when teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience were compared with counselors who had
less than 5 years of teaching experience and less than 1 year of counseling experience.

2. There was a significant difference at the .01 level when teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience were compared with counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience.

3. There was a significant difference at the .01 level when teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience were compared with counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience and 1 or more years of counseling experience.

4. There was a significant difference at the .01 level when teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience were compared with all counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience.

5. There was a significant difference at the .01 level when teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience were compared with all counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience.

6. There was a significant difference at the .01 level when teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience were compared with all counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience.

7. There was a significant difference at the .05 level when teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience
were compared with all counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience.

In each instance where a significant difference occurred, counselors scored higher than teachers. This indicated that counselors were more student centered in their beliefs.

Chapter V contains the conclusions and recommendations which are based on the findings which have been presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The work of the elementary school counselor includes working directly with children in a counseling relationship and consulting with significant others in an attempt to provide an optimum learning climate for each child. Although the consulting role can involve counselor interaction with students, teachers, administrators, parents, or any combination of these subgroups, the focus of this investigation was related to the role of the elementary counselor as a consultant to teachers.

When the teacher and the counselor establish a consulting relationship it is often for the purpose of removing blocks to learning which may be present in the classroom. However, teachers and counselors may disagree over what constitutes an effective learning climate.

The question which was posed for this study was, "Do counselors who are functioning in an elementary school setting and who have had teaching experience in the elementary school have the same beliefs about the teaching process as elementary teachers?"

Twenty-nine elementary counselors and twenty elementary teachers in the Columbus, Ohio, public schools were compared on their beliefs
about the teaching process as measured by the Beliefs About the Teaching Process Instrument (BATPI). The BATPI measured 8 dimensions of beliefs: Classroom Order, Consideration of Student Viewpoint, Emotional Disengagement, Integrative Learning, Personal Adjustment, Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction, Student Challenge, and Subject Matter Emphasis.

Sixteen comparisons involving various combinations of teacher and counselor groups were made on the 8 dimensions and on a composite score for all 8 dimensions. The 9 hypotheses of the study paralleled the 8 dimensions and the composite score on all 8 dimensions. In essence, these 9 hypotheses stated that "there is no significant difference between elementary school counselors who have had elementary school teaching experience and elementary school teachers in their beliefs about the teaching process as measured by each of the 8 dimensions and the composite score for all 8 dimensions."

The findings in Chapter IV were presented for each of the sixteen comparisons. The comparison of the total N of teachers with the total N of counselors formed the basis for rejecting or not rejecting the 9 hypotheses. Findings for the other 15 comparisons were reported so that subgroups of the counselor and teacher population which differed significantly could be identified. In the next section the findings will be briefly reviewed and then conclusions based on the findings will be presented.

Conclusions

Review of the Findings

The study revealed that significant differences occurred on the
Classroom Order, Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction, and Subject Matter Emphasis Dimensions when the total N of counselors was compared with the total N of teachers.

Five subgroup comparisons also differed significantly on the Classroom Order and Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimensions. Counselors scored higher on each dimension and thus were more student centered in their beliefs.

The Classroom Order Dimension measured counselors' and teachers' beliefs about conducting the class according to established rules and procedures; quick punishment for those who depart from the rules; and the elimination of nonsense, noise, and distraction. The Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimension measured counselors' and teachers' beliefs about whether the locus of control over the classroom learning process lies with the teacher or with the student. There is a commonality in the Classroom Order and the Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimensions in that they are both related to classroom control and discipline.

The 5 subgroup comparisons which differed significantly on both of these dimensions revealed that beginning teachers differed with counselors--regardless of the length of counselor teaching or counseling experience. Teachers with 5 or more years of teaching experience differed significantly with counselors who had less than 5 years of teaching experience--regardless of length of counseling experience but did not differ significantly with counselors who had 5 or more years of teaching experience--regardless of length of counseling experience.
In other words, the counselors and teachers who had spent 5 years or more in the classroom were in agreement in their beliefs about Classroom Order and Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction.

Three subgroup comparisons showed significant differences on the Subject Matter Emphasis Dimension. These 3 comparisons revealed that it was the beginning teacher who differed with counselors—regardless of the length of counselor teaching or counseling experience.

The Subject Matter Emphasis Dimension measured counselors' and teachers' beliefs about whether the subject-matter content of the course—the facts and information, skills, principles, and disciplines of thought—has educational value in and of itself.

When all of the teachers were compared with all of the counselors no significant differences occurred on the Consideration of Student Viewpoint, Emotional Disengagement, Integrative Learning, Personal Adjustment, and Student Challenge Dimensions.

Conclusions Based on Findings of the Study

The following conclusions are based on the findings of the study. The rationale for arriving at each conclusion and the implications of each conclusion for the preparation of elementary school counselors will be discussed after the conclusions have been presented.

