11-15-68

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO.				IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ED 023 939				ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
CH ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE	LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐
AA 000 320	24	Dec68	RIEAPR69	

AUTHOR
Wilder, David E.; And Others

TITLE
ACTUAL AND PERCEIVED CONSENSUS ON EDUCATIONAL GOALS BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY. FINAL REPORT. VOLUME I AND VOLUME II.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
QPX17250	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y., Bureau of Applied Social Research
SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY
RMQ660014	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C., Bureau of Research

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
2.50;31.90	OEC-5-10-238	OEG-5-10-238
REPORT NO.		BUREAU NO.
		BR-5-1067

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
636p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Educational Objectives; *Perception; Role Perception; *School Community Relationship; Mothers; Secondary School Teachers; Elementary School Teachers; High School Students; Role Conflict; Teaching Styles; Teacher Role; Sociolization; Mother Attitudes; Parent Influence; Socially Deviant Behavior; *Parent School Relationship; Educational Research; *Social Integration

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT
Based on interview response data collected in 1965 in 11 representative New Jersey communities, a social integration study sought to determine the extent of consensus regarding educational goals as perceived by parents, teachers, and students. Communities were selected to permit comparisons with respect to size, relative isolation, growth rate, socioeconimic composition, and racial composition. Respondents included 1,392 mothers (83%) of two first grade and two fifth grade classes in each elementary school and of two 10th grade English classes in each high school, 518 students (97%) of the 10th grade English classes, principals of all 20 subject schools, and 283 teachers (99%) of all first through sixth grades and of all high school English classes. Extensive findings, primarily in the form of percentages, are discussed in the following major sections: (1) The goals of education: preferences and perceptions of mothers, teachers, and students; (2) teaching styles: professional role definitions and the preferences and perceptions of mothers and students; (3) the extent and consequence of observability in school systems; (4) socialization, achievement, and alienation from the school; (5) mother-child consensus on educational plans; and (6) role strain, alienation, and deviant behavior among high school students. Copies of survey instruments are appended. (JK)

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

ACTUAL AND PERCEIVED CONSENSUS ON EDUCATIONAL GOALS BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY

Report submitted to

Office of Education
Bureau of Research
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Volume I

BUREAU OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

Columbia University
605 West 115th Street
New York, N. Y. 10025

The Bureau of Applied Social Research is an instrument of Columbia University's Graduate Faculties for training and research in the social sciences. The Bureau has for many years served as the research laboratory of the Department of Sociology, and it also facilitates social research by students and faculty of other departments and schools of the University. The Bureau's governing board includes representatives from all of the University's social science departments and several professional schools.

The Bureau carries on a program of basic and applied research under grants and commissions from foundations, government agencies, social welfare and other nonprofit organizations, and business firms. In so doing it provides experience on major empirical studies to graduate students and makes available data and facilities for student projects; it provides research facilities to faculty members; it offers training and consultation to visiting scholars, especially from social research institutes in other countries; and it makes the results of its investigations available through publications for lay and scientific audiences.

A bibliography of Bureau books, monographs, articles, unpublished research reports, dissertations, and masters' essays may be obtained from the Bureau's Librarian.

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 5-1067-2-12-1
Grant No. OE-5-10-238

ACTUAL AND PERCEIVED CONSENSUS ON EDUCATIONAL GOALS BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY

December 1968

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

VOLUME I

ACTUAL AND PERCEIVED CONSENSUS ON EDUCATIONAL GOALS BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY

Project No. 5-1067-2-12-1
Grant No. OE-5-10-238

David E. Wilder
with
Nathalie S. Friedman
Robert B. Hill
Eva Sandis
and
Sam D. Sieber

December 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Columbia University

Bureau of Applied Social Research

New York, New York

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study has been a collective effort from its inception, and the list of individuals and groups to whom we are indebted is a lengthy one. The original version of the proposal for the study was written by Sam D. Sieber and funded by the New Jersey State Department of Education. It was then submitted to the Office of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Supplementary funds were later granted by the Russell Sage Foundation.

The research team was assembled during the late months of 1964 and immediately began to select communities in which to conduct the study and to design the instruments to be used in the field. Dr. Robert Flemming, Associate Commissioner of Education for the State of New Jersey, was especially helpful to us in selecting the study sites and in gaining permission for us to conduct research in their schools. The basic instruments were designed with the help of consultation contributed by Professors Allen H. Barton, William S. Goode, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and Robert K. Merton of the Department of Sociology of Columbia University. We next began our collaboration with Roper Research Associates, and during this period Burns W. Roper and Carol Crusius were especially helpful in refining our lengthy instruments and in executing the fieldwork for the study. When the interviews were returned to the Bureau, the laborious job of editing and coding began, soon to be followed by card punching and computer processing. The majority of the many who participated in these activities will have to remain anonymous, but especially helpful in solving problems created by our unusual study design were Peter Graham and Harvey Sohnen. As manuscript began to be produced, Professors Barton and Goode kindly agreed to lend their red pencils and advice. And finally, Madeline Simonson ably supervised the typing and other clerical work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I

THE PROBLEM

All major institutions and organizations in our society are, to some extent, interdependent for adequate functioning. Both schools and families "produce" young men who will serve in the armed forces. The military receive support from the citizens and from industry, but in turn are obligated to protect them. Churches are supported by their congregations, but in turn offer services that members desire. In short, any organization must engage in a continuing series of exchanges with others in order to carry out its allocated tasks. A set of inputs and outputs link each unit with many others.

This is a study of one set of the complex interactions that link school systems and the families they serve. The primary focus is on relations among pupils, parents, teachers, and school systems, but, at a deeper level, our findings throw some light on the links between any two institutions.

If the connections and exchanges between institutions are to be effective, several conditions must be met. For example, every organization requires money, which in turn depends on its constituents' believing that it is doing a good job. This combination of loyalty and belief depends on outsiders being able to observe some part of the work of the organization. Accordingly, some part of every organization's budget is normally allocated to presenting information to its constituents about itself. But, if the product -- in this case, the education of the child -- is to fit the wishes of constituents, the organization must also obtain information about their

goals, values and norms.

Any continuing organization does, of course, meet these conditions in part, and also fail to some extent. But the relations among pupils, parents, and schools are especially contingent upon and susceptible to potential misunderstandings. A few of these may be noted illustratively:

> The school is the only institution to which the family regularly gives over a major responsibility for shaping the child, but the family has no day to day supervisory position from which to check the result.
>
> Schools presumably train and socialize children in accordance with the goals and preferences of parents, but they typically have no effective means of ascertaining parental goals and preference.
>
> School systems are more directly dependent on the good will of their constituents than almost any other governmental agency, but since they often fail to know what parents are troubled about, their efforts to inform constituents often misfire or are irrelevant.
>
> A major factor in pupils' decisions about their academic future is their parents' judgements and attitudes, but children may misperceive their parents' wishes, and parents may misperceive their childrens' aspirations and performances.
>
> School systems -- that is, educators -- have a firm faith in two-way communication, but engage mainly in one-way communication with parents. However, it is not clear that <u>full</u> communication would in fact create harmony or even effectiveness.

These brief examples at least suggest the wide range of problems that arise in studying interaction among pupils, parents, and educators. We shall explore many such problems in detail in the course of this report. But these deeper explorations can be seen as examples of a number of more general problems that schools and families share in meeting the conditions necessary for their continued coexistence. Let us take a somewhat closer look at some of the typical circumstances under which educators, parents, and pupils interact before moving on to more specific considerations.

Parents do not inform schools of their desires. Parents in all communities take their children to school with a vague understanding that the child will receive an education. Sometimes parents have already chosen occupations for very young children; sometimes there are specific subject areas beyond the three R's that parents want their children to learn; and sometimes there are attitudes or beliefs, such as patriotism or respect for authority, that parents expect their children to acquire at school. But parents do not usually tell the school what they expect their children to learn, how they expect their children to be treated, and which specific behavioral standards they wish to have applied.

Parents have no adequate way of checking on the school. In the course of his schooling, the child will be placed under the temporary control of a number of adults who may approach him in very different ways and set widely varying standards for performance or conduct. Parents often believe they know what is going on in school, how the child is treated, what the child is learning, and what the goals are that will be met. But typically, parents have no adequate way of checking to see whether their beliefs are correct. Some teachers require that homework be signed by parents; some send elaborate report cards to the home; and some parents engage in extensive conversations about school with their children or with the teachers. But even where these practices are common, parents cannot ascertain objectively whether the child is being shaped in accordance with their desires.

Educators "inform" but do not seek advice from parents. Despite the current press for increased Federal and State support for elementary and secondary education, the United States continues to be unlike most Western

nations in that the largest proportion of school money is raised by local taxes. In addition, educators almost universally advocate closer school-community relations than now exist; and greater parental involvement in school matters is now being suggested as a prerequisite to solving the problems of massive academic failure in our urban ghettoes. Yet in most communities neither teachers nor administrators have reliable information about how parents want their children shaped or whether they think the schools are doing an adequate job. Moreover, financial support from the local community and the fate of school bond issues are often unrelated to these matters, resting mainly on the views of citizens who have no children in the schools. At the same time, educators' messages to parents are usually formulated without benefit of or consultation with parents, and hence they do not contain answers to the questions that are of most interest to parents. Feedback from parents is generally negligible, and the school is left without substantial indication of whether their messages have been accepted.

Existing communication mechanisms are inadequate even when utilized. Educators typically assume that disagreements with and misperceptions by parents would be erased if only parents would take advantage of the opportunities they are given for learning about the school. But, in actuality, the opportunities that parents are provided for learning about the school are not sufficient to give them the information they would like to have. Usually the school has a few PTA meetings every year that are devoted to matters only remotely related to the interests of parents in their individual children. Group meetings with parents can seldom provide an appropriate format for broaching the personal questions that parents might like to ask.

But even in the few systems where frequent conferences between individual parents and teachers are held, parents are often at a loss as to what to ask because their specific knowledge about the behavior of their children in classroom situations is so meagre. Only daily observation of their children in the classroom setting could provide the type of information that many parents would like to have about their children in relation to the school.

Complete knowledge among parents and educators might not be desirable. Ironically, it is probably fortunate that parental observation of classroom behavior is not common practice, that parents do not have full knowledge of what goes on in school, and that the school does not have full knowledge of parents' desires and perceptions. For if they did, mutual awareness of conflicting demands, preferences, and practices might well prove to be far more disruptive to the integration of schools and families than the disputes that sometimes occur when mutual knowledge is limited. Parents would undoubtedly find specific practices of teachers and the treatment of their own children objectionable at times, and educators would find the special desires of some parents and the conflicting demands of others difficult to refuse, to accommodate, or to reconcile with their own.

In sum, educators and parents are both exposed to extensive speculation about one another; and in light of their limited and unsystematic mutual communications, it would not be surprising to find that they are often mistaken about one another. It is quite conceivable that educators often assume they agree with parents or that parents assume they agree with educators on matters of mutual importance, when in fact, there is sharp disagreement. It is equally possible that parents or educators assume that they

disagree with one another, when, in fact, they agree. In the first case, parents and educators can proceed happily as long as they fail to discover their diagreement with one another. And in the second case, there is likely to be considerable unnecessary unhappiness. But in both cases, teachers' and parents' perceptions of one another are likely to have a greater impact on their behavior than the actual opinions and practices of parents and teachers.

This study is an attempt to ascertain the extent and consequences of both actual and perceived agreements between teachers, parents and students on a number of educational matters in several different community settings. The topics covered range from very general considerations, such as the goals of education and the styles of teaching most preferred, to very specific ones, including actual school practices and the behavior of individual teachers, students and mothers. But in every instance, the structured relationships among teachers, their students, and the mothers of their students provide the framework on which the research is built.

Questions concerning the coexistence of the school and family as social institutions are, of course, prototypes of a set of more general questions about how societies work as a whole. Social scientists will recognize the fact that the problems associated with relationships between the school and family are not basically different from the problems that arise between a number of mutually dependent social institutions, such as the military and the government, the church and its parish, and science and the universities. Social scientists frequently conduct studies of such institutions one at a time, and sometimes they study more than one institution at the same time.

Studies of single institutions often include quantitative data that describe or illuminate structured relationships within the institution. Studies of more than one institution usually describe structured relationships in more qualitative terms. One of the unusual aspects of this study is that we will be describing structured relationships both within and between two institutions using quantitative data gathered from a number of different social settings.

Among the general questions that arise when sociologists consider mutually dependent institutions are such matters as: How much agreement is there among members of the same institution and between members of different institutions on issues of mutual concern? How accurate are the mutual perceptions of behavior and beliefs within and between institutions? Are there identifiable social structural factors that promote or impede agreement and accuracy of mutual perceptions? For instance, do individuals who interact regularly tend to agree more or to have more accurate mutual perceptions than those who seldom confront one another, or is location or relative position within each institutional structure a more important factor? Are individuals who occupy positions in both institutions more aware of agreements and disagreements between institutions? Finally, what are the consequences of various situations of agreement and dicagreement and accuracy of mutual perceptions both within and between institutions?

Obviously a single study of school-community relations cannot provide systematic answers to all the general problems shared by mutually dependent institutions in our society, or even to the few problems to which we have already alluded. Accordingly, in the report that follows, we have attempted

to identify examples of some of these problems as they occur in a variety of school districts, to investigate these systematically, and to provide a common conceptual scheme for discussion.

Social integration is the concept that sociologists have usually applied to the general problem of coexisting social institutions, and we shall follow this tradition. However, this concept, like many concepts in sociology, has been employed with a variety of meanings and is seldom precisely defined.[1] Hence, we begin by briefly discussing some of these alternative meanings and a group of related concepts in order to clarify the manner in which the concept of integration will be used in the remainder of the report.

Social Integration: A Conceptual Perspective

The most general sense in which the concept of integration has been used in sociology is as a functional requirement for all social systems. Parsons, for instance, has noted that:

> Internal differentiation, which is a fundamental property of all systems, requires integration. It is a condition of the existence of the system that the differentiated roles must be coordinated, either negatively, in the sense of the avoidance of disruptive interference with each other, or positively, in the sense of contributing to the realization of certain collective goals through collaborated activity.[2]

Parsons' concern with the general problem of maintenance or the continued functioning of social systems tends to beg the question of what is meant by integration beyond "avoidance of disruptive influence" or "collaborated activity," and it does not lend itself well to empirical investigation. Moreover, the notion of functional requirement suggests that the investigator might gain from a search for limiting cases where social systems have

"disintegrated" or failed to persist; when in actuality, the systems with which we will be concerned seldom fail to persist. For example, while it is true that large numbers of dissatisfied parents have withdrawn their children from public schools in central cities, this loss of members does not or has not yet led to the complete disintegration of urban public schools. Hence generalization at this broad level does not contribute much to our discussion.

Some authors have recognized the need to further specify the concept of social integration, and others have operationalized their specifications for social research purposes or suggested indicators for different types of integration.

The formulation by Landecker was especially helpful for our early conceptualization of some of the central issues in the present study.

Landecker[3] distinguished four types of integration:

1) cultural integration: the consistency of cultural standards or norms (e.g. do parents, teachers, and students agree on how teachers should behave in the classroom?)

2) normative integration: the consistency between norms and actual behavior (e.g. do teachers behave in a way that conforms to the expectations of other teachers, parents, and students?)

3) communicative integration: the extent to which the communicative contacts and exchange of meaning permeate a group (e.g. do all teachers, parents and students interact with all their role partners and share meanings with them?)

4) functional integration: the degree to which there is mutual interdependence among the units of a system or division of labor (e.g. do teachers, parents, and students all depend on one another in order to adequately perform their individual roles?)

Obviously, there is considerable overlap between Landecker's functional integration and the latter part of the Parsons' definition, but the resemblance

ends at this point. Landecker claims to have derived his four types by combining "cultural standards, on the one hand, and persons and their behavior, on the other,"[4] but it is not possible to derive his types as four mutually exclusive and exhaustive alternatives from these two elements. Nevertheless, these two elements, cultural standards (or norms), and behavior are two of the three basic elements which we eventually used to construct our own typology. The third element was found in the social psychological literature.

Among social psychologists the concept of social integration has frequently been interchangeable with the concept of social cohesion. As with the Parsons' version, this general usage suggests that unless there is integration the group or society will dissolve or fall apart. This extreme implication again tends to force the theorist to search for a general set of functional requirements for social systems, and these would most likely have limited utility for social research. However, social psychologists have often bypassed this problem by operationalizing integration or cohesion in terms of the affectional ties of members of the group or attractiveness of the group. Thus while Cartwright and Zander have provided a general definition of cohesiveness as the "resultant of all the forces acting on the members to remain in the group,"[5] their empirical studies and those of most social psychologists have tended to be limited to measures of interpersonal attractiveness.[6] Among sociologists, Blau[7] has adopted this more limited social psychological usage in his writing. But Blau has made it clear that the types of problems one can investigate are dependent upon whether the reciprocity of attraction between the individual and the group are taken into account.[8] In this study we will have occasion to consider a number of

affectional ties among pupils, parents, and educators.

In our formulation of the concept of integration we have simply taken the two elements from the Landecker types, norms and behavior, and combined them with the social psychological element, affect. Both our problem formulation and instrument construction were influenced from the beginning by consideration of these three elements as the building blocks, and whatever limitations or merits are found in the research are largely traceable to this decision which was made long before the fieldwork commenced.[9]

It should be pointed out that the problem of social integration was not the central focus of the initial proposal on which this study was based. As originally conceived and as the title suggests, our study was to be mainly concerned with problems of actual versus perceived consensus between parents and educators, and we shall return to these problems below. However, as we became engrossed in finding out how to research these initial problems, methodological issues led to an examination of the concept of social integration and to our eventual realization that integration was the most appropriate general concept for organizing our discussion. Subsequent reading of the literature led to the discovery that others had already come very close to our own formulation of the relevant elements of social integration.

Edward Gross,[10] for instance, distinguished "consensus" or agreement on norms and "symbiosis" or behavioral interdependence as the two most important integrative forces in small groups. He then proceeded to relate these to a sociometric measure of integration based on affective ties between group members. In a similar vein, Newcomb, Turner, and Converse[11] have

recently distinguished three important bases of group cohesion:

1) structural integration, or coordinated behavioral interdependence
2) shared attitudes, consensus on group-relevant matters
3) mutual attraction[12]

Clearly Gross' "consenus," the "shared attitudes" of Newcomb et al., and Landecker's "cultural integration" are virtually identical, as are Gross' "symbiosis," the "structural integration" of Newcomb et al., and Landecker's "functional integration." The affective element, or affectional ties, are also found in the schemes of all these authors with the exception of Landecker. But, Landecker is the only author who considers the problem of the consistency between norms and behavior, which he calls normative integration. (It is not clear whether Landecker's communicative integration should be regarded as a combination of the other three types or as some other special construct.) The general problem of the "consistency" between the sub-elements of integration raised by Landecker suggests that one could construct a typology of integration based on the three elements that we have adopted. This is in contrast with Gross[13] and others who have hypothesized about the relationships among different bases of integration. We shall make use of both procedures.

There does not appear to be sufficient a priori basis for hypothesizing extensively about the relationships among the three elements of integration that we have selected without taking additional factors into account. To illustrate, we shall construct a primitive typology of the logically possible situations based on assigning dichotomous values to each of the three selected elements of integration. This typology will enable us to consider relationships among norms, interdependent behavior, and affect in a more systematic way and to seek illustrative empirical examples. Moreover, brief consideration of the types that result will reveal certain limitations

in the typology and suggest additional factors that should be taken into consideration.

It is possible to conceive of groups that would fit most of the eight types that result from assigning dichotomous values to norms, interdependent behavior, and affect. At first blush, it would appear that groups can be initially formed on the basis of each of the three elements alone, but it seems doubtful that groups represented by some of these patterns could persist over long periods of time except under rather unusual circumstances.

CHART I

A PRIMITIVE TYPOLOGY OF SOCIAL INTEGRATION

	Shared Norms	Coordinated Behavior	Mutual Attraction
1.	yes	yes	yes
2.	yes	yes	no
3.	yes	no	yes
4.	no	yes	yes
5.	no	no	yes
6.	no	yes	no
7.	yes	no	no
8.	no	no	no

Where all three elements are present (type 1) we have the ideal situation that seemingly needs no comment (e.g. a school system where educators, parents, and students share educational norms, interact harmoniously and interdependently, and have positive feelings about one another). Type 2, a group that has coordinated behavior and shared norms, but no affectional ties also does not present any special difficulties (e.g. educators and

parents or students who agree on what is to be done, do their jobs, but don't like each other). This is the situation that Homans,[14] for instance, hypothesized would eventually lead to affectional ties. However, Type 3, a group with shared norms and affectional ties but no interdependent coordinated behavior does appear to present some problems. For instance, are the norms and coordinated behavior referring to the same acts? If they are (as with Landecker's conformity), and group members are able to observe one another's behavior, such nonconformity might make group life very difficult (e.g. if mothers and the teachers agree that the teacher should assign more homework, but the teacher does not comply, the teacher may feel guilty, and the mothers may hesitate to criticize because of their positive feelings). But what if group members are unaware of one another's noncomformity? Perhaps behavior does not have to be well coordinated as long as it is not very disruptive. Some coordinated acts may be more important to the group than others, but is it possible to have no coordinated interdependent acts in a membership group?[15]

In Type 4 another problem arises. Although it is conceivable that there might be affectional ties and that the behavior of group members might be coordinated even though members do not agree upon specific norms, is it possible for group members to continue to interact in such a way over time while sharing no norms or mutual expectations[16] (including linguistic conventions, gestures, etc.)? These problems become even more acute in Type 5 where only affectional ties are found, and in Types 6 and 7 where there is only coordinated behavior or shared norms, respectively. Type 8, where none of the three elements is found, would appear to be a pure limiting case of

"no integration."

It is obvious from our cursory treatment of the types in Chart I that meaningful discussion of social integration is more complex than our typology allows even when the discussion is guided by the three elements we have selected. Three sets of problems can be abstracted from our brief discussion. One problem is that each element may take on a number of values in addition to the simple dichotomy of "yes" and "no" that we have used. This became obvious when we considered the possibility of a group with no coordinated behavior and wondered "how much" disruptive behavior could be tolerated or "how much" coordination was necessary for group preservation. Once additional values are permitted for each element, hypotheses about the relationships among the elements seem to follow naturally. (Does increased coordinated behavior among educators and parents lead to higher affect and vice versa? If a group has high consensus on norms and highly coordinated behavior, does it also need high affect to survive, etc.?)

A second set of problems seemed to stem from the fact that groups commonly have a multiplicity of norms, interdependent links, and affective ties. Hence questions arise as to what <u>mixtures</u> of these can be tolerated, and does one mixture represent higher integration than another? (Perhaps some norms or behavior are more important to educators and parents than others, etc.)

A third set of problems is related to the fact that group members may be <u>unaware</u> of the norms, behavior, and affective ties of other members and thus remain undisturbed by a lack of consensus, by non-conformity or by the ill feelings of others. We will consider this last problem first, the problem

of whether role partners have accurate knowledge about one another's norms, behavior, and affect. This brings us back to the original problem around which our study was designed.

Actual Versus Perceived Consensus and Conformity

It might appear to some that the question of whether role partners have accurate perceptions of one another's beliefs and behavior is merely a trivial methodological issue. If this is true, we hasten to correct this mistaken impression. The question of the accuracy of mutual perceptions is germane to all social control and is a fundamental issue of social organization. Deception in human interaction is not limited to the intentional ruse of the con man or magician. It is well-known that our senses may deceive us or that we may unintentionally deceive ourselves into believing things congenial to our predispositions. But perhaps most important, we base our behavior on our beliefs regardless of whether they are correct.

Whenever role partners interact, it is problematic whether they actually agree upon or share norms and whether they perceive that they agree upon specified norms. It has often been assumed by social scientists that role partners must agree on norms, but during recent years the "postulate of role consensus" has not borne up well under empirical tests. For example, in the general educational setting with which we will be concerned, Jenkins[17] found a number of differences among mothers, teachers, principals and students regarding their role prescriptions or norms for teachers. More recently, Foskett[18] has found that elementary school teachers, principals and mothers of elementary students disagree on a number of norms and that they also perceive that they disagree on a number of norms, but he fails to investigate

whether the lack of agreement of the perception of disagreement makes any difference to the educational system or to its members.

Neal Gross et al. have demonstrated that there are both actual and perceived differences among the relevant norms held by school superintendents and by their related board members. Moreover, Gross and his colleagues base their theory of role conflict on perceived differences in normative expectations among role partners, but they so not check to see whether these perceived differences are also actual differences. Getzels and others[20] have found it useful to distinguish between the perceived expectations and the actual behavior of role partners, and they have shown that satisfaction of role partners tends to be contingent upon perceived agreement in expectations regardless of actual behavior.

Landecker, in his discussion of normative integration, seems to have anticipated the problem of actual versus perceived differences in norms to some extent. He acknowledges the fact that logical contradictions among norms might not be recognized by actors in the system and that "the earmark of inconsistency among standards should be experienced difficulty"[21] (italics in original). Hence Landecker appears to have been referring in part to what we now call role conflict as a symptom of low integration. Indeed, the discussions of role conflict by Gross[22] and Merton[23] both imply that inconsistencies or conflicts experienced by actors will tend to be disruptive or "distintegrative" to the social system, and Goode[24] makes the connection between role strain and social integration explicit.

In sum, there are three distinct problems common to all of the discussions and studies noted above, but none of these studies or discussions

distinguishes all three. These are: (1) Do role partners actually agree or do they think they agree? (2) Under what conditions do role partners agree or think they agree? (3) What difference does it make whether role partners agree or think they agree?

It follows from the above distinctions that an actor may perceive consensus or dissensus with role partners, and his perceptions may be accurate or inaccurate. These four possibilities are presented in Chart II.

CHART II

	Ego Perceives:	
Ego's Role Partner Actually:	Consensus (agreement)	Dissensus (disagreement)
Agrees	I	II
Disagrees	III	IV

It is not clear in many discussions of social integration or of role conflict which of the four situations in Chart II is most applicable. Many authors appear to assume that they are talking about situation IV (where actual dissensus is accurately perceived) when they speak about low integration or role conflict, but it is possible that situations II or III might be equally applicable.[25] We shall make these distinctions explicit throughout this report. Thus teachers' perceptions of mothers' norms will be distinguished from and compared with mothers' stated norms.

It should be equally clear that role partners' perceptions of behavior and affect may be accurate or inaccurate.[26] We shall also have occasion to examine situations of these types in our report (e.g. mothers' perceptions of

the behavior and affect of teachers and students will be compared with self-reports by the relevant teachers and students).

Let us now turn to the other two problems that arose in considering the relationships among actual and perceived norms, coordinated behavior, and affect: (a) the problem of the conditions under which perceptions tend to be accurate and inaccurate, and (b) the problem of what difference it makes whether perceptions are accurate or inaccurate.

Observability and Importance

The conditions under which perceptions among role partners are relatively accurate or inaccurate are dependent upon both social and psychological factors. For example, some mothers find themselves in positions where it is possible for them to directly perceive what teachers are doing or thinking and some must depend upon hearsay or other indirect evidence. The sociological concept that best represents this distinction is observability, which we define as the structured opportunity for gaining knowledge.[27] This concept is operationalized and systematically examined in Section V of the report. The psychological or social psychological factor that appears to have most relevance for our discussion is one that we shall call importance for lack of a better term. By importance we mean that individuals assign weight or significance to a norm, to behavior, or to an affective relationship. As Sumner[28] indicated many years ago, some norms have far more importance to group members than others, and we have merely generalized this distinction to include overt behavior and affective ties. Sometimes the sanctions associated with specific norms or behavior offer clues as to the importance that group members assign to them, but we prefer to treat this as an empirical

question in view of the fact that individual members of groups may differ or misperceive.

The four situations of actual and perceived consensus in Chart II (and the parallel situations involving behavior and affective ties) can be studied under four general conditions of observability and importance as shown in Chart III.

CHART III

FOUR GENERAL CONDITIONS OF OBSERVABILITY AND IMPORTANCE

	Observability is:	
Importance is:	High	Low
High	I	II
Low	III	IV

It is theoretically possible for both accurate and inaccurate perceptions of consensus, conformity or affective ties to occur under each of the four general conditions of observability and importance. However, we predict that some of these situations are more likely to occur than others. Our examination of these relationships will be guided by two general hypotheses:

(1) Perceived dissensus, nonconformity, or negative affect will be more disruptive when importance is high, and more tolerable when importance is low.

(2) Perceptions are more likely to be accurate when actors are in positions with high observability.

Some correlate hypotheses are:

(3) Actors are more likely to perceive consensus, conformity, and positive affect when these are especially important.

(4) Actors are more likely to misperceive consensus, conformity, and positive affect when importance is high and observability is low.

(5) Actors are more likely to make special efforts to obtain accurate information when importance is high and observability is low.

(6) Actors are more likely to make special efforts to conceal behavior, belief, or affect that they perceive as opposing expectations important to their role partners.

(7) Perceived dissensus, nonconformity, and negative affect are more disruptive than actual, but unknown dissensus, nonconformity, and negative affect.

We noted earlier that there were three problems (assigning multiple values to norms, behavior, and affect; dealing with more than one norm, behavior or sentiment simultaneously; and allowing for inaccurate perceptions) that arose from our consideration of the eight types of social integration in Chart I. The problem of assigning additional values to each of the elements of integration is partially resolved in this study by the fact that multiple values are allowed for most of the normative, behavioral and affective items with which we will be concerned (e.g. the amount of agreement with norms among mothers, the <u>frequency</u> of selected behavior and the strength of affect will be examined). The problem of having to simultaneously consider multiple norms, behavior, and affect is accommodated to some extent by the fact that we will concern ourselves with many different items of each type in our analysis (e.g. what is the relationship between liking teachers generally and liking a particular teacher?) and by the fact that we are studying issues that are usually of considerable importance to the actors in the system. The problem of the variability in actor's awareness of the actual feelings and behavior of others is taken into consideration by our allowances for inaccurate perceptions and differences in observability.

It would be possible at this point to assert that some levels of normative agreement among group members, or some ratio of the interdependent acts to the number of individuals in the group, or some ratio of mutually attractive ties within the group will produce an integration score that would allow us to ascertain which groups are more highly integrated than others. However, it is our contention that the exploratory nature of much of our survey data in the present inquiry does not warrant such precision. In addition, as we have stated above, the concept of integration is too general and multi-dimensional to lend itself to a unilinear operationalization. Indeed, the concept of integration is much like the concept of organization, and attempts to demonstrate that some groups or societies are more highly organized than others or that some are "disorganized" have tended to be far less productive than inquiries about different types or problems of organization. Therefore we wish to make it clear that our introductory discussion of the concept of integration has been undertaken with the limited intention of locating and clarifying the general set of problems with which we will be dealing.

The three problems that will receive special consideration throughout this report are the same three that have received partial consideration in previous studies and discussions of role conflict, or role strain, and social integration. Thus we will be concerned with: (1) whether teachers, parents and students agree or think they agree on a number of normative, behavioral and affective items; and (2) with the conditions under which they agree or think they agree. But perhaps more important, we will try to determine (3) whether it makes any difference whether role partners agree or think they

agree. We will also attempt to make the connection between these concepts and areas of study explicit and to elaborate these relationships.

This last problem, whether agreement or the perception of agreement makes any difference, is, we believe, the crucial question that must be answered before precise theorizing about social integration can proceed. Ideally we should demonstrate that some measure of disintegration or disruption of the system results when agreement or perceived agreement among role partners is low, but this task is made difficult by the limitations of interview data. Many of the most important disruptions or signs of disintegration in the system might be detected only by trained observers over extended periods of time. Thus we have employed the concept of role strain, the expression of dissatisfaction, and negative affective responses as dependent variables and indicators of disruption in the system since these are all easily obtainable from interviews. Whether the measures we have selected are as good as others, such as the recording of critical incidents, is an empirical question that can only be answered by further research.

Up to this point in our discussion of the concept of social integration, we have avoided the fact that the social system with which we are concerned (and which we briefly discussed in the introductory paragraphs) consists of a number of subsystems that must somehow be integrated. We have done this intentionally in order to simplify our already complex presentation. However, it is our belief that the problem of integrating subsystems within larger systems is not radically different from the problem of integrating a single primary group. Once subjective states of individual actors are taken into account in the system, each actor becomes in a very real sense a subsystem

with its own integrative problems. The social psychological studies of cognitive dissonance[29] make this quite clear, and much of the sociological literature on role conflict can be viewed social psychologically as special problems of cognitive dissonance. Moreover, as Simmel[30] and others have pointed out, once a group has three or more members, the problem of sub-group formation and integration arises. Hence the unit of analysis regarded as a subsystem may differ from small groups to large collectivities, but the analytic variables relevant to social integration may remain relatively constant.

Perhaps the only emergent variable that needs to be mentioned as peculiar to larger systems is that of formal organization. The school is, of course, a formal organization, and we have attempted to distinguish formal from informal aspects of the social system throughout our report and to indicate the special problems of social integration that are related to this distinction.

Outline of the Report

In the short section that follows, we describe the unusual design that was selected for our study and the rationale for this design. Only the basic descriptive facts about the study design are presented so that the reader may proceed immediately to the substantive findings that bear directly on the problems selected for investigation. A more detailed description of methodological issues connected with selecting ideal-typical communities and gaining access to their schools is included as an appendix at the end of the report.

Section III, the first substantive section, is devoted to what is perhaps the most general normative problem of school-community integration,

the problem of consensus on the goals of education. Goals preferred by mothers, teachers and high school students are examined and compared within each school context and according to characteristics of individuals. Descriptions of the specific schools attended by the children and where the teachers are employed are then examined and compared with each respondents' preferences as a measure of organizational conformity. We then ask whether there is normative consensus on the goals of education most preferred within each status group and between role partners in various settings. Measures of role strain are then related to perceived organizational conformity for each status occupant. The relative impact of actual and perceived consensus with mothers on the teachers' job rewards and on teachers' affective responses to school are also examined. Finally, satisfaction with the students' school performance is employed as a test variable for the relationship between perceived organizational conformity and role strain within each status group.

Section IV is devoted to the problem of teaching styles, or the role behavior of teachers that is preferred and perceived by teachers, mothers, and students. Teaching styles are viewed as instrumental means of the educational system, and the general format of this section is very similar to that found on the section on educational goals that precedes it. The teaching styles preferred and the descriptions applied to particular teachers by mothers, teachers, and students, are presented according to characteristics of individual respondents and their social contexts. Actual and perceived normative consensus and conformity of teachers to their role partners' preferences are also examined and related to individual and contextual characteristics and to measures of role strain among mothers, teachers, and students.

In Section V the concept of observability is operationalized as it applies to mothers in their relationship with the school. The level of observability of mothers is examined according to specific community and school contexts, and the extent to which mothers take advantage of opportunities for communication with the school are related to their opportunity structures and to their educational characteristics. Mothers' knowledge about the school is then examined and related to mothers' observability, behavior, social context, and personal background. Finally mothers' satisfaction with the schools and their school-election voting behavior are treated as dependent variables in relation to observability and to the other major variables.

Section VI contains three interrelated subsections or chapters. In the first of these we are concerned with socialization practices reported by parents and teachers as they relate to age-grade and sex characteristics of the children. Frequencies of certain general types of socializing behavior reported by mothers and teachers are examined according to social context and according to individual characteristics of the mothers and children. The patterns that emerge are discussed in relation to other studies of socialization. In the second subsection parental responses to and perceptions of the school performance of their children are examined and related to actual school performance of the children (as measured by letter grades) and to other characteristics of the mothers and their children. Role strain among mothers is then analyzed in relation to these findings. In the third sub-section, responses of the students to their school situation are examined to see if they match the perceptions of their mothers and teachers and to see

whether these responses are related to the same factors that influence their role partners' perceptions. Self-image of students and alienation from school are then analyzed as they relate to the formal structure of the school and to characteristics of the students.

In Section VII the problem of parental influence on their children's educational plans is examined in detail using the responses of high school students and their mothers. Mutual perceptions and aspirations of parent-child pairs are analyzed in relation to the actual educational plans of each. The impact of parents' educational background, children's IQ's, letter grades, curriculum, track and parental pressures on students' perceptions and plans are then examined singly and in combination with one another.

Section VIII of the report turns to the question of students' non-conformity and deviant behavior. The chief dependent variable is students' own reports of their cheating in school which is examined in relation to the adaptive role students assume in the educational setting. Personal characteristics of students, social context and the mutual perceptions of students, their mothers, and their teachers are then related to actual cheating rates.

In Section IX, we present a brief recapitulation and overview of major findings in relation to the conceptualization and delineation of problems set forth in Section I. Suggestions for future research are included.

SECTION I

FOOTNOTES

1. For a discussion of the varieties of meanings and related problems associated with the use of the term function, see Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957). For a similar discussion of the concept of role, see Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958).

2. Talcott Parsons and E. A. Shils (eds.), Toward a General Theory of Action (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1951), p. 197.

3. Werner S. Landecker, "Types of Integration and Their Measurement," American Journal of Sociology, LVI (January, 1951), pp. 322-40.

4. Ibid., p. 323.

5. Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (eds.), Group Dynamics: Research and Theory (Evanston: Row, Peterson and Company, 1960), p. 74.

6. See Leon Festinger, Stanley Schacter, and Kurt Back, Social Pressures in Informal Groups (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950).

7. Peter M. Blau, "A Theory of Social Integration," American Journal of Sociology, LXV (May, 1960), pp. 545-557.

8. Ibid.

9. At that time we wrote, "The kinds of relational questions asked in surveys seem to fall into three general categories: (1) behavioral, (2) normative, and (3) affective. Examples of each are: (1) What does John do? (2) What should John do? and (3) How much do you like John? Sometimes, two or more kinds of questions are combined, e.g. What did John do and how do you feel about it? In addition, hypothetical questions such as the ones Stouffer used in asking students what they would do if they caught others cheating are sometimes asked. These might fall into any of the categories we have already described." David E. Wilder and Thomas P. Wilson, "Codification of Emergent Problems Associated with the Use of Surveys to Collect Sociometric and Other Relational Data for the Analysis of Social Systems (BASR, Mimeo), 1964, pp. 6-7.

10. Edward Gross, "Symbiosis and Consensus as Integrative Factors in Small Groups," American Sociological Review, XXI (April, 1956), pp. 174-179.

11. Theodore M. Newcomb, Ralph Turner, and Philip E. Converse, Social Psychology: The Study of Human Interaction (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.), 1965.

12. Ibid., pp. 484-486.

13. Edward Gross, op. cit.

14. George Homans, The Human Group (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1950). In Homans' scheme increased interaction leads to increased positive sentiments.

15. If we allow for non-membership groups such as reference groups, there is, of course, no need for interdependent coordinated behavior. However, our discussion has been limited to membership groups.

16. If we include sub-human groups or societies, these in the strict sense would not share norms (if norms are defined as cultural elements, and hence dependent on symbolic processes).

17. D. Jenkins, Interpersonal Perceptions of Teachers, Students, and Parents (Washington: National Educational Association, 1951).

18. John M. Foskett, The Normative World of the Elementary School Teacher (Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1967).

19. Neal Gross, op. cit.

20. Jacob W. Getzels, "Conflict and Role Behavior in the Educational Setting," in W. W. Charters, Jr. and N. L. Gage (eds.), Readings in the Social Psychology of Education (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1963), pp. 309-318. See also, S. P. Hencley, A Typology of Conflict Between School Superintendents and Their Reference Groups (University of Chicago: unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1960), and E. Ferneau, Role-Expectations in Consultations (University of Chicago: unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1954).

21. Werner Landecker, op. cit., p. 334.

22. Neal Gross, op. cit.

23. Robert K. Merton, op. cit. See also, "The Role Set: Problems in Scciological Theory," British Journal of Sociology, 8 (June, 1957), pp.

24. William S. Goode, "A Theory of Role Strain," American Sociological Review, 25 (August, 1960), pp. 483-496. The concept of role strain is a much broader concept than role conflict and includes the latter as employed by Goode.

25. In more popular discourse situation III could be described by the expression "what you don't know can't hurt you" or by "having a false sense

of security." Situation II could be described as "looking for trouble where it doesn't exist." Each of these situations is also described by Merton in his discussion of pluralistic ignorance. "There are two patterns of pluralistic ignorance -- the unfounded assumption that one's own attitudes and expectations are unshared and the unfounded assumption that they are uniformly shared." Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, p. 377.

26. A recent study provides an excellent example of how failure to distinguish "actual" from "perceived" may lead to conclusions that would be modified if the distinction were made. Feldman employs essentially the same elements of integration that we have chosen. He calls them normative integration, functional integration (division of labor), and interpersonal integration (reciprocal liking). However, he operationalizes these for his study by obtaining measures of actual agreement on norms, perceived adequacy of role performance by fellow group members, and actual reciprocal liking. He then proceeds to report correlations between each of the three pairs that result. The only high correlation (r = .51) results from the combination of functional integration and interpersonal integration. Ronald A. Feldman, "Interrelationships Among Three Bases of Group Integration," Sociometry, 31 (March, 1968), pp. 30-46.

27. This is essentially the same definition as that offered by Merton: "the extent to which norms and role-performances within a group are readily open to observation by others." Merton, op. cit., p. 319.

28. For Sumner's distinctions between folkways and mores, see William G. Sumner, Folkways (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1906).

29. For an early presentation of the concept of cognitive dissonance, see Leon Festinger, Henry W. Riecken, and Stanley Schacter, When Prophecy Fails (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956). For an overview of useages, see Shel Feldman (ed.), Cognitive Consistency: Motivational Antecedents and Behavioral Consequences (New York: Academic Press, 1966).

30. Kurt H. Wolff (trans. and ed.), The Sociology of Georg Simmel (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950).

SECTION II

STUDY DESIGN AND METHOD

Studying actual and perceived consensus among teachers, mothers, and students as aspects of social integration in a variety of communities has called for a complex study design that departs considerably from that of the usual survey. The design had to meet the following five criteria:

(1) A variety of carefully selected community contexts should be included in order to allow between community comparisons.

(2) Sufficient numbers of teachers, mothers, and students in early and later grades of school should be included to permit age-grade comparisons.

(3) Specific interacting role partners, including teachers, mothers, and students should be asked equivalent or corresponding questions about one another in order to permit measures of actual and perceived consensus.

(4) Comparisons should be permitted between students located in different ability levels or tracks and their role partners.

(5) Sufficient numbers of individuals should be included from each context to allow characterization of the context as well as testing for possible interaction between individual and contextual variables.

The community characteristics deemed most relevant for our purposes were size, relative isolation, growth rate, socio-economic composition, and racial composition.[1] Each of these was considered as a potentially significant factor for school-community relations. However, many logical combinations of these factors do not exist or are very rare. Accordingly, we designed the sampling frame to include clusters of respondents from a rural village (stable size, relatively isolated, mixed socio-economic composition),

two small towns (stable size, relatively isolated, one primarily middle-class and one working-class), four suburbs (two growing and two settled, one middle-class and one working-class within each growth category), and one city (with large numbers of Negroes and whites). A detailed description of selection procedures is presented in Appendix A. Pseudonyms and general characteristics of each community are presented in Table 2.1

TABLE 2.1

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE COMMUNITIES

Pseudonym	Composition	Size
1. Metropolis	Racially mixed city	100,000 plus
2. Suburban Estates	Stable, middle-class suburb	18,000
3. Nouveau Heights	Growing, middle-class suburb	23,000
4. Old Home	Stable, working-class suburb	30,000
5. New Home	Growing, working-class suburb	23,000
6. Resort Town	Middle-class small town	4,000
7. Working Town	Working-class small town	6,000
8. Green Hollow	Rural village	2,500

A total of eleven school attendance areas were designated as sampling points, one in each of the seven smaller communities and four in the city (a middle-class white, a working-class white, a working-class Negro, and a working-class mixed neighborhood). One elementary school and the high school into which it feeds were selected from each attendance area. (A city high school was found that was fed by all four elementary schools in the sample.) In each elementary school, two first grade and two fifth grade classes were selected, and in each high school, two tenth grade English classes were chosen. (English was selected because it is required of all students. One

class was to be from a faster track and the other from a slower track in each high school.)

All mothers[2] of the students in each class were designated as respondents. Each was notified by a letter[3] from the study director that she would be called upon by a Roper interviewer and that this was being done with the permission of the local school authorities. Since most mothers had phones, it was possible for the interviewers to make special appointments with most at their homes. All teachers in each elementary school and all high school English teachers were interviewed.[4] These interviews were conducted at the schools during school hours as were the interviews with the tenth grade students.[5] Interviews with mothers, teachers, and students were conducted by trained interviewers of Roper Research Associates. Interviews with mothers averaged ninety minutes, and interviews with teachers and students averaged fifty minutes. In addition, each principal and school superintendent was interviewed by the study director or by the assistant director, Mrs. Friedman. All interviews were conducted during the late Spring of 1965.

Response rates for each category of respondents are presented in Table 2.2. It can be seen that interviews were completed with all 20 principals, 283 (or 99%) of the teachers, 518 (or 97%) of the tenth grade students, and 1,392 (or 83%) of the mothers.

Our study design was not intended to provide representative results from which we could generalize to all elementary and high schools in the United States or to any other larger population. Rather it falls within the tradition of what Hyman has called an explanatory survey design.[6] It provides

TABLE 2.2

INTERVIEW RESPONSE RATES BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREAS

Attendance area	Mothers		Teachers[b]		Students		Principals	
	Number assigned[a]	Per cent interviewed	Number assigned	Per cent interviewed	Number assigned	Per cent interviewed	Number assigned	Per cent interviewed
Green Hollow	139	91%	19	100%	50	98%	2	100%
Working Town	169	75	30	100	56	100	2	100
Resort Town	173	90	23	100	45	100	2	100
New Home	173	82	48	100	45	100	2	100
Old Home	145	78	25	100	48	100	3	100
Nouveau Heights	146	88	31	100	49	98	2	100
Suburban Estates	146	90	22	100	60	98	2	100
Metropolis High School	170	82	30	97	169	93	1	100
Metropolis Elementary								
White, middle-class	108	85	13	100	---	---	1	100
White, working-class	112	82	9	100	---	---	1	100
Mixed	105	80	18	100	---	---	1	100
Negro	97	67	16	100	---	---	1	100
Total	(1683)	83%	(284)	99%	(522)	97%	(20)	100%

[a]Assigned on the basis of actual number of children in the sample classes.

[b]All sample class teachers, all English teachers in the high school, and all first- through sixth-grade teachers in the elementary school.

a sample that allows us to see whether certain key variables that are built into the sampling frame are related to the phenomena that we are studying. Nevertheless, there are occasions when our results are presented or discussed in such a manner that the reader may tend to lose sight of this important fact.

A Note on Method

The complexity of the study design makes it possible to present findings according to a number of different units of analysis, and this has created some special problems for our presentation. Sometimes the responses of all mothers are compared with the responses of all teachers or all students. Sometimes a single category of respondents is divided into subgroups according to individual characteristics such as the age-grade or the sex of students or the educational attainment of parents, and sometimes the "natural" groups found in the various communities are compared individually or combined (e.g. middle-class communities versus working-class communities). Sometimes specific interacting role partners (mother-child, teacher-child, or mother-teacher) are compared. When this is done for teachers, only the subsample of the sixty-seven teachers whose role partners were interviewed are used in the analysis; but the number of role relationships or specific comparisons is determined by the size of the classrooms. Hence these sixty-seven teachers have role relationships with 1,392 mothers, and it is sometimes this latter number that is used in the analysis.

We found very few precedents to guide us in selecting the appropriate units of analysis,[7] but it was clear from the beginning that we would not be able to exhaust all the logical possibilities. The reader will find

that the principle units of analysis vary somewhat from one section of the report to another. Sometimes, as in Sections III, IV, and V, we begin by comparing results among the various communities in the sample; and sometimes, as in Sections VI, VII, and VIII, we begin by presenting results for the sample as a whole and then dividing respondents according to their individual attributes. The decision to proceed one way rather than the other was usually dictated in part by the logic of the problem at hand, and partly by the fact that findings were more strongly related to one set of variables than to another. However, in every section the data have been examined according to characteristics of individuals and to characteristics of the social setting.

During recent years sociologists have become especially concerned that much of the work they do is based on attributes of individuals rather than social groups. Accordingly, there has developed a tradition of considering both individual and group characteristics simultaneously. This procedure is most commonly called contextual analysis.[8] This mode of analysis is also utilized where appropriate in each of the substantive sections.

Some sections of the report are mainly concerned with one or two of the major categories of respondents and some are concerned with all three. Section V deals mainly with mothers, Section VIII deals mainly with high school students, and Section VII deals with high school students and their mothers. The other three sections, III, IV, and VI, make extensive use of responses from mothers, students and teachers. The decisions as to which respondents to include in the various sections were dictated largely by the nature of the problems under consideration.

Most findings are presented in the form of percentage comparisons. Statistical tests of significance have been avoided for the most part because our data do not meet the underlying assumptions for many such tests, and because our large sample size guarantees that percentage differences worth discussing will also produce statistically significant differences when such tests are employed.

SECTION II

FOOTNOTES

1. The manner in which each of these community characteristics was operationalized is presented in detail in Appendix A.

2. Mothers were selected as the only parental respondents because it was estimated that interviews with fathers would be more difficult to obtain (and thus more expensive) and because it was felt that mothers were usually more directly involved in school-related activities. Some mothers had more than one child who fell into the sample, and it was necessary to construct special "short forms" of interviews so that these mothers would not have to be asked all questions twice. These mothers are treated as more than one respondent in the analysis because of their multiple affiliations with the school and our interest in each role relationship.

3. See Appendix B.

4. Originally, we had intended to interview all teachers in each high school, but the high schools were so much larger than the elementary schools that it was necessary to limit the sample to English teachers. This may introduce some systematic bias into our results at the high school level, but we suspect this is negligible for most of the items in which we are interested. The subsample of teachers whose role partners were also interviewed were asked approximately twice as many questions as the other ten here.

5. Of course, it would be desirable to have interviews with the younger children, but these would have added considerably to the costs and posed additional methodological problems in asking identical questions of role partners.

6. Herbert H. Hyman, Survey Design and Analysis (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955).

7. Judging from Coleman's remarks concerning his study of Illinois high schools, this may be an inherent problem of doing surveys of social systems where relational data are collected. Coleman suggests he might just as well have treated each high school grade as a separate group within the school rather than regarding each school as a unit. "All but one had four grades, which were to some degree separate social systems, and, in retrospect, the analysis would have been greatly aided by treating each grade as a unit. This would have given 39 cases for boys and 35 cases for girls, rather than

10 and 9." James S. Coleman, "Research Chronicle: The Adolescent Society," in Phillip E. Hammond (ed.), Sociologists at Work, p. 210.

8. For a discussion of what sociologists mean by contextual characteristics see Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Herbert Menzel, "On the Relation between Individual and Collective Properties," in Amitai Etzioni, ed., Complex Organizations, Holt Reinhart & Winston, New York: 1961, pp. 422-440.

SECTION III

THE GOALS OF EDUCATION: PREFERENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF MOTHERS, TEACHERS, AND STUDENTS

Any institution that must accommodate a highly differentiated constituency on a continuing basis will tend to have diffuse and multiple goals. Priorities between the multiple goals of such institutions usually cannot be stated explicitly or, when disputes occur, compromise will be difficult to accomplish. Seen from this perspective, the public schools in the United States may be the institution that is subject to the most potential strain from its differentiated constituency. Parents enroll their children in the same schools expecting them to eventually become physicians, farmers, and mechanics. For several years their children spend most of the day receiving instruction together in the same room, and they return to the influence of separate homes at night. Somehow the school must meet the variety of demands and expectations held by the parents of these children. Some parents may be particularly anxious that their child learn to read, some may be mostly concerned that the child receive support and encouragement for his efforts and that he is not forced to do things which he does not originate, and some may simply want the child to learn to get along with others. But the school and the individual teacher must contend with and attempt to satisfy these contrasting demands. In short, the school must be integrated with families of the community of which it is a part.

Some of the potential strain to which the schools are subjected is eliminated by the relative homogeneity of social and ecological groupings which occur within most communities. The amount of social differentiation found within the sending district of any particular public school tends to be considerably less than that found in the general population, and this in turn reduces the range of conflicting demands to which the school is subjected. Indeed, parents may tend to share educational goals within certain communities while differing from parents in other communities. But despite tendencies toward consensus in some communities, there is always some variation in the values and expectations held by the constituents of a particular school. Just how much variation is an empirical question, but it can be taken as axiomatic that differences will exist. In short, every public school must maintain continuing relationships with sets of children and parents who do not agree with other sets of children and parents as to the purposes of education and the functions which it is most important for the school to perform.

The goals of education have long been a subject for debate and normative pronouncement but seldom a subject for empirical research. It is evident that one of the chief functions of education is to transmit and thereby preserve the culture of which it is a part, and the content and emphases of education have varied markedly from one locality to another throughout history. We know, for instance, that the purposes of education were very different in Sparta and Athens; and in the United States alone during the past one hundred years, a high school education has changed from a relatively rare experience to one that a large majority of the younger generation shares. Such gross differences and

changes make it possible to characterize the goals of education at different times and places in very general terms. But while we know that education in Sparta differed from education in Athens, we do not know to what extent the mothers of students in Sparta and Athens shared the goals implicit in these differences. Indeed, we might consider the priorities and desires of mothers somewhat irrelevant in these societies. However, the educational priorities and desires of mothers in the United States are relevant to the system with which we are concerned because here the schools must contend with the norm of local autonomy and with the corollary norm that parents should have a voice in determining what goes on in school.

Teachers and students also have educational goals with which the schools must contend. Teachers may differ as to which goals should receive the highest priority, students may differ, and teachers, mothers, and students may or may not agree with one another. Thus the first concern of this section is to describe the extent to which certain educational goals are preferred by sets of interacting teachers, mothers and students. A closely related task is to attempt to ascertain some of the social determinants of the educational goals for each status occupant. In addition, we shall find out whether teachers, mothers, and students perceive that their school is giving priority to their own goal preferences.

A basic hypothesis for this section is that perceived discrepancies between goals preferred and school descriptions are potential sources of strain to the social system of the school. To test this hypothesis we will examine in turn the relationships among goal preferences, school

descriptions, and role strain for teachers, mothers, and students. A closely related hypothesis to be tested is that perceived differences with one's role partners are more disruptive to the system than actual differences. To test this hypothesis, we shall examine the level of role strain reported by teachers and students under varying conditions (perceived and actual) of agreement with mothers on educational goals.

Procedure

There are many ways in which one might conceptualize the alternative goals of education in the United States. Many books and articles have been devoted to this subject alone, and pronouncements are made periodically by various voluntary associations and public agencies.[1] We are not interested in adding any new formulations to this already complex area. Rather we want to assess the manner in which existing alternative goals are rated by mothers, teachers, and students who participate directly in the schools. Accordingly, for purposes of our research, we derived a group of alternative goals from a larger set developed in an earlier study by Downey.[2]

In order to determine the preferred goals of teachers, mothers and high school students, each was asked a series of similar questions and provided with a list of ideal-typical schools from which to select. Mothers were asked:

> Although all schools teach children more or less the same things, some schools emphasize different aspects of education. Suppose that there were four elementary (high) schools in (community) and you had to decide the one you wanted to send your child to. Which one of these schools would you most want to send your child to? Which would be your second choice? Which of these schools is most like (present school)?

Teachers were asked:

> Although all schools teach children more or less the same things . . . and you had to choose the one you wanted to teach in: Which one of these schools would you most want to teach in? Which would be your second choice? Third choice? Which do you think most of the mothers of your students would prefer for their children? Which of these schools is most like (present school)?

Students were asked:

> Although . . . and you had to choose the one you wanted to attend: Which of these schools would you most want to attend? Which would be your second choice? Third choice? Which do you think your mother would prefer? Which of these schools is most like (present school)?

Each respondent was then given a card with these four alternatives written on it:

> (1) School #1 feels that the most important task of elementary (high) schools is primarily <u>intellectual</u>, that is, to provide children with information, teach them reading, writing, and arithmetic, give them the ability to figure things out for themselves, and a desire to learn more.
>
> (2) School #2 is primarily interested in <u>social</u> things like teaching students how to get along with others, giving them knowledge of people in other lands, and teaching them to be good citizens who are loyal to America.
>
> (3) School #3 is concerned with the personal development of students, that is, seeing that they possess a sense of right and wrong, develop into mature and stable persons who are in good physical condition, and learn to enjoy things like music and hobbies.
>
> (4) School #4 is most concerned about the more practical things like helping students choose the right occupation or college, giving them specialized job training, and preparing them for marriage and family living.

<u>School Goals Preferred by Mothers</u>

Our first findings from the responses of mothers provide evidence of normative consensus on educational goals. A large majority of mothers (67%)

choose the intellectual school over the other three types, but age of the child modified this general finding in a significant manner (Table 3.1). The intellectual school is the first preference of over 70% of both the first and fifth grade mothers, and this proportion drops to 56% for the tenth grade mothers. Just 10% of the first grade mothers prefer the practical school, and this proportion increases to 17% for fifth grade mothers and to 29% for tenth grade mothers.

