To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Elma Hubbard Mardis entitled "A Study of the Perceived Impact on Teachers and Administrators of an Instructional Program for Disadvantaged Students from Selected Schools in Memphis, Tennessee." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Dewey H. Stollar, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

A STUDY OF THE PERCEIVED IMPACT ON TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS OF AN INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS FROM SELECTED SCHOOLS IN MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee

Elma Hubbard Mardis

March 1974

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgments are extended to those who were instrumental through their patience, kindness, support and encouragement toward my attainment of this goal. Approval to conduct the study was granted by the Memphis City School System. Special thanks is extended to Terry B. Davis for her time and assistance. The cooperation of the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction, the Division of Research and Planning, particularly, Joyce B. Weddington, Kathy E. Davis, and Irene Barrentine is greatly appreciated. My gratitude is also extended to Sara Lee Lewis.

To my committee: Dr. Dewey Stollar, Chairman; Dr. John Lovell; Dr. Robert Howard; and Dr. William Cole, who gave continuous assistance, advice, and support, I offer special words of gratitude. Members of the UT-MSU Center deserve praise for their encouragement and confidence in me, along with the staff members of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision on the Knoxville Campus.

To my parents, thanks for their encouragement, love, understanding and devotion which impelled me to seek further study. My brothers and sisters gave endless support, love and help. They too are deservant of a word of thanks.

To my husband, William, I express my deepest thanks and appreciation for his love, patience, kindness, concern and understanding when it was needed most. The task could not have been completed without his sincerity, dedication, and interest.

1137239

To my daughter, Marlah, who within her framework, was able to understand and accept my absence and for the patience during the time of intensive work necessary for me to complete this document, I express my deepest love and affection.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether an instructional program for disadvantaged students had a significant impact upon the teachers and administrators involved in its implementation. The study was conducted in nine Title I (inner-city) schools in Memphis, Tennessee.

The primary problem investigated by the researcher was: Were there significant differences in the knowledge and attitudes of teachers and administrators toward disadvantaged students after participating in the implementation of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills as opposed to the knowledge and attitudes toward the disadvantaged students of regular Title I classroom teachers who did not participate in the program?

The subquestions tested were:

1. Did Title I teachers and administrators engaged in the implementation of the program on Problem-Solving Skills exhibit higher levels of expectancy for their students than Title I teachers who were not involved in the program?
2. Were there significant differences between the cooperating teachers in the program in their abilities to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the disadvantaged students and regular Title I classroom teachers?

3. Were there significant differences in the relationship between the intended goals of the program and the perceptions and behaviors of teachers and administrators involved in the program?
4. Did the specific activities help the cooperating teachers in the program understand and work more effectively with disadvantaged students?

The population for the study consisted of two groups of educators in Title I (inner-city) schools. Group A included those teachers and administrators engaged in the implementation of the program. Group B included teachers who were not involved in the implementation of the program.

A Likert type instrument developed by the researcher was used to assess the responses from the population relative to their perceptions of the program being studied and the disadvantaged students. The instrument was subjected to a reliability check using the Spearman-Brown procedure and yielded a reliability coefficient of .89.

The Mann-Whitney U test was applied to the raw scores of the attitudinal items of the questionnaire to calculate the differences between the two samples for the primary question. The U scores were then converted to z scores. Chi-square and t-test were used to determine if the responses to the attitudinal section for Groups A and B were statistically significant at the .05 level.

The binomial probability model was used to determine the level of significance of the differences in responses of Groups A and B on the

thirty attitudinal items in section two of the questionnaire. These findings were significant at the .01 level.

The major findings of the study were:

1. There were significant differences in the knowledge and attitudes of the personnel of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills toward disadvantaged students and regular Title I classroom teachers.
2. Teachers, administrators and the staff of the program exhibited higher levels of expectancy for their students than regular Title I classroom teachers.
3. The personnel of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills were more attuned to and able to determine the strengths and weaknesses of their children than regular Title I classroom teachers.
4. The staff of the program internalized and supported the goals of the program. Also the activities engaged in by the cooperating teachers were successful in helping them to work more effectively with the disadvantaged students.

Thus, it can be inferred from the data gathered in the study that the instructional program for disadvantaged students did have a significant impact on teachers and administrators involved in its implementation as measured by their responses to the questionnaire.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	General Introduction	1
	The Problem	13
	Statement of the problem	14
	Purpose	15
	Significance and implications of the study	15
	Limitations and delimitations	17
	Assumptions	18
	Definitions of Terms	19
	The Study Design	22
	Samples	24
	Instrumentation	24
	Reliability study	25
	Collection of data	26
	Treatment of the data	27
	Organization of the Study	28
II.	A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH	29
	Introduction	29
	The Importance of In-Service Training for Teachers of Disadvantaged Students	30

CHAPTER PAGE

The Nature and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Students 37
The Impact of Teacher Perceptions on the Achievement of Disadvantaged Students 45
The Impact That the Curriculum, Learning Experiences and Materials Have on the Achievement of Disadvantaged Students 50
The Impact of School Administrators on the Achievement of Disadvantaged Students 58
III. COLLECTION, PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA 62
Procedures 62
Sample selection and return rate 62
Instrumentation 63
Collection of data 71
Treatment of the data 72
Presentation and Analysis of Data 73
Analysis of the data 77
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 92
Introduction 92
Data analysis 93
Conclusions 95
Recommendations 96
BIBLIOGRAPHY 99

CHAPTER PAGE

APPENDIXES 104

Appendix A 105

Appendix B 112

Appendix C 115

Appendix D 122

Appendix E 125

Appendix F 126

Appendix G 127

VITA 128

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Sample and Return Rate for Respondents to the Program on Problem-Solving Skills Personnel Questionnaire for Administrators, Cooperating Teachers, and POPS Staff Members	64
II.	Sample and Return Rate for Respondents to the Title I Schools Personnel Questionnaire for Classroom Teachers	64
III.	Formula and Calculations for the Split-Half Reliability Study on the Responses to the Program on Problem-Solving Skills Personnel Questionnaire for the Total Sample	67
IV.	Results of Item—Total Score Correlations for the Attitudinal Items in the Second Section of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills Questionnaire	68
V.	Results of the Demographic Data Collected in Section One of the Personnel Questionnaire Comparing POPS Personnel and Title I Classroom Teachers	74
VI.	The Results of the Mann-Whitney U Test and the Z-Test Comparing the Responses of the POPS Personnel and Title I Personnel on the Attitudinal Section of the Questionnaire	78

TABLE PAGE

VII. Results of the Chi-Square Analyses Comparing the Responses of the POPS Personnel and the Title I Personnel on the Attitudinal Items on the Second Section of the Personnel Questionnaire 80

VIII. Frequency and Percentage of Positive Responses to Items 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, and 47 in the Third Section of the POPS Personnel and Title I Questionnaire by Teachers and Administrators 89

IX. Frequency and Percentage of Positive Responses to Items 43 and 48 in the Third Section of the POPS Personnel and Title I Questionnaire by Teachers and Administrators 91

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

There is a growing concern among educators and the public as to the kind and quality of education provided students who are referred to as disadvantaged, culturally or educationally deprived. This concern is not restricted to the national level, but includes local educators as well. Thus, ". . . it is the problem of today's society and of particular concern to educators to find effective solutions to properly meet the needs of disadvantaged students. . . ."[1]

The problems of urban education are not unique to any one section of the country, but penetrate the total system of education. This has caused many school systems to review and assess the kind and quality of education being provided students who are categorized as disadvantaged. In the process of assessing and/or evaluating various instructional programs, it has become obvious to many educators including Rioux, ". . . that at the present time we operate under a serious handicap in working effectively with disadvantaged children in schools. . . ."[2] He further states that:

---

[1]Nancy C. Barker, "Knowledge of Teachers As Related to Diagnosing the Individual Needs of Culturally Deprived Children." (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1960.)

[2]J. William Rioux, "The Disadvantaged Child in School," in Disadvantaged Children, Volume I. Jerome Hellmuth, (ed.), (Washington: Straub and Hellmuth, Co-publishers, 1967), p. 85.

> . . . In an over-simplified sense we still, with few exceptions, produce teachers for work in depressed areas whose only tools for success are warmed-over versions of Sociology, Psychology, and Child Development I and II. Even this might help if the re-warmers of the material had a reasonably precise understanding of deprived populations. . . .[3]

In attempting to meet the demands of the disadvantaged child, educators have begun to recognize the importance of teachers and administrators whose responsibility it is to transmit the instructional program to the students. ". . . Schools have long realized that professional growth on the part of the teacher and administrator is necessary if they are to successfully meet the challenge of education today. . . ."[4]

Realizing the importance of the role of the teachers and administrators in the instructional process, there is a need for programs which emphasize teacher training that will assist in making the schools responsive to the needs and potentials of all children, particularly the disadvantaged. In the article by J. William Rioux, he pointed out the fact that:

> The search is still underway for the best ways to train teachers to work with children from disadvantaged backgrounds. Few will quarrel with the fact that much time should be devoted to understanding the life styles of the children and their families, and the numerous ways economic deprivation influence their lives. The best ways to achieve these understandings and translate them into meaningful differences in classroom approaches is the relatively undefined aspect. . . . Certainly

---

[3] Ibid.

[4] Joseph G. Brown, "A Study of the Effects of an In-Service Training Program on the School Behavior of Children and Teachers" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, 1967).

> a vital ingredient in whatever combination of approaches is felt to be most productive will include a balanced look at strengths and weaknesses in family life.[5]

Many school systems and institutions of higher learning have directed their attention toward trying to find new and better ways of training teachers to work with the disadvantaged. Institutions such as Hunter, Queens and Bank Street Colleges, Los Angeles City, Philadelphia, Chicago, New York City, and Buffalo public schools have established programs to train or reeducate teachers and administrators in ways of working more effectively with the disadvantaged. A large number of federal programs have been earmarked for this purpose.

Education of students from urban areas is also a problem of great concern to the Memphis City School System. Memphis, too, has long recognized the need for the kind of instructional programs which will be relevant and responsive to the needs of the disadvantaged. To this extent, financial assistance has been sought through various federal agencies to aid in establishing such programs. The system has been granted financial assistance through the Elementary and Secondary School Act to develop these programs. There are presently several instructional programs designed for the purpose of meeting the needs of disadvantaged students. Many of these programs are funded from Title I and Title III allocations with emphasis on teacher training.

Title I was designed to provide programs to help raise the achievement levels of disadvantaged students. Title III was designed

---

[5]Rioux, op. cit., p. 101.

to provide exemplary programs for the disadvantaged which could be implemented in regular classroom situations.

In designing special programs for the disadvantaged in Memphis, the program planners began to realize the importance of teacher training as a necessary ingredient for effective program implementation. Michale D. Urdan in his article, "The Preparation of Teachers for the Disadvantaged," reiterated this view when he stated that:

> . . . to train adequately persons to teach disadvantaged youngsters necessitates the development of programs that do more than merely "educate" in the narrow classroom sense. . . . specialized teacher education programs must be predicated upon the assumption that far more extensive field oriented training is necessary.[6]

Therefore, in order to move in the direction toward solving this problem, programs have been developed with teacher goals as well as student goals. Teacher goals focus on the theoretical and practical aspects of training teachers to work more efficaciously with the disadvantaged.

The Memphis Community Learning Laboratory (MCLL), a federally funded Title III program, under the direction of the Department of Instruction of the school system, undertook the task of trying to develop programs geared toward helping the disadvantaged both in the cognitive and affective sense. The developmental staff of the now defunct Memphis Community Learning Laboratory was especially concerned about the lack of academic performance and achievement of students, particularly inner-city students. They proposed to devise a program which would tend to

---

[6]Michael D. Urdan, "The Preparation of Teachers for the Disadvantaged," in The Disadvantaged Child; Volume I. Jerome Hellmuth, (ed.) (Washington: Straub and Hellmuth, Co-publishers, 1967), p. 225.

remediate these academic deficiencies. The result of these efforts was the Program on Problem-Solving Skills.

The Program on Problem-Solving Skills, a process oriented Title I project, was initially developed in 1969 by the Memphis Community Learning Laboratory, which was funded under a Title III ESEA grant. The basic purpose of the MCLL was to devise exemplary programs, instructional activities, and teaching modalities which could be used to raise the achievement of students in the language arts, social studies, science and mathematics. It was the philosophy of the MCLL staff that children could "learn how to learn" if they were provided with the proper instructional atmosphere and learning experiences. The staff also believed that in order to work more effectively with disadvantaged children, teacher training through in-service programs, workshops, and on-the-job training was necessary. Thus, the goals of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills were two-fold—teacher and student.

However, in preparing for the task of developing programs for the disadvantaged such as the Program on Problem-Solving Skills, there was a need for the identification of (a) personnel who were open to new ideas and methodologies; (b) teachers who were aware that problems existed and were willing to gear their human resources toward eliminating these problems; (c) more appropriate instructional materials and equipment; (d) the learning characteristics of educationally deprived children; (e) ways to detect and diagnose instructional problems for individual students; (f) methods of selecting and organizing instructional materials relating to specific learning needs, abilities and interests; (g) means

of determining appropriate techniques for evaluating student accomplishments; and (h) community awareness, acceptance and support.

The staff also felt the need for actual data which would specify the problems of the students served by the Lab. Thus, a study was conducted by the evaluation component of the Lab which resulted in the identification of twenty-one problems peculiar to inner-city children in Memphis.[7] These problems which were discussed in Chapter II parallel, in many instances, those documented by such outstanding authorities as Riessman, Biehler, Passow, Deutsch, Ausubel, Bloom, Davis and Hess.

Robert F. Biehler in an article entitled, "Teaching the Disadvantaged," identified the major problems of the disadvantaged children. They are: diet, health, moves, test taking difficulties, poor language skills, preference for physical learning, slow learning rate, poor motivation, low expectations on the part of the teacher, poor self-perceptions, and antagonism toward school.[8] These children, with their attendant problems, enter into an educational world which is foreign to their lifestyles and customs and which generally affects their lives in a negative manner. However, despite their differences, many disadvantaged pupils are likely to show some ". . . universal background characteristics."[9]

---

[7]"Interim Evaluation Report of the Memphis Community Learning Laboratory," Memphis City Schools (unpublished information, 1969).

[8]Robert F. Biehler, Psychology Applied to Teaching (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1971), p. 348.

[9]Ibid., p. 355.

Biehler's comments were applicable to the POPS students whose learning potential was considered to be markedly greater than was evidenced by their present performance and achievement levels. Though their achievement test scores were 1.0 or more below grade level on reading and mathematics subtests of a standardized test, other factors including I.Q. scores indicated that these students were indeed capable and desirous of learning.

The needs of the disadvantaged children were thus assessed; and an instructional program was developed. Implied in the program was the necessity for teachers to exhibit the development, internalization and demonstration of higher levels of expectancy for the students. Teachers had to become aware of the students' needs in order to construct and implement activities commensurate with the antecedent experiences and affective behaviors of the students. Thus, conditions for more intimate and knowledgeable contacts were provided that would enable the teachers to identify the strengths and weaknesses of their students.[10]

Though the funding period for the Title III grant terminated in June, 1971, POPS remained operational under Title I. The program was a skills oriented program in the language arts and mathematics for selected fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students in nine inner-city elementary schools in Memphis, Tennessee. It was funded by Title I and operated under the auspices of the Department of Instruction of the Memphis City Schools and was housed at the Vance Learning Center.

---

[10]"Program on Problem-Solving Skills: A Proposal" (Unpublished information, Department of Instruction, Memphis City Schools, 1972), p. 15.

The primary purpose of POPS was to raise the achievement levels of economically deprived and academically deficient students in mathematics and the language arts. Though the emphasis of the program was on the cognitive domain, the affective domain has not been neglected, for inherent within POPS were measures to improve, enhance and reward the students' self-concepts and their feelings of personal worth and dignity.[11]

The 1972-73 project included specific teacher goals, as well as student goals. The teacher goals implied modification and change in the behavior of teachers and administrators toward disadvantaged children. The project was designed to facilitate more meaningful interaction between the teachers and students by providing a program of sequential and developmental learning experiences in the problem-solving process. The POPS staff purported that this purpose could be accomplished by (1) teachers becoming more knowledgeable of the characteristics of academically deficient students; (2) teachers incorporating instructional materials and learning experiences which were commensurate with the needs, interests and abilities of the students; and (3) teachers becoming cognizant of and willing to use appropriate instructional activities, learning experiences, and teaching modalities which would better facilitate and improve the quality and quantity of learning. . . ."[12]

The POPS staff further postulated that unless the responsibility for developing programs specifically designed to improve the disadvantaged child's concept of school, learning and himself is accepted by

---

[11] Ibid., p. 20.

[12] Ibid.

school personnel, the problem will continue to be perpetuated and ever increasing. The program has been evaluated from the student vantage point. The intent of this study was to validate the program in an effort to determine if teachers and administrators have accomplished their goals.

The stated teacher goals of the program were:

1. Teachers will develop, internalize, and demonstrate higher levels of expectancy for their students.
2. Through more intimate and knowledgeable contacts, teachers will be able to identify the strengths and weaknesses of their students.
3. Teachers will construct and implement activities, utilizing methods and procedures commensurate with the ability levels of the students.[13]

The administrator is the instructional leader in the school and will be included in the evaluation because he can facilitate or inhibit the teachers in their attempts to meet the goals of the program. John E. Corbally, Jr., and his associates support this view by stating that:

> The primary purpose of leadership is to facilitate teaching and learning in . . . schools. To perform effective instructional leadership the . . . school administrator must be able to trace a direct relationship between the acts in which he engages and the improvement of teaching and learning conditions. His challenge, primarily, becomes that of creating conditions under which contributors can work positively. . . .[14]

---

[13]Ibid., p. 15.