1. The differences manifested by elementary teachers and elementary counselors in their beliefs about classroom control further substantiate the widely-held belief of counselor educators and counselors that the role of disciplinarian should not be a function of the elementary counselor.
2. The differences manifested by elementary teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience and elementary counselors in their beliefs about subject matter emphasis reveal that help should be given to the beginning teacher so that he is freer to see his role as a helper and facilitator rather than just a presenter of facts, a giver of information, a developer of skills, etc.

3. Because of low scores received by elementary counselors on 4 of the dimensions which measured beliefs about the teaching process, elementary counselor education programs must provide more opportunities for examining conditions which create favorable classroom learning climates.

Implications of Conclusion 1 for Counselor Education

Counselor educators and counselors generally agree that they view the role of disciplinarian as a contradiction to the role of counselor. The role of disciplinarian, they argue, is more properly a function of administration. However, it is not unusual to find that teacher and administrator expectancies of the counselor include the expectancy that counselors should reduce or eliminate pupil behavior that causes classroom friction and disturbance.

The findings of this study revealed that teachers differed significantly with counselors on the Classroom Order and Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimensions. Counselors received higher scores on these dimensions which indicated counselors were more student centered in their beliefs. These finding illustrate that counselors generally see themselves in a freeing rather than a controlling role.
A basic philosophic orientation of counselors is their belief in man's need for freedom. Erich Fromm says that man has freed himself from the old bonds of slavery and feudalism and become an individual, enjoying certain rights and liberties, but has not gained freedom in the positive sense of realizing his intellectual and artistic abilities. (1941) Paraphrasing this statement, Shertzer and Stone say that "He [man] has gained too much freedom from traditional controls, too little freedom to live actively and spontaneously." (1968, 340)

The actions of a child who has been labeled by the classroom teacher as a disruptive force in the classroom may be viewed by the counselor as actions that are positive in nature for that child. The counselor may see the classroom environment as an inhibiting factor in the development of spontaneity in that child. Thus, when counselors and teachers see such different behavioral outcomes relative to classroom control and when counselors see their purpose as freeing rather than controlling, counselor incongruence and teacher-counselor conflicts occur if the counselor is asked to perform a disciplinarian role.

Counselor educators and counselors have been active in promoting the idea among teachers and administrators that counselor effectiveness is lessened when counselors are asked to perform the disciplinarian role. This promotion needs to continue and the findings of this study which revealed that elementary counselors and elementary teachers hold different beliefs about classroom order and student autonomy vs. teacher direction should be used as supportive evidence.

Elementary counselors should define their role so that they do not accept the administration of discipline as one of their functions.
Certainly, in the course of their work, elementary counselors may well work with discipline problems. But, these discipline problems should eminate from the open, accepting type of relationship that is established between counselor and counselee—a relationship that could not be established if the counselor is conceived by the counselee as performing a disciplinarian function.

**Implications of Conclusion 2 for Counselor Education**

The findings of the study revealed that the beginning teacher placed more emphasis on subject matter than either the experienced teacher or the counselor. Evidently, the beginning teacher feels he is held responsible for the acquisition of skills and the understanding of knowledge and even the more child-centered beginning teachers have difficulty saying to the student (as was also evidenced by findings on the Student Autonomy vs. Teacher Direction Dimension), "It is up to you to decide."

Arthur Combs, in an address titled "Teaching as a Helping Profession" has noted that "how a person will behave in education depends upon how he conceives the purposes of our schools, the purposes of his class, and his personal purposes in being in that class in the first place." (1969, 11) He also noted that "one of the differences which clearly distinguished between good and bad helpers is whether his purposes are freeing purposes or controlling purposes; that is, are they facilitating and aiding or making, forcing, and coercing." (1969, 11)

What role, then, does the elementary counselor play in helping
the beginning teacher create a classroom environment that is more student centered, helping, and facilitating in nature?

The answer to this question involves the controversy over whether the elementary counselor should work with elementary teachers in a consulting relationship or in a counseling relationship. There are those counselor educators who feel that the more didactically-oriented approach associated with the consulting approach is the only feasible way for the elementary counselor to work effectively with elementary teachers. Other counselor educators argue that it is the "person" of the teacher that needs to be considered so these educators advocate a counseling approach.

Faust and Wrenn (Faust, 1968c) believe that the counselor cannot effectively implement both the consultant role and the counselor role while working with any one teacher. However, counselor educators do need to consider the types of circumstances under which a counseling role might be preferable over a consulting role and vice versa.

The findings of this study indicated that beginning teachers felt that they determine the curricular experience and that they must impose, perhaps gently or nicely, but still, impose curricular offerings upon children. Perhaps the developmental stages through which some beginning teachers go in making the transition from a subject matter orientation to a more child-centered orientation could be hastened if the counselor worked with the teacher in a counseling relationship.