Table 3.1

Schools Preferred by Mothers of First, Fifth, and Tenth Grade Children

	Type of School				
	Intellectual	Social	Personal	Practical	Totals
First Grade	73%	7%	11%	10%	(454)
Fifth Grade	71%	4%	7%	17%	(491)
Tenth Grade	56%	5%	10%	29%	(423)
TOTALS	67%	5%	9%	19%	(1368)

It should be noted, however, that in spite of their higher preference for the practical school, tenth grade mothers still favor the intellectual school over all the other types combined.

Downey[3] has reported that region of the country, education, age, and other factors are related to the goals of education preferred by adults who are members of certain voluntary associations. We find that these factors have relatively minor effects on the preferences of mothers for their school children. The largest percentage of mothers prefers the intellectual type of emphasis in every group of mothers we have examined,

whether the groups are constructed on the basis of individual attributes such as age or education, or according to the natural groupings in the locations selected for the study. Nevertheless, the natural settings of the communities in which the study was conducted do provide some interesting modifications in the modal preference of mothers. These are presented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

Proportion of Mothers Preferring Schools with an Intellectual Emphasis in Different School Attendance Areas*

		Elementary School		High School	
Metropolis	White Working-Class	61%	(90)		
	Mixed Area Working-Class	64%	(84)	50%	(135)
	Negro Working-Class	65%	(65)		
	White Middle-Class	74%	(90)		
	Suburban Estates	85%	(78)	62%	(50)
	Nouveau Heights	76%	(89)	61%	(38)
	Old Home	67%	(73)	46%	(33)
	New Home	70%	(104)	54%	(37)
	Resort Town	75%	(111)	61%	(41)
	Working Town	73%	(82)	63%	(43)
	Green Hollow	85%	(79)	57%	(46)
	TOTALS	72%	(945)	56%	(423)

*Numbers in parentheses are the totals on which percentages are based.

Several patterns can be abstracted from the proportions of mothers preferring the intellectual school in different school settings. Among the elementary school mothers, the working-class areas of the city

consistently contain the lowest proportions preferring the intellectual school, and only four percentage points separate the proportions for the three schools. But racial composition is apparently not a factor. The settled working-class suburb, Old Home (67%), is next lowest, followed by the growing working-class suburb, New Home (70%), and the working class small town, Working Town (73%). The middle-class attendance areas begin with a low preference area in the city (74%) and range through the settled suburb, Suburban Estates (85%). Thus a relationship between the type of school goals preferred and social class is suggested by the fact that mothers in the working-class attendance areas consistently choose the intellectual school less than the mothers in the middle-class areas, but the rural community and the settled middle-class area tie for the top percentage (85%), and this is not consistent with the general ranking by social class.

The high school mothers' preferences for the intellectual school are not in the same rank order by community as the elementary school mothers', but there is some tendency for the high school mothers in the working-class areas to choose the intellectual school less frequently. However, the community with the highest proportion of high school mothers preferring the intellectual school is Working Town (63%), and the mothers in Green Hollow have dropped to the fifth rank. These inconsistencies, and the generally narrow range of percentage differences at each school level suggest that social class and community characteristics are not strongly related to the type of school goals preferred by mothers once grade level of the child has been taken into consideration. Perhaps the single pronounced exception is the lower preference for intellectual goals among

elementary school mothers residing in working-class areas of the city.

In contrast to the somewhat inconsistent relationships between type of social setting and preference for intellectual school goals, a consistent decrease in preference for intellectual goals occurs between the mothers of elementary and high school children in every community. This decrease in the preference for the intellectual school is always accompanied by an increase in the proportion of high school mothers preferring the practical school. But there is no community in which more high school mothers prefer the practical school than prefer the intellectual school. (The highest proportion of high school mothers preferring the practical school is 37%, which is found in Green Hollow, and the smallest proportion is the 24% found in Suburban Estates.) It is clear from the fact that this shift occurs in every one of the diverse settings from which respondents were chosen that age of the child has an influence on the type of school preferred above and beyond any differences attributable to social context. This suggests that, in addition to the high general consensus on school goals shared by mothers in every social setting, there are different orientations toward school that are not simply a reflection of different characteristics of individual mothers or communities. Rather, these differences in mothers' preferences appear to be linked to age-grade characteristics of the children.

Parental Education and School Preferences

We have attempted to locate variables or attributes of individual mothers that would account for the difference among the preferences of mothers in different social settings and among the mothers of elementary and high school children. These attempts have been unsuccessful with one

minor exception. Among the many factors we have considered, combined education of mothers and their husbands is the variable which is most strongly related to the school goals preferred by mothers. Mothers who have been to college, or whose husbands have attended college, are more likely to prefer the intellectual school than mothers in homes where educational attainment is lower. This applies to both elementary and to high school mothers (see totals in Table 3.3).

Because educational attainment is also strongly related to the type of community context within which the mothers live,[4] it is possible that the higher preference for the intellectual emphasis in middle-class areas is attributable to differences in parental educational attainment. However, comparisons among the preferences of mothers from homes with different educational attainment in the same social settings show that this is only sometimes the case (Table 3.3).

Differences between the preference of mothers from college and non-college homes are largest for the city high school. But the city high school, unlike the other high schools in the study sample, is attended by children from widely varying socio-economic circumstances. The differences among the educational levels of the homes of the high school children in the city are roughly equivalent to the community differences that distinguish the middle- and working-class communities. Indeed, given the consistent relationships between socio-economic status and elementary school constituencies in the city,[5] there is good reason to assume that the two groups of mothers of city high school children represent quite different subcommunities and social contexts. However, there is no reason to make this assumption for the different groups of mothers

Table 3.3

Proportion of Mothers Preferring the Intellectual School
by Type of Community and Educational Attainment

	Elementary School			High School	
	Education of Parents			Education of Parents	
	Some College	No College		Some College	No College
City (Working-Class)	65% (17)	62% (219)	(Mixed SES)	65% (46)	43% (87)
Middle-Class	81% (243)	69% (125)		62% (76)	60% (53)
Working-Class	78% (49)	69% (210)		54% (26)	55% (87)
Village	89% (27)	69% (52)		--- (7)	54% (39)
TOTALS	81% (335)	68% (606)		62% (155)	52% (266)

in the communities designated as middle-class and working-class. It is especially interesting that in both of these two groups of communities, educational level in the homes of elementary school mothers appears to account for the community differences in school preference which were shown in Table 3.2. But educational level is not related to the preferences of the high school mothers in these same communities. In addition, while community context appears to have had no effect upon the school preferences of the elementary school mothers in these communities, the high school mothers have a slightly higher preference for the intellectual school in the middle-class settings than in the working-class communities.

Since elementary school mothers with higher education have a higher preference for the intellectual school in most social settings, the obvious

implication is that as average level of educational attainment increases in the United States, the already pronounced preference for the intellectual type of school will increase even more. Such a trend, combined with the post-Sputnik s· ess on academic achievement, could make the task of educators with a non-intellectual orientation a difficult one in coming years.

Perhaps more interesting is the finding that the preference for the intellectual school continues to be lower with high school mothers in every community when educational level of the home is taken into consideration. This finding suggests that mothers' school goals are influenced by the schools or by the behavior of their children as schooling proceeds, and that these are not merely fixed predispositions. As we have seen, the drop in preference for the intellectual school is usually offset by a comparable gain in preference for the practical school. It is possible that many parents become socialized by the schools into the realization that high school must prepare their children for the outside world. If this is the case, then mothers whose children are in the slower tracks or terminal curricula in high school should prefer the practical school more often than mothers whose children are in the faster groups or college preparatory curricula. However, we shall postpone our consideration of this possible explanation until after we have presented the initial findings from teachers and students.

Mothers' Descriptions of Schools

Descriptions of the schools their children attend closely resemble the preferences expressed by the mothers of both the elementary and high school children (Table 3.4). In fact, the resemblance is so close that it

Table 3.4

Proportion of Mothers Choosing Each Type of School as Best Description of School Attended by Their Children in Various Community Settings

Elementary Schools

	Best description is: Intellectual	Social	Personal	Practical	
City (Working-class)	72%	10%	12%	6%	(201)
Working Class Suburbs and Town	81%	6%	5%	8%	(224)
Middle Class City Suburbs and Town	81%	9%	8%	3%	(317)
Village	84%	6%	10%	---	(69)
TOTAL	79%	8%	9%	4%	(811)

High Schools

	Best description is: Intellectual	Social	Personal	Practical	
City (Mixed SES)	54%	7%	12%	27%	(121)
Working Class Suburbs and Town	60%	7%	5%	29%	(101)
Middle Class Suburbs and Town	72%	3%	7%	18%	(123)
Village	53%	8%	8%	32%	(43)
TOTAL	61%	6%	8%	25%	(388)

suggests that mothers usually indicate agreement between the type of school they prefer and the description of the school their child attends. We shall call such agreement perceived organizational conformity.

Seventy-one per cent of the mothers believe their children attend schools that are best described as the type they most prefer (76% of the first grade mothers, 73% of the fifth grade mothers, and 63% of the tenth grade mothers). However, the proportion of perceived organizational conformity varies by specific preference. In fact, as Table 3.5 shows, it is only the mothers who prefer the intellectual school who perceive organizational conformity from their children's schools in a majority of cases.

Table 3.5

Perceived Organizational Conformity, or Agreement Between Type of School Preferred by Mothers and Best Description of School Child Attends

	Description of School Child Attends:		
School Preferred	Agrees	Differs	
Intellectual	86%	14%	(817)
Social	39%	61%	(52)
Personal	41%	59%	(101)
Practical	37%	63%	(219)
TOTAL	71%	29%	(1189)

While 86% of the mothers who prefer the intellectual school also describe the schools attended by their children as intellectual, less than half as large a proportion of the mothers with the other three preferences describe their childrens' schools as identical with their preferences.

These findings suggest that possibly the intellectual goals are in some way of more importance, that only the mothers who prefer intellectual goals are generally content or satisfied with the schools their children attend, and that the pervasiveness of the maternal preference for intellectually oriented schools acts as a constraint on schools in all social settings. If this is the case, then mothers with non-intellectual preferences could be a source of potential strain or disruption for the schools. We shall explore these possibilities by examining the relationship between the amount of expressed satisfaction with the school the child attends and agreement between various preferred goals and descriptions of schools.

Level of satisfaction with the schools is generally quite high, with a slight majority of mothers (53%) indicating that they are "very satisfied" with the local schools.[6]

Table 3.6

Relationship Between Agreement Between Preferred Goals, and Description of School and Amount of Satisfaction with Local Schools

Preference and Description	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Dissatisfied	
Agree	59%	30%	11%	(834)
Disagree	41%	37%	22%	(347)
TOTAL	53%	32%	14%	(1181)

When preferences and descriptions agree, 59% of the mothers say they are "very satisfied" with the school, but just 41% say they are "very satisfied" when preferences and descriptions disagree[7] (Table 3.6). Because level of satisfaction with the school is so markedly reduced when mothers

think their preferences are not being met, it appears that the schools may be legitimately concerned whether mothers of the children who attend think that the school is emphasizing the goals that are most suited to their childrens' needs. However, since a considerable proportion of the mothers remain "very satisfied" even when they believe their preferences are not being met, there may be other factors that are more strongly related to parental satisfaction. We shall investigate this problem later. Let us first examine the immediate question of whether some preferences are more strongly related to satisfaction than others.

Table 3.7

Per Cent of Mothers Very Satisfied with the Local Schools When Descriptions of Schools Agree and Disagree with Specific Preferences

Goals Preferred	Description of School: Agrees	Disagrees	Difference
Intellectual	55% (694)	35% (117)	-20%
Social	80% (20)	56% (32)	-24%
Personal	68% (41)	45% (60)	-23%
Practical	65% (79)	40% (138)	-25%
TOTAL	59% (832)	41% (347)	

Given the fact that a majority of mothers prefers an intellectual goal emphasis in every setting, schools will always run the risk of alienating or creating dissatisfaction among the largest numbers of

mothers when they give the impression that intellectual goals are not receiving the most emphasis. From this standpoint, the pervasiveness of intellectual goals among the mothers does constrain schools in every social setting. But it is possible that mothers with certain preferences remain more or less satisfied with the school regardless of whether they believe the school is the type they prefer. This is indeed the case (Table 3.7). Mothers who prefer an intellectual emphasis in the schools are somewhat less satisfied than mothers with other preferences. This is true whether the mothers think the school is best described by their preference or not. In fact, the rank order of the per cent "very satisfied" is identical for the four preferences whether descriptions agree or disagree with preferences. But no matter what the specific preference, the amount of satisfaction is reduced when descriptions do not agree with preferences.

To summarize, the general implications of these findings would seem to be that schools must always be concerned with whether mothers believe sufficient emphasis is being given to the traditional intellectual goals since this is always their most common first preference. In addition, mothers with the intellectual preference are the most difficult to satisfy, so the schools are doubly constrained. It appears that the mothers of school children are a generally conservative influence in the community with regard to schools' goals, and that the non-intellectual goals of education that have been stressed in progressive education or in other educational movements, cannot count on the broad base of social support for high priority enjoyed by intellectual goals. Some shifting toward the practical goals is evident among mothers of the high school

students in all settings, but this shift is never sufficient to offset the major support for intellectual goals. Therefore, despite the many important differences among the communities where our study was conducted, preference for intellectual goals can be viewed as an example of actual normative consensus among mothers that is shared by a majority in all these social settings. Furthermore, majorities of mothers in every school setting perceive organizational conformity for the schools attended by their children; and because this perception is so strongly related to mothers' satisfaction with the school, it is an integrative force regardless of the specific preference held.

Let us now examine the goals of education preferred by teachers.

Teachers and the Goals of Education

Although majorities of mothers have consensus on school goals and perceive organizational conformity on the part of their children's schools, it is quite possible that this is a fiction that promotes good relations between mothers and schools. Perhaps other members of the relevant social system, such as the teachers and students, do not agree with either the mothers' preferences or descriptions. We shall begin exploring this possibility by examining the preferences and descriptions of the teachers in the schools attended by the children of the mothers whose responses have just been presented.

Elementary and high school teachers differ somewhat on the types of schools they prefer. In Table 3.8 we find that a slight majority of the elementary school teachers (58%) selects the intellectual school, but the proportion with this preference is less than a majority (46%) among the

Table 3.8

School Goals Preferred by Elementary and High School Teachers

	Intellectual	Social	Personal	Practical	
Elementary School	58%	11%	22%	9%	(164)
High School	46%	1%	32%	18%	(101)

high school teachers. This difference is in the same direction as the one exhibited by the mothers, but is somewhat smaller.[7] The mothers are also more oriented toward the intellectual school at both school levels than are the teachers, but the personal school is chosen second most frequently by both groups of teachers, and this preference is more common among the high school teachers. In short, both teachers and mothers prefer the intellectual school over the other types, and this preference is larger at the elementary school level. But, teachers are not as united in this preference as are the mothers, and their second most frequent preference is the personal school, in contrast with the practical school which is the second most frequent choice of the mothers. Thus the elementary schools are in a situation where majorities of both teachers and mothers share normative consensus in their preference for an intellectual emphasis. In contrast, the high schools are faced with a situation where a slight majority of mothers favors an intellectual approach, and a sizable minority favors the practical emphasis; but just less than half the high school English teachers favor the intellectual school, and a sizable minority choose the personal school. It would appear from these findings that the task of achieving integration with its constituency is a more complex one for the high schools.

Some studies have shown teachers to agree more on educational matters than mothers.[8] But it is not surprising that there is less consensus among the teachers than among the mothers on the general question of educational goals when we consider the complexity of roles a teacher is expected to play in school and the multiplicity of educational emphases to which teachers are exposed at various points in their careers. It is possible for mothers to rely on folk wisdom, somewhat hazy memories of their own schooling, or what they consider to be the needs of a particular child in making a selection from the alternatives presented; but the teacher has a far more difficult task. Teachers must contend with the needs and demands of many different individuals in the classroom, and sometimes teachers are made acutely aware of these differences. The overriding cultural emphasis on the three R's does prevail in the elementary schools where a majority of teachers agrees with the mothers on the intellectual goals, but even at this level the basic dilemma of coping with many different children simultaneously begins to show. If there is one frustration shared by most teachers, it may be the fact that they are not able to give adequate attention to the personal needs of every student. However, whether the tendency of teachers to prefer the personal school second most is a reflection of this common frustration, or of some educational movement, such as the current concern with individualized instruction, is not ascertainable from our data.

Like the mothers, a majority of teachers (61%) perceive organizational conformity for their own school (Table 3.9). Also like the mothers, the largest proportion of teachers (70%) report the school as best described by their preference when this preference is for the

intellectual school. Approximately half the teachers with each of the other three preferences perceive agreement between their preferences and descriptions. Furthermore, the cost of perceived disagreement between description and preference (or perceived organizational nonconformity) to the teachers' job satisfaction (Table 3.10) is just as pronounced as the cost of perceived agreement is to mothers' satisfaction with the school (compare Table 3.7 with Table 3.10). When teachers perceive organizational conformity for their own school, 69% report their job as "very rewarding"; but just 49% say their job is very rewarding when they perceive organizational nonconformity. However, unlike the mothers, the proportion of teachers who find their job very rewarding is relatively high regardless of specific preference as long as their description and preference agree. In other words, the teachers' preference for the intellectual school does not have the uniquely constraining potential for schools as the mothers' intellectual preference. Job rewards are reduced most for teachers when preference is for the intellectual or practical school and the description does not agree. In addition, the potentially disruptive consequence of perceived organizational nonconformity is demonstrated by the reduction of reported job rewards among the teachers under these conditions.

Table 3.9

Agreement Between Type of School Preferred by Teachers and Best Description of School

Type School Preferred:	Teachers' Description of School: Agrees	Disagrees	
Intellectual	70%	30%	(131)
Social	53%	47%	(17)
Personal	47%	53%	(60)
Practical	52%	48%	(31)
TOTALS	61%	39%	(239)

Table 3.10

Per Cent of Teachers Who Find Their Job Very Rewarding When Their Descriptions of Schools Agree and Disagree with Preferences

Type School Preferred:	Description of School: Agrees	Disagrees	Difference
Intellectual	70% (92)	46% (39)	-24%
Social	67% (9)	63% (8)	-4%
Personal	71% (28)	63% (32)	-8%
Practical	63% (16)	33% (15)	-30%
TOTALS	69% (145)	49% (94)	

Community Context and Teacher Preferences

Teachers' preferences among the school goals do not vary from community to community in the same manner as mothers' (Table 3.11). In fact, the teachers' preferences for types of schools are virtually identical in every community, with two minor exceptions. First, the elementary school teachers in the middle class communities prefer the personal school 33% of the time compared with 19% of the teachers in other communities. In this respect they resemble the high school teachers more than they resemble the elementary school teachers in other communities. Second, a majority (54%) of the high school teachers in the middle-class communities prefers the intellectual school, and thus the preferences of elementary and high school teachers in middle-class settings are virtually identical. It is not clear how the higher preference for intellectual goals should be interpreted. If choice of the intellectual school can be interpreted as more conservative, then the high school teachers in the more affluent social settings are more conservative than their counterparts in the other communities. But the more intellectual orientation among teachers could also be interpreted as a response to the demands of the post-Sputnik era. It is also possible that this difference is a reflection of teachers' perceptions of the preferences of mothers in various community settings. We have seen that teachers express preferences which are somewhat different from those of the mothers. Let us see whether the teachers are aware of these differences.

High school and elementary teachers believe that the mothers of the children they teach want different goals than those they prefer to be emphasized, and they are correct in perceiving the general direction of

these differences (Table 3.12). Two-thirds of the elementary school teachers perceive the mothers as preferring the intellectual emphasis, while just 35% of the high school teachers think mothers prefer the intellectual emphasis. The teachers are also correct in reporting that it is the practical emphasis that is the second preference receiving significant support from the mothers, and that there is more preference for the practical emphasis at the high school level. Indeed, teachers perceive more of a shift among the mothers toward a practical emphasis at the high school level than actually occurs, since a majority of high school mothers (55%) actually prefers the intellectual emphasis.

Table 3.11

School Goals Preferred by Teachers
in Different Social Settings

	Setting	Goal Preferred: Intellectual	Social	Personal	Practical	(N)
Elementary School	City (Working-class)	56%	16%	16%	12%	(43)
	Working-class (Suburb and town)	57%	13%	22%	8%	(60)
	Middle-class (Suburb and town)	55%	6%	33%	6%	(51)
High School	City (Mixed)	39%	4%	32%	25%	(28)
	Working-class (Suburb and town)	46%	---	33%	21%	(39)
	Middle-class (Suburb and town)	54%	---	36%	11%	(28)

Table 3.12

Teachers' Perceptions of the Type of Emphasis Preferred by Elementary and High School Mothers

	Intellectual	Social	Personal	Practical	
Elementary School	67%	5%	9%	19%	(156)
High School	35	5	19	41	(98)

Comparisons of what the teachers think the mothers of their students prefer with the actual preference of the mothers in the same communities permit some specification of the above findings. The largest discrepancies between the teachers' perceptions of mothers' preferences and the actual preferences of mothers are found in the working-class suburbs and in the working-class small town (Table 3.13). In each case, the mothers have more preference for the intellectual goals and less preference for the practical school than teachers think they have. Teachers' perceptions of mothers' preferences also are somewhat more accurate in the elementary schools, which suggests that teachers' observability of mothers is higher in the elementary schools than in the high schools, and higher in the middle-class high school settings than in the working-class high school settings. (These findings are consistent with the general tendency for higher rates of social interaction between teachers and mothers in elementary schools and in middle-class communities: but we shall defer our systematic discussion of observability until Section V.) Generally, teachers seem to think that mothers' preferences differ more from one school setting to another than is actually the case, and, as already noted, they are farthest from the mark in the working-class suburban and town settings. For example, 55% of the mothers of tenth graders in the working-class settings

Table 3.13

Comparisons of Teachers' Perceptions of Mothers' School Preferences and Actual Preferences of Mothers in Different School Settings

	Setting	Per Cent Prefer Intellectual		Per Cent Prefer Practical	
		Mothers	Teachers' Perceptions	Mothers	Teachers' Perceptions
Elementary School	City (Working-class)	63% (239)	57% (42)	19% (239)	19% (42)
	Working-class (Suburb and town)	72% (260)	58% (57)	11% (260)	32% (57)
	Middle-class (Suburb and town)	78% (368)	77% (47)	9% (368)	11% (49)
High School	City (Mixed)	48% (141)	35% (23)	29% (141)	39% (23)
	Working-class (Suburb and town)	55% (113)	20% (40)	32% (113)	52.5% (40)
	Middle-class (Suburb and town)	61% (129)	63% (30)	28% (129)	20% (30)

prefer the intellectual school. In fact, a slight majority (52.5%) of the teachers in the working-class high schools think most mothers prefer the practical school.

Several questions arise as a result of the discrepancies among teachers' own school preferences, their descriptions of the schools where they teach, and their perceptions of the preferences of mothers: (1) Do teachers think that there is consensus between themselves and the mothers of their students regarding the goals of education? (2) How much actual consensus on school goals do teachers and mothers share? (3) Do both actual and perceived consensus affect teachers' satisfaction with their jobs? (4) Do teachers think the schools where they teach are more like

their own preferences or more like the preferences of mothers? (5) What difference does it make whether teachers think the school matches their own or the mothers' preferences? Let us briefly examine each of these questions.

Teachers do not always think they agree with mothers as to which goals the school should stress. In fact, they are almost evenly divided on this issue, with 48% thinking they share a preference with a majority of the mothers of their students, and 52% thinking they differ. (Since this is a lower proportion of perceived agreement than the 61% which thinks the schools conform to their preference, we suspect that it is of less importance to teachers whether they think mothers agree with them on school goals than it is that they think the school conforms to their preference, but we shall defer examining this issue until later.) The proportion of teachers who think a majority of mothers agrees with them varies sharply with the specific preference of the teachers (Table 3.14).

Table 3.14

Teachers' Perceived Consensus with Mothers on School Goals by Specific Preference of Teachers

	Perceived Mothers' Preference		
Teacher prefers:	Agrees	Disagrees	(N)
Intellectual	62%	38%	(121)
Social	6%	94%	(17)
Personal	26%	74%	(58)
Practical	57%	43%	(28)
TOTALS	48%	52%	(224)

A majority of the teachers who prefer the intellectual and practical schools perceive that they share normative consensus on school goals with a majority of the mothers of their students (62% and 57% respectively). But only 6% of the teachers who prefer the social school and just 26% of the teachers who prefer the personal school perceive agreement with their constituencies of mothers. It appears that teachers who prefer these latter two types of schools are especially aware of the fact that their preferences are not shared by the mothers of their students.

Since, as we have seen, a preference for the intellectual school is actually the most frequent response of mothers in every setting, teachers preferring the social and personal schools are <u>correct</u> in perceiving <u>dissensus</u> with most mothers even though they may not be correct in designating the specific preferences which the mothers hold. By the same reasoning, only teachers with a preference for the intellectual school can be <u>correct</u> in perceiving <u>consensus</u> with mothers; and 62% of the teachers with this preference are thus correct. Therefore, it is only among the teachers preferring the practical school that a majority <u>misperceives consensus</u>. However, since the preference for the practical school is the second most popular choice of the mothers, the high rate of misperceived consensus among teachers with this preference is perhaps partly a reflection of accurate perceptions of <u>some</u> of the mothers' preferences.

If the general preference for the intellectual school goals among mothers means that <u>actual consensus</u> with the majority of mothers can only exist when teachers also prefer the intellectual goals, then 54% of the teachers are in situations where there is actual consensus. However, as

we have been careful to point out, both agreement and disagreement may be inaccurately or accurately perceived, and we are interested in each of the possible situations. Teachers tend to be accurate in perceiving both agreement and disagreement with mothers, but slightly more accurate in the latter situation. Perception of agreement is accurate 62% of the time and perception of disagreement is accurate 69% of the time, for an overall average of 65% accuracy. In all, 14% of the teachers misperceive consensus, and 21% misperceive dissensus (Table 3.15).

Table 3.15

Relationship Between Teachers' Perceived and Actual Consensus with Mothers on Educational Goals

	Teachers Perceive:		
Actual:	Consensus	Dissensus	(Total Actual)
Consensus	33% (75)	21% (46)	54% (121)
Dissensus	14% (32)	32% (71)	46% (103)
(Total Perceived)	47% (107)	53% (117)	100% (224)

The four situations of actual and perceived consensus in Table 3.15 present us with our first opportunity to test the hypothesis that perceived consensus with role partners has more consequences for system integration than actual consensus. Curiously, if we compare the proportion of teachers who report their jobs as "very rewarding" under either the actual or perceived conditions separately, the results are remarkably similar, and it is not possible to infer that there is any difference between the impact of the different types of situations. The proportions

of teachers finding their jobs "very rewarding" are 65% and 53% respectively under conditions of actual consensus and actual dissensus, and they are 64% and 52% respectively under conditions of perceived consensus and perceived dissensus. However, when the four situations are presented simultaneously, it is evident that perceived consensus has a stronger impact on teachers' job rewards, and our hypothesis receives partial confirmation (Table 3.16). The highest proportion (71%) of teachers finds their jobs very rewarding when actual consensus is accurately perceived. The smallest proportion (50%) finds the job very rewarding when there is actual consensus that is misperceived. It is particularly interesting that this group of teachers who look for trouble where it does not exist should find their jobs somewhat less rewarding than those who accurately perceive dissensus. Perhaps those teachers who accurately perceive disagreement with mothers are somewhat better able to cope with role strain or cognitive dissonance than those who perceive disagreement where none exists. As a result of the difference between these two groups, the net effect of actual consensus is close to zero. However, the net effects of perceived consensus are somewhat increased when controlled for the actual situation.

Even though the perceived agreement with mothers on educational goals has a marked impact on the job rewards reported by teachers, it is possible that a belief that the school is best described by their own preference or by the preference they think the mothers hold has an even greater impact. Overall, 60% of the teachers think that the school is best described by their own preference, and 60% believe that the school is best described by the preference of the mothers. But just 39% of the

Table 3.16

Per Cent of Teachers Reporting Their Jobs as "Very Rewarding" Under Conditions of Actual and Perceived Consensus With Mothers on Educational Goals

	Teachers Perceive:		
Actual:	Consensus	Dissensus	Difference
Consensus	71% (75)	50% (46)	-21%
Dissensus	66% (32)	56% (71)	-10%
Difference	-5%	+6%	

teachers think the school is best described by a preference which they share with mothers, and 20% think the school is best described by a preference which neither they nor the mothers hold (Table 3.17). Equal proportions (21%) believe the school is either like the mothers' preference and not their own, or vice versa. This latter symmetrical distribution does not offer any suggestion that either the belief that the school is the type which they or the mothers want is more important to them. A majority of teachers (61%) believes that the school either does not conform to their own preference, to the preference of mothers, or to both; and thus just 39% believe that they are in a situation where both they and the mothers are getting the type of emphasis in school which they prefer. Hence it would appear that if teachers think that both their own preferences and the preferences of the mothers are important, they must usually adapt to a situation which contains some cognitive dissonance.

Table 3.17

Per Cent of Teachers Who Think Their School Is Best Described by Their Own Preferences or the Preferences of Mothers

Perceived Mothers' Preference:	School Matches: Teacher's Preference	Does not match: Teacher's Preference
Matches	39% (88)	21% (47)
Does not match	21% (46)	20% (44)

We would expect that among the four groups in Table 3.17 the teachers who think the school is best described by a preference which they share with mothers would report that their jobs are most rewarding. This is indeed the case (72% very rewarding). However, it is the teachers who believe that the school is best described by neither their own nor the mothers' preferences who find their jobs second most rewarding, and the teachers who think the school matches the mothers' preference and not their own who find their jobs least rewarding. Clearly, the teachers are concerned with whether the school matches either their own or the mothers' preferences, but the relationship is not a simple one. If they believe that neither they nor the mothers are getting what they want, this is at least a "fair" situation which may be beyond the control of both, and the job rewards are affected only slightly. However, if teachers think that mothers' preferences are being met while their own are not, the perceived situation is not a "fair" one; and only a minority report the job as very rewarding. In contrast, if they believe the school is like their own preference and not like that of the mothers, the situation may not be "fair," but it is perhaps justified by the teachers' belief that their own

judgments are professional and hence should carry more weight.

Table 3.18

Per Cent of Teachers Reporting Their Job as Very Rewarding When They Perceive the School as Matching Their Own or the Preferences of Mothers

	Teacher Thinks School:		
	Like Own Preference	Not Like Own Preference	Difference
Like Mothers' Preference	72% (88)	45% (47)	-27%
Not Like Mothers' Preference	57% (46)	61% (44)	+4%
Difference	-15%	+16%	

Thus far we have seen that elementary school mothers and teachers share a general preference for schools that stress intellectual goals. But mothers move toward a preference for the practical emphasis when their children reach high school, and the teachers move toward the personal emphasis. Moreover, belief that the school is the type they most prefer is strongly related to mother's satisfaction with the school and with teacher's job rewards. Let us now see whether the high school students have similar preferences and what significance their preferences have.

Types of Schools Preferred by Tenth Grade Students

Students' preferences for types of emphasis in schools are different both from the preferences of their mothers and from those of their English teachers (Table 3.19). Overall, the students are evenly divided in their

preference for the intellectual school and for the practical school (40% each), and thus they are the only respondents who do not choose the intellectual school far more frequently than they choose any of the other three types. The high preference for the practical school among the students -- an even higher preference than the one which their mothers express -- does not support the notion that teenagers are more idealistic than their elders. If anything, this finding indicates that the students are far more down to earth in their view of education and of the schools than are either their mothers or teachers. Perhaps as the lowest status and involuntary members of schools, students have a perspective which is not conducive to idealism.[9] For whatever reasons, while a majority of their mothers express a preference for the intellectual school, and while their teachers prefer the personal school more often than either mothers or students, the students choose the practical school more often than either of their role partners.

Students' preferences for types of schools vary somewhat by community context but the variations do not appear to be systematic (Table 3.20). The highest preference for the intellectual school is shared by the students in the city and the rural village high schools (48%), and the lowest preference (31%) is found in the growing middle-class suburb and in the stable working-class suburb. The highest preference for the practical school (51%) is found in the stable working-class community. But when the communities are combined by social class composition, differences are negligible.

The students' descriptions of the schools they attend also do not vary systematically by the socio-economic composition of their

Table 3.19

Types of Schools Preferred by Tenth Grade Students, Their Mothers, and the English Teachers in the Schools They Attend

	School Type				
	Intellectual	Social	Personal	Practical	(N)
Students	40%	6%	14%	40%	(507)
Mothers	55%	5%	10%	29%	(421)
Teachers	46%	1%	32%	18%	(101)

Table 3.20

Students' School Preferences by Community

	School Type				
	Intellectual	Social	Personal	Practical	(N)
Metropolis	48%	5%	11%	36%	(154)
Suburban Estates	42%	9%	17%	32%	(59)
Nouveau Heights	31%	4%	23%	43%	(48)
Resort Town	36%	9%	18%	38%	(45)
Old Home	31%	8%	10%	51%	(49)
New Home	33%	7%	11%	49%	(45)
Working Town	39%	5%	11%	45%	(56)
Green Hollow	48%	4%	13%	35%	(48)

community (Table 3.21). Compared with the students in other settings, higher proportions of the students in middle-class communities usually describe their schools as intellectual; and the growing working-class suburb is the only community where the intellectual description is the one

not chosen most frequently. But overall, the general similarities among the distributions of descriptions of schools from community to community tend to outweigh the differences.

Comparisons of the preferences and descriptions in Tables 3.20 and 3.21 reveal that in every type of community except the city, more students describe their school as intellectual than prefer the intellectual school. Also, more students prefer the practical school than describe the school as practical in every setting except the city.

Table 3.21

Students' Descriptions of Schools Attended by Community

	School Type				
	Intellectual	Social	Personal	Practical	(N)
Metropolis	42%	5%	11%	42%	(149)
Suburban Estates	56%	10%	7%	27%	(57)
Nouveau Heights	65%	2%	2%	31%	(48)
Resort Town	68%	2%	7%	23%	(44)
Old Home	56%	6%	8%	29%	(48)
New Home	36%	7%	11%	46%	(44)
Working Town	52%	7%	15%	26%	(54)
Green Hollow	53%	4%	16%	27%	(45)

Overall, 54% of the high school students think their school is the type they most prefer. This is a somewhat smaller percentage of perceived organizational conformity than was found among the mothers (71%) and among the teachers (61%). But, like both their mothers and teachers, the proportion varies with their specific preference (Table 3.22), and the

Table 3.22

Perceived Organizational Conformity Among Students
(Proportion of Students Whose Descriptions of
Their Schools Agree and Disagree with
Their Expressed Preferences

	Description		
Preference	Agrees	Disagrees	(N)
Intellectual	72%	28%	(197)
Social	32%	68%	(28)
Personal	27%	73%	(67)
Practical	53%	47%	(199)
TOTALS	54%	46%	(491)

proportion is highest among those who prefer the intellectual school. In addition, a very slight majority of those who prefer the practical school also perceives agreement between school description and preference. However, while a majority of mothers in each of the 19 school attendance areas studied perceive organizational conformity, there is one high school where the proportion of students perceiving organizational conformity is not a majority. (The range of agreement is from 47% in the middle-class town to 57% in the city.)

The generally lower belief that the school is the type they prefer among the students than among mothers and teachers suggests that either (a) this belief is of less importance to the students, or (b) although it is important to students, daily confrontation with the school and high student observability of evidence to the contrary do not permit this belief. We will attempt to ascertain which of these interpretations is more correct by examining the relationship between students' perceived

organizational conformity on goals and their affective response to the school.

According to our earlier hypotheses, if it is generally important to students to think that their school is the type which they most prefer, then students with this belief should express more positive feelings about the school than those whose preferences and descriptions differ. Results from the comparisons of these two groups of students are somewhat inconclusive (Table 3.23). Overall, there is a tendency for the students to say they like school "quite a bit" (33%) or "somewhat" (35%) and only relatively small proportions express the extreme views (28% like school "very much" and 5% "not at all"). Those who perceive agreement between their expressed preference and description do say they like school somewhat more than those whose preferences and descriptions differ (66% "very much" or "quite a bit" compared with 55%). But this relationship (.05 level of significance) is not nearly as strong as the one for mothers between perceived organizational conformity of the school and satisfaction with the school, and the relationship for teachers between perceived organizational conformity and job rewards (both .001 level of significance). Thus perceived organizational conformity to goals appears to be of some importance to students according to the measure of role strain we have used, but the lack of this belief does not have nearly the impact on the students' liking school as it has on their mothers' satisfaction with school and on their teachers' job rewards.

Another indication that the type of goals emphasized by the schools does not have the same meaning to students that it has to mothers and teachers can be found by examining the relationship of agreement between

school description and the specific school preferences of the students with liking school (Table 3.24).

Table 3.23

Relationship Between Students' Belief That Their School Is the Type They Most Prefer and Liking School

Preference and Description:	Students say they like school this year: Very Much	Quite a Bit	Somewhat	Not at all	(N)
Agree	28%	37%	32%	3%	(274)
Disagree	27%	28%	38%	7%	(217)

Table 3.24

Proportion of Students Saying They Like School "Very Much" or "Quite a Bit" by Specific School Preference and Perceived Agreement Between Preference and Description

School Preference:	Description: Agrees	Disagrees	Difference
Intellectual	66% (142)	66% (55)	----
Social	78% (9)	68% (19)	-10%
Personal	72% (18)	53% (49)	-19%
Practical	62% (105)	47% (94)	-15%
TOTALS	65% (274)	55% (217)	

Students with the intellectual preference like school equally well regardless of whether they think their school is best described as intellectual. But students who prefer the practical or the personal schools like school considerably less when their descriptions do not match their preferences. The reader will recall that the mothers who preferred the intellectual

school were the most difficult to satisfy (Table 3.5). But mothers were less satisfied when preferences and descriptions differed regardless of the specific preference. Teachers, it will be recalled, found their jobs considerably less rewarding when they preferred the intellectual or the practical school and their descriptions differed; but disagreement between preference and description had relatively little effect on job rewards for the teachers with the other two school preferences (Table 3.10). These differences support the contention that, in addition to having somewhat different preferences, students, mothers and teachers do not have similar levels of concern about the goals of education, and their integration within the system is not equally dependent upon the belief that the school is emphasizing the goals they most prefer. Curiously, it is the students, the ones for whom differential emphasis will mean the most in the long run, for whom differences between preferences and descriptions are the least disturbing. It is possible that this is a sign of the immaturity of tenth grade students, that they do not yet realize the weighty significance of educational goals for their lives. But it is also possible that there are other aspects of education which have far more immediate importance for students than the general emphasis of the schools they attend. Before exploring these possibilities, let us first briefly inquire whether students, like teachers, exaggerate community differences in their perceptions of the preferences of their mothers, whether actual or perceived agreement with mothers is more highly related to their feelings about school, and whether perception that the school is the type they prefer or the type their mother's prefer is more highly related to their feelings about school.

Community differences among the preferences for schools that the students attribute to their mothers are negligible for the most part. A slight majority of the students in Old Home believe that their mothers prefer the practical school, but in every other setting the largest proportion of students reports that mothers prefer the intellectual school. The range of this proportion is from a low of 43% in Old Home to a high of 60% in Resort Town. There is a tendency for the students in the working-class communities to perceive their mothers as preferring the practical school more frequently than in the middle-class communities (43% compared with 26% when the working-class and middle-class communities are combined into two distinct groups). But there is no comparable higher proportion of perceived preference for the intellectual school among the students in the middle-class communities. Rather, students in these settings perceive their mothers as preferring each of the three-non-practical schools somewhat more frequently than in the working-class settings.

Overall, 64% of the students believe that their preference for school emphasis is the same as their mothers', and thus more students believe they have the same school preference as their mothers than believe their school is the same type they prefer (64% and 54%). However, only 39% of the students <u>actually</u> express the same school preference as their mothers. Furthermore, just 42% of the students <u>accurately perceive</u> their mothers' specific preferences. It is obvious from these small proportions of actual agreement and accurate perceptions that school goals cannot be a topic of much salience between mothers and their children. Indeed, there is no community in the study sample in which a <u>majority</u> of the pairs of

students and mothers agree on school preference or where a majority of students accurately perceives the preferences of their mothers. Apparently the normal situation for the high school is one where goal priority is not well-established within pairs of mothers and their children, even though majorities of mothers or majorities of students may share preferences in some communities. To state it another way, there appears to be considerable intra-status consensus among mothers and some tendency toward intra-status consensus among students on school goals, but inter-status consensus between pairs of mothers and students is unusual.

The largest proportion of students (38%) misperceives consensus with their mothers on educational goals (Table 3.25). Accurate perception of consensus and dissensus occur with relatively similar frequencies. When we examine the proportions of students who report that they like school very much or quite a bit under the four general conditions of actual and perceived agreement with their mothers, it is evident that perceived agreement with mothers continues to be positively related to liking school, especially when there is actual agreement with the mothers (Table 3.26). However, the net effect of actual agreement with mothers on liking school is negligible. Thus the students resemble the teachers in the persistence of the relationship between perceived consensus with the mothers and role strain, and the lack of relationship between actual consensus and role strain. Furthermore, among both the students and the teachers, it is those who perceive disagreement when there is none who report the highest rates of role strain.

The proportion of students believing that their school matches their own preference is almost identical with the proportion believing the school

matches their mothers' preference (Table 3.27). The largest proportion of students report they like school when they believe the school matches both their own and their mothers' preferences. In this respect, they are also like the teachers. But unlike the teachers, the smallest proportion like school when they believe the school matches neither their own nor their mothers' preferences (Table 3.28).

Table 3.25

Relationship Between Students' Actual and Perceived Agreement with Mothers on Educational Goals

	Students' and Mothers' Goals Actually		
Students believe their goals and their mothers'	Agree	Disagree	Totals
Agree	29% (119)	38% (153)	67%
Disagree	10% (41)	23% (94)	33%
TOTALS	39%	61%	

Table 3.26

Proportion of Students Reporting They Like School Very Much or Quite a Bit Under Conditions of Actual and Perceived Consensus with Their Mothers on Educational Goals

	Goals Actually		
Students believe their goals and their mothers'	Agree	Disagree	Difference
Agree	66% (119)	58% (153)	-8%
Disagree	51% (41)	54% (94)	+3%
Difference	-15%	-4%	

(It will be recalled that the lowest proportion of teachers reported their jobs as very rewarding when they felt the school was the type preferred by the mothers and not themselves (Table 3.18). In fact, it appears that students' liking school is more strongly related to the belief that the school matches their mothers' preference than to the belief that the school matches their own preference, when the relationships are considered simultaneously. From this we might conclude that the students give more weight or legitimacy to the educational preferences of their mothers than to their own, but the opposite is true for the teachers.

Table 3.27

Relationship Between Students' Belief That Their School Emphasizes the Goals They Prefer and Belief the School Emphasizes Goals Their Mothers Prefer

Students believe school and their mothers' preference	Students Believe School and Their Preferences: Agree	Students Believe School and Their Preferences: Disagree
Agree	42% (206)	13% (66)
Disagree	14% (64)	31% (148)

Table 3.28

Per Cent of Students Reporting They Like School Very Much or Quite a Bit Under Conditions of Belief That School Matches Their Own and Their Mothers' Preferences

Students believe school and their mothers' preference	Students Believe School and Their Preferences: Agree	Disagree	Difference
Agree	67% (206)	62% (66)	-5%
Disagree	58% (64)	52% (148)	-6%
Difference	-9%	-10%	

A Note on Tracking, Curriculum and School Goals. One of the general findings of this section on school goals that is especially interesting and warrants further discussion is the fact that the mothers' preference for the intellectual school loses ground at the high school level to the preference for the practical school. At first blush this would appear to be a contradiction of the known fact that the stress on subject matter increases in the schools at the higher grade levels. We originally hypothesized that preference for the practical school would, nevertheless, increase at the high school level by virtue of the fact that high schools must provide terminal and vocationally oriented education for many students. As a result, we felt that the increase in the practical preference would be largely attributable to mothers whose children were in terminal curricula.

Part of the rationale for providing different curricula and ability groups in high schools is to permit the individual goals of various students and their parents to be better accommodated than would otherwise

be possible. If curricula and tracks are performing these functions and the system is well integrated, then the preferences and school descriptions of mothers and students should vary widely according to curricula and ability group, but the perceived agreement between preference and description should not. We would expect that, if the system is rational, there would be higher preference and description of the school as intellectually oriented among mothers and students associated with the college preparatory curriculum and the faster tracks, and higher description and preference of the school as practical among mothers and students associated with the terminal curricula and with the slower tracks. But this rational model does not predict the preferences and descriptions of mothers and students as well as we had expected.

The relationship between curriculum and track is, of course, very strong, but far from perfect. Just 9% of the students enrolled in terminal curricula are in the fast or high ability groups, but 35% of the students in the slower group are enrolled in college preparatory curricula in the eight high schools studied. Curiously, the school goal preferences of the mothers are not related to the track or curriculum in which their children are enrolled (Table 3.29). Almost identical proportions of mothers express each of the preferences whether the mothers are considered according to program or classroom grouping. The preferences of students are also not related to curriculum. However, students' preferences are significantly related to the track in which the students are located, and the differences are in the predicted direction (Table 3.30). Nevertheless, there is neither a majority preference for the intellectual school among students in the faster track groups nor a majority preference for

the practical school among those in the slower groups. In addition, the students in the two tracks perceive that there are significant differences in the preferences of their mothers, and these perceptions are also in the predicted direction (Table 3.31). Oddly enough, a larger proportion of the mothers of students in the faster groups (68%) believe the school is best described as the type they most prefer than the mothers of the slower group of children (57%). But the proportions of students perceiving organizational conformity on goals are almost identical for the fast and slow tracks (57% and 55%).

From the above it is clear that the shift toward the practical emphasis among high school mothers cannot be accounted for by the relationship of their children to the academic structure of the schools or to the system of ability grouping. Rather, the higher preference for the practical emphasis among these mothers appears to be a reflection of a more pragmatic orientation toward older children that occurs regardless of the formal category in which the school has placed them.

The fact that the mothers express similar goal preferences regardless of the placement of their children also reveals that the curriculum and ability groupings employed by the schools are <u>not</u> effective devices for narrowing the range of goals with which individual classroom teachers will have to cope. However, the fact that mothers of children in the faster track more frequently believe that the school is the type they prefer suggests that the orientations of the mothers are being better accommodated by the faster tracks. At least the more frequent belief that this is true among the mothers of children in the faster tracks suggests that these mothers are experiencing less strain in relation to the school, and

Table 3.29

School Preference of High School Mothers by Track of Child

Students' Track	School most preferred is: Intellectual	Social	Personal	Practical	(N)
Fast	57%	4%	12%	27%	(239)
Slow	53%	7%	8%	33%	(184)

Table 3.30

School Preferences of High School Students by Track

Track is:	School most preferred is: Intellectual	Social	Personal	Practical	(N)
Fast	45%	4%	17%	34%	(271)
Slow	35%	8%	10%	47%	(236)

Table 3.31

Students' Perceptions of Their Mothers' School Preferences by Track of Students

Track is:	Students believe mothers' preference is: Intellectual	Social	Personal	Practical	(N)
Fast	54%	4%	16%	26%	(270)
Slow	48%	7%	6%	40%	(235)

thus are better integrated with the system. However, this may not be the case with the students. Let us briefly examine the relationships between goal orientations of mothers and students and our measures of role strain within each track.

Belief that the school is the type they most prefer is related almost equally to the students' liking school in each of the two tracks. However, the students in the slower track report they like school somewhat less regardless of whether they think the school is their most preferred type (Table 3.32). Similarly, the mothers of the students in each of the two tracks are far more satisfied with the school as long as they believe the school is the type they prefer, but satisfaction rates are somewhat lower among the mothers of children in the slower tracks (Table 3.33). As a consequence, students associated with the slower tracks and their mothers can both be described as more frequently expressing role strain than their counterparts in the faster tracks. In the case of the mothers, the higher rate of dissatisfaction in the slower track is partly traceable to the higher rates of perceived organizational non-conformity (or the more frequent belief that the school is not emphasizing the proper goals) but this is not true with the students. Nevertheless, according to our measures, both the mothers and students associated with the slower tracks are more poorly integrated with the system than those in the faster tracks.

Table 3.32

Per Cent of Students Who Like School "Very Much" or "Quite a Bit" by Relationship Between School Preferences and Descriptions and Track

	School Preferences and Descriptions:		
Student's Track:	Agree	Disagree	Difference
Fast	69% (147)	59% (113)	-10%
Slow	61% (127)	50% (104)	-11%
Difference	-8%	-9%	

Table 3.33

Per Cent of Mothers Very Satisfied with the School by Relationship Between Their School Preferences, School Descriptions, and Track Their Children Are In

	School Preferences and Descriptions:		
Track of child is:	Agree	Disagree	Difference
Fast	57% (148)	37% (70)	-20%
Slow	52% (93)	28% (69)	-24%
Difference	-5%	-9%	

A Skeptical Look at the Relevance of Goal Orientations

We have stressed the fact that we are not interested in merely describing the goal orientations of the various respondents, rather, that we would attempt to locate some of the determinants and consequences of a variety of goal-related situations. We have found, for example, that it is

possible to account for some of the variance in the school goal preferences of mothers by the type of community, educational attainment in the home, and school level of the child. In addition, we have found that when mothers believe that their school is not the type they most prefer, their satisfaction with the school is lower than when preference and description agree. In some respects this is a more interesting finding than the former group of findings because it suggests that there are ascertainable costs to the schools when their constituencies believe very general goal priorities are not being adequately met. That teachers find their jobs less rewarding and that students like school less when they think their school is not the type they most prefer are equally interesting and for similar reasons. Together these findings suggest that the general goal orientations of each major partner have relevance for the integration of the system about which we are concerned. Or, to state it another way, it appears that widespread belief that the school is not emphasizing certain goals is a potential source of strain or disruption for schools whether this belief is held by mothers, teachers, or students. Furthermore, our findings have consistently shown that the belief that role partners disagree with one's own preferences is more disruptive than actual disagreement among role partners.

Because the goals of education are in some respects the most general and long-range aspects of education with which participants in the system are concerned, it is quite likely that these goals lack importance, salience, or relevance for teachers, mothers and students on a day to day basis. In schools, as in most organizations, terminal goals are frequently displaced by more immediate and tangible concerns. It is difficult to

keep one's eye on long-range diffuse considerations when there are tests to pass, assignments to complete and classes to prepare. As a consequence, there is reason to suspect that while perceived organizational non-conformity to preferred goals is related to role strain for system members, this perception may be merely a reflection of some more important disruption in the system rather than a direct cause of disruption. Moreover, the fact that most teachers, mothers and students believe that many goals of education are very important should make it easier for each to accept the fact that his own particular preference is not the one stressed most by the school.[10] In effect, the common acceptance of the school as an institution with a multiplicity of legitimate and important goals should provide the schools with a convenient cushion against the accusation that certain goals are not adequately stressed. However, this common acceptance of the importance of multiple goals provides even more reason to suspect that the belief that the schools are not placing the most stress on a particular group of goals might not be as direct a cause of disruption to the system as the analysis and our interpretation thus far have indicated.

In addition, while it is true that the belief that the school does not match one's first preference is related to measures of role strain for each participant status group, there are many mothers who are "very satisfied" with the school, many teachers who find their jobs "very rewarding," and many students who like school "very much" or "quite a bit" in spite of the fact that they perceive organizational non-conformity.

Each of these considerations has led us to search for some underlying cause or explanation for the strong relationships between perceived discrepancies among preferences and descriptions of schools and role strain.

We have found a number of additional factors that are related to mothers' satisfaction with the school, teachers' rewards from their jobs, and students' liking for school. The specific factors are not identical for occupants of each of the three statuses, but some of these factors are more or less interchangeable in their effects on specific measures of disruption. Nevertheless, we have not discovered any factors that fully account for or substantially eliminate the disruptive effects of the belief that the school is not the type most preferred.

There is one factor that is more strongly related to each of the measures of role strain that we have used than any other. Mothers' satisfaction with the school, teachers' job rewards, and students' liking for school are each significantly related to satisfaction with the performance of specific students in school. We shall not concern ourselves at this point with what factors tend to make students, teachers and mothers more satisfied with students' school performance. Rather we want to stress the fact that, in addition to the perceived relationship between goal preferences and school descriptions, there is another factor shared by each actor in the system that is potentially even more disruptive to the schools, but that this factor, satisfaction with students' performance, does not fully account for the disruptive influence of perceived disagreement between preferences and descriptions. Let us briefly examine the combined effects of perceived organizational conformity on goals, and satisfaction with students' performance, on the measures of role strain for mothers, teachers, and students before concluding our discussion of school goals.

Students are the most severe critics of their own school performance. While 39% of the high school mothers say they are "very satisfied" with their child's performance, 26% of the high school teachers say they are "very satisfied" with the performance of most of their students, and just 16% of the students say they are "very satisfied" with their own performance (Table 3.34). Despite the gross differences in these proportions, satisfaction with performance is significantly related to the measures of role strain for each of these role partners (X^2 beyond .001). But the joint effects of satisfaction with performance and perceived organizational conformity on the measures of role strain are somewhat different. The proportion of mothers who say they are "very satisfied" with the school ranges from 70% when they are "very satisfied" with student performance and their preferences and school descriptions match, to a low of 29% when satisfaction with performance is lower and preferences and descriptions differ (Table 3.35). The proportion of teachers who report their jobs are "very rewarding" ranges from a high of 86% to a low of 42% under the same conditions (Table 3.37) and the proportion of students who like school "very much" or "quite a bit" ranges from 85% to 36%. Inspection of Table 3.35 also reveals that goal orientation of the mothers has a marked effect upon mothers' satisfaction with the schools regardless of level of satisfaction with the performance of their children. In contrast, perceived disagreement between preferences and school descriptions has no impact on teachers' reports of their job rewards and on students' liking for school when teachers or students are "very satisfied" with the students' performance (Tables 3.36 and 3.37). However, perceived organizational conformity to toals remains strongly related to these measures of

role strain for both teachers and students when either is less than "very satisfied" with student school performance.

Thus, in spite of the strong relationship between satisfaction with performance of students and role strain (among mothers, teachers and students), this relationship only modifies, and does not eliminate, the relationship between perceived organizational conformity to goals and role strain.

Table 3.34

Satisfaction of High School Students, Their Mothers and Their Teachers with the Performance of the Students in School

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied	(N)
Mothers	39%	46%	16%	(429)
Teachers	26%	69%	5%	(106)
Students	16%	56%	28%	(506)

Table 3.35

Per Cent of Mothers Very Satisfied with the School Under Various Conditions of Perceived Agreement Between School Goal Preferences and School Descriptions, and Satisfaction with Child's Performance in School

Level of Mothers' Satisfaction with Child's Performance	Mother Reports School Preference and Description: Agree	Disagree	Difference
Very satisfied	70% (428)	58% (144)	-12%
Not very satisfied	44% (403)	29% (203)	-15%
Difference	-26%	-29%	

Table 3.36

Per Cent of Students Liking School Very Much or Quite a Bit Under Various Conditions of Perceived Agreement Between School Goal Preferences and Descriptions, and Satisfaction with Own Performance in School

Level of Satisfaction with Own School Performance	Child's School Preference and Description: Agree	Disagree	Difference
Very satisfied	85% (47)	85% (33)	----
Somewhat satisfied	66% (151)	58% (120)	-8%
Not at all satisfied	51% (73)	36% (62)	-15%
Difference	-34%	-49%	

Table 3.37

Per Cent of Teachers Reporting Their Jobs Very Rewarding Under Various Conditions of Perceived Agreement Between School Goal Preferences and Descriptions, and Satisfaction with Performance of Most of Their Students in School

Level of Teachers' Satisfaction with Performance of Students	Teachers' School Preferences and Descriptions: Agree	Disagree	Difference
Very satisfied	86% (58)	83% (23)	-3%
Not very satisfied	58% (87)	42% (67)	-16%
Difference	-28%	-41%	

It is especially interesting that it is the mothers, the only role partners who are not full-fledged members of the school as an organization, who experience the most role strain when they believe the schools are not properly stressing the goals they consider the most important. Mothers, it appears, must depend more heavily upon general orientations and second-hand information about the schools by virtue of their greater social distance from and lower observability of the schools. However, by the same reasoning, mothers may be the members of the system who are least prone to goal displacement.[11] The insulation of mothers from daily contention with the crises surrounding tests, assignments, and having to cope with a wide variety of role partners within the school may enhance their ability to keep organizational goals in mind. Teachers and students, the role partners who confront each other in the classroom each day, are far more vulnerable to goal displacement. In fact, concern with daily activity in the classroom is so high that perceived disagreement between the school and the type they most prefer is only related to job rewards of the teachers and to the students' liking school when they are <u>not</u> very satisfied with the students' role performance. It is as if school goals can only assume significance as a source of role strain in the schools for teachers and students as "something else that is wrong" in addition to the level of performance of the students. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that the proportions of high school students and teachers who are very satisfied with the performance of the students is so small that goals do have relevance to role strain for the vast majority.