[14]John E. Corbally, Jr., T. J. Jensen, and W. Frederick Staub, Educational Administration: The Secondary School (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961), p. 63.

Ralph Tyler also admits that "the principal . . . is a major influence on the morale and the ways of working of the teachers. . . ."[15]

Consequently, the posture of the principal influences the posture and instructional methodologies of teachers. Consideration of this item is important because without effective teaching, no educational endeavor will succeed, be it conventional or a "new" approach. The possibility of reversing the course of instructional retardation in the disadvantaged child depends on an optimal learning environment. With this in mind, teachers must be trained to fulfill the needs of these children by becoming aware of their learning styles and those physical, emotional, and mental needs necessary for maximum success. Teachers must be fortified with knowledge about low socioeconomic culture—particularly its strengths, attitudes toward education, inventiveness, and cooperativeness.[16] The Riot Commission Report states:

> Teacher training institutions should place major emphasis on preparing teachers for work in schools serving disadvantaged children. Courses should familiarize teacher candidates with the psychology, history, culture and learning problems of minority group pupils.[17]

In order for teachers and administrators to work efficaciously in the project, special in-service programs and workshops were conducted prior to program implementation and periodically thereafter. During

---

[15]Leon Lessinger and Ralph Tyler, (ed.), "Accountability in Perspective" in Accountability in Education (Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1970), pp. 1-5.

[16]Program on Problem-Solving Skills: A Proposal, op. cit., p. 6.

[17]Biehler, op. cit., p. 351.

these training sessions the cooperating teachers were given an orientation to the basic philosophy, goals, objectives, content and processes of the program, the problems of disadvantaged students, the processes and criteria of curriculum development, alternative teaching and instructional activities and modalities and various instructional management systems. In addition to the services of the POPS staff, the expertise of research specialists and educational consultants was utilized to plan and conduct the in-service training sessions.

Emphasis was placed on in-service training and continuous evaluation because authorities are agreed that this is necessary in order to change teacher behavior. "In-service education was aimed at reorienting teachers to the characteristics of the disadvantaged and providing them with skills, attitudes, and techniques which they had not acquired in earlier preparation. . . ."[18]

The in-service programs ". . . focused on reeducating the teachers to use new materials and apply new strategies (Learning Centers Approach-Skills Centers) to teaching reading and other skill subjects. The meaning of "curriculum relevancy" was sharpened, and a critical evaluation of instructional materials was utilized. Principles for curriculum development . . . were set forth to advantage the disadvantaged. . . ."[19]

---

[18]Doxey A. Wilkerson, "Compensatory Programs Across the Nation: A Critique," in Teaching the Disadvantaged Learner. "A Harry Passow" (ed.) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), p. 1.

[19]A. Harry Passow, (ed.), Teaching the Disadvantaged Learner (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), p. x.

Teachers' understanding of the problems and differences provides the basis for more effective teaching because no system works for all children. We have to know a variety of methods so that we can reach the child with his particular needs.[20]

The Program on Problem-Solving Skills has been operational since 1969. It has been continuously evaluated to determine if the students have made progress both affectively and cognitively. The program has never been evaluated to determine its impact upon the teachers and administrators involved in its implementation. ". . . The educational significance of the direct influence of the mature personality of teachers upon the behavior of impressionable children is worthy of careful evaluation and study. . . ."[21] With the clarion call to determine the best ways and kinds of training for teachers and administrators of the disadvantaged, and with a phase of the project emphasizing teacher training, a study of the effectiveness of the program from a teacher-administrator point of view was necessary. The study should be of value to the Memphis City School System in their efforts to find effective methods of dealing with the problem—training teachers and administrators to work more effectively with the disadvantaged.

---

[20]Leon Eisenberg, "Strengths of the Inner-City Child" in Education of the Disadvantaged. A. Harry Passow, Miriam Goldberg, and Abraham Tannenbaum (ed.), (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967), p. 83.

[21]Brown, loc. cit.

II. THE PROBLEM

"Within the past . . . years, there has been increasing concern with the problem of providing maximum educational stimulation for children from . . . disadvantaged groups. . . ."[22] Schools have had pressures exerted on them, both internally and externally, to change and/or modify the school curriculum and structure to meet the needs of the disadvantaged. These pressures have been mainly directed toward teachers and administrators, for they are at the center of the educational process.

Research studies have indicated that successful programs for disadvantaged students necessitate extensive teacher training if the goals of these programs are to be achieved. This situation has caused many school systems, including Memphis City Schools, to develop projects, such as the Program on Problem-Solving Skills, which emphasize reeducating teachers through in-service programs and on-the-job training.

Thus, a major problem confronting educators is the lack of training programs which would help teachers to become more knowledgeable of the lifestyles, values, mindsets and learning modes of disadvantaged students. Therefore, there is a need for programs which would aid teachers in diagnosing and assessing the unique needs, interests and problems of disadvantaged students in order to develop corresponding instructional strategies and activities. Diagnosing and assessing the strengths and

---

[22] Kenneth B. Clark, "Educational Stimulation of Racially Disadvantaged Children," in Education in Depressed Areas. A. Harry Passow, (ed.), (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970), p. 143.

weaknesses of the students are not ends in and of themselves, but only means to an end—the attainment of the goals of the school. The information gained by the teacher in such endeavors should be transmitted to those persons in decision-making positions, in order that decisions affecting curriculum and instruction would reflect the direct input of those who are expected to operationalize them.

Statement of the Problem

The primary problem investigated in this study was: Were there significant differences in the knowledge and attitudes of teachers and administrators toward disadvantaged students after having participated in the implementation of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills as opposed to the knowledge and attitudes toward the disadvantaged students of regular Title I classroom teachers who did not participate in the program?

The following subquestions were also answered:

1. Did Title I teachers and administrators engaged in POPS exhibit higher levels of expectancy for their students than Title I classroom teachers who were not involved in POPS?
2. Were there significant differences between POPS cooperating teachers in their abilities to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the disadvantaged students and regular Title I classroom teachers?
3. Were there significant differences in the relationship between the intended goals of the program and the perceptions and behavior of teachers and administrators involved in the implementation of the program?
4. Did the specific activities help the POPS cooperating teachers to understand and work more effectively with disadvantaged students?

In most instructional programs, the progress of the students is usually the factor evaluated. Various methods of evaluation are utilized to assess this dimension. However, educators in most instances, fail to

realize the importance of the teachers and administrators in the instructional process. The role of the teacher and administrator can either facilitate or detract from effective program operation. Robert L. Hammond suggests that:

> Assessment programs of the past have focused on the child and his response to content in a given subject area. With the change taking place in instructional programs, more evidence is needed as to the influence of teachers, administrators, parents and the community on a given innovation. . . .[23]

Lee J. Cronbach agrees that a problem ". . . of major concern to many educators is that of how the effectiveness of new curricula and other innovations can best be determined. . . ."[24]

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to determine whether the Program on Problem-Solving Skills had an impact upon the teachers and administrators directly involved in its implementation.

Significance and Implications of the Study

The Program on Problem-Solving Skills was implemented in the twelfth largest school system in the United States, thus, a large number of students were affected by the decisions made. The needs of disadvanted students were unique. If through participation in this program

---

[23]Robert L. Hammond, "Evaluation at the Local Level," in Readings in Curriculum Evaluation. Peter A. Taylor and Doris M. Cowley, (ed.), Iowa: William C. Brown Co. Publisher, 1972), p. 177.

[24]Lee J. Cronbach, cited by Peter A. Taylor and Doris M. Cowley, (ed.) in Readings in Curriculum Evaluation (Iowa: William C. Brown Publishing Co., 1972), p. 234.

teachers became more aware of the problems of the disadvantaged and provided the kind of help needed, the findings of this study will be valuable in assisting the school system by providing data for making decisions relative to future implementation of special programs, particularly POPS. The findings will further provide information about the effectiveness of teachers and administrators in program implementation. Most evaluation schemes or procedures do not consider whether teacher goals of the program are achieved in the process of program implementation, nor whether teachers and administrators themselves have changed as a result of participating in the implementation of the program. The study will also provide additional information which can lead to improved professional growth activities or in-service programs for teachers of students, in general, and disadvantaged students, in particular. It has important implications for teacher education programs, especially those dealing with the disadvantaged students. Furthermore, this study will provide information that will assist in the development of a different method of evaluation of program effectiveness. This is very necessary, because, the component of the school system charged with the onus of evaluating programs has never attempted this type of evaluative study. Robert Hammond states that:

> . . . local program evaluation will provide data for the school system to make those important decisions necessary for providing instructional programs to meet the needs of every child.[25]

---

[25]Hammond, op. cit., p. 237.

Limitations and Delimitations

1. The study was limited by the two major problems of reliability and validity of instrumentation. Reliability is the accuracy or precision of a measuring instrument. High reliability is no guarantee of good scientific results but there are no good scientific results without reliability.[26] A test or scale is valid for the scientific or partical purpose of its user.[27] Validity refers to the extent to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure.[28] There is great difficulty in achieving reliability and validity of psychological, sociological, and educational measurements. Reliability is to a large extent a technical matter. Validity is more than technique. It deals with the essence of science itself.[29]
2. The study was delimited to the population of the schools selected to participate in the program.
3. The study was delimited to one Title I program operational in nine Title I schools.
4. The study was further delimited by the teacher goals of the program.

---

[26]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973), pp. 443-457.

[27]Ibid.

[28]Donald Ary, Lucy C. Jacobs and Anghar Razevich, Introduction to Research in Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973), p. 191.

[29]Kerlinger, op. cit., p. 473.

5. The study was limited by the quality of the perceptions of the population included in the study.
6. The study was also delimited in terms of interpretation of the results. Though the data showed attitudinal differences, it dealt with affective aspects and was not directed toward the cognitive domain.

III. ASSUMPTIONS

1. The stated program goals are appropriate, realistic, valid and capable of being assessed.
2. The goals are capable of being met or are attainable.
3. The teachers and administrators will cooperate in accomplishing the goals.
4. The instrument developed by the researcher will measure the perceived impact of the stated goals on teachers and administrators.
5. Given the necessary educational training teachers can diagnose needs of disadvantaged students.
6. Given the necessary training teachers can construct and implement materials and activities to meet the needs of the disadvantaged.
7. The perceptions of the personnel concerning the program are primary factors in determining its effectiveness.

IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

There are many terms that were used in discussing educational programs for disadvantaged students. Some of these terms were germane to the Program on Problem-Solving Skills. However, in order to facilitate better understanding of the program and the study, it was necessary to define the terms endemic to this study.

1. Administrators. Administrators were principals of the nine Title I schools where the program was implemented.
2. Back-Up-Teachers. Those teachers who facilitated the implementation of the program by working with the staff members and cooperating teachers in developing instructional activities and materials commensurate with the needs, abilities and interests of the project pupils.
3. Component. Component was the work area for the staff members in each discipline (language-arts and mathematics) at the Lab.
4. Cooperating Teachers. Staff members of the nine Title I schools operating in the regular classroom who team with the POPS staff in implementing the program.
5. Disadvantaged. Disadvantaged were students in Title I schools whose learning potential was considered to be greater than was evidenced by their performance and achievement levels. (Synonymously used with inner-city, culturally deprived or intellectually deprived students.)
6. ESEA. Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

7. Goals. Goals were the stated purposes that the program anticipated achieving.

8. Impact. Impact related to the degree to which teachers and administrators achieved stated teacher goals established for the project.

9. Inner-City. Inner-City was the section of the city with a high density of school children, and approximately 40,000 residents. Nine of the ten schools in the area are located within a two-mile proximity of the downtown shopping area and were surrounded by three low rent housing projects carved from the larger slum area. The average incidence of poverty among the families was 58.3 percent (annual incomes of less than $3,000). The community was characterized by a high dropout and suspension rate, relatively low academic achievement among pupils and a high incidence of adults who had not received an elementary level education. There was an urgent need to modify methods and techniques of instruction, to develop new instructional materials and equipment, and to develop new evaluative instruments and procedures.[30]

10. I.Q. A number held to express the relative intelligence of a person determined by dividing his mental age by his chronological

---

[30] Evaluation Report of the Memphis Community Learning Laboratory (Unpublished information, Division of Research, Memphis City Schools, 1970), pp. i-ii.

age with chronological years above 14 or sometimes 16 disregarded and then multiplying by 100 to eliminate decimals.[31]

11. Lab. Lab was the name used synonymously to identify the MCLL or Memphis Community Learning Laboratory.

12. Memphis City School System. Memphis City School System was the public school system in Memphis, the twelfth largest system in the United States.

13. Memphis Community Learning Laboratory (MCLL). Memphis Community Learning Laboratory was a part of the Memphis City School System which housed the program components and the staff. It was originally a Title III Central Cities Task Force project authorized under ESEA and administered by the Memphis City School System.

14. Program on Problem-Solving Skills (POPS). POPS was the program which was developed under a Title III grant and is now operating as a Title I Project. It was developed as an exemplary program to meet the needs of the disadvantaged.

15. Regular Title I Teachers. Regular Title I classroom teachers were members of group B.

16. Resource Teacher. Resource Teacher was the person responsible for the overall coordination of the project in the nine Title I schools.

---

[31] A. Merriam-Webster, Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Volume II (Chicago: William Benton Publisher, 1972), p. 1174.

17. Staff Members. Staff members were those members assigned to the personnel component of the program to team teach with the cooperating teachers on a regularly scheduled basis and to assist in developing instructional activities commensurate with the abilities, needs, and interests of the project students.

18. Title I. Title I was designed to establish programs to meet the needs of educationally and culturally deprived children.

19. Title I Schools. (Project Schools) Title I Schools were those schools with more than 20.2 percent incidence of poverty and an average family income of up to $3,000 as established criteria by the Federal Government.

20. Vance Learning Center. Vance Learning Center was the name given to the now defunct Title III Memphis Community Learning Laboratory which housed the staff of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills.

V. THE STUDY DESIGN

This research study was designed to investigate and provide a description of the changes effected in teachers and administrators as a result of their participation in the Program on Problem-Solving Skills. The subjects were divided into two groups; A and B. Group A included teachers, administrators, and the POPS staff who were directly involved in the implementation of the program. Group B included regular Title I classroom teachers. A questionnaire was developed to assess the knowledge

and attitudes of the subjects concerning the program and disadvantaged students.

The research was geared toward an assessment of an instructional program that required modification of the attitudes and behaviors of the teachers and administrators who participated in its implementation. This study was not of the traditional pretest, posttest, curriculum evaluation design.

The purposes of descriptive research as outlined by Carter V. Good are:

1. To secure evidence concerning an existing situation or current condition.
2. To identify standards or norms with which to compare present conditions, in order to plan the next step.
3. To determine how to make the next step (having determined where you wish to go).[32]

In the Science of Education Research, George J. Mouly advanced the following purpose of descriptive research; ". . . to establish the status of the phenomena under investigations.[33] Frederick L. Whitney supports this statement by indicating ". . . that descriptive research is fact finding and adequate interpretation."[34]

---

[32]Carter V. Good, Essentials of Educational Research (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc., 1966), p. 162.

[33]George J. Mouly, The Science of Educational Research (New York: American Book Co., 1967), p. 231.

[34]Frederick L. Whitney, The Elements of Research (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1950), p. 160.

Samples

The sample used in this study was composed of two groups which included administrators and teachers in selected Title I (inner-city) schools and the staff of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills. Group A was composed of those teachers and administrators who participated in the implementation of the program. This group included nine administrators, forty-one cooperating teachers in the project schools and the twelve POPS staff members. Group B included a group of teachers of regular Title I classes.

The selection of the members of Group B was conducted by the Division of Research and Planning using a stratified random sampling procedure. This procedure was necessary to identify those teachers in Group B who matched Group A on the basis of geographic location, socio-economic status, past educational achievement, aptitude records and racial ratios of the students.

Instrumentation

A survey of the literature did not reveal an instrument conducive to investigating and collecting the necessary data for the study. Thus, the questionnaire, a Likert type scale, used in the study was developed by the researcher. The instrument was presented to a panel of experts from the Division of Research of the Memphis City School System for review and comments. This panel was selected because of their knowledge of evaluation and understanding of the program being studied.

The questionnaire using the Likert type scale included three sections: (a) demographic data; (b) information relative to the goals of the program; and (c) general information relating to the disadvantaged. Demographic data for both groups are presented in tabular form. Item analyses were made on the second section of the questionnaire using nonparametric statistical tests. The tests used to report the interpretation of the data collected were the Mann-Whitney U, z-test, t-test and the binominal probability model. Percentages of the responses for both groups on the third section of the questionnaire were calculated and presented in tabular form. This interpretation of data was explained more thoroughly in Chapter III.

Reliability Study

The instrument developed by the researcher was subjected to a reliability study. This study was performed by applying the Spearman-Brown formula, and the split-half reliability coefficient used to determine the internal consistency of the instrument. Statistical computation between odd items and even items (for part two) was performed by applying the Spearman-Brown formula which yielded a reliability coefficient of .89.

> The Spearman-Brown formula was designed to estimate the reliability of a test N times as long as the one for which we know a self-correlation. Many times a split-half correlation is known for a test and the correlation of halves is an estimate of r_u for the half test.
>
> It is possible to get a measure of reliability from a single administration of one form of a test by using the split-half procedure. The test is administered to a group of subjects, and later the items are divided into two comparable halves. Scores are obtained for each individual or the comparable halves and a coefficient of correlation calculated between these two scores.