It may be that if counselors are to help change the behavior of beginning teachers it will be necessary to concentrate on the beliefs of these teachers rather than on what they are doing in the
classroom. The counselor can help the beginning teacher ask himself "What do I believe about myself? What do I believe about people? What is my purpose in teaching?" Counselors are trained in getting individuals to concentrate on their feelings and on their beliefs as to how things seem to the individual. Thus, it seems if an "internal" approach is to be used in changing teacher behavior the elementary counselor may be an unused resource in the in-service education of teachers.

Whether the counselor should establish a counseling relationship with beginning teachers is indeed still controversial. However, the findings of this study have isolated a certain subset of the teacher population who need help in improving classroom climate. If counselor educators are to progress in their attempts to delineate the role of the elementary counselor, then efforts are going to have to be made to determine when or if the counselor should implement a consulting role or a counseling role as he works with elementary teachers.

Implications of Conclusion 3 for Counselor Education

With the exception of the Emotional Disengagement Dimension, the lack of significant differences on the 5 dimensions on which no significant differences occurred was caused by low scores manifested by both counselors and teachers.

If educators are in agreement that empathy should be used as an instructional strategy, that the acquisition of meaning is more important than the acquisition of facts, that the instructional process should be organized around student needs and interests, and that learning
can occur even though students are not working hard—the 4 areas on which both counselors and teachers received low scores—then both counselor education programs and teacher education programs need to be altered so that teachers and counselors in training manifest these philosophical orientations about classroom climate.

In view of the fact that most counselor education programs stress that acceptance, empathy, congruence, and unconditional positive regard are necessary conditions which must exist in a counseling relationship, it was indeed interesting that counselors did not score high on the Consideration of Student Viewpoint Dimension—the dimension which measured the use of empathy as an instructional strategy.

Counselors also did not score high on the belief that instruction should be based on student interests and needs. Belief in individual differences and the worth of each individual are fundamental concepts which underlie counselor education. Yet, counselors did not place high emphasis on these beliefs when they were asked if these beliefs should be present in the classroom. If counselors do not hold these beliefs about classroom environment, one wonders to what extent counselors are implementing these beliefs in the counseling relationship. One also wonders whether counselors who scored low on these beliefs would make any attempts to help alter classroom environment relating to these beliefs.

Traditionally, counselor education programs for producing secondary school counselors have not included instruction on classroom climate. If the role of the elementary counselor is to work with the
teacher to help improve classroom climate, then counselor education programs must provide more opportunities for examining conditions which create more favorable learning climates.

Questions Raised by the Study

During the course of the investigation several questions arose which may be helpful to researchers who wish to conduct other studies on counselor and teacher beliefs about classroom climate.

Do counselors who are no longer in the classroom feel they are freer than teachers to hold student-centered beliefs about classroom control and emphasis placed on subject matter? Does the beginning teacher feel more at ease when he is presenting content? Has the beginning teacher had time to assess what he really feels should constitute classroom learning? Is the disparity in beliefs about the emphasis placed on classroom control and subject matter a source of conflict between beginning teachers and counselors? Or were these disparities unique to the elementary counselor and teacher population of the Columbus, Ohio, Public Schools?

Recommendations

The recommendations presented in this section are based upon the investigator's experience in conducting the study.

Recommendations for Counselor Education

1. Counselor educators should use the findings of this study relative to classroom control to further promote the idea among teachers and administrators
that counselor effectiveness is lessened when counselors
are asked to perform a disciplinarian role.

2. Counselor educators should see that the role of the
   elementary counselor is defined in a manner which
   excludes the discipline function.

3. Counselor educators should actively promote the con­
ducting of research on the use of consultation with
teachers vs. the counseling of teachers.

4. Counselor education programs should provide prospective
   elementary school counselors with opportunities for
   learning that teachers differ with counselors in their
   beliefs about classroom control.

5. Counselor education programs should provide prospective
   elementary school counselors with opportunities for
   learning that beginning teachers tend to be committed
to a subject-matter orientation.

6. Counselor education programs should provide prospective
   elementary school counselors with opportunities for
   examining conditions which create more favorable
   learning climates.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. When the supply of elementary counselors becomes more
   plentiful, replications of this study should be conducted.

2. A study should be conducted in which the BATPI would be
   administered to counselors prior to entering a counselor
education program, upon the completion of a counselor education program, and again after they have been in a counseling position for 1 year. This study would help determine whether the counselor education program changes counselor beliefs, whether removal from the classroom "firing line" changes counselor beliefs, or whether counselor beliefs are not altered by either of these variables.

3. A longitudinal study should be conducted in which the BATPI is administered to a large sample of first-year teachers or seniors in the college of education. Five years later a follow-up of the sample should be conducted in order to determine how many individuals in the sample are still teaching, how many have become counselors, how many have become administrators, etc. The BATPI scores of the occupational groups should be compared to determine whether any commonalities exist.

4. A study should be conducted which would use the same design as outlined in Recommendation 3 but a battery of instruments that would measure teacher self-concepts, what teachers believe about others, and what teachers believe about the teaching process should be administered.