Conclusions

It is obvious from our findings that if the continued existence of schools were dependent upon consensus on educational goals among teachers and their constituencies of mothers and students, the schools would not survive. Our findings demonstrate several reasons why the schools do not undergo severe strain from dissensus on school goals. (1) Pretest interviews firmly established the fact that individual mothers, teachers and students believe there are many goals of education that are very important, and the recognition of the legitimacy of multiple goals provides the schools with a cushion against those who would stress one goal to the exclusion of others. (2) Perceived dissensus with role partners on educational goals produces far more role strain than actual dissensus, and while actual consensus is low in many cases, majorities of mothers, and students perceive consensus with their role partners. (3) Majorities of mothers, teachers and students perceive organizational conformity or believe that their school is the type they most prefer. (4) The belief that the school is not the type they most prefer has the strongest relationship with role strain among the mothers, but smaller proportions of mothers than students or teachers hold this belief. (5) Although a slight majority of teachers perceives disagreement with mothers on educational goals, the belief that the school is the type they prefer has a greater impact on their job rewards; and a majority of teachers hold this belief. (6) Satisfaction with the performance of students is more highly related to role strain for each participant than the belief that the school is not the type most preferred.

SECTION III.

FOOTNOTES

1. See, for instance, Educational Policies Commission, The Purposes of Education in American Democracy (Washington: National Education Association), 1938. Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1918. The Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society, General Education in a Free Society (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press), 1946. Lester A. Kirkendall, Irwin R. Kuenzli, and Floyd W. Reeves, Goals for American Education (Chicago: American Federation of Teachers), 1948. Warren G. Findley, "The Ultimate Goals of Education," The School Review, LXIV (1956), pp. 10-17. Frederick W. Mayer, "The Aims of Education," Education, LXXVI (1956), pp. 630-38. Perhaps the most exhaustive treatments can be found in Benjamine S. Bloom (ed.), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (David McKay Company, Inc., New York), 1956, and David R. Krathwohl et al., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Handbook II: Affective Domain (David McKay Company, Inc., New York), 1964.

2. Lawrence W. Downey, The Task of Public Education (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago), 1960. Downey constructed a mail questionnaire after conducting a thorough content analysis of the literature on educational goals. He asked respondents to sort sixteen items into a Thurstone Scale and performed a factor analysis on the results. This produced four factors which we adopted as the basis for the four schools in our interviews. Originally we intended to repeat his items verbatim, but it was discovered in the pretest interviews that (1) respondents tended to consider most of the sixteen original items "very important" and hence the initial sorting for ranks was not productive, (2) time to administer this single question averaged about twenty minutes and did not allow sufficient time for the rest of the interview, and (3) respondents often reacted unfavorably to the length and complexity of the question in its original format.

3. Ibid.

4. See Appendix A.

5. See Appendix A.

6. Many previous surveys have found high levels of satisfaction with the schools. For a national rating, see Elmo Roper, "What the U.S. Thinks of Its Schools," Life, 24 (October, 1950), pp. 11-18. For some local assessments, see Bloomington, Illinois Board of Education, What

the People of Bloomington Think About Their Public Schools (Bloomington, Illinois, Board of Education), 1962. Denver Board of Education, Denver Looks at Its Schools (Denver Board of Education), 1953. New England CPEA, "Research into Social Relationships and 'Interest' in Schools," School Executive, 74 (1955), pp. 109-114. It should be pointed out that very little systematic analysis has been done regarding the possible determinants of satisfaction.

7. The lower preference for the intellectual goals among the high school teachers is somewhat surprising given the fact that the respondents are all English teachers. If differences among school goals preferred are related to the subject matter areas in which teachers are located, we would expect teachers of English and of other academic subjects to be more inclined to prefer the intellectual goals than their non-academic colleagues. Therefore the differences between the goal preferences of elementary and high school teachers in our sample may actually be smaller than would be found if all secondary school teachers had been included.

8. See, for instance, John M. Foskett, The Normative Word of the Elementary School Teacher (Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration), 1967.

9. During recent years many writers have stressed the fact that school is involuntary for its students and that this may have undesirable consequences. See, for instance, Charles E. Bidwell, "The School as a Formal Organization," in James G. March (ed.), Handbook of Organizations (Chicago: Rand McNally), 1965.

10. It will be recalled that this was one of the major reasons why the original Downey version of the goals question had to be changed. That is, respondents tended to have a response set that assigned high importance to most educational goals.

11. For a discussion of goal displacement, see Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe: The Free Press), Revised edition, 1957.

SECTION IV

TEACHING STYLES: PROFESSIONAL ROLE DEFINITIONS AND THE PREFERENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF MOTHERS AND STUDENTS*

One area of potential conflict between parents and educators is that of the appropriate role behavior of teachers. From the theoretic standpoint, the role behavior of teachers can be regarded as reflecting instrumental means as distinguished from terminal goals or the eventual outputs desired from education. We have maintained in the previous section that the terminal goals of education must be diffuse in order to accommodate the diverse expectations of highly differentiated clientele. Indeed, the ultimate goals of education are often stated in such general terms that they become platitudes. As a result, there are seldom public disputes between parents and teachers over the terminal goals of education. In contrast, instrumental means concern the daily behavior of teachers and students. Both parents and teachers may have rather specific ideas about what this behavior should be like, and open disputes may more readily result.[1]

The preferences and images of parents regarding instructional practices has been a subject of considerable debate in the past ten years. Spokesmen on both sides of the "great debate" concerning the most suitable kind of education for the post-Sputnik era have imputed attitudes to the community to support their individual claims. Thus,

*A shorter version of some of the material in this section was published in Sociology of Education, 40, (Fall 1967) under joint authorship with Sam D. Sieber.

the critics of progressive education have averred that parents are dismayed by the poverty of instruction in the basic subjects, while the defense has argued that current instructional approaches reflect the desires of local publics, and that parents are highly concerned about the school's contribution to the emotional and social development of their children.[2]

In the midst of this controversy, some educators have become worried that teachers themselves have been misled by a vocal minority of prominent critics. They fear that teachers wrongly believe that parents favor much greater pressure on pupils to master the substantive content of their courses to the detriment of non-intellective types of growth.[3] By examining the evaluations of parents and students with regard to various styles of teaching, we hope to furnish a partial answer to the practical question of what sorts of instructional experiences are preferred by what types of parents and students. By juxtaposing self-images of teachers against the expectations of their role partners, we should be able to determine the degree of discrepancy between parents' and students' desires and teachers' own role-definitions. In sum, another objective of our study is to bring some enlightenment to the subject of preferences for styles of teaching, and to settle certain questions about the congruence between public demands and professional role definitions.

The order of procedure in this section is very similar to that found in the previous section on school goals. We begin by presenting the preferences of mothers for specific teaching styles according to grade level of the child in school, community context, and educational

attainment in the home. We then compare the mothers' preferences and descriptions of teachers and examine the relationship between mothers' perceived non-conformity of teachers and role strain. Next we explore the self-descriptions of teachers and their perceptions of the mothers' preferences. This is followed by an examination of the relationship of these to role strain among teachers. Thirdly, we ask about students' preferences and descriptions of teachers and the relationship of these to role strain. Then we turn to the question of the amount of agreement among the interacting pairs of role partners on preferences and descriptions and the relationship of these to educational attainment of parents and to the tracking system of the high school. Finally, we ask whether actual or perceived conformity by the teacher to mothers' and students' preferences is more strongly related to role strain.

METHODS

Styles of teaching can be conceptualized in many ways -- for example, authoritarian versus permissive, pupil-directed versus content-oriented, or businesslike versus unplanned. Several writers have developed lists of teaching styles.[4] As pointed out by Wallen and Travers in their recent review of research on teaching methods, however, just what teachers actually do is still very much an open question.[5] The main reason for this lack of research evidence on teacher behavior patterns is the difficulty of measuring classroom behavior. But despite the absence of empirically documented styles, a number of ideal-constructs have been derived from "philosophies" of teaching, from controversies over progressive versus traditional education, and from the everyday discourse of practitioners and parents.

Two especially important aspects of the teaching role are widely discussed in the literature: (1) the extent to which subject matter is emphasized, and (2) the extent to which adult authority is exercised. By dichotomizing and combining these two dimensions, we obtain four distinct styles of teaching:

		Emphasis on subject matter	
		High	Low
Relations between teacher and child	Adult centered (authoritarian)	Content-oriented	Control-oriented
	Child centered (permissive)	Discovery-oriented	Sympathy-oriented

The four styles singled out for study are not exhaustive of the popular conceptions of teaching and are not wholly accurate reflections of behavior patterns, but the four styles represent some of the most common images that are held of teaching at the elementary and secondary levels.

The four styles of teaching were presented to all categories of respondents, including first, fifth, and tenth grade teachers, the mothers of many of these teachers' pupils, the pupils of selected tenth grade English teachers, and the principals of the schools where the teachers were located. The questions that were posed were the following:

Mothers and Students -- Although teachers have to concern themselves with many different things in their jobs, some teachers emphasize certain things more than others. Suppose there were four first (fifth, or tenth) grade teachers in (school) and you could choose the one you wanted to be (M: child's teacher; S: your 10th grade English teacher). Which of these would be your first choice?

Which of these best describes (M: child's teacher; S: name of English teacher)?

Teachers -- Although teachers have to concern themselves with many different things in their jobs, some teachers emphasize certain things more than others, we would like to know which one of the following four types of teachers you think best describes you.

Which of these four types of teachers do you think most of the mothers of the students in your class prefer?

How about your principal? Which type do you think he (she) prefers?

Principals -- (Same basic question as above, but:) Which of these four types of teacher do you prefer having as a teacher in (school)?

The four teaching styles were described as follows:

(Control-oriented) Teacher #1 is most concerned with maintaining discipline, seeing that students work hard, and teaching them to follow directions.

(Content-oriented) Teacher #2 feels it's most important that students know their subject matter well, and that he (she) cover the material thoroughly and test their progress regularly.

(Discovery-oriented) Teacher #3 stresses making the class interesting and encourages students to be creative and to figure things out for themselves.

(Sympathy-oriented) Teacher #4 thinks it's most important that a teacher be friendly and well liked by students and able to understand and to handle their problems.

Preferred Teaching Styles at Different Grade Levels

It is generally assumed that elementary and secondary teachers are expected to perform their teaching roles quite differently. As the pupil passes from lower to higher grade levels, he is expected to become more intellectually serious, and especially so if he wishes to enter college. One would therefore predict that parents with children in the higher grades would place greater emphasis on teaching of content.

Also, one would expect parents of younger children to desire greater support or sympathy from teachers.

Despite these common impressions, our data show only a slight trend in the direction of parents' placing greatest emphasis on content-orientation from lower to higher grade levels, and practically no difference with respect to preferences for the sympathy-oriented teacher. As shown in Table 4.1, 33 per cent of the mothers of first graders would choose a teacher who was content-oriented, compared with 38 per cent of the mothers of fifth graders, and 43 per cent of the mothers of tenth graders. There is a clear trend, but it is much less pronounced than common sense would predict. The sympathy-oriented style was favored by only 11 per cent of first grade mothers, 11 per cent of fifth grade mothers, and 8 per cent of tenth grade mothers.

The greatest difference occurs with respect to preferences for the control-oriented teacher: 26 per cent of the first grade mothers, 22 per cent of the fifth grade mothers, and 13 per cent of the tenth grade mothers desire this teaching style. Thus, the younger the child, the greater the desire for the non-intellectual authoritarian style. This result would appear to be a direct contradiction of the professional educational ideology that stresses the importance of a permissive classroom climate in the early grades.

It is also apparent from inspection of Table 4.1 that mothers do not share consensus on the style of teaching they prefer for their children at any grade level. This is in direct contrast with our earlier finding that a majority preference for intellectual goals is shared by mothers in all settings and at all grade levels. However,

Table 4.1

Teaching Styles Preferred by Mothers with Children in Different Grade Levels

	% Mothers					
	Teaching Styles					
Grade Level of Child	Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
1st	26%	33%	30%	11%	100%	(453)
5th	22	38	29	11	100%	(494)
10th	13	43	36	8	100%	(426)

it should be pointed out that mothers of the older children more often prefer the two styles of teaching that emphasize subject matter, i.e., content-orientation and discovery-orientation. It will be recalled that the majority preference for the intellectual goals among elementary school mothers is reduced among high school mothers, and this decrease is accompanied by an increase in the preference for the practical school. It is clear from Table 4.1 that the decrease in preference for the intellectual goals among high school mothers should not be interpreted as signifying a desire for lessening the emphasis on subject matter or on the cognitive aspects of education in the higher grades. But, by the same reasoning, the greater preference for cognitive-oriented styles of teaching among high school mothers should not be interpreted as an increase in a purely intellectual orientation toward school. Nevertheless, the overall differences between the

teaching style preferences of first and tenth grade mothers is not as pronounced as differences between goal preferences, suggesting that variations in the teaching role expectations of parents with children in different grade levels have been overestimated by educators.

Perhaps of greater significance is the observation that within each grade level, the mothers prefer the content-oriented teacher first and the discovery-oriented teacher second in order of frequency. Only a small percentage of the mothers opted for the sympathy-oriented teacher. In short, it is not true that mothers are only secondarily concerned with the intellectual maturation of their children. Even in the elementary grades, only about a tenth of the mothers prefer a teacher who is primarily oriented to playing a nurturance role with pupils (i.e., the sympathy-oriented teacher). The critics of educational practices who claim that parents are mainly concerned about the intellective aspects of education are by and large correct in their assessment, and especially with reference to the higher grade levels.

Preferred Teaching Styles and Social Position

The variation in preferences of mothers by social context is considerable. But these differences follow relatively complex patterns that do not lend themselves easily to simple presentational format or to simple summary statements. At the risk of employing a format that is difficult for the reader to follow, we present the distribution of mothers' preferences for each type of teacher in every school attendance area before presenting summary tables that conceal some of these differences.

In Table 4.2 we find that Nouveau Heights is the only elementary school attendance area where 50% or more of the mothers prefer the same style of teacher. This is in contrast with the high schools where majorities of mothers prefer the same teaching style in five of the eight sample schools. In Suburban Estates 62% of the high school mothers express a preference for the discovery style, and in Nouveau Heights, Old Home, New Home, and Green Hollow, 50% or more of the mothers prefer the content-oriented teacher. Moreover, preference for the content style is the modal response for the high school mothers in Resort Town and Working Town. Hence agreement among the mothers on teaching styles is considerably more prevalent at the high school level; and, with the exception of Suburban Estates, it is the content style that is chosen most often. Thus while the schools are confronted with less agreement among high school mothers on the goals of education, teachers encounter higher agreement among mothers regarding teaching styles at the high school level.

Closer inspection of the preferences of elementary school mothers in different residential areas reveals several interesting patterns. Starting at the top of Table 4.2 and moving down, we find that the three working-class areas of the city are unique in having constituencies of mothers who express a modal preference for the control-oriented teaching style. Despite the deliberate and careful selection of these schools according to their racial composition, the mothers of the children in these three schools resemble one another in their preferences more than they resemble the mothers in any of the other school areas. Therefore we can conclude that race, per se, is not relevant to teaching style

Table 4.2

Teaching Styles Preferred by Mothers
in Various School Settings

Elementary Schools

School Setting		Style of Teaching Preferred Is: Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy	(N)
City	Working Class:					
	White	41%	25%	13%	21%	(92)
	Mixed	40	33	17	10	(82)
	Negro	35	26	22	17	(65)
	Middle-Class	21	40	30	9	(91)
	Suburban Estates	17	35	47	1	(79)
	Nouveau Heights	9	37	50	4	(90)
	Old Home	22	35	25	18	(73)
	New Hoem	16	41	28	15	(103)
	Resort Town	23	44	26	7	(111)
	Working Town	24	31	34	11	(82)
	Green Hollow	17	38	35	10	(79)
		24%	35%	30%	11%	(947)

High Schools

School Setting	Style of Teaching Preferred Is: Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy	(N)
City (mixed SES)	19%	34%	37%	10%	(136)
Suburban Estates	6	22	62	10	(50)
Nouveau Heights	5	53	42	--	(38)
Old Home	9	73	--	18	(33)
New Home	18	50	32	--	(38)
Resort Town	15	46	34	5	(41)
Working Town	9	47	37	7	(43)
Green Hollow	8	51	28	13	(47)
	13%	43%	36%	8%	(426)

preferences. In fact, these three schools are the only ones where 50% or more of the mothers express preferences for the two non-subject matter oriented styles of teaching (control and sympathy). But it is their higher preference for the authoritarian, non-cognitive control style that plays the major role in setting them apart from the mothers in all other areas.

Mothers in the middle class attendance area of the city choose each of the two subject matter oriented styles of teaching more frequently than any of the groups in the working-class areas of the city. This suggests that the preferences of mothers may vary systematically according to the socio-economic composition of attendance areas. The preference for the two subject-matter oriented styles is even greater among mothers in the two middle-class suburbs, Suburban Estates and Nouveau Heights, but their modal choice is the discovery style rather the content style. Continuing to move down the Table, the two working-class suburbs, Old Home and New Home, contain mothers who prefer the content style more frequently than their working-class counterparts in the city, and just about as often as the mothers in the middle-class areas. The major difference between mothers in the working- and the middle-class suburbs is the high preference of the latter for the discovery style of teaching. Indeed, the preferences of the mothers in the middle-class area of the city resemble the preferences of the mothers in the two working-class suburbs more than they resemble those of the mothers in the two middle-class suburbs.

As we examine the responses of the remaining elementary school mothers, it becomes clear that the difference between the proportion of

mothers preferring the discovery method in the two small towns is neither large nor in the same direction as the difference between the mothers in the middle and working-class suburbs. Furthermore, it appears that elementary school mothers in Resort Town, Working Town, and Green Hollow have preferences for teaching styles that follow patterns closer to those found in the middle-class area of the city and in the working-class suburbs than to the patterns found in the working-class areas of the city or to the patterns found in the middle-class suburbs.

In sum, there are three general patterns of teaching style preferences into which the various communities can be grouped at the elementary school level. The first pattern, found only in the three working-class areas of the city, reveals a modal preference for the control style of teaching (39% when the three groups of mothers are combined). The second pattern, found in the group containing the middle-class area of the city, Old Home, New Home, Resort Town, and Green Hollow, has a modal preference for the content method (39% for the combined groups). The third pattern, found in the two middle-class suburbs, reveals a strong modal preference for the discovery style of teaching (49%).[6]

Preferences of the high school mothers follow much simpler patterns than the ones we have just discussed. As we noted above, high school mothers have a majority or modal preference for the content style in all settings except in Suburban Estates, where there is a strong preference for the discovery style, and in the city, which is of mixed socio-economic origins.

Perhaps the most interesting comparison between the elementary and high school mothers is the one that combines the two subject matter oriented styles of teaching (content and discovery). This reveals that there is a higher preference for these two styles of teaching among the high school mothers than among the elementary school mothers in every community studied. Therefore, while the age-grade characteristics of children are not quite as strongly related to the teaching style preferences of mothers as we had anticipated, they are, nevertheless, strongly and consistently related in every community.

Suggested Implications of Socioeconomic Differences

If we ignore some of the specific differences between individual school attendance areas noted above and group the communities on the basis of general social class composition, certain patterns persist that are difficult to abstract from the complexity of Table 4.2. These patterns are evident from a few comparisons made among the figures in Table 4.3.

It is clear that mothers in the middle-class areas more often prefer the discovery-oriented style of teaching both at the elementary and at the high school levels. (As previously noted, this is particularly true in the two suburbs.) Two possible explanations for this finding suggest themselves. The first is that the middle-class emphasis on training for independent effort reasserts itself in the preferences of mothers regarding their children's formal education.[7] Secondly, if current literature on education and pronouncements by educators in other mass media stress the "discovery method," then mothers who are more highly exposed to these media, i.e. middle-class mothers, may be

Table 4.3

Mothers' Preferred Teaching Styles by Grade Level of Child and Socioeconomic Level of Community*

	Community SES Is:	Teaching Style Preferred: Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy	(N)
First and Fifth Grades	City Working-Class	39%	28%	23%	15%	(239)
	Other Working-Class	20	36	29	14	(258)
	Middle-Class	16	39	40	5	(280)
High School	Working-Class	12%	55%	25%	8%	(114)
	Middle-Class	8	40	47	5	(129)

*Middle-class mothers in the city are excluded from the elementary school group so that the middle-class high school group will contain comparable populations from exactly the same communities. The city high school and the rural schools are excluded because they contain mixtures of social class backgrounds.

partially persuaded by them.[8] Whether one or both of these explanations is correct, one important implication of this finding is that teachers who actually use the discovery method will be more successful with middle-class children, because of the cultural support for independent effort that middle-class students receive in the home. This is a possibility that has been overlooked in the psychological literature on the subject.[9]

Of the images preferred by the working-class mothers of elementary school children, it is a preference for the control-oriented teacher that more clearly differentiates the two groups. Thirty-nine per cent of the working-class mothers of grade school children in the city prefer this teaching style compared with 20% of the other working-class mothers.

But it is the discovery method that most clearly distinguished the working-class from the middle-class at the elementary school level. In contrast, at the tenth grade level, it is the content-oriented style that most clearly distinguishes the two social classes. These apparent differences mask an underlying similarity. It will be recalled that control- and content-orientation are the two styles that have been designated as authroitarian. The proportion of elementary school mothers preferring these two styles is highest among the city working-class (67%). Almost identical proportions prefer these combined styles in the other working-class and in the middle-class groups (56% and 55% respectively). But the proportion of mothers choosing these two styles increases in the working class areas (67%) and decreases in the middle-class areas at the high school level (48%). In sum, when the working-class mothers choose content oriented style of teaching, they choose "authoritarian intellectualism" (content) rather than "permissive intellectualism" (discovery), and this is especially pronounced at the high school level.

These results are in accord with research that reports a tendency among working-class members to value authoritarian social relationships, particularly the child-rearing studies that show greater emphasis on parental dominance among working-class mothers.[10]

Parental Education and Teaching Style Preferences

We found in the previous section that many of the differences among the types of school goals preferred by mothers in different communities are traceable to the educational attainment of the mothers and their husbands. This is also true with regard to the teaching styles

preferred by mothers in different communities. Let us briefly examine the evidence for this statement before moving on to the mothers' descriptions of their childrens' teachers.

Table 4.4 reveals that many of the differences among the preferences of mothers in socioeconomically different communities are considerably reduced or eliminated when educational attainment of the mothers and their husbands is taken into account. If we begin by comparing the totals at the bottom of each of the four sections of the table, we find that educational attainment is strongly related to the preferences of both elementary and high school mothers. At both school levels educational attainment is positively related to choosing the discovery-oriented teacher, and negatively related to choosing the two mother surrogate styles, control and sympathy. There is higher preference for the two subject matter oriented styles (content and discovery) within each educational group at the high school level than at the elementary school level. However, it should be pointed out that the two mother surrogate styles are preferred more frequently by high school mothers from the homes where at least one parent has attended college (27% and 16% respectively). Thus it appears that the recognition by mothers of specialized roles for teachers is largely a reflection of educational level of the home.

More careful examination of Table 4.4 reveals that when both school level of the child and educational attainment of the parents are taken into account, there are very few contextual effects within the community groups. The most persistent community difference that appears to be a contextual effect is the higher preference for the control teacher in the city at both school levels. This difference appears to be limited

Table 4.4

Mothers' Teaching Style Preference by SES of Community and Educational Attainment in the Home

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Mother or Husband Have Attended College

Teaching Style Preferred:

Community	Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
City (Working-Class)	24%	47%	18%	12%	100%	(17)
Other Working-Class	15	27	48	10	100%	(48)
Middle-Class	12	40	45	3	100%	(246)
Rural	4	50	46	--	100%	(28)
Total	12%	40%	44%	4%	100%	(339)

Mother and Husband Have Not Attended College

Teaching Style Preferred:

Community	Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
City (Working-Class)	41%	27%	16%	16%	100%	(220)
Other Working-Class	19	35	30	16	100%	(208)
Middle-Class	28	39	22	11	100%	(124)
Rural	24	31	29	16	100%	(51)
Total	29%	33%	23%	15%	100%	(603)

HIGH SCHOOLS

Mother or Husband Have Attended College

Teaching Style Preferred:

Community	Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
City (Mixed SES)	9%	35%	52%	4%	100%	(46)
Working-Class	4	59	33	4	100%	(27)
Middle-Class	5	34	57	4	100%	(76)
Rural	--	(43%)	(57%)	--	100%	(7)
Total	6%	39%	51%	4%	100%	(156)

Mother and Husband Have Not Attended College

Teaching Style Preferred:

Community	Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
City (Mixed SES)	25%	34%	29%	12%	100%	(89)
Working-Class	15	54	22	9	100%	(87)
Middle-Class	13	45	34	7	100%	(53)
Rural Village	10	54	23	13	100%	(39)
Total	17%	46%	27%	10%	100%	(268)

to the working class areas of the city, however, since most of the high school mothers from college homes live in middle-class areas of the city, and their preference for the control teacher is not appreciably higher than the preferences of their counterparts in the other settings. We are at a loss to explain this contextual difference except to suggest that it might reflect some of the special hazards and fears connected with raising children in working class urban areas.

A second contextual effect is the persistence of the lower preference for the discovery-oriented teacher among mothers with high school children in the working-class communities. This is accompanied by a higher preference for the content teacher. Thus it would appear that both of the contextual effects reflect higher authoritarianism on the part of working class mothers.

In spite of the fact that education accounts for much of the variance in mothers' preferences, this finding should not be allowed to obscure the fact that the demonstrated differences among the preferences of mothers in various school attendance areas are the social reality with which the schools must contend. Educational attainment in the home is very highly related to mothers' preferences, but the significance of the high relationship between educational level of parents and school attendance areas is that individual schools will tend to have constituencies of mothers who hold more homogeneous sets of expectations than would otherwise be the case.

However, accounting for some of the reasons why normative climates of constituencies of mothers vary is but one of our tasks. Let us now see whether mothers believe teachers conform to their role expectations,

and whether the belief that they do not is related to measures of role strain.

Mothers' Descriptions of Teachers

Descriptions of their childrens' teachers among the four teaching styles do not vary nearly as much from one school setting to another as the mothers' preferences. In addition, the descriptions of teachers selected by mothers do not repeat the general patterns by community that we have just discussed. By way of example, we find that the proportion of working-class mothers in the city elementary school areas describing their teachers as control-oriented is almost exactly the same as the proportions of mothers choosing this description in the remaining working class areas and in the middle-class communities (Table 4.5). In addition, we find that the middle-class area mothers are no more likely to describe their teachers as discovery-oriented than the mothers in the other settings.

It is especially interesting that no single description receives a majority of the mothers' choices. On the basis of this limited information we might suspect that mothers are choosing the teacher descriptions quite arbitrarily. However, there is evidence to suggest that this is not always the case. First we find that mothers of the high school children are far more hesitant to describe their childrens' English teachers than the elementary school mothers are to describe their childrens' classroom teachers. Just 6 per cent and 8 per cent of the first and fifth grade mothers fail to choose among the four types, but 27 per cent of the mothers of tenth graders are unable to choose. However, these same high school mothers show no hesitancy to express a preference from among the four types.

Table 4.5

Mothers' Descriptions of Their Childrens' Teachers
by School Level and Socioeconomic Classification
of Attendance Area

Elementary School

School Setting	Mother Describes Child's Teacher as: Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
City (Working-Class)	31%	33%	20%	16%	100%	(223)
Other Working-Class	29	23	34	14	100%	(236)
Middle-Class	29	32	29	10	100%	(349)
Rural Village	12	43	28	16	100%	(74)
Total	28%	31%	28%	13%	100%	(882)

High School

School Setting	Mother Describes Child's Teacher as: Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
City (Mixed SES)	17%	33%	39%	11%	100%	(94)
Working-Class	15	47	28	10	100%	(89)
Middle-Class	15	41	35	8	100%	(97)
Rural Village	15	39	33	12	100%	(33)
Total	16%	40%	34%	10%	100%	(313)

It makes sense that mothers of the high school students should be more reluctant to describe the English teachers in light of the fact that their children have several teachers, none of whom may be very familiar to them. The likelihood of elementary school mothers being able to describe their childrens' teachers is enhanced by the fact that each child has but one classroom teacher, and by the fact that the amount of contact between mothers and the schools is generally higher at the elementary school level. (These issues will be dealt with systematically

in the following section on observability.) Furthermore, when we separate the constituencies of mothers into 67 classroom units, so that each group of mothers is describing the same teacher, we find that there is often considerable consensus in describing particular teachers. (In 23 of the groups, 50% or more of the mothers describe the teachers as the same type, and in an additional 27 groups more than 40% of the mothers are agreed in their descriptions.) Therefore, while we do not know the specific types of evidence on which mothers base their descriptions of the teachers, it appears that mothers who can be expected to have less evidence are less likely to attempt a description; and mothers who offer descriptions are often in agreement in describing specific teachers.

Overall, 59% of the mothers who describe teachers believe that the teacher is the type they most prefer. It will be recalled that 71% of the mothers believe that the school is the type they most prefer (Table 4.5). The somewhat larger percentage who believe their child's teacher is not the type they most prefer tends to substantiate our claim that disputes over instrumental means are more common than disputes over terminal goals, but we have yet to see whether this belief produces measurable strain in the system. First let us see whether mothers with certain teaching style preferences more often believe the teacher is the type they prefer.

Curiously, a slight majority of mothers with each of the teaching style preferences believes that their own child has a teacher who is best described by their preference. It will be recalled that a large majority of the mothers with a preference for the intellectual school

believes that the school is best described as intellectual, but majorities of the mothers with the other three preferences think that the school is some type other than the one they prefer. Thus the relationships among mothers' specific teaching style preferences and descriptions are radically different from the relationships among the specific school goal preferences and descriptions.

Table 4.6

Mothers' Teaching Style Preferences by Descriptions of Their Childrens' Teachers

	Mother Describes Teacher as:					
Mother Prefers:	Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
Control	59%	18%	12%	11%	100%	(239)
Content	16	59	16	9	100%	(447)
Discovery	15	19	61	5	100%	(382)
Sympathy	19	15	14	52	100%	(121)
Total	25%	33%	30%	12%	100%	(1189)

Although majorities of the mothers with each teaching style preference believe their children have teachers who conform to their preferences, perceived deviance from some preferences is more strongly related to satisfaction with the teacher than perceived deviance from others. As a measure of satisfaction with the teacher's performance, we have employed the following question:

> Are there any things that you think it is important for (teacher's name) to be doing differently than he (she) is in order to help (child's name) get the most out of school?

Table 4.7 shows that mothers who perceive the teacher as deviating from their expectations much more often desire some modification in the

Table 4.7

Mothers' Dissatisfaction with Teachers, According to Mothers' Perception of Conformity to Preferred Styles of Teaching

Mothers' Preferred Teaching Style:	Per Cent of Mothers Saying Teachers Should Do Something Different When: Description of Teacher: Agrees	Disagrees	Difference
Control	16% (141)	29% (96)	+13%
Content	16% (257)	40% (172)	+24%
Discovery	14% (231)	47% (144)	+33%
Sympathy	13% (62)	35% (57)	+22%
Totals	15% (691)	39% (469)	

teacher's behavior. Only 15 per cent of those who perceive conformity express the desire for different behavior, contrasted with 39 per cent of those who perceive deviance.

Perceived deviance from two of the four styles is especially highly related to dissatisfaction. These styles are the two subject matter oriented styles: content and discovery. These are also the two patterns of teaching that are most commonly preferred at all grade levels. Thus while schools are especially constrained by the maternal expectation that they emphasize intellectual goals, teachers are especially constrained by the maternal expectation that they practice subject matter oriented styles of teaching. The belief that the schools are not emphasizing intellectual goals is especially highly related to

dissatisfaction with the schools, and the belief that teachers are not properly stressing subject matter is especially strongly related to dissatisfaction with the teacher. Hence both the school and the teacher must contend primarily with cognitive-intellective orientations of mothers; as a result, the critics of education who claim that either the schools or teachers are not sufficiently oriented toward the intellectual or cognitive development of the children are guaranteed a larger concerned audience than critics with different claims. Furthermore, since both the intellectual goal orientation and the subject matter teaching style preferences are most prevalent among the more highly educated, educators can be expected to encounter increasing concern among parents for the cognitive intellectual aspects of education as educational levels rise in our society.

Let us now see whether teachers describe themselves as conforming to the styles of teaching that are most frequently preferred by the mothers of their students, and whether the teachers accurately perceive the mothers' preferences.

Teachers Self-Descriptions and Their Perceptions of Mothers' Preferences

We have just seen that mothers who believe that teachers are not teaching the way they would like them to teach are much more often dissatisfied with teachers. Apparently there is much room for dissatisfaction. There is considerable discrepancy between the teachers' self descriptions and the teaching styles preferred by mothers. For example, as seen in Table 4.8, only 30% of the elementary school mothers prefer the discovery-oriented style, but 56% of the teachers claim that this

Table 4.8

Mothers' Preferred Styles of Teaching and Descriptions of Their Childrens' Teachers Compared with Teachers' Self Descriptions and Perceptions of the Mothers' Preferences

Elementary School

	Teaching Style:					
Mothers:	Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
Prefer	24%	35%	30%	11%	100%	(947)
Describe Teachers	28	31	28	13	100%	(882)
Teachers:						
Self Descriptions	20%	18%	56%	6%	100%	(175)
Think Mothers Prefer	32	37	18	13	100%	(161)

High School

	Teaching Style:					
Mothers:	Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
Prefer	13%	43%	36%	8%	100%	(424)
Describe Teachers	16	40	34	10	100%	(313)
Teachers:						
Self Descriptions	10%	16%	72%	2%	100%	(104)
Think Mothers Prefer	31	40	20	9	100%	(97)

is the style that best describes them. The discrepancy is even larger at the high school level where the proportions are 36% and 72% respectively.

Teachers also diverge widely from mothers' expectations in the category of content-oriented teaching. At the elementary school level, 35% of the mothers prefer this style, but only 18% of the teachers

describe themselves in this fashion; and the proportions are 43% and 16% respectively at the high school level. In short, mothers most often prefer the content-oriented style, while teachers tend to espouse the discovery-oriented style; and higher intra-status agreement among both mothers and teachers at the high school level means higher inter-status disagreement. Furthermore, the specific styles preferred confirm the critics of public education who claim that parents want more attention devoted to the basic content of courses while school personnel favor a more permissive intellectual approach stressing "independent discovery." However, it should be pointed out that while mothers do not have a majority preference among the four styles at either school level, a majority of teachers chooses the discovery description at both levels.

It can also be seen in Table 4.8 that teachers' perceptions of the mothers' preferences are somewhat closer to the actual preferences of the mothers than are the teachers' self-descriptions, suggesting that teachers are often aware of the fact they do not agree with the mothers. However, the teachers underestimate the mothers' preference for the discovery style by 12 per cent at the elementary level and by 16 per cent at the high school level, and they overestimate the mothers' preference for the control style by 8 per cent and 18 per cent at the two respective levels. Thus the teachers perceive the mothers to be more authoritarian and less subject matter oriented than the mothers' preferences would indicate.

As noted above, the major difference between the self descriptions of the elementary and high school teachers is the higher proportion of the latter selecting the discovery style. However, the teachers'

perceptions of the mothers' preferences are virtually identical at the two school levels. This suggests that perhaps the social context is highly related to the teachers' perceptions of the mothers' teaching style preferences as was found with the school goals (Table 3.13). However, this is not the case. With one interesting exception, neither the teachers' self descriptions nor their perceptions of the mothers' preferences vary appreciably from one school attendance area to another. Indeed, majorities of the teachers describe themselves as discovery-oriented in 9 of the 11 elementary schools and in all eight high schools; and content-orientation is the style that is modally perceived as the mothers' preference in all settings except the working-class areas of the city. In these latter areas 46 per cent of the teachers indicate they think the mothers want a control-oriented teacher. Since this is the actual modal preference of the mothers in these areas, and in these areas only, the teachers are correct in perceiving the manner in which the mothers' preferences in these areas differ from preferences in other areas.

The obvious differences between the teachers' self descriptions and the teachers' perceptions of the mothers' preferences, hint that teachers do not usually think they are conforming to the desires of their students' mothers. This is confirmed by Table 4.9. Here we find that just 41 per cent of the teachers believe that they conform to the style preferred by the majority of their students' mothers. However, majorities of the teachers who describe themselves as the two authoritarian styles (control and content) believe they are conforming to the mothers' wishes, while minorities of those describing themselves as more child-centered

(discovery and sympathy) hold this belief. (It will be recalled that a majority of mothers believes the teacher is the type they prefer regardless of preference. See Table 4.6.)

We have seen earlier that a majority of the teachers find their jobs to be very rewarding. But now we find that a majority of teachers believe they are not conforming to the style of teaching mothers prefer. Let us now see how these two findings are related.

Table 4.9

Teachers' Self Descriptions by Their Perceptions of Styles Preferred by the Mothers of Their Students

Teachers' Self Descriptions	Teachers Think Mothers Prefer: Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
Control	68%	16%	2%	14%	100%	(43)
Content	16	69	11	4	100%	(45)
Discovery	27	35	27	11	100%	(158)
Sympathy	25	33	9	33	100%	(12)

Further evidence for the assertion that the role teachers assign to mothers regarding their teaching style preferences is quite different than the one they assign mothers regarding the goals of education can be found in Table 4.10. Teachers who believe they are not conforming to the preferences of the mothers report their jobs as more rewarding than those who believe they are conforming. This is just the reverse of the situation that was found regarding the goals of education (Table 3.10). The fact that teachers' job rewards are positively related to the belief that they agree with mothers on school goals and

Table 4.10

Job Satisfaction of Teachers According to Perceived Agreement Between Mothers' Preferences and Teachers' Own Role Definitions

	Teachers Report Job Is:		
Teachers Perceive	Very Rewarding	Less Rewarding	(N)
Agreement	58%	42%	(106)
Disagreement	68	32	(137)

negatively related to the belief that they agree with mothers on teaching styles can serve as partial confirmation for our earlier assertion that educators are more willing to allow parents to help determine the goals of education than to let them help determine the means by which these are to be achieved.

This difference becomes even more pronounced when we introduce the teachers' perceptions of their principals' preferences. In Table 4.11 we find that teachers' job rewards are positively related to the belief that they are the type of teacher their principal most prefers. And when teachers' perceptions of the preferences of both their principals and the mothers are taken into consideration simultaneously, both relationships are increased somewhat. As shown in Table 4.12, 74 per cent of the teachers report their jobs as "very rewarding" when they believe they are the type of teacher their principal most prefers and not the type preferred by the mothers, and just 41 per cent report their jobs as "very rewarding" when they believe they are the type of teacher preferred by the mothers but not by their principals.

Table 4.11

Job Satisfaction of Teachers According to Perceived Agreement Between Principals' Preferences and Teachers' Own Role Definitions

	Teachers Report Job Is:		
Teachers Perceive	Very Rewarding	Less Rewarding	(N)
Agreement	69%	31%	(151)
Disagreement	55	45	(101)

Table 4.12

Per Cent of Teachers Reporting Their Jobs "Very Rewarding" According to Perceived Agrement Among Mothers' and Principals' Preferences and Teachers' Own Role Definitions

Teachers Perceive Their Role and Mothers' Preferences:	Teachers Perceive Their Role and Principals' Preferences: Agree	Disagree	Difference Agreement with Principals
Agree	63% (72)	41% (27)	+22%
Disagree	74% (77)	61% (69)	+13%
Difference Agreement with Mothers	-11%	-20%	

The difference between teachers' perceived agreement with mothers and principals on educational goals and roles is further substantiated when we view the job rewards of teachers under varying conditions of perceived agreement with these role partners on the goals of education. In Table 4.13 it can be seen that perceived agreement with both mothers and principals on the goals of education are positively related to the job rewards reported by the teachers. Thus 76 per cent of the teachers

say their jobs are "very rewarding" when they believe they are in agreement with both their principal and the mothers, and just 44 per cent say the job is "very rewarding" when they perceive disagreement with both role partners. But agreement with mothers is slightly more important than agreement with the principal.

Table 4.13

Per Cent of Teachers Reporting Their Jobs "Very Rewarding" According to Perceived Agreement Among Mothers' and Principals' Preferences and Teachers' Own School Goals

Teachers Their Goals Preference and Mothers':	Teachers Perceive Their Goal Preference and Principals' Preference: Agree	Disagree	Difference Agreement with Principals
Agree	76% (50)	66% (53)	+10%
	60% (57)	44% (61)	+16%
Difference Agreement with Mothers	+16%	+22%	

The contrasting relationships in Tables 4.12 and 4.13 are intriguing for a number of reasons. First, for the reason we have cited, as evidence for the assertion that teachers are more willing to allow parents a role in determining the goals of education than in determining how teaching should be done. The norm of local autonomy in American education would seem to provide the general basis for the former; but the latter, and especially the fact that teachers report higher job rewards when they think they disagree with mothers, suggests that professional expertise and autonomy are at issue when teaching roles are under consideration.

Expertise and autonomy may well be the two most important dimensions of teaching considered as a profession.[11] Compared with other professions, school teachers can lay little claim to having special knowledge about the subject matter that they teach. This becomes increasingly true as educational levels rise in the United States; and it is expertise, the claim that they have specialized knowledge not shared by the layman, that especially legitimates the autonomy afforded other professions. But the low intellectual level of substantive materials taught in most classrooms and the high educational attainment of adult Americans preclude most teachers laying claim to subject matter expertise. As a consequence, the American educators' strong emphasis on pedagogy and teaching methods courses has served to fill this gap. The special knowledge that teachers have been forced to claim is knowledge of <u>how</u> to teach. Thus the belief that they are <u>not</u> the style of teacher that mothers prefer can serve to reinforce the teachers' belief that they have expert knowledge about <u>how</u> to teach that is not shared by mothers. Moreover, it is important to teachers that they <u>share</u> role definitions with their fellow educators, the principals under whom they serve.

In sum, integration of the social system with which we have been concerned is dependent on the teachers' believing they share educational <u>goals</u> with both mothers and principals. However, somewhat more role strain is reported by teachers perceiving disagreement with mothers than from those perceiving disagreement with the principal. In contrast, teachers appear to regard teaching styles as a <u>professional</u> matter, and role strain is higher when teachers perceive agreement with mothers, but lower when they perceive agreement with their principals.

Students' Teaching Style Preferences and Descriptions of Their Teachers

The differences between the role expectations of teachers and mothers are obviously too large to be merely a result of background characteristics. The consistent differences between the preferences of elementary and high school teachers and between elementary and high school mothers have demonstrated that location within the social system is also an important determinant of their role expectations. In addition, the high consensus among teachers for the discovery-oriented style of teaching suggests that degree of involvement in the educational subsystem may be related to specific preferences. When we examine teaching preferences of the students, the only respondents who are full-fledged members of both the family and the school subsystems, the importance of degree of involvement in the educational subsystem is clearly revealed.

As shown in Table 4.14, students stand midway between their mothers and their teachers in the teaching style they prefer. Students are unlike their mothers in that a majority prefer the discovery teacher in every high school except one, Nouveau Heights; and the discovery style is the modal preference (45%) in Nouveau Heights. However, there is considerable variance in the descriptions that students assign to the individual teachers. Nevertheless, the discovery style is the modal description employed (45%), and a slight majority of the students (54%) believe their teacher is the type they most prefer. As Table 4.15 shows, this belief is most prevalent among the majority who prefer the discovery style (61%) and least prevalent among the small group who prefer the sympathy style (35%).

Table 4.14

High School Teaching Styles Preferred by Mothers, Students, and Principals Compared With Self Descriptions of High School Teachers

	Teaching Style					
	Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
Mothers Prefer	13%	43	36	8	100%	(424)
Students Prefer	7%	22	56	15	100%	(507)
Teachers' Self Descriptions	10%	16	72	2	100%	(104)
Principals Prefer	--	(14%)	(86%)	--	100%	(7)

In order to determine whether role strain is experienced by students who believe their teacher is not the type they most prefer, we have employed the following question:

How about (English Teacher) -- would you say you like him (her):

Very much,
Somewhat
Not so much, or
Not at all?

We have run the risk of contamination in using students' affective evaluation of the teacher as our measure of role strain in conjunction with students' perceptions of the correspondence between the best description of teachers and the types they most prefer. However, students are apparently able to make rather fine discriminations where teachers are concerned. The relationship between these variables is very strong, but there is a sizable minority of students who like their teachers very much even though they think the teachers do not represent the style they most prefer, and a sizable minority who do not like their teachers very much even though they perceive them as the style they most prefer.

Furthermore, affective response of students to their teachers varies considerably by specific preference.

Table 4.15

Students' Teaching Style Preferences by Descriptions of Their Teachers

	Student Describes Teacher as:					
Student Prefers:	Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
Control	43%	34	11	11	100%	(35)
Content	14%	54	25	7	100%	(110)
Discovery	15%	21	61	3	100%	(280)
Sympathy	14%	18	33	35	100%	(77)
Totals	16%	29%	45%	10%		(502)

By way of illustration, in Table 4.16 we find that the students who like their teachers the most are the small group perceiving conformity and preferring the control teacher. They are followed closely by the small group preferring the sympathy style and perceiving conformity. Next comes the modal group of students who prefer discovery oriented teachers while perceiving conformity: and finally, the students who prefer the content style and perceive conformity. The fact that the students who like their teachers most are more prevalent in the two groups preferring the non-subject matter orientations suggests that affective response to the teacher may be less of a factor when students are more oriented toward cognitive-intellective aspects of the teacher and more important when they are oriented toward teachers as mother surrogates. However, when we examine the affective evaluations of teachers when the

Table 4.16

Students' Affective Evaluations of Their Teachers by Perceived Conformity with Preferred Styles of Teaching

Students Prefer	% Liking English Teacher "Very Much" When Students' Descriptions: Agree	Disagree	Difference
Control	87% (15)	45% (20)	- 42%
Content	59% (59)	47% (51)	- 12%
Discovery	69% (170)	25% (110)	- 44%
Sympathy	82% (27)	38% (50)	- 44%
Totals	69% (271)	34% (231)	- 35%

students perceive non-conformity (the second column of Table 4.16) this hypothesis is only borne out for students preferring the discovery style. Indeed, the most striking feature of Table 4.16 is the fact that the proportion of students saying they like their teachers very much is reduced markedly for students perceiving non-conformity unless their preference is for the content teacher. Apparently students who prefer the content style of teachers are disturbed very little when they have teachers they perceive as another type. This raises the question of whether teachers run a greater risk of being disliked by students when they are perceived as one type rather than another.

In order to answer this question, in Table 4.17 we have related students' affective evaluations of their teachers to their descriptions

Table 4.17

Students' Affective Evaluations of Their Teachers by Description of Teachers and Whether Described Type Is the One Most Preferred

Students Describe Teachers as:	Per Cent of Students Who Like Their Teacher "Very Much" When: Students' Preferences		
	Agree	Disagree	Difference
Control	87% (15)	21% (68)	- 66%
Content	59% (59)	26% (86)	- 33%
Discovery	69% (170)	57% (56)	- 12%
Sympathy	82% (27)	52% (21)	- 30%

of the teachers, and controlled for whether the students' preferences agree. (The first column of Table 4.17 is identical with the first column of Table 4.16, but it is the second column that is of special interest.) It is clear from comparison of the numbers on which percentages are based in the first and the second columns of Table 4.17 that the two authoritarian styles of teaching, control and content, are used more frequently by students to describe teachers whom they do not like very much. If a teacher is described as one of these two styles, it is likely that he is not the type the students describing him prefer and that students do not like him very much. However, if a teacher is described as discovery- or sympathy-oriented, it is likely that he is also the type students describing him prefer and that they like him very much.

To summarize, it appears that teachers and principals usually share an educational philosophy that maintains teaching should be done in a manner that stresses "independent discovery" on the part of the students. This style can be characterized as "permissive intellectualism." Whether this style is merely a reflection of a current educational fad or a functional requirement of American education cannot be determined from our data. However, it is evident that mothers tend to espouse a more "authoritarian intellectualism," as exemplified by the content-oriented style of teaching, and thus the high consensus among educators must have its origins within the professional experience and training that educators undergo. Students, sharing membership in both the school and the family, also express a majority preference for the discovery style. This could be either a reflection of their emerging generational values or a result of socialization that occurs within the school. Whatever the origin, the result is that teachers are in a situation where they usually agree with all their major role partners within the school setting on the general style of teaching that is desirable.

Let us now see whether mothers or students describe their individual teachers in the same terms as their teachers.

Observability of Teachers' Roles

If mothers are unaware of the extent to which the role-definitions and associated behaviors of teachers deviate from their expectations, they will not be motivated to criticize teachers, regardless of the extent of deviation. Thus, mothers' low observability of teachers' behavior can obviate the role-strain occasioned by incompatibility between expectations inside and outside of the school by reducing the

likelihood that outsiders will be aware of incompatabilities. The first question, then, concerns the extent to which educational organizations are characterized by low visibility of the members' roles to outsiders.

When we asked the mothers to designate the style of teaching that best described the teacher of their child, 12 per cent said they did not know. Among those who answered the question, only 32 per cent described the teacher in the same way that the teacher described himself. This represents only 28 per cent of the total mothers.

Table 4.18 shows that there is but a slight relationship between the styles imputed to the teachers and the styles claimed by the teachers themselves. Mothers whose perceptions are most inaccurate have teachers who regard themselves as sympathy-oriented -- only 15 per cent of the mothers with such teachers described them in this way. If there is even a moderate relationship between teachers' self-reports and their classroom behavior, then the magnitude of the discrepancy between mothers' perceptions and teachers' own role-definitions would suggest that mothers are generally ignorant of teachers' behavior.

But since we do not have a measure of the teachers' classroom behavior which would serve to confirm their self-descriptions, we cannot be certain that the discrepancy between mothers' and teachers' reports is entirely due to misperception on the part of mothers. It is very likely that certain teachers described themselves wholly according to their preferred self-image, rather than according to their dominant behavior pattern. While it is quite important to observe the large gap between mothers' beliefs about teachers and teachers' beliefs

Table 4.18

Mothers' Perceptions of Teaching Styles, According to Teachers' Own Role-Definitions

Mothers' Descriptions of Teachers' Styles	Teachers' Own Role-Definitions (Self-Descriptions)			
	Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy
Control	31%	23%	24%	21%
Content	37	36	32	23
Discovery	22	24	32	41
Sympathy	10	17	12	15
	100%	100%	100%	100%
N Mothers	(261)	(165)	(688)	(47)

about themselves, we need to bear in mind that this discrepancy may be partly a consequence of the teachers' inaccurate self-descriptions. To the extent that teachers were dishonest with themselves or with the interviewer, we are unable to attribute disagreement between mothers and teachers solely to low observability of mothers. If on the other hand the discrepancy were entirely due to the inaccuracy of teachers' reports, then we should find that students disagree with teachers as often as mothers do.

Unlike mothers, students are able to observe teachers directly; we would therefore expect their perceptions to be more accurate than mothers' perceptions. It would of course be a mistake to assume that students' perceptions are wholly accurate -- for reasons of immaturity of judgment and affective involvement in the student-teacher relationship. But we would nevertheless expect them to be better informants than mothers, who almost never have the opportunity to watch teachers

perform in the classroom. Thus, if agreement between student and teacher with respect to teaching styles is greater than agreement between mother and teacher, we would be able to conclude that some part of the disagreement between mothers and teachers is attributable to low observability of the teachers' performance in the classroom. (Since only tenth grade students were included in our study, the following analysis is restricted to the tenth grade level.)

Students' perceptions of teachers are substantially more reliable than mothers' perceptions. Twenty-seven per cent of the tenth grade mothers felt unable to describe their child's teacher, while only 1 per cent of the students felt this way. Quite obviously, the students much more often felt qualified to describe their teacher. Further, those mothers who felt qualified to answer the question less often agreed with the teachers' self-reports than the students did. Thirty-six per cent of the tenth grade mothers who answered the question concerning teaching styles described the teacher in the way that he described himself, compared with 45 per cent of the students. The difference is not very large, however, until we take into account the sizable minority of mothers who were unable to describe the teacher at all. Considering these mothers as well, we conclude that only 24 per cent of all tenth grade mothers agreed with the teachers' self-reports, compared with 44 per cent of all tenth grade students. In short, the greater agreement between students and teachers than between mothers and teachers testifies to the role of observability in affecting the knowledge that mothers have of teachers' classroom performance. Although it is likely that some teachers responded normatively rather than

factually to the question concerning their style of teaching, the lack of agreement between teachers' and mothers' reports is by no means sheerly a product of the teachers' false reports.

Educational Attainment and Role Consensus Among Teachers, Mothers and Students

We have seen that mothers' preferences for styles of teaching are strongly related to the education of mothers and of their husbands. More specifically, we have seen that mothers from homes where educational attainment includes some college choose the discovery-oriented style of teaching more frequently. Since this is the style that the vast majority of teachers use to describe themselves, we would expect that mothers from homes with higher educational attainment would more often agree with the teachers' self-reports, and more often have teachers who conform to their preferences. We shall present data to confirm these expectations below. However, let us first determine whether the students' choices among the teaching styles are also affected by the educational attainment in the home, so that they too can be included in the discussion.

As Table 4.19 indicates, there is considerable difference between the teaching styles preferred by high school students from homes where either parent has attended college and those from lower educational backgrounds. (X^2 significant at .001 level.) Like their mothers, students favor the discovery style more when educational level is higher. Unlike their mothers, students from lower educational backgrounds are no more likely to choose the two authoritarian styles. Instead, they turn to the sympathy style, and a slight majority still

Table 4.19

Students' Teaching Style Preference by Educational Attainment of Their Parents

	Style Preferred Is:				
Parents' Education:	Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy	(N)
Some College	27%	24%	64%	5%	100% (154)
No College	7	21	53	19	100% (264)

favor the discovery style. Nevertheless, the difference in the proportions selecting the discovery style is large enough to raise the possibility that both mothers and students from homes with higher educational attainment are more often in agreement with the teachers and with one another.

It can be seen in Table 4.20 that educational attainment is related to the preferences and descriptions of mothers and students in such a way that the self description of the teacher is more often identical with each when educational attainment is high. Both mothers and students from homes with some college are especially more likely to have teachers who conform to their preference. In addition, the pairs of mothers and their children are far more likely to agree with one another on preferred styles when education is higher. This is most likely a direct result of the higher preference for the discovery style among mothers and students in the higher educational group. Thus one of the unforeseen consequences of higher educational attainment in the home is the much greater likelihood that mothers, their children, and their teachers will share normative consensus with regard to the teachers' role behavior. This might be expected to facilitate integration of school

Table 4.20

Agreement Among Mothers' and Students' Teaching Style Preferences and Descriptions of Teachers, and Teachers' Self Descriptions by Educational Attainment of Mothers and Their Husbands

	Per Cent Agreement When Educational Attainment Is: Some College	No College	Difference	X^2 Significance Level
Mothers' Preference and Teachers' Self Descriptions (Actual Conformity)	40% (476)	28% (852)	- 12%	.001
Mothers' Descriptions and Teachers' Self Descriptions (Accurate Perception)	36% (416)	30% (742)	- 6%	.05
Mothers' Preferences and Mothers' Descriptions (Perceived Conformity)	59% (432)	59% (754)	--	--
Mothers' Preference and Students' Preferences (Normative Consensus)	49% (153)	32% (263)	- 17%	.001
Mothers' and Students' Descriptions (Descriptive Consensus)	42% (116)	36% (188)	- 6%	--
Students' Preferences and Teachers' Self Descriptions (Actual Conformity)	61% (135)	41% (244)	- 20%	.001
Students' Descriptions and Teachers' Self Descriptions (Accurate Perception)	53% (133)	41% (242)	- 12%	.05
Students' Preferences and Teachers' Self Descriptions (Perceived Conformity)	59% (152)	53% (262)	- 6%	--

[a]In this table specific role partners have been matched. Thus 40% of the mothers from college homes have teachers for their children whose self descriptions match the individual mothers' preferences, or 49% of the pairs of mothers and their high school children express the same teaching style preference, etc.

and community in settings where parental educational attainment is especially high. However, the relationship between the descriptions of mothers and students and the self descriptions of the teachers, although statistically significant, are not nearly as strong as the relationships between the teachers' self descriptions and the mothers' and students' preferences. In addition, educational attainment is not related to either the mothers' or the students' perceptions that their teacher is the style they prefer. Stated another way, actual conformity of teachers to the preferences of mothers and students is strongly and positively related to educational attainment in the constituents' homes. But neither mothers nor students from homes where educational levels are higher perceive that their teachers are more often conforming to their personal preferences. Therefore, if perceived conformity is more important than actual conformity, we would expect role strain to be about equally distributed among the educational groups.

Ability Grouping and Preferences and Descriptions of Teaching Styles

We have just seen that some of the relationships among perceptions and descriptions of mothers, teachers, and students are found to vary systematically according to the educational attainment of the students' mothers and fathers. However, we remind the reader that these relationships are mainly significant as determinants of the modal characteristics of constituencies that particular schools and teachers encounter. The educational level of adults in a school area will tend to establish the general normative orientation of the mothers and students with whom the school and its teachers interact. However, in assigning high school

students to classrooms on the basis of ability or performance, the school structure becomes a better predictor of the teaching style preferences and descriptions of mothers and students than educational background.