> The correlation coefficient computed between the two halves will systematically underestimate the reliability of the entire test . . . . To transform the split-half correlation into an appropriate reliability estimate for the entire test, the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula is employed.[35]

Collection of Data

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Department of Instruction of the Memphis City School System. The instrument used in the study was divided into three sections: (a) demographic data; (b) program information; and (c) general information to ascertain other pertinent knowledge relative to disadvantaged or inner-city students. The instrument was then distributed to the administrators and teachers involved in the study on October 22, 1973.

Included in the packets distributed were the questionnaire forms and the response sheets which were color coded to distinguish the two groups in the study, directions for completing the questionnaire and self-addressed envelopes. Respondents were requested to complete the response sheets and return in the envelope via the regular mail service, provided by the school system. In the process, complete anonymity was requested by the researcher to eliminate certain variables that would have affected the returns.

The Department of Instruction and the Division of Research and Planning were interested in and supportive of the study to be conducted by the researcher. Thus, a letter was sent by personnel of these

---

[35]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations in Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963), p. 438.

departments to the participants in the study requesting and encouraging their full and immediate cooperation in completing the questionnaires (see Appendix G).

After a check was made on the return rate of the questionnaires distributed, it was found that no follow-up for further returns was necessary. This was attributed to the coordination of the dissemination process through the regular Title I evaluation program utilizing the intersystem mail. After all questionnaires were returned, the members of the Division of Research and Planning were instrumental in securing the services of the computer center.

Treatment of the Data

Upon examination of the data collected, the statistical measures most amenable to analysis and interpretation of these data were chi square, X^2, the Mann-Whitney U test, z-test, t-test and the binomial probability model. These tests were used to analyze the attitudinal items in the second section of the questionnaire.

Since the researcher was interested in determining the differences between observed behavior of the subjects and what was expected according to a theoretical model under the laws of chance, the statistical technique chi square, X^2, was used.[36] The chi square, X^2, statistic tells whether one's observations differ from what is expected by chance at a particular level of significance. Data can be of any level of

---

[36]Dean J. Champion, Basic Statistics for Social Research (Pennsylvania: Chandler Publishing Co., 1970), p. 152.

measurement.[37] The Mann-Whitney U test was used because the researcher was interested in determining if differences in attitudes between the two groups existed concerning the program at the .05 level of significance. It is a test for the significance of difference between two samples where the elements have been ranked according to some ordinal-level variable. Specifically it was designed to determine whether the various ranked values for any given variable are equally distributed throughout both samples.[38]

VI. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This study is divided into four chapters. Chapter I included (1) the introduction to the study, (2) statement of the problem, and questions to be answered, (3) purpose of the study, (4) significance and implications of the study, (5) limitations and delimitations of the study, (6) assumptions, (7) definitions of terms, (8) methodology used for collecting and analyzing the data. Chapter II contained a review of pertinent literature. Chapter III included procedures for collection, presentation, and analyses of the research findings. The summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study are presented in Chapter IV.

---

[37] Ibid., p. 134.

[38] Ibid., p. 176.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

I. INTRODUCTION

Research abounds with literature which focuses attention on the disadvantaged, poverty-stricken, and/or underachieving children who reside in the inner city, and do little more than attend inner-city schools. Numerous studies have been made to assess the nature and extent of the academic underachievement of a significant number of these studies. Other studies have been conducted to ascertain why the rate of academic achievement in inner-city schools is lower than that in more affluent schools. Scores of agencies, committees, and organizations have been established to formulate ways and means of alleviating the noneducation or undereducation of the disadvantaged—and yet the problems of the disadvantaged remain largely unsolved.

With the proliferation of information resulting from the various studies by authorities, however, more attention has been focused on disadvantaged students, their attendant problems, and how teachers and administrators can best cope with them. Projects have been designed and studies conducted to find ways to train professional personnel to work more effectively with the disadvantaged because the evidence indicated that their problems were not attributable to a single aspect or factor.

II. THE IMPORTANCE OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Project "TEACH" (Teacher Education for Advancing the Culturally Handicapped, Los Angeles) was designed to decrease the culture shock to the teachers in a disadvantaged classroom by providing on-site or on-the-job training. The project proved to be a definite help to teachers of the disadvantaged. It was concluded that teachers need to study the kind and degree of deprivation each child suffers in order to know what methods will be most appropriate.[1]

In a similar project in the Houston Independent School District entitled, "Teaching the Disadvantaged," it was found that providing an effective program for economically deprived children required a school staff that was committed to attending the individual needs of pupils. The teachers and staff recognizing the unique needs of children of meager backgrounds must demonstrate warm, friendly attitudes toward them.[2]

The Atlanta area conducted a workshop on preparing teachers to work with disadvantaged youth. The purpose of the workshop was to generate

---

[1]Hanna Lyle et al., "Teacher Education for the Culturally Handicapped, Elementary Teacher Preparation" (California State College: Los Angeles School of Education, January, 1967), pp. 1-148.

[2]"Teaching the Disadvantaged," Houston Independent School District (Washingtin, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education, 1968), pp. 1-18.

ideas for preservice and in-service teacher education programs that attend to the special problems of working with disadvantaged youth.[3]

Collier County Department of Public Instruction provided training for teachers of the disadvantaged through an in-service program. The program was aimed at providing an intensive orientation to the problems of the disadvantaged and a look at some promising practices which may assist teachers in helping provide better educational opportunities for these children.[4]

In a study by Dorothy W. Gibson on in-service education, she found that teachers of disadvantaged are seen as a special case needing sensitizing to their particular clientele. The implications for teacher education are:

1. Teachers should be helped to learn new roles as they change from being primarily dispensers of information to becoming catalysts in the learning process and coordinators of instruction.
2. In-service training programs should be planned for administrators as well as teachers.
3. Taking formal courses may not be as effective a means of in-service as more informal processes.
4. Cooperative teaching—a plan whereby two or more teachers work with the same group of students opens up new possibilities for in-service education.
5. There is a need for simultaneous development of curriculum and in-service education.
6. Teachers in schools for the disadvantaged need opportunities to develop new attitudes, understandings and skills.[5]

---

[3]Wilma C. Cody et al., "The Atlanta Area Workshop on Preparing Teachers to Work with Disadvantaged Youth" (Atlanta: The Urban Laboratory in Education, 1967), p. 1.

[4]"Collier County Institute for Teachers of Disadvantaged Children and Youth" (Florida: Collier County Board of Instruction, 1967), ED013127.

[5]Dorothy W. Gibson, Inservice Education Perspectives for Education (Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1967), pp. 1-82.

Muriel Crosby (1967) in an article reported that in-service education for teachers of disadvantaged should be planned to: (1) effect a change of attitude on the part of the teacher, (2) enable teachers to learn new approaches and techniques in diagnosing human relations needs of children, and (3) help teachers acquire skills in building curriculum experiences based on children's perceptions of their needs.[6]

Project BOOTSTRAP (Better Opportunities for Teachers and Students to Realize the Awareness for Progress), was designed to serve teachers, administrators and students. It was initiated to improve the educational capabilities of teachers in teaching the disadvantaged students. The by-product was better educated teachers which make for better educated students.[7]

The Tulsa, Oklahoma School System was concerned with the kind of teacher training which would tend to ameliorate the problems of working with the disadvantaged. Consequently, they developed a program geared toward improving the quality of instruction for educationally and culturally disadvantaged, low-achieving students. As a result of working in the program it was concluded that a critical need was served when teachers were trained or taught to teach disadvantaged children. Training was provided that would not have been otherwise available. It is

---

[6]Muriel Crosby, "Elementary School Program for the Education of the Disadvantaged," in The Educationally Retarded and Disadvantaged. Sixty-sixth Yearbook, Part I. Paul Witty (ed.) (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1967), pp. 168-183.

[7]Virginia Grundy, "Project BOOTSTRAP," Buchanan County School Board (1968), ES001938.

important that efficient ways of instruction be found and implemented by teachers and curricular materials appropriate for their pupils be developed, selected, and evaluated in classroom interaction. Teachers assigned to work with educationally deprived children can improve their skills through in-service education. Retraining of teachers and other professional personnel is important for developing more effective ways of working with educationally or culturally deprived children.[8]

William T. Acuff in his study, "Orientation of Beginning Teachers in Small Urban Systems," cited the need for and importance of orientation programs for teachers. He also proposed that the purpose for such programs should be based on a careful analysis of the new needs and problems that teachers will experience. This will help to initiate an effective program of orientation for newly assigned teachers to inner-city and/or Title I schools and assist those presently working in these schools.[9]

A study conducted by Storen, Harris, Edgar and Kornberg, called project BRIDGE (Building Resources of Instruction for Disadvantaged Groups in Education) dealt with teacher education and had as its major objective, developing ways to better prepare teachers to help

---

[8]"To Establish and Operate a Resource Center for In-Service Training for School Personnel Working with Educationally Deprived Children" (Tulsa, Oklahoma Independent School District, 1967), pp. 1-23.

[9]William T. Acuff, "Orientation of Beginning Teachers in Small Urban Systems" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, July, 1952), p. 81.

disadvantaged children to learn. Teachers learned how to reach their children and how to make school work more meaningful to them.[10]

The literature has borne out the fact ". . . that for effective learning to take place, teachers should be able to reach the individual child and diagnose his needs. . . ."[11] ". . . Teachers at all levels must be trained to operate in schools which are servicing a population with unique characteristics and needs. More and more institutions of higher education have become cognizant of the need to effectuate program changes which will prepare their graduates to teach in cities in which the proportion of disadvantaged youngsters continues to increase greatly. . . ."[12]

Hunter College and Queens College of the City University of New York have been pioneering institutions experimenting in programs for preparing teachers to work with the disadvantaged. Reports from these projects provide evidence that anxieties of college students can be mitigated by direct contact with the school and the disadvantaged community it serves.[13] Their evidence suggests that the need for practical field experiences for prospective teachers of the disadvantaged is important in helping them to work effectively in disadvantaged schools.

---

[10]Leonard Kornberg, "Meaningful Teachers for Alienated Children," in Education in Depressed Areas. A. Harry Passow, (ed.) (New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College Pub., 1963), pp. 265-269.

[11]Michael D. Urdan, "Program for Preparing Teachers of the Disadvantaged," in Disadvantaged Child Volume I. Jerome Hellmuth, (ed.) (Washington: Straub and Hellmuth Co-publishers, 1967), p. 226.

[12]Ibid., p. 227.

[13]Ibid., p. 230.

Harry N. Rivlin in his studies of urban teacher education programs set forth some basic assumptions:

1. The elementary or secondary school classroom, not the college, is the place where teachers learn most about how to teach.
2. Teaching is more than a craft to be mastered through an apprenticeship.
3. No teacher-education program can be effective without the close cooperation of schools and colleges.
4. Attending classes is only one way of learning: prospective teachers can learn a great deal from . . . working with children at school.[14]

The literature supports the contention that if teachers are to work successfully with disadvantaged students, they must be aware of the characteristics, needs and problems of their students. They must be able to diagnose their strengths and weaknesses in order to develop the appropriate instructional strategies to ameliorate their existing conditions. Therefore, programs must strive to develop and nurture attitudes in prospective teachers, as well as, teachers already in service toward disadvantaged children that reflect acceptance and belief in the educability and human dignity of their children.[15]

Studies have also shown that there is a great need to train teachers to deal with and attempt to overcome their own "culture shock" and "culture bias." Once a teacher begins to understand and to appreciate the slum community, she is closer to understanding and appreciating why

---

[14]Harry N. Rivlin, cited by Jerome Hellmuth, Disadvantaged Child Volume I (Washington, D.C.: Straub and Hellmuth, Co-publishers, 1967), p. 231.

[15]Jerome Hellmuth, (ed.), Disadvantaged Child Volume I (Washington: D.C.: Straub and Hellmuth, Co-publishers, 1967), p. 238.

the children "are the way they are" and will not be likely to condemn and reject them because they are not what she in her middle-class framework thinks they "ought to be." She will then be in a more palatable position to be able to reach and teach them.[16]

Beck and Saxe, two protagonists of in-service training for teachers, particularly the disadvantaged, concluded from their studies that teachers can be trained to use procedures, methods and materials that have been found to work with the disadvantaged.[17]

James C. Stone in recent studies which dealt with the effects of in-service education programs for teachers of the disadvantaged found some interesting data in regards to successful teaching. The studies indicated that too many teachers are not fully aware of the problems of the deprived child, steps must be taken to change this lack of awareness, and at the same time, change the attitudes of the teachers. The author listed some specific objectives which an appropriately planned in-service training program for teachers of the disadvantaged should include. These are:

1. To increase the sensitivity and awareness of school personnel and enhance their understanding of the many dimensions and effects of poverty, cultural deprivation, and educational disadvantagement on children.
2. To help teachers gain familiarity with and skill in the use of instructional procedures, techniques, media, materials, and equipment that are especially effective in meeting the educational needs of the disadvantaged pupils.

---

[16]Staten W. Webster, The Disadvantaged Learner, Knowing; Understanding, Educating (California: Chandler Publishing Co., 1966), p. 435.

[17]John M. Beck and Richard N. Saxe, Teaching the Culturally Disadvantaged Pupil (Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1965), p. xii.

3. To help school personnel to become increasingly sensitive to and understanding of the characteristics, cultural backgrounds, educational needs, and special learning problems of disadvantaged children and youth.
4. To encourage goal planning that would result in changes in the instructional program consistent with the needs of disadvantaged children.
5. To help them develop a positive self-image within each child.
6. To help them change the child's attitude toward school and education.
7. To help understand and accept disadvantaged children.
8. To train teachers in the use of testing and diagnostic techniques in the assessment of specific reading and learning disabilities and also in the use of prescriptive techniques and special materials in meeting . . . skills and needs of disadvantaged children.[18]

III. THE NATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Research has indicated that teachers and other professional personnel must be knowledgeable about and understand the nature and characteristics of the disadvantaged to be able to work more effectively with them. Data cited in "An Experiment in Teaching the Disadvantaged," indicated that deprived youth can learn the same as more privileged youth if difficulties diagnosed are remediated through planned programs and they are exposed to quality instruction. This study also indicated that program planners must take into account what is unique about the disadvantaged, and what is impairing their ability to learn or perform within the

---

[18]James C. Stone, Teachers for the Disadvantaged (California: Jassey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1969), pp. 268, 31-32, 46, 54.

framework of the present educational structure in order to devise appropriate curricula and teaching strategies.[19]

Frank Riessman supports this contention when he noted in his investigations that:

> Patterns exist which are particularly characteristic of the disadvantaged learner. If these patterns are understood and used as a basis for planning and teaching and guidance, they can greatly enhance achievement by lower class youngsters. Each individual's strengths and weaknesses should be diagnosed and treated through appropriate strategies of instruction.[20]

Disadvantaged children cannot sever themselves from the familiar and immediately delve into experiences that are foreign and be expected to communicate and perform by the usual methods. For children whose worlds extend, for the most part, only a few blocks in any direction from their residences, branching out into other experiences is necessary. Since the child can do little about his environment, schools and society should, as far as possible, modify those conditions providing a new realm of experiences for the students.

Ralph Tyler in an address to the National Conference on the Education of the Disadvantaged—1966 stated:

> The learning which is important for more fortunate children is the aim of those who are disadvantaged. The path to reach this goal and the rate of progress may be differed, but we

---

[19]"An Experiment in Teaching the Disadvantaged," Alabama State College (November, 1971), ERICD067373.

[20]Frank Riessman, "The Strategy of Learning Styles," Teachers College Record (New York 1964-65), pp. 483-484.

> shall not be satisfied until we have devised ways by which all children may become lifelong learners. Schools have not effectively dealt with the education of this group.[21]

The Educational Policies Commission concurs and points out that ". . . The goals of education for the disadvantaged are not different from those of other American children."[22] Tyler further states that:

> There must be an all out effort to learn what kind of changes need to be made in the organization and administration of schools, their curricular offerings, the methodology of teaching, facilities, and in the preparation of teachers to produce an educational program that will afford each individual the kind of opportunity for education to which he is entitled. There is a need to identify the appropriate changes in the educational process.[23]

In preparing for the instruction of the inner-city child and the understanding of this child by those who will teach him, much has been expounded as to his needs and how these needs are to be met. However, much has been lost when it is time to implement these ideas. For this reason, it is necessary to review some of the research which explains the factors that have caused the disadvantaged child to be undereducated and ways teachers can effectively and efficiently deal with the problem.

Deutsch in his investigation found that part of the problem lies in early years before the child attends school. He maintains that many disadvantaged children do not receive the variety and kind of stimuli in

---

[21]Ralph W. Tyler, address to National Conferences on "The Education of the Disadvantaged," cited in Education for the Culturally Disadvantaged (Arkansas: 1967), p. 3.

[22]Educational Policies Commission, "American Education in the Search for Equal Opportunity" (Washington, D.C., 1965), p. 7.