5. A study should be conducted which would use the same design as outlined in Recommendation 3 but the BATPI (or a battery of tests) should be administered to those
individuals whom the follow-up identified as teachers or counselors. Changes which occurred since the first administration of the instrument(s) should then be identified.

6. A study should be conducted which would determine whether a correlation exists between teacher beliefs about the teaching process and observed teacher behavior. Both verbal and non-verbal teacher behavior should be observed.

7. Studies should be conducted which help determine under what conditions the consultation with teachers vs. the counseling of teachers seems to be most appropriate. Specifically, "Is consultation or counseling more effective in helping beginning teachers make the transition from a subject-matter orientation to a more child-centered orientation?"
EPILOGUE: THE EVOLVING ROLE OF THE ELEMENTARY COUNSELOR

As this study progressed, some spinoffs related to the definition of the role of the elementary counselor began to appear.

Thus far in the history of elementary school counseling, there has been a hesitancy on the part of elementary counselors to implement a role which includes the counseling of teachers. The author believes that (1) in order for an elementary counselor to effectively utilize the findings of this study that a counseling approach rather than a consulting approach is necessary and (2) the elementary counselor cannot morally and ethically maintain passiveness when he observes teacher behavior that is detrimental to the psychological well-being of students.

It is doubtful that a consulting approach would change teacher behavior relative to classroom control, student-autonomy vs. teacher direction, and subject matter emphasis. The teacher needs to examine why he manifests these beliefs. He has to ask himself, "What are my needs and how do my needs relate to what I do in the classroom?" In order to do this, teachers need the guidance and acceptance of a person specifically trained to help individuals examine their feelings and beliefs. The elementary counselor can be that person who gives the elementary teacher an opportunity that the elementary teacher has never had in the past: to examine his wants, needs, beliefs, and interests in terms of their implications for his chosen profession.
The elementary counselor cannot implement the counseling-of-teachers role by waiting for the elementary teacher to come to him. Neither can the counselor morally and ethically ignore situations in which the actions of teachers are psychologically damaging to students.

There is a two-fold obligation of the counselor which cannot permit him to remain passive when teachers exhibit characteristics which negatively affect classroom climate. One of these obligations is to the students who are affected by the negative teacher actions and the other obligation is to the teacher. Confrontation has a negative overtone but the teacher must be confronted. The counselor is not doing the teacher a favor to ignore his behavior. Rather, the counselor is performing the humane act of showing concern for a fellow human being. And it is that concern which must be conveyed to the teacher.
APPENDIX A

TEACHER PERSONAL DATA SHEET
TEACHER PERSONAL DATA SHEET

1. Age __________
2. Sex __________
3. Name of school at which you are presently employed ______________
4. Grade level which you are teaching _________________________________
5. Number of years of teaching experience in grades:
   K - 6 ________ years ________ months
   7 - 9 ________ years ________ months
   10 - 12 ________ years ________ months

6. Academic preparation: (Include quarter hours of credit earned beyond highest degree received)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institutions in Order of Attendance</th>
<th>Degree Received</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Area of Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Has your academic preparation included any courses in guidance and counseling? ________ If so, how many quarter hours? ________
8. Have you ever been employed as a guidance counselor? __________
9. Has your academic preparation included any courses in educational research? ________ If so, how many quarter hours? ________

(Please return by December 10)
APPENDIX B

COUNSELOR PERSONAL DATA SHEET
COUNSELOR PERSONAL DATA SHEET

1. Age ________

2. Sex ________

3. Name of school(s) at which you are presently employed ________

4. Number of years of counseling experience in grades:

   (Check One)

   K - 6 ________ years ________ months Full Time Part Time

   7 - 9 ________ years ________ months

   10 - 12 ________ years ________ months

5. Number of years of teaching experience in grades:

   K - 6 ________ years ________ months

   7 - 9 ________ years ________ months

   10 - 12 ________ years ________ months

6. Academic preparation: (Include quarter hours of credit earned beyond highest degree received)

   Name of Institutions in Order of Attendance Degree Date Area of
   Received Received Specialization

(Please return by December 10)
APPENDIX C

BELIEFS ABOUT THE TEACHING PROCESS INSTRUMENT
DIRECTIONS: Answer each statement below in terms of how you view the educative process.

Circle the one response after each item which best expresses your views.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Teaching of specific skills and factual subject matter is the most important function of the school.  

2. The teacher assures optimum learning conditions by giving top priority to the social-emotional needs of pupils.

3. Pupils learn to stay alert when they are expected to respond immediately to teacher demands.

4. There is too great an emphasis on keeping order in the classroom.

5. The effectiveness of teaching is enhanced when the teacher has the ability to see the world as each of his pupils sees it.

6. Pupils respect teachers who expect them to work hard in school.

7. Pupils never really understand a subject until they can relate what they have learned to the broader problems of the world.

8. The curriculum consists of subject matter to be learned and skills to be acquired.

9. In the interest of good discipline pupils who repeatedly disrupt the class must be severely punished.

10. The development of social and emotional security for pupils is the most important function of the school.

1Underscore indicates most student-centered response.
11. Children should be given more freedom in the classroom than they usually get.