In Table 4.21 it can be seen that the differences between the preferences of mothers and students associated with the two general track or ability group designations differ in much the same manner as is found when educational differences are employed. But the differences are much larger between the tracking groups than between the educational groups; all differences in Table 4.21 are significant beyond the .001 level of significance. Both students and mothers associated with the faster tracks prefer the discovery oriented teaching style far more frequently. But only minorities of students prefer the two authoritarian styles (control and content) in either track, while majorities of mothers prefer these styles. Students in both tracks describe their teachers as considerably more authoritarian than they prefer, and this is especially true for those in the slower tracks.

Given these pronounced differences, we expect that differences in the relationships among the perceptions and descriptions of the various role partners will be even more striking when track is held constant than is found when educational level is held constant.

When Table 4.22 is compared with Table 4.20, it is evident that, with one interesting exception, the track to which the students are assigned is more strongly related to agreement with role partners on perceptions and descriptions of teachers than is educational attainment in the home. Differences in the conformity of teachers to the

Table 4.21

Teaching Style Preferences and Descriptions of Teachers by Mothers and Students According to Track of Students

	Track of Child Is:	Teaching Style: Control	Content	Discovery	Sympathy		(N)
Mothers Prefer	High	6%	45%	45%	4%	100%	(239)
	Low	21	41	25	13	100%	(187)
Mothers Describe Teachers as:	High	9	43	41	7	100%	(186)
	Low	26	37	23	14	100%	(125)
Students Prefer	High	2	23	68	7	100%	(272)
	Low	12	20	43	25	100%	(235)
Students Describe	High	12	24	56	7	100%	(269)
	Low	22	34	32	12	100%	(233)

preferences of mothers and students in the two tracks are significant beyond the .001 level in both tables, but the percentage differences are markedly larger in Table 4.22. Similarly, accuracy of perception by mothers, and mothers' perception of conformity are 14 per cent higher in the faster track. However, it is among the students that the differences between the two tracks are largest. Differences in actual conformity, accuracy of perception and perceived conformity are each significant beyond the .001 level.

It is tempting to speculate that the much stronger relationships associated with the ability groupings are a result of socialization and a special contextual effect found within the schools. Of course,

Table 4.22

Agreement Among Mothers' and Students' Teaching Style Preferences and Descriptions of Teachers, and Teachers' Self Descriptions by Track of Student

	Per Cent Agreement When Student's Track Is:			X^2 Significance Level
	Fast	Slow	Difference	
Mothers' Preferences and Teachers Self Descriptions (Actual Conformity)	43% (199)	26% (287)	- 17%	.001
Mothers' Descriptions and Teachers' Self Descriptions (Accurate Perception)	44% (154)	28% (125)	- 16%	.01
Mothers' Preferences and Mothers' Descriptions (Perceived Conformity)	68% (185)	54% (125)	- 14%	.01
Mothers' Preferences and Students' Preferences (Normative Consensus	44% (235)	30% (183)	- 14%	.01
Mothers' Descriptions and Students' Descriptions (Descriptive Consensus)	43% (183)	32% (122)	- 11%	--
Students' Preferences and Teachers' Self Descriptions (Actual Conformity)	64% (225)	29% (235)	- 35%	.001
Students' Descriptions and Teachers' Self Descriptions (Accurate Perception)	57% (222)	32% (232)	- 25%	.001
Students' Preferences and Students' Descriptions (Perceived Conformity)	61% (269)	46% (233)	- 15%	.001

it is also possible that the schools engage in selective recruitment when assigning students to the two groups, that students with a preference for discovery-oriented teaching are sought for the faster track. However, several facts indicate that some socialization has taken place. First is the fact that students show much larger differences between tracks than do their mothers. Also to the extent that students share background characteristics with their parents and background characteristics tend to determine teaching style preferences, differences between Tables 4.20 and 4.22 should be similar for both mothers and students; but this is not the case. However, most provocative is the one exception to the generally stronger relationships in Table 4.22. In Table 4.20 we find that the normative consensus on teaching styles between mothers and their children is more strongly related to education than it is related to track in Table 4.22. To be sure, the relationship is still significant at the .01 level when track is used; but the reduction of this relationship contrasts sharply with the increase for all other relationships. It suggests that students as participants within the school are being socialized into holding different views from their mothers while coming to share more views with their teachers regarding teaching styles.

Perhaps most significant for schools are the strong relationships between track and perceived conformity of teachers among both mothers and students. We found in the previous section that perceived consensus on school goals was more relevant to system integration than actual conesnsus, in that the former was more strongly related to role strain among teachers than the latter. However, we also found that perceived

consensus on goals was strongly related to role strain for mothers and students, and that role strain was higher among high school others and students connected with the slower track. Let us now see whether similar relationships are associated with perceived conformity on teaching roles.

Correctness of Perceptions of Conformity and Non-Conformity

If we continue to treat the self descriptions of teachers as legitimate reports of their behavior, four types of role partners can be distinguished:

		Ego perceives:	
		Conformity	Non-Conformity
Ego's Perception Is:	Correct	I	II
	Incorrect	III	IV

The four types are exactly parallel to the four types of consensus in the previous section on school goals, except that behavior, rather than belief, is the criterion for conformity. If we were to treat the teachers' self descriptions as their own preferences, which is perhaps a more accurate interpretation, then consensus might conceivably be substituted for conformity in the chart. However, since all role partners were asked specifically about teachers' behavior we will employ the more literal interpretation.

According to this typology, each role partner may correctly or incorrectly perceive conformity and non-conformity. In Table 4.23 we compare teachers' and mothers' perceptions of one another and the students' perceptions of the teachers as they are distributed among the

Table 4.23

Proportion of Mothers, Teachers and Students Correctly and Incorrectly Perceiving Conformity and Non-Conformity of Teacher to Preferred Style

	Ego's Perception is:	Mothers	Teachers[a]	Students
I Conformity	Correct	21%	19%	31%
II Non-Conformity	Correct	30	41	31
III Conformity	Incorrect	38	21	22
IV Non-Conformity	Incorrect	11	19	16
		100%	100%	100%
		(1128)	(57)	(455)

[a]Mothers' teaching style preferences and descriptions of teachers were examined for congruence and then compared with the individual teacher's self description. The same procedure was followed for students. In the second column teachers' perceptions of "most" mothers' preferences were examined for congruence and then compared with the style actually preferred by the specific constituency of mothers. (The mode was used where there was no majority designation by the mothers. In cases where mothers chose two preferences with equal frequency, teachers were eliminated from the analysis.)

four types. The major finding that emerges from these comparisons is that mothers most frequently overestimate conformity (Type III). Teachers are most frequently correct in their assessment of non-conformity with mothers' preferences, and students are more frequently correct in perceiving conformity than either the mothers or teachers. The total proportion of correct perceptions (both conformity and non-conformity) is 51% for the mothers, 60% for the teachers, and 62% for the students. Because teachers were not asked for their perceptions of students' preferences, it is not possible to determine whether teachers are more often correct perceivers than students in their mutual

role relations. However, the teachers are more frequently correct than the mothers in their mutual assessments. In addition, students are more accurate judges of teachers' behavior than their mothers, and this is probably largely a result of their higher observability.

But we are more interested in the possible consequences of actual and perceived conformity and non-conformity for the various role partners than in their comparative distributions among the mothers, teachers and students. Unfortunately, the number of core teachers whose students and related mothers were interviewed is not large enough to allow further analysis among the four types. The relationships among the four types of situations and role strain are presented for mothers and students in Tables 4.24 and 4.25.

We find in Tables 4.24 and 4.25 that perceived conformity of teachers by both mothers and students is very strongly related to role strain (X^2 test beyond .001 level of significance). But to the extent that they are related at all, actual conformity by teachers to the preferences of mothers and students is negatively related to role strain among the mothers and students. Only 15% of the mothers indicate they would like the teacher to do something differently when they perceive conformity, and whether the teachers' self descriptions indicate that the conformity is actual or merely perceived does not produce any change in this proportion. However, students who incorrectly perceive conformity on the part of the teachers are somewhat more inclined to say they like their teachers "very much" than those with accurate perceptions (75% and 67% respectively).

Perhaps most interesting is the fact that both the mothers and students who incorrectly perceive conformity show the most role strain

Table 4.24

Per Cent of Mothers Indicating Teachers Should Do Something Different Under Conditions of Actual and Perceived Conformity of the Teacher With the Mothers' Teaching Style Preferences

Mothers Perceive: Their Preferences and Teachers' Behavior:	Teachers' Self Descriptions and Mothers' Preference: Agree (Actual Conformity)	Disagree (Actual Non-Conformity)	Difference Actual
Agree (Perceived Conformity)	15% (236)	15% (431)	----
Disagree (Perceived Non-Conformity)	46% (126)	37% (335)	- 9%
Difference Perceived	+31%	+22%	

Table 4.25

Per Cent of Students Saying They Like the Teacher "Very Much" According to Actual and Perceived Conformity of Teacher to Students' Preferred Style of Teaching

Students Perceive: Their Preferences and Teachers' Behavior:	Teachers' Self Descriptions and Students' Preferences: Agree (Actual Conformity)	Disagree (Actual Non-Conformity)	Difference Actual
Agree (Perceived Conformity)	67% (139)	75% (102)	+8%
Disagree (Perceived Non-Conformity)	33% (73)	38% (141)	+5%
Difference Perceived Conformity	- 34%	- 37%	

in their relationships with the teachers. What makes this finding especially intriguing is the fact that it exactly parallels the finding in the previous section that teachers experience the most role strain when they incorrectly perceive consensus with mothers on school goals (Table 3.16). In each case the individuals who are looking for trouble where it doesn't exist are the ones who report the most role strain. (We hasten to point out that in no case is the percentage difference very large, but the similarity of pattern for the three different groups of respondents is undeniable and most provocative.) In sum, it is the perception of conformity by mothers and students rather than the actual conformity of teachers to their teaching style preferences that is more relevant to the integration of the system of interaction among these three role partners.

Conclusions

In comparing the preferences of mothers among four typical teaching styles with the preferences of their children and with the self-images of their childrens' teachers, we have found a number of similarities and differences. Mothers tend to prefer a content-oriented style while a majority of teachers see themselves as discovery-oriented. In addition, just 31% of the mothers express role preferences that are in accord with the self description of their child's teacher. A higher proportion of the mothers of 10th graders than mothers of first and fifth graders were found to prefer the two subject-matter oriented styles. Large differences were also found between the preferences of mothers in different school attendance areas, with mothers in middle-class areas more often preferring the discovery-oriented style of

teacher, and mothers in working-class areas preferring the two authoritarian styles more often. These community differences were found to be largely a result of differences in educational attainment among parents in the attendance areas; however, working-class mothers in the city show a higher preference for the control style of teaching even when education is taken into account. The higher preference for the discovery style of teaching among middle class mothers was interpreted as suggesting a compatibility between the independence training stressed by middle class parents and the teaching styles advocated by teachers.

High school students were found to prefer the discovery style in a majority of cases, but not as frequently as teachers. This was interpreted as partially reflecting the socialization students undergo as a result of higher involvement in the educational structure than the mothers. In addition, students were found to be more accurate than their mothers in describing their teachers, and 46% of the students have teachers whose self descriptions match their preferences. Education of parents was shown to be positively related to students' preference for the discovery style, but track in which the student is located was found to be even more highly related to preferences. In addition, students and their mothers who are associated with the faster track were found to have higher agreement with one another and with their teachers on preferences and descriptions.

It is not clear whether the preference of teachers for the discovery-oriented style is a reflection of professional socialization or a functional requirement of the teaching role. However, the high

consensus among teachers and among their principals suggests a pervasive educational ideology.

Evidence that the instrumental means of education are potential sources of conflict was shown by the higher degree of role strain among mothers and students whose preferred and perceived teaching styles were dissimilar. Moreover perceived conformity of teachers was seen to be negatively related to role strain among mothers and students, while actual conformity was not significantly related. Hence mothers' low observability of teacher behavior frequently allows them to perceive conformity when it does not exist.

Teachers were found to experience role strain when they perceived agreement with mothers on teaching styles and disagreement with their principals. This finding was interpreted as supporting the assertion made at the beginning of this section that instrumental means will more frequently be the source of controversy between school and community than terminal goals. Our reasoning was that educators are willing to assign parents an active role in determining the goals of education, but teaching styles represent virtually the only domain of expertise that teachers can claim. Encroachment on this domain by non-educators therefore represents a threat to the professional status of teachers, which is often legitimated by the claim that they have expert knowledge.

In view of the current agitation for increased parental participation in the schools in working-class areas of cities, the especially high preference for the control-oriented teaching style among the mothers of elementary school children in such areas appears to be a potential source of parent-teacher conflict. If increased participation

results in increased awareness among mothers of their disagreement with teachers, then the likelihood of conflict should also increase unless (a) the schools are able to legitimate teacher behavior that is not in accord with parental expectations (for example, by socializing the parents in working-class areas to the rationale for discovery-oriented teaching), or (b) teachers change their role definitions in accord with the expectations held by the constituency of parents.

FOOTNOTES

1. Traditionally, educators have maintained that the purposes or terminal goals of education should be determined by the citizenry, but that professional educators should be left to decide how subject matter will be taught. Citizens have not always shared this definition of the situation judging from the controversies over methods of teaching reading, for example, and the pronouncements of popular critics of American education, such as Admiral Rickover and Martin Mayer. The limits of lay authority become especially relevant when parents participate in school activities; and in New York, much of the difficulty over decentralization proposals has been related to the question of whether parents should have the right to participate in the selection of professional school personnel.

2. See, for example, Winfield C. Scott, Clyde M. Hill, and Hobert W. Burns, The Great Debate-Our Schools in Crisis, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1959.

3. This study of parents' and teachers' opinions about the goals of education was originally prompted by precisely this concern on the part of officials in one of the State Education Departments.

4. The most extensive list of dimensions for classifying teacher behavior has been developed by Ryan as part of the Teacher Characteristic Study, Characteristics of Teachers.: American Council on Education, 1960. More sociologically oriented conceptualizations can be found in Orville Brim, Sociology and The Field of Education, Philadelphia: Russell Sage, 1958; W. W. Charters, Jr., "The Social Background of Teaching," in N. L. Gage, editor, Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago: Rank McNally & Co., 1965. Bidwell's recent restatement of Waller (W. Waller, The Sociology of Teaching, New York: Wiley, 1932) in terms of two conflicts faced by teachers, the use or non-use of affect in controlling students, and whether to emphasize nurturance or student achievement produces four types very similar to those we have used.

5. See Norman E. Wallen and Robert M. W. Travers, "Analysis and Investigation of Teaching Methods," in N. L. Gage editor, op. cit., pp. 448-505.

6. Working Town does not conform well to any of these patterns with its slight modal tendency toward the discovery style (34%).

7. For a review of research on "independence training" according to social class of parents, see Urie Bronfenbrenner, "Socialization and Social Class through Time and Space," in Maccoby, Newcomb, and Hartley, editors, Readings in Social Psychology, 3rd. ed., New York: Henry Holt, 1958, pp. 400-425.

8. See, for example, Jerome S. Brunner, "The Act of Discovery," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 33, No. 1, (Winter 1963), pp. 124-135.

9. It should be pointed out, however, that this is precisely the approach that Carl Bereiter and his associates have taken with their work on teaching the preschool disadvantaged at the University of Illinois. They have combined authoritarian practice with subject matter emphasis in their teaching methods and have been accused of using "pressure cooker" tactics by many educators as a result.

10. Seymour M. Lipset, "Democracy and Working-Class Authoritarianism," American Sociological Review, Vol. 24 (1959), pp. 482-501. Richard Christie, "Authoritarianism Re-Examined", in Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality," Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda, Editors, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954, pp. 123-196.

11. For a discussion of these and other dimensions of teaching as a profession see Myron Lieberman, Education as a Profession, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

SECTION V

THE EXTENT AND CONSEQUENCES OF OBSERVABILITY IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS*

> Obviously, all relations which people have to one another are based on their knowing something about one another . . . without such knowledge . . . interaction could not take place at all.[1]

The "obviousness" of Simmel's statement does not obviate the necessity for examining some of the means through which such knowledge is obtained. Although these means will vary depending upon such factors as the size and extent of internal differentiation of the group, or the quality and frequency of interaction within the group, every social system, large or small, has the problem of maintaining a steady and reliable flow of information among its members.

In everyday face-to-face contact often a gesture, a grimace, a word will suffice to inform those about us as to our wishes, our fears, our feelings, our standards. As members of small groups, the problem of providing sufficient information about behavior and normative commitment for the maintenance of group integration is usually handled without the necessity of formally structured arrangements. The diffuse, informal, everyday, affective contacts prevailing in small groups, such as the family, make a formal communication structure unnecessary. Even in small groups, however, although such arrangements may not be formalized, certain mechanisms exist for the maintenance of intra-system communication. The small talk at family dinner, for instance, may keep family members informed of one another's activities and opinions. This mode of interchange may help achieve consensus

---

*This Section was written by Nathalie S. Friedman.

regarding norms, conformity between conduct and norms, and recognition, if not reconciliation, of dissensus and non-conformity.

In large, complex organizations, formal devices and channels usually exist which serve to increase communication within and between departments or hierarchical levels. Regular departmental reports, memos to supervisors, the grading system in schools, double-entry bookkeeping in business firms all contribute to keep members informed about selected aspects of organizational behavior. Such arrangements presumably promote the effective functioning of the organization for they serve to render organizational members accountable to one another and to facilitate the effective exercise of social control within the group.

Since all social systems are to some extent accountable to selected individuals or groups outside of their boundaries, they must also provide some means of articulation with selected other systems in the society. Accordingly, organizations which are in some measure accountable to the public, to some segment of the public, or to some other organization, and over which these "non-members" exercise some measure of social control, provide certain arrangements through which their goals and activities may become visible to some degree. Thus government officials, over whom constituents exercise social control on Election Day, utilize newspapers, letters, or The Congressional Record to make their stands on public issues visible. Similarly, corporations issue regular reports of their activities and financial status to stockholders, and public relations experts are hired by colleges, hospitals, and governmental agencies to increase public knowledge and support of the organizations' goals and practices.

Because of the dependence of the American school (in contrast to the English or French school systems) on the local public for financial support, school personnel must render a certain measure of accountability to parents and community. Similarly, the parent and the community exercise some control over the school through their power to approve or defeat proposed school budgets at the polls. For this reason, American schools have initiated certain arrangements for the purpose of increasing the visibility of school goals and practices. PTA's, Open School Weeks, Back-to-School Nights, parent-teacher conferences, and report cards have traditionally served as arrangements through which parents may obtain information about school matters.

Schools have tried to keep parents informed through these devices because they believe that parents who are well-informed about the objectives and practices of their local schools and who are brought within the orbit of the school system will also be inclined to support the school's programs and goals. This assumption is made explicit by Bolmeier, for example, who says:

> One of the greatest barriers to educational progress is the general lack of knowledge regarding education. . . . Even the factual understanding of local educational problems is pitifully meager for the majority of American citizens. It is quite understandable therefore that there should be a growing reluctance to support our expanding public-school system.[2]

Similarly, Carter in Communities and Their Schools says:

> Today, about a fourth of all the money requested in bond issues is not approved by the voters . . . the most frequent response /of the schools/ is to try to bridge the gap with an informational program. . . . An attempt is made to increase public understanding of educational problems and, hopefully, the acceptance of its financial programs.[3]

Schools apparently recognize that parents are seeking more and more of a voice in the determination of school policy and even in the selection of school personnel.[4] Although past polls[5] have indicated that the overwhelming majority of parents are satisfied with the performance of their local schools, current newspaper reports suggest increasing dissatisfaction and expressed discontent, especially among the ghetto population of our large cities. The demand for power on the part of these groups places an increasing burden on schools to provide parents with more information about the operation of schools in order to ensure that such power will be exercised by informed and knowledgeable parent groups. The degree to which schools provide formally structured opportunities for parents to obtain such information is thus hardly an academic question. For the answer to this, and to a series of related questions, may well shed light on one of the foremost problems facing today's public schools -- namely that of maintaining an active, informed, and satisfied parent clientele which will support and buttress school programs and policies.

This section examines some of the arrangements which have been socially structured by schools for parents to obtain information about school matters, locates these arrangements within the schools in the sample, and then notes their relationship to parental involvement in, knowledge about, and satisfaction with the school.

Preceding chapters, in examining the degree of consensus and accuracy of perception among mothers, teachers, and students regarding appropriate role and goal definitions, have noted that one or another status may have greater <u>observability</u> of these roles and goals. The

term observability was first used by Merton to denote socially-structured opportunity for knowledge, or "the extent to which the norms and role-performances within a group are readily open to observation by others..."[6]

Merton suggests that observability is a functional requirement for the effective exercise of social control and accountability within social systems. He says:

> Whether they realize it or not, people who are effectively engaged in exercising social control must in some sense be informed about the norms obtaining in the group, just as they must be informed about the actual behavior of members of the group.[7]

Similarly,

> . . . some measure of observability of role performance by members of the role set is required, if the indispensable requirement of accountability is to be met.[8]

Both individuals and groups must therefore provide bases for making their norms and role performances visible to significant others. Sometimes these arrangements are deliberately instituted for the purpose of providing ready access to such information, and sometimes the provision of this information is an unplanned by-product of group structure and process. This section focuses on school-structured arrangements, their distribution, utilization, and consequences for parental knowledge and satisfaction.

TYPES AND LOCATION OF OBSERVABILITY ARRANGEMENTS

Parents can obviously obtain information of certain kinds about the schools their children attend from a variety of sources other than those provided by the school. Still both parents and educational personnel suggest and several studies show that school-sponsored activities, through which parents are brought into direct contact with the school,

can serve as effective instruments for increasing parental knowledge about school matters. A high school administrator states:

> Open houses, parent nights, and school programs which bring the parents into the school offer opportunity for the public to learn at first hand what is being taught in the schools.[9]

The 20 schools in our sample employed a number of arrangements designed to keep parents informed about school matters. Since the present analysis focuses on the extent to which certain arrangements, when utilized by parents, are related to parental knowledge about the school, it was decided to include in the analysis only those arrangements for which the rates of utilization by mothers could be ascertained. For example, four principals reported that an annual Open School Week[10] was held in their schools, but since our interviews did not ask whether mothers attended these occasions, this is omitted from the investigation. Another school sponsored a series of luncheons for mothers and teachers during the school year, but we collected no data on mothers' attendance at these gatherings. Several schools published bulletins or newsletters for parents but whether these reached the home and were read by mothers, or ended unread in a wastebasket, was not determined in the interview.

Information was obtained on rates of utilization by mothers of three distinct arrangements: PTA or Home-School Organization, "Back-to-School Night" or "Open House Night," and "School-Scheduled Conferences for All Parents." As Table 5.1 shows, all schools have provided at least one of these arrangements, with others having two or all three of them. These arrangements, in combination, represent the extent to which the school provides ready opportunity for parents to obtain

knowledge regarding the norms and role-performance of school personnel. Thus they are taken here to constitute a measure of "observability" or the "readiness of access to information about the norms and values prevailing in the /school/."[11] By adding the schools' scores for each separate arrangement we obtain a summary score with a possible range of zero to four.[12] These summary scores are presented in the extreme right hand column of Table 5.1; they represent the extent to which each school has provided opportunities for its parent-clients to obtain information about school matters. For purposes of analysis, schools with scores of 3 or 4 will be characterized as providing "high observability" for parents; those with scores below 3 will be said to rank "low" in the extent of observability provided for parents. The observability rating constitutes a global property of the school, and provides a context within which differences in parental contact with the school and knowledge about it may be analyzed.[13]

Table 5.1 shows that eight schools have received a rank of "high" and twelve a rank of "low" on the basis of their summary scores. Is it possible to discern any consistent pattern in the extent to which schools differ in the provision of observability for parents? What are some of the characteristics of the schools that are relatively generous in providing such arrangements? In what types of schools are these arrangements limited?

A casual inspection of Table 5.1 is enough to find that more elementary than high, more suburban than non-suburban, and more middle- than working class schools rank high on the Index of Observability.

In Table 5.2 which groups the data, this impression is confirmed. Two of the eight high schools, but six of the twelve elementary schools

Table 5.1

Observability Scores and Ratings of Schools

Schools[a]	Back-to School Night	Scheduled Conferences	PTA	Total Score	Rating on Index
Metropolis					
High School	1	0	1	2	Low
Elementary #1	1	0	2	3	High
Elementary #2	0	1	1	2	Low
Elementary #3	1	1	0	2	Low
Elementary #4	1	0	1	2	Low
Suburban Estates					
High School	1	0	2	3	High
Elemtnary School	1	1	2	4	High
Nouveau Heights					
High School	1	0	2	3	High
Elementary School	1	1	2	4	High
Old Home					
High School	1	0	1	2	Low
Elementary #1	1	1	2	4	High
Elementary #2	1	0	2	3	High
New Home					
High School	1	0	0	1	Low
Elementary School	1	.5[b]	1	2.5	Low
Resort Town					
High School	1	0	1	2	Low
Elementary School	1	0	1	2	Low
Working Town					
High School	1	0	1	2	Low
Elementary School	1	1	2	4	High
Green Hollow					
High School	0	0	1	1	Low
Elementary School	0	1	1	2	Low

Scoring: 0 = None; 1 = Exists; 2 = Active PTA

[a]For description of attendance areas see Chapter 3.

[b]For grades 1-4 only.

Table 5.2

Number of Schools Ranking High or Low on the Index of of Observability by School Level, by Community Type, and by Predominant Socio-Economic Composition of Community

	Observability		
	High	Low	Number of Schools
School Level			
Elementary	6	6	12
High	2	6	8
Community Type			
City	1	4	5
Suburb	6	3	9
Town	1	3	4
Village	0	2	2
Community Socio-Economic Status*			
Middle-Class	5	2	7
Working-Class	3	7	10

*The rural schools and Metropolis High School, which are socio-economically heterogeneous, are excluded.

rank high on the Observability Index. Similarly, six of the nine suburban, but only two of the eleven non-suburban schools provide high observability, as do five of the seven middle-class, but only three of the ten working-class schools. The obviously non-random distribution of these observability arrangements merits further discussion.

Observability and School Level

School personnel frequently complain that high school parents have much less contact with the school than do elementary school parents. We suspect that this is precisely because high schools limit

the opportunity for such parental contact.[14] The limitation by high schools of arrangements for parents to obtain information may reflect the difficulties encountered by these large schools in handling an influx of parents on a regular basis.

The constraint which the size of an organization may have on the kinds of arrangements through which it makes itself visible to its clients is reflected in the fact that no high schools or large elementary schools held scheduled conferences for all parents (see Table 5.1). While the size of the school or of its parent body may render certain arrangements less workable, however, it may also be that a lack of normative support of such arrangements contributes to the low observability ratings of most high schools. Thus high school administrators may limit such arrangements because they feel that high school parents are less concerned about school affairs.[15] Our data indicate, however, that school personnel may be misperceiving the relative interest of high school and elementary school mothers in school matters, for about the same proportion of high school and elementary school mothers report that they are "very interested" in school affairs (66% of the former and 69% of the latter).

If high school mothers are as often interested as elementary school mothers, in school matters, high schools may be performing a disservice to themselves, as well as to parents, by limiting the opportunities for parents to be drawn into the school's orbit.

Observability and Community Type

The problem of presenting itself to the community may differ greatly between the school in a small town or rural village and the

suburban or metropolitan school. In the former, the school system is apt to be a community institution, symbolizing community identity and values, and providing the major focus for the integration of community life. Vidich and Bensman, for example, describe Springdale's school as one whose

> . . .budget of a quarter of a million dollars makes the school the major industry of the village, a major purchaser of goods and services and the source of a substantial section of purchasing power. . . . Most of the major social, cultural and athletic events of the community take place within its halls.[16]

This suggests that, just as in the family or small informal group, there is less need for the small town or village school to provide formal mechanisms or devices for parental knowledge. It is rather in the large suburban or metropolitan communities, where the school is but one of many formal organizations competing for the attention of residents, that schools may self-consciously have to institute certain arrangements to attract parents and to enlist their interest and support.

Our data confirm the suggestion that small town or rural village schools have less need (or perhaps <u>feel</u> that they have less need) of formal observability devices.[17] Only one of the six small town or village schools ranks high on the Observability Index. Conversely, six of the nine suburban schools have high observability ratings. Contrary to our expectations, however, with the exception of the white, middle-class school, none of the schools in Metropolis provides extensive formal opportunity for parental knowledge.

Table 5.2 indicates that observability is clearly a <u>suburban</u> phenomenon.[18] Sociologists have suggested that there may be a selective

migration to suburbs of individuals who place particular emphasis on the importance of the school and of a "good education" in the process of upward mobility. It may be, then, that administrators of suburban schools are responding to demands of suburban parents for more contact with the schools and knowledge about them.

We have several indirect indicators of parental concern with the importance of education: self-reported interest in school matters, agreement that "a young man must do well in school in order to get ahead" and that it is important for parents to confer privately with the teacher at least once during the school year. A comparison of the responses of suburban and non-suburban mothers to these three questions (Table 5.3) shows that there is no difference between suburban and non-suburban mothers insofar as their interest and stress upon educational matters are concerned.

Table 5.3

Interest and Concern Regarding School Matters of Suburban and Non-Suburban Mothers

Type	"Very Interested"	Should Have Private Conference	"Young Man Must Do Well"	Number of Mothers
Suburban Mothers	69%	69%	91%	(512)
Non-Suburban Mothers	75	72	95	(879)

It appears then, that non-suburban administrators are responding less frequently to the normative requirements of their constituents. Perhaps the parents in these areas are not as vocal as suburban mothers in apprising school personnel of their interest and concern.[19] In any

event, suburban administrators are providing parents with more extensive opportunities for obtaining knowledge about the schools; we shall see later, that although suburban mothers express no more concern about educational matters than do their non-suburban counterparts, they utilize these school-structured arrangements more extensively than do non-suburban mothers.

Observability and Community Socio-Economic Composition

One of the primary criteria for selecting communities for the study was that of the predominant social-class affiliation of residents. Rogoff suggests that the community's stratification structure

> . . . may set in motion both formal arrangements -- such as school, library, and general cultural facilities in the community -- and informal mechanisms such as normative climates or modal levels of aspiration which are likely to affect all members of the community to some extent.[20]

Although Rogoff's concern is the effect of middle- as compared to working-class community climates on mobility, it might also be that higher levels of aspiration and a stronger emphasis on the value of education in the middle-class community provide normative support for extensive school-structured channels of communication between home and school.

Table 5.2 shows that five of the seven middle-class schools, but only three of the ten working-class schools, are high on the Observability Index. As is well-known, schools in middle-class communities have more favorable pupil-teacher ratios, better library facilities, and higher per capita expenditures on teachers' salaries, textbooks, and equipment than schools in working-class areas.[21] Apparently,

school-structured opportunity for parental knowledge is still another item that is differentially distributed on the basis of the socio-economic level of the school's clients, to the advantage of the middle-class parent.

UTILIZATION OF OBSERVABILITY ARRANGEMENTS

Thus far we have identified three devices or arrangements which the schools in the sample have instituted, either singly or in combination, in order to increase the visibility of their programs and practices and to enlist parental support and have found these arrangements especially prevalent in elementary schools, suburban schools, and schools located in middle-class communities. This finding led us to suggest that the size of an organization, or of the public which it is attempting to reach, may exercise a constraint on the kinds of arrangements through which it makes itself visible. We also suggested that formal arrangements for the promotion of visibility are less necessary for schools which are located in small communities, where informal networks of relationships among parents, or between parents and educational personnel, may serve as alternative channels for parental knowledge about the school. And finally, it was noted that the successful institutionalization of these organizationally-structured arrangements may depend to a large extent on the normative support afforded them -- actual or perceived -- by organizational members and non-members. It has usually been assumed, and school personnel in our sample seem to agree, that such support is more characteristic of elementary than of high school parents, more prevalent in the suburbs than in the city, town, or village, and stronger in middle- than in working-class areas.

However, "opportunity for exposure to an event does not automatically lead to actual exposure."[22] Similarly, the provision of opportunities for parental knowledge about the schools is no guarantee of the utilization of these opportunities. We now examine the extent to which mothers of school children actually utilize the opportunities provided by the schools. Utilization rates will be examined for the sample as a whole, and differences will be analyzed within selected school, community, and observability settings.

The Location of Utilizers and Non-Utilizers

Every mother was asked if she had utilized each of the three school-provided arrangements comprising the Index of Observability: the Back-to-School Night, the Scheduled Conference, and at least one PTA meeting. Table 5.4 shows the percentage of mothers in each school who reported making use of each arrangement. The percentages in the next to last row of Table 5.4 show that, while only slightly more than half of all mothers took advantage of Back-to-School Night and PTA, more than four-fifths attended Scheduled Conferences.[23]

The percentages for all mothers obscure the wide range of differences in the utilization of these arrangements within the schools in the sample. Among all mothers, approximately 3 out of 5 attended Back-to-School Night. In Metropolis High School, however, less than one out of five attended this gathering, while in Nouveau Heights Elementary School more than four out of five utilized this arrangement. The range of PTA attendance is even greater: from 10% in Metropolis High School to 96% in Suburban Estates Elementary School. Scheduled Conferences, on the other hand, were attended by the vast majority of mothers in every elementary school which provided this arrangement.

Table 5.4

Percentage of Mothers Utilizing Each Arrangement by School

School	Observability Rating	Back-to-School Night	Scheduled Conferences	PTA	Number of Mothers
Suburban Estates					
High School	High	84%	*	86%	(51)
Elementary School	High	81	95	96	(80)
Nouveau Heights					
High School	High	70	*	63	(37)
Elementary	High	86	82	81	(90)
Working Town					
Elementary School	High	69	88	35	(81)
Old Home					
Elementary School					
#1	High	77	87	66	(47)
#2	High	77	*	69	(30)
Metropolis					
Elementary School #1	High	63	*	64	(92)
Working Town					
High School	Low	40	*	26	(43)
Old Home					
High School	Low	65	*	50	(34)
New Home					
High School	Low	34	*	*	(38)
Elementary School	Low	68	30**	57	(104)
Resort Town					
High School	Low	54	*	49	(41)
Elementary School	Low	74	*	53	(113)
Green Hollow					
High School	Low	*	*	22	(46)
Elementary School	Low	*	92	45	(80)
Metropolis H					
High School	Low	17	*	10	(138)
Elementary School					
#2	Low	*	77	35	(82)
#3	Low	26	69	*	(89)
#4	Low	46	*	62	(66)
All Mothers		59%	83%	52%	(1392)
Range of Utilization		17-86%	69-95%	10-96%	

*Arrangement not provided

**Conferences were held only for parents of children in Grades 1-4. Among First Grade mothers, 74% attended.

Thus, in addition to the fact that certain arrangements are not universally available, even when these arrangements are provided they are not universally utilized. The wide range of utilization rates from one school to another merits further attention. For we are led to wonder under what conditions and in which school and community settings mothers tend to take extensive advantage of these school-structured arrangements. Are there patterns in the differential utilization of these observability arrangements?

Grouping the results of Table 5.4 shows that in schools ranking high on the Observability Index, attendance at each school gathering is generally higher than in schools which rank low on the Observability Index.

Table 5.5

Percentage of Mothers Utilizing Each Arrangement When Available

Observability	Back-to-School Night	Scheduled Conferences	PTA	Number of Mothers
High	76%	88%	70%	(511)
Low	46	78	40	(796)
All Mothers	59%	83%	52%	(1307)

For example, in schools where there was a Back-to-School Night, 59% of the mothers reported that they attended this gathering. But in those schools where general observability was low, even though a Back-to-School Night was held, only 46% of the mothers reported attending, compared to 76% of the mothers in schools where overall observability was high. The percentages reporting attendance at Scheduled Conferences and PTA follow the same pattern.

It might have been assumed that when mothers are given a range of opportunities for visiting the school, they will be somewhat selective in choosing the channels they will utilize. On the other hand, when a PTA or a Back-to-School Night is the only formal arrangement for obtaining information, we might expect most mothers to take advantage of this arrangement. We find instead that the more opportunities the school provides, the more mothers take advantage of each opportunity.

Why should it be that more mothers attend the PTA in those settings where other opportunities are provided?[24] Perhaps in those schools which provide multiple opportunities for parents to obtain information, there is a climate of a prevailing Open Door Policy to which parents are responding. It is possible that in these schools, the normative climate generated by school personnel is one which encourages parents to utilize each opportunity to attend school functions. This, in turn, may lead to the establishment and strengthening of informal networks of mothers, which reinforces the tendency and ease of visiting the school.

Thus an unintended consequence of attendance at formal school meetings may be the formation of friendship groups based on recognition of mutual problems, resentments or satisfactions regarding the child's teacher, or the school's goals and practices. During the refreshment hour following the Back-to-School Night or PTA program, or during the period when parents are awaiting their Scheduled Conference, there is opportunity for mothers to meet one another informally and for social networks to develop.[25]

This then may partially account for the unexpected finding that in the Open Door schools (schools with high observability ratings) each

arrangement is utilized more extensively than are these same arrangements in the low observability schools.

The Index of Formal School Contact

For purposes of further analysis, the separate contacts of each mother were combined into an Index of Formal School Contact. Mothers may have utilized all three, two, only one, or none of the available channels provided by the school; those with two or three contacts will be said to rank "high" and those with one or no contacts "low," on the Index of Formal School Contact. The distribution of the 1,307 mothers on the Index of Formal Contact is as follows:

3 contacts	(248)	19%		
2 contacts	(431)	33%	52%	High
1 contact	(288)	22%		
0 contacts	(340)	26%	48%	Low
All Mothers	(1307)[26]	100%		

We have already noted that under conditions of high observability, mothers utilize each available channel at a higher rate than under conditions of low observability. We now may ask: what effect does the degree of observability have on the number of contacts of each mother?

As Table 5.6 shows, overall contact (Index of Formal School Contact) is higher when observability is high than when it is low. Only 38% of the mothers in schools where opportunities are limited rank high on overall formal contact, compared to 75% in schools where an Open Door Policy exists. It is not surprising that overall utilization rates are higher in those schools which afford more opportunities for parental contact. What is unexpected, however, is that under conditions of high

Table 5.6

Percentage of Mothers with a Given Number of Contacts by Observability

Number of Contacts	Per cent ranking high or low on Index of Formal School Contact when observability is: High		Low	
3	35%	75%	8%	38%
2	40		30	
1	13%	25%	30%	62%
0	12		32	
Number of Mothers	(511)		(796)	

observability, these rates are twice as high as they are in low observability schools. Furthermore, it is significant that the percentage of mothers reporting no formal contact at all with the school is almost three times as great in the low as in the high observability schools. Apparently, when formal opportunities to visit the school are limited, parents tend to reject even the few opportunities which are available.

This appears to have implications for school policy. If schools are concerned with maintaining parental support, and if, as they have regularly asserted, such support is most forthcoming from an involved and informed parent body, the Open Door appears to be an important element of school policy. For when observability arrangements are generously provided by the schools, far more mothers turn out. When such arrangements are relatively limited, however, utilization rates drop sharply and fully three out of five mothers have little or no formal contact with the school.

This is not to suggest that schools necessarily take the initiative in providing observability arrangements for parents. It may be, and

the data presented previously suggest, that these arrangements are partially a response to actual or perceived parental interest and concern. In any event, utilization of school-structured arrangements for parental knowledge is substantially higher when such arrangements are generously provided than when they are relatively limited. What effect, however, do varying observability conditions have upon the utilization rates of mothers who are located in different school and community settings? When non-suburban mothers, for example, are provided with high observability, do they take advantage of these arrangements to the same extent as do suburban mothers? When working-class mothers are located in Open Door Schools do their participation rates approximate those of middle-class mothers?

The Location of Utilizers and Non-Utilizers and School Level

Since opportunities for mothers to visit the schools are more extensive for elementary than for high school mothers, it is not surprising that utilization rates are higher for the former than for the latter (Table 5.7). Our data seem to confirm the findings of previous studies, that elementary school mothers participate more in school affairs than do high school mothers, until we control for observability, for the differences in utilization rates between high school and elementary school mothers are sharply reduced under conditions of high observability. As Table 5.7 shows, when observability is high, high school mothers report as much attendance at Back-to-School Night and PTA as do elementary school mothers. Both groups have substantially less contact when observability is low than when it is high, but the reduction of opportunities has more impact on the utilization rates of

Table 5.7

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on the Index of Formal School Contact by School Level and By Observability

School Level	All Mothers	Observability	
		High	Low
Elementary	59% (962)	76% (422)	46% (540)
High School	34% (345)	74% (89)	20% (256)
Per Cent Difference	25%	2%	26%

high school than elementary school mothers. When extensive opportunities for mothers to participate in school affairs are provided, high school mothers take as much advantage of such opportunities as do elementary school mothers. When opportunities are limited, however, about half of the elementary school, but less than one-fourth of the high school mothers do so. That the elementary school serves the immediate neighborhood, while the high school draws its students from wider distances, may account for the fact that elementary school parents continue to utilize school-structured arrangements for observability in the low observability schools at a higher rate than do high school mothers.

Every study of parental contact with the school has found that high school parents attend school gatherings at a lower rate than elementary school parents.[27] None of these studies has controlled, however, for the number of opportunities available to high school as compared to elementary school parents. It is possible that low observability is characteristic of high schools in general, and that this may explain

the relatively low attendance rates of high school parents found in previous studies.

Perhaps low utilization of school-provided opportunities for knowledge is not uniformly characteristic of high school parents.[28] Social class or community type difference, rather than school level may be more crucial in discriminating utilizers and non-utilizers. We proceed to examine differences in utilization rates by community type.

The Location of Utilizers and Non-Utilizers and Community Type

It has previously been seen (Table 5.2) that suburban mothers are presented with more opportunities to visit the schools than are mothers in the city, small towns, or rural village. Correspondingly, we find that the overall contact of suburban mothers is higher than that of mothers in the other community types (Table 5.8). Next highest in

Table 5.8

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on the Index of Formal School Contact by Community Type and Observability

		Observability	
Community Type	All Mothers	High	Low
Suburb	75% (473)	82% (335)	59% (138)
Small Town	50 (280)	70 (83)	43 (197)
Rural Village	41 (80)	* (0)	41 (80)
City	32 (468)	54 (92)	27 (376)
Per Cent Difference Between Suburbs and City	28%	22%	43%

overall contact are mothers in small towns, followed by mothers in the rural community, with city mothers ranking lowest. Our data are congruent with the opinion of Havighurst and Neugarten who state:

> Generally speaking, it is the school in a small town or small suburb where close school-family relationships are to be found. Here there is more immediate and local control by community members over school policy . . . and there is a greater amount of face-to-face acquaintanceship between teacher and parent. In the large city, where matters of school policy tend to be depersonalized and organized into 'the school system' and where school services are seen by the typical citizen as one of many specialized functions of the city government, relations between teacher and parent tend to become more remote.[29]

It will be noted that non-utilizers are concentrated in the two extreme community types -- the city and the rural area. While the statement of Havighurst and Neugarten may explain the low utilization rates in Metropolis, as compared to our suburban and small town schools, it does not explain why the rural mothers are relative non-utilizers of school-provided opportunities for knowledge. We would expect utilization rates of rural mothers to approximate those of the small town, rather than the large metropolis. Both rural schools, however, were rated low on the Observability Index. When we compare utilization rates of mothers in the different community settings holding observability constant, a somewhat different picture emerges. The difference in utilization rates between small town and rural mothers disappears when observability is held constant (43% compared to 41%). More significantly, although the rank order remains the same, the gap between the suburban rates and those of the other community types is reduced under conditions of both high and low observability.

The substantially higher contact rates among suburban mothers may reflect the general tendency of suburbanites to participate at a higher

level than city or rural folk in all kinds of voluntary organizations. Martin suggests that as a result of the daily commuting of males, women play an unusually important role in voluntary associations in the suburbs. Moreover, the fact that the commuters and their wives are also younger, wealthier, and better educated than non-commuters (all of which attributes have been found to be related to higher participation in voluntary associations) reinforces the likelihood that suburban mothers are more practiced in organizational participation, including the PTA.[30]

It may be then that the higher overall contact rates of suburban mothers are partially an artifact of the higher socio-economic status of the suburban, compared to the non-suburban, population.[31] Let us see, however, if mothers' utilization of these school-provided arrangements is related to the socio-economic composition of the community.

Location of Utilizers and Non-Utilizers and Socio-Economic Level of the Community

Since school-structured opportunities for parental knowledge are relatively more numerous for mothers located in middle-class communities, it is not surprising to find (Table 5.9) that utilization rates are higher in middle-class than in working-class attendance areas. Overall contact, as well as utilization of each arrangement offered by the schools, is higher for mothers in middle- than in working-class communities. Table 5.9 corroborates previous findings that high socio-economic status and high parental participation in school events go hand in hand.[32]

Table 5.9

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on the Index of Formal Contact by SES of Attendance Area and Observability

		Observability	
SES	All Mothers	High	Low
Middle-class	68% (504)	77% (350)	50% (154)
Working-class	51 (581)	72 (160)	43 (421)
Difference	+ 17%	+ 5%	+ 7%

None of these studies, however, has taken into account that school-structured opportunities for contact may be more limited for the working-class parent. It is generally assumed that low participation rates among working-class parents are a function of lack of interest or time (since there are likely to be more working-mothers in this group).

Table 5.9 shows that when observability is held constant, the differences in overall utilization rates between middle- and working-class mothers are greatly reduced: from a difference of 17% to differences of 5% and 7% under the differing socio-economic conditions. When opportunities for mothers to visit the school are relatively numerous, mothers in working-class communities take almost as much advantage of these opportunities as do mothers in middle-class areas. When opportunities are limited, the contacts of mothers in both middle- and working-class communities are reduced to almost the same level.

Thus it appears that a differentiator of utilization rates is the structural property of observability. For while the socio-economic level of the community makes a difference alone, when opportunity is

equalized, the general socio-economic level of the community has little impact on the utilization rates of mothers.

These findings raise more general questions about participation in voluntary associational activities and social class. They suggest that both social class and the opportunity structure must be considered, for given sufficient opportunity for participation, the traditionally apathetic working-class individual is almost as likely as his middle-class counterpart to take advantage of the opportunity.

The Location of Utilizers and Non-Utilizers and Educational Background

Thus far, we have used the characteristics of the community to define the characteristics of individuals, that is, instead of classifying mothers according to their own socio-economic position, we have classified them according to the socio-economic composition of their community. The analysis can be carried a step further by introducing the education of the individual mother. The relation between educational background and utilization rate will first be examined alone, and then within the two observability settings.

Parents were classified into groups, one in which either husband or wife had attended college (at least for some time) and the other in which neither husband nor wife attended college. 501 mothers, or 37% of the sample, fell into the first category; 884, or 63% into the second.[33]

Table 5.10 shows that education of parents makes a substantial difference in attendance at Back-To-School Night and PTA, but is only slightly related to utilization of the school-scheduled conference with

the teacher. Ten per cent more college- than non-college mothers attended the scheduled conferences, while approximately 25% more took advantage of PTA and Back-to-School Night.

Table 5.10

Utilization Rates of Available Arrangements by Educational Background

Educational Background	Back-to-School Night	Scheduled Conferences	PTA	Per Cent High on Index of Formal School Contact
College	74% (459)	89% (225)	69% (478)	67% (501
Non-college	49 (711)	79 (378)	41 (768)	40 (884)

The large difference in formal contact rates between college- and non-college mothers probably reflects the tendency for the less-educated, lower SES individual to be relatively inactive in voluntary associations.

> In general /says Sexton/, lower-income adults tend to be non-joiners and non-participants . . . /they/ rarely feel at ease in social groups.[34]

In the setting of the Back-to-School Night or PTA, the less educated mother may feel ineffective in her interaction with the well-dressed, well-educated middle-class mother. In the privacy afforded by the scheduled conference, however, she may feel less exposed and somewhat more in control of the situation.

The Scheduled Conference is thus a particularly effective arrangement for attracting the traditionally non-participating working-class parent to the school. We might note that the Scheduled Conference for all parents is a relatively new arrangement which schools have provided.

Formerly, the PTA was the major means of school-parent communication. That the PTA attracts the more educated, middle-class parent may partially account for social class differences in parental knowledge reported in previous studies.

One further question remains, namely, the effect that educational background of the mother has on school contact within the two observability contexts. Both education and observability are highly related, as we have seen, to utilization rates. What are the joint effects, however, of education and observability on mothers' utilization of each type of school-provided opportunity, as well as on overall contact with the school.

Looking first at the separate items in Table 5.11, we see that whether observability is high or low, college mothers take advantage of each available opportunity more than non-college mothers. Again it is in attendance at PTA meetings that the difference between the more and less educated mothers is most pronounced. Still, for each item (with the exception of attendance at Scheduled Conferences) the non-college mother in high observability contexts has a higher utilization rate than does the college mother in low observability contexts.

When the joint effect of education and observability on mothers' overall contacts is examined, it appears that the reduction of observability affects the overall utilization rate of college mothers somewhat more than that of non-college mothers. The percentage of college mothers ranking high on the Index of Formal School Contact drops from 84% to 44% as we move from high to low observability; the drop is slightly less for the non-college mother, from 63% to 32%. More significant, however,

Table 5.11

Utilization Rates by Educational Background and Observability

Type of Contact	Observability High: College	Observability High: Non-College	Difference Education
Back-to-School Night	82%	66%	- 16%
Scheduled Conferences	91	84	- 7%
PTA	81	54	- 27%
High on Index of Formal Contact	84 (294)	63 (216)	- 21%
	Observability Low		
	College	Non-College	
Back-to-School Night	59%	42%	- 17%
Scheduled Conferences	85	77	- 8%
PTA	50	37	- 13%
High on Index of Formal Contact	44 (189)	32 (602)	- 12%
Difference Observability	-23%	-24%	
	- 6	- 7	
	-31	-17	
	-40	-31	

is the fact that the overall utilization rate for non-college mothers under conditions of high observability is substantially higher than the rate for college mothers under conditions of low observability.

Thus when the school provides extensive opportunity for parents to obtain knowledge about school matters, both college and non-college mothers, but especially the former, utilize these opportunities at a high rate. When these opportunities are relatively limited, however,

the college mothers sharply reduce their rate of formal contact, narrowing the gap between themselves and their non-college counterparts. Why, under conditions of low observability, does the better educated mother curtail her rate of formal contact with the school?

Most college mothers (63%) are located in communities in which the schools maintain an Open Door Policy, that is, where multiple arrangements for parental observability exist. In those schools, however, where such arrangements are limited, the better educated mother may turn to alternative channels in order to obtain information about school matters. These alternative sources of information, such as the principal, other school personnel, teacher friends, or school board members may not be as readily available to the working-class parent, who therefore must rely for her knowledge on the formal arrangements which the school may provide.[35]

THE DISTRIBUTION OF PARENTAL KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE SCHOOL

We have seen that the structural property of observability must be taken into account in an analysis of potential contact with the school. When observability, or the extent to which the school provides formal arrangements for increasing communication between school and home, is introduced as a control, the usual differences in participation rates between elementary and high school mothers, between suburban and non-suburban mothers, and between mothers in middle- and working-class communities are either reduced or eliminated. The rates of formal school contacts of all mothers, regardless of school level, community type, or individual or community socio-economic level are high when observability

is high and are sharply reduced when school-structured opportunities for parental knowledge are limited.

Our ultimate concern, however, is with the extent to which the arrangements which schools may provide in order to make themselves more visible to parents are in fact related to parental knowledge about the school. As Merton has suggested, after identifying the "structural arrangements and group processes which provide for [observability]," the sociologist needs "to establish whether these structural arrangements provide for greater knowledge."[36] Thus Merton raises the question of the conditions under which observability leads or does not lead to actual knowledge. We turn now to an empirical analysis of the relationship between observability (opportunity for knowledge) and actual knowledge.

Indicators of Knowledge

The indicators of mothers' knowledge of the school fall into two general categories: items pertaining to school personnel, and items pertaining to school practices. The first category includes such matters as knowledge of the teacher's or principal's name, or whether the school has a psychologist, nurse, librarian, or other designated personnel. The second category consists of such items as whether the school gives IQ tests or achievement tests, whether it teaches the New Math, employs TV in the classroom, or utilizes other designated school practices.

The responses to the separate items (Table 5.12) suggest that mothers know more about school personnel than about school practices. While more than three out of four mothers know the teacher's or principal's name and almost all are acquainted with the fact that the school

Table 5.12

Percentage of Mothers who Know about Selected School Personnel and School Practices

Know principal's name	81%
Know teacher's name	76
Know whether school has:	
Nurse	97
Music teacher	85
Gym teacher or coach	82
Librarian	66
Assistant principal	62
Psychologist	47
Know whether school system:	
Teaches New Math*	72%
Teaches foreign language in elementary school	64
Uses TV in the classroom	57
Gives IQ tests*	56
Gives achievement tests*	56
Groups slow learners	50
Groups fast learners	49
Uses teaching machines	37
Practices social promotion	36
Practices skipping	35
Number of mothers	(1392)

*These were universally employed among the schools in the sample.

has a nurse on the premises, two of every three mothers responded that they do not know whether skipping or "social promotion" are practiced, or whether programmed learning is part of the school's curriculum. Only slightly more than half of the mothers know that IQ and achievement tests are regularly administered or that TV is sometimes used in the classroom.

The outstanding exception to mothers' general ignorance of school practices is the New Math, which three-quarters of the respondents correctly stated is being taught in the system. Of all the school practices about which mothers were questioned, this is the one which is most widely visible to parents. Perhaps this is because most of the schools had only recently instituted the New Math as part of their curriculum and principals reported that they had made special efforts to explain the reasons for its introduction to parents through bulletins, PTA meetings, or the Back-to-School Night. Even without such meetings or bulletins, however, the parent who sits down to help the child with his arithmetic homework can hardly be unaware of the fact that the New Math is being taught.

The rather limited extent of knowledge about other school practices, especially skipping and social promotion, may be a direct effect of attempts of school personnel to insulate these practices from parental observability. Even during our interviews with the principals of each school, it was often difficult to learn whether certain practices were actually employed in the school. Principals were frequently reluctant to state in so many words that a practice such as skipping or social promotion was regularly employed. This reluctance may stem from the recognition that there is dissensus among parents about the desirability of these practices.[37]

If principals were hesitant to inform the interviewer whether these educational practices were being utilized in the school system, they may also be reluctant to make this known to parents.[38]

Another factor contributing to the higher proportion of mothers knowing about school personnel than school practices may be that

personnel are people and people are generally more visible than ideas, issues, or practices. Public opinion studies have found that the public is more likely to recognize the names of people who have appeared in the newspaper, or of political candidates, than to be aware of current issues or have an opinion regarding them.[39]

Unless they impinge on the everyday, personel lives of individuals, issues are not as likely as are people to be accurately identified. Erskine's data show that in 1950 only 27% of a national cross-section of Americans were familiar with the issue of Farm Price Supports, whereas understandably 43% of the farming population had heard of the issue. Similarly, "right-to-work" laws were familiar to only 66% of the general population as compared with 82% of "union families."[40]

It may be that the recent emphasis on mathematics and science, as well as the fact that the child usually has daily homework assignments in math, has made this subject more relevant to parents and so one they are likely to know about.

The Indices of Knowledge: Personnel and Practices

Since school personnel and school practices appear to be two different subjects of parental knowledge, it was decided to keep them separate for purposes of analysis. Accordingly two indices of parental knowledge were constructed: an index of knowledge of school personnel and an index of knowledge of school practices.[41]

The indices were formed as follows:

Index of Personnel	Index of Practices
1) Know teacher's name	1) Know about IQ tests
2) Know principal's name	2) Know about achievement tests
3) No "don't know" responses regarding other school personnel[42]	3) Know about New Math
	4) 0 - 1 "don't know" responses regarding other school practices[43]

Mothers knowing both the name of the teacher and the principal and with no "don't know" responses to the questions regarding other school personnel, were classified as ranking "high" on the Index of Personnel; the others ranked "low" on this Index. As can be seen in Table 5.13, slightly over 1/3 of the mothers rank high on the Index of Personnel, with the rest ranking low.

Table 5.13

Number of Items in Indices of Personnel and Practices Correctly Perceived by Mothers

Index of Personnel			Index of Practices		
Know all 3	34%	High 34%	Know all 4	19%	High 47%
Know 2	40%		Know 3	28	
Know 1	19	Low 67%	Know 2	26%	
Know 0	8		Know 1	17	Low 52%
			Know 0	9	
Number of mothers	(1392)		Number of mothers		(1392)

Mothers were ranked high on the Index of Practices if they correctly answered the three questions regarding IQ tests, achievement tests, and the New Math, or answered two of these three questions and had only one or no "don't know" responses regarding the other school practices. Almost half of them ranked high on the Index of Practices and half, low.