[23]Tyler, op. cit., p. 35.

their environment which is necessary to promote the development of the prerequisite academic skills necessary for success in school. In other words, the child is likely to be deficient in the "equipment" required for learning. This emphasis on the importance of and variety in the environment implies the detrimental effects of lack of variety. This in turn leads to the concept of stimulus deprivation. This deprivation has effects on both the formal and the contentual aspects of cognition.[24] The statement suggests that the range of experiences for the disadvantaged is restricted. They do not develop in a manner which is considered optimal and constitutes less variety in input, which would be reasonable to assume a concomitant restriction in the variety of output.[25]

"Support for" Deutsch's position "is found in Hunt who, in discussing his research on Piaget's developmental theories, points out that, according to Piaget . . . the rate of development is in substantial part . . . a function of environmental circumstances."[26]

Wilkerson further notes that:

> . . . substandard academic performance commonly observed among children of the poor is partially—if not wholly—a function of negative influence in the environment where they are nurtured. They enter school with low academic motivation, distorted self-concepts and lacking in experiential basis for normative cognitive development.[27]

---

[24]Martin Deutsch, "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," in Education in Depressed Areas. A. Harry Passow, (ed.) (New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College Pub., 1963), pp. 168-169.

[25]Ibid. [26]Ibid.

[27]Doxey A. Wilkerson, "Compensatory Programs Across the Country: A Critique," in Reaching the Disadvantaged. A. Harry Passow, (ed.) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), p. 10.

Research studies have documented the fact that disadvantaged children enter school with a myriad of problems, strengths and weaknesses. Riessman has assembled evidence indicating that the culturally disadvantaged child appears to have a physical and visual style of learning, is inclined to work at a leisurely pace, and acquires generalizations slowly. In general, he appears to be less persevering in difficult tasks than more privileged children. A disadvantaged child is more prone to tenacity or an habitual approach when pursuing solutions to problems. Specifically, Riessman's studies indicated that the disadvantaged child is:

1. Physical and visual rather than aural.
2. Content-centered rather than form centered.
3. Externally oriented rather than introspective.
4. Problem-centered rather than abstract centered.
5. Inductive rather than deductive in thinking.
6. Spatial rather than temporal.
7. Slow, careful, patient and persevering.[28]

Basil Bernstein, an authority on language patterns and usage of children found in his research that disadvantaged children "communicate in a restrictive language code lacking formal language."[29]

Fusco in his studies noted that "poor comprehension of middle-class language impairs performance to a substantial degree. Disadvantaged

---

[28]Frank A. Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962), p. 73.

[29]Basil Bernstein, cited in Education of the Disadvantaged. A. Harry Passow, Miriam Goldberg, and Abraham Tannenbaum, (ed.) (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967), p. 376.

children have difficulty responding to the "advanced linguistic forms" of the middle class.[30]

Martin Deutsch in a study entitled, "The Role of Social Class in Language Development and Cognition," reports that:

> If language is a mediator of intellectual and academic development as well as a consequence of mental growth, then the limited language development of disadvantaged pupils impedes school learning.[31]

J. McVicker Hunt, who has done much research on environmental factors which influence behavior and development noted that disadvantaged children:

> . . . exhibit unequal achievement in certain subject areas; have developed basic skills but are deficient in their application; have not developed the precursive or technical skills for a subject or apply processes inconsistently; are intellectually superior but underachieve in some or all subjects.[32]

Leon Eisenberg's findings from his studies may be subsumed under the following categories:

1. More equalitarian value system
2. Concreteness in learning and thinking
3. Superior physical coordination and skills
4. Physical rather than verbal

---

[30]Gene C. Fusco, "Preparing the City Child for His School," School Life, Vol. 46, No. 6, Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office (May, 1964), p. 5.

[31]Martin Deutsch, "The Role of Social Class in Language Development and Cognition," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 35 (1965), pp. 78-88.

[32]J. McVicker Hunt, "Intelligence and Experience" (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1961), p. 4.

5. Externally oriented rather than introspective

6. Inability to abstract

7. Slow cognitive style, careful and patient

The style of the inner-city child is physical and visual. What they can see is better than what they hear.[33]

Wilkerson from his research sums the lot of the disadvantaged student, school, learning and himself in the following statement:

> There is no doubt that minimal academic motivation, substandard school performance and alienation are endemic among the children of the poor; these and many other characteristics of disadvantaged children have been documented profusely by relevant research.[34]

Numerous studies have been conducted which deal with the problem of the disadvantaged and the effects these problems have on their learning styles. Thus, in planning the Program on Problem-Solving Skills, consideration was given to those deficiencies in the learning styles of inner-city school children of Memphis in order to develop a program that would address itself to the needs of the disadvantaged. From a study conducted by the Division of Research and Planning, the problems unique to the disadvantaged in Memphis were assessed. It was found that disadvantaged children have a slow mental style which gives the impressions of less ability than actually exists. There are deficiencies in effective habits of perception including both auditory and visual discrimination. They lack confidence in self and have minute feelings of worth and dignity.

---

[33]Leon Eisenberg, "Strengths of the Inner-City Child," Baltimore Bulletin of Education. Baltimore: 1963, Vol. 64, No. 41, p. 2.

[34]Wilkerson, op. cit., p. 5.

They do not possess basic problem-solving skills or those skills for optimum learning. Thus, ability to follow directions is limited as are listening and interpretation skills. There exists a fear of failure and inadequate motivation to pursue long-range educational goals. There are deficiencies in psychomotor development (gross and fine motor skills), as well as limited language and number experiences. The children have little or no rapport with the school, learning situations, or school personnel. They lack enriched social skills and experiences. They are frequently in poor health, suffer hunger syndromes usually accompanied by improper diet and poor personal grooming habits. Attendance in school is irregular and there is little or no educational tradition in the home.[35]

The implications are that the school's program must be developed in consonance with those problems confronted by the disadvantaged child. Efforts must be made to adjust academic considerations to his abilities, interests and needs. The guiding principle must be what the educational system does to the total child.[36] For as Miriam Goldberg says in her investigation, ". . . the best test of any approach is its effect on pupil learning in the classroom."[37]

---

[35]Program on Problem-Solving Skills: A Proposal (Unpublished information, Department of Instruction, Memphis, Tennessee, 1972), p. 8.

[36]Ibid., p. 9.

[37]Miriam Goldberg, "Methods and Materials for Educating Disadvantaged Youth," in Education of the Disadvantaged. A. Harry Passow, Miriam Goldberg, and Abraham Tennenbaum, (ed.) (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963), p. 373.

Attention, therefore, must be focused on the instructional techniques, materials and experiences which motivate the disadvantaged child. To help eliminate these problems, the Program on Problem-Solving Skills was designed to improve the basic academic, sociological, and psychological needs of educationally deprived children.[38]

Lassar Gotkin also calls attention to this fact by stating that:

> . . . when objectives are clearly defined and appropriate instructional sequences are provided to facilitate and encourage children to accelerate, large portions of ghetto children not only reach grade level expectancies but exceed them.[39]

IV. THE IMPACT OF TEACHER PERCEPTIONS ON THE ACHIEVEMENT OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

There is also a growing body of information which implies that many teachers feel the lower-class or disadvantaged child is intellectually limited. Frank Riessman noted a similar belief based on his conversations with teachers. Charles Silberman suggests:

> The teacher who assumes that her children cannot learn very much will discover that she has a class of children who are indeed unable to learn—a prime example of what sociologists call the "self-fulfilling prophecy."[40]

Kenneth B. Clark discusses the meaning and thesis of R. K. Merton's "The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy." Clark, a chief exponent of this point

---

[38]Program on Problem-Solving Skills, op. cit., p. 9.

[39]Lassar G. Gotkin, "Programmed Instruction a Stragey for Developing Curriculum for Disadvantaged Children," in Reaching the Disadvantaged. A. Harry Passow, (ed.) (Columbia University Press, 1970), p. 106.

[40]Charles Silberman, Crisis in Black and White (New York: Random House, 1964), p. 262.

of view—performance in academic achievement is influenced by society's values, standards, and expectations regarding the achievement of particular groups, and by the economic-social opportunities (or lack of same) which society offers in return for attainment—invokes the principle of the self-fulfilling prophecy as a major course of academic failure among the disadvantaged. The thesis is that the wider society does not expect the lower status minority group youngster to succeed. This very expectation significantly affects administrative policy regarding his education, the way in which he is taught, and the methods by which he is approached. These, in turn, contribute to the child's ultimate failure and the prophecy becomes reality. As Clark states, "Children who are treated as if they are uneducable almost invariable become uneducable."[41]

Martin Deutsch has pointed out that the child of disadvantaged background is preconditioned to failure in school. He feels that this failure is due largely to discrepancies between the teachers' expectations and the skills the child possesses.[42] This is true because the child is denied the kind of experiences which gives the middle class an advantage, such as exposure to a rich and varied environment and the encouragement of parents who reward curiosity and verbal facility and who inculcate a positive attitude toward school. This accounts for the "failure syndrome" of many disadvantaged students.

---

[41]Kenneth B. Clark, Prejudice and Your Child (2nd Ed., Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), p. 61; Kenneth B. Clark, "Clash of Culture in the Classroom," in Learning Together. M. Weinberg, (ed.) (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1964), pp. 18-25; see also R. K. Merton, "The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy," Antioch Review, 8 (1948), pp. 193-210.

[42]Deutsch, "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," p. 168.

Rosenthal and Jacobson emphasize the impact of teacher expectation in their book Pygmalion in the Classroom. Although this study has been questioned, there seems to be much truth in the contention that many teachers of the disadvantaged, perhaps in spite of themselves, expect less of their pupils.[43]

The study by Rosenthal and Jacobson was designed to test the hypothesis that the disadvantaged student often does poorly in school because that is what is expected of him. Shortcomings may originate not in his ethnic, cultural and/or economic background, but in his teacher's responses to the background. The results of the experiment showed that the teachers predicted expectations of their students were true because of the limited knowledge the teachers had of their students.[44] The Program on Problem-Solving Skills took steps to alleviate this and other problems by incorporating teacher goals, in-service and on-the-job training for those involved in the implementation of the project. Through these processes, educators became more knowledgeable about the disadvantaged and were able to plan and implement instructional strategies geared toward the interests, needs and abilities of the disadvantaged students.

Helen H. Davison and Gerhard Lang in their investigation found that teachers tend to be less favorably disposed toward deprived children

---

[43]Robert F. Biehler, Psychology Applied to Teaching (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1971), p. 352.

[44]Robert Rosenthal and Lenore F. Jacobson, "Teacher Expectations for the Disadvantaged," Scientific American, Vol. 218, No. 4 (April, 1968), pp. 19-22.

even when their school achievement is good. Furthermore, the pupils themselves are aware of this.[45]

Recent studies provide information indicating teachers respond differently to white and Negro children, as well as to children of different social classes. Gottlieb compared Negro and white elementary school teachers' views of their students. He found Negro teachers manning schools in low income areas expressed more satisfaction with their work. They also tended to see Negro students as fun-loving, happy, cooperative, energetic and ambitious. White teachers perceived the same students as talkative, lazy, fun-loving, high-strung, and frivolous.[46]

Douglas P. Howard noted in his studies that middle class teachers' perceptions of the needs, problems, or wishes of lower class students are misinterpreted. Studies on attitudes of teachers toward disadvantaged children tend to be more negative than toward middle class children.[47]

Disadvantaged students are capable of effective learning. Therefore, programs should be instituted to compensate for and assist in remediating the deficiencies of these students. If the educational needs of children in a constantly changing society are to be met, the findings by Thomas K. Horn must be considered:

---

[45]Biehler, loc. cit.

[46]David Gottlieb, "Teachers and Students. The Views of Negro and White Teachers," Sociology of Education, Vol. 37 (Summer, 1964) New York: American Sociological Association, p. 353.

[47]Douglas P. Howard, "The Needs and Problems of Socially Disadvantaged Children as Perceived by Students and Teachers," Journal of Exceptional Children (January, 1961), pp. 327-335.

> . . . the school's first responsibility lies in equipping them with the basic tools necessary for success both in school and life in general. It is this success that builds self-confidence which in turn often leads to perseverence in task completion and to a broadening of interests. Teachers should make sure pupils regularly experience real success. This admonition is made to all teachers, but it is particularly important to the disadvantaged. An additional factor in academic success is a positive self-concept. The effect of repeated academic failure or the withholding of social approval by school personnel, possibly because of nonstandard language, may be the development of a negative or at best a deflated self-concept.[48]

Teachers who experience success in working with disadvantaged students accept them as being worthy and thus exhibit high levels of expectation for them. This enhances the students' self-image and raises their levels of aspiration.

Richard W. Flint states that:

> A child's concept of himself as a learner is very dependent on the attitudes . . . his teacher displays. There is also strong evidence that his achievement is affected by the way you regard his learning attempts. The child looks to you for clues that he is on the right tract—that he is understood, accepted, respected, trusted, and loved. He finds these clues in your behavior. He sees acceptance or rejection in words, facial expressions, gestures and general mood.[49]

Hilda Taba and her associate in their studies concluded that new teaching procedures contribute to happier students and promote better school attendance. They further conclude that:

> It takes a good bit of self-confidence on the part of the teacher to maintain a position that in order to raise standards, students must have some kind of positive self-image. The two

---

[48]Thomas D. Horn, Reading for the Disadvantaged: Problems of Linguistically Different Learners (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1970), pp. 194-195.

[49]Richard W. Flint, "Your Attitudes Are Showing," Weekly Reader 2, Teachers Edition. Vol. 38 (September 18, 1968), p. 1.

need to be built simultaneously: increasing the ability to learn raises the self-image; this in turn releases the ability to learn. When standards are individualized, achievement becomes possible. As the student experiences the thrill of achievement, he begins to regard himself in a new light.[50]

Studies by Paul C. Berg make it obvious:

. . . that feelings of anxiety, rejection, or a negative self-concept seriously affect pupil success. Teachers who want to help children succeed can modify their behavior toward their children. Teachers contribute significantly to the development of children's self-concepts.[51]

V. THE IMPACT THAT THE CURRICULUM, LEARNING EXPERIENCES AND MATERIALS HAVE ON THE ACHIEVEMENT OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

There are other factors and/or variables which affect and influence the achievement or lack of achievement of disadvantaged students. These include teaching modalities, learning experiences, activities and materials, the perceptions and attitudes of the administrators toward inner-city students, along with the selection and assignment of teachers.

. . . School leaders operate largely on the assumption that more of the same methods and materials used in urban populations will provide the solution for educating the present population. Such an approach is little more than an anachronism in an age with . . . low income-low status families, when the pressures upon schools to retain large numbers of unmotivated, uninterested pupils is mounting.[52]

---

[50]Hilda Taba and Deborah Elkin, Teaching Strategies for the Culturally Disadvantaged (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966), p. 270.

[51]Paul C. Berg, "Reading: The Learner's Needs and Self-Concepts," The Florida Reading Quarterly. Vol. 4 (June, 1968), pp. 3-8.

[52]Passow et al., Education of the Disadvantaged, op. cit., p. 31.

Many authorities in their writings about the disadvantaged agree that this assumption militates against success in school for all students, but particularly the disadvantaged and in turn leads to a more realistic and relevant issue confronting education today:

> . . . to discover the means by which the school can compensate for the lack of readiness for learning which lower-class children, in general, bring to school work. Education must provide the children with the skills and knowledge which will enable them to select their future directions rather, than be hemmed in by increasingly limited sphere of operations left to them who lack these skills.[53]

Efforts must be made by teachers and administrators to ". . . raise the educational sights of the disadvantaged children through modification in school organization, curriculum, staffing and shifting the climate from one of failure to one of success. . . ."[54]

Robert M. Smith and other authorities report that:

> . . . instructional environments, materials and strategies must be designed to move a student from a lower to a higher level of competency on any particular dimension. Continual assessment is first necessary to discover a student's status on a certain dimension and later after pedagogic help is given to move the student to a higher level to find out if he has reached that level of performance.[55]

Learning activities must allow disadvantaged students to experience success fairly immediately. Hilda Taba adheres to the idea that this can be done by:

> . . . restructuring curriculum, teaching strategies and approaches to learning in order to make learning relevant to students. The main point is that it is necessary to

---

[53]Ibid., p. 51.

[54]Ibid., p. 55.

[55]Robert M. Smith, Diagnosis of Educational Difficulties (Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub. Co., 1969), p. 2.

> restructure both the content and process of education to make an impact on the disadvantaged students. Use the content as a vehicle to develop certain powers and skills to employ devices especially designed to kindle motivation in ways that touch these students. Radical changes in curriculum and teaching on all levels is needed to align materials and methods with realities of the child.[56]

M. E. Dunkley in the study, "Mathematics and the Disadvantaged Child," agrees with the fact that:

> . . . programs must be developed to overcome the deficits faced by disadvantaged children. Children from deprived backgrounds are not initially prepared to move at the same pace as middle class children in learning . . . and may not have reached the same level of cognitive development.[57]

The same view is shared by Calvert H. Smith who maintains that:

> . . . urban educators too often have worked on the assumption that programs hold the key to successful educational development of inner-city youngsters. Many other variables affect the level of achievement. One significant variable is the adjustment of teachers who are the vehicles through which the program is transmitted to the students. Unless teachers are fundamentally sound in terms of their orientation toward inner-city students and unless they have certain attitudes, a program cannot achieve its objectives.[58]

Lassar Gotkin stresses this point of view by noting that:

> Not even the most appropriate materials work if the teachers do not understand the intent; yet schools adopt whole courses of study and the teacher uses them with minimal preparation.[59]

---

[56]Taba, op. cit., Vol. 15, p. 264.

[57]M. E. Dunkley, "Mathematics and the Disadvantaged Child," Elementary School Journal, Vol. 73, No. 1 (October, 1972), pp. 44-48.

[58]Calvert H. Smith, "Teaching in the Inner-City: Six Prerequisites to Success," Teachers College Record, Vol. 73, No. 4 (May, 1972), p. 547.

[59]Gotkin, op. cit., p. 111.