12. Students who misbehave or do not learn are generally children who need more love.

13. Lessons presented in the form of problems to be solved are the best means of motivating pupils.

14. Teachers must always be prepared to explain to pupils interrelationships among various elements of the overall curriculum.

15. Proper control of a class is amply demonstrated when pupils work quietly while the teacher is out of the room.

16. The backbone of the school curriculum is subject matter; activities are useful mainly to facilitate the learning of subject matter.

17. Pupil failure is averted when mastery of subject matter is the prime requisite for promotion.

18. The individuality of pupils is sustained when teachers make allowances in the grade reports for the varying interests pupils have.

19. Pupils gain a sense of belonging when the teacher encourages friendships among pupils in the room.

20. A properly motivated group of mature students might learn more in a semester's time if they were left entirely to their own resources than if they had a teacher to guide them.

21. Optimum learning takes place when the classroom setting is completely free of distractions.

22. A teacher's effectiveness rests upon his ability to maintain proper "professional distance" between the pupils and himself.

23. Children learn best in an atmosphere filled with love and emotional support.

24. Pupils frequently learn much more under their own initiative than they do under teacher direction.
25. The teacher's ability to see the world as each of his students sees it is an absolute must if he is to have any success at all in teaching.

26. Pupils learn self direction by having opportunities to set their own goals for learning.

27. Under ideal conditions pupils would view each teacher as a specialist in the subject matter taught.

28. Teachers must set definite items aside to show pupils the relationships between their subject and the overall goal of education.

29. The overall plan of education suffers when teachers depart substantially from the subject outline.

30. Grading pupils separately on achievement and citizenship assures that teachers will insist on mastery of subject matter as well as good behavior.

31. Before pupils are encouraged to exercise independent thought they should be thoroughly grounded in the facts and knowledge about the subject.

32. Teachers increase their chances of directing the work into productive channels by having pupils participate in the planning.

33. Group activity teaches children to think and plan together, independent of direct supervision by the teacher.

34. The goals of education should be dictated by children's interests and needs as well as by the larger demands of society.

35. Pupils learn efficiently the essentials of a subject when every member of the class moves simultaneously through carefully planned lesson sequences.

36. Across-the-school routine imposes a consistency in classroom procedure which tends to restrict important avenues for learning.
37. Pupils are induced to greater motivation when the teacher remains somewhat aloof from the interpersonal affairs of the class.  

38. Pupils are motivated to do better work when they feel free to move around the room while the class is in session.  

39. Pupils respect teachers who stand firm on their convictions.  

40. Pupils gain better understanding of the subject if assignments are presented to them as a series of interrelated problems.  

41. The natural flow of events is enhanced by the teacher who manages to eliminate any disruptive pupil behavior.  

42. The basic function of education is fulfilled only when pupils are led to understand the general significance of the material they have learned.  

43. Learning is essentially a process of increasing one's store of information about various fields of knowledge.  

44. The structure of a field of knowledge is intrinsically interesting to pupils when it is clearly taught.  

45. The attitudes learned by a student are often the most important result of a lesson or unit.  

46. Small group work uses to best advantage the contrasting personalities, skills, and interests pupils have.  

47. A good teacher will establish a routine and stick to it.  

48. His effectiveness is seriously impaired when the teacher permits himself to become emotionally involved in the personal problems of pupils.  

49. Good rapport with pupils is maintained by the teacher who always finds time to help individuals with special problems.
50. The use of sarcasm by the teacher can accomplish nothing but emotional harm for the pupil.

51. The completion of any worthwhile task in education requires hard work on the part of pupils.

52. If curriculum plans are to be developed, they must go into detail on how course content can be integrated across subjects.

53. The logical structure of subject matter is the most realistic guide to the organization of the work in the classroom.

54. In teaching it is quite essential to cover the material in the course of study.

55. The main reason for the curriculum guide is to provide the teacher with definite information regarding the material to be covered in the course.

56. Teachers who like pupils will usually encourage pupil initiation and participation in planning lessons.

57. The effectiveness of the teacher depends entirely on the amount of personal interest he can invest in the progress of each pupil.

58. Nothing captures students' interest in school work as quickly as allowing them to wrestle with problems of their own choosing.

59. When given a choice of activity, pupils generally select what is best for them.

60. A firm hand by the teacher promotes emotional security for pupils.

61. Pupils do their best work when they know exactly what to expect from day to day.

62. Learning is enhanced when teachers praise generously the accomplishments of pupils.

63. Pupils must be kept busy or they soon get into trouble.

64. In planning their work teachers should rely heavily on the knowledge and skills pupils have acquired outside the classroom.
Pupils gain more satisfaction from doing a difficult task well than any other achievement.

The pupil's knowledge is best developed when teachers interrelate facts and figures from many different subject fields.

Children need and should have more supervision and discipline than they usually get.

The essential function of junior high school courses lies in their preparing pupils for later courses.