We already know that school-structured opportunities for knowledge about the school are not equally available to the mothers in our sample. Let us then examine the extent to which the provision by schools of arrangements for parental observability is related to the level of actual parental knowledge about school personnel and practices.

Observability and Parental Knowledge

It would seem hackneyed to show that when schools provide relatively greater opportunities for parents to obtain information, such information is greater. Although this is the case, as Table 5.14 indicates, there are several questions which must be answered before we conclude that the provision of these arrangements by schools is associated with a high enough level of parental knowledge to warrant their existence.

Table 5.14

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on the Indices of Personnel and Practices by Observability

Observability	Index of Personnel	Index of Practices	Number of Mothers
High	46%	59%	(511)
Low	26	40	(881)

Before proceeding to the question of observability as a means of ensuring a high level of parental knowledge about the schools we first examine the possibility that the relationship uncovered in Table 5.14 may be spurious. We have found that college-educated families tend to be located in high observability settings. The higher rate of knowledge associated with high observability may be a reflection of the large college population in these settings, for it may be that mothers with

college backgrounds know more about the schools than their counterparts without a college education.

Table 5.15 shows that more college mothers rank high on both indices of knowledge than do non-college mothers. As a matter of fact, a comparison of Tables 5.14 and 5.15 shows a striking similarity between the relationship of observability and that of education to mothers' knowledge of school personnel and school practices. Perhaps it is not the opportunity structure provided by schools, but rather the individual attribute of education, which differentiates the more from the less knowledgeable mothers.

Table 5.15

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on Indices of Personnel and Practices by Education

Education	Personnel	Practices	Number of Mothers
College mothers	47%	62%	(500)
Non-college mothers	26	39	(871)

Table 5.16 examines the joint effects of observability and education on mothers' knowledge of personnel and practices and shows that observability and education together have a substantial effect on mothers' knowledge of both school personnel and practices. While 51% of the college mothers in high observability contexts rank high on knowledge of personnel, and 66% on knowledge of practices, the corresponding figures for non-college mothers in low observability settings are 22% and 36%. Thus observability and education jointly produce a difference of about 30% in the proportion of knowledgeable mothers.

Table 5.16

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on Indices of Personnel and Practices by Observability and Education

	Knowledge of Personnel		Knowledge of Practices		Number of Mothers	
Observability	College	Non-College	College	Non-College	College	Non-College
High	51%	39%	66%	50%	(294)	(216)
Low	42	22	57	36	(207)	(668)
Per Cent Difference	9	17	9	14		

Furthermore, we see that education does not completely account for the relationship between observability and knowledge which was indicated in Table 5.14. For given equal education, observability still makes a substantial difference in knowledge, especially for the knowledge of the non-college mother. The college mother's knowledge about school personnel is 9% higher, but the non-college mother's is 17% higher in high observability settings than in low ones. The difference is not substantial, but it suggests that the traditionally less knowledgeable can be reached by the observability arrangements which schools may provide. In fact, we find that under conditions of high observability, the differences in knowledge between college and non-college mothers are somewhat reduced. When the school provides more opportunities for mothers to obtain information regarding school matters, non-college mothers are closer to college mothers in the extent of their knowledge than when such opportunities are limited. This is especially true for knowledge of personnel, where non-college mothers in high observability

settings are about as informed as are college mothers in low observability schools (39% compared to 42%).

Thus education makes a difference in mothers' knowledge when the school does not intervene to provide sufficient opportunities for parents to obtain information; but when such opportunities are offered, the gap in knowledge between college and non-college mothers is reduced.

Apparently, the familiar class differences in knowledge found in other studies of parental information about the schools as well as in most public opinion studies can be partly explained by the fact that the more educated segment of the population is provided with greater opportunity for access to sources of knowledge. Our findings suggest, that if it were in some measure possible to reduce the opportunity gap (as is being done to some extent in the current Head Start Program), there might be an accompanying reduction in the usual class differences in actual knowledge.

We may ask, however, whether school-structured arrangements to increase parental knowledge operate in the same manner for parents who are located in different school and community settings. Are such arrangements required for knowledge in small towns or rural areas where information about schools may be obtained through more informal channels? Are they associated with an increase in the level of knowledge of the traditionally non-participating mother of the high school child? Are they necessary for mothers who are located in middle-class areas where the reservoir of knowledge is presumably higher? Let us examine the level of knowledge of mothers who are located in different school and community settings, in order to determine the relationship of such location to parental knowledge.

Knowledge by School Level

We already know that elementary school mothers are provided with more opportunities to obtain information about the school than are high school mothers. We expect, therefore, that the former will have higher levels of knowledge than the latter. Table 5.17 shows that this is true for knowledge of school personnel, but not of school practices.

Table 5.17

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on Indices of Personnel and Practices by School Level

School Level	Personnel	Practices	Number of Mothers
Elementary School	40%	45%	(962)
High School	18	52	(430)

Apparently, by the time a child reaches the high school level, even though mothers may have little contact with the school they are aware that certain school practices exist in the system. Personnel, however, are in the particular school, rather than system-wide, and the mother of the 10th grade student (whose child may have been in the high school only one year) may have had little opportunity to learn that, say, a psychologist or a librarian are in the school.

When observability is introduced as a control (Table 5.18), we find that location in a high observability setting is related to an increase in the level of parental knowledge for both elementary and high school mothers. Elementary school mothers still know considerably more about school personnel, but slightly less about school practices than do high school mothers.

Table 5.18

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on Indices of Personnel and Practices by School Level and Observability

School Level	Personnel		Practices		Number of Mothers	
	Observability		Observability		Observability	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Elemementary	50%	33%	58%	34%	(422)	(540)
High School	27	16	63	50	(89)	(341)
Difference	+23	+17	- 5	-16		

When school-structured opportunities are limited, however, the gap in knowledge of personnel between elementary and high school mothers remains about constant, but differences in knowledge of school practices between the two groups are increased. In low observability settings elementary school mothers' knowledge of school practices is particularly limited. Only under conditions of high observability are these mothers able to obtain information about school practices. Because high school mothers are likely to be aware of these system practices by the time their children have reached the 10th grade, it is less important that the high school provide extensive communication channels with the home in order for mothers to obtain this kind of information.

Knowledge by Community Type

Since mothers in suburban communities are provided with more opportunities to obtain information regarding schools, and since their participation rates are higher than those of mothers in non-suburban areas, it is surprising to find in Table 5.19 that suburban mothers know no

more about school matters than do mothers in any of the other community types, with the exception of the city. This is true for both knowledge of personnel and knowledge of practices and is surprising since rural and small town mothers start out with the handicap of limited school-structured opportunities for knowledge, while such opportunities are extensive in most suburban schools.

Table 5.19

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on the Indices of Personnel and Practices by Community Type

Community Type	Personnel	Practices	Number of Mothers
City	20%	34%	(473)
Suburb	40	51	(512)
Town	39	59	(280)
Rural village	44	55	(127)

Since the opportunities provided by the schools differ from one community type to another, Table 5.20 shows how community location is related to parental knowledge when the arrangements for gaining such knowledge are similar. We see that the relationship of observability to parental knowledge is far different in the large city or suburb than in the small town. Formal school-structured opportunities seem to make little difference in the level of information of small town mothers, but a great difference in the knowledge of suburban and city mothers. Knowledge of personnel is 18% higher for city mothers and 27% higher for suburban ones when observability is high than when it is low. Similarly 30% more mothers in city and suburban schools rank high on the Index of Practices when observability is high than when it is low.

Table 5.20

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on the Indices of Personnel and Practices by Community Type and Observability

Community Type	Personnel Observability		Practices Observability		Number of Mothers Observability	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
City	35%	7%	57%	28%	(92)	(381)
Suburban	50	23	61	31	(336)	(176)
Town	43	38	53	62	(83)	(197)
Rural village	*	44	*	55	(0)	(127)

*There are no high-observability schools in the rural community.

On the other hand, formal school-structured opportunities for parental knowledge appear to have little relationship to the knowledge of small town mothers. In fact, 9% more small town mothers rank high on the Index of Practices in the low observability schools than in the high ones.

Thus observability appears to be a prerequisite for parental knowledge regarding the schools in the large city or suburb, but irrelevant to the knowledge of mothers in the small town or rural area. When observability is high, the differences in parental knowledge by location which were observed in Table 5.19 are altered, with suburban mothers now ranking highest on both indices of knowledge. Under conditions of low observability, however, we find that knowledge is steadily reduced as we move from the small rural village to the large city.

Size is thus a crucial factor in determining the extent to which organizations require certain formal arrangements to provide information

about the norms or characteristics of the group. Such information is more readily obtainable in the small group through the everyday face-to-face contacts, diffuse relationships and informal communication networks which are characteristic of small groups. In the large formal association, however, where impersonal relationships prevail, certain formally-structured channels through which information can be distributed are functional requirements for knowledge.

This is especially true when it is a matter of providing information about an organization to clients of the organization. In the small town or rural community where the school often serves as a center for community activities, parents are more likely to be personally acquainted with teachers and other school personnel, to have more diffuse relationships with other parents, and to have more contact with a number of their children's friends. From these sources they may obtain information about school matters without having to depend on formal school-structured arrangements.

In the large city or suburb the school is only one of a host of formal organizations claiming the attention of the parent. Mothers are apt to have little more than a nodding acquaintance with most school personnel. Diffuse relationships are restricted to a small fraction of one's neighbors and so mothers may have few sources of information about school matters other than the formal opportunities provided by the schools. Suburban school administrators are apparently attempting to provide these opportunities for parents, with the result that suburban mothers in high observability schools have far more knowledge of personnel and practices than suburban mothers in low observability settings.

In the large city, however, despite the apparent effectiveness of such channels for increasing mothers' knowledge of school matters, these channels are limited to the one middle-class elementary school. Since the knowledge of mothers in the city seems to suffer most from the absence of these arrangements, city school administrators might take this into account when they want to increase the level of knowledge about these schools.

Some administrators of city schools in relatively deprived neighborhoods might assume that increasing the number of arrangements will have little effect in increasing parental knowledge about the schools. It was seen that while working-class mothers have less contact with the school than do middle-class parents, when opportunities for such contact are extensive, working-class mothers are as likely to utilize these opportunities as are their middle-class counterparts. But perhaps the working-class mother's contact with the school does not produce as much knowledge of school matters as comparable contact of the middle-class parent. We next present data that illustrate the relationship to parental knowledge of location in middle- and working-class communities, especially when the degree of observability provided by the school is taken into account.

Knowledge by Socio-Economic Composition of the Community

Table 5.21 shows that mothers in middle-class settings have considerably more knowledge of both school personnel and practices than do those in working-class settings.

Almost half the mothers in middle-class communities, compared to one-quarter of those in working-class areas, rank high on the Index of

Table 5.21

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on the Indices of Personnel and Practices by Community SES

Community SES	Personnel	Practices	Number of Mothers
Middle-class	46%	66%	(505)
Working-class	27	29	(622)
Difference	+19%	+37%	

Personnel. The difference between the two groups is even greater for knowledge of practices; 2/3 of the mothers in middle-class, compared to less than 1/3 in working-class schools rank high on this dimension of knowledge. That the gap between the two groups is greater for knowledge of practices than for knowledge of personnel may be due to the more abstract nature of school practices. Knupfer, for example, comments on the lack of interest of the lower class individual in abstract matters, and on the fact that the less educated person is far more likely because of timidity and lack of information, to have a higher rate of "don't know" responses on these kinds of items.[44]

We have seen that when school structured channels for parental knowledge were provided for working-class mothers, they utilized these channels almost as frequently as did their middle-class counterparts. Correspondingly, Table 5.22 indicates that when the opportunity gap between middle- and working-class mothers is eliminated, the knowledge gap is substantially reduced, in fact almost eliminated, where knowledge of school personnel is concerned.

Location in a working-class community constitutes almost no handicap for parental knowledge of school personnel, and only a small

handicap for knowledge of school practices when the school provides the working-class mother with the same opportunity to obtain information as it does the middle-class parent. The absence of such opportunities, however, has almost no impact on the knowledge of mothers in middle-class communities, but is associated with a reduction in the working-class mother's knowledge of personnel (from 43% to 21%) as well as in her knowledge of school practices (from 48% to 23%). The consequence is a substantial increase in the knowledge gap between middle- and working-class mothers.

Table 5.22

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on the Indices of Personnel and Practices by Community SES and Observability

	Personnel		Practices		Number of Mothers	
	Observability		Observability		Observability	
Community SES	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Middle-class	48%	42%	64%	71%	(351)	(154)
Working-class	43	21	48	23	(160)	(462)
Difference	- 5%	-21%	-16%	-48%		

Apparently these school-structured arrangements are prerequisites for knowledge of school matters in working-class communities. Their absence or reduction heightens the class differential in parental knowledge. Middle-class mothers may not only have a fuller reservoir of information regarding school matters than do working-class parents, but they also have readier access to alternative sources of information when school-structured opportunities are limited.[45] Working-class parents, who may possess little information to begin with, also are less

likely to have access to alternative sources such as other knowledgeable parents, school officials, or community influentials who might provide them with information about school matters.

Contact: An Intervening Variable

We have analyzed the relationship of school-structured opportunities for parental knowledge and actual parental knowledge. We found that mothers' knowledge of school matters is higher in those schools that provide extensive formal channels between school and home. We also found that observability is especially associated with an increase in the level of knowledge about the school of city and suburban as compared to rural and small town mothers, and of working-class as compared to middle-class parents.

We might well ask at this point why knowledge should be greater for mothers in high observability settings. That schools provide extensive opportunities for parents to obtain information is surely no guarantee of increased parental knowledge.

A key intervening variable between the existence of opportunity-structures for knowledge and actual knowledge may be the degree of utilization of such opportunity-structures. If mothers with similar utilization rates have similar knowledge of school matters, regardless of the observability setting, we may conclude that increased opportunities for knowledge which schools may provide are themselves relatively ineffectual in increasing parental knowledge. If, on the other hand, knowledge is higher in those settings where observability is high than it is under conditions of low observability, despite similar amounts of contact, then we must search for some explanation in the

climate of those schools which offer extensive opportunities for knowledge.

Table 5.23

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on the Indices of Personnel and Practices by Contact

Rank on the Index of Formal School Contact	Index of Personnel	Index of Practices	Number of Mothers
High	47%	55%	(690)
Low	21	39	(702)
Difference	+26%	+16%	

Table 5.23 shows that mothers with much contact have more knowledge of school personnel and school practices than do mothers ranking low on contact. It shows, too, that formal contact is less related to knowledge of practices than to knowledge of personnel. Perhaps attendance at a PTA meeting or a Back-to-School Night enables mothers at least to learn of the existence of certain school personnel (who may be introduced or referred to at such gatherings) while such contacts are not as likely to increase knowledge of school practices, unless these practices are themselves topics of discussion at these meetings.

Observability, Contact, and Parental Knowledge

We have seen that under conditions of high observability mothers have more knowledge regarding school personnel and practices than when observability is low. We have also seen that formal contact with the school, or utilization of opportunities for knowledge, discriminates the more from the less knowledgeable mothers. Is it possible, since formal contacts are substantially higher in high observability settings than

in low, that contact alone, rather than contact and observability jointly, is accounting for the increased level of parental knowledge?

In Table 5.24 we see the proportion of mothers who rank high on the Indices of Personnel and Practices, with both contact and observability controlled.

Table 5.24

Percentage of Mothers Ranking High on Indices of Personnel and Practices by Contact and Observability

	Index of Personnel			Index of Practices		
	Observability			Observability		
Contact	High	Low	Difference	High	Low	Difference
High	52% (384)	40% (306)	+12%	65% (384)	40% (306)	+25%
Low	28 (127)	19 (575)	+9%	43 (127)	39 (575)	+4%
Difference	+14%	+21%		+22%	+1%	

It is obvious that the contextual property of observability has a spillover effect on mothers' knowledge of both personnel and practices when contact is held constant. 12% fewer mothers rank high on the Index of Personnel, and 25% fewer on the Index of Practices, when observability is low than when it is high -- when these mothers have had regular contact with the school.

When mothers' contact rates are low, however, the spillover effect of observability on knowledge of personnel is reduced, and, on knowledge of practices, eliminated. Only those who have the advantage of multiple school-structured arrangements and who utilize these arrangements, rank high on the Index of Practices. High contact in low observability

settings is barely related to information regarding school practices; nor is the existence of a high observability climate without accompanying contact.

Why, given similar frequency of contact, is parental knowledge generally greater in high than in low observability settings? Is there something in the social climate of those schools which maintain an Open Door Policy which permits a level of information beyond that obtained through direct formal contact?

We found previously that mothers utilized each formally-structured opportunity provided by schools more extensively when an Open Door Policy existed than when opportunities were limited. That is, more mothers attended PTA meetings or Back-to-School Night when other opportunities were also available than when these were the only arrangements provided. It was suggested at that time that the normative climate of schools providing high observability might be one which encourages mothers to utilize each opportunity. This in turn may lead to the existence and reinforcement of informal networks of mothers through which information regarding school matters is generated.[46] The informal networks established through regular utilization of school-structured channels may then have a spillover effect on the information level of those mothers who do not utilize these channels regularly.

Furthermore, schools with an Open Door Policy, which supposedly place a higher normative premium on parental knowledge, may also be providing other arrangements to increase school-home communication, such as frequent bulletins sent home with the child, parent-teacher teas, or Open Houses.

It is significant that the five schools in our sample which held an Open School Week all rank high on the Observability Index, as does the one school which reported holding regular parent-teacher teas. Perhaps when parents do not utilize the formally-structured arrangements composing our Observability Index, they may be kept informed through other arrangements which are more numerous in the Open Door Schools.

While the above explanation may account in part for the fact that observability has an effect on parental knowledge beyond that of contact, it does not account for this holding for knowledge of personnel, but not for knowledge of practices.

Why, as was seen in Table 5.24, are the joint effects of observability and contact on mothers' knowledge different, depending on the dimension of knowledge? We have suggested previously that, with the exception of the New Math, school practices constitute a dimension of knowledge which is less concrete, less relevant and therefore generally less visible to parents and that educational administrators and teachers may be restricting the visibility of certain school practices. It is unlikely, therefore, that the existence of an Open Door Policy is sufficient to generate a high informational level regarding these practices, unless accompanied by a high rate of parental contact. At the same time, contact with these schools which provide only limited observability arrangements may not be sufficient to promote parental knowledge about these practices. Both an Open Door Policy and a high rate of contact are requirements for knowledge of school practices. Either an Open Door Policy or a high rate of contact, however, is sufficient for parents to obtain information about the more visible school personnel, although

contact appears to contribute more to this dimension of parental knowledge than does observability.

One explanation then for the fact that the joint effects of observability and contact are somewhat different for knowledge of personnel than for knowledge of practices may lie in the differences inherent in these two kinds of knowledge. Another explanation, however, may be that certain attributes, which are themselves related to parental knowledge rates, differentiate mothers who have high or low contact within each of the observability settings.

After all, a high rate of contact is to be expected when the school maintains an Open Door Policy. Opportunities to attend school meetings are extensive and it is hardly surprising to find that the majority of mothers takes advantage of these opportunities.

A high rate of contact in a low observability setting, however, is a different matter for it means that mothers are utilizing each of the arrangements provided. It is possible that mothers with high contact rates where observability arrangements are limited may be distinguished by deep interest in school matters or strong convictions as to their relevance.

Similarly, a mother with a low contact rate, even when school-structured opportunities are extensive, may be very different from her counterpart with a low contact score when such opportunities are limited. In the first instance, the mother is <u>rejecting</u> the Open Door Policy; in the second, she is passively accepting the absence of opportunity and it may be then that the very characteristics of the mother which cause her to reject the Open Door Policy, contribute to her inability to obtain information about the partially insulated, relatively abstract school

practices. In other words, both high and low contact scores must be seen in the light of the opportunity-structure provided by the school, for there may be significant differences between mothers who have similar rates of contact but who are located in different observability settings.[47]

PARENTAL SATISFACTION WITH THE SCHOOL

Educational administrators have given full ideological support to the notion of high observability. Without exception, the prevalent feeling is that higher parental participation in school affairs will lead to increased knowledge and understanding of the school, and as a result, to more wholehearted support of school policy and financial requirements. We have seen that increased participation is indeed associated with higher levels of knowledge. It remains to be seen, however, whether increased knowledge is accompanied by greater satisfaction with the school and readiness to support its policies and programs.

Distribution and Correlates of Parental Satisfaction

We now examine the distribution of general or over-all parental satisfaction with the child's school and then note variations among selected groups of mothers.

Table 5.25 shows that most parents in our sample report being satisfied with the child's school; only 15% of the mothers report dissatisfaction.

Unlike many studies of parental satisfaction with schools, we find that the educational background of the parent makes little difference in the overall satisfaction rate. Only 4% more college than non-college

Table 5.25

Percentage of Mothers Reporting Varying Degrees of Satisfaction With the School by Educational Background

Degree of Satisfaction	All Mothers	College Mothers	Non-college Mothers
Very satisfied	52%	55%	51%
Somewhat satisfied	33	32	34
Dissatisfied	15	14	16
Number of mothers	(1369)	(494)	(875)

parents report that they are very satisfied with the job that the school is doing. Cloward and Jones report, however, that among those with children in school, about half of the lower- and working-class respondents evaluate the school favorably, while only a third of the middle-class respondents do so. In sum, they state that middle-class respondents

> . . .are more likely to consider the public school one of the major problems of the community, are less likely to feel that it is doing a good job, and are more likely to disagree with the assertion that the teachers are really interested in their students.[48]

They, as well as others who have found an inverse relationship between socio-economic status and parental satisfaction, suggest that the negative opinion voiced by middle-class respondents may reflect their higher expectation of what schools are supposed to accomplish.[49]

Cloward and Jones' respondents are all residents of a relatively deprived working-class area; therefore, we are not surprised that they express dissatisfaction with the school. We also find that if the overall satisfaction rates of mothers, both college and non-college, are examined within middle- and working-class communities (Table 5.26),

the better educated mothers in working-class areas are less satisfied with the schools than their non-college counterparts. While half of the non-college mothers are very satisfied with the school in the working-class community, one-third of the better educated parents in working-class areas report much satisfaction. On the other hand, in middle-class areas, both college and non-college mothers report approximately the same (high) rates of satisfaction.

Table 5.26

Percentage of Mothers Who are Very Satisfied with the School by Educational Background and Community SES

Educational background	Community SES: Middle-Class	Working-Class	Difference
College	61% (319)	35% (95)	+26%
Non-college	56 (178)	50 (516)	+6%
All Mothers	59% (497)	48% (611)	+11%

As Table 5.26 also indicates, college mothers in middle-class communities have a 26% higher satisfaction rate than those living in working-class areas. Non-college mothers, however, are only 6% less satisfied with the schools in the working- than in the middle-class communities. Thus any analysis of socio-economic differences in parental satisfaction with the community's schools must control for the predominant socio-economic level of the community.

Observability and Parental Satisfaction

Is the extent to which the school provides ready access to school-related information related to the satisfaction rates of the mothers in our sample? Is it possible that the general limitation of such access,

which is characteristic more of the working- than the middle-class school, is contributing to the differences in satisfaction found in Table 5.26?

Table 5.27 presents data which throw light on these questions. If we look first at the relationship of the observability setting to satisfaction of all mothers, regardless of their educational background or community's SES, we find that 58% of the mothers in high, but 48% in low observability settings are very satisfied with the school. This relationship is specified, however, when examined within middle- and working-class contexts. In middle-class areas, observability makes a 12% difference in mothers' satisfaction rates (63% very satisfied in high observability schools compared to 51% in low ones), while it makes no difference in the working-class community (49% compared to 47%).

In the same way, the observability setting has a greater relationship to the satisfaction rates of college than non-college mothers. The former have an 18% higher satisfaction rate in the high observability setting than in the low one (62% to 44%); the non-college mothers have about the same overall satisfaction rate regardless of the observability setting. This is true in both middle- and working-class communities. Particularly interesting is that college mothers in working-class areas report about as much satisfaction with the high observability school (43%) as do college mothers in middle-class settings with their low observability schools (48%).

Although the community's socio-economic level contributes more to mothers' satisfaction than does observability, still the satisfaction rates of mothers, particularly college mothers, are considerably lower when observability is low. Almost 64% of these mothers are very satisfied with their high observability schools in middle-class areas; only

Table 5.27

Percentage of Mothers who are Very Satisfied with the School by Educational Background, Community SES, and Observability

a. All Mothers

Educational background	Observability: High		Observability: Low		Difference
College	62%	(289)	44%	(125)	18%
Non-college	54	(210)	50	(484)	4
All mothers	58%	(499)	48%	(609)	10%
Difference between college and non-college mothers	+8%		- 6%		

b. Middle-class Communities

Educational background	Observability: High		Observability: Low		Difference
College	64%	(259)	48%	(60)	16%
Non-college	59	(85)	53	(93)	6
All mothers	63%	(344)	51	(153)	12%
Difference between college and non-college mothers	+ 5%		- 5%		

c. Working-class Communities

Educational background	Observability: High		Observability: Low		Difference
College	43%	(30)	31%	(65)	12%
Non-college	50	(125)	50	(391)	0
All mothers	49%	(155)	47%	(456)	2%
Difference between college and non-college mothers	- 7%		-19%		

48% are as satisfied in these same areas when observability is low. Similarly in working-class areas the satisfaction rate is 12% higher for college mothers when an Open Door Policy prevails.

Clearly, the existence of extensive opportunities for parental knowledge means more to the college than the non-college mother. Loss of observability is accompanied by a 16% drop in the satisfaction rate of college mothers, but a 6% drop for non-college mothers in middle-class areas. Similarly, low observability in working-class areas is accompanied by a 12% reduction in the satisfaction rate for college mothers, compared to no reduction at all in the rate for non-college parents. Or it might be stated thus: the satisfaction rate of non-college mothers remains relatively unchanged under varying socio-economic or observability conditions. College mothers, on the other hand, are highly satisfied only under optimum conditions of observability and socio-economic level. Their satisfaction rate is more or less equally related to the community's socio-economic level and the observability conditions.[50]

Apparently, the extent to which the school provides opportunities for the college mother to obtain information about school matters is an important component of her overall satisfaction, but bears only a minimal relationship to the satisfaction of the less educated mother.

PARENTAL SUPPORT OF THE SCHOOL

Although schools are concerned among other things with maintaining high levels of satisfaction among their parent constituency, they also are interested in obtaining financial support for expansion of physical or curricular facilities. The assumption of educational administrators

has been that if parents are increasingly brought into the school they will gain a better understanding of the goals and requirements of the school and will become more active supporters of the organization.

Is parental support more likely to be forthcoming from mothers as they become increasingly involved and knowledgeable? Is there a relationship between parents' overall satisfaction with the school and their willingness to support the financial needs and policies of the school?

We have selected two indicators of mothers' attitudes toward school financial matters. Parents were asked:

Do you think there are any things the local schools are spending too much money on?

Do you think there are any things that the local schools should spend more money on, even if this meant an increase in your taxes?

Parental Satisfaction and Attitudes Toward School Finances

As Table 5.28 shows, only 16% criticize the present spending policy of the schools, while 66% indicate a willingness to see the schools spend more money, even if this involved an increase in their taxes.

Table 5.28

Percentage of Mothers Who Criticize Present Spending Policy and Percentage Who Would Support Increased Spending, by Satisfaction with the School

Satisfaction Level	Spending too much	Schools should spend more
Very satisfied	12% (554)	57% (605)
Somewhat satisfied	15 (353)	72 (389)
Dissatisfied	30 (156)	80 (194)
All Mothers	16% (1063)[a]	66% (1188)[a]

[a]The total N is somewhat smaller since those mothers who replied "don't know" to these questions were eliminated from the analysis.

Mothers who are dissatisfied with the school are more than twice as likely to criticize present spending policy (30% compared to 12%) but are also more willing to assume an added tax burden in order to see the schools spend more.[51]

It may be then that a high level of satisfaction with the school is not entirely desirable, from the standpoint of educational personnel, if it assumes the form of a passive complacency with the status quo. Active and informed dissatisfaction may be a necessary condition for innovation and change. If schools are seeking support for increased budgets and innovative programs such as the New Math or programmed learning, a certain amount of parental dissatisfaction, if properly mobilized by the school, can become a constructive force for the support of needed change in the system.

Involvement, Knowledge, and Attitudes Toward School Finances

Can schools mobilize such support by providing channels through which parents become more involved and more knowledgeable? Is there a relationship, in other words, between parental knowledge and involvement on the one hand and parental willingness to extend financial support to the school on the other?

Apparently, as Table 5.29 indicates, the mothers who know more about the school are more critical of its spending policy but are also slightly more willing to support increased school spending -- even if this meant an additional tax burden. The difference for the latter item is only 8%, but it suggests that while knowledge is associated with increased tendency to criticize, it is also accompanied by an

increased readiness to shoulder a tax increase in order tc support further school spending.

As the balance of Table 5.29 shows, neither the amount of formal contact with the school nor the extent to which observability is provided is related either to the tendency to criticize present spending policy or the readiness to support increased spending.[52]

Table 5.29

Percentage of Mothers Who Criticize Present Spending Policy and Who Would Support Increased Spending by Knowledge, by Formal Contact, and by Observability

Characteristics	Schools spend too much on some things		Schools should spend more	
Knowledge Level				
High on Both Indices[53]	23%	(279)	69%	(299)
High on One Index	13	(402)	68	(451)
Low on Both	12	(395)	61	(451)
Formal Contact				
High	17%	(550)	64%	(617)
Low	15	(526)	68	(584)
Observability				
High	18%	(405)	64%	(464)
Low	14	(671)	66	(747)

The results of Tables 5.28 and 5.29 present us with somewhat of a dilemma. We have found that the provision of extensive observability arrangements is conducive to increased parental involvement, knowledge, and satisfaction with the job the school is doing. Clearly, if schools were concerned only with maintaining an involved, knowledgeable and satisfied parent body, the provision of formal observability arrangements would be an important step toward this end.

Schools, however, must be concerned also with the practical problem of obtaining adequate financial support of their constituents in order to expand their facilities and underwrite innovations in the curriculum. Which parents appear to be willing to support such increased school spending? We find that it is generally the parent who is less satisfied with the job the school is doing and more critical of present spending policy who expresses a readiness to shoulder an increased tax burden in order to underwrite further school spending. This suggests that, while a satisfied parent body may be desirable from the point of view of the general stability of home-school relationships, a certain amount of dissatisfaction may be functional when it comes to underwriting innovation, expansion, and change in the system.

Is there any possibility, therefore, that school personnel can "have their cake and eat it too?" In other words, can they maintain a relatively satisfied parent constituency and at the same time channel the expressed dissatisfaction into support of innovation and expansion? We think that this is possible and our data buttress this assumption. For until this point we have limited our discussion to the attitudes of satisfaction or financial willingness to support increased spending.

Involvement, Knowledge, and Voting Behavior

The test of the strength and saliency of an attitude, however, is the extent to which it results in action. As Merton points out, attitude and overt behavior can differ, and markedly so, under specified conditions. The prejudiced person, for example, does not always engage in discriminatory behavior, while the unprejudiced individual may be

inactive when it comes to the support of racial integration, and may even engage in discriminatory practices.[54]

One test of a parent's expressed attitude of financial willingness is whether or not she goes to the polls to vote "yes" in the school election. It remains to be seen whether parental involvement and knowledge, so closely tied to the existence of an Open Door Policy, are associated with the likelihood of voting in school elections.

Table 5.30

Percentage of Mothers Who Voted in the Last School Election by Knowledge, by Observability and by Formal Contact

	Voted in Last School Election	
	Per Cent	Number
All Mothers	42%	(1184)[a]
Knowledge Level		
High on Both Indices	62%	(265)
High on One Index	43	(430)
Low on Both	30	(489)
Observability		
High	55%	(395)
Low	36	(789)
Formal Contact		
High	55%	(576)
Low	30	(608)

[a]The smaller N is the result of eliminating Old Home mothers since no election was held in this community.

The average turnout rate at the polls, as Table 5.30 shows, is 42%. Less than half the parents exercise their prerogative of voting in elections which may directly affect the education of their children. Still, the turnout rate is higher when the schools provide extensive observability arrangements (55%) and even further increased when parents

utilize these arrangements at a high rate (63%). Similarly, parents who rank high on both indices of knowledge have a turnout which is more than twice as high as that of the "chronic know-nothings."[55] Apparently, it is the involved and knowledgeable parents who consistitute the bulk of those who actually vote. When mothers are both involved and knowledgeable, as Table 5.31 indicates, the voting rate is 70%.

Table 5.31

Percentage of Mothers Who Voted in the Last School Election by Formal Contact and Knowledge

	Formal Contact	
Knowledge	High	Low
High	70% (187)	45% (78)
Medium	54 (212)	33 (218)
Low	40 (177)	24 (312)

On the other hand, only one of every four uninvolved chronic know-nothings turned out to vote in the last school election. Thus the turnout rate is three times as high for knowledgeable and involved parents as it is for uninvolved, uninformed ones. If school administrators want to encourage a large parental turnout at the polls, the maintenance of an involved and knowledgeable parent body through the provision of an Open Door Policy apparently contributes much to this end.

Is it possible, however, that in the process of encouraging a large parental turnout at the polls, the schools may draw a disproportionate number of dissatisfied and non-supportive parents who are likely to vote "no" on a school bond issue? Evidence to the contrary is supplied both by our own data and by other researchers who have found that the

parents of children in school generally vote in favor of the school's financial program and that it is rather a large non-parent vote which is predictive of a school bond defeat.[56] In general, surveys and polls have found parents to hold more favorable attitudes toward the schools, to criticize them less frequently, and to be more supportive of increased school spending. On the basis of evidence of past research therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that the parent who votes in a school election will less often than others cast her vote against the bond issue.

Let us turn to our data, however, and see if it is possible to estimate the favorable vote which schools might expect under normal conditions and then compare this with the favorable vote which might be predicted were all mothers provided with extensive observability arrangements.

Although we do not know whether mothers voted in favor of or against the bond issue, we do have an indicator of their expressed support of increased school spending. It will be remembered that mothers were asked if they thought the schools should spend more on certain things even if this meant an increase in their taxes? In Table 5.28 we saw that 66% of the mothers replied "yes" to this question, and for the moment we shall assume that if these mothers actually voted, they would have voted in favor of increased spending.

Now let us look at these two groups, supporters and non-supporters, and ascertain whether one or the other group is overrepresentd among those with high formal school contact, those in high observability settings, those with a high level of knowledge. That is, are non-supporters

perhaps drawn to the school at a higher rate than supporters? Is the non-supporter more likely to be a knowledgeable parent than is the supporter? Is she more likely to be located in a high observability setting?

Table 5.32 shows that supporters and non-supporters are equally distributed in high and low observability settings. Similarly, the same proportion of supporters as non-supporters have had formal contact with school and approximately the same proportion are equally knowledgeable. We see, then, that by maintaining an Open Door Policy, by involving mothers in school activities, and by encouraging an informed parent body, schools are neither drawing upon a disproportionate number of supporters or non-supporters.

Table 5.32

Percentage and Number of Supporters and Non-Supporters with Varying Degress of Observability, Formal Contact, and Knowledge

	Supporters		Non-Supporters	
Totals	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
1) Observability				
High	38%	(299)	38%	(155)
Low	62	(493)	62	(254)
2) Formal Contact				
High	50	(397)	53	(220)
Low	50	(395)	47	(189)
3) Knowledge				
High	26	(205)	23	(94)
Medium	39	(311)	34	(140)
Low	35	(276)	43	(175)
Number of Mothers		(792)		(409)

A Hypothetical Election

We saw in Table 5.28 that 66% or 792 mothers stated that they would like to see the school spend more on some things even if this meant an increase in their taxes. Obviously, if they all turned out at the polls and voted "yes," the bond issue would be overwhelmingly passed, by almost 400 votes.[57]

How many supporters and non-supporters, however, actually did vote?

Table 5.33

Proportion of Supporters and Non-Supporters
Among Voting Mothers

Voting Mothers	Supporters		Non-Supporters		Number of Mothers
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	
Total	66%	(310)	34%	(154)	(464)

Among all voters (464 mothers), 66% were supporters and 34% were non-supporters; the polls were attracting supporters and non-supporters in the same proportion as their distribution in the total sample. Thus, of those who turned out at the polls, 310 or 66% could be expected to vote "yes"; 154 or 34% to have voted "no."

As a first step therefore we see that in encouraging parents to vote, schools are not attracting disproportionate numbers of non-supportive parents. Since they start out with twice as many supporters as non-supporters in the general parent body, the non-supporters would have to be drawn to the polls at twice the rate of supporters in order for a bond issue to be defeated.

We have already seen that involvement and knowledge are related to the likelihood of voting in a school election. We have also seen that supporters and non-supporters are about equally represented among the

involved and the knowledgeable mothers. If supporters and non-supporters are involved in school activities, or knowledgeable about school matters at approximately the same rates, but the former outnumber the latter by a margin of two to one, then we can assume that there are almost twice as many involved or knowledgeable supportive parents, as non-supportive ones. A glance at Table 5.32, where the actual numbers appear in parentheses, shows this to be true.

Let us carry the argument a bit further. We saw in Table 5.31 that involved and knowledgeable mothers voted at a rate of 70%. We now present the same data controlling for support.

Table 5.34

Percentage of Mothers who Voted in the Last School Election by Formal Contact, Knowledge, and Support of Increased School Spending

	High Formal Contact		Low Formal Contact	
Knowledge	Supporters	Non-Supporters	Supporters	Non-Supporters
High	70%	73%	50%	31%
Medium	54	57	36	26
Low	45	46	24	24

When mothers have had high formal contact with the school, at all levels of knowledge the turnout rate is approximately the same for supporters as for non-supporters. For involved and knowledgeable mothers the rate is 70% for supporters, 73% for non-supporters.

When mothers have only limited formal contact with the school, there is a tendency for supporters to vote at a higher rate than non-supporters, unless knowledge is very low. Our purpose, having established that voting rates for involved and knowledgeable mothers are

similar whether or not increased spending is supported, is to determine the significance of this fact for the expectation of a "yes" vote.

We stated before that at the present voting rate of 42%, the school could have expected a bond issue to be passed by a majority of 156 (310 supporters -- 154 non-supporters). Let us suppose, however, that the voting rate was raised to the level of 70% which was found to obtain for involved and knowledgeable parents. The number of supporters, as Table 5.32 showed, is 792; the number of non-supporters, 409. If the voting rate were raised to those levels which were found to obtain for involved and knowledgeable mothers (Table 5.34) we could expect the following result:

"Yes": 70% of 792 supporters, or 554

?No": 73% of 409 non-supporters, or 299

This would produce a margin of 255 "yes" votes. That is, at a voting rate of 70%, school administrators could expect a margin of 100 more "yes" votes than at the actual voting rate of 42%. From the standpoint of those who are seeking increased funding, therefore, the provision of observability arrangements, through which parents become more knowledgeable and involved, can contribute considerably to the likelihood of a larger margin of "yes" votes in school bond elections. Under these conditions, the less school personnel will have to fear that a large turnout of the general electorate will be successful in defeating a bond issue.

Summary

An Open Door Policy appears to have consequences beyond those of increasing parental involvement in the schools and knowledge about them.

It is associated with a reduction of the gap between middle-class and working-class parental involvement and knowledge. A by-product of its positive relationship to involvement, knowledge, and satisfaction levels seems to be its strong effect in moving mothers to action, that is to voting in school elections, for almost three out of every four involved and knowledgeable mothers is a voter.

If school officials are concerned among other things with maintaining an involved, knowledgeable, and actively supportive parent constituency, the provision of an Open Door Policy may contribute substantially toward this end.

FOOTNOTES

1. K. Wolff (ed. and trans.) The Sociology of Georg Simmel (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950), p. 307.

2. E. C. Bolmeier, "More About Education Is Needed," Educational Forum (January, 1950), pp. 195-6.

3. R. F. Carter and J. Sutthoff, Communities and Their Schools (Stanford, California: Stanford University, 1960), pp. 1-2.

4. Only recently in one of the Harlem schools debate raged fiercely as to whether parents should play a role in the appointment of a principal.

5. For a summary of many of these see National Educational Association Research Division, Public Opinion Polls on American Education (Washington: National Education Asscciation, 1958).

6. R. K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), p. 319.

7. Ibid., p. 341.

8. Ibid., p. 376.

9. W. L. Cooper, "Meeting Conflicting Demands on the High School," in The High School in a New Era (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), p. 321.

10. The fact that three of these four schools are located in middle-class communities suggests that the decline of the Open School Week may be a reflection of the higher employment rates today, as compared to thirty years ago, of mothers of school-age children. Critics of the Open School Week have argued that this arrangement does little to increase the visibility of the classroom behavior of teacher or students, since both teacher and students have prepared themselves carefully to "put their best foot forward" for the parents. On the other hand, one teacher asserts:

> Getting into the classroom to see for themselves what goes on is worth a dozen notes or conferences . . . .

For it provides the parents with

> . . .firsthand observation of the rewards and harassments of the teacher who must daily cope with an average class of 25 spirited young children (T. Morris, "What Your Child's Teacher Thinks of You," Redbook (October, 1962).

11. Merton, op. cit., p. 337.

12. A score of 4 was assigned to those schools which held both scheduled conferences and a Back-to-School Night and in which the PTA was "active." Inactive PTA's were given a score of "1," active ones, "2." Whether a school's PTA was active or inactive was assessed on the basis of principals', teachers' and parents' ratings.

13. The range of contact with the school reported by mothers in the sample extends far beyond the utilization of these three arrangements. Many mothers have had casual contact with the child's teacher, have spoken with other school personnel such as the principal, librarian, or nurse, or have called their child's teacher for a private conference. Most mothers have also spoken with their child or other parents about school matters and some have friends who are teachers. These too represent channels for obtaining information about school matters and for an analysis of the relationship between utilization of these "informal observability" arrangements and parental knowledge about the school, see N.S. Friedman, "Observability in School Systems: A Problem of Inter-System Integration" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Sociology, Columbia University, 1968), ch. 7.

14. Later we present data which show that when high schools provide ready observability, high school mothers have about as much contact as elementary school mothers.

15. Forty-five per cent of high school teachers, but 61% of elementary school teachers feel that the mothers of their students are "very concerned" about school matters. It may be, however, that there are qualitative differences between the "interest" of elementary and high school mothers. The former, whose children are still in the early stages of their schooling, may in fact be expressing genuine interest in school matters. The interest expressed by the latter, on the other hand, may stem from the normative requirement that parents be concerned about matters having to do with their children's education.

16. A. J. Vidich, and J. Bensman, Small Town in Mass Society (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1960), pp. 174-5.

17. The principal of one of the small town elementary schools said, for example:

> This is a small town and . . . I'm closer to the people and situations than in a bigger town. . . .

It may also be significant that in Working Town and Green Hollow, the two smallest communities in the sample, about half the elementary and high school teachers reside within the community itself. Although a large proportion of teachers both live and teach in Metropolis, the relative anonymity of city life probably reduces the opportunities for informal interaction with parents that are likely to exist in the small town or village.

18. This is partially an artifact of the higher socio-economic level of suburban communities. Still, two of the five working-class suburban schools rank high on the Index of Observability.

19. A slightly higher proportion of teachers in suburban than in non-suburban schools (62% of the former but 53% of the latter) feel that the mothers of their students are "very concerned" about school matters.

20. N. Rogoff, "Local Social Structure and Educational Selection," Education, Economy, and Society, ed. by J. Floud Halsey and Anderson (New York: The Free Press, 1965), pp. 242-3.

21. F. Sexton, Education and Income (New York: Viking Press, 1961), pp. 123-32.

22. C. Glock, G. Selznick, and J. Spaeth, The Apathetic Majority (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 19.

23. The high attendance rates at Scheduled Conferences signals the qualitative differences among the three arrangements. In contrast to the PTA meeting or the Back-to-School Night, the Scheduled Conference affords mothers an opportunity to confer privately with the child's teacher. The mother is able to discuss matters or ask questions which pertain specifically to her child. The privacy of the Scheduled Conference may appeal to those parents who are ill-at-ease in the more social environment of the PTA or the Back-to-School Night. Nor does the Scheduled Conference require the parent to take as much initiative as is involved in deciding whether to attend a PTA meeting or Back-to-School Night, for each parent is usually assigned a specific fifteen-minute to half-hour period with the teacher. For all these reasons, we find that when this arrangement is offered, it is more widely utilized than the others, even by the traditionally non-participating working-class parent.

24. The obvious explanation is a socio-economic one. Observability arrangements are more prevalent in suburbs and middle-class areas, where participation rates would normally be expected to be high. Later we shall test this explanation, however, and find that it only partially accounts for the finding that the more opportunities the school provides the more mothers take advantage of each opportunity.

25. We have no direct indicators of the extent to which informal networks of parents are formed as a consequence of parental attendance at school gatherings. Elsewhere it has been found, however, that such attendance is accompanied by a higher frequency of discussion of school matters with other parents, and a higher rate of "neighboring," (See Friedman, op. cit., ch.6).

26. The 85 mothers in Green Hollow and New Home High Schools are excluded from this analysis since in the former a PTA, and in the latter a Back-to-School Night, were the only observability

arrangements available to parents. Mothers in these schools could at most have had only one type of formal contact with the school. In these two schools, only 28% of the mothers have utilized the one channel available to them; 72% have had no formal contact at all with the school.

27. Sexton, op. cit., pp. 166, 228, and H. Grobman, "Attitudes of Parents Toward School Programs," Clearing House (October, 1958), p. 69.

28. The results of Table 5.7 may be somewhat misleading since the only two high schools ranking high in observability are located in wealthy suburban communities. As none of the high schools in working-class areas rank high on the Index of Observability, it cannot be determined whether the high contacts of mothers in Suburban Estates and Nouveau Heights are the result of the extensive opportunities offered them by their schools, or of their high socio-economic status. An indication that it may be the former, however, is provided when we see that of the 25 working-class mothers in these two communities, that is, mothers with only a high school education, 16 rank high on the Index of Formal School Contact.

29. R. J. Havighurst and B. L. Neugarten, Society and Education (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962), p. 122.

30. W. T. Martin, "The Structuring of Social Relationships Engendered by Suburban Residence," American Sociological Review, XXI (August, 1956), pp. 446-453.

31. The strong relationship of suburban residence to utilization rates is evidenced, however, by the fact that working-class mothers in the suburb have higher utilization rates than do middle-class mothers in non-suburban communities. (See Friedman, op. cit., pp. 78-9).

32. See, for example, Sexton, op. cit.; R. A. Cloward and J. A. Jones, "Social Class: Educational Attitudes and Participation," Education in Depressed Areas, ed. A. H. Passow (New York: Teachers College Press, 1963), p. 208; R. E. Herriott and N. H. St. John, Social Class and the Urban School (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 41; J. M. Foskett, "New Facts About Lay Participation," The Nation's Schools, LIV (August, 1954) and "Who Discusses School Affairs?" School Executive, XIV (February, 1955).

33. We are using education, rather than income or some general measure of socio-economic status, since other studies have found that in attitudes regarding educational questions the former is a better differentiator of responses. D. Wilder, "Social Factors in the Awareness Perception and Evaluation of the Teaching of Reading," Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1965 (mimeographed); also J. M. Foskett, "Who Discusses School Affairs?" pp. 79-81; D. M. Black, "Public Attitudes Toward Education," Journal of Experimental Education, XXIX (September, 1960), pp. 23-26.

34. Sexton, op. cit., p. 108.

35. Friedman found that alternative channels for obtaining information about the school are in fact utilized more frequently in high than in low observability settings and more regularly by college than non-college mothers. However in low observability settings, the college mother takes substantially more advantage of the alternative channels and thus maintains a high level of knowledge, while the working-class or non-college mother appears to be doubly deprived--both of formal school-structured opportunities as well as informal, alternative sources of information.

36. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, p. 341.

37. For example, 35% of the mothers think that skipping is a "good idea" but 57% are opposed to this practice.

38. This is reminiscent of the practice of many political leaders in election campaigns who

> . . . may avoid discussing an issue which they assume to be prominent but which they also assume to be a weak point in their political position. The Democratic candidates' avoidance of the corruption issue in 1952 is a case in point.

This tendency seems to exist in various kinds of social systems. Merton notes that a certain amount of ignorance, or insulation from observability may be functional for a system. He says:

> . . . if the facts of all role-behavior and all attitudes were freely available to anyone, social structures could not operate. . . . 'Privacy' is not merely a personal predilection; it is an important functional requirement for the effective operation of social structure. (Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, p. 375.)

Similarly, in his paper, "The Role of the Category of Ignorance in Sociological Theory," Schneider suggests that ignorance may be functional for a system when knowledge regarding certain actions or attitudes would be painful or distasteful to the observer, but would have no positive consequences. (See L. Schneider, "The Role of Category of Ignorance in Sociological Theory," American Sociological Review, XXVII (August, 1962), pp. 492-508.

39. H. G. Erskine, "The Polls: The Informed Public," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXVI (Winter, 1962), pp. 669-77.

40. H. G. Erskine, "The Polls: Exposure to Domestic Information," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXVI (F-11, 1963), pp. 491-500.

41. These will be referred to in the balance of the analysis as the "Index of Personnel" and the "Index of Practices."

42. See Table 5.12 for school personnel and practice items. Because of technical considerations the percentage of "don't know" responses is taken as an indicator of mothers' knowledge of those personnel and practices items which were not universal among the schools in the sample. 46% of the mothers had no "don't know" responses regarding selected school personnel; 48% had one or no "don't know" responses on the practice items. Both groups include a very small percentage of mothers who may have responded inaccurately.

43. See Table 5.12 for school practices.

44. G. Knupfer, "Portrait of the Underdog," Class, Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification, ed. R. Bendix and S. Lipset (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1953), pp. 255-63.

45. See footnote 35.

46. Mothers who attend school gatherings regularly are more likely to designate themselves as "opinion leaders" who are frequently questioned about school matters. The Open Door Policy may produce a "two-step flow" of information to the general parent body, thus accounting perhaps for the "spillover-effect" of observability.

47. For an analysis of the attributes of mothers with differing degrees of contact in the two observability settings, see Friedman, op. cit., ch. 7.

48. R. A. Cloward and J. A. Jones, "Social Class: Educational Attitudes and Participation," op. cit.

49. Ibid., p. 209. The other studies which found an inverse relationship between SES and parental satisfaction did not control for the socio-economic level of the community of residence of respondents.

50. College mothers in working-class areas, or in low observability schools, may feel relatively deprived, compared to their counterparts in middle-class areas or high observability schools. For example, 56% of the college mothers in middle-class areas, but only 12% in working-class areas think that their child's school is better than most in the United States. Similarly, 56% in high observability schools, but only 18% in low ones, compare their school favorably with others. Cloward and Jones, op. cit., p. 208.

51. A cross-tabulation of these two items yields the following results:

		Schools Should Spend More		
Schools spend too much on some things		Yes	No	No. of Mothers
	Yes	75%	25%	(157)
	No	62%	38%	(776)

The 118 mothers who feel that the schools are spending too much on some things and should spend more on certain things do not raise any problem as to the consistency of their responses. Most of these mothers felt the schools were spending too much on "frills," such as playground equipment, art supplies, etc., but should spend more on teachers' salaries, more personnel, etc.

52. We did find, however, that mothers with high formal contact and mothers in high observability settings have a lower rate of "don't know" responses regarding these financial questions. Apparently, while involvement in school matters is unrelated to either financial criticism or financial willingness, it does tend to reduce the reluctance of inability of mothers to express an opinion regarding these matters.

53. That is, on both the Index of Personnel and the Index of Practice.

54. R. K. Merton, "Discrimination and the American Crred," Discrimination and the National Welfare, ed. R. M. MacIver (New York: Harper, 1948), pp. 99-126.

55. I.e., those who rank low on both indices of knowledge. The term is borrowed from H. Hyman and P. Sheatsley, "Some Reasons Why Information Campaigns Fail," Readings in Social Psychology, ed. E. Maccoby, T. Newcomb, and E. Hartley (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958), pp. 164-74.

56. Carter, Voters and Their Schools.

57. Since this is a hypothetical case, we are assuming that the mothers in the sample constitute one voting group. Actually, of course, they are located in different school districts.

SECTION VI.

SOCIALIZATION, ACHIEVEMENT, AND ALIENATION FROM THE SCHOOL

This section contains three sub-sections, or chapters. The first is devoted to consideration of the relationship between selected socialization practices of parents and teachers and the age and sex characteristics of children. By making comparisons among the mothers, teachers, and students at three different grade levels, we shall find shifts reported in the types and frequencies of adult-child interaction. These shifts in interaction patterns are not accounted for by the sex of the child or by the socioeconomic circumstances of the family. In the second chapter, we are concerned with the actual and perceived school performance of children as these relate to their age, sex, and social background. It is found that responses to children by their mothers and teachers are strongly related to the formal reward structure of the school and that normative standards are different according to the age and sex of the child. In the third chapter, we are chiefly concerned with the high school students' evaluative responses to school and the correlates of alienation. From the three chapters it is evident that differences between the responses of boys and girls to school are large and consistent, and that adaptation to school is better among girls and younger children than boys and older children according to every measure employed. Moreover, as students get older, the marks earned by the children in school become the single most important factor for the integration of school and family as indicated by our measures of role strain.

I. SOCIALIZATION PRACTICES OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS AS RELATED TO AGE AND SEX OF CHILDREN

Age-Grade Related Changes in Parent-Child Interaction

Age and sex are perhaps the two most important dimensions along which socialization occurs in every society. Virtually every anthropological description of a primitive tribe includes accounts of changes in socialization practices and accounts of differences in behavior and normative expectations associated with boys and girls of various ages.[1] Psychologists also employ age and sex as organizing dimensions in most of their studies and discussions of socialization.[2] Many sociological accounts of socialization borrow from the psychological and anthropological literature, and thus they too include age and sex as important factors. However, empirical sociological research on socialization has tended to neglect age-grade and sex differences. This has been largely a result of the fact that few large-scale, empirical sociological studies have included children from different age groups as well as their parents as subjects. Instead, they have usually chosen infant-child rearing practices or "adult" socialization as major concerns.

Studies of "child rearing" practices associated with the very young have tended to be directed at (1) testing Freudian hypotheses or (2) demonstrating that there are differences associated with social class.[3] In contrast, adult socialization studies have tended tc be mainly concerned with trying to determine whether adult socializing agencies such as colleges,[4] professional schools,[5] and the military[6] are able to produce changes in values that are not attributable to earlier socialization, as

measured by background characteristics. Thus our study design can be seen as providing an urusual opportunity to obtain systematic information about the socialization of boys and girls between the ages of five and seventeen and relating this information to their school performance.

Socialization is a process whereby knowledge, skills, values and attitudes are acquired by members of social groups. With children, the acquisition of these traits is accompanied by developmental or maturational changes in the organism. Until certain changes take place, the maturational level of the child places constraints upon or limits the range of behavior and the types of social controls employed by socializing adults. It is difficult, for instance, to explain to the very young child the meaning of much of what he may see on the television news broadcast, or to keep the behavior of the small child within socially acceptable limits without resorting to coercive means of control. A normative outgrowth of these maturational factors is that some behaviors are felt to be appropriate for adults who are socializing younger children that would not be considered appropriate for dealing with older ones. In addition, as the child internalizes basic social skills and checks on his own behavior, the frequency of certain types of responses from socializing adults will be reduced or increased accordingly. As many observers have noted, relationships between adults and young children are generally more diffuse.[7] Rewards and punishments are used repeatedly in attempts to manipulate the young child; and exaggerated gestures, expressive language, and affectively loaded responses are deemed appropriate. As the child grows older, his prior socialization and maturation permit socializing adults to enter into more highly specified relationships with him, and to give less attention

to acting as agents of social control. In other words, both the quality and quantity of adult-child interaction change as the child ages.

If the school and community are well integrated, and adults in each are constrained by the developmental levels of children, the above generalizations should hold for both parent-child and for teacher-child relationships. The expressive behavior commonly associated with social control situations should be more frequent among the mothers of younger children than among the mothers of older children. Similarly, teachers who deal with younger children should employ expressive behavior more frequently than those who teach older children. Moreover, there should be an accompanying increase in specificity and objectivity in appraising the behavior of older children in the school situation as task orientation on the part of both the adults and the children replaces the need for constantly imposing social controls. We should also expect to find differences between the behavior of younger and older children that are consonant with those found among their mothers and teachers. If mothers and teachers are sanctioning them less frequently, older children should be behaving less often in ways that require punishment or other social controls from adults. It also follows that if children in the earlier grades have more diffuse relationships with the school and with teachers, it is more appropriate (and perhaps more important) that the younger child like school and the teacher.