He further notes that:

> Many problems in curriculum development and evaluation stem from failure to distinguish between problems of instruction and problems of implementation. Unless implementation problems are considered and dealt with as a separate class of problems, instructional difficulties are compounded.[60]

In further research, Robert Smith found that students differ markedly in terms of their educationally relevant competencies, no matter how homogeneously they are grouped. Thus, the infinite variety of personalities and skills present in every classroom demand that every teacher be able to identify and assess individual strengths and weaknesses so that she can design the program to give each student the full benefit of his educational years.[61]

Gotkin has agreed that the present curriculum has failed to permit disadvantaged students to demonstrate how capable they are of learning. Instruction needs to be more individualized.[62]

Taba stated that:

> . . . when teaching focuses on the development of concepts especially when disadvantaged students are the learner, it is necessary to allow each student to find his own way to the concept of individualization: that of developing the approach to learning and the materials used while concentrating on a common focus. Teachers need to learn to produce and to invent a variety of other materials. Using differentiated materials requires the use of new teaching strategies, cultivates readiness and upgrades learning.[63]

---

[60] Ibid., p. 83.

[61] Robert M. Smith, op. cit., p. VI, 1.

[62] Gotkin, op. cit., p. 106.

[63] Taba, op. cit., pp. 276-277.

Curriculum development and planning learning sequences requires a fairly thorough knowledge of what students know and can do in order to break the learning into bite size pieces appropriate to the student's capacity to master them. Teachers should select learning sequences, plan activities, translate what they know about children into motivational devices and learn how to make abstractions concrete.[64]

Since it is the responsibility of the educational system to educate all students, Kvaraceus feels that schools must provide a program that strikes at the antecedents of the consequences of deprivation. This means that the schools will need to revamp rather than simply review their curriculum, overtly and covertly, to meet the special problems of not only the deprived child, but of all children. This will call for a close scrutiny of existing academic content and methods to determine which of these are amenable to the education of the disadvantaged. In addition more attention will have to be focused on the training and selection of those who teach the disadvantaged. In the study Kvaraceus also points out several working principles for advancing the lot of the disadvantaged. He suggests that:

1. . . . schools revise their views about what the parents of the poor want for their children insofar as schools and schooling are concerned. Teachers, principals and counselors must stop projecting failure and limited aspirations for the disadvantaged, projections which serve as self-fulfilling prophecies.
2. Teachers differentiate among learners on the basis of meaningful pedagogic criteria.

---

[64] Ibid., p. 273.

3. Teachers avoid attempting both therapy and middle-class indoctrination, fulfilling his unique and essential role: "to educate—to develop the cognitive processes." Teachers must be authentic.
4. . . . understanding of both overt and covert curricula each of which affects what is learned and how.
5. . . . the school be regarded as a social system as well as an educational institution.
6. . . . school must become an ego-supporting rather than an ego-destroying institution.[65]

While working with teachers in inner-city, Jean D. Grambs noted that the success stories of the teachers who work with disadvantaged children seem to include some common elements, which are: content involvement, immediacy of content, reality of content, reward for creativity, nonpunitive and nonjudgmental comments, organization and structure, empathy, warmth, and adult closeness.[66]

Research studies also reported that more constructive testing and evaluation of the teaching techniques of the deprived children will help refine, modify and improve program effectiveness in the following areas: computation skills in arithmetic, reaching students who are not motivated by workbooks, improving communication skills and the general classroom atmosphere, individual discipline problems disappear, increase in individual reading levels and achievement scores, improvement in school attendance, general reading is stimulated and there are gains in self-esteem.[67]

---

[65]William C. Kvaraceus, "Advantaging the Disadvantaged in the Secondary School. Some Problems and Guiding Practices: Six Hypothetical Working Principles," in Reaching the Disadvantaged Learner. A. Harry Passow, (ed.) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), pp. 183-184, 201.

[66]Jean D. Grambs, "Instructional Materials for the Disadvantaged," in Reaching the Disadvantaged. A. Harry Passow, (ed.) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), p. 179.

[67]Wilkerson, op. cit., p. 118.

Therefore, authorities are generally agreed that continuous involvement of teachers in assessment of student progress will provide information that will assist in determining the effectiveness of instructional innovations.

Robert Smith advocates a similar point of view and emphasizes that:

> If a teacher understands the advantages of educational diagnosis, develops the required skills for evaluating strengths and weaknesses in youngsters and is able to translate the evaluation into meaningful experiences and activities, both the child and the teacher will benefit (can develop appropriate educational prescriptions for each child's abilities and disabilities).[68]

The role of the teacher in achieving program effectiveness is tantamount in any instructional endeavor. S. Alan Cohen in "Increasing Reading Achievement Among the Disadvantaged," supports this view as he outlined the role of the teacher in working with the disadvantaged. Thus, the teacher should seek to:

1. Arrange conditions conducive to learning by structuring a "therapeutic classroom." Such learning is free of punitive reinforcement for behavior related to learning: A wrong answer signals an opportunity to learn.
2. Teach pupils how to teach themselves. The largest portion of time is spent helping pupils "learn how to learn."
3. Improve chances of learning success by matching materials to learning disabilities. The role of a teacher as a diagnostician and treatment expert, therefore, becomes more and more apparent in the classroom.
4. Diagnose, guide, interpret, and evaluate growth.
5. Supply on-the-spot instructional first aid when materials are not effective and develop a library of self-instructional materials for repeated use.
6. Personally interact with individuals in small groups. Provide ego-support as needed.

---

[68]Robert Smith, op. cit., p. 8.

7. Group and regroup small learning teams. Pupil learning teams organized on the basis of learning deficits are continuously modified in accordance with achievement.[69]

Therefore, as Bruce R. Joyce stated, ". . . The teacher for the culturally deprived then is an experimentalist. He participates in the research and development which seeks to attack the problems of the inner-city. . . ."[70]

The literature has indicated that the successful teacher of the disadvantaged is a creative, innovative, experimentalist and diligent practitioner. But in addition to these qualities the:

> . . . teacher needs more than techniques. Above all else the teacher needs a respect for and serious interest in the child and his family demonstrated not by word but by dedication to service of the child and patient interest in his family. The important variable is teacher attitude.[71]

The successes of this type of teacher and teaching strategy naturally depends, a great deal, on the availability of dedicated teachers who have been especially trained and are desirous of working with culturally deprived children.[72]

---

[69]S. Alan Cohen, "Increasing Reading Achievement among the Disadvantaged," in Reaching the Disadvantaged. A. Harry Passow, (ed.) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), p. 146.

[70]Bruce R. Joyce, "Teachers for the Culturally Disadvantaged," in Teaching the Culturally Disadvantaged Pupil. John M. Beck and Richard W. Saxe (eds.) (Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Pub., 1965), p. 275.

[71]Eisenberg, op. cit., p. 89.

[72]David P. Ausubel, "A Teaching Strategy for Culturally Deprived Pupils: Cognitive and Motivational Conditions," School Review, LXXI (Winter, 1963), pp. 454-463.

VI. THE IMPACT OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ON THE ACHIEVEMENT OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Likewise the specialized and administrative personnel must have preparations designed to promote understanding of the children and parents with whom they deal. In addition they can learn from each other. The principal should encourage such sharing and should foster the willingness of teachers to consult with specialists on the staff. Special administrative efforts are required to sustain morale-rewarding good performance and encourage experimentation.[73]

Implementation of educational goals depends upon local administrators as well as classroom teachers. Administrators as well as teachers must keep the educational goals clearly in mind. Administrators must have a program that makes it possible for objectives to be carried out. For both administrators and teachers, diagnostic information is essential to planning. The principal needs to know how his school stands with respect to achievement of the objectives set. Specific objectives help suggest specific activities to reach long-term goals.[74]

Lloyd J. Mendelson in "The Role of the Principal" as it relates to the total operation of the school found that the administrator plays a crucial role in developing positive school programs in disadvantaged

---

[73]Educational Policies Commission, "Education and the Disadvantaged American" (NEA Journal, April, 1962), p. 15.

[74]William Itkin, "Evaluation and the Disadvantaged Pupil," in Teaching the Culturally Disadvantaged Pupil. John M. Beck and Richard W. Saxe, (eds.) (Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Pub., 1965), pp. 242-243.

communities. He reports that the focus must be on the behavior of the administrator, rather than on what traits are postulated for being a good administrator. He must have a fairly well developed concept of the nature of his job. For within the milieu of school policies and common demands, nevertheless, the principal has latitude in developing programs applicable to his school's needs. The author cites four major task areas in the inner-city schools with which the principal ought to be concerned: ". . . developing and prioritizing goals for the school; providing educational leadership for the entire school staff; understanding and respecting the values of families served by the school; and developing positive relationship with and within the community. He is, therefore, primarily responsible for seeing that instructional goals of the school are attained and provides leadership for instructional improvement."[75]

The principal has the responsibility for fostering and maintaining faculty stability and increasing teacher effectiveness. Mendelson agrees that he must help the staff understand the background and needs of disadvantaged children, initiate in-service programs within the school designed to improve understanding of inner-city children; encourage staff members to take courses which are designed to develop understanding of disadvantaged children, help teachers to improve subject matter competency; learn about new teaching strategies, develop better insights into the learning process and develop a two-way communication system.[76]

---

[75]Lloyd J. Mendelson, "The Role of the Principal," in Teaching the Culturally Disadvantaged Pupil. John M. Beck and Richard W. Saxe, (eds.) (Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Pub., 1965), pp. 283-291.

[76]Mendelson, loc. cit.

Taba also reported that:

> Teachers need support and help from administrators, teamwork cannot flourish without administrative support. Perhaps the greatest contribution administrators can make is to support experimentation they must allow for the slow pace it takes to perfect new strategies of learning and teaching.[77]

The literature indicated that administrators must exhibit an open mind and a willingness to change in order to help teachers work effectively with disadvantaged students whose behaviors seem to be contradictory to that of the middle class students. An open climate should also be characteristic of schools in a culturally deprived area.

Rokeach (1960) substantiated these facts by a study in which:

> . . . he introduced two concepts—"open and closed mind." The author contends that the beliefs or disbeliefs which a person entertains constitutes a "belief" or attitude change. To the extent that a person's belief system is resistant to change, it is described as being closed. The opposite type of person is attributed to the belief system. The essential point is that certain individuals do display the tendency to be dogmatic and resistant to change in the case of belief systems. Thus, it is inferred that teachers who tend to be dogmatic in their defense of their belief system would encounter difficulties in understanding and working effectively with students whose environments were productive of attitudes and behavior which were in contradiction with those of the typical middle-class teachers.[78]

Therefore, the principal or school administrator must be cognizant of the lifestyles, mindsets, problems and values of the disadvantaged students in order to establish an open climate which would be mutually inclusive of the aforementioned factors. Such a cognizance would enable

---

[77]Taba, op. cit., p. 280.

[78]Webster, op. cit., p. 463.

the principal to work with teachers in planning and implementing a curriculum which would be responsive to the needs of the disadvantaged.

In order to break the "self-fulfilling prophecy" and the "failure syndrome" that is evidenced in the literature by the underachieving students, a distinct need exists for professional training and retraining programs specifically aimed at acquainting professional personnel with the problems of the children if the cycle of underachievement is to be broken.[79] If educators are to accept the challenge, they must be knowledgeable of the problems, needs, interests of the disadvantaged students in order to create the kind of environment in which the needs of the students can be satisfied.[80]

---

[79]Nancy C. Barker, "Knowledge of Teachers as Related to Diagnosing the Individual Needs of Culturally Deprived Children" (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1960).

[80]Joseph G. Brown, "A Study of the Effects of an In-Service Training Program on the School Behavior of Children and Teachers" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, 1967).

CHAPTER III

COLLECTION, PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

I. PROCEDURES

Sample Selection and Return Rate

The population involved in this study was composed of administrators and teachers in Title I (inner-city) schools. The sample was two pronged with Group A including the teachers and administrators directly engaged in the implementation of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills in the nine project schools. There were sixty-two members of Group A delineated as follows: nine administrators, forty-one cooperating teachers and twelve POPS staff members which included one resource teacher and eleven staff teachers.

The resource teacher had the responsibility for the overall coordination of the program. Nine of the staff teachers were assigned to each of the project schools. Their duties were to team-teach with the cooperating teachers on a regularly scheduled basis and engage in curriculum development. Two staff members who served as back-up-teachers assisted the other personnel in curriculum development and were involved in team-teaching with the cooperating teachers whenever necessary.

The Division of Research and Planning of the Memphis City School System assisted in the selection of Group B using a stratified random

selection procedure. Group B was composed of forty-three teachers from eighteen Title I schools. In order to match the two groups as closely as possible, the members of Group B were selected on the basis of the following factors as they related to the students: geographic location, socioeconomic status, past educational achievement, aptitude records, and racial ratios. Thus, the subjects were teachers of regular fourth, fifth and sixth grade Title I classes.

The questionnaires were then sent to the selected sample. Of the total number of questionnaires sent, nine administrators, forty-one cooperating teachers, twelve POPS staff members and forty-three regular Title I teachers, one hundred-five (105) were completed and returned, indicated a one-hundred percent return rate. Tables I and II show the number of questionnaires sent, representative percent of the sample total, number and percent of usable returns.

Instrumentation

A survey of literature did not reveal an instrument conducive to investigating and collecting the necessary data for the study. Thus, the instrument, a Likert type scale, used in the study was developed by the researcher. This instrument was designed to assess the impact of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills on teachers and administrators involved in its implementation. A preliminary procedure for evaluation of the instrument involved a screening of the instrument by a panel of experts from the Division of Research and Planning of the Memphis City School System. The panel selected because of their knowledge of

TABLE I

SAMPLE AND RETURN RATE FOR RESPONDENTS TO THE PROGRAM ON PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADMINISTRATORS, COOPERATING TEACHERS, AND POPS STAFF MEMBERS

Group A	Number Sent	Percent of Total Sample	Number of Usable Returns	Percent of Usable Returns
Administrators	9	100	9	100
Cooperating Teachers	41	100	41	100
POPS Staff Members	12	100	12	100

TABLE II

SAMPLE AND RETURN RATE FOR RESPONDENTS TO THE TITLE I SCHOOLS PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Group B	Number Sent	Percent of Total Sample	Number of Usable Returns	Percent of Usable Returns
Regular Title I Classroom Teachers	43	100	43	100

evaluation and understanding of the program being studied, was asked to review the instrument and comment on the wording of the items, scope of the demographic data, and clarity of the instructions preceding each section of the instrument. This initial rational screening was followed by an empirical reliability and validity study.

The instrument included three sections: (a) demographic data; (b) information relative to the goals of the program; and (c) general information relating to the disadvantaged. The first section of the instrument included ten forced-choice items dealing with the respondents personal and professional background. Results of this section were used to verify the comparability of Groups A and B and to describe more completely the study populations. These data were not subjected to statistical analysis because they did not deal with the purpose of this study, per se. The second section of the instrument included Likert type attitudinal items dealing with the goals of the program of the study. The evaluation of the goals of the program was three dimensional dealing with: teachers becoming more knowledgeable of the characteristics of academically deficient students including their strengths and weaknesses, and demonstrating higher levels of expectancy for their students; incorporating materials and learning experiences commensurate with the needs, interests and abilities of the students; and a willingness to use the appropriate instructional strategies to better facilitate and improve the quality and quantity of learning. The final section of the instrument involved a series of forced-choice questions to provide the respondent with an opportunity to communicate with the evaluators about general

issues involved in working with the disadvantaged. This section did not deal specifically with the goals of the program as it was not statistically analyzed. Frequency of responses to the items were presented as part of this study.

The instrument was subjected to a reliability study by applying the Spearman-Brown formula. The formula was calculated and the reliability for the internal consistency of the instrument was found to be .89. This reliability study was performed using the split-half procedure. The questionnaire was administered to the sample used in the study. The items were then divided into two comparable halves and the scores calculated for each subject. The coefficient of correlation was performed between these two sets of scores, and the Spearman-Brown formula was used to change the results into an acceptable estimate of reliability for the entire test. The computations and resulting reliability coefficient were shown in Table III.

The researcher performed other statistical procedures to determine if the instrument used measured what it purported to measure, or if the instrument had internal validity. In order to assess, to some degree, the validity of the instrument, an empirical item analysis procedure was utilized, correlating each item with the total score on the second section of the instrument, the thirty Likert items comprising the body of the instrument. Of the thirty items in section two of the instrument, with the exception of one item (27) that correlated negatively, all other items correlated positively which indicated that the instrument had internal validity. Data describing the correlations between test items were displayed in Table IV.

TABLE III

FORMULA AND CALCULATIONS FOR THE SPLIT-HALF RELIABILITY STUDY ON THE RESPONSES TO THE PROGRAM ON PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE

$$RX_1X_2 = \frac{2r1\ x_1x_2}{1 + r^1x_1x_2}$$

where:

RX_1X_2 = the estimated reliability of the entire test

$R^1x_1x_2$ = the reliability of half of a test found by means of the split-half technique[a]

$$R\ x_1x_2 = \frac{2\ (.7957)}{1 + .7957} = \frac{1.5914}{1.7957} = 8862 \text{ or } .89$$

[a]Donald Ary, Lucy C. Jacobs and Arghar Razevich, Introduction to Research in Education (New York: Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973), p. 206.