Pupils master the essentials of a subject only when extensive plans are made for accommodating individual differences in pupils.

A well established classroom routine enhances the emotional stability of pupils.

The pupil's impression of the teacher's personality greatly influences what he learns.

Pupils must see clearly that it is the teacher, not they, who has charge of classroom learning.

The deep interest which pupils sometimes develop in one subject can be valuable to them, but only if teachers succeed in broadening their perspectives across subject matter boundaries.

Children learn the necessary skills of group participation only when they are exposed to sequences of activities requiring increasingly difficult skills from kindergarten through grade twelve.

The most important thing a teacher can do to set the stage for learning is to discover the interests of students.

The effective teacher has complete control of the learning situation at all times.

Pupils learn library skills more readily by using their own devices in searching for materials of special interest than by a series of exercises designed to teach the logical steps in library procedure.
78. A teacher can frequently "reach" a rebellious pupil by taking an intense personal interest in his welfare.  
79. Time to choose freely their own activity during the school day is a must for pupil morale.  
80. The teacher who organizes the material and presents it to pupils in a forceful way gets the best results.  
81. Nothing stimulates a pupil to apply himself more diligently than a warm, personal interest in his progress shown by the teacher.  
82. Teachers who do not like pupils will usually decide on and plan lessons alone rather than use pupil participation.  
83. Pupils learn best when permitted to set their own pace in doing the work.  
84. The teacher must avoid strict adherence to the sequence provided by a textbook series.  
85. Establishing the rules well in advance strengthens the teacher's hand in meeting the various problems that might arise.  
86. An essential component of a good lesson is one of showing how it is related to other areas of knowledge.
APPENDIX D

INSTRUMENT ITEMS GROUPED ACCORDING TO DIMENSION
INSTRUMENT ITEMS PERTAINING TO 
CLASSROOM ORDER DIMENSION OF THE TEACHING PROCESS

Item No.  

3. Pupils learn to stay alert when they are expected to respond immediately to teacher demands.

9. In the interest of good discipline pupils who repeatedly disrupt the class must be severely punished.

15. Proper control of a class is amply demonstrated when pupils work quietly while the teacher is out of the room.

21. Optimum learning takes place when the classroom setting is completely free of distractions.

27. Under ideal conditions pupils would view each teacher as a specialist in the subject matter taught.

35. Pupils learn efficiently the essentials of a subject when every member of the class moves simultaneously through carefully planned lesson sequences.