In order to obtain some measure of gross changes in general types of parent-child interaction, each mother was asked a series of questions about the frequency with which she behaved in certain specified ways. Interviewers handed a card to each respondent listing frequencies ranging

from "often" (twice a week or more) to "never," and respondents were asked to select the appropriate category for each behavioral item. The individual items included questions about school-related interaction (1. below), assigning responsibility to the child (2.), negative affective-expressive response to the child (3.), rewarding the child verbally (4.), discussing controversial social issues (5.), and mutual play or enjoyment (6.). In addition, mothers were asked later in the interview how frequently they had to punish the child for something he had done. The format of these questions is presented below:

> We have a list of things that parents sometimes do. We would like to know how often you do each. (HAND CARD TO RESPONDENT.)
>
> About how often do you:
>
> 1. Talk with (child) about what he (she) is doing at school.
> 2. Give (child) a chore to do at home.
> 3. Lose your temper or get mad at (child).
> 4. Praise (child) for something he (she) had done.
> 5. Talk with (child) about events like what's going on in the South or in Vietnam.
> 6. Do something with (child) that's fun for both of you.
>
> How often do you find you have to punish him (her)?

When comparisons are made among the frequencies with which the selected behaviors are reported by the mothers of first, fifth, and tenth grade mothers, interesting and sometimes dramatic differences are found that largely confirm the general hypotheses stated above. We find, for example, that all three types of expressive or affectively-loaded interaction with the child are reported more frequently by the mothers of the younger children than by the mothers of the older ones. In Table 6.1 it

can be seen that 77% of the mothers of first graders say they praise their child at least twice a week, while just 57% of the mothers of tenth graders praise this frequently. Similarly, 57% of the mothers of first graders report doing something with the child that is fun for both of them at least twice a week, compared with just 37% of the tenth grade mothers; and while 43% of the first graders' mothers admit losing their tempers or getting mad at least twice a week because of something the child does, only 23% of the tenth graders' mothers are in this category.

Praising the child is the most frequent of these behaviors at each grade level, and having fun is the second most frequent. In fact, praising is still a more frequent behavior of mothers at the tenth grade level than losing tempers is at the first grade level. The most striking fact is that each of these three behaviors is reported as less frequent by 20% of the mothers at the tenth grade level than at the first grade level. In other words, while mothers claim to make positive responses to the child more frequently than negative responses at each grade level, all types of expressive response to the child are reported equally less frequently by the mothers of the older children than by the mothers of the younger ones.

One might suspect that the decreasing frequencies in reports of these three types of behaviors are merely artifacts of the increasing social distance between mothers and their older children, that mothers would report interacting less frequently with their older children in <u>all</u> ways. However, this is clearly not the case. There are some forms of relatively neutral interaction between mothers and their children that continue to occur almost every day regardless of the age of the child in

school. Talking with children about school would seem to fit into this category, with 95% of the first grade mothers and 85% of the tenth grade mothers saying they talk with their child about school at least twice a week. More important, there are some behaviors that mothers report doing more often with older children than with the younger ones. Two of these are shown in Table 6.1. The proportion of mothers assigning chores at least twice a week increases from 67% at the first grade level to 81% at the tenth grade level. Undoubtedly, the nature of chores assigned changes radically from the first to the tenth grades as well, but this is not ascertainable from our question. Nevertheless, it is probably safe to interpret this item as reflecting increased responsibility being given to the older child. Even more convincing is the fact that the proportion talking about current events with the child at least twice a week increases from 22% at the first grade level to 51% at the tenth grade level. The increase in talking about controversial current events is especially interesting in view of the fact that the question specifically alluded to racial problems and to the war in Vietnam. These are adult topics, to say the least, and it is clear that the older children are entering into discussions with their parents about adult subjects more frequently.

When viewed in conjunction with one another, the six behavioral items in Table 6.1 present additional evidence of the changing nature of interaction between parents and their developing children. Talking about school is the most frequently reported form of interaction for all three age groups, and this is unambiguous testimony for the fact that there is continuing need for integration of the school and family throughout the

Table 6.1

Proportion of First, Fifth, and Tenth Grade Mothers Reporting They Engage in Selected Behaviors Vis-a-Vis Their Children at Least Twice a Week

	Grade Level			
	First Grade	Fifth Grade	Tenth Grade	Difference
Praise child	77%	67%	57%	-20%
Mutual fun	57%	49%	37%	-20%
Lose temper or get mad	43%	35%	23%	-20%
Talk about school	95%		85%	-10%
Assign chores	67%	79%	81%	+14%
Talk about current events	22%	44%	51%	+29%
	(459)	(500)	(428)	

Table 6.2

Proportion of Mothers Reporting They Punish Child at Least Once a Month by Grade Level of Child

First Grade	Fifth Grade	Tenth Grade	Difference
71% (459)	57% (500)	33% (428)	-37%

childhood and adolescent years. This common area of communication is the only relatively consistent and pervasive thread amidst the generally shifting emphases in the parent-child interactions reported. Among the mothers of first graders, praising the child is the most frequent of the other five behaviors (77% twice a week or more). This is followed by

assigning chores (67%), having fun together (57%), losing one's temper (43%), and finally, talking about current events (22%). In contrast, at the tenth grade level, assigning chores has become the most frequent activity (81%). This is followed by praising (57%), talking about current events (51%), having fun (37%), and finally, losing one's temper (23%). Judging from these reports alone, the general tone of interaction between mothers and their children has changed from being heavily loaded with expressive resoonses characteristic of reward and punishment situations at the first grade level, to higher frequencies of affectively neutral responses to the child, more task oriented behavior, and more communication about the adult world at the tenth grade level.

The most dramatic age-grade related differences among the behaviors reported by mothers are those that concern the direct use of punitive negative sanctions as a means of social control. The frequency of punishing the child for something that he has done is reported as at least once a month by 71% of the first grade mothers, 57% of the fifth grade mothers, and just 33% of the tenth grade mothers (Table 6.2). It is clear that a majority of the older children have either learned to behave in such a way that punishment is only rarely employed by the parents, or parents have stopped punishing the child for certain types of behavior. Whatever the explanation, the change is a relatively slow one judging from the fact that 57% of the fifth grade mothers still report that punishment is administered at least once a month. In any case, the frequency of this particularly critical form of interaction between parents and their children is radically reduced over the years as the child matures.

Because the emphasis in many studies of socialization has been on differences between the sexes and among socioeconomic groups, it is logical to ask at this point whether the differences among age groups that we have just reported might not be partially explained or modified when sex of the child and socioeconomic circumstances are taken into account. We shall present the appropriate tables including these factors below. However, since our major concern is with the problem of integration among sub-systems, we shall first ask whether teachers report differences in their behavior with the children that parallel the age-grade related differences among mothers.

Differences in Classroom Behavior Reported by Elementary and Secondary School Teachers

The assertion that there is less need for social control with and less frequent expressive-affective response to children in the higher grades gains additional support from teachers' reports of their classroom behavior. It can be seen in Table 6.3 that 93% of the elementary school teachers indicate they praise a student at least twice a week compared with 75% of the high school teachers. Losing one's temper or getting mad at a student occurs at least once a week with 44% of the elementary school teachers compared with just 15% of the high school teachers; and while 73% of the elementary school teachers say they scold a student at least once a week, this proportion is just 45% in the high schools.

Use of actual punishment by teachers is not frequent at any school level according to the teachers, but 84% of the elementary school teachers say they have found occasion to punish individual students compared with 30% of the high school teachers. Group punishment is even less frequent

Table 6.3

Frequencies of Selected Teacher-Student Interactions Reported by Teachers of Sample Children*

	Elementary School Teachers	High School Teachers	Difference
Praise a Student			
(Twice a week or more)	93%	75%	-18%
Lose Temper or Get Mad			
(Once a month or more)	44%	15%	-29%
Scold a Child			
(Once a month or more)	73%	45%	-28%
Punish a Student			
(Ever)	84%	30%	-54%
Punish the Whole Class			
(Ever)	31%	25%	-6%
Get Fun Out of Class			
(Twice or more a week)	91%	84%	-7%
Number of Cases	(45)	(20)	

*These questions were asked only of the subsample of teachers whose constituencies of mothers were interviewed.

judging from the fact that only 31% of the elementary school teachers and 25% of the high school teachers report ever having punished the class as a whole. With one exception, changes are in the same direction and of almost identical magnitude as those reported by the mothers of these children. The exception is that 91% of the elementary and 84% of the high school teachers report they get fun out of something that happens in class at

least twice a week. The reduction in proportions of mothers reporting "fun" is considerably larger. However, it should be pointed out that this item does not parallel the question asked of the mothers since the latter stipulated that the fun should be mutual or shared by both the child and the parent. As we shall see below, the high school teachers report that their students get considerably less fun out of school than elementary school teachers report among their students.

The sharpest reductions between elementary and high school teachers are for the negative affect item -- losing the temper or getting mad -- and for the social control sanctions of scolding and punishing. These reductions mirror differences found among the mothers in a way that suggests the older students have learned to control their potentially disruptive behavior both at home and at school.[8] (If it is no longer necessary for the majority of high school teachers to get mad, or to scold or to punish students, one obvious implication is that teachers in the high school might be more free to spend their time on specific learning directed activities and other such task-oriented behaviors.)

In sum, despite the small numbers of teachers asked about their classroom behavior, the differences between the elementary and high school teachers also reflect reductions in expressive, affective and sanctioning behavior that are consistent with our general hypothesis. As we shall see below, there are additional responses from the total sample of teachers that reveal changes in orientation toward children of different ages, and these changes also parallel the ones found among the mothers. But before examining additional evidence of age-grade related changes, let us see whether consideration of sex of child and educational

attainment of parents modifies any of the findings reported above.

Sex of Child and Education of Parents as Determinants of Mothers' Reports of Their Own Behavior

When sex of the child is distinguished at each grade level, age-grade differences in the children continue to produce the major differences in mothers' reports of their behavior (Table 6.4). Nevertheless, consideration of sex does produce a few interesting specifications of the findings reported above.

Sex of the child is not related to the frequency with which mothers say they praise their children. Both boys and girls receive praise far more frequently when they are in the first grade than in the fifth and tenth grades, and both are praised about equally within each level. However, fun persists as a mutual activity for mothers and their older daughters more frequently than it persists with sons. At the first grade level, 57% of the mothers of both girls and boys report that mutual fun occurs at least twice a week. But only 30% of the boys' mothers are in this category at the tenth grade level compared with 47% of the girls' mothers. This is the one instance where differences between the mothers of first and tenth graders are affected appreciably by the introduction of a third variable. Overall comparisons of mothers by grade level of child conceal the fact that the lower frequency of mutual fun between mothers and their older children is confined largely to boys. Undoubtedly, the Freudians and other psychological theorists can find appropriate post hoc explanations for this finding. This, however, goes beyond the general purposes of our investigations. Rather we shall confine our remarks to pointing out such differences where they are found and to

Table 6.4

Reported Frequencies of Selected Mother-Child Interactions by Sex and Grade Level of Child

		Sex		
		Male	Female	Difference
Praise Child (Twice a week or more)	First Grade	80%	76%	-4%
	Fifth Grade	69%	69%	----
	Tenth Grade	60%	60%	----
	Difference by Grade	-20%	-16%	
Mutual Fun (Twice a week or more)	First Grade	57%	57%	----
	Fifth Grade	45%	54%	+9%
	Tenth Grade	30%	47%	+17%
	Difference by Grade	-27%	-10%	
Lose Temper or Get Mad (Twice a week or more)	First Grade	42%	45%	+3%
	Fifth Grade	42%	28%	-14%
	Tenth Grade	24%	23%	-1%
	Difference by Grade	-18%	-22%	
Punish Child (Once a month or more)	First Grade	75%	67%	-8%
	Fifth Grade	64%	49%	-15%
	Tenth Grade	34%	32%	-2%
	Difference by Grade	-41%	-35%	
Assign Chores (Twice or more a week)	First Grade	66%	68%	+2%
	Fifth Grade	79%	79%	----
	Tenth Grade	80%	84%	+4%
	Difference by Grade	14%	16%	
Discuss Controversial Events (Twice a week or more)	First Grade	25%	19%	-6%
	Fifth Grade	48%	41%	-7%
	Tenth Grade	52%	49%	-3%
	Difference by Grade	27%	30%	
Number of Cases	First Grade	(237)	(222)	
	Fifth Grade	(262)	(238)	
	Tenth Grade	(241)	(187)	

suggesting what we believe are their implications for integration of the particular social system with which we are concerned.

By way of example, it can be seen that mothers of boys and girls report roughly equivalent frequencies of temper loss at the first grade level (42% and 45%) and considerably reduced rates that are similar for both sexes at the tenth grade level 24% and 23%). However, the boys' mothers report temper loss just as frequently at the fifth grade level as at the first grade level (42%), while the frequency for the fifth grade girls' mothers has fallen almost to the level found at the tenth grade (28% and 23%). We cannot ascertain whether the difference in rates of decline is the result of slower maturation among boys, different types of behavior from boys, different standards held by mothers for their sons, or some other such factor. But the difference is unmistakable. Similarly, punishment is administered more frequently to boys and girls alike at the lower grade levels; however, mothers punish the boys somewhat more frequently than the girls at the first grade level, and the rate of decline is much slower for boys than for girls. (Sixty-four per cent of the boys' mothers punish twice or more a week at the fifth grade level compared with 49% of the girls' mothers.)

When these three items, mutual fun, temper loss, and punishment are viewed in conjunction with one another, they take on added significance. Differences between the reported rates of mutual fun, temper loss, and punishment are negligible for the mothers of boys and girls in the first grade. But, by the time the children are in the fifth grade, boys have become less fun, and they are more often the cause of mothers' temper loss and the recipients of punishment. To be sure, these latter two items have

approximately the same rates again for the mothers of boys and girls at the tenth grade level. However, the net frequencies of the more unpleasant forms of interaction are clearly higher for the boys and their mothers throughout the formative years that we have sampled. Hence, if we subscribe to the notion that earlier forms of socialization have consequences for later behavior and attitudes, then we should expect that the differential treatment of boys has such consequences. Whatever the explanation, the differential treatment of sons and daughters reported by the mothers tends to substantiate the folk wisdom that boys are more difficult to raise than girls.

Mothers say they assign chores to sons and daughters with almost equal frequency within each grade level, with the few percentage points advantage going to daughters. They claim to discuss current events just slightly more frequently with their sons than with their daughters at each grade level, but the percentage differences are never large. Therefore, with the partial exception of the three items discussed above, sex of child does not appear to be a significant factor for the frequencies of the general forms of mother-child interaction with which we have been concerned.

We have used educational attainment of parents as a crude indicator of socioeconomic status in Table 6.5 as we have in other sections of the report. The differences between communities and between economic groups in frequency rates for these items are generally even smaller than those found when education is used alone to differentiate the mothers, and thus we feel justified in limiting our presentation of this aspect of the analysis to the differences between the two educational groupings.

Table 6.5

Reported Frequencies of Selected Mother-Child Interactions by Parental Education and Grade Level of Child

		Sex		
		Male	Female	Difference
Praise Child (Twice a week or more)	First Grade	82%	75%	-7%
	Fifth Grade	77%	62%	-15%
	Tenth Grade	61%	57%	-4%
	Difference by Grade	-21%	-18%	
Mutual Fun (Twice a week or more)	First Grade	54%	60%	+6%
	Fifth Grade	51%	48%	-3%
	Tenth Grade	37%	38%	+1%
	Difference by Grade	-17%	-22%	
Lose Temper or Get Mad (Twice a week or more)	First Grade	44%	43%	-1%
	Fifth Grade	30%	38%	+8%
	Tenth Grade	22%	25%	+3%
	Difference by Grade	-22%	-18%	
Punish Child (Once a month or more)	First Grade	73%	69%	-4%
	Fifth Grade	51%	60%	+9%
	Tenth Grade	40%	30%	-10%
	Difference by Grade	-33%	-39%	
Assign Chores (Twice a week or more)	First Grade	70%	66%	-4%
	Fifth Grade	85%	76%	-9%
	Tenth Grade	83%	81%	-2%
	Difference by Grade	+13%	+15%	
Discuss Controversial Events (Twice a week or more)	First Grade	26%	21%	-5%
	Fifth Grade	47%	43%	-4%
	Tenth Grade	61%	46%	-15%
	Difference by Grade	+35%	+25%	
Number of Cases	First Grade	(165)	(290)	
	Fifth Grade	(178)	(321)	
	Tenth Grade	(157)	(268)	

Generally, the differences between the behavior reported by mothers in the two educational groupings are negligible. Mothers in homes where at least one parent has attended college say they praise their children somewhat more frequently at all three grade levels than mothers in homes where educational attainment is lower. The difference is especially pronounced at the fifth grade level where 77% of the college mothers and 62% of the non-college mothers say they praise twice a week or more. But only four percentage points separate the frequency rates at the tenth grade level.

There is virtually no difference between the rates of mutual fun and temper loss for the two educational groups, and the pattern for changing rates of punishment is unlike patterns found anywhere else in the table. Punishment is administered with relatively similar frequency by the two groups of mothers of first graders -- a slight edge going to mothers in the college group (73% compared with 69%). At the fifth grade level, punishment is more frequent among the non-college group 51% and 60%; but at the tenth grade level, punishment is more frequent among the college mothers again (40% and 30%). Thus there is a pronounced reduction in punishment rate for each group, from first to tenth grade, but the difference is mainly between the first and fifth grades with college mothers, and mainly between fifth and tenth grades for the non-college mothers. However, punishment remains at a higher rate of frequency among college mothers than among non-college mothers of tenth graders.

Majorities of mothers within each of the grade levels and educational groupings report they assign chores at least twice a week. Proportions are somewhat smaller for the non-college groups, and this is especially

pronounced at the fifth grade level, but differences in rate of change appear to account for this. Mothers in the college educated group reach a high proportion of 85% at the fifth grade level, an increase of 15% over the first grade proportion, while mothers in the non-college group continue to increase the frequency of this activity beyond the fifth grade level, reaching 81% at the tenth grade.

The difference in rates of discussing controversial current events between the two educational groups is especially striking. The frequency of these discussions increases markedly within each group from the first to the tenth grades. But these discussions are more frequent in the homes where educational attainment of parents is higher, and the difference is largest with the oldest children. Indeed, these discussions are as frequent in college homes at the fifth grade level as they are in non-college homes at the tenth grade level. To the extent that such discussions reflect vital socialization for future citizenship responsibilities and for political awareness, the advantage enjoyed by children from homes with higher educational attainment is undeniable.[9]

To summarize, thus far we have seen that changes in the proportions of first, fifth, and tenth grade mothers reporting selected interactions with their children fall into a relatively unambiguous pattern. Expressive-affective and social control behaviors occur more frequently in response to younger children, and assignment of responsibility and discussion of controversial issues occur more frequently with older children. Similar patterns are evident from the behavior reported by the teachers of the same children. Moreover, when sex of the child and educational attainment of the parents are taken into consideration, the age-grade related

differences are modified only in a few cases, and they are never substantially explained.

We hasten to point out that the style of praising, the types of activities engaged in for fun, the specific acts that lead parents to lose their tempers, to get mad or to punish children, and the forms these responses take, the specific chores assigned, and the manner or content of controversial events discussed might vary considerably with the sex of the child and with educational attainment in the home. Obviously, the short battery of closed-response questions that produce the patterns above cannot reveal any of these potentially rich and varied changes from one group to another. Nevertheless, it is equally obvious that, regardless of any gross or subtle differences that might be found in specific forms of behavior, the rates of certain general forms of interaction between mothers and their children are intimately connected with the age-grade classifications of the children.

II. SCHOOL PERFORMANCE OF CHILDREN

Previous studies have shown that girls tend to perform better in school on the average than boys and that students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds perform better in school than those from less favored circumstances. These general findings have led some critics of education to assert that our schools are designed more for girls and for children from middle and upper socioeconomic groups.[10] Our findings tend to support both of these claims and to offer some interesting clues as to how boys and the lower socioeconomic groups become alienated over the years. Indeed, according to our findings, the response to school by boys, by girls, and by their parents in different socioeconomic groups, and the formal response of the school to different groups of children are often very similar at the first grade level. It is only as schooling progresses that many significant differences emerge.

Whatever distinctions are made between the letter grades of the students in our sample, girls do better than boys, and children from homes where educational attainment is higher do better than children from homes where education of parents is lower. For convenience, we have divided the students into two general groups throughout this section, those with modal letter grades of A or B and those with modal letter grades of C or lower.[11] Dichotomizing the letter grades tends to reduce the size of differences between the groups with which we will be dealing, but differences are still of considerable magnitude, and presentation is simplified, particularly when additional variables are taken into consideration.

Larger proportions of girls than boys receive modal letter grades of A or B at all three grade levels in our sample (Table 6.6). A majority of girls receives modal grades of A or B within each age group; but the boys start lower, with 48% receiving A or B's modally at the first grade level, and just 39% at the tenth grade level. Girls begin at the first grade with 61% receiving A or B as modal letter grades, and they fall to 54% at the tenth grade level. But while marks are lower for both boys and girls in the higher grades, a higher proportion of girls receives A's and B's in the tenth grade than is found among boys even in the first grade.

It has been suggested by some critics that the slower maturation rate of boys and the prevalence of women teachers in elementary schools combine to place the boys at a disadvantage in the early years of schooling, and that this disadvantage is never overcome by a majority of boys. Whether the scholastic performance of boys is, or would be, lower than that of girls of equal age in radically different school and cultural settings is an empirical question that cannot be answered with our data. However, regardless of whether the lower performance of the boys in our sample is attributable to slower maturation rates or to some other factor, the fact remains that boys' performance is lower, and, as we shall see, lower performance is asscciated with negative response to the school by parents and by children alike.[12]

Lower letter grades for students in the higher school levels are found within each of the school attendance areas in the sample and therefore cannot be attributed to peculiarities of certain sample schools. In fact, if we consider the current letter grades of the tenth grade

students and compare them with the modal letter grades received by the same students in elementary school, a very similar pattern emerges (Table 6.7). The vast majority of the tenth grade students for whom we were able to collect data from two points in time reveal stability in the quality of their school performance as measured by letter grades. Forty per cent of the students received modal grades of A or B in elementary school and continue to receive high grades in high school. An additional thirty-six per cent received modal grades of C or lower in elementary school and remain in the lower group at the high school level. But there is academic "downward mobility" for 16% of the students. This group received modal grades of A or B in elementary school and fall to C or lower in high school. Upward academic mobility -- movement from C or lower in elementary school to A or B in high school -- occurred for just 6% of the students.

Table 6.6

Proportion of Students Receiving Modal Letter Grades of A or B by Sex and Grade Level of Child

	Sex is: Male	Female	Difference (Sex)
First Grade	48% (237)	61% (222)	+13%
Fifth Grade	44% (262)	52% (238)	+8%
Tenth Grade	39% (211)	54% (187)	+15%
Difference by Grade	-9%	-7%	

Thus despite nearly universal age-grade promotion in the sample schools, the schools continue to operate as "sifting and sorting" mechanisms, and this is reflected by the letter grades that students receive. A majority (58%) of the tenth graders were A or B students in elementary school, but a minority (46%) are A or B students by high school standards. In other words, the longitudinal and cross-sectional data lead to virtually the same conclusions.

It is not possible to ascertain unequivocably from our data the extent to which performance of selected students is lower in the higher grades or the extent to which standards for better than average work become more strict as schooling progresses. There are several indications that both processes are at work. To begin with, some students are able to sustain higher levels of achievement than others, and this is largely attributable to factors associated with the educational attainment of parents. Students from the homes where educational level is higher start in the first grade by receiving slightly better marks on the average than students from lower educational backgrounds, but by the time the students are in the tenth grade, differences have become much larger (Table 6.8). Indeed, students from college backgrounds increase their higher performance slightly, with 58% receiving A's or B's in the first grade compared with 62% in the tenth grade, while their schoolmates from less favored backgrounds start with 51% A's or B's, and end up with only 36% A's or B's.

We saw in Sections III. and IV. that the ecological groupings of parents with similar social characteristics tend to mitigate potential differences among them with regard to preferred school goals and teaching

styles, and it is well known that similar processes operate with regard to differences among the performance levels of students. If IQ or achievement test scores are compared from one school setting to another in our sample, the expected relationships appear. That is, students in the middle class areas score much higher on the average on standardized tests than students in working class areas.[13]

Table 6.7

Modal Letter Grades Received by High School Students in Elementary School and in Tenth Grade

	Elementary School:			
High School:	A or B	C or Lower	Total	
A or B	40%	6%	46%	(126)
C or Lower	18%	36%	54%	(147)
Total	58% (159)	42% (114)		

The distributions of rewards administered to students by the schools in the form of letter grades do not vary strictly in accordance with standardized test scores. Every school gives sizable proportions of students A's and B's, even though the students' performances may not measure up to the standards necessary for receiving high marks in other communities. Davis[14] has referred to some aspects of this familiar phenomenon as the "frogpond" effect at the college level, but there is ample evidence that it exists at all school levels. For example, colleges are often confronted with the fact that the best students from some high schools score lower on entrance examinations and other tests than the average students from other high schools that are known to have high

Table 6.8

Proportion of Students Receiving Modal Letter Grades of A or B by Education of Parents and Grade Level of Child

	Parents' Educational Attainment Is:		
	Some College	No College	Difference
First Grade	58% (166)	51% (282)	-7%
Fifth Grade	58% (173)	42% (308)	-16%
Tenth Grade	62% (156)	36% (265)	-26%
Difference by Grade	+4%	-25%	

standards, even though both students have completed similar courses in a so-called college preparatory curriculum. But, in spite of the fact that we deliberately chose communities with homogeneous populations for our sample, community context does not eliminate the relationship between educational level of parents and letter grades received by students in any of the schools studied. In every community in our sample, students from homes where at least one parent has attended college receive higher marks on the average than students from homes with lower educational attainment. Thus while the socioeconomic level of a community may raise or lower the relative inter-community educational performance level of various categories of students, as measured by objective tests, it appears from our data that the general relationship between educational attainment of parents and school performance of children as measured by letter grades persists within all settings.

When sex of child and educational attainment of parents are considered simultaneously, their relationships with school performance

Table 6.9

Proportion of Students Receiving Modal Letter Grades of A or B by Sex of Child, Educational Attainment of Parents and Grade Level in School

Parents' Education Is:		Sex Is: Male	Female	Difference (Sex)
College	First Grade	55% (83)	62% (82)	+7%
	Fifth Grade	57% (95)	60% (78)	+3%
	Tenth Grade	58% (84)	67% (72)	+9%
	Difference by Grade	+3%	+5%	
No College	First Grade	44% (149)	60% (135)	+16%
	Fifth Grade	37% (158)	48% (149)	+11%
	Tenth Grade	29% (151)	46% (113)	+17%
	Difference by Grade	-15%	-14%	
Differences by Education of Parents		-11%	-2%	
		-20%	-12%	
		-29%	-21%	

become more clear (Table 6.9). Educational attainment of parents is more strongly related to the school performance of boys. Girls receive higher marks than boys at every grade level regardless of parents' education, but the differences between boys and girls from college homes are never as large as the differences for the groups where educational backgrounds are lower. In addition, high performance levels are sustained throughout the

grades by both boys and girls from the higher educational backgrounds, but the marks oi both sexes are considerably lower at the higher grade levels for the non-college group. The net result is that 67% of the tenth grade girls from college homes receive A's or B's modally, but just 29% of the tenth grade boys from non-college homes receive high marks.

Mothers' Perceptions of Their Children's School Performance

The fact that the formal reward structure of the school is so strongly related to sex of children, to educational level of parents and to grade level of children gains additional meaning for school-community integration when we see how parents' perception of the performance of their children, their satisfaction with the performance of the child, and their satisfaction with the schools is related to the marks their children receive in school. Our first firm evidence of changing standards comes from the fact that parents view the marks their children receive in school differently depending upon the grade level of the child. Furthermore, these age-grade related responses to the marks received by children are sometimes larger than those found when sex of child and educational level of parents are considered.

Let us consider initially the parents' perceptions of the performance level of the children in school. Each mother was asked:

> Generally, how well would you say (child) is doing in School?
> Above average,
> Average,
> or Below average?

Mothers' perceptions of how well their children are doing in school do not vary appreciably by grade level, and mothers are reluctant to admit that their children are doing below average. Overall, 32% say

their children do "above average," 58% say they do "average," and 10% say they do "below average." If we assume that the above and below average groups should be of approximately equal size, there is a considerable tendency to say that below average work is average.

Curiously, neither the relationship between sex, grade level of child, and the marks earned by the child, nor the relationship between parental educational attainment, grade level of child and the marks earned is adequately reflected by parents' perceptions of how well the child is doing in school (Tables 6.10 and 6.11). The differences between proportions of mothers of boys and girls perceiving their children as doing above average in school are always somewhat smaller than the differences in proportions of actual marks received by the students. Girls are perceived as doing better than boys at each grade level, but just 36% of the mothers of first grade girls say their children are doing better than average, and this proportion rises slightly to 39% at the tenth grade level. Similarly, just 30% of the mothers of first grade boys say their sons are doing above average, and this figure drops slightly to 28% for the tenth graders. Thus neither the higher proportions of children receiving A's and B's at the first grade level, nor the decline in high marks in upper grades is reflected by mothers' perceptions of school performance. In addition, the differences between the sexes are somewhat smaller than when actual marks are used.

When mothers' perceptions are compared according to parents' educational attainment and grade levels of children, actual differences in marks received by the children continue to be concealed (Table 6.11). The differences in the proportions of mothers saying the child is doing above

Table 6.10

Proportion of Mothers Perceiving Their Children as Doing "Above Average" in School by Sex and Grade Level of Child

	Sex of Child:		
	Male	Female	Difference
First Grade	30% (237)	36% (222)	+6%
Fifth Grade	27% (262)	34% (238)	+7%
Tenth Grade	28% (241)	39% (187)	+11%
Difference by Grade Level	-2%	+3%	

Table 6.11

Proportion of Mothers Perceiving Their Children as Doing "Above Average" in School by Parents' Educational Attainment and Grade Level of Children

	Parents' Education Is:		
	Some College	No College	Difference
First Grade	49% (166)	23% (282)	-26%
Fifth Grade	42% (173)	24% (308)	-18%
Tenth Grade	50% (156)	23% (265)	-27%
Difference by Grade Level	+1%	----	

average are quite similar within each educational group from first grade to tenth grade, and this conceals the drop in marks for children from the non-college homes. Just 23% of the mothers of first graders from non-college homes perceive their children as doing above average, in spite of the fact that the school awards modal letter grades of A or B to 51% of their children (Table 6.8). It would appear from this pronounced discrepancy between marks received and level of performance perceived that non-college mothers seldom expect their children to perform above average, and consequently they tend to ignore official rewards given by the school in the form of marks that are actually above average. If this is the case, it could easily operate as a self-fulfilling prophecy with regard to the later school performance of their children.

There is a considerable literature today that discusses and demonstrates the relationship between students' self-images and their levels of school performance.[15] This literature tends to stress the point that school is experienced as a punitive experience, especially among members of lower socio-economic groups, and that the self-image of such students is damaged by school experiences. As a result, students who might have done well, define themselves as poor students, and do poorly in school. It seems likely that this syndrome is relatively common among working-class students, but systematic evidence would require longitudinal data that our sample does not include. Our data do suggest that an additional, and perhaps more important, process is also at work. Namely, low self-image and the expectation of poor performance are transmitted by parents to their children. The basis for such low expectations might often be the previous poor performance of the parents themselves in school; but

whatever its origin, the significant point remains that non-college parents often choose to ignore or to disbelieve the formal messages from the school to the contrary, namely modal grades of A or B.

Parsons,[16] among others, has suggested that teachers in the early grades of schooling assign letter grades to students largely on the basis of non-academic considerations, and that there is a shift to more exclusive use of academic criteria in the higher grades. We cannot determine whether this is true for our sample schools, but we can demonstrate that the same letter grades are differentially perceived by mothers of children in different age groups. We find, for example, that the proportion of mothers of first grade children perceiving their children as doing above average work in school is 44% when the children's modal grades are A or B, and just 18% when the modal letter grades are C or lower (Table 6.12). By the tenth grade level, these proportions are 64% and 6% respectively. Thus the letter grades of the students are much more highly related to mothers' perceptions of level of performance in the higher school grades. It should be noted, however, that most of the increase in the relationship between letter grades and mothers' perceptions has already taken place by the fifth grade.

If children in the lower grades are assigned marks partly on the basis of non-academic considerations, the better fit between marks and mothers' perceptions of childrens' school performance in the higher grades could be largely explained by the fact that the mothers are using academic criteria at all levels. An alternative explanation that would fit our findings equally well is that schools use academic criteria at all grade levels, but mothers have to learn how to correctly interpret

Table 6.12

Proportion of Mothers Perceiving Their Children as Doing "Above Average" in School by Modal Letter Grades of the Child and Grade Level in School

	Modal Letter Grades: A or B	Modal Letter Grades: C or Lower	Difference
First Grade	44% (243)	18% (207)	-26%
Fifth Grade	57% (231)	6% (251)	-51%
Tenth Grade	64% (192)	6% (230)	-58%
Difference by Grade Level	+20%	-12%	

the marks that their children receive. In effect, the schools must socialize parents about the educational performance and potential of their children. A third possibility is that both the schools and mothers change criteria over time.

According to the first explanation, mothers' perceptions of the performances of their children are better measures or reflections of the academic performances of their children in the lower grades of school than are the actual letter grades that the schools assign. According to the second explanation, letter grades are the more accurate measure of academic performance at all school levels, but mothers often have to learn to relate these grades to the academic performance of their children. According to the third explanation, both letter grades and mothers' perceptions reflect academic performance more accurately in higher grades. We suspect that all of these processes are at work in the schools in our sample and

that they may reinforce one another in many instances. Unfortunately, the cross sectional nature of our data make it difficult to approximate the models that would be required to determine the extent to which one or more of these explanations are applicable. Nevertheless, we can present some additional findings that are extremely suggestive.

To begin with, mothers' satisfaction with the performance of their children in school is also very highly related to the marks that the children receive from the school. Overall, satisfaction with performance of children is much higher for both mothers and teachers at the elementary school level (Table 6.13). We have seen in earlier sections that satisfaction with students' performance is crucial to system integration in that low satisfaction is very strongly related to role strain for mothers, teachers and students alike. Hence, anything that increases our understanding of the origins of dissatisfaction with performance should have implications for our understanding of school-community integration.

Curiously, parents' satisfaction with the school performance of their children is somewhat more consistently related to letter grades received by their children than is their perception of level of performance. In fact, higher dissatisfaction with performance of students in higher grades is largely accounted for by the decrease in A's and B's among these students (Table 6.14). But it should be noted that mothers of older children are also considerably less satisfied with marks of C or lower. Thus the schools are able to maintain high levels of satisfaction with performance among parents by assigning high proportions of A's and B's to students in the early grades. However, by assigning fewer A's and B's to students in the higher grades, the schools are producing

Table 6.13

Per Cent of Mothers and Teachers "Very Satisfied" with the School Performance of Their Children or Students by School Level

	School Level Is:			
	First Grade	Fifth Grade	Tenth Grade	Difference
Mothers	58% (450)	43% (482)	38% (423)	-20%
Teachers	41% (175)		26% (107)	-15%

Table 6.14

Proportion of Mothers "Very Satisfied" with the Performance of Their Children in School by Modal Letter Grades and Grade Level of Child

	Modal Letter Grade:		
	A or B	C or Lower	Difference
First Grade	73% (243)	41% (207)	-32%
Fifth Grade	67% (231)	25% (251)	-42%
Tenth Grade	67% (192)	15% (230)	-52%
Difference by Grade Level	-6%	-26%	

much higher rates of dissatisfaction with the performance of their children among parents. They are also running the obvious risk of producing higher dissatisfaction with the school.

Additional evidence for the assertion that parents' standards change somewhat as the children progress through school can be seen from the relationship between satisfaction with school and grades received by children within the different age groups (Table 6.15).

Table 6.15

Proportion of Mothers "Very Satisfied" with the School by Modal Letter Grades Received by Child and Grade Level of Child

	Modal Letter Grade:		
	A or B	C or Lower	Difference
First Grade	55% (243)	63% (207)	+8%
Fifth Grade	55% (231)	49% (251)	-6%
Tenth Grade	59% (192)	35% (230)	-24%
Difference by Grade Level	+4%	-28%	

Surprisingly, the relationship between marks received by children in the first grade and parents' satisfaction with the school is somewhat negative. But this relationship shifts to the positive direction by the fifth grade and becomes extremely pronounced (X^2 test beyond .001) in the high school. From this it would appear that schools need not be overly concerned with producing dissatisfaction with the school as a result of increasing the proportion of low marks in the early grades. Apparently there are additional mediating factors that prevent low marks from lowering parental evaluation of the school when children are first starting school. But regardless of what these factors are, the letter grades of

children have assumed greater importance to the mothers of the older children and are more crucial factors for school-community integration.

We have already noted that the relationship between mothers' satisfaction with the school performance of their children and childrens' marks is of greater magnitude in the higher grades. When parental education is also taken into consideration, an especially interesting specification of this relationship emerges (Table 6.16). Among the "college" mothers of first graders, 58% say they are very satisfied with the performance of their children who get low marks; but just 32% of the mothers in homes with lower educational attainment say they are very satisfied when the children get low marks. This is the only instance in which the mothers in the higher educational group express higher satisfaction with school performance than the less educated mothers. By the fifth grade level, just 17% of the college mothers of children with low grades express high satisfaction compared with 28% of the non-college mothers, and at the tenth grade level, the proportions are 12% and 17% respectively. In fact the first grade mothers in the college group are almost as satisfied when the marks are low as they are when they are high, but marks of the child produce at least a 40% difference in the proportion very satisfied in every other instance. Thus it appears that the mothers in the more highly educated group change their responses to marks radically between the first and fifth grades, while mothers in the less educated group do not. The college mothers tend to withhold harsh judgement of the child's performance based on marks until he is older. But the non-college mothers appear to be quickly discouraged by low marks received by young children. If parental support and encouragement is

Table 6.16

Proportion of Mothers "Very Satisfied" with the School Performance of Their Children by Grade Level and Modal Letter Grades of the Child and Educational Attainment of Parents

Grade Level Is Modal Letter Grades:		Parental Education Is: Some College	No College	Difference
A or B	First Grade	70% (97)	75% (144)	+5%
	Fifth Grade	64% (101)	69% (128)	+5%
	Tenth Grade	65% (97)	69% (96)	+4%
	Difference by Grade Level	-5%	-6%	
C or Lower	First Grade	58% (69)	32% (137)	-26%
	Fifth Grade	17% (71)	28% (177)	+11%
	Tenth Grade	12% (59)	17% (165)	+5%
	Difference by Grade Level	-46%	-15%	
Difference by Modal Letter Grades		-12%	-43%	
		-47%	-41%	
		-53%	-52%	

especially important for children during the early years of schooling, then the reluctance of mothers in the non-college homes to say their children are performing above average and their tendency to become easily dissatisfied with the early school performance of their children can be seen as two more factors that could contribute to the lower performance levels of their children. Again the implication is that integration of the school and family is lower where parental educational attainment is lower.

Another indication of the changing meaning of letter grades for the parents of older children can be seen from the relationship between age-grade of child and the educational expectations of parents for their children.

Table 6.17

Proportion of Mothers Expecting Their Children to Complete Four Years or More of College by Modal Letter Grades and Grade Level of Child

	Modal Letter Grade:		
	A or B	C or Lower	Difference
First Grade	59% (220)	45% (178)	-14%
Fifth Grade	68% (218)	33% (228)	-35%
Tenth Grade	82% (189)	30% (215)	-52%
Difference by Grade Level	+23%	-15%	

We will only touch briefly on this topic since the problem of the transmission of educational values is the major subject throughout Section VII. For our present purposes, it should be noted that there is already a significant positive relationship between the marks received by the children in the first grade and their mothers' educational expectations for them, but this relationship increases dramatically by the tenth grade. The proportion of mothers expecting their children to complete four years of college increases from 59% to 82% among the mothers of children with modal marks of A or B. It decreases from 45% to 30% in the proportion expecting four years of college for children with modal marks of C or lower.

The increasing strength over ten years of schooling in the relationships of the school's formal reward structure with mothers' perceptions of children's performances, mothers' satisfaction with children's performances, mothers' satisfaction with the school, and mothers' educational expectations for children are extremely suggestive when viewed in conjunction with one another. First, it appears that over the years mothers learn to interpret the letter grade reports from schools as more objective assessments of their children's performances. If the schools intend letter grades to represent objective appraisals of children's work in the early grades, then it is evident that many mothers are not getting this message, and schools need to socialize those parents about the meaning of letter grades. If, on the other hand, letter grades are meant to be more loosely interpreted in the early years of schooling, then college mothers are tending to correctly suspend judgement until the child has had additional schooling. We cannot, as indicated above, be sure at this

point what the official position of the schools is or what the actual criteria are for assigning letter grades to children in different age groups. However, we suspect that the schools and teachers change criteria in much the same manner as the mothers, since the differences in the responses of elementary and high school teachers to many items parallel the differences between the responses of mothers of children of different ages.

If the above is true, then school must become a more harsh and difficult place for the child as he moves up through the grades. In effect, the child is given his "golden age" during the early years. When he begins school, his performance is judged by multiple and diffuse criteria that allow a good deal of slippage. He has a sense of self-importance as one capable of producing affective responses from adults at home and at school. It is easy to get good marks from the school, and his school performance is often judged as very satisfactory even when his marks are C or lower. In addition, his mother's relationship with the school is not strongly influenced by the marks he receives. But over the years, the rules of the game are changed both at home and at school. There is no rite of passage to signal his change of status and no formal announcement to let him know that he will now be graded more strictly in accord with his academic performance. Instead, he most likely must learn these facts for himself. Going to school becomes a serious business that is not much fun for many students as the rules of the game are changed. We shall see how students' responses confirm this view below, but first let us see additional evidence from the responses of mothers and teachers.

Mothers' Perceptions of Their Children's Evaluations of the School and of the Teacher

Both the mothers and teachers were asked for their perceptions of the children's affective responses to school and to the teacher. The mothers were asked:

> How much do you think (child) likes (teacher)? Does he (she) like (teacher):
>
> Very much,
> Somewhat,
> Not so much,
> or
> Not at all?
>
> How much do you think (child) likes school this year? Does he (she) like it:
>
> Very much,
> Somewhat,
> Not so much,
> or
> Not at all?

The teachers were asked:

> Would you say that most of the children in your class think school is:
>
> A lot of fun,
> Some fun,
> Somewhat unpleasant,
> or
> Very unpleasant?
>
> How do you think most children in your class feel about you -- would you say most of them like you:
>
> Very much,
> Somewhat,
> Not so much,
> or
> Not at all?

Both the mothers and teachers of younger children perceive them as liking their school and liking teachers more than the older children. In addition, both mothers and teachers see the students as liking teachers

considerably more than school, especially during the elementary school years. It is especially interesting that the reduction in positive response to school is accomplished mostly between the first and fifth grades. Since elementary school usually becomes more subject matter oriented in the intermediate grades of four through six, the above findings suggest that increases in students' negative responses to school are coterminous with and perhaps brought about in part by this change in subject matter emphasis. These findings also suggest that children tend to like the teacher more when there is but one teacher with whom they interact most of the day, but that strong positive affect is much less common when children are taught by several teachers every day.

There is, of course, considerable disagreement about the relationship between affective response to teachers and learning.[17] If the relationship is generally a positive one, then the drop in positive affect among the older students may signal a considerable reduction in learning among students who do not like the teacher. It is also possible that strong positive feelings for the teacher do not develop very often among students unless there is prolonged interaction of the sort that is found in elementary schools, and that these feelings are generally unrelated to students' learning. In the latter case, lower rates of positive affect toward teachers might be just another age-grade related change in the norms governing adult-child interaction.

We cannot determine which of these points of view is most correct from our cross-sectional data. Nevertheless, it should be made clear that according to the mothers, there is a strong relationship between student's affective responses to school and to teachers and the marks

Table 6.18

Proportion of Mothers Perceiving Their Children as Liking School and Liking the Teacher "Very Much" by Grade Level of Children

	Like School	Like the Teacher	Difference
First Grade	69% (456)	87% (454)	+18%
Fifth Grade	49% (499)	71% (493)	+22%
Tenth Grade	46% (427)	49% (394)	+3%
Difference by Grade Level	-23%	-38%	

Table 6.19

Proportion of Elementary and High School Teachers Perceiving Their Students as Thinking School Is "Lots of Fun" and as Liking the Teacher "Very Much"

	Students Think School Is Lots of Fun	Students Like Teacher Very Much	Difference
Elementary School Teachers	37% (175)	62% (171)	+25%
High School Teachers	11% (106)	30% (101)	+19%
Difference by School Level	-26%	-32%	

they get at school. We do not know whether the mothers believe that students get poor marks because they don't like school and teachers, or that mothers think their children don't like school and teachers because they get poor marks, but the connection between the two in the minds of the mothers is unmistakable. For example, 79% of the mothers of first graders who get high marks say the child likes school very much compared with 58% when children get low marks (Table 6.20). The proportions are, respectively, 63% and 32% at the tenth grade level. Mothers perceive their children as liking school somewhat less in the higher grades regardless of marks, but the reduction over the years is considerably more pronounced when the child receives low marks. As a result, the now familiar pattern of increasing relationships in the higher grades appears again.

Table 6.20

Proportion of Mothers Perceiving Their Children as Liking School Very Much by Grade Level Modal Letter Grades of Child

	Modal Letter Grade:		
	A or B	C or Lower	Difference
First Grade	79% (243)	58% (204)	-21%
Fifth Grade	62% (231)	37% (251)	-25%
Tenth Grade	63% (193)	32% (230)	-31%
Difference by Grade Level	-16%	-26%	

The relationships mothers perceive between their children's liking teachers and the marks they receive are somewhat weaker than for their liking school. There is virtually no relationship at the first grade level, but the differences become pronounced at the fifth grade level, and continue at the tenth grade level (Table 6.21). From this it appears that mothers see their children's liking teachers as more exclusively an age-grade phenomenon than their liking school.

Table 6.21

Proportion of Mothers Perceiving Their Children as Liking Their Teachers Very Much by Grade Level and Modal Letter Grade of Child

	Modal Letter Grade		
	A or B	C or Lower	Difference
First Grade	88% (243)	85% (203)	-3%
Fifth Grade	77% (227)	66% (249)	-11%
Tenth Grade	56% (184)	44% (207)	-12%
Difference by Grade Level	-32%	-41%	

It should be noted that mothers' perceptions of how much their children like school and like their teachers, and mothers' satisfaction with the school performance of their children are also strongly related to the sex of the child. Lower proportions of boys than girls are perceived as liking school and teachers at each grade level. Perhaps more important, satisfaction with the performance of sons is lower than for daughters at each grade level (Table 6.22) and this relationship is only

Table 6.22

Proportions of Mothers Perceiving Their Children as Liking School Very Much, Liking Teachers Very Much and Who Are "Very Satisfied" with Their Children's School Performance by Grade Level and Sex of Child

		Child Is: Male	Female	Difference by Sex
Likes School "Very Much"	First Grade	67%	73%	+6%
	Fifth Grade	44%	54%	+10%
	Tenth Grade	39%	56%	+17%
	Difference by Grade Level	-28%	-17%	
Likes the Teacher "Very Much"	First Grade	86%	87%	+1%
	Fifth Grade	68%	74%	+6%
	Tenth Grade	41%	60%	+19%
	Difference by Grade Level	-37%	-17%	
Mothers "Very Satisfied with Performance	First Grade	53%	65%	+12%
	Fifth Grade	41%	49%	+8%
	Tenth Grade	33%	46%	+13%
	Difference by Grade Level	-20%	-19%	
		Male	Female	
Number of Cases	First Grade	(237)	(222)	
	Fifth Grade	(262)	(238)	
	Tenth Grade	(241)	(187)	

reduced slightly when grades of the children are also taken into consideration. (For example, the proportion of mothers "very satisfied" with the performance of tenth grade sons with high marks is 60%, but it is 73% for daughters.) It appears that either mothers have higher performance standards for sons than daughters, or sons more often provide reasons for mothers to be less satisfied with their school performance than daughters, even when marks are high. Again, the data do not allow us to determine which interpretation is more correct, but regardless of the reason for these differences, they add further support to our general argument that school is more productive of role strain for boys and their role partners than for girls.

According to their mothers, boys and girls like school and teachers almost equally well at the first grade level, but as schooling progresses, the boys like both considerably less than the girls (Table 6.22). The letter grade differences between boys and girls do not wholly account for mothers' thinking boys like school and teachers less than girls do at the higher grades. Thus less positive response to school and to teachers appears to be another aspect of increasing role differentiation between boys and girls, to judge from their mothers' responses.

Before seeing whether these impressions by mothers of the school-related differences between their sons and daughters are confirmed by the children themselves, let us examine some additional evidence of important age-grade and sex-related differences from the mothers' responses.

The Shift of Responsibility to Children

We have seen above that mothers assign chores more frequently to older children, and we interpreted this as an indication of the increasing responsibility that is given to older children. There are, however, other indications of increased responsibility that have more far-reaching implications for school-community integration. One of the most important dimensions along which responsibility changes in adult-child relationships is in the amount of responsibility assigned to the child for his own acts. That young children should not be held responsible for many of their acts is an established aspect of our legal system, but the limits of the child's responsibility in many spheres of life remain relatively ambiguous and undefined. As far as work in school is concerned, it is generally assumed that the child will do his own work; but schools often assume that it is partially up to parents to see that homework is done, as evidenced by the not uncommon practice of requiring parents to sign homework sheets. However, the extent to which parents should take an active role in the education of their children, teach them to read at home or help them with homework assignments are subjects for considerable debate. Because of our interest in the rather ill-defined roles and division of labor among parents, teachers and students, we asked each mother three general questions about the perceived adequacy of the role performances of each primary role partner:

> Are there any things at all that you think it is important for you to be doing differently than you are in order to help (child) get the most out of school?
>
> Are there any things that you think it is important for (teacher) to be doing differently than he (she) is in order to help (child) get the most out of school?

> Are there any things you think it is important for (child) to be doing differently in order to get the most out of school?

We hypothesized that (1) parents would shift the responsibility for doing something differently to older children, and (2) parents would more often perceive the need for each role partner to do something differently when the child was not getting high marks in school.

Table 6.23

Relationship Between Grade Level of Child and Mothers' Saying There Is Something That They, the Teacher, or the Child Should Do Differently in Order to Get the Most Out of School

	Something Different Should Be Done by:		
	Mother	Teacher	Child
First Grade	43% (453)	19% (452)	38% (455)
Fifth Grade	46% (494)	32% (484)	59% (496)
Tenth Grade	39% (414)	27% (403)	66% (425)
Difference by Grade Level	-4%	+8%	+28%

We find that grade level makes very little difference in the proportion of mothers saying they ought to do something differently themselves (Table 6.23). There is a 13% increase in the proportion expressing dissatisfaction with the teacher between the first and fifth grades, but this drops back by 5% at the tenth grade level. However, the proportion thinking the child should do something differently increases by 21% between the first and fifth grades, and by 7% more at the tenth grade level. Thus the general direction of changes between the age groups are

Table 6.24

Proportion of Mothers Saying They Should Do Something Different in Order to Help the Child Get the Most Out of School According to Grade Level and Marks Received

	Modal Letter Grade		
	A or B	C or Lower	Difference
First Grade	39% (239)	49% (205)	+10%
Fifth Grade	42% (229)	51% (248)	+9%
Tenth Grade	32% (190)	46% (222)	+14%
Difference by Grade Level	-7%	-3%	

Table 6.25

Proportion of Mothers Saying Their Child's Teacher Should Do Something Different to Help the Child Get the Most Out of School by Grade Level of Child and Marks Received

	Modal Letter Grade		
	A or B	C or Lower	Difference
First Grade	16% (239)	22% (205)	+6%
Fifth Grade	34% (226)	32% (241)	-2%
Tenth Grade	22% (186)	32% (213)	+10%
Difference by Grade Level	+6%	+10%	

approximately what had been anticipated.

There is also unmistakable evidence that the marks the child receives at school are a factor relevant to the mothers' assessments of each role partner's behavior (Tables 6.24, 6.25, and 6.26). Mothers are more likely to say something should be done differently by each role partner when the children receive marks of C or lower. But marks do not reduce the differences between age-grade groups, and, as a result, we have another example of different norms being associated with children of different ages.

The proportion of mothers expressing inadequacy or guilt in the form of acknowledging something they ought to do differently themselves is relatively stable from one grade level to another. It is about 10% larger within each grade level when the child gets marks of C or lower (Table 6.24). There is a significant increase in the proportion expressing dissatisfaction with the teacher's role performance above the first grade, but these proportions only become strongly related to the children's marks at the tenth grade level (Table 6.24). This again suggests that the greater social distance from school and lower observability of high school mothers makes their attitudes and impressions more dependent on formal communications from the school. But, it is the mothers' assessments of their children's role performances that are most interesting (Table 6.26).

Both age-grade and marks received from the school are very strongly related to mothers' wanting their children to do something differently (X^2 beyond .001). As noted above, much of the age-grade effect takes place between the first and fifth grades, but the increase is almost identical within each modal letter group over the ten year span. At the

Table 6.26

Proportion of Mothers Saying There Is Something Different Their Child Should Do in Order to Get the Most Out of School, According to Grade Level of Child and Marks Received

	Modal Letter Grade		
	A or B	C or Lower	Difference
First Grade	31% (242)	47% (205)	+16%
Fifth Grade	51% (230)	66% (249)	+15%
Tenth Grade	57% (193)	75% (226)	+18%
Difference by Grade Level	+26%	+28%	

same time, the difference between the proportions associated with the two modal letter groups remain very large within each age group. In other words, good marks reduce the likelihood that mothers will say there is something their children should do differently at each grade level, but mothers are more likely to say their children should do something differently as the child gets older. The net result is that just 31% of the mothers say the child should do something differently if the child is in the first grade and gets A's or B's, but 75% say the child should do something differently when the child is in the tenth grade and gets C's or lower. A majority of mothers expresses dissatisfaction with the children's behavior at the tenth grade level even when the marks are high (57%), but only a minority (47%) expresses dissatisfaction at the first grade level even when the marks are C or lower. Thus while mothers' assessments of their own behavior and of the teachers' are both

affected by age of child and marks earned at school, it is the children who must bear the brunt of criticism for receiving poor marks and for aging.

Comparing the individual cells in Tables 6.24, 6.25, and 6.26, makes the above point more obvious. At the first grade level, mothers are somewhat more likely to say they should do something differently than to say that their children should. However, by the fifth grade level they are considerably more likely to say the children should change their ways; and by the tenth grade, the shift of responsibility to the child is even more complete. It is also clear from comparing the three preceding tables that mothers are always <u>least</u> likely to say the teacher should do something differently at each age-grade level and within each letter grade category. Hence, the school is usually in the fortunate situation where mothers will be self-critical or critical of the child before being critical of the teacher, even when school performance of the children is low. In fact, even when mothers' perceptions of the level of performance are taken into account, or when finer distinctions are made in the letter grades, the results are substantially the same. In every instance larger proportions of mothers say they should do something differently themselves, or their children should, than say the teacher should do something differently. Moreover, even when the children are receiving <u>D's</u> or lower as modal grades in school, or when mothers perceive them as doing "below average," the proportion saying the teacher should do something differently remains a minority. As we have seen, general dissatisfaction with the school also increases strongly among mothers of older children who do not get high marks, but the relationship with the teacher

is not as strongly affected. Thus the suggestion that mothers are quick to blame the teacher for poor performance among their children rather than to assume the responsibility themselves or to assign it to their children is not borne out by our findings.

Because the marks received by children in school are also strongly related to the educational attainment of parents and to the sex of the child, it is possible that these relationships account for or explain the relationships between the marks of the child and mothers' believing that they, the teachers, and the children should do something differently. However, both education of parents and sex of the child are also related to the mothers' belief that they, teachers, and children should change their behavior in some way. As a result, all these factors combine to produce larger differences between the subgroups of mothers. We present these more complex tables below for the interested reader, but our discussion will be very brief so that we may consider the responses of the children.

Marks of the child, grade level of child, and education of parents all continue to be related to the belief that the teacher should do something differently when considered in conjunction with one another (Table 6.27). Education is especially strongly related to this belief among the mothers of fifth and tenth graders; and in each case, college education produces higher discontent. It is as if higher educational attainment provided mothers with a license to be more critical of the behavior of teachers.[18] Age-grade of child is also more strongly related to criticism of teachers among the college mothers. However, it should be noted that higher education does not make the mothers more critical

of teachers alone. Rather, higher education is related to higher rates of criticism by mothers of all three role partners. Mothers in homes with higher educational attainment are more likely to be self-critical (Table 6.28) and critical of their own children (Table 6.29) in addition to being more critical of the teachers. To the extent that this criticism serves to keep all three role partners on their guard against failing to maintain standards, the propensity of "college" mothers for higher criticism is an extremely important means of "quality control" for the educational system that is not adequately shared by schools in areas where performance levels are demonstrably lower. Nevertheless, we hasten to point out that the strong relationships between educational attainment and mothers' expressions of discontent with role performances do not appreciably alter the other relationships with which we have been concerned, the one between child's age-grade and discontent, and the one between child's school marks and discontent.