TABLE IV

RESULTS OF ITEM—TOTAL SCORE CORRELATIONS FOR THE ATTITUDINAL ITEMS IN THE SECOND SECTION OF THE PROGRAM ON PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS QUESTIONNAIRE
(N = 62)

	Item	r
11.	Children in POPS seem to have achieved.	.48*
12.	Children in POPS are capable of learning.	.45*
13.	It is difficult to establish an atmosphere conducive to student motivation in POPS.	.50*
14.	The children in POPS present severe discipline problems.	.64*
15.	The school attendance of children in POPS is poor.	.57*
16.	Children in POPS find it difficult to be self-directive.	.41*
17.	Children in POPS do not like school.	.45*
18.	Achievement motivation is low for students in POPS.	.50*
19.	Children in POPS have poor self-concepts.	.45*
20.	There is more rapport between teachers and the students in the POPS classrooms than in other classrooms.	.57*
21.	A teacher in POPS should not be expected to construct additional instructional or learning activities on his own time.	.48*
22.	Classwork should not be based on the needs and interests of the students in POPS.	.53*
23.	A teacher in POPS should provide a variety of learning activities in the classroom.	.57*

TABLE IV (continued)

	Item	r
24.	In POPS there is a problem in securing instructional activities on an appropriate level.	.23*
25.	POPS materials and activities are varied enough so that they can be used by the project students at any level.	.18
26.	POPS provided materials and activities which were commensurate with the ability levels of the pupils.	.47*
27.	Early in the school year frequent problems occurred in the construction of activities which were commensurate with the ability levels of the students in POPS.	.03
28.	Later in the school year fewer problems occurred in the construction of activities which were commensurate with the ability levels of the students in POPS.	.43*
29.	After having participated in the POPS Idea Workshop, teachers felt more secure and knowledgeable about constructing appropriate instructional activities.	.34*
30.	The methods and procedures used for selection of instructional activities for the students in POPS are inappropriate.	.38*
31.	Students in POPS are more difficult to understand.	.34*
32.	A teacher or administrator in POPS should not be expected to become involved with the problems of the students.	.36*
33.	Students in POPS should not be expected to meet the same standards of work.	.35*
34.	For the students in POPS, being successful is a greater motivating factor than failure.	.46*
35.	The students in POPS do not apply themselves.	.60*
36.	The POPS student is more physically oriented in his learning style.	.53*

TABLE IV (continued)

	Item	r
37.	Students in POPS are not interested in learning.	.50*
38.	Students in POPS have a slow learning rate which gives the impression of less ability than actually exists.	.30*
39.	Students in POPS lack the prerequisite academic skills necessary for certain learning tasks.	.21*
40.	Children in POPS work at a more leisurely pace than other children.	.37*

*$p < .05$.

The responses of the subjects in Group A were more homogenous than those of the subjects in Group B. It was found that test items twenty-five and twenty-seven were not significantly related to the other test items. Item twenty-five stated "POPS materials and activities are varied enough so that they can be used by the project students at any level"; item twenty-seven was "Early in the school year frequent problems occurred in the construction of activities which were commensurate with the ability levels of the students in POPS." Test items that showed significant positive correlations indicated that people or subjects responded in nonrandom patterns. The lack of significant positive correlations on test items twenty-five and twenty-seven were indicative of the fact that teachers' ideas about activities and materials, their construction and availability, are not necessarily a function of their perceptions of the students, but also their creativity and knowledge of the materials.

Collection of Data

After permission to survey the population of the study was granted, the questionnaires were distributed on October 22, 1973. This dissemination process was coordinated through the Division of Research and Planning and the Department of Instruction in conjunction with the previously scheduled system-wide evaluation process. Thus, the Division of Research and Planning included the questionnaires in their system-wide Title I evaluation program. Therefore, it was highly unlikely that subjects in the sample were aware that any other type of evaluation other than that supported by regular Title I guidelines was being conducted. The instrument was distributed and returned via the intersystem mail service.

Included in the packets distributed were the questionnaire forms and response sheets which were color-coded in order to distinguish between the two groups involved in the study, directions for completing the questionnaire and a self-addressed envelope.

Treatment of the Data

Demographic data for section one of the questionnaire were collected from the sample population and presented in Table V. For section two of the questionnaire, the statistical measures considered most amenable to analyzation and interpretation of these data were the Mann-Whitney U test, chi square (X^2), z-test, t-test, and the binomial probability model. These procedures, both parametric and nonparametric, are statistical tests of differences of means. These procedures were chosen to meet the assumptions of the data and to answer the questions posed in this study, requiring a comparison of the means of two samples. Chi square was used because the researcher was interested in determining the difference between observed responses of the subjects to the questionnaire and what was expected according to chance. The z-test and t-test were used to determine if the observed responses were significantly different from what would have been expected by chance alone. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to calculate the differences between two samples by ranking the scores of the subjects. This ranking procedure was used to insure equal distribution of the values for both groups (A and B). The results were then converted to z scores because the sample size exceeded twenty. The binomial probability model was used to determine

the level of significance of the differences in responses for Group A and Group B on the thirty items.

II. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Table V shows the demographic data gathered on the sample (Groups A and B). The categories listed in the table are: position, sex and race, age, number of years of employment completed in the Memphis City School System, grade level taught, highest level of education attained, number of years experience completed in education, number of years service completed at the present school, years of experience in POPS or other Title I projects, and years of experience completed in the present Title I school.

The primary question tested in this study was: There were no significant differences in the knowledge and attitudes of teachers and administrators of disadvantaged students after having been involved in the implementation of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills and the teachers of regular Title I classes who did not participate in the program. To test this question, the researcher used the Mann-Whitney U test. The raw scores for both the groups (A and B) were analyzed to determine if there were significant differences between the samples at the .05 level of significance. Responses to the test items were computed and the results included in this chapter.

Within each of the groups, because of the sample size and the ordinal level of data obtained, the raw scores for section two, items eleven through forty of the questionnaire were ranked. These rankings

TABLE V

RESULTS OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC DATA COLLECTED IN SECTION ONE OF THE PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE COMPARING POPS PERSONNEL AND TITLE I CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Data	Group A	Group B
Position		
Cooperating teacher	41	0
Regular Title I teacher		43
Staff members	12	0
Principal	9	0
Sex and Race		
Black female	37	30
Black male	5	1
White female	20	11
White male	0	1
Age		
21-30	14	11
31-40	23	10
41-50	15	12
51 or older	10	10
Years employed in Memphis		
Less than 1	0	2
1-5 years	14	12
6-10 years	11	3
11 or more years	37	26
Grade level taught		
fourth	13	13
fifth	14	18
sixth	15	11
not a teacher, other	20	1

TABLE V (continued)

Data	Group A	Group B
Highest level of education attained		
Bachelor's degree	18	21
Bachelor's degree +	14	13
Master's degree	17	8
Master's degree +	12	1
Doctorate	1	0
Number of years experience in education		
Less than 1 year	0	2
1-5 years	14	11
6-10 years	8	7
11-15 years	16	5
16 or more years	24	18
Number of years completed at present school		
Less than 1 year	8	12
1 year	12	3
2 years	11	3
3 or more years	31	25
Years of experience completed in Title I projects		
None	0	25
Less than 1 year	17	8
1-3 years	31	7
4-5 years	9	1
6 or more years	5	2
Years of experience in this Title I project		
Less than 1 year	9	0
1 year	24	0
2 years	28	0
3 years	1	0
Years of experience completed in a Title I School		
Less than 1 year		5
1 year		4
2 years		32
3 years		2

were subjected to statistical analyses using the Mann-Whitney U test with the following formula.

$$U = n_1 n_2 + \frac{n_1(n_1 + 1)}{2} - ER_1 \quad ,$$

and

$$U^1 = n_1 n_2 + \frac{n_2(n_2 + 1)}{2} - ER_2$$

where ER_1 = the sum of ranks for n_1, or the first group; and ER_2 = the sum of ranks for n_2, or the second group.[1]

The U scores were converted to z scores in order to determine the level of significance, because the sample size exceeded twenty. The formula used was:[2]

$$Z = \frac{U - \frac{(n_1 n_2)}{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{(n_1 n_2)\ (n_1 + n_2 + 1)}{12}}}$$

In order to test the remaining four subquestions, chi square and t-test analyses were performed on the thirty items in the second section of the questionnaire. The subquestions dealt with more specific differences in Groups A and B that could be reflected in the responses to individual questions in the second section of the instrument. The

---

[1]Dean J. Champion, Basic Statistics for Social Research (Scranton, Pennsylvania: Chandler Publishing Company, 1970), p. 176.

[2]Ibid., p. 179.

significance of these differences was determined by comparing the distributions of the responses of Groups A and B on the Likert items with a chi-square analysis. Further analysis used a t-test to compare the summated responses of Group A respondents to the expected score of the instrument to determine if the respondents' responses were significant in their deviations from the theoretical expected score. The formulas for these analyses follow.

The chi square formula used was:

$$X^2 = E \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

where O = the observed frequency for each cell, and E = the expected frequency for each cell.[3]

Calculations for the t-test were performed using the following formula:[4]

$$t = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu}{s/\sqrt{n-1}}$$

Analysis of the Data

In order to determine if significant differences did exist between Group A (administrators, cooperating teachers and the POPS staff members) and Group B (regular Title I classroom teachers), the results of the questionnaire were subjected to the Mann Whitney U test. The results of the analyses were shown in Table VI.

---

[3]Ibid., p. 153.

[4]Ibid., p. 99.

TABLE VI

THE RESULTS OF THE MANN-WHITNEY U TEST AND THE Z-TEST COMPARING THE RESPONSES OF THE POPS PERSONNEL AND TITLE I PERSONNEL ON THE ATTITUDINAL SECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Sample A $\bar{x}$ Score	Sample B $\bar{x}$ Score	Mann Whitney U	z Score
122.23	101.74	108.5	7.98*

*($p < .001$)

A z score of 7.98 ($p < .001$) was found. This z score is highly significant and means that the groups were statistically different. The responses to the questionnaire of the personnel for the Program on Problem-Solving Skills were significantly more positive and indicated the teachers were more knowledgeable about the disadvantaged than the responses of the regular Title I personnel. There were significant differences in the knowledge and attitudes of teachers and administrators of disadvantaged students after having been involved in the implementation of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills and regular Title I classroom teachers.

The first two subquestions comparing POPS personnel and regular Title I classroom teachers on selected aspects of the goals of the program were tested using chi square analyses. The responses of the two groups were compared on each item to determine if the distribution of the responses on the Likert continuum were comparable in the two groups.

Differences in the number of positive, neutral, or negative responses to each item were compared using the chi-square analysis to determine if the respondents in the two groups displayed similar attitudes on each item. The results of these analyses for each of the thirty items on the second section of the questionnaire were shown in Table VII.

Significant differences in the two samples were found in twenty-six of the thirty items. This proportion of the items favorable to Group A were statistically significant at the .001 level (z = 8.03). The procedure used to arrive at this level of significance was the binomial probability model[5] to determine a level of significance for an observed response.

$$N = 30$$

$$P = 1/2$$

$$X = NP \div 30(1/2) = 15$$

$$S^2 = (N)\ (P)\ (1\text{-}P) = 7.5$$

$$SE_m = s/n = \frac{7.5}{5.46} = 1.37$$

$$z = \frac{15 - 4}{1.37} = \frac{11}{1.37} = 8.03$$

In the following paragraphs, the four subquestions are dealt with individually. To test the first two subquestions the results of the chi square analyses of pertinent items were noted in Table VII. The

---

[5]Fred Kerlinger, Foundation of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973), pp. 187-193.

TABLE VII

RESULTS OF THE CHI-SQUARE ANALYSES COMPARING THE RESPONSES OF THE POPS PERSONNEL AND THE TITLE I PERSONNEL ON THE ATTITUDINAL ITEMS ON THE SECOND SECTION OF THE PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE

Items	Percentage Responses** POPS Personnel S	A	U	D	SD	Title I Personnel S	A	U	D	SD	χ^2
11. Children in POPS seem to have achieved.	52	48	0	0	0	0	9	35	30	26	33.64*
12. Children in POPS are capable of learning	65	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	44	53	2.45
13. It is difficult to establish an atmosphere conducive to student motivation in POPS.	2	3	0	55	40	9	23	9	28	30	22.75*
14. The children in POPS present severe discipline problems.	2	2	0	66	31	19	21	12	33	16	33.29*
15. The school attendance of children in POPS is poor.	0	0	0	60	40	0	16	5	53	26	14.76*
16. Children in POPS find it difficult to be self-directive.	2	5	3	73	18	21	26	7	33	14	26.36*
17. Children in POPS do not like school.	0	0	0	60	40	5	5	12	51	28	14.42*

TABLE VII (continued)

Items	Percentage Responses** POPS Personnel S	A	U	D	SD	Title I Personnel S	A	U	D	SD	X^2
18. Achievement motivation is low for students in POPS.	0	0	0	74	26	14	30	2	40	14	35.62*
19. Children in POPS have poor self-concepts.	3	3	3	68	23	14	28	19	28	12	31.26*
20. There is more rapport between teachers and the students in the POPS classroom than in other classrooms.	31	50	10	2	8	5	40	30	19	7	32.28*
21. A teacher in POPS should not be expected to construct additional instructional or learning activities on his own time.	6	10	10	42	32	7	12	12	37	33	.34
22. Classwork should not be based on the needs and interests of the students in POPS.	0	2	0	26	73	9	0	2	42	47	12.71*
23. A teacher in POPS should provide a variety of learning activities in the classroom.	65	34	2	0	0	2	0	2	47	49	3.62
24. In POPS there is a problem in securing instructional activities on an appropriate level.	0	5	3	69	23	19	37	12	28	5	42.61*

TABLE VII (continued)

Items	Percentage Responses** POPS Personnel S	A	U	D	SD	Title I Personnel S	A	U	D	SD	χ^2
25. POPS materials and activities are varied enough so that they can be used by the project students at any level.	18	76	2	2	3	12	26	19	37	7	31.77*
26. POPS provided materials and activities which were commensurate with the ability levels of the pupils.	29	71	0	0	0	12	28	16	40	5	46.85*
27. Early in the school year frequent problems occurred in the construction of activities which were commensurate with the ability levels of the students in POPS.	16	42	5	5	3	27	19	30	37	7	7.10
28. Later in the school year fewer problems occurred in the construction of activities which were commensurate with the ability levels of the students in POPS.	13	68	8	2	10	2	16	30	42	9	11.50*
29. After having participated in the POPS Idea Workshop, teachers felt more secure and knowledgeable about constructing appropriate instructional activities.	45	30	2	2	2	7	2	16	42	33	10.52*

TABLE VII (continued)

Items	Percentage Responses** POPS Personnel S	A	U	D	SD	Title I Personnel S	A	U	D	SD	χ^2
30. The methods and procedures used for selection of instructional activities for the students in POPS are inappropriate.	29	66	2	3	0	5	28	44	16	7	48.81*
31. Students in POPS are more difficult to understand.	0	2	2	61	35	7	21	5	49	19	18.33*
32. A teacher or administrator in POPS should not be expected to become involved with the problems of the students.	0	0	0	37	63	5	5	7	53	30	17.12*
33. Students in POPS should not be expected to meet the same standards of work.	55	19	8	8	10	16	47	5	19	14	24.62*
34. For the students in POPS, being successful is a greater motivating factor than failure.	35	61	0	2	2	7	9	12	24	30	17.59*
35. The students in POPS do not apply themselves.	0	2	3	71	24	14	28	5	40	14	28.61*
36. The POPS student is more physically oriented in his learning style.	13	52	23	2	11	12	16	37	28	7	11.09*

TABLE VII (continued)

Items	Percentage Responses** POPS Personnel S	A	U	D	SD	Title I Personnel S	A	U	D	SD	X^2
37. Students in POPS are not interested in learning.	0	0	0	45	55	5	19	9	40	28	24.58*
38. Students in POPS have a slow learning rate which gives the impression of less ability than actually exists.	10	63	6	2	19	14	23	16	40	7	11.14*
39. Students in POPS lack the prerequisite academic skills necessary for certain learning tasks.	18	71	3	2	6	12	26	7	42	14	15.58*
40. Children in POPS work at a more leisurely pace than other children.	19	56	13	0	11	21	16	16	40	7	17.84*

*With 4dfa $x^2 \geq 9.49$ is $p \geq .05$.

**Scores reflect percentages of responses in each of FIVE LIKERT CATEGORIES, i.e., Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD).

remaining two subquestions were tested with t-tests and reported in narrative discussion of the subproblems.

The first subquestion tested was to determine if significant differences existed between the groups in the extent to which they exhibited higher expectancy levels for their students. Items 12, 14-16, 18-19, 31, 33-40, dealt with teacher expectations for students. POPS personnel were significantly more favorable in their responses to fourteen of these fifteen items as determined by the chi square analyses. POPS personnel did exhibit significantly higher expectancy levels for their students than regular Title I classroom teachers.

The second subquestion tested was to determine if significant differences were shown to exist between POPS cooperating teachers and regular classroom teachers in their abilities to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the disadvantaged students. Items 22-23, 31, 33-40 addressed themselves to this issue. Responses to ten of these eleven items were found to be significantly different using the chi square analyses. Again, these differences are in favor of the POPS personnel and are significant. The POPS personnel were more attuned to the strengths and weaknesses of the disadvantaged students than regular Title I classroom teachers.

The last two subquestions did not require comparison with the regular Title I classroom personnel for their evaluation. To test these two subquestions, the summated responses on the second section of the instrument were analyzed for Group A respondents. The purpose of the analysis was to determine the degree of positiveness in the responses

of the POPS personnel. The neutral point on each item is a response of 3, therefore the expected mean score on the 30 items was 90. The mean of the POPS personnel responses equals 122.23. This mean is significantly positive. Comparison of the sample mean with the expected mean yielded a t-value equal to 3.76, significant at $p < .01$.