41. The natural flow of events is enhanced by the teacher who manages to eliminate any disruptive pupil behavior.

47. A good teacher will establish a routine and stick to it.

53. The logical structure of subject matter is the most realistic guide to the organization of the work in the classroom.
INSTRUMENT ITEMS PERTAINING TO
CONSIDERATION OF STUDENT VIEWPOINT DIMENSION OF THE TEACHING PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The effectiveness of teaching is enhanced when the teacher has the ability to see the world as each of his pupils sees it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Students who misbehave or do not learn are generally children who need more love.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Children learn best in an atmosphere filled with love and emotional support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The teacher's ability to see the world as each of his students sees it is an absolute must if he is to have any success at all in teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Good rapport with pupils is maintained by the teacher who always finds time to help individuals with special problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>The use of sarcasm by the teacher can accomplish nothing but emotional harm for the pupil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Learning is enhanced when teachers praise generously the accomplishments of pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>The pupil's impression of the teacher's personality greatly influences what he learns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Instrument Items Pertaining to Emotional Disengagement Dimension of the Teaching Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>A teacher's effectiveness rests upon his ability to maintain proper &quot;professional distance&quot; between the pupils and himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Pupils are induced to greater motivation when the teacher remains somewhat aloof from the interpersonal affairs of the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>His effectiveness is seriously impaired when the teacher permits himself to become emotionally involved in the personal problems of pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Pupils never really understand a subject until they can relate what they have learned to the broader problems of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Teachers must always be prepared to explain to pupils interrelationships among various elements of the overall curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Teachers must set definite items aside to show pupils the relationships between their subject and the overall goal of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Pupils gain better understanding of the subject if assignments are presented to them as a series of interrelated problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>The basic function of education is fulfilled only when pupils are led to understand the general significance of the material they have learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>If curriculum plans are to be developed, they must go into detail on how course content can be integrated across subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>In planning their work teachers should rely heavily on the knowledge and skills pupils have acquired outside the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>The pupil's knowledge is best developed when teachers interrelate facts and figures from many different subject fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>The deep interest which pupils sometimes develop in one subject can be valuable to them, but only if teachers succeed in broadening their perspectives across subject matter boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>The most important thing a teacher can do to set the stage for learning is to discover the interests of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>The teacher must avoid strict adherence to the sequence provided by a textbook series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>An essential component of a good lesson is one of showing how it is related to other areas of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUMENT ITEMS PERTAINING TO
PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT DIMENSION OF THE TEACHING PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The teacher assures optimum learning conditions by giving top priority to the social-emotional needs of pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The development of social and emotional security for pupils is the most important function of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The individuality of pupils is sustained when teachers make allowances in the grade reports for the varying interests pupils have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Pupils gain a sense of belonging when the teacher encourages friendships among pupils in the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Teachers increase their chances of directing the work into productive channels by having pupils participate in the planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Group activity teaches children to think and plan together, independent of direct supervision by the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>The goals of education should be dictated by children's interests and needs as well as by the larger demands of society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>The attitudes learned by a student are often the most important result of a lesson or unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Small group work uses to best advantage the contrasting personalities, skills, and interests pupils have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Teachers who like pupils will usually encourage pupil initiation and participation in planning lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>The effectiveness of the teacher depends entirely on the amount of personal interest he can invest in the progress of each pupil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Pupils master the essentials of a subject only when extensive plans are made for accommodating individual differences in pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>A teacher can frequently &quot;reach&quot; a rebellious pupil by taking an intense personal interest in his welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Nothing stimulates a pupil to apply himself more diligently than a warm, personal interest in his progress shown by the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Teachers who do not like pupils will usually decide on and plan lessons alone rather than use pupil participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>There is too great an emphasis on keeping order in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Children should be given more freedom in the classroom than they usually get.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>A properly motivated group of mature students might learn more in a semester's time if they were left entirely to their own resources than if they had a teacher to guide them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Pupils frequently learn much more under their own initiative than they do under teacher direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Across-the-school routine imposes a consistency in classroom procedure which tends to restrict important avenues for learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Pupils are motivated to do better work when they feel free to move around the room while the class is in session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Nothing captures students' interest in school work as quickly as allowing them to wrestle with problems of their own choosing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>When given a choice of activity, pupils generally select what is best for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>A firm hand by the teacher promotes emotional security for pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Pupils do their best work when they know exactly what to expect from day to day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Pupils must be kept busy or they soon get into trouble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Children need and should have more supervision and discipline than they usually get.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>A well established classroom routine enhances the emotional stability of pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Pupils must see clearly that it is the teacher, not they, who has charge of classroom learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Children learn the necessary skills of group participation only when they are exposed to sequences of activities requiring increasingly difficult skills from kindergarten through grade twelve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>The effective teacher has complete control of the learning situation at all times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Time to choose freely their own activity during the school day is a must for pupil morale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>The teacher who organizes the material and presents it to pupils in a forceful way gets the best results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Pupils learn best when permitted to set their own pace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Establishing the rules well in advance strengthens the teacher's hand in meeting the various problems that might arise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUMENT ITEMS PERTAINING TO
STUDENT CHALLENGE DIMENSION OF THE TEACHING PROCESS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Pupils respect teachers who expect them to work hard in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Lessons presented in the form of problems to be solved are the best means of motivating pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Pupils learn self direction by having opportunities to set their own goals for learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Pupils respect teachers who stand firm on their convictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>The completion of any worthwhile task in education requires hard work on the part of pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Pupils gain more satisfaction from doing a difficult task well than any other achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUMENT ITEMS PERTAINING TO
SUBJECT MATTER EMPHASIS DIMENSION OF THE TEACHING PROCESS

Item No.   Item

1. Teaching of specific skills and factual subject matter is the most important function of the school.
8. The curriculum consists of subject matter to be learned and skills to be acquired.
16. The backbone of the school curriculum is subject matter; activities are useful mainly to facilitate the learning of subject matter.
17. Pupil failure is averted when mastery of subject matter is the prime requisite for promotion.
29. The overall plan of education suffers when teachers depart substantially from the subject outline.
30. Grading pupils separately on achievement and citizenship assures that teachers will insist on mastery of subject matter as well as good behavior.
31. Before pupils are encouraged to exercise independent thought they should be thoroughly grounded in the facts and knowledge about the subject.
43. Learning is essentially a process of increasing one's store of information about various fields of knowledge.
44. The structure of a field of knowledge is intrinsically interesting to pupils when it is clearly taught.
54. In teaching it is quite essential to cover the material in the course of study.
55. The main reason for the curriculum guide is to provide the teacher with definite information regarding the material to be covered in the course.
68. The essential function of junior high school courses lies in their preparing pupils for later courses.
77. Pupils learn library skills more readily by using their own devices in searching for materials of special interest than by a series of exercises designed to teach the logical steps in library procedures.
APPENDIX E

LETTER SENT TO COUNSELORS
Dear Counselor:

Dr. Anthony Riccio, Dr. Joseph Quaranta, and I are currently cooperating in an effort to assess how elementary school counselors view activities which take place in the classroom.

You are probably aware that the supply of elementary school counselors is limited. Thus your assistance is very important to the success of the research we are conducting.

Will you please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it by December 10 in the self-addressed envelope which has been provided for you. In reporting the results no reference will be made to you or your school.