One especially interesting specification emerges when parental education is taken into consideration. Mothers in the lower educational group are less self-critical when children are older regardless of the marks earned by the child at school (Table 6.28). This is most pronounced among mothers whose children receive low marks. But mothers in the more highly educated group are more self-critical when children are in fifth than in first grade, and this is also especially pronounced among those whose children receive lower marks (71%). At the tenth grade level, self-criticism is lower again for college mothers whose children are receiving A's and B's, but for those whose children receive C's or lower, self-criticism is higher at the tenth grade (58%), than at the

Table 6.27

Proportion of Mothers Who Say There Is Something the Teacher Should Be Doing Differently by Grade Level and Marks of Child and Educational Attainment of Mothers and Their Husbands

Educational Level of Parents Is:		Modal Letter Grade Is: A or B	Modal Letter Grade Is: C or Lower	Difference
Some College or Higher	First Grade	21% (96)	25% (68)	+4%
	Fifth Grade	43% (100)	48% (69)	+5%
	Tenth Grade	30% (97)	47% (57)	+17%
	Difference by Grade Level	+9%	+22%	
No College	First Grade	12% (142)	21% (137)	+9%
	Fifth Grade	26% (125)	26% (171)	----
	Tenth Grade	14% (87)	27% (155)	+13%
	Difference by Grade Level	+2%	+6%	
Difference by Education of Parents	First Grade	-9%	-4%	
	Fifth Grade	-17%	-22%	
	Tenth Grade	-16%	-20%	

Table 6.28

Proportion of Mothers Who Say There Is Something They Should Do Differently by Grade Level and Marks of Child and Educational Attainment of Mothers and Their Husbands

Educational Level of Parents Is:		Modal Letter Grade Is: A or B	Modal Letter Grade Is: C or Lower	Difference
Some College or Higher	First Grade	39% (97)	46% (69)	+7%
	Fifth Grade	48% (100)	71% (70)	+23%
	Tenth Grade	31% (96)	58% (57)	+27%
	Difference by Grade Level	-8%	+12%	
No College	First Grade	38% (141)	51% (135)	+13%
	Fifth Grade	37% (128)	44% (177)	+7%
	Tenth Grade	33% (94)	41% (163)	+8%
	Difference by Grade Level	-5%	-10%	
Difference by Education of Parents	First Grade	-1%	+5%	
	Fifth Grade	-11%	-27%	
	Tenth Grade	+2%	-17%	

Table 6.29

Proportion of Mothers Who Say Their Children Should Do Something Differently by Grade Level and Marks of Child and Educational Attainment of Mothers and Their Husbands

Educational Level of Parents Is:		Modal Letter Grade Is: A or B	Modal Letter Grade Is: C or Lower	Difference
Some College or Higher	First Grade	40% (97)	49% (68)	+9%
	Fifth Grade	52% (101)	83% (71)	+31%
	Tenth Grade	68% (97)	75% (59)	+7%
	Difference by Grade Level	+28%	+26%	
No College	First Grade	25% (144)	47% (137)	+22%
	Fifth Grade	51% (128)	60% (177)	+9%
	Tenth Grade	46% (94)	75% (163)	+29%
	Difference by Grade Level	+21%	+28%	
Difference by Education of Parents	First Grade	-15%	-2%	
	Fifth Grade	-1%	-23%	
	Tenth Grade	-22%	----	

first grade (46%).

It seems clear from the above that mothers in homes with higher educational attainment are not only more critical generally, but they are also willing to assume more continuing personal responsibility for the school performance of their children. These mothers do not hesitate to share the blame for not doing all that they should to help the child in school -- especially when the child does poorly in the higher grades. This is in sharp contrast with mothers in homes where educational levels are lower. These latter mothers, while often willing to criticize themselves when their children do poorly in the first grade, more often deny there is anything they should do differently to help the older child. This denial appears to reflect a more limited concept of the parental role in facilitating the educational performance of children. From the perspective of the more highly educated parents, this more limited role with older children who are not performing well could be seen as a failure to meet one's obligations as a parent. From the perspective of the school, it would appear that attempts to enlist the aid of mothers in trying to improve school performance of older children are most often doomed to failure when parental educational attainment is low. To the extent that schools depend on the willingness of parents to assume such responsibility, it again follows that the integration of school and community is higher where parental educational attainment is high.

The relationships between sex of the child and mothers' criticism of role performance are such that mothers of boys are considerably more critical of themselves and of their children than are the mothers of girls, but they are only slightly more critical of the teachers. When

grade level of child and marks are also taken into consideration, the relationship between sex of the child and the belief that the teacher should do something differently is negligible (Table 6.30); but the relationships with age-grade and with marks persist.

There are also some additional specifications of previously discussed relationships when sex of child, age grade and marks are considered simultaneously in conjunction with mothers' self criticisms and criticisms of their children. For instance, mothers are considerably more likely to feel they should do something differently themselves when their sons get high marks than when their daughters get high marks (Table 6.31), but they are considerably more likely to say sons than daughters should do something differently when marks are low (Table 6.32). Nevertheless, all differences between the mothers of girls and boys at each grade level and in each marking group reveal higher dissatisfaction when there are sons than when there are daughters. These differences are largest at the tenth grade level where equal proportions of sons with high marks and daughters with low marks are supposed to do something differently (62%).

To summarize, mothers from homes where educational attainment is high are more likely to criticize the behavior of each of the three role partners we have considered. In addition, mothers are more likely to be critical of sons than of daughters. Each of these factors combines with the marks earned at school and with the grade level of the child to produce selected groups of mothers with very high rates of criticism or very low rates of criticism. Nevertheless, the general tendency for mothers to be most critical of their children, second most critical of themselves,

Table 6.30

Proportion of Mothers Who Say There Is Something the Teacher Should Do Differently by Grade Level, Marks, and Sex of Child

Sex of Child Is:		Modal Letter Grade Is: A or B	Modal Letter Grade Is: C or Lower	Difference
Male	First Grade	17% (110)	23% (119)	+6%
	Fifth Grade	36% (109)	31% (137)	-5%
	Tenth Grade	20% (89)	34% (133)	+14%
	Difference by Grade Level	+3%	+11%	
Female	First Grade	14% (129)	21% (84)	+7%
	Fifth Grade	32% (117)	33% (104)	+1%
	Tenth Grade	24% (196)	29% (79)	+5%
	Difference by Grade Level	+10%	+8%	
Difference by Sex of Child	First Grade	-3%	-2%	
	Fifth Grade	-4%	+2%	
	Tenth Grade	+4%	-5%	

Table 6.31

Proportion of Mothers Who Say There Is Something They Should Do Differently by Grade Level, Marks, and Sex of Child

Sex of Child Is:		Modal Letter Grade Is: A or B	Modal Letter Grade Is: C or Lower	Difference
Male	First Grade	42% (110)	52% (121)	+10%
	Fifth Grade	49% (111)	52% (138)	+3%
	Tenth Grade	38% (92)	48% (138)	+10%
	Difference by Grade Level	-4%	-4%	
Female	First Grade	36% (129)	46% (83)	+10%
	Fifth Grade	35% (118)	51% (109)	+16%
	Tenth Grade	27% (97)	42% (83)	+15%
	Difference by Grade Level	-9%	-4%	
Difference by Sex of Child	First Grade	-6%	-6%	
	Fifth Grade	-14%	-1%	
	Tenth Grade	-11%	-6%	

Table 6.32

Proportion of Mothers Who Say There Is Something Their Children Should Do Differently by Grade Level, Marks, and Sex of Child

Sex of Child Is:		Modal Letter Grade Is: A or B	Modal Letter Grade Is: C or Lower	Difference
Male	First Grade	35% (111)	49% (119)	+14%
	Fifth Grade	51% (111)	71% (140)	+20%
	Tenth Grade	62% (92)	82% (141)	+20%
	Difference by Grade Level	+27%	+33%	
Female	First Grade	28% (131)	45% (84)	+17%
	Fifth Grade	51% (119)	60% (108)	+9%
	Tenth Grade	52% (100)	62% (84)	+10%
	Difference by Grade Level	+24%	+27%	
Difference by Sex of Child	First Grade	-7%	-4%	
	Fifth Grade	-----	-11%	
	Tenth Grade	-10%	-20%	

and least critical of the teachers, persists. Hence there is no group of mothers in the preceding tables where a majority says the teacher should do something differently, but when a combination of older children, lower marks, children who are boys, or higher parental education exists, majorities of mothers say the child should do something differently.

III. HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' EVALUATIVE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL AND THE CORRELATES OF ALIENATION

We have seen above that there are a number of factors related to mothers' perceptions of how well their children are doing in school, mothers' perceptions of how much their children like school and like teachers, and how satisfied mothers are with the school performance of their children. Chief among these factors are age of the child, sex of the child, marks earned by the child at school, and educational attainment of mothers and their husbands. But we have found in previous sections that there is often considerable discrepancy between what students, their mothers, and their teachers say about school, and it is possible that there are similar discrepancies regarding the students' evaluative responses to teachers, to school, and to their own performances. Since only the tenth grade students were interviewed, it is not possible to confirm or refute the important age-grade differences reported by the mothers and teachers with responses from students of varying ages. However, we can examine selected responses of the high school students to see whether the same factors are related to differences in responses for each role partner.[19]

To begin, a few direct comparisons of mothers' and teachers' perceptions can be made with the students' own responses. We noted in Section I. that students tend to be their own most severe critics. This is particularly striking with comparisons among the proportions of high school mothers, teachers, and students who are "very satisfied" with the students' performance at school (Table 6.33). Mothers and teachers

set standards that only minorities of students meet, but the students' standards for their own performance are even higher. High school students also like school considerably less than their mothers realize, judging from the fact that 46% of the mothers and 28% of the students say the students like school "very much." However, it appears that students like their English teachers slightly more than their mothers realize (53% and 49%, respectively, say "very much"). The teachers' responses are not precisely comparable for these two items since teachers were asked how much "most of their students" liked them and school, and, as noted earlier, the wording of alternative response categories was somewhat different when teachers were asked about students' liking school. Nevertheless, it is evident that the high school English teachers do not perceive their students as being very enthusiastic about their own performance, the school, or the teacher; and as noted earlier, both mothers and teachers report that the younger children like school and teachers considerably more than the older children.

Our findings also reveal that the English teachers in the subsample are liked somewhat more than teachers are liked generally. When asked how much they like "most teachers" just 38% of the students said they like them "very much" compared with 53% who gave this response for the English teachers whose classes were selected for interviews. We have been unable to find any characteristic shared by this subsample of teachers that distinguishes them from the other high school English teachers whose classes were not interviewed. It is not clear whether there is something special about the teachers whose classes were interviewed that our instruments did not detect or whether English teachers

Table 6.33

Proportions of High School Students, Their Mothers and Their Teachers Who Are "Very Satisfied" with the Students' School Performance, and Comparisons of Students' Evaluative Responses to School and to Their English Teachers with Responses Perceived by Mothers and Teachers

	Mothers	Teachers	Students
Very satisfied with the Students' Performance	38% (423)	26% (107)	16% (498)
	(Perceptions)*		
Students Like School Very Much	46% (427)	11% (106)	28% (497)
Students Like English Teacher Very Much	49% (394)	30% (101)	53% (507)

*The most positive category for Teachers' perceptions was most students "think school is a lot of fun."

are generally more popular than most teachers. Thus we shall examine the students' evaluative responses to most of their teachers as well as their responses to their English teachers to see whether the same sets of factors are related to both evaluations. It is likely that students' evaluations of "most teachers" are subject to considerable stereotyping, and asking about evaluations of particular English teachers might give undue weight to whatever idiosyncratic characteristics these individual teachers possess. Both questions have obvious limitations. As it turns out, there is a strong tendency for the individual students to say they like both the English teacher and most teachers about equally, but there are some interesting differences as well that will be reported below.

Table 6.34

Comparisons of Selected Responses to School
According to Sex of Students

	Sex of Student Is:		
	Male	Female	Difference
Like school "very much"	19%	35%	+16%
Like most teachers "very much"	31%	47%	+16%
Like the English teacher "very much"	46%	61%	+15%
Says grades are "very important"	74%	75%	+1%
"Not at all" satisfied with own school performance	31%	24%	-7%
Says parents pressure "a great deal"	30%	17%	-13%
	(280)	(220)	

For the most part, the factors related to students' evaluations of their own performance, of the school, and of their teachers are similar to those disclosed by our analysis of the mothers' responses. Boys tend to make lower evaluations than girls, and students with lower marks make lower evaluations than those with higher ones. But educational attainment of parents is not strongly related to the evaluative responses of students. This last finding is especially interesting in view of the fact that it has often been asserted that parents transmit their own educational values to their children -- the subject of Section VII. on educational plans that follows. It is well known that students' educational plans and aspirations are strongly related to the educational attainment of their parents. But the fact that their alienation from school, as expressed by the attitudes examined in this section, is more

strongly related to their sex and to their marks than to their parents' education, has important implications for the integration of the social system.[20] Some of these will be discussed below, but first we will examine the findings themselves.

In Table 6.34 it can be seen that 13% fewer boys than girls say they like their teachers "very much," and 14% fewer boys than girls say they like the English teacher "very much." In addition, 31% of the boys, compared with 21% of the girls say they are "not at all satisfied" with their own performance at school, and a smaller proportion (24%) of the boys than girls (33%) say they like school "very much." Moreover, when asked how much their parents pressure them to do well in school, 31% of the boys and just 15% of the girls said "a great deal."

In contrast with the pronounced differences between the responses of girls and boys, students whose parents' educational attainments are differentiated at the college level have very similar responses to each of these items (Table 6.35). Higher parental educational attainment is associated with slightly more favorable responses to each item, but the largest difference is only 7% (liking school).

Marks received in school produce the largest differences in students' evaluative responses to their school situation. Students with high marks say they like school "very much" 20% more frequently, say they like most teachers "very much" 23% more frequently, say they are "not at all satisfied" with their own performance 32% less frequently, and say their parents pressure them a great deal 16% less frequently than the students with low marks (Table 6.36). But, surprisingly, evaluations of the English teacher are almost identical for the students in the two groups.

Table 6.35

Comparisons of Selected Responses of Students to School by Educational Level of Parents

	Parents' Education Is:		
	Some College	No College	Difference
Like school "very much"	33%	26%	-7%
Like most teachers "very much"	41%	37%	-4%
Like English teacher "very much"	55%	50%	-5%
Grades are "very important"	78%	72%	-6%
"Not at all" satisfied with own school performance	24%	28%	+4%
Parents pressure "a great deal"	21%	26%	+5%
	(154)	(263)	

As a result of this last finding, it appears safe to conclude that although students may stereotype their teachers collectively, they are nevertheless quite capable of responding to each teacher differently. In other words, the fact that students tend to become alienated from school and tend to dislike teachers when they receive low marks does not prevent them from liking particular teachers -- even teachers of academic subjects such as English.

The especially strong relationship between students' marks and their evaluative responses to these items is not surprising in view of the high importance that students assign to letter grades. When asked how important it is to get good grades in school, 75% of the students chose the "very important" response. The proportions are almost identical for

girls and for boys and for students with different educational backgrounds. Marks received by the students are the only factor of the three considered above that is strongly related to this belief. Eighty per cent of the students with high marks and 67% of those with low marks say grades are "very important." It appears from this that there is some tendency for students to rationalize their own low marks with a "sour grapes" response to the question regarding the importance of marks, and their assigning lower importance to marks may in turn contribute to their receiving poor marks. Whatever the explanation, it is most striking that a decisive majority of the students with lower marks continues to acknowledge the high importance of marks. This acknowledgment persists in spite of the fact that large proportions of these students express alienation from school and from their teachers. Undoubtedly this is the main reason why low marks are so strongly related to the evaluative responses of students and of their mothers. As we have seen, by the time children are in high school, marks have assumed such high importance to almost all concerned, that each type of participant shows signs of role strain when marks are low.

During recent years there has been considerable concern among sociologists of education with the student subcultures that are found in secondary schools and colleges.[21] The Coleman study, The Adolescent Society,[22] has probably been the single most influential with regard to discussions of secondary school subcultures, although this study has not been without its critics.[23] Coleman treats student subcultures that stress athletics, dating, and other non-academic values as being dysfunctional to the academic goals of education by showing that students with

Table 6.36

Comparisons of Selected Responses of Students to School by Modal Letter Grades of Students

	Modal Letter Grade Is:		
	A or B	C or Lower	Difference
Like School "Very Much"	39%	19%	-20%
Likes Most Teachers "Very Much"	51%	29%	-22%
Likes English Teacher "Very Much"	54%	52%	-2%
Grades Are "Very Important"	80%	67%	-13%
"Not At All" Satisfied with Own School Performance	10%	42%	+32%
Parents Pressure "A Great Deal"	15%	31%	+16%
	(214)	(284)	

the highest I.Q.'s do not always receive the highest marks in schools where athletics and social activities are stressed.[24] However, the almost universal acceptance of the importance of marks, and the higher rates of role strain among students with lower marks and among their mothers in our sample, suggest that the system is far more monolithic than the current interest in and discussion of student subcultures would lead us to believe.

There is little reason to doubt that emphasis on athletics and dating is high in most high schools in the United States; and in our sample, a majority of students in every high school agreed that most of the students are "more interested in sports or dating than in their studies." However, there is also considerable evidence that this situation is

anything but new. Over thirty years ago Willard Waller[25] typified student culture in high schools as consisting of athletics and the "rating and dating" game. But Waller tended to see these activities as safety valves or relatively healthy outlets for adolescents, and as particularly useful in maintaining interest in school among students who do poorly academically. We hardly wish to take the position of defending athletics and the other non-academic activities of high school students as being worthy of as much emphasis as they often receive. However, it should be pointed out that in view of the fact that high school students are so frequently alienated by our present system of education, the schools may have been fortunate indeed in being the center of so many other activities that the students can continue to find interesting and enjoyable. Obviously it would be desirable to make changes in our schools such that more students would like school, like teachers, and find their studies more interesting; but until such changes are made, a purge of athletics and other non-academic activities would clearly remove the only positive aspects of school for many students. Our findings suggest, if anything, that marks are already too important to students and to their mothers and that they have frequently displaced the more terminal goals of education.

There are a number of different ways that the impact of letter grades or marks and their special importance can be demonstrated. We have already seen that the relationships between children's letter grades and responses of mothers to the children and to the school become much stronger as the children get older; and as shown in the above tables, marks are also the best single predictor of the students'

evaluative responses and of their alienation from school. In addition, marks are also strongly related to the location of children within the tracking system of the school, and this too has far-reaching implications for the system.

One of the problems shared by all high schools in the sample is how to assign letter grades within the slow and fast tracks. If uniform standards are used throughout the English classes, some groups will tend to get all the high marks and others the low ones. But if standards are adjusted to the ability and performance levels of particular groups of students, marks can be very similar from one ability group to another. A marking system completely relative to each classroom would make it difficult to assess the relative performance of students in the school as a whole, but finer discriminations could be made within particular classrooms. The principals in some of the sample schools acknowledged that the accusation had sometimes been made that a quota system was used for assigning high marks within each track, but they uniformly denied that this was true. Nevertheless, letter grades are much higher in the faster track classes in each of the sample schools. Thus while some attempt may be made to give high marks to students in the lower ability groups who try especially hard or who do better than the other students in their groups, the vast majority (70%) of students in the faster tracks get A's and B's but only 11% in the slower groups get A's and B's. From this it would appear that the high school marking systems tend to be much more uniform than flexible within these schools.

It is especially interesting that the boys and girls get very similar letter grades within the two ability groupings (Table 6.37). The

Table 6.37

Proportion of Students with Modal Letter Grades of A or B by Sex and Track of Students

	Male	Female	Difference
Track 1	66% (125)	75% (142)	+9%
Track 2	12% (153)	10% (78)	-2%
Difference by Track	-54%	-65%	
TOTALS	36% (278)	52% (220)	+16%

overall academic superiority of girls is substantially reduced in the fast track and is eliminated in the slow track; and there is some tendency for boys to be assigned disproportionately to the slower groups and girls to the faster. Given the fact that marks and sex are strongly related to track, it is not surprising that students in the slower track also report they like school and teachers considerably less and are less satisfied with their school performance than are their age-mates in the faster groups (Table 6.38). Students in the slower track also perceive somewhat more pressure from their parents to do well in school, but their liking for their English teachers and feelings about the importance of grades are almost identical with these found in the faster groups. As we would expect, mothers of the students in the slower track perceive that their children like school and like the teachers less, and these mothers are also less satisfied with the school performance of their children (Table 6.39). Indeed, these percentage differences are even larger than those found among the students. Most of these differences

Table 6.38

Comparisons of Selected Responses of Students to School by Track in Which Students Are Located

	Track Is: Fast	Slow	Difference
Like School "Very Much"	32%	23%	-9%
Like Most Teachers "Very Much"	45%	30%	-15%
Like English Teacher "Very Much"	53%	52%	-1%
Says Grades Are "Very Important"	74%	71%	-3%
"Not at All" Satisfied with Own School Performance	17%	40%	+23%
Says Parents Pressure "A Great Deal"	21%	29%	+8%
	(272)	(235)	

Table 6.39

Selected Perceptions and Responses of Mothers of High School Students by Track of Child

	Track Is: Fast	Slow	Difference
Says Child Likes English Teacher "Very Much"	54%	43%	-11%
Says Child Likes School "Very Much"	56%	33%	-23%
"Very Satisfied" with Child's Performance	52%	21%	-31%
	(240)	(189)	

in attitudinal responses of students and mothers are attributable to the poorer grades and to the higher concentrations of boys in the lower track classes. However, the fact that differences can be largely explained in this manner does not reduce the problem they present to the school since these classroom groups are part of the formal organization of the school and individual teachers must contend with these students and with their parents as groups.

The task of teaching groups of students with negative orientations toward school, toward teachers and toward their own performance is undoubtedly different from teaching groups where orientations are positive, and it may also be a more difficult one in some ways. It has been found in other studies that there is more prestige associated with teaching the brighter students and that teachers assigned to the faster tracks are often the more experienced and more highly trained ones.[26] In other words, the reward structures for teachers and students are both reflected by their classroom assignments. We will not digress on the individual attributes of the few English teachers in our subsample who can be identified with specific tracks. However, there are some especially interesting differences in the classroom behavior reported by these teachers that are presented below. Admittedly the number of cases is small but the patterns of response are consistent with the position we have taken throughout this section and they are relatively unambiguous (Table 6.40).

Looking briefly at the behavioral items discussed earlier, we find that the teachers of the faster groups report they get fun out of class more often and praise their students more often, but they lose their

tempers less frequently and scold students less frequently than the teachers of the slower groups. Moreover, not one of the teachers of the faster groups reports ever having had to punish either an individual student in the specified class or having had to punish the class as a whole, but the proportions are 54% and 45% for the teachers with the slower groups. Thus in some ways the classroom behavior reported by the teachers of the lower track groups resembles the behavior reported by the elementary school teachers more than it resembles the behavior of their high school colleagues with the faster groups.

It appears then that the students assigned to the slower groups have been less adequately socialized to the demands of school, and this conclusion is supported by the responses of all three role partners. The students get lower grades and are more alienated from school, their mothers perceive this alienation and are less satisfied with their school performance, and the teachers of these students make more frequent use of negative sanctions as social control mechanisms. In effect, the more difficult cases are more heavily concentrated in the slower track classes, and signs of role strain and malintegration are considerably more prevalent among the members of this group and their role partners.

One encouraging finding can be found in the midst of the generally negative factors associated with the slower track. In spite of the fact that the boys, the students with lower marks, and those who are more alienated from school are found more frequently in these groups, and in spite of the fact that their teachers report higher frequencies of negatively loaded interaction with them, the students in the lower track English classes report they like their English teachers almost exactly

Table 6.40

Frequencies of Selected Behavior Reported by English Teachers According to Track of Class

	Track of Class Is: Fast	Slow	Difference
Get Fun Out of Class (Twice a week or more)	100%	82%	-18%
Praise a Student (Twice a week or more)	89%	73%	-16%
Lose Temper or Get Mad (Once a month or more)	11%	18%	+9%
Scold a Student (Once a month or more)	33%	54%	+21%
Punish a Student (Ever)	0%	54%	+54%
Punish the Class as a Whole (Ever)	0%	45%	+45%
	(9)	(11)	

as much as the students in the faster groups (Table 6.38). It is encouraging to think that students with the most predispositions against school and against teachers can still show the capacity to respond positively to individual teachers.[27] Indeed, this finding suggests again that students' alienation is selective and that it may still be possible for individual teachers to reach many of the students who have learned to dislike school and to dislike most teachers.

As we have already indicated, the concentrations of students with lower marks and of boys in the slower track classes explain most of the higher rates of negative response to school among the students in the slower track classes. However, when just marks and sex of students are

taken into consideration, both can be seen to contribute independently to rates of alienation among the students (Table 6.41). Sometimes both marks and sex combine to produce larger differences. For instance, the proportion of students who like school very much ranges from a low of 17% among boys who receive low grades to a high of 44% among girls with high grades. Similarly, the proportion liking most teachers very much ranges from 23% among boys with low marks to 55% among girls with high marks, and the proportion saying their parents pressure them a great deal to do well in school ranges from 8% among girls with high marks to 37% among boys with low marks.

Generally the effects of marks are somewhat stronger than those of sex, but there is one item where grades have no effect and sex does. This is the item that reflects feelings about the English teacher. Virtually identical proportions of students with high marks and low marks say they like their English teacher very much, but lower proportions of boys say they like these teachers very much regardless of marks. This might well be the result of the fact that boys have greater difficulty with English and literary skills than girls, or the result of some special characteristic of these particular teachers, but neither explanation is ascertainable from our data. As a result, our evidence suggests that while individual teachers may be able to overcome negative attitudes of students toward teachers that are associated with having previously received low marks, it is still more difficult to get boys to like them as much as the girls do.

Perhaps the most significant finding in Table 6.41 is the fact that the lower satisfaction of boys with their own school performance is

Table 6.41

Selected Responses to School by Sex and Modal Letter Grade of Students

	Modal Letter Grade:	Sex Is: Male	Female	Difference (Sex)
Like School Very Much	A and B	33%	44%	+11%
	C	11%	24%	+13%
	Difference (Grades)	-22%	-20%	
Like Most Teachers Very Much	A and B	46%	55%	+9%
	C	23%	39%	+16%
	Difference (Grades)	-23%	-16%	
Like English Teacher Very Much	A and B	45%	61%	+16%
	C	46%	59%	+13%
	Difference (Grades)	+1%	-3%	
Say Grades Are Very Important	A and B	80%	81%	+1%
	C	69%	64%	-5%
	Difference (Grades)	-11%	-17%	
Not at All Satisfied with Own Performance	A and B	10%	10%	----
	C	43%	40%	-3%
	Difference (Grades)	+33%	+30%	
Say Parents Pressure a Great Deal	A and B	22%	10%	-12%
	C	35%	25%	-10%
	Difference (Grades)	+13%	+15%	
Number of Cases	A and B	(100)	(114)	
	C	(180)	(106)	

almost completely accounted for by the fact that boys get lower marks than girls. Apparently both boys and girls judge their own performance about equally on the basis of the marks they receive; and when marks are held constant, it can also be seen that both also say grades are of about equal importance. Hence even the simple dichotomy of modal grades between the C and B levels produces very large differences in the proportions of students who are not satisfied with their own performance (30% among the boys and 33% among the girls). These differences become considerably larger when finer discriminations are made among the letter grades. The chief implication of this finding that suggests itself is that if boys could somehow earn an equal share of rewards from the schools as girls, their self-image would be proportionately more positive, and their alienation from school would be reduced proportionately.

CONCLUSIONS

We have purposely touched lightly upon a number of different topics in this section at the risk of not giving sufficient attention to any one. This has been done because the primary intent of our investigation is to raise and discuss problems relevant to the integration of the subsystems of the social system with which we are concerned. Some of the topics we have touched upon have been the primary subjects of intensive investigations by other authors. But rather than attempt to replicate or to test the specific findings of others, we have stressed the systemic nature of a number of different findings that are strongly interrelated. Most studies of parental attitudes toward school or of teachers' or students' attitudes have had to rely on data gathered from only one status occupant; and as we have seen, such data are often misleading largely because of inaccuracies in the mutual perceptions of role partners. The topics covered in this section are unusual in that results are similar regardless of whose responses are examined for evidence. The consistency and complementarity of the interrelationships among certain key items from one role partners to another are, we believe, some of the most significant findings that we have uncovered, and these items taken together gain meaning and lead to conclusions that would not be warranted by more intensive analysis of each item taken separately.

We began by exploiting the cross-sectional aspect of our study design and demonstrating that mothers and teachers report parallel

differences in the frequencies of selected forms of interaction with the sample children according to the age-grade of the children. Expressive, affective and sanctioning responses were found to be less frequent with older children, but assigning chores and discussing controversial subjects are more frequent with the older children. These age-grade differences were found to be larger than and mainly independent of any differences that might be attributable to sex of the child or to education of parents. However, mothers report they lose their tempers more often, have fun less often, and more often punish their sons than their daughters, and higher educational attainment of parents is related to higher rates of discussion of controversial events with the older children.

When marks received by the child are taken into consideration, the familiar pattern of girls getting better marks than boys holds for our sample; but it is clear that fewer high marks are given to the older children, and this finding applies to both the cross-sectional and to the longitudinal data. However, it is only among students from homes where neither parent has attended college that marks become lower in high school. Furthermore, the mothers' attitudes toward their children and toward the school are much more strongly related to the marks received by their children in the higher grades, where low marks are very strongly related to both low satisfaction with the child and to low satisfaction with the school.

The same factors are related to mothers' perceptions of their children's affective responses to school. Mothers see their older children, their sons, and those who receive poor marks as liking school

and liking teachers less. The teachers of older students also perceive lower positive affect among their students.

Especially interesting are the findings with regard to mothers' criticisms of role performance. Parental education is related to higher rates of criticism of each role partner, but mothers are least critical of the teachers and most critical of their children. Mothers are also more critical of each role partner when the children receive low marks, and they are somewhat more critical of themselves and of their children when the latter are boys. In addition, they are more critical of themselves and of the teachers when the children are young, and more critical of the children who are older. The college mothers remain critical of themselves when their older children receive low marks, but mothers from homes with lower educational attainment become less critical of themselves under similar circumstances. These patterns were interpreted as reflecting a shift in responsibility for the child's school performance from the mothers and teachers to the older children, and as reinforcing other socioeconomic and sexual differences.

While sex and age-grade of the child and socioeconomic circumstances of the family have been included in many studies of socialization in the home, it seems clear from our findings that performance of the child in school is an equally if not more important factor for family integration in our achievement-oriented society. In addition, as we have seen, marks are probably the single most important factor for school-family integration when children are older. If most children must spend the major part of their weekdays in school from the ages of five through seventeen, then it is clear that influences will flow two ways over

time, both from the family to the school, and from the school to the family. Educational literature abounds with statements pertaining to the former process, but the latter is acknowledged far less often. Indeed, one of the most regrettable consequences of the sociological studies that have demonstrated how strongly socioeconomic circumstances of the home can predict school performance of children[28] is that these findings tend to reinforce the expectations of both teachers and parents and to provide a convenient rationalization for the poor school performance of low socioeconomic groups. The school can blame poor home circumstances for the poor performance of students, and our findings show that the parents tend to blame the children. But the reciprocity of influence between school and home has never been adequately studied. This study is but one step in that direction. We have seen that mothers' assessments of the role behavior of their children, the teachers, and of themselves, and their evaluation of the school are strongly related to the letter grades their children receive from the school. Moreover, we have seen that the influence of marks tends to be stronger among the mothers of older children. In short, we have seen strong evidence of the feedback between the school and family subsystems.

Given the strong relationships between educational attainment and eventual occupation and economic status in our society, the lifetime success of the child who does well in school tends to be established at quite an early age. But conversely, the child who gets poor marks is often defined as a failure when he is quite young. Hence it should not surprise us to find that grades received by the child have such a strong impact on mothers, especially when the children are boys. However, in

view of the frequent assertion that education is less highly valued among lower socioeconomic groups, we were somewhat surprised to find that low marks have as strong an impact on mothers' attitudes in homes where parental educational attainment is low as in homes where it is high. Indeed, we found that mothers in such homes are much less satisfied with the school performance of younger children with low marks than mothers in homes with higher parental educational levels; and the former also tend to place the responsibility for poor performance on the older child, while the latter continue to assume considerable self-responsibility for the poor school performance of older children.

The high school students' responses reveal higher rates of alienation from school among the boys and especially among students with lower marks. These same groups dislike teachers more, are less satisfied with their own school performance, and more frequently say they are pressured by their parents to do well in school. The tracking system of the school can be seen as reinforcing these relationships by placing higher proportions of boys and students with low marks in the slower groups. The behavior reported by the teachers in these classrooms contrasts sharply with that of the teachers of the faster groups, particularly with regard to their more frequent use of negative expressive responses and of social control sanctions. In addition, mothers of these students are aware their children are more alienated from school, and they are considerably less satisfied with their children's school performance.

Most striking is the fact that the vast majority of students think it is very important to get good grades, and neither parental education nor sex of the child is related to this belief. Hence the students,

like their parents, give evidence of role strain and lower self-image brought about by poor marks even among the groups where low marks are more likely to occur. There is no convenient alternative value system to insulate them from the pain of experiencing failure and no widespread withdrawal from the values of the majority. At the tenth grade level, a majority of the students who dislike school and teachers, who are dissatisfied with their own school performance, or who get low marks still subscribe to the belief that getting good marks is very important.

SECTION VI.

FOOTNOTES

1.The fact that anthropologists customarily use age and sex categories in organizing their discussions of socialization has made it possible for some quantitative cross-cultural comparisons to be made. See, for example, John W.M. Whiting, Richard Kluckhohn, and Albert Anthony, "The Function of Male Initiation Ceremonies at Puberty," in Maccoby, Newcomb, and Hartley (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology (New York: Henry Holt and Co.), 3rd. ed., 1958, pp. 359-370.

2. See, J.W.M. Whiting and Irwin L. Child, Child Training and Personality (New Haven: Yale University Press), 1953; Robert R. Sears, Eleanor E. Maccoby, and Henry Levin, Patterns of Child Rearing (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Co.), 1957.

3. On testing Freudian Hypotheses see William H. Sewell, "Infant Training and the Personality of the Child," American Journal of Sociology, LVIII (1953), p. 157. For socioeconomic correlates see Urie Bronfenbrener, "Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space," in Maccoby et al. (eds.), op. cit., pp. 400-425.

4. See especially Philip E. Jacob, Changing Values in College (New York: Harper), 1957 and Allen H. Barton, Studying the Effects of College Education, A Methodological Examination of Changing Values in College (New Haven: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation), 1959.

5. See Howard S. Becker and Blanche Geer, "Fate of Idealism in Medical School," American Sociological Review, Vol. 23, No. 1 (February, 1958), pp. 50-56; Robert K. Merton, George G. Reader, and Patricia C. Kendall (eds.), The Student Physician (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 1957; Seymour Warkov with Joseph Zelen, Lawyers in the Making (Chicago: Aldine), 1965; Jerome E. Carlin, Lawyers' Ethics: A Survey of the New York City Bar (New York: Russell Sage), 1966.

6. Sanford M. Dornbusch, "The Military Academy as an Assimilating Institution," Social Forces, Vol. XXXIII (1955), p. 317. For an overview of adult socialization literature see Orville G. Brim, Jr. and Stanton Wheeler, Socialization after Childhood: Two Essays (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 1966.

7. See Talcott C. Parsons, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States," American Sociological Review, VII (1942), pp. 604-616, and Parsons, "The School Class as a Social System," in Halsey, Floud, and Anderson, Education, Economy and Society (New York: Free Press of Glencoe), 1961, pp. 434-454.

8. In this report the cross-sectional data are sometimes treated as though they were longitudinal. A serious weakness in this practice would occur if there were appreciable drop-outs from the schools surveyed between the grades one and ten. However, school personnel in each community assured us this was not the case.

9. For evidence of the high correlations between political opinions of parents and children see Herbert H. Hyman, Political Socialization: A Study in the Psychology of Political Behavior (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press), 1959.

10. See e.g. Edgar Z. Friedenberg, Coming of Age in America: Growth and Acquiescence (New York:Random House), 1965.

11. Schools in one community did not assign letter grades for first graders. However, a global rating of average, above average, and below average was given to each child and coded as C, B, D respectively.

12. Even when I.Q.'s are controlled for our sample, boys get lower grades than girls with similar I.Q.'s.

13. We had originally hoped to use achievement test scores as well as letter grades and I.Q.'s in our analysis. However, tests utilized and time of testing varied so much from one community to another that this was virtually impossible.

14. James A. Davis, "The Campus as a Frogpond," American Journal of Sociology, 72, No. 1, pp. 17-31.

15. See especially, Morris Rosenberg, Society and the Adolescent Self-Image (Princeton: Princeton University Press), 1965. More recently, Coleman has found self-image of students strongly related to academic achievement on a national scale. James S. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1966.

16. Parsons, "The School Class as a Social System," op. cit.

17. Brookover, for instance, has found negative relationships between subjective ratings of teachers by pupils and objective measures of student achievement. Wilbur B. Brookover, "Person-to-Person Interaction between Teachers and Pupils and Teaching Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, 34 (1940), pp. 272-287.

18. From the teachers' perspective, this might be an example of a little knowledge doing a great deal of harm. It would appear that teachers feel the impact of this more critical orientation of mothers with higher education, judging from the fact that teachers in the sample schools serving more highly educated mothers more frequently report that mothers have at some time attempted to interfere with what they were doing in the classroom.

19. There are a number of items in this section that are not presented as "consensus" items even though they have been analysed in this manner at the Bureau. For instance, mothers and their children were asked how well the child performs in school, how much the child likes school and likes the teacher, etc. Chi Squares for most of these items are well beyond the .001 level of significance; and for the most part, major directions of discrepancies are apparent from the marginal distributions that are compared in the text. For example, mothers perceive that their children like school more than the children actually like school. However, we have not chosen to inquire into the determinants of consensus and dissensus on these items in this report.

20. It is tempting to speculate that parents transmit negative or positive attitudes toward education to their children and that these attitudes are imperfectly correlated with parental education. We attempted to provide for this possibility in our instruments with the inclusion of items asking about the importance of education, how much education is needed to get along in the world, etc. However, such large majorities of mothers considered education important, believed one must do well in school, and thought a college education was necessary that we were unable to get much use out of these items in our analysis. An attempt to ascertain the independent effects of parental attitudes on their children's academic achievement while controlling for parental education was made in the recent English study known as the Plowden Report. (Central Advisory Council on Education, Children and Their Primary Schools: Volume I, The Report; Volume II, Research and Surveys, London, H.M.S.O., 1967.) However, at least one critic has questioned whether the indicators used for parental attitudes toward education are adequate in this study. (See David K. Cohen, "Children and Their Primary Schools: Volume II." Harvard Educational Review, 38, No. 2 (1968), pp. 329-340.)

21. For a representative bibliography and a discussion of some of the methodological issues in these studies see Walter L. Wallace, Student Culture (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.), 1966.

22. James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society (New York: Free Press of Glencoe), 1961.

23. See especially the reviews by William Peterson, (Science, 134, No. 3485, pp. 1061-1062, 1961) and Albert K. Cohan (American Sociological Review, 28, No. 4, pp. 644-645, 1963).

24. It is interesting to note that in order to make his chief points about academic achievement in The Adolescent Society and in Equality of Educational Opportunity, Coleman implicitly treats I.Q.'s and achievement test scores as though they were both valid. Yet sociologists have long been critical of cultural biases in these tests.

25. Willard Waller, op. cit.

26. See Anna Lee Hopson and David E. Wilder, A Study of Teachers in the Public Schools of Washington, D.C., (New York: Columbia BASR), 1967.

27. This, of course, is one of the major complications in trying to study the relationship between student achievement and affective response to teachers.

28. For an early documentation of this relationship see Charles Elmer Holley, The Relationship between Persistence in School and Home Conditions, NSSE, 15th Yearbook, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1916. During recent years the number of such studies has multiplied considerably. See, for example, James Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1966.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

BUREAU OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

ACTUAL AND PERCEIVED CONSENSUS ON EDUCATIONAL GOALS BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY

Report submitted to

Office of Education
Bureau of Research
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Volume II

BUREAU OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

Columbia University
605 West 115th Street
New York, N. Y. 10025

The Bureau of Applied Social Research is an instrument of Columbia University's Graduate Faculties for training and research in the social sciences. The Bureau has for many years served as the research laboratory of the Department of Sociology, and it also facilitates social research by students and faculty of other departments and schools of the University. The Bureau's governing board includes representatives from all of the University's social science departments and several professional schools.

The Bureau carries on a program of basic and applied research under grants and commissions from foundations, government agencies, social welfare and other nonprofit organizations, and business firms. In so doing it provides experience on major empirical studies to graduate students and makes available data and facilities for student projects; it provides research facilities to faculty members; it offers training and consultation to visiting scholars, especially from social research institutes in other countries; and it makes the results of its investigations available through publications for lay and scientific audiences.

A bibliography of Bureau books, monographs, articles, unpublished research reports, dissertations, and masters' essays may be obtained from the Bureau's Librarian.

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 5-1067-2-12-1
Grant No. OE-5-10-238

ACTUAL AND PERCEIVED CONSENSUS ON EDUCATIONAL GOALS BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY

December 1968

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

VOLUME II

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME II

SECTION VII

MOTHER-CHILD CONSENSUS ON EDUCATIONAL PLANS*

The decision that most frequently has a direct bearing on life chances in our society is the one regarding how much education to complete. It is well established that eventual adult earning power and occupational status are strongly related to level of education attained earlier.[1] Indeed, the strength of the relationship between educational attainment and life chances is so well known that education is frequently cited by the poor as the best hope for their childrens' economic advancement. At the same time, the wealthy in our society frequently exert strong pressure on school personnel to secure the enrollment of their children at college. In short, high educational attainment has become an important and widely shared life goal in our society, a goal with both instrumental and symbolic significance.

Many studies have been made of the educational plans of American high school students and the plans their parents hold for them.[1] Both educational aspiration and school attainment of students have consistently been found to be strongly related to the measured intelligence and the socio-economic circumstances of high school students,[2] and a few studies have shown that encouragement by parents is also a strong determinant of whether students plan to go to college.[3] However, virtually all of the studies of educational plans have shared two limitations. First, they have usually included either students or their parents as respondents, but not both.

*This section was written with Eva E. Sandis

As a result, consensus and accuracy of perception between parents and their children on educational plans cannot be ascertained; and it has not been possible to inquire into the role that parental persuasion has played in determining the plans of their children. Second, college plans tend to be treated as desirable goals for all children when, in fact, there may be a number of circumstances under which it would not make much sense for students or their parents to plan on college. We will show some of the consequences of both these limitations in this section.

Because of the high importance of educational attainment and the major role assumed by parents, and especially by mothers, in the socialization of their children, we would expect students to have high consensus on educational plans with their mothers. That adolescents frequently learn to disagree with their parents on a number of matters, such as how to dress, who they like as friends, and the type of music that is best, may be an important aspect of social maturation in our society. But the decision as to how much education to complete is such an important aspect of societal and family integration that widespread disagreement between mothers and their adolescent children on this issue would signal an alarming disruption of our two most basic socializing institutions.

Although mothers and their adolescent children can be expected to have high agreement on educational plans, the actual extent of this agreement and the relative impact of parental plans, as compared with other influences on adolescents' decisions remains unknown. While previous studies have shown that such factors as academic ability, motivation, and family background are strong predictors of educational plans, it is possible that these factors are associated

with students' educational plans regardless of their parents' plans for them. For example, students' ability or motivation may set limits on their educational plans no matter how much their mothers want them to complete four years of college. On the other hand, it may be that parental ambitions for their children tend to override such factors as academic ability of students or family background in their impact on adolescents' educational plans. That is, perhaps even "average" students have college plans if their mothers have such plans for them, despite their scholastic standing. If, as a result of successful parental persuasion, parent-child consensus on educational plans is generally high, such factors as students' ability and social background may be related to childrens' plans only because they affect their parents' plans for them. We have also seen evidence in the previous section that parents change assessments of their children to conform with the feedback they receive from the school about their children's performance. In short, parental plans for their children are also subject to a number of influences, and the systemic or interdependent nature of many of these factors makes it difficult or impossible to infer causality among them.

It would be folly to argue that parental persuasion has always occurred merely because mothers and their children agree on educational plans, but it would be even more foolish to argue that persuasion has always occurred when parents and their children disagree. As we have seen in previous sections, role partners may often agree on issues without being aware of agreement. Yet we would expect that adolescents in our society usually perceive accurately the educational plans that their mothers hold for them because of the high importance of educational attainment and the high rates of mother-child communication

about school. But the extent of the accuracy of children's perceptions of their mothers' plans for them may depend, in part, on the kinds of plans parents have for their children. Given the cultural emphasis on the desirability of going to college, perhaps children are less likely to be aware that their parents do not have college plans for them, and this may be especially true when children are doing particularly well in school or when they are in the midst of classmates who plan to attend college.

In this section we shall be concerned with the educational plans of students, the plans their mothers hold for them, and the perceptions the students have of their mothers' ambitions for them. First we will examine the students' plans and relate these to a number of other attributes of the students and to the circumstances in which they are found. Then we turn to the plans held by the mothers for their children, and the factors most strongly related to these. Consensus, or agreement on plans, between pairs of mothers and children is next examined according to a number of potentially influential factors. Some of these are singled out as being especially productive of lower rates of mother-child agreement. Finally we consider the accuracy of children's perceptions of the plans their mothers hold for them and examine some of the determinants and consequences of inaccurate perceptions.

Educational Plans of High School Students

The tenth grade students in our sample were asked a series of open-ended questions about their educational aspirations and plans, including the following:

"How far do you want to go in school?"

and

"How far do you really think you will go in school?"

Answers to these questions were coded into six categories ranging from "some high school" through "graduate school," but large majorities of respondents answered each of these questions in terms of either finishing high school or completing four years of college.[4] That is, even when given the opportunity to express alternative levels or categories of schooling, the vast majority of respondents framed their responses in terms of earning either the traditional high school diploma or a four year college degree. Little awareness of trade school or of junior college as alternatives to four years of college beyond high school was elicited.[5] As a result, it is possible to dichotomize the responses to these questions as four years of college or less without distorting the actual response categories appreciably.

There has been considerable inconsistency in the research literature on educational aspirations regarding the appropriate questions to ask respondents and our aim in distinguishing between how much education students "want" and how much the "really think" they will complete was to see how much discrepancy there would be in responses to questions designed to obtain aspirations and expectations or plans separately. We expected to find that students' educational aspirations would exceed their educational expectations in many cases, but the amount of education the students in our sample <u>expect</u> to get is usually identical with the amount of education they say they <u>want</u> for themselves. Fifty-four per cent want, and plan, at least four years of college, and thirty-four per cent neither want, nor plan, to complete four years of college. (Table 7.1) Just ten per cent of the students want four years of college and have lesser plans while

only one percent of the students say they expect to complete four years of college and have lower aspirations.

It seems reasonable to conclude from these data that, for the vast majority of students, statements about the amount of education they think they will get are also indicative of their aspirations. Many prior studies have concentrated on students' aspirations rather than plans, but we have chosen the latter, more conservative measure as being more realistic. Since, however, there are some discrepancies between students' aspirations and their educational plans, let us briefly examine some of their sources.

We would expect that socio-economic conditions, such as lack of financial resources, would lead some students with college aspirations to have lower educational plans, especially if their school performance is not outstanding. On the other hand, it is possible that mediocre or poor school performance may also affect the educational plans of students, regardless of their socioeconomic status. That is, despite their college aspirations, these adolescents may come to the conclusion that they cannot cope with the intellectual demands of college, and they therefore have lower educational plans.

Table 7.1

Relationship Between High School Students' Educational Plans and Educational Aspirations

	Students Aspire to:	
Students' Educational Plans	Four years of College or More	Less than four Years of College
Four Years of College or More	55%	1%
Less than Four Years of College	10%	34%

N = 475

According to our data, both low socio-educational status and low grades tend to produce a gap between college aspirations and college plans, but the impact of low grades is stronger. If we examine only those students with college aspirations, 99 per cent from college homes have college plans provided they also have above average grades; whereas 79 per cent have college plans if they have lower grades. Among students from non-college homes, the respective proportions are 89 per cent and 71 per cent. (Table 7.2) Socio-educational origins therefore appear to be less of a barrier to holding plans in accordance with college aspirations than does the lack of demonstrated success in school. (This is perhaps made more clear when we consider the fact that while there are just 36 students in the sample who aspire to college, who have lower plans, and for whom modal grades could be computed, 27 or 75 per cent, of these have modal grades of C or lower.) However the discrepancy between aspirations and plans is only 29 per cent even when both socio-educational origins and modal grades are low.

Table 7.2

Proportions of College Aspiring Students Who Do Not Plan on Completing College by Parents' Education and Modal Grades

	Parents' Education is:		
Modal Grades are:	Some College	No College	Difference Parents' Education
A or B	1% (90)	11% (72)	+ 10%
C or lower	21% (42)	29% (61)	+ 8%
Difference Grades	+20%	+18%	

Let us now briefly consider some of the factors that are usually found to be related to the educational plans of high school students to see if these relationships hold for our sample.

Sex, Socio-Educational Origins and Students' Educational Plans

The proportion of students with four-year college plans is roughly the same for the boys and girls in our sample. Other studies that have investigated the relationship between students' sex and college plans have found that boys are somewhat more likely to plan on college at every socioeconomic level but that the relationship is sometimes stronger among the lower socioeconomic groups.[6] In our sample this generalization does not hold. Among children from college background homes, 86 per cent of the boys and 81 per cent of the girls plan on at least four years of college. Among students with lower educational origins, 43 per cent of the boys and 47 per cent of the girls have college plans. Thus it is clear that the relationship between socio-economic origins and educational plans is quite strong for our population of students, but the usual sex differences are not found.

The explanation for the lack of difference between the aspirations of boys and girls in our sample can be found in the cluster sampling procedure that was used for obtaining respondents. It will be recalled that the study design called for obtaining two high school English classes from each attendance area, one fast track and one slow track.[7] The sample that resulted consisted of somewhat more boys than girls overall, but as noted in Section VI, there are somewhat more girls than boys in the fast track classes and considerably more boys than girls in the slower groups. It is this relationship between track and sex in our sample that accounts for the lack of a relationship between sex and educational plans for the group as a whole. However, when we

examine the educational plans of boys and girls within each of the track levels, it can be seen that while almost as many girls as boys in the faster groups have college plans, boys in the slower groups have considerably more tendency to plan on college than girls. (Table 7.3)

Table 7.3

Proportion of High School Students Planning Four or More Years of College by Sex and Track Level

	Sex is:		
Track is:	Male	Female	Difference Sex
Fast	81% (123)	77% (136)	- 4%
Slow	30% (150)	18% (75)	-12%

Students' IQs, and Grades, and Their Educational Plans

The relationships between students' IQ's, grades, and educational plans are also documented in prior studies.[8] As we have seen in the previous section, ability to handle schoolwork, and to behave in ways that produce good grades, is likely to make school a rewarding experience. Students with these demonstrated skills also tend to plan on college, and to receive encouragement from the schools and from their families.

Our data confirm the strong, positive, association between students' ability, scholastic standing, and college plans. Eighty five per cent of the students with IQ's of 111 or more have four year college plans, as compared with only 29 per cent with lower scores.[9] The association between modal grades and college plans is very similar,

The percentages are 82 and 35 respectively for students with modal grades of A or B and C or lower.

When modal grades and IQ's are considered simultaneously, we find the low grades tend to depress the college plans of students with high ability; but not nearly as much as average or below average ability depresses the plans of students with high grades. As Table 7.4 shows, 68 per cent of the students with high IQ's and low grades have college plans, as compared with only 45 per cent of the students with low IQ and high grades. Apparently, underachievers usually have confidence in their ability to handle the intellectual demands of college despite their poor grades, which may also reflect their lack of motivation to conform to school standards. On the other hand, overachievers may think that effort alone will not be enough to get them through four years of college.

Table 7.4

Proportion of Students Planning At Least Four Years of College, by Students IQ's and Modal Grades

	IQ is:		
Modal Grades Are:	111 or More	110 or Less	Difference IQ
A or B	92% (157)	45% (42)	-37%
C or Lower	68% (68)	25% (185)	-43%
Difference Grades	-24%	-20%	

It can also be seen in Table 7.4 that the relationship between IQ and modal grades is extremely strong, as we would expect it to be. In Table 7.5 we have rearranged the data in Table 7.4 so that all the

logical combinations are shown and the distribution is percentaged on the total base in order to make this relationship more clear. Sixty-three per cent of the students are in the two extreme cells. (Thirty-two per cent have high IQ's, high modal grades and college plans, and 31 per cent have low modal grades, low plans and low IQ's. The other 37 per cent are distributed among the six remaining cells of the table.) However, some additional findings are revealed by examining the entire distribution of students according to these three attributes. For example, the two largest "deviant" groups have exactly the same number of students in the sample who plan on four years of college. There are 46 students who plan on college when IQ is high but grades are low, and 46 who plan when IQ and grades are both low. Thus in spite of the strong relationships among IQ, letter grades and college plans, when students plan on college in spite of having low grades, they are just as likely to have low IQ's as high IQ's. This contrasts with the groups of students who have high grades but do not plan on college, where there are nearly twice as many with low IQ's (23) as there are with high IQ's (14).

In addition to being strongly related to the educational plans and expectations of students, other studies have shown that high school students' IQ's and grades are strongly related to their eventual educational attainment.[10] Thus the educational expectations of the students in our sample could be regarded as "realistic" to the extent that the relationships between these expectations and IQ's and grades are similar to those found between these same factors and actual rates of completion of college. Of course, for a variety of reasons, not all students who enter college with both high IQ's and high grades successfully complete a four year college program, and there are some with

bot[illegible]ies and low IQ's who manage to complete college. But let us assume for [illegible]ment that some combination of IQ's and grades is a virtually perfect predictor of success in college and see what the implications are for the students in our sample.

Tab. 7.5

Relationships between Students' Educational Expectations, Grades and IQ's

	Educational Expectations Are:			
	Four Years of College or More		Less Than Four Years of College	
	IQ is:		IQ is:	
Medal Grades Are:	111 or More	110 or Less	111 or More	110 or Less
A or B	[illegible]%	4%	3%	5%
C or Lower	10%	10%	5%	31%

N = 452

If we say that all students should expect to complete college regardless of IQ or grades, then 44 per cent of the students in our sample, "under aspire," since by definition there is no such thing as "over-aspiration." However, when IQ and grades are employed as criteria for "realistic" planning on completing four years of college, the proportion of students who "over aspire" soon becomes larger than the proportion who under aspire. If we say that one should have either an IQ of more than 110 or better than average grades to realistically expect to complete four years of college, just 10 per cent overaspire, while 13 per cent underaspire. If we say they should have high ability but grades are irrelevant, 14 per cent overaspire and 8 per cent underaspire. If we

say grades are important and IQ irrelevant, 20 per cent overaspire and 8 per cent underaspire. Finally, if we say that both IQ and grades should be high, 24 per cent overaspire and just 3 per cent underaspire.

It appears from this brief exercize that, to the extent that IQ and grades are accurate predictors of the likelihood that students will be able to successfully complete four years of college, there is a stronger tendency toward overaspiration than underaspiration within our sample.[11]

It may be that this is the way the system should operate in order to get maximum achievement from the most students. But to the extent that there is high psychological or social psychological cost among those who aspire high educationally and are unable to make it, the sociological cost of maximizing this "failure" rate might far outweigh the gains of producing higher rates of college graduates. Recognition of the fact that "success" in life is related to educational attainment has doubtless contributed to the rising levels of educational attainment in our society. At the same time, the educatinnal system at its upper levels imposes performance standards that not everyone can attain. There is, of course, a market phenomenon operating such that the college level institutions tend to expand to meet the demands of potential students, and one of the consequences of this appears to be a lowering of standards at some institutions. However, about half of the students who start college fail to complete four years.[12] As a result, the system is now producing larger numbers of "achievement failures" today and fewer numbers of "aspiration failures" than it did in the past. That is, more students now attempt college and fail (along with more who succeed), and fewer never attempt college among those who might stand a good change of succeeding. "Whether it is

better to have tried and failed than never to have tried at all" would seem to be the underlying question.

Most sociological studies of students' educational plans have neglected this problem. One that has not is Burton Clark's study of the California junior colleges in which he discusses the necessity for "cooling out" large numbers of students' who hope to complete four years of college and are unable to meet the required performance standards.[13] The California educational structure can be expected to produce a considerable amount of overaspiring of this type because of the regulation that anyone who graduates from high school is eligible to attend a junior college. However, it appears that even without a viable junior college system, or even a large state system of higher education, there are forces producing large numbers of overaspiring potential academic failures in New Jersey. What then are some of these forces? One of our principle tasks in this section will be to identify those factors which seem to be most relevant.

Track and Curriculum and Students Educational Plans

We have already seen that students' educational expectations are highly related to their socio-educational origins and to their IQ's and grades. There are some additional factors in their school situation that are also strongly related to these expectations. Chief among these are the structural aspects of school organization as revealed through track and curriculum placement.