The overall responses of POPS personnel to the items in section two of the questionnaire were positive, as shown by the previous analysis. To evaluate the final two subquestions, selected items were studied. The third subquestion dealt with the perceptions of POPS personnel of the intended goals of the program. Items 11, 20, 23, 30, 32 and 34 highlight the goals of the program. Positive responses on these items reflect support for the goals of POPS. On these six items, the percentages of positive responses ranged from 81 percent to 100 percent with five items having at least 95 percent positive responses. The POPS personnel apparently internalized and supported the goals of the program as reflected by their responses.

To test the fourth subquestion which dealt with the effectiveness of specific activities in helping POPS teachers to work more successfully with the disadvantaged students, items 21, 24, 29-30 were studied as indicative of responses to their activities. The range of favorable responses on these items were from 74 percent to 95 percent, with three of the items having favorable responses in at least 90 percent of the cases. Therefore, POPS personnel considered the activities to be successful in helping them to work more effectively with disadvantaged students.

In summary, the data gathered from the responses to the questionnaire for the five questions studied were found to be significant. Personnel of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills were found to be superior to regular Title I teachers in their knowledge and attitudes toward the disadvantaged students. They were also found to be favorable toward the goals and activities of the program. Thus, it can be inferred that the instructional program for disadvantaged students did have a significant impact on teachers and administrators as perceived by the POPS staff members, administrators and cooperating teachers implementing the program.

The third section of the questionnaire dealt with general information related to the Program on Problem-Solving Skills and Title I (inner-city) students. The number and percentages of responses to items 41 through 48 indicated they were favorable for Group A. A greater percentage of the subjects in Group A had participated in workshops designed to serve disadvantaged students than Group B. The responses of Group A showed that more teachers had lived in inner-city and preferred to work in inner-city than the members of Group B. Thus, the members of Group A were more positive toward working in inner-city schools and preferred to remain, while a greater percentage of Group B preferred to work in non-Title I schools.

The data showed that the subjects of Group A had participated in more parent conferences and visited more homes of the students than Group B. The percentages of responses further indicated that Group A knew the goals of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills. A significant

number of these members had also engaged in activities outside of school which were geared toward the disadvantaged as opposed to the members of Group B. The frequency distributions and percentages of responses of both Group A and Group B were presented in Tables VIII and IX.

Based on the results of the responses to the remaining five questions in section three of the questionnaire, the following generalizations were made:

1. Teachers need to have experiences in ways to assess the needs of the students they teach in order to develop the kinds of instructional programs which would be more responsive to their needs.
2. Teachers engaged in the implementation of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills have read more literature pertaining to the lifestyles of disadvantaged students than Group B.
3. The members of Group A have taken more educational courses that relate to disadvantaged children.
4. The members of both groups have been involved in activities outside of the educational field which related to the disadvantaged.
5. Teachers are desirous of the opportunity to become more involved in curriculum development, modification and refinement.
6. Teachers and administrators feel the need for in-service training programs and workshops conducted on a continuous basis which would help them to work more effectively and efficiently with disadvantaged students.

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE RESPONSES TO ITEMS 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, AND 47 IN THE THIRD SECTION OF THE POPS PERSONNEL AND TITLE I QUESTIONNAIRE BY TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS (N = 105)

Item		CATEGORY, NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES			
		Yes	Percent	No	Percent
41. Have you participated in workshops designed to serve: A. POPS students or B. inner-city students?	Group A	57	92%	5	8%
	Group B	10	23	33	77
42. Have you ever lived in inner-city?	Group A	35	56	27	44
	Group B	19	44	24	56
44. Have you engaged in activities outside school which are geared toward the disadvantaged?	Group A	42	68	20	32
	Group B	21	49	22	51
45. Did you have an opportunity to participate in an orientation workshop or in-service during 1972-73 which was designed to acquaint you with the goals of your instructional program and your specific duties in its implementation?	Group A	56	90	6	10
	Group B	27	63	16	37

TABLE VIII (continued)

Item		CATEGORY, NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES			
		Yes	Percent	No	Percent
46. Do you know the teacher goals of POPS?	Group A	61	98%	1	2%
	Group B	0		43	100
47. Do you prefer to work in a Title I (inner-city) school?	Group A	60	97	2	3
	Group B	15	35	28	54

TABLE IX

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE RESPONSES TO ITEMS 43 AND 48
IN THE THIRD SECTION OF THE POPS PERSONNEL AND TITLE I
QUESTIONNAIRE BY TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS
(N = 105)

			NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES			
			Group A	Percent	Group B	Percent
43.	How many parent-teacher conferences have you had?	0 (1)	5	8%	3	7%
		1-2 (2)	8	13	7	16
		3-4 (3)	11	18	18	42
		5-6 (4)	14	23	10	23
		7+ (5)	24	38	5	12
48.	How many homes of students have you visited?	0 (1)	3	5	9	21
		1-2 (2)	6	10	6	14
		3-4 (3)	20	32	13	30
		5+ (4)	33	53	15	35

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the Program on Problem-Solving Skills had an impact upon the teachers and administrators directly involved in the implementation of the program. This was done by comparing two groups of educators. Thus, the sample population for this study was composed of two groups, A and B. Group A included cooperating teachers, administrators and the staff of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills who were engaged in the implementation of the program. The members of Group B were regular Title I classroom teachers who did not participate in the program. These teachers were selected by a stratified random sample procedure.

A Likert type instrument was used to assess the responses from the population relative to their perceptions about the Program on Problem-Solving Skills and the disadvantaged students. A reliability coefficient of .89 was found using the Spearman-Brown procedure. The results of the questionnaire were subjected to statistical analyses to test the questions in the study.

The primary question tested in this study was: Were there significant differences in the knowledge and attitudes of teachers and administrators toward disadvantaged students after having participated

in the implementation of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills as opposed to the knowledge and attitudes toward the disadvantaged of teachers in regular Title I classes who did not participate in the program? The subquestions tested in this study were:

1. Did Title I teachers and administrators engaged in POPS exhibit higher expectancy levels for their students than Title I teachers not involved in POPS?
2. Did significant differences exist between POPS cooperating teachers and regular Title I classroom teachers in their abilities to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the disadvantaged students?
3. Were there significant differences in the relationship between the intended goals of the program and the perceptions and behaviors of teachers and administrators in the implementation of the program?
4. Did specific activities help the POPS cooperating teachers to understand and work effectively with disadvantaged students?

Data Analysis

The analyses of the data were performed using the Mann-Whitney U test, chi square, z-test, t-test, and the binomial probability model. Chi square was used to determine the difference between observed responses of the subjects to the attitudinal items in section two of the questionnaire and what was expected according to chance. The z-test

and t-test were also used to determine if the observed responses were significantly different from what would have been expected by chance alone. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to test the primary question. Raw scores for both groups (A and B) were analyzed to determine if there were significant differences between the responses of the samples at the .05 level of significance. The binomial probability model was used to determine the level of significance for the observed responses in the thirty items in section two of the instrument.

The major findings of this study were:

1. A z score of 7.98 was significant and indicated that the groups were statistically significant in their responses to the primary question tested in the study. Thus, there were significant differences in the knowledge and attitudes of the personnel of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills toward disadvantaged students and regular Title I classroom teachers.
2. Chi square analyses performed on the first subquestion revealed that Group A was significantly more favorable in their responses than Group B. This difference was significant at the .05 level. The results of these data indicated that teachers, administrators and the POPS staff exhibited higher levels of expectancy for their students than regular Title I classroom teachers.
3. The second subquestion tested yielded a difference in responses between Groups A and B at the .05 level. Thus, it can be inferred that POPS personnel were more attuned to and able to

determine the strengths and weaknesses of their students than regular Title I classroom teachers.

4. The results computed for the third and fourth subquestions yielded a t-value of 3.76 which was significant at the .01 level. Thus, it can be inferred that the POPS staff has internalized and supported the goals of the program. Also, the activities engaged in by the cooperating teachers was successful in helping them to work more effectively with the disadvantaged students.

II. CONCLUSIONS

1. The personnel of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills and the regular Title I classroom teachers differed in their perceptions and attitudes of disadvantaged students.
2. Title I teachers engaged in the Program on Problem-Solving Skills exhibited higher levels of expectancy for their students than Title I teachers not involved in POPS.
3. Perceptions of POPS personnel as regards the positive worth, dignity and potential of disadvantaged students differed markedly from Group B.
4. The kind and success of the activities engaged in by the POPS personnel demonstrated that they apparently internalized and supported the goals of the program. This was indicated by their responses to items such as 11, 20, 33, 32 and 34 as opposed to negative responses to these items by Group B.

5. POPS personnel were more aware of and attuned to the strengths and weaknesses of disadvantaged students than the members of Group B.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were generated as a result of the findings and conclusions of this study.

1. Emphasis on continuous staff development and teacher-training programs as conceived, designed, and implemented by the staff of the Program on Problem Solving Skills should be replicated by other Title I projects and regular Title I school programs.
2. The Memphis City School System should persevere in its efforts to solicit federal funds to continue the operation and expansion of the Program on Problem Solving Skills.
3. In lieu of federal funds, state and local funds should be allocated to continue the operation of POPS by the Memphis City School System.
4. The program which operated in nine elementary schools, should be expanded to include more elementary schools with the ultimate goal being the implementation of POPS in all elementary schools.
5. The Division of Research and Planning of the Memphis City School System should develop more evaluative procedures designed to assess teacher-administrator perceptions of

instructional programs for the disadvantaged, as well as regular students.

6. Additional studies, with emphasis on the role of teachers and administrators in implementing programs for disadvantaged students, should be conducted by the school system.
7. The Department of Instruction of the Memphis City School System should place more emphasis on teacher goals as well as student goals, in planning and implementing other instructional programs, along with programs currently funded by Title I.
8. The department charged with the onus of developing professional growth programs for the Memphis City School System should emphasize special service programs for teachers and administrators who work with disadvantaged students.
9. The Department of Instruction of the Memphis City School System should organize a core of curriculum developers and writers to construct materials locally and coordinate existing commercially prepared materials into the best possible curriculum for the disadvantaged.
10. Cooperative planning of preservice programs for prospective teachers and administrators of disadvantaged students with local colleges and universities is necessary for teachers and administrators to understand and work successfully with the disadvantaged students.

11. Other researchers interested in the area which deals with the impact of the perceptions of teachers and administrators on instructional programs for the disadvantaged should replicate this study to determine if a well planned and balanced program of preservice, in-service, on-the-job training, and instructional support will affect their attitudes relative to the capabilities of disadvantaged students.
12. As with all applied research, this study should be replicated to provide for cross-sectional validation of the results and conclusions.

This study has demonstrated that the Program on Problem Solving Skills had a significant impact on teachers and administrators. With this in mind, and realizing that the teachers and administrators are integral parts of the teaching-learning process, more evaluation procedures should be directed toward ascertaining their perceptions of problems encountered in implementing special programs. Evaluation should deal with these factors and particularly with teacher variables.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acuff, William T. "Orientation of Beginning Teachers in Small Urban Systems." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, 1952.

Alabama State College, "An Experiment in Teaching the Disadvantaged, (November, 1971), ERIC0067373.

Ary, Donald, Lucy C. Jacobs and Anghar Razevich. Introduction to Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Ausubel, David P. "A Teaching Strategy for Culturally Deprived Pupils: Cognitive and Motivational Conditions," School Review, LXXI (Winter, 1963), 454-463.

Barker, Nancy C. "Knowledge of Teachers as Related to Diagnosing the Individual Needs of Culturally Deprived Children." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1960.

Beck, John M. and Richard N. Saxe. Teaching the Culturally Disadvantaged Pupil. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1965.

Berg, Paul C. "Reading: The Learner's Needs and Self-Concepts," The Florida Reading Quarterly, Vol. 4 (June, 1968), 3-8.

Biehler, Robert F. Psychology Applied to Teaching. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971.

Brown, Joseph G. "A Study of the Effects of an In-Service Training Program on the School Behavior of Children and Teachers." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, 1967.

Champion, Dean J. Basic Statistics for Social Research. Scranton, Pennsylvania: Chandler Publishing Company, 1970.

Clark, Kenneth B. Prejudice and Your Child. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Cody, William C., et al. "The Atlanta Area Workshop on Preparing Teachers to Work with Disadvantaged Youth." Atlanta: The Urban Laboratory in Education, 1967.

"Collier County Institute for Teachers of Disadvantaged Children and Youth." Florida: Collier County Board of Instruction, 1967, ED013127.

Corbally, John E., Jr., T. J. Jensen and W. Frederick Staub. Educational Administration: The Secondary School. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Incorporated, 1961.

Deutsch, Martin. "The Role of Social Class in Language Development and Cognition," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 35 (1965), 78-88.

Dunkley, M. E. "Mathematics and the Disadvantaged Child," Elementary School Journal, Vol. 73, No. 1 (October, 1972), 44-48.

Educational Policies Commission, "American Education in the Search for Equal Opportunity," Washington, D.C., 1965.

Eisenberg, Leon. "Strengths of the Inner-City Child," Baltimore Bulletin of Education, Vol. 64, No. 41 (1963), 2.

Evaluation Report of the Memphis Community Learning Laboratory. Unpublished information, Division of Research, Memphis City Schools, 1970.

Fennen, Mildred S. National Education Association Journal, Vol. 51, No. 4, Washington, D.C. (April, 1962), 9-15.

Flint, Richard W. "Your Attitudes Are Showing," Weekly Reader 2, Teachers Edition. Vol. 38 (September, 1968), 1.

Fusco, Gene C. "Preparing the City Child for His School," School Life, Vol. 46, No. 6, Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office (May, 1964), 5.

Gibson, Dorothy W. Inservice Education Perspectives for Education. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1967, 1-82.

Good, Carter V. Essentials of Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Incorporated, 1966.

Gottlieb, David. "Teachers and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers," Sociology of Education, Vol. 37 (Summer, 1964), 353.

Grundy, Virginia. "Project BOOTSTRAP," Buchanan County School Board, (1968), ES01938.

Hellmuth, Jerome (ed.). Disadvantaged Child, Volume I. Washington, D.C.: Straub and Hellmuth, Co-publishers, 1967.

Horn, Thomas D. Reading for the Disadvantaged: Problems of Linguistically Different Learners. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Incorporated, 1970.

Houston Independent School District, "Teaching the Disadvantaged," Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education, 1968, 1-18.

Howard, Douglas P. "The Needs and Problems of Socially Disadvantaged Children as Perceived by Students and Teachers," Journal of Exceptional Children (January, 1961), 327-335.

Hunt, J. McVicker. Intelligence and Experience. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1961.

"Interim Evaluation Report of the Memphis Community Learning Laboratory," Memphis City Schools, unpublished information, 1969.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations in Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated, 1963.

Lessinger, Leon and Ralph Tyler (ed.). Accountability in Education. Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970.

Lyle, Hanna, et al. "Teacher Education for the Culturally Handicapped, Elementary Teacher Preparation," California State College: Los Angeles School of Education (January, 1967).

Merton, R. K. "The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy," Antioch Review, 8 (1948), 193-210.

Mouly, George J. The Science of Educational Research. New York: American Book Company, 1967.

Passow, A. Harry, Miriam Goldberg, and Abraham Tannenbaum (ed.). Education of the Disadvantaged. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated, 1963.

Passow, A. Harry (ed.). Teaching the Disadvantaged Learner. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

_____ (ed.). Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College Publisher, 1963.

_____. Reaching the Disadvantaged. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

"Program on Problem-Solving Skills: A Proposal," unpublished information, Department of Instruction, Memphis City Schools, 1972.

Riessman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962.

_____. "The Strategy of Learning Styles," Teacher College Record. (New York, 1964-65), 483-484.

Rosenthal, Robert and Lenore F. Jackson. "Teacher Expectations for the Disadvantaged," Scientific American. Vol. 218, No. 4 (April, 1968), 19-22.

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in Black and White. New York: Random House, 1964.

Smith, Calvert H. "Teaching in the Inner-City: Six Prerequisites to Success," Teacher College Record, Vol. 73, No. 4 (May, 1972).

Smith, Robert M. Diagnosis of Educational Difficulties. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.

Stone, James C. Teachers for the Disadvantaged. California: Jassey-Bass Incorporated, Publishers, 1969.

Taba, Hilba and Debora Elkin. Teaching Strategies for the Culturally Disadvantaged. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.

Taylor, Peter A. and Doris M. Cowley (ed.). Readings in Curriculum Evaluation. Iowa: William C. Brown Publishing Company, 1972.

"To Establish and Operate a Resource Center for In-Service Training for School Personnel Working with Educationally Deprived Children," Tulsa, Oklahoma Independent School District, 1967.

Tyler, Ralph W. An Address to National Conference on "The Education of the Disadvantaged," Arkansas, 1967.

Webster, A. Merriam. Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Volume II. Chicago: William Benton Publisher, 1972.

Weinberg, M. (ed.). Learning Together. Chicago: Integrated Education Association (1964), 18-25.

Whitney, Frederick L. The Elements of Research. New York: Prentice Hall, Incorporated, 1950.

Witty, Paul (ed.). The Educationally Retarded and Disadvantaged. Sixty-sixth Yearbook, Part I. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1967.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM ON PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS
PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate ALL responses to the following questions on the accompanying Response Sheet. Your responses should be marked according to the code number which appears in parentheses with each choice. For example, on Items 1 and 2, if you are a cooperating teacher who is a white female you would indicate your response to Items 1 and 2 as shown below. The code for a cooperating teacher is 1, and the code for a white female is 3.