We will truly appreciate any cooperation you can give us.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Marla Peterson
Research Associate

P. S. December 3--Because of a three-day mailing delay the deadline for returning this questionnaire has been extended to December 15.
APPENDIX F

LETTER SENT TO TEACHERS
Dear Teacher:

Dr. Anthony Riccio, Dr. Joseph Quaranta, Dr. William Jennings, and I are currently cooperating in an effort to assess how elementary school teachers view the teaching process.

You are one of thirty randomly selected Columbus teachers invited to participate in this study. Thus your assistance is very important to the success of the research we are conducting.

Will you please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it by December 10 in the self-addressed envelope which has been provided for you. In reporting the results no reference will be made to you or your school.

We will truly appreciate any cooperation you can give us.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Marla Peterson
Research Associate

P. S. December 3—Because of a three-day mailing delay the deadline for returning this questionnaire has been extended to December 15.
APPENDIX G

NUMBER OF SCORES (BY GROUP) BELOW AND ABOVE RANGE MEAN ON THE EIGHT DIMENSIONS OF THE BELIEFS ABOUT THE TEACHING PROCESS INSTRUMENT
### TABLE 5
NUMBER OF SCORES (BY GROUP) BELOW AND ABOVE RANGE MEAN ON CLASSROOM ORDER DIMENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>( N &lt; \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( N &gt; \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( N )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/L1C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/1MC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/1MC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range = 19-40
Range Mean = 29

### TABLE 6
NUMBER OF SCORES (BY GROUP) BELOW AND ABOVE RANGE MEAN ON CONSIDERATION OF STUDENT VIEWPOINT DIMENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>( N &lt; \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( N &gt; \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( N )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/L1C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/1MC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/1MC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range = 25-40
Range Mean = 32
### Table 7

**Number of Scores (by Group) Below and Above Range Mean on Emotional Disengagement Dimension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>( N &lt; \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( N &gt; \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( N )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/L1C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/1MC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/1MC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range = 7-15  
Range Mean = 11

### Table 8

**Number of Scores (by Group) Below and Above Range Mean on Integrative Learning Dimension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>( N &lt; \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( N &gt; \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( N )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/L1C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/1MC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/1MC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range = 31-57  
Range Mean = 44
### TABLE 9

NUMBER OF SCORES (BY GROUP) BELOW AND ABOVE RANGE MEAN ON PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT DIMENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N &lt; ( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>N &gt; ( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/L1C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/1MC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/1MC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range = 44-74  
Range Mean = 59

### TABLE 10

NUMBER OF SCORES (BY GROUP) BELOW AND ABOVE RANGE MEAN ON STUDENT AUTONOMY DIMENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N &lt; ( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>N &gt; ( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/L1C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/1MC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/1MC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range = 42-79  
Range Mean = 60
### TABLE 11

**NUMBER OF SCORES (BY GROUP) BELOW AND ABOVE RANGE MEAN ON STUDENT CHALLENGE DIMENSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$N &lt; \bar{x}$</th>
<th>$N &gt; \bar{x}$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/L1C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/1MC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/1MC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range = 12-22*
*Range Mean = 17*

### TABLE 12

**NUMBER OF SCORES (BY GROUP) BELOW AND ABOVE RANGE MEAN ON SUBJECT MATTER EMPHASIS DIMENSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$N &lt; \bar{x}$</th>
<th>$N &gt; \bar{x}$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/L1C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/1MC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/1MC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range = 31-58*
*Range Mean = 44*
### TABLE 13

NUMBER OF SCORES (BY GROUP) BELOW AND ABOVE RANGE MEAN ON BELIEFS ABOUT THE TEACHING PROCESS INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N ≤ \bar{x}</th>
<th>N &gt; \bar{x}</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5T/NC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/NC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/L1C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/L1C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5T/1MC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MT/1MC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range = 244-348
Range Mean = 296
APPENDIX H

TOTAL SCORE ON EACH DIMENSION AND OVERALL SCORE FOR EACH S
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>Sub. Matter Emphasis</th>
<th>Student Challenge</th>
<th>Student Autonomy</th>
<th>Personal Adjustment</th>
<th>Integrated Learning</th>
<th>Emotional Disengagement</th>
<th>Consideration of Stu.</th>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Overall Score for Each S</th>
<th>Total Score on Each Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table I4**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>Sub-Matter Emphasis</th>
<th>Student Challenge</th>
<th>Student Autonomy</th>
<th>Personal Adjustm</th>
<th>Learning Integrative</th>
<th>Emotional Disengage</th>
<th>Consideration of St. V.</th>
<th>Classroom Order Group S's Arranged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 14--Continued

127
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>Sub. Matter Emphasis</th>
<th>Student Challenge</th>
<th>Student Autonomy</th>
<th>Student Emphasis</th>
<th>Personal Adjustment</th>
<th>Integrative Learning</th>
<th>Emotional Disengage</th>
<th>Consideration of Stu. V.</th>
<th>Classroom Book Order</th>
<th>S's Arranged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE I4--continued**
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