		Response Sheet
EXAMPLE:	I.	Background Data
	1.	1
	2.	3

Please respond to all questions and indicate only one response per question.

I. Background Data

1. Position:

Cooperating teacher	(1)
Staff member	(2)
Principal	(3)

2. Sex and race:

Black female	(1)	White male	(4)
Black male	(2)	Other female	(5)
White female	(3)	Other male	(6)

3. Age:

21-30 years	(1)	41-50 years	(3)
31-40 years	(2)	51 years or older	(4)

4. Number of years of employment completed in the Memphis City School System: ("Completed" means the majority of this school year.)

Less than 1 year	(1)	6-10 years	(3)
1-5 years	(2)	11 or more years	(4)

5. Grade level you presently teach:

Fourth	(1)	Sixth	(3)
Fifth	(2)	Other (or not a teacher)	(4)

6. Highest level of education:

Bachelor's Degree	(1)	Master's Degree+	(4)
Bachelor's Degree+	(2)	Doctorate	(5)
Master's Degree	(3)		

7. Number of years experience completed in education:

Less than 1 year	(1)	11-15 years	(4)
1-5 years	(2)	16 or more years	(5)
6-10 years	(3)		

8. Number of years of service completed at present school:

Less than 1 year	(1)	2 years	(3)
1 year	(2)	3 or more years	(4)

9. Years of experience completed in a Title I Project such as Reading Improvement, Achievement Emphasis, etc.:

Less than 1 year	(1)	4-5 years	(3)
1-3 years	(2)	6 or more years	(4)

10. Years of experience completed in this Title I Project:

Less than 1 year	(1)	2 years	(3)
1 year	(2)		

II. Program Information

The items below deal with the students and activities of the Program on Problem-Solving Skills. Please respond to each item based on your experience with POPS. The code for these items is: Strongly Agree (1); Agree (2); Undecided (3); Disagree (4); Strongly Disagree (5). Indicate all responses to items 11-40 on the Response Sheets. Example: If you Agree with Item 11 your response sheet would show a 2 on Item 11.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
11.	Children in POPS seem to have achieved.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Children in POPS are capable of learning.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	It is difficult to establish an atmosphere conducive to student motivation in POPS.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	The children in POPS present severe discipline problems.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	The school attendance of children in POPS is poor	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Children in POPS find it difficult to be self-directive.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Children in POPS do not like school.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Achievement motivation is low for students in POPS.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Children in POPS have poor self-concepts.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	There is more rapport between teachers and the students in the POPS classrooms than in other classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
21.	A teacher in POPS should not be expected to construct additional instructional or learning activities on his own time.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Classwork should not be based on the needs and interests of the students in POPS.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	A teacher in POPS should provide a variety of learning activities in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	In POPS there is a problem in securing instructional activities on an appropriate level.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	POPS materials and activities are varied enough so that they can be used by the project students at any level.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	POPS provided materials and activities which were commensurate with the ability levels of the pupils.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Early in the school year frequent problems occurred in the construction of activities which were commensurate with the ability levels of the students in POPS.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Later in the school year fewer problems occurred in the construction of activities which were commensurate with the ability levels of the students in POPS.	1	2	3	4	5

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
29.	After having participated in the POPS Idea Workshop, teachers felt more secure and knowledgeable about constructing appropriate instructional activities.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	The methods and procedures used for selection of instructional activities for the students in POPS are inappropriate.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Students in POPS are more difficult to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	A teacher or administrator in POPS should not be expected to become involved with the problems of the students.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Students in POPS should not be expected to meet the same standards of work.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	For the students in POPS, being successful is a greater motivating factor than failure.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	The students in POPS do not apply themselves.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	The POPS student is more physically oriented in his learning style.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Students in POPS are not interested in learning.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
38. Students in POPS have a slow learning rate which gives the impression of less ability than actually exists.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Students in POPS lack the prerequisite academic skills necessary for certain learning tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Children in POPS work at a more leisurely pace than other children.	1	2	3	4	5

III. General Information

41. Have you participated in workshops designed to serve the POPS students?

Yes (1) No (2)

42. Have you ever lived in the inner city?

Yes (1) No (2)

43. How many parent-teacher conferences have you had?

0	(1)	5-6	(4)
1-2	(2)	7 or more	(5)
3-4	(3)		

44. Have you engaged in activities outside school which were geared toward the disadvantaged?

Yes (1) No (2)

45. Did you have an opportunity to participate in an orientation workshop or in-service during 1972-73 which was designed to acquaint you with the goals of your instructional program and your specific duties in implementing the program?

Yes (1) No (2)

46. Do you know the teacher goals of POPS?

Yes (1) No (2)

47. Do you prefer to work in a Title I (inner-city) school?

Yes (1) No (2)

48. How many homes of the students have you visited during 1972-73?

0 (1) 3-4 (3)
1-2 (2) 5 or more (4)

Please answer questions 49-53 on the last two sheets of the Response Sheets:

49. What do you think teachers should have done to assess the needs of POPS students?

50. What kind of literature have you read pertaining to the life of disadvantaged children?

51. What kind of educational courses have you taken that relate to disadvantaged students?

52. What areas of work experience have you been involved outside of the educational field which relate to the disadvantaged?

53. According to your experience in working with POPS children, if you had an opportunity to add an innovative feature(s) to the curriculum, what feature(s) would you add?

APPENDIX B

RESPONSE SHEET
PROGRAM ON PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS
PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Background Data

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

II. Program Information

11. _____
12. _____
13. _____
14. _____
15. _____
16. _____
17. _____
18. _____
19. _____
20. _____
21. _____
22. _____
23. _____
24. _____
25. _____

II. Program Information

26. _____
27. _____
28. _____
29. _____
30. _____
31. _____
32. _____
33. _____
34. _____
35. _____
36. _____
37. _____
38. _____
39. _____
40. _____

III. General Information

41. _____
42. _____
43. _____
44. _____
45. _____
46. _____
47. _____
48. _____

NOTE: Please answer Questions 49-53 on the next two pages.

49. What do you think teachers should have done to assess the needs of POPS students?

50. What kind of literature have you read pertaining to the life of disadvantaged children?

51. What kind of educational courses have you taken that relate to disadvantaged students?

52. What areas of work experience have you been involved outside of the educational field which relate to the disadvantaged?

53. According to your experience in working with POPS children, if you had an opportunity to add an innovative feature(s) to the curriculum, what feature(s) would you add?

APPENDIX C

TITLE I SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate ALL responses to the following questions on the accompanying Response Sheets. Your responses should be marked according to the code number which appears in parentheses with each choice. For example, on Items 1 and 2, if you are a regular classroom teacher who is a white female you would indicate your response to Items 1 and 2 as shown below. The code for a regular classroom teacher is 1, and the code for a white female is 3.

EXAMPLE:	Response Sheet
	I. Background Data
	1. 1
	2. 3

Please respond to all questions and indicate only one response per question.

I. Background Data

1. Position:

Regular classroom teacher	(1)
Other	(2)

2. Sex and race:

Black female	(1)	White male	(4)
Black male	(2)	Other female	(5)
White female	(3)	Other male	(6)

3. Age:

21-30	(1)	41-50	(3)
31-40	(2)	51 years or older	(4)

4. Number of years of employment completed in the Memphis City School System: ("Completed" means the majority of the school year.)

Less than 1 year	(1)	6-10	(3)
1-5	(2)	10 or more years	(4)

5. Grade level you presently teach:

Fourth	(1)	Sixth	(3)
Fifth	(2)	Other (or not a teacher)	(4)

6. Highest level of education:

Bachelor's Degree	(1)	Master's Degree+	(4)
Bachelor's Degree+	(2)	Doctorate	(5)
Master's Degree	(3)		

7. Number of years of experience completed in education:

Less than 1 year	(1)	11-15 years	(4)
1-5 years	(2)	16 or more years	(5)
6-10 years			

8. Number of years of service completed at present school:

Less than 1 year	(1)	2 years	(3)
1 year	(2)	3 or more years	(4)

9. Years of experience completed in Title I Projects such as Reading Improvement, Achievement Emphasis, etc.:

Less than 1 year	(1)	4-5 years	(3)
1-3 years	(2)	6 or more years	(4)
		None	(5)

10. Years of experience completed in a Title I School:

Less than 1 year	(1)	2 years	(3)
1 year	(2)		

II. Program Information

The items below deal with the students and activities of Title I Schools. Please respond to each item based on your experience in Title I Schools. The code for these items is: Strongly agree (1); Agree (2); Undecided (3); Disagree (4); Strongly Disagree (5). Indicate ALL responses to Items 11-40 on the Response Sheets. Example: If you Agree with Item 11 your response sheet would show a 2 on Item 11.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
11.	Children in regular Title I classes seem to have achieved.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Children in regular Title I classes are capable of learning.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	It is difficult to establish an atmosphere conducive to student motivation in regular Title I classes.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Children in Title I classes present severe discipline problems.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	The school attendance of Title I children is poor.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Title I children find it difficult to be self-directive.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Title I children do not like school.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Achievement motivation is low for Title I students.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Title I children have poor self-concepts.	1	2	3	4	5

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20.	There is more rapport between teachers and the students in Title I classes than in other schools.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	A teacher of a Title I class should not be expected to construct additional instructional or learning activities on his own time.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Classwork should not be based on the needs and interests of the students in Title I classes.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	A teacher in a regular Title I class should provide a variety of learning activities in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	In Title I classes there is a problem in securing instructional activities on an appropriate level for the disadvantaged student.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Materials and activities in Title I classes are varied enough so that they can be used by the students at any level.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Materials and activities in Title I classes are commensurate with the ability levels of the pupils.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Early in the school year, frequent problems occurred in the construction of activities which were commensurate with the ability levels of the students in Title I classes.	1	2	3	4	5

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28.	Later in the school year fewer problems occurred in the construction of activities which were commensurate with the ability levels of the students in Title I classes.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Participation in a workshop would help teachers of Title I classes feel more secure and knowledgeable about constructing appropriate instructional activities.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	The methods and procedures used for selection of instructional activities for the students in Title I classes are inappropriate.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Title I students are more difficult to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	A teacher or administrator in Title I Schools should not be expected to become involved with the problems of the students.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Students in Title I classes should not be expected to meet the same standards of work.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	For students in regular Title I classes, being successful is a greater motivating factor than failure.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	The students in regular Title I classes do not apply themselves.	1	2	3	4	5

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
36.	The students in regular Title I classes are more physically oriented in their learning styles.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Students in regular Title I classes are not interested in learning.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Students in regular Title I classes have a slow learning rate which gives the impression of less ability than actually exists.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	Students in regular Title I classes lack the prerequisite academic skills necessary for certain learning tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Children in regular Title I classes work at a more leisurely pace than other children.	1	2	3	4	5

III. General Information

41. Have you participated in workshops designed to serve the Title I students?

Yes (1) No (2)

42. Have you ever lived in the inner-city?

Yes (1) No (2)

43. How many parent-teacher conferences have you had?

0 (1) 5-6 (4)
1-2 (2) 7 or more (5)
3-4 (3)

44. Have you engaged in activities outside school which were geared toward the disadvantaged?

Yes (1) No (2)

45. Did you have an opportunity to participate in an orientation workshop or in-service during 1972-73 which was designed to acquaint you with the goals of your instructional program and your specific duties in implementing the program?

Yes (1) No (2)

46. Do you know the teacher goals of Program on Problem-Solving Skills?

Yes (1) No (2)

47. Do you prefer to work in a Title I (inner-city) school?

Yes (1) No (2)

48. How many homes of the students have you visited during 1972-73?

0 (1) 3-4 (3)
1-2 (2) 5 or more (4)

Please answer questions 49-53 on the last two sheets of the Response Sheets:

49. What do you think teachers should have done to assess the needs of Title I students?

50. What kind of literature have you read pertaining to the life of disadvantaged children?

III. General Information

51. What kind of educational courses have you taken that relate to disadvantaged students?

52. What areas of work experience have you been involved outside of the educational field which relate to the disadvantaged?

53. According to your experience in working with Title I children, if you had an opportunity to add an innovative feature(s) to the curriculum, what feature(s) would you add?

APPENDIX D

RESPONSE SHEET
TITLE I
PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Background Data

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

II. Program Information

11. _____
12. _____
13. _____
14. _____
15. _____
16. _____
17. _____
18. _____
19. _____
20. _____
21. _____
22. _____
23. _____
24. _____
25. _____

II. Program Information

26. _____
27. _____
28. _____
29. _____
30. _____
31. _____
32. _____
33. _____
34. _____
35. _____
36. _____
37. _____
38. _____
39. _____
40. _____

III. General Information

41. _____
42. _____
43. _____
44. _____
45. _____
46. _____
47. _____
48. _____

NOTE: Please answer Questions 49-53 on the next two pages.

49. What do you think teachers should have done to assess the needs of Title I students?

50. What kind of literature have you read pertaining to the life of disadvantaged children?

51. What kind of educational courses have you taken that relate to inner-city students?

52. What areas of work experience outside of the educational field have you been involved which relate to the disadvantaged?

53. According to your experience in working with disadvantaged children, if you had an opportunity to add an innovative feature(s) to the curriculum, what feature(s) would you add?

APPENDIX E

BOARD OF EDUCATION
Memphis City Schools
2597 Avery Avenue, Memphis, Tennessee 38112

Please reply to office of:
Joyce B. Weddington, Asst. Dir.
Division of Research and Planning

Mrs. Elma Mardis
2324 Bridgeport Drive
Memphis, Tennessee 38114

Dear Mrs. Mardis:

Your request to conduct a research study entitled, "A Study of the Perceived Impact on Teachers and Administrators of an Instructional Program for Disadvantaged Students from Selected Schools in Memphis, Tennessee," has been reviewed and endorsed by this office.

If I can be of further help to you, please contact me.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Joyce B. Weddington

(Mrs.) Joyce B. Weddington

bk

APPROVED BY: _____
W. D. Callian, Assistant Superintendent
Department of Instruction

APPENDIX F

BOARD OF EDUCATION
Memphis City Schools
2597 Avery Avenue, Memphis, Tennessee 38112

Please reply to office of:

O. Z. Stephens, Jr.
Director, Division of
Research and Planning

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The instrument developed by Elma H. Mardis for the study entitled, "A Study of the Perceived Impact on Teachers and Administrators of an Instructional Program for Disadvantaged Students from Selected Schools in Memphis, Tennessee," has been reviewed and approved by a panel of experts from the Division of Research and Planning of the Memphis City School System.

Respectfully submitted,

O. Z. Stephens, Ed.D.
Director, Division of
Research and Planning

OZS/bk

APPENDIX G

BOARD OF EDUCATION
Memphis City Schools
2597 Avery Avenue, Memphis, Tennessee 38112

Please reply to office of:
Joyce B. Weddington, Asst. Dir.
Division of Research and Planning

TO: Title I Personnel

FROM: Joyce B. Weddington, Assistant Director
Division of Research and Planning

SUBJECT: Title I Evaluation Program

The Division of Research and Planning is conducting an evaluation of instructional programs in Title I Schools which will involve teachers and administrators. You will receive a questionnaire, response sheets and other information relative to your role in the evaluation.

Please fill out the questionnaire you receive and return it to the Division of Research and Planning, via the intersystem mail services as soon as possible.

Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated. If additional information is desired, please contact me at extension 218.

JBW/bk

APPROVED BY: _____
W. D. Callian, Assistant Superintendent
Department of Instruction

VITA

Elma Hubbard Mardis, the sixth of nine children, was born in Memphis, Tennessee, to Mr. and Mrs. Walter Lee Hubbard, Sr. She received her formal educational training in the Memphis Public School System with the exception of grades seven and eight which were spent at Cooperative Private School. She entered LeMoyne College in 1948 and received the B.S. degree in 1952, with a major in elementary education.

After graduation from college, she was employed as an elementary teacher for the Memphis City School System at Magnolia School where she remained until 1962 and served as grade chairman for four years. In 1961, she was transferred to the junior high department at Magnolia School to teach mathematics.

Beginning in the summer of 1957, she enrolled in a Master's Degree program at the University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. She completed requirements for the Master of Education degree from this institution in 1960. She also engaged in further graduate study at Memphis State University.

Beginning in the fall of 1962, she was transferred to Lincoln Junior High School to teach seventh and eighth grade mathematics. While there, she was saluted as teacher of the week by a local radio station and teacher of the year in 1965, for the school upon recommendation of the principal.

During the summer of 1966, she was recommended to work as a pilot teacher for the University of Illinois Committee for the Study of Mathematics, under the late Dr. Max Beberman, at Corry Junior High School.

Beginning in the summer of 1968, she began to work in a Title III project for the Memphis City School System, as lead teacher in the mathematics-science component. In the spring of 1970, she was appointed curriculum coordinator for the project, a position she held until the project was terminated. She was then transferred to a Title I program.

During the 1972-73 school year she requested and received a sabbatical leave to attend the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, to pursue further study.

She is married to William C. Mardis of Parkin, Arkansas. A daughter Marlah Hubbard Mardis was born to this union in 1965.

She has membership in the following organizations: National Education Association, West Tennessee Education Association, Tennessee Education Association, the Memphis Education Association, the International Reading Association, Pi Lambda Theta National Honor and Professional Organization, Beta Epsilon Omega Chapter of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, and Jack and Jill Incorporated of America. She is also an active member of Second Congregational Church and a member of the Second Association of the Church.

Elma Mardis entered the Graduate School, University of Tennessee in March, 1970. She received the Doctor of Education degree in Educational Administration and Supervision—March 19, 1974.