In their study The Educational Decision Makers,[14] Cicourel and Kitsuse have argued that the school, through its guidance counselors who advise the students on which courses to take and curriculum to enroll in, operates as a major factor in deciding what the educational expectations

and life chances of students will be. Moreover, they suggest that the chief concern of guidance counselors is with talent hunting for potential college students. This they claim has been brought about largely because their jobs require them to send the student applicants' transcripts and other materials to colleges, and because they are under considerable pressure from parents and the school to successfully place as many students as possible in college. It is especially interesting that Cicourel and Kitsuse do not concern themselves with the problem of "overaspiration" in view of the fact that the guidance counselors are in a strategic position to place a ceiling on the expectations of students or to encourage them through counseling and through classroom and curriculum placement.

We saw in the previous section that the modal grades of students are strongly related to their track location (Table 6.37) with approximately 70 per cent of the students in the faster groups and only 11 per cent in the slower groups having modal grades of A or B. As we have just seen, the relationship between modal grades and educational expectations is also very strong, and thus we would expect to find track placement of students to also be a good predictor of educational plans. Of course, curriculum, by definition, should be a good predictor. Each of these expectations is borne out by the data.

The relationship between track and curriculum placement is, of course, also very strong. When their relationships with the students' educational expectations are considered simultaneously, 85 per cent of those with both high track and college curriculum placement expect to complete four years of college compared with just 10 per cent of those in the slower groups and the other curricula. (Table 7.6) It can also be seen that curriculum enrollment is a somewhat better predictor of

college expectations than track.

Table 7.6

Proportion of Students Planning at Least Four Years of College by Track and Curriculum

	Curriculum is:		
Track is:	College Preparatory	Other	Difference Curriculum
Fast	85% (238)	30% (23)	-55%
Slow	57% (77)	10% (140)	-47%
Difference Track	-28%	-20%	

It would appear that the schools in our sample are relatively generous about letting students enroll in a college preparatory curriculum even though their grades and IQ's might not be above average. For example, we find that 66 per cent of the sample students are enrolled in a college preparatory curriculum, but just 50 per cent have IQ's of more than 110, and only 44 per cent have modal grades of A or B. Thus even if all of the students with high IQ's or high letter grades were placed in the college curriculum, there would be considerable numbers in the college curriculum with lower grades and/or lower IQ's. Perhaps the high schools recognize the fact that placement in a non-college curriculum is especially likely to place a ceiling on educational expectations. We find that there are just 21 students in the sample in the non-college curricula who expect to complete four years of college compared with 68 in the college curriculum who have lower expectations. Thus the schools in their generous standards for placing students into the college curriculum appear to be encouraging overaspiration rather than taking the risk of producing underaspiration and facing the resulting

lower placement levels, and parental and administrative displeasure.[15]

Mother-Child Consensus on Educational Plans

We asked the mothers two questions that were very similar to those asked of their children in order to see whether the educational aspirations and expectations they held for their children and their children's own aspirations and expectations were identical.

"How far do you want (child) to go in school?"

and

"Realistically, how far do you think he (she) will actually go in school?"

Table 7.7

Relationship between Mothers' Educational Aspirations and Expectations for their Children

	Mothers Expect:	
Mothers Want:	Four Years of College or More	Less than Four Years of College
Four Years of College or More	52%	16%
Less than Four Years of College	1%	31%

N = 408

As anticipated, we found that more mothers "wanted" a college education for their children than "expected" it (Table 7.7) However 83 per cent of the mothers have aspirations and plans for their children that are identical, with 52 per cent both wanting and expecting college graduation, and 31 per cent wanting and expecting less. As was found with their children, when a discrepancy exists, it is usually

between high aspirations and lower expectations (16 per cent) and rarely between high expectations and low aspiration (1 per cent).

It will be recalled that the proportions of students aspiring and expecting to graduate from college are 65 per cent and 56 per cent, and hence mothers have slightly higher aspirations for their children than the children hold, but children have slightly higher expectations than their mothers hold for them. These proportions are so similar that we would expect to find high agreement between pairs of mothers and their children.

Table 7.8

Relationship between Mothers' Educational Aspirations for their Children and their Children's Aspirations

	Children Want:*	
	Four Years of College or More	Less than Four Years of College
Mothers Want:		
Four Years of College or More	57%	11%
Less than Four Years of College	10%	22%

N = 409

Actual consensus on educational aspirations and on educational expectations between mothers and their children are both very high. (79 per cent and 86 per cent respectively). It is especially interesting that the more "reality bound" expectations are more identical than

*Percentages in this table are slightly different from those in the text because of the shifts in population base when both students and their mothers are included in the table.[16]

Table 7.9

Relationship between Students' Educational Plans and their Mothers' Plans for Them

	Students Expect:	
	At Least Four Years of College	Less than Four Years of College
Mothers Expect:		
College	51%	5%
Less	9%	35%

N = 384

the aspirations. But agreement on college aspirations is higher than agreement on college expectations (57 per cent compared with 51 per cent), while agreement on a lower level of aspiration is less than agreement on lower levels of expectations (22 per cent and 35 per cent respectively). There are almost as many pairs where either the mother or the child aspires to college and the other does not (31 per cent) as there are pairs where both agree on aspiring to less than a college degree. But there are more than twice as many pairs where both plan on less than a college degree (35 per cent) as there are pairs where one has higher plans (14 per cent). Hence it can be seen by comparing Tables 7.8 and 7.9 that the higher level of agreement on plans than aspirations is largely a result of the increase in the number of pairs of mothers and their children who both expect less education than college completion.

It can also be seen that there are slightly more mothers who aspire higher than their children, while there are considerably more children with higher expectations than their mothers. Nevertheless,

agreement is extremely high between pairs of mothers and their children regardless of whether aspiration or expectation are considered. Indeed, the relationships are so strong that we find 78 per cent agreement between mothers' aspirations and children's expectations, and 81 per cent agreement between mothers' plans and their children's aspirations. However, we shall concentrate mainly on the plans or expectations of mothers as we have with their children.

Let us see first whether the educational plans of the mothers for their children are related to the same factors as the plans of their children.

Parents' Socio-Educational Status, and Mother-Child Consensus on Educational Plans

We already know that children's educational plans are highly related to their family's educational status. We would also expect to find family status is related to mothers' plans. If so, mother-child consensus on educational plans need not imply a process of parental persuasion. Consensus might simply mean that both mother and child have independently come to the conclusion that the child should complete a college education, or that both move in circles where a high level of education is considered unimportant.

Among college-background families, 78 per cent of the mothers have four year college plans for their children, whereas only 40 per cent of the mothers have such plans if neither they nor their husband are college educated.

In view of the similarity between this relationship and the one found between children's educational plans and their socio-educational origins, we would expect to find that consensus between mothers and

their children is high in both socio-educational groups. As Table 7.10 shows, there is high consensus on educational plans between mothers and their children regardless of educational level of the home, but consensus is somewhat less when educational level of the home is low than when it is high. Nevertheless, consensus is lowest when mothers from college homes expect less than four years of college for their children, but a majority of pairs (61 per cent) agree even in this latter group. It is especially interesting that consensus is lowest within the most deviant or less frequently found group of mothers, those from college level homes who do not expect their children to graduate from college. The students in this group would appear to be experiencing a strain toward conforming to the dominant educational norms for their socio-educational group regardless of the expectations of their mothers, whereas there are clearly forces producing high agreement between mothers and their children with lower educational origins regardless of the expectations of either the mothers or the child.

Table 7.10

Proportion of Students whose Educational Plans Agree with their Mothers' Plans for them, by Mothers' Plans and Educational Level of the Home

	Home Education Level is:	
	One or Both Parents Some College	No College
Mother Plans		
College Graduation	97% (115)	85% (97)
Less than four years of College	61% (28)	83% (140)

Given such high rates of agreement between mothers and their children it is tempting to argue that parental persuasion or parental value transmission is the explanation, especially since majority agreement persists regardless of socio-educational origins. But such an explanation is by no means warranted by the data we have presented. Agreement on educational expectations might well come about by some other means, such as membership in special communal or subcultural groups or even through the persuasion of parents by their children. Chief among the alternative sources is the feedback from the school itself regarding the performance and potential of the child. We found in Section VI that mothers' educational expectations for their children are highly related to the modal grades their children earn at school but that the relationship becomes markedly increased as the children progress from first to tenth grade. (Table 6.17) We interpreted this finding as evidence for the socializing influence of the school on the mothers. In a similar vein, we have seen above that students' plans and aspirations are strongly related to such school-related factors as measured intelligence, modal grades, and location in the track and curriculum structure of the school. What then is the relationship between each of these factors, mothers' educational expectations for their children, and agreement between mothers and their children?

Of course, the interrelationship between school performance and parents' expectations for their children is very complex. There is little doubt that parents who consider education important, who provide their children with opportunities to learn, and who expose them to a stimulating environment early in life, also influence the children's ability and motivation to do well in school in the early grades. Once

the children are in school, however, parents learn from the school, and from the children's own reports, about how well the pupils are doing, and develop a conception of the children as either bright or not bright, ambitious or not ambitious.

Kahl's interview data of "common man" families provide evidence that children's school performance during the grammar school years was crucial in "defining the situation" for these parents. According to Kahl, "parents used school performance as their main criterion" for placing their children. If a boy did well, his parents expected him to continue doing well; if he did poorly, they usually decided he was "just one of those who was not smart" and emphasized other qualities, such as skill with his hands or ability to get on well with people.[17]

Our data suggest that how well the children do in school influences not only "common man" families, but also the mothers of higher socio-educational status. Among college educated parents, 96 per cent of the mothers have college plans for their children if the students rank high on both IQ and grades, as compared with 33 per cent if the children rank low on both (Table 7.11). Among parents neither of whom have been to college, 83 per cent of the mothers have college plans for their children if the students rank high IQ and grades, whereas only 16 per cent do so if the children rank low on both. It is especially interesting that 75 per cent of the mothers from college homes have college plans for their children when either IQ or modal grades are high but not both, compared with just 43 per cent of the non-college mothers. It appears that the former are quick to grasp any encouraging sign that their children are college material whereas the latter require both high IQ and grades before planning on a college education. Thus while the child's performance in school influences

the educational plans of both college and non-college background parents, it takes both to move the mothers' plans away from the dominant position of their socio-educational origins. That is, IQ and grades must both be low for a majority of college mothers to have low educational plans for their children, and both must be high for a majority of non-college mothers to have high educational plans for their children. Hence "over aspiration" for their children is more characteristic of college background mothers if we apply IQ and grades as criteria for realistic planning; and underaspiration is more characteristic of non-college mothers. However, while "rates" of overaspiration are higher among college mothers, the actual numbers of both over-and under-aspiring mothers are larger for the non-college group because of its greater overall size.

Table 7.11

Proportion of Mothers with Four Year College Plans for their Children by Students' IQ's, Modal Grades, and Parents' Education

Students' IQ's and Modal Grades Are:	Parents' Education: Some College	No College	Difference Educational Background
Both High	96% (84)	83% (63)	-13%
One High	75% (24)	43% (63)	-32%
Both Low	33% (33)	16% (118)	-17%
Difference Grades and IQ	-63%	-67%	

When IQ, modal grades, and mothers' expectations for their children are considered simultaneously in relation to the plans of the students, the impact of each persists. (Table 7.12) First we find that the proportion of students planning on graduating from college ranges from 99 per cent where IQ, grades, and mothers' plans are all high to just 16 per cent when IQ, grades, and mothers' plans are low. But agreement between mothers and their children is over 60 per cent for each group. Agreement is lowest when mothers have plans for their children that are "unrealistic," that is, not in keeping with the likelihood that the child would perform well or poorly at college based on IQ's and grades. Thus when mothers expect their children to complete college in spite of both low IQ and grades, just 62 per cent of the students have high plans, and when mothers do not expect their children to complete college in spite of a high IQ or grades, agreement is 69 per cent and 68 per cent. Again, it is these less frequently found or "deviant" situations that produce lower levels of agreement. But we should not lose sight of the fact that a majority of students and mothers agrees even in each of these situations. This is strong evidence for arguing that mothers and their children tend to communicate their expectations to one another and that consensus remains important even when plans are not consistent with potential or performance.[18]

Track and Curriculum and Mother-Child Consensus on Educational Plans

We have already seen that students' educational plans are highly related to their track and curriculum placement in the schools, but the question remains whether mothers' plans are equally highly

related to these formal aspects of the school structure and whether consensus between mothers and their children is also related to them.

Table 7.12

Per cent Agreement between Students and their Mothers on Educational Plans by IQ and Grades

	IQ and Grades Are:		
Mothers' Plans:	Both High	One High	Both Low
Graduate College	99% (131)	88% (42)	66% (29)
Less than College Graduate	69% (13)	68% (38)	84% (111)

As we found with the students, mothers' plans for their children are somewhat more strongly related to curriculum than to track. The essential difference is again the fact that mothers whose children are in a non-college curriculum seldom plan on four years of college for them. (Just ten per cent of the mothers with children in the non-college curriculum have college graduation expectations compared with 24 per cent in the college curriculum with lower plans. Twenty-two per cent of the mothers with children in fast tracks plan on lower attainment, and 24 per cent in slower tracks plan on college graduation.) Non-college preparatory curriculum placement thus tends to place a ceiling on the expectations of both the mothers and their children.[19]

Agreement on educational expectations between mothers and their children is high regardless of track or curriculum placement. (Tables 7.13 and 7.14) Overall, 85 per cent agree in the college curriculum, 84 per cent in the non-college, 87 per cent in the fast track, and 84

per cent in the slow track. However, when mothers or students have plans that are not in accord with the majority of those in the same track or curriculum, agreement is lowered considerably. For example, when mothers plan on college completion and their children are in the slow track, agreement is 74 per cent, and when they have lower plans and the children are in the fast track, agreement is 61 per cent. Similarly, when mothers plan on college and the children are in a non-college curriculum, agreement is 64 per cent, and when they plan on less education and the child is in a college curriculum, agreement is 59 per cent.

Table 7.13

Per cent Agreement between Children's Educational Plans and the Plans of their Mothers by Mothers' Plans and Track Location

	Track is:	
Mother Plans	Fast	Slow
College Graduation	95% (174)	74% (38)
Less	61% (49)	87% (121)

Table 7.14

Per cent Agreement between Children's Educational Plans and the Plans of their Mothers by Curricula

	Curriculum is:	
Mother Plans:	College Preparatory	Other
College Graduation	93% (201)	64% (11)
Less	59% (63)	91% (103)

It is clear from the above that both mothers' educational plans for their children and children's own educational plans are strongly related to the same factors, and agreement between their expectations is only reduced appreciably when expectations of either the mother or child are different from those of the majority in their situation. That is, when mothers or their children have low expectations in spite of high socio-educational origins, high grades, high IQ, fast track placement, or placement in a college preparatory curriculum, agreement is considerably lower. By the same token, when educational expectations are high in spite of low socio-educational origins, low grades, low IQ, low track placement or non-college curriculum, agreement is lowered. Nevertheless, agreement remains relatively high (over 50 per cent) even when certain of these deviant situations are combined. For example, when mothers have high expectations in spite of both low IQ and grades, or low expectations in spite of both high IQ and grades.

In spite of the persistence of relatively high levels of agreement on educational expectations between mothers and their children, there is not sufficient evidence to argue conclusively that mothers have "persuaded" their children to hold these expectations. Rather we have taken the position that mothers and their children are subject to a host of similar influences including socio-educational origin, school performance of the child, and undoubtedly the point of view of the fathers as well. These forces combine to produce agreement between mothers and their children in the vast majority of cases, but we suspect that the specific manner in which this agreement is reached may vary considerably from one family to another. What seems obvious, however, is that agreement on this issue is very important

to mothers and to their children. Disagreement on educational expectations would constitute a continuing strain in the relationships between mothers and their children that would be very difficult to live with on a day to day basis if it were adequately communicated. And it is precisely because education is so important that we would expect children and their parents to be aware of the expectations of one another. Let us now examine the accuracy with which students perceive the aspirations that their mothers hold for them, and see whether these perceptions alter the picture appreciably.

Students' Educational Plans and Perceptions of their Mothers' Plans for Them

Many studies have shown that there is a strong relationship between high school students' perceptions of parents' behavior and attitudes and their own educational plans.[20] However, since these studies contain no data on the actual educational plans of mothers for their children it is difficult to draw any conclusions other than those that refer to the cognitive organization of high school students. It is apparent from these studies that students seldom perceive disagreement with their parents on educational plans but the accuracy of these perceptions and the conditions under which accuracy varies have never been adequately examined.

We asked students the following question about their mothers' educational aspirations for them:

"How far do you think your mother wants you to go in school?"

Seventy per cent of the students replied that they thought their mothers wanted them to complete at least four years of college. The remaining 30 per cent thought their mothers had lesser educational aspirations for them.

Students in our sample, like those in other studies seldom perceive disagreement between the educational aspirations of their mothers and their own aspirations and plans. Ninety-one per cent of the students perceive agreement between their own aspirations and those of their mothers (Table 7.15) and 85 per cent perceive agreement between their own plans and their mothers aspirations (Table 7.16). While these high levels of perceived agreement were anticipated, there is one aspect of these relationships that had not been foreseen, and, to the best of our knowledge, has not been reported elsewhere. Students' perceptions of their mothers aspirations for them place a definite ceiling on their own plans and aspirations. Just 7 students in our sample report that they want to complete college while perceiving their mothers as wanting less, and only 3 students say they expect to complete college while perceiving their mothers as wanting less. Thus when students perceive disagreement with their mothers, it is overwhelmingly the perception that mothers want more education for them than they want (34 students) or that mothers want more for them than they expect to complete (67 students). Apparently it is acceptable to adolescents to see their mothers as having ambitions for them that they feel they cannot fulfill, but they dare not have ambitions that they perceive as exceeding the dreams of their mothers. Thus, it is clear that the perceptions students have of their mothers' aspirations for them play a definite supportive role for those who wish to complete college regardless of whether persuasion may have taken place.

Given the strong relationships between students' perceptions of their mothers' aspirations and the students' own aspirations and plans, and the strong relationships between the actual aspirations and plans

Table 7.15

Students' Perceptions of How Much Schooling their Mothers Want them to Complete by How Much Schooling Students Want to Complete

Students think Mothers Want:	Students Want: At Least Four Years of College	Less than Four Years of College
At Least Four Years of College	63%	8%
Less than Four Years of College	1%	28%

N = 479

Table 7.16

Students' Perceptions of How Much Schooling their Mothers Want them to Complete by How Much Schooling Students Expect to Complete

Students think Mothers Want:	Students Expect to Complete: At Least Four Years of College	Less than Four Years of College
At least four years of College	55%	14%
Less than four years of College	1%	30%

N = 472

of mothers and their children, we would expect to find that students' perceptions of their mothers' views are usually quite accurate. It should be noted, however, that students tend to perceive the high aspirations of their parents much more accurately than the low. (Table 7.17) Actual agreement between how much education the mothers say they want and the perceptions of the students is 81 per cent

overall. But just 11 per cent of the students whose mothers want them to complete college "misperceive," compared with 35 per cent of the students whose mothers want less education for them.

Table 7.17

Children's Perceptions of Mothers' Aspirations
by Mothers' Educational Aspirations
for their Children

	Child thinks Mother Wants	
Mother Wants:	College	No College
College Graduation	61%	7%
Not College Graduation	11%	20%

N = 407

Table 7.18

Children's Perceptions of Mothers' Aspirations
by Mothers' Educational Plans
for their Children

	Child thinks Mother Wants:	
Mother Expects:	College Graduation	Less
College Graduation	53%	2%
Less	21%	25%

N = 400

Agreement between mothers' educational expectations and the students' perceptions of mothers' aspirations is also very high (Table 7.18) with 78 per cent agreement overall. Again, students tend to inflate the position of their mothers, as evidenced by the fact that just 4 per cent "misperceive" when their mothers expect them to

complete college, compared with 46 per cent who misperceive when their mothers have lower expectations,

When we examine the combined effects of mothers' actual plans and their childrens' perceptions of their aspirations on the children's plans, the supportive function of perceived aspirations becomes even more clear. (Table 7.19) Among those students who perceive their mothers as wanting them to complete less than four years of college, only one of 101 say they expect to complete college themselves. But 51 of the 277 who think their mothers want them to complete college do not plan on it themselves. Overall, 76 per cent of the students have accurate perceptions of their mothers' desires, and their plans are also in accord with their mothers'. In sum, the vast majority of the students who misperceive exaggerate their mothers' aspirations, while the majority of those with different plans from their mothers' have higher plans than their mothers. But in order to have higher plans than their mothers' actual plans, students must also misperceive their mothers as having college plans for them. The question thus becomes where do these misperceptions of mothers wanting college for them tend to come from? Do these also tend to be the students who overaspire according to their IQ and school performance?

Table 7.19

Per cent Agreement between Students and their Mothers on Educational Plans by Mothers' Plans and Students' Perceptions of their Mothers' Aspirations for Them

	Students Perceive Mothers' Want:	
Mothers Expect:	College Graduation	Less than College Graduation
College Graduation	95% (203)	13% (8)
Less than College Graduation	55% (74)	100% (93)

Sources of Students' Misperceptions of their Mothers' Educational Expectations

We have seen in previous sections that there is usually higher agreement between students and their mothers on educational issues when one or both parents have attended college. Of course, higher levels of agreement might be due to the fact that education is a more salient and well-defined aspect of the lives of the more highly educated. It could also be argued that this is but one aspect of the greater demand for general verbal conformity among the more highly educated parents and their children[21] regardless of the reasons why agreement is higher among the more highly educated. But the question of the accuracy of the perceptions of students should be distinguished from the actual agreement between students and their parents because of the vital role played by these perceptions. We would expect, of course, that students with higher socio-educational origin would have more accurate perceptions of their mothers' points of view as well as more actual agreement, and this expectation is borne out by the data. Overall, 87 per cent of the students with at least one parent who has attended college have perceptions of their mothers' aspirations for them that are in accord with the mothers' actual plans. This compares with 74 per cent accuracy among their classmates with less educated parents.

When the level of expectations held by the mother is also taken into consideration, this relationship becomes altered considerably. (Table 7.20) We have already seen that agreement between the perceptions of students and the expectations of their mothers is considerably lower among those whose mothers have lower expectations, but it is by far the lowest among the more highly educated with low expectations.

As long as the mothers expect their children to complete college, their childrens' perceptions are almost always equally high regardless of socio-educational origins. However, when mothers have lower educational expectations, if socio-educational level is high, only 27 per cent of the students have matching low perceptions, compared with 60 per cent from lower socio-educational levels. Hence the same combination of factors that produces low agreement among students and mothers' educational plans, also produces inaccurate perceptions among the students. Apparently it is extremely difficult for students to perceive that their mothers do not have high educational aspirations for them when one or both parents have already attended college. The prospect of downward educational mobility implied by this pattern is ... only foreseen by a few students even when mothers expect it. At the same time, it should be noted that it is again the deviant situation of mothers with low expectations and high origin that produces the highest rates of misperception.

Table 7.20

Proportion of Students Whose Perceptions of their Mothers' Aspirations for them Agree with Mothers' Expectations, by Mothers' Expectational Levels and Education of Parents

Mothers' Expectations	Parents' Education is: Some College	No College
Four Years of College	97% (115)	95% (97)
Less than Four Years of College	27% (30)	60% (145)

It is theoretically possible that mothers in college level homes may unknowingly "persuade" their children that they expect them to go to college even though they in fact have lower expectations for them. Such "misunderstandings" could easily be a result of educational values expressed by the mothers, for example, or a result of the fact that these mothers talk to their children about their schoolwork or pressure them to do well in school. Let us briefly examine each of these factors to see if they are, in fact, related to students' misperceptions.

Apparently virtually all students talk with their mothers about their school plans, and the complete absence of such communication does not appear to be related to the accuracy of the students' perceptions. Just 6 per cent of the students say they have <u>not</u> talked with their mothers about their school plans. Communication rates about educational plans are somewhat higher among mothers who have college plans for their children (98 per cent) than among those who do not (89 per cent). But students' perceptions agree with their mothers' actual plans somewhat more frequently for those students who say they have <u>not</u> discussed their educational plans when both level of mothers' plans and talking about plans are taken into consideration. (Table 7.21)

In contrast with acknowledged discussions about educational plans, when the perceived importance of a college education for one's life chances is taken into consideration, it appears that the mothers' "educational values" may lead many students to misperceive their mothers as having high aspirations for them. When asked "About how much schooling do you think most young men need these days to get along well in the world?" 70 per cent of the mothers said at least four

years of college. Of course, it is mothers who also expect their own children to complete four years of college who more frequently say that a college education is needed by most young men. But there is a sizeable group of mothers who take this position even though they do not expect their own children to complete college. Just 46 per cent of the children of these mothers have perceptions that match their mothers' lower plans compared with 65 per cent when mothers also do not think most young men need a college education. (Table 7.22) It appears that the high value placed on a college education by these mothers is misinterpreted by children as meaning that their mothers want them to complete college in many cases where parents actually have lower educational ambitions. Moreover, it should be noted that this combination of views is quite frequently found among the mothers. That is, it is not a "deviant" situation for students, in the same sense as mothers from college homes who do not want college for their children, for example. Ninety-two, or 24 per cent of the mothers in the high school sample feel that college is needed by most young men but do not expect their own child to complete college; and a majority of these have children who misperceive them as wanting college. Nevertheless, saying that most young men need a college education while not expecting one's own child to complete college is "deviant" in the sense that it represents an inconsistent or contradictory situation.

A number of studies have investigated the relationship between parental pressure on students and students' educational plans.[22] There has been considerable variance in the manner in which parental pressure is operationalized, but it has generally been maintained that parental pressure helps to produce higher educational aspirations among students who might otherwise not go to college. It will be recalled that in

the previous section we found students' perceptions of mothers' applying pressure to them to do well in school were much higher among students with lower grades, and we interpreted these perceptions as signs of role strain among the students. Mothers, according to their own reports, also apply more pressure to do well in school to students who are getting lower grades. For example, 49 per cent of the mothers report they apply a lot or some pressure to their children with modal grades of A or B compared with 82 per cent of the mothers whose children have lower grades. It follows that mothers also report applying more pressure to students whom they do not expect to complete college. The proportions are 55 per cent and 80 per cent respectively for mothers with high and low expectations.

Table 7.21

Proportion of Students whose Perceptions of their Mothers' Educational Aspirations for them Agree with their Mothers' Plans, by Mothers' Actual Plans and Students' Having Talked About Plans with their Mothers

	Students Say:	
Mother Plans:	Talked with Mother	Did not Talk
Four Years of College	96% (204)	(100%) (5)
Less	54% (157)	63% (19)

Table 7.22

Proportion of Students with Perceptions of Mothers' Aspirations that Agree with Mothers' Expectations by Mothers' Level of Expectation and Mothers' Belief that College is Necessary for Young Men to get Along

	Mother Says Amount of Education Needed:	
Mother Expects:	At Least four Years of College	Less than four Years of College
At Least Four Years of College	96% (178)	97% (33)
Less than Four Years of College	46% (92)	65% (83)

Reports by mothers that they pressure their children to do well in school are positively related to their children's misperceiving that mothers want them to complete college. Twenty-eight per cent of the students with mothers reporting pressure misperceive compared with 12 per cent of those whose mothers say they apply little or no pressure. However, when the level of mothers' expectations is also taken into consideration, it becomes clear that misperception is most commonly found among those whose mothers do not expect them to complete college and also say they apply pressure to them to do well in school (Table 7.23). More interesting, perhaps, is the fact that this is the largest single group of mothers when both mothers' pressure and level of expectations are taken into consideration. Applying pressure is not related to the accuracy of students' perceptions as long as the mothers expect them to complete college, since almost all these students perceive their mothers as wanting them to complete college. But when mothers have lower expectations, pressure is more frequently related to children perceiving their mothers as wanting them to complete college. This also runs counter to our previous findings

that students who are in the most unusual situations are most likely to misperceive the aspirations of their mothers. While it is more likely that mothers with low educational expectations for their children will apply pressure, it is also more likely that their children will perceive them as having high aspirations than when pressure is not applied.

Table 7.23

Per cent Agreement between Students' Perceptions of How Much Schooling their Mothers Want them to Complete and Mothers' Expectations, by Level of Mothers' Expectations and Mothers' Reports of Pressuring their Children to Do Well in School

Mother Expects:	Mother Reports: A Lot or Some Pressure	Little or No Pressure
Four or more years of College	96% (116)	97% (95)
Less than four years of College	52% (140)	64% (36)

Ability and School Performance and the Students' Perceptions of Mothers' Aspirations

We found earlier that the aspiration and plans of students and their mothers, and agreement between these are also strongly related to the school factors. Let us now briefly determine whether students' perceptions of their mothers' aspirations for them and the agreement between these perceptions and the mothers' expectations are similarly related to the school situation of the child.

Both the IQ's of students and their modal grades are related to the agreement between students' perceptions and the mothers'

expectations. Eighty-nine per cent of the students with modal grades of A or B have perceptions that match their mothers' expectations compared with just 67 per cent of the students with lower grades. Similarly, 84 per cent of the students with IQ's of 111 or higher have perceptions that match the expectations of their mothers compared with 66 per cent of the students with lower scores. One might speculate that more intelligent students should be expected to have more accurate perceptions of their parents' expectations since more accurate perceptions are but one aspect of higher intelligence. But when the level of mothers' expectations is taken into consideration, it becomes clear that high IQ and grades are only positively related to accurate perceptions of mothers' aspirations when mothers have expectations that are high. (Tables 7.24 and 7.25) In fact, the majority of students perceive their mothers as having college aspirations for them when IQ's are high and mothers have lower plans (66 per cent) and when grades are high and mothers have lower plans (53 per cent). Thus when mothers' plans are lower than the educational potential of their children, as measured by IQ or grades, students tend to assume that mothers' aspirations for them are high and hence consistent with this potential when they, in fact, are lower.

Table 7.24

Agreement between Students' Perceptions of their Mothers' Educational Aspirations for them and Mothers' Actual Expectations, by Level of Mothers' Expectations and Modal Letter Grades of Students

Mother Expects:	Students' Modal Grades Are: A or B	C or Lower
Four Years of College or More	98% (149)	92% (61)
Less than Four Years of College	47% (34)	58% (139)

Table 7.25

Agreement between Students' Perceptions of their Mothers' Educational Aspirations for them by Level of Mothers' Expectations and IQ of Students

Mother Expects:	Students' IQ's Are: 111 or Higher	110 or Lower
Four Years of College or More	98% (160)	88% (42)
Less than Four Years of College	34% (35)	58% (135)

In sum, students' perceptions of their mothers' educational aspirations for them are usually identical with the actual plans and aspirations held by the mothers. But many students overestimate the aspirations held by the mothers while very few underestimate them. The factors that tend to make students misperceive their mothers as wanting them to complete college are usually situations containing cross-pressures or contradicting forces. That is, students who come from college level homes, students whose mothers say most young men need to complete college, students whose mothers say they pressure them to do well in school, students with high IQ's, or students with high grades, will tend to see their mothers as wanting college for them even when the mothers actually do not.

Summary and Conclusions

In this section we have examined the educational aspirations and expectations of high school students and their mothers and the agreement between them from a number of different perspectives. We have found that the educational expectations and aspirations of both the students and their mothers are related to the same general factors, including socio-educational origins, and school-related items such as IQ, modal grades, curriculum and track placement.

We have also seen that there is very high agreement between each of the paired combinations of mothers' aspirations and expectations, and students' aspirations, expectations, and perceptions of their mothers' aspirations for them. Despite these high levels of agreement, we were able to demonstrate that certain combinations of factors produce lower levels of agreement. These combinations are usually deviant situations either in the sense that they occur infrequently, or in the sense that they consist of elements that are associated with opposite effects. For example, when socio-educational origins are high and mothers' plans do not include college, when IQ or students' grades are high and mothers do not expect them to complete college, or when track or curriculum are high and mothers do not plan on college, the students' aspirations and plans disagree with those of their mothers far more frequently.

Students' perceptions of the aspirations their mothers hold for them have been seen to play an especially vital supportive role such that the students rarely plan or aspire higher then they

perceive their mothers as aspiring for them. Students, however, tend to interpret any encouraging sign, such as high IQ or high academic performance as an indication that their mothers have college aspirations for them even when the mothers do not. And when mothers consider a college education to be necessary for most young men, or they pressure their children to do well in school. their children also tend to hold inflated perceptions of their aspirations for them.

Despite the fact that very high agreement is found between students' plans and aspirations and the plans and aspirations held for them by their mothers, we have been careful not to interpret this as sufficient evidence for concluding that mothers usually persuade their children to hold positions similar to their own. It is entirely possible that this is the most prevalent pattern of attitude formation and change that takes place on these issues, but the interaction between parents and their children in relation to the schools is far too complex to warrent making this assumption on the basis of the limited information we have presented.

Perhaps the most important limiting factor is the fact that each of the sets of parents and their children in our tenth grade sample have been interacting together for at least ten years in systems that include schools. There is, of course, a strong tendency for the socio-educational origins of parents to influence their own educational aspirations and expectations and those of their children. But this influence is probably predispositional for the most part; and, as we have seen, educational expectations are more strongly related to the school performance of the students than to the educational level of their parents. Moreover, we found in

Section VI that the relationship between mothers' educational expectations for their children and the performance of their children at school increases dramatically between first and fifth and between fifth and tenth grades. We repeat the table containing this evidence at this point in order to remind the reader of the strength of these relationships.

Table 7.26*

Proportion of Mothers Expecting Their Children to Complete Four Years of College by Modal Letter Grades and Grade Level of Child

	Modal Letter Grade:		
	A or B	C or Lower	Difference
First Grade	59% (220)	45% (178)	-14%
Fifth Grade	68% (218)	33% (228)	-35%
Tenth Grade	82% (189)	30% (215)	-52%

*Previously Table 6.17.

The increasing relationship between modal grades and the educational expectations of the mothers far exceeds any differences in grades attributable to such factors as socio-educational origins. Hence it is clear that the school plays a vital role as monitor and assessor of the educational potential of the child, and the mothers' expectations are usually consistent with the official record of the school by the tenth grade. It appears from this evidence that it is often the child who persuades his parents that he is or is not college material on the basis of his own school performance as assessed by the school. Whether the child then needs to be "persuaded" himself raises some interesting methodological and

semantic questions. Clearly one would need extensive and detailed longitudinal data to establish who has persuaded whom and in what sense of the word. However, it is our contention that the direction and content of persuasion are not the most significant sociological issues. What is significant is the fact that agreement between parents and their children on educational expectations and aspirations is unusually high and that the students perceive agreement to be even higher than it actually is. Thus the system is especially well integrated on this very important issue when compared with such matters as the goals of education and styles of teaching.

SECTION VII.

FOOTNOTES

1. See, for example, Paul C. Glick, "Educational Attainment and Occupational Advancement," Transactions of Second World Congress of Sociology, II (1954).

2. The most extensive investigation of these variables to date is probably contained in the continuing studies of Sewell and his associates. See especially, William H. Sewell and Vimal P. Shah, "Parents' Education and Children's Educational Aspirations and Achievements," American Sociological Review (April, 1968), pp. 191-209. For a more elaborate analysis of the data in this Section and extensive bibliography see Eva E. Sandis, "The Influence of Parents on Students' Educational Plans," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1967.

3. See for example, David J. Bordua, "Educational Aspirations and Parental Stress on College," Social Forces, XXXVIII (March, 1960), pp. 262-269; Richard L. Simpson, "Parental Influence, Anticipatory Socialization, and Social Mobility," American Sociological Review, XXVII (August, 1962), pp. 517-522; Joseph A. Kahl, "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common-Man' Boys," Harvard Educational Review, XXIII (Summer, 1953), pp. 186-203.

4. The complete distribution of responses to the open-end question and probes on educational expectations includes 1% who did not expect to complete high school, 26% who expected to complete high school, 8% who specified business or technical school beyond high school., 9% who said some college, 47% who said four years of college, and 9% who specified graduate school.

5. Undoubtedly the fact that the sample was chosen entirely from communities in New Jersey was a factor in these responses. At the time of the study, the New Jersey State Department of Education was under considerable pressure to renovate and expand the higher education facilities of the state to better accomodate the large numbers of students who sought education beyond high school. The lack of a significant system of junior colleges was one of the chief points at issue.

6. See especially Sewell and Shah, op. cit.

7. In two of the working-class communitties the slower groups that we were given for sample classrooms turned out to be somewhat more college oriented than those in the other communities. This has reduced the differences between the

tracks for the sample as a whole, but these differences are nevertheless considerable. See Appendix A.

8. See Sewell and Shah, op. cit.

9. The cutting point of 110 for our sample also reflects a slight upward bias in the high school sample. Tests varied somewhat from one community to another, but the test scores were found to be related to other factors in the same manner in all communities.

10. See especially Natalie Rogoff, "Local Social Structure and Educational Selection," in Halsey, Floud and Anderson (eds.), Education, Economy, and Society (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe), 1963, pp. 241-251.

11. By this, of course, we simply mean that there are more students aspiring to college in spite of low grades and IQ's than there are students who fail to aspire with high grades and IQ's.

12. See Sewell and Shah, op. cit., for longitudinal data on a large recent sample. It is possible that the system will change in the future so that this proportion will increase or decrease radically. But it appears that approximately half the high school graduates have attended college from each cohort group for more than fifty years in the United States, and about half of these go on to complete four years of college. Thus the increasing proportion of high school graduates in each generation has accounted for the increase in numbers of college graduates. We will soon reach a saturation point or ceiling on high school graduation for our population as the proportion approaches 100%. It will be interesting to see whether the ratios of college attendance and graduation to high school graduation will change when virtually all our population becomes high school graduates.

13. Burton R. Clark, "The 'Cooling-Out' Function in Higher Education," in Halsey, Floud, and Anderson, op. cit., pp. 513-523.

14. Aaron V. Cicourel and John I. Kitsuse, The Educational Decision Makers (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill), 1963.

15. Another factor in the formation and persistence of educational plans is the extent to which parents may successfully pressure the school into allowing their children to enroll in the college curriculum even though school personnel may not believe that the child is capable of doing satisfactory work. Our data do not permit us to investigate the extent to which this situation prevails, but the interaction between the school and parents on this matter is often a very sensitive matter. See Cicourel and Kitsuse, op. cit.

16. Although the sample included a target population of 524 high school students, not all the interviews were successfully obtained. The number of students interviewed in 507, and the number of mothers is 429. (See Appendix A.) There are 418 pairs of students and mothers with both successfully interviewed. The actual numbers in the tables tend to be somewhat smaller than these totals because of ambiguous or "no answer" responses.

17. Joseph A. Kahl, op. cit.

18. It is interesting to note that the strain toward over-aspiration persists for pairs of mothers and their children when IQ and grades are considered. For example just 8 pairs of mothers and their children agree on less than four years of college when both IQ and grades are high, but 18 pairs agree on college when both are low. Similarly, 37 pairs agree on college completion when either IQ or grades alone are high compared with 26 pairs agreeing on less education under these same conditions.

19. Of course, this would tend to argue in favor of an "open-door" college curriculum admissions policy for high schools if the main objective is to avoid discouraging high educational plans among students and their parents.

20. See especially Sewell and Shah, op. cit. and Bardua, op. cit.

21. This arguement is one put forth by Furstenberg in his study of the transmission of attitudes in the family. Frank F. Furstenberg, "The Transmission of Attitudes in the Family," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1967. This study is one of the few containing data from both parents and their children.

22. See Kahl, op. cit. and Bordua, op. cit.

SECTION VIII

ROLE STRAIN, ALIENATION AND DEVIANT BEHAVIOR AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS*

In Section VI, it was noted that certain kinds of students (particularly those receiving low grades) were more likely to be alienated from school than other types of students. It was also suggested that alienation was strongly related to the role strain experienced by some students while attempting to meet their role obligations. In this section, we will try to determine the degree to which role strain and alienation are related to students' cheating.

The frame of reference for this analysis will be based largely upon Goode's theory of role strain which considers dissensus, deviance and role strain--and not consensus, conformity, and harmony--as integral parts of the "normal" functioning of all social structures.[1] According to this view, because one is continually engaged in numerous role relationships, one cannot be expected to meet all of the demands of his role partners to their satisfaction. Consequently, for the purposes of our analysis, we assume that all students experience some role strain in trying to satisfy the various role demands of their parents, teachers and peers. But although all students may experience role strain--or, as Goode describes it, "the felt difficulty in meeting role demands"--not all students resort to cheating as a means of alleviating this tension.[2] We shall, therefore, attempt to demonstrate that cheating is more likely to be used as a mechanism for reducing

---

*This section was written by Robert B. Hill.

role strain by the more alienated students than by those students who are less alienated.

One main indicator of role strain will be the degree of parental pressure for academic success as perceived by the students. Another is the role pressure for social success exerted by students' peers. Our measure of alienation will result from an operationalization of Merton's four modes of individual adaptation--conformity, ritualism, innovation and retreatism--within the organizational context of the school.[3] The last three adaptations, according to Merton, are deviant responses to anomic strains in the social structure.

In brief, the thesis of this analysis is as follows: All students are subjected to conflicting role pressures from their parents, teachers and peers to attain either the goal of academic success (high grades) or social success (e.g., being popular, attending parties) or both. In order to be academically successful, however, students must devote many hours to homework assignments, classroom work, and outside reading. Similarly, to be socially successful or popular, they must spend a considerable amount of time attending dances and parties and/or engaging in some sports activity. All students, therefore, must decide how to allocate their limited time and energy between these two alternative ends.

In this section, we will attempt to show that those students who are highly committed to either the goal of academic success (like the conformists) or the goal of social success (like the retreatists) are less likely to experience role strain than those students who are highly committed to both goals (like the innovators). Consequently,

we predict that the greatest pressures for cheating will be found among those students with an ambivalent orientation toward the goals of academic and social success--the innovators.

This analysis is based primarily upon the sub-sample of 524 10th grade students from eight New Jersey communities. It will be recalled, all students in 22 tenth grade English classrooms were interviewed.

The section has six sub-divisions. The first examines the correlation of cheating rates with students' grades, I.Q., sex, family SES, and school attitudes. The second sub-section shows how parental pressure is related to cheating when one controls for such variables as grades, I.Q., or family socio-economic status. The third sub-section investigates the relationship of peer group pressures to cheating and demonstrates that the quest for popularity among one's peers plays a significant role in student dishonesty. The fourth sub-section introduces Merton's concept of modes of individual role adaptations. His role types will be used to distinguish the more alienated students (i.e., those less committed to academic success) from those less alienated. First we will attempt to validate the components of this concept as operationalized, and then relate it to role pressures and cheating rates. In the fifth sub-section we examine the visibility of cheating among the students' role partners--their parents, teachers and peers. The final sub-section summarizes our findings and briefly discusses some of their implications for the integration of role relationships in school systems.

I. The Correlates of Cheating

In his nationwide study of academic dishonesty among college students, Bowers found that 50% of the students reported that they had cheated on examinations.[4] In this study the tenth grade students were asked:

> About how often this school year have you . . . cheated on tests or exams: never, once, a few times, several times, or often?*

Slightly more than half (52%) of the tenth graders said that they had cheated at least once, while 48% claimed never to have cheated that school year. (It should be remembered that the interviewing of the students was done near the close of the school year from April through June.) Therefore, about the same proportion of high school, as well as college students report cheating on examinations.

The next question is, Who cheats? According to Merton's theory of anomie, we would expect deviance rates (in this case, cheating) to be higher among those with low accessibility to the society's legitimate means than among those with a high degree of access. For the society in general "legitimate means" may refer to "a good education" or "an honest job." In school contexts, however, "access to legitimate means" may refer to a student's ability to obtain high grades. In his analysis, Bowers considered ability as an indicator of legitimate access:

> Cheating is, of course, a manifestation of using illegitimate means to achieve a legitimate end, in this case academic success or at least the avoidance of academic

---

*This was part of a battery of questions that also inquired whether students had "cut school," "lied to a teacher," or "lied to your mother."

> failure. As Merton has pointed out, deviant behavior in pursuit of approved ends is apt to occur when access to legitimate means is restricted. In the case at hand, restricted means translates primarily into a lack of ability to perform well in college courses. We can expect the poor students, those who have difficulty keeping up with the work in their courses, to be the ones most tempted to cheat. This image of the cheater is certainly widespread among college deans and student body presidents. 'Students with bad grades' or 'poor students' or some equivalent phrase constitutes the most frequent response . . . to a question asking what groups or kinds of students on their campus cheat or plagiarize more often than others. They seem to feel that this is the most common characteristic of students who engage in academic dishonesty on their campuses.[5]

We would expect, therefore, the cheating rates to be inversely correlated with students' grades and I.Q.: the lower the grades or I.Q., the higher the rates of cheating. Also, since family SES is strongly correlated with students' grades and I.Q., we would expect low SES students to have higher cheating rates than high SES students. The figures presented in Table 8.1 below appear to confirm these expectations somewhat.

As predicted, a higher proportion of students with low grades cheat than those with high grades. Fifty-four per cent of those with modal grades of C or less cheat, compared with 46% of those with grades of A or B who cheat. Although grades are not as strongly related to cheating as we might have expected, the relationship is nevertheless in the predicted direction.

Interestingly, Table 8.1 suggests that I.Q., farily income, and father's occupation are related curvilinearly, and not inversely, to cheating behavior. The highest rates of cheating are NOT found among those with the lowest I.Q., lowest family income, or lowest paternal occupations. For example, while 50% of those with I.Q.'s falling in

the 61-99 range cheat, 57% of those with I.Q.'s in the 111-120 interval cheat. Similar findings result for both family income and father's occupation.

Table 8.1

Proportion Cheating by Selected Social Characteristics

Modal Grades	A or B	C or lower		
	46%	54%		
	(213)	(285)		
I.Q.	121-164	111-120	100-110	61-99
	40%	57%	55%	50%
	(98)	(132)	(118)	(127)
Family Income (in $1,000's)	High ($15 +)	Medium ($6-14)	Low (Under $6)	
	37%	57%	54%	
	(76)	(189)	(99)	
Father's Occupational Status[a]	High	Medium	Low	
	44%	59%	49%	
	(158)	(180)	(134)	
Parental Education[b]	College Educated		Non-College	
	46%		53%	
	(187)		(241)	
Sex	Female	Male		
	46%	55%		
	(221)	(285)		

[a]High occupations refer to managerial and professional jobs; medium refers to white-collar sales, clerical and skilled blue-collar craftsmen; low refers primarily to blue-collar operative and service jobs.

[b]"College-educated" parents are those families in which at least one of the parents had some college; "non-college" are those in which neither parent attended college.

Parental education and students' sex are also not related very strongly to cheating, but the relationships are in the expected order. Forty-six per cent of the students from college homes and 53 per cent from non-college homes report having cheated. Forty-six per cent of the girls cheat, and 55% of the boys cheat.

It can be seen from the above that for those variables in Table 8.1 which we have dichotomized (i.e., grades, parental education and sex), cheating is somewhat, but not strongly, related. And for those variables indicated in Table 8.1 which we have trichotomized, cheating appears to be curvilinearly related. Thus, contrary to our expectations, our findings suggest that greater pressures for cheating may be found among the middle, and not the lowest, stratum of students.

It could be that these are spurious relationships that can be adequately accounted for by student grades. And once grades are also taken into consideration, these relationships may disappear. In Table 8.2 we repeat a number of these relationships with grades also considered.

In Table 8.2 we again obtain results that suggest curvilinear relationships with cheating for both students' I.Q. and family income--even when we control for grades. It is clear that for those with grades of B or better, the highest rates of cheating can be found among (1) those students with I.Q.'s in the 111-120 range and (2) those coming from medium income families. Similar, but less strongly related, results obtain for "C" students with the same characteristics.

Table 8.2

Proportion Cheating by Selected Characteristics and Grades

	Per Cent Cheated	
	Modal Grades	
High School I.Q.	A or B	C or Lower
121-164	39 (82)	44 (16)
111-120	55 (77)	59 (54)
100-110	47 (30)	58 (88)
61-99	47 (15)	50 (111)
	Modal Grades	
Family Income (in $1,000's)	A or B	C or Lower
High ($15 +)	35 (49)	43 (28)
Medium ($6-14)	55 (95)	57 (95)
Low (Under $6)	47 (32)	55 (67)
	Modal Grades	
Sex	A or B	C or Lower
Male	53 (91)	56 (140)
Female	40 (99)	54 (82)

With regard to sex and cheating, however, grades have almost no effect upon the cheating behavior of boys; a high proportion of boys cheat regardless of their grades. Fifty-six per cent of the boys with lower grades cheat, but almost the same proportion (53%) of boys with grades of B or better cheat. For girls, on the other hand, we obtain a different story. While 54% of the girls with lower grades cheat, only 40% of the girls with B grades or better cheat.

Up to this point, we have examined the correlation of background characteristics with cheating. Before concluding this sub-division, let us briefly turn our attention to the relationship between attitudes toward schoolwork and cheating behavior. All of the tenth graders were asked the following three questions:

a) How interested would you say you are in most of your schoolwork, very interested, fairly interested, a little interested, or not at all interested?

b) How satisfied are you with the way you are doing in school, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, or not at all satisfied?

c) Generally, what is the lowest mark that you would really be satisfied with?

Cheating rate increases with decreasing interest in schoolwork. While 41% of those who are "very" interested in schoolwork cheat, almost two-thirds (64%) of these who are "a little" or "not interested at all" cheat. Therefore, the more "alienated" students are more likely to cheat than the less alienated students. But since we know that the more alienated students are also more likely to receive low grades, this relationship might well be spurious. It is possible that once grades are controlled for, we will find no difference between interest in schoolwork and cheating. This, however, does not occur.

Among the students with high grades as well as those with low grades, the cheating rate consistently increases with decreasing interest in schoolwork. Among the B or higher students, for example, slightly more than one-third (37%) of the "very" interested students cheat, but almost three-fourths (70%) of those with "little or no" interest cheat. In fact, Table 8.3 reveals that interest in schoolwork is a stronger determinant of cheating than grade average. Degree of interest in schoolwork accounts for a maximum difference of 23% in the cheating rates of the students with grades of B or higher, while grade average accounts for a maximum difference of 10% in the cheating rates of the "very" interested students.

Table 8.3

Proportion Cheating by Selected Attitudes Toward School

Current Grade Average	Per Cent Cheated: Interest in Schoolwork — Very Interested	Fairly Interested	A Little Interested
A or B	37% (98)	52% (105)	70% (10)
C or lower	47 (61)	54 (165)	63 (62)
Totals	41% (158)	54% (274)	64% (74)

Satisfaction with Own Performance	Satisfaction with Own Performance: Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not at All Satisfied
Totals	39% (80)	51% (284)	58% (140)

Current Grade Average	Lowest Grade Satisfied With: B	C	D
A or B	43% (120)	51% (83)	a (4)
C	53 (19)	54 (123)	59% (34)
D or F	(0)	58 (74)	48 (31)
Totals	44% (140)	54% (284)	56% (72)

[a]The percentage has been omitted since it is based upon only 4 cases.

In the second sub-table of Table 8.3 we find the relationship between students' satisfaction with academic performance and cheating. It can be seen that cheating increases as dissatisfaction with one's performance increases. While 39% of the "very" satisfied students cheat, 58% of the "not at all" satisfied students cheat. (Although the data are not presented in this table, this relationship also holds when grades are controlled for.)

The third sub-table of Table 8.3 reveals an interesting relationship between the lowest grade students are satisfied with, current grades, and cheating. The totals indicate that cheating increases as the lowest grade one is satisfied with decreases. Forty-four per cent of those satisfied with a minimum grade of B cheat, while 56% of those satisfied with a minimum grade of D cheat. In this sub-table we trichotomize grades in order to make the categories of the two independent variables more comparable. When we control for actual grades we would expect to find the lowest rates of cheating among the "satisfied" students (i.e., those falling along the diagonal). For the most part, this result is obtained since two out of the three percentages along the diagonal are the two lowest percentages in the table. Only 43% of those students who would be satisfied with a minimum grade of B--and who have averages of B or higher--cheat. Similarly, 48% of those students who would be satisfied with a grade of D--and who have grades of D or lower--cheat. The highest cheating rates are found among: (1) those students who would be satisfied with a minimum grade of C, but who have averages of D or lower (58%), and (2) those students who say they would be satisfied with a grade of D, but who have C averages (59%). The former result was anticipated since we expected to find the highest rates of cheating among those students most susceptible to role strain, that is, those having percentages that fall below the diagonal. But the 53% cheating rate for those students with a grade average of C who reported that they would be satisfied with a grade of B is lower than we had anticipated due to the discrepancy between their aspirations and actual achievement.

A comparison of Tables 8.2 and 8.3 reveals that attitudinal variables such as interest in schoolwork, satisfaction with one's performance, and the lowest grade one would be satisfied with are just as strong, if not stronger, correlates of cheating than the traditional background characteristics such as I.Q., grades, sex, and family income. In fact, as we shall see, these attitudinal variables serve as intervening variables that partly help to explain the relationship between role strain and cheating behavior.

II. Parental Pressure and Cheating

In this sub-section, we will attempt to show that parental pressure, as an indicator of student role strain, is a significant component of the cheating "process" as it links background characteristics with rates of cheating.

Each student was asked the following question:

> How much pressure would you say your mother puts on you to do well in your schoolwork, a lot of pressure, some pressure, little pressure, or no pressure?

This question was repeated with "father" inserted for the word "mother." Since, as will be shown later in this section, students' perceptions of the pressure from their mothers is more strongly correlated with cheating than their perceptions of the pressure from their fathers, we will use perceived pressure of the mothers as the sole indicator of student role strain in this sub-section.

In Table 8.4 we present the correlation of some key variables with maternal pressure. It should be noted that for the purpose of our analysis the dependent variable, perceived pressure from mother, has

been dichotomized into (a) those responding "a lot" or "some" pressure and (b) those responding "a little" or "no" pressure from the mother. The first sub-table indicates a result that was reported earlier in Section VI: the lower a student's grades, the more parental pressure for academic success he is likely to perceive. Sixty per cent of the "A or B" students perceive "a lot or some" maternal pressure, but 83% of the "C or lower" students perceive a similar amount of pressure. A similar relation exists between I.Q. and parental pressure. The lower a student's I.Q., the more parental pressure he is likely to perceive. And, finally, the lower the grade that a student is satisfied with, the greater the parental pressure he is likely to perceive. While only 39% of those students who would be satisfied with at least a grade of B perceive "a lot or some" parental pressure, 78% of the students who would be satisfied with a grade of D perceive a similar amount of pressure. Although the latter have relatively low academic standards, it is clear that these students who are satisfied with a minimum grade of D--itself an indicator of a high degree of alienation from educational values--nevertheless experience a high degree of role strain as a result of the high level of perceived pressure from their parents to improve their academic performance. Thus, the third sub-table of Table 8.4 provides us with a clear empirical example of a significant relationship between student alienation and role strain. We will, of course, examine this relationship in greater detail later.

Now that we have examined some of the correlates of perceived or experienced parental pressure, we will investigate the relationship of

Table 8.4

Proportions of Students Perceiving "A Lot" or "Some" Pressure to Do Well in School From Their Mothers by Modal Grades, I.Q., and Lowest Grade Satisfied With

Modal Grades	
A or B	C or Lower
60% (210)	83% (180)

I.Q.			
121-164	111-120	100-110	61-99
55% (96)	70% (131)	83% (116)	81% (124)

Lowest Grade Satisfied With		
B	C	D
39% (65)	69% (242)	78% (109)

parental pressure (or "role strain") with cheating rates of students. But, first, we will determine the amount of congruence between student's perception of maternal pressure and mothers' reports of the amount of pressure they exert. Then we will assess their relative impact upon cheating rates.

The base figures (i.e., those numbers in parentheses) along the diagonal in Table 8.5A indicate the number of student-mother pairs agreeing on the degree of maternal pressure. The number of mothers and students agreeing that the mother exerts "a lot" or "some" pressure is 215, while the number of mother student pairs agreeing that the mother exerts "a little or no" pressure is 55. Therefore, 65% (or 270 out of

1.16) of the mothers and students agree upon the amount of maternal pressure exerted.

Table 8.5

Cheating by Perceived and Actual Parental Pressure

A
Proportions Cheating by Students' and Mothers' Reports of Maternal Pressure

Students' Perception of Maternal Pressure	Mothers' Reports of Pressure: A Lot or Some	A Little or None	Per Cent Difference
A lot or some	58% (215)	50% (84)	+ 8%
A little or none	45 (62)	35 (55)	+10%
Per cent difference	+13%	+15%	

B
Proportions Cheating by Students' Perceptions of Maternal and Paternal Pressure

Students' Perception of Paternal Pressure	Students' Perceptions of Maternal Pressure: A Lot or Some	A Little or None	Per Cent Difference
A lot or some	56% (292)	38% (29)	+18%
A little or none	52 (42)	38 (94)	+14%
Per cent difference	+4%	0%	

In Table 8.5B the base figures along the diagonal reveal that 386 students (292 plus 94) perceive their mothers and fathers as exerting approximately the same degree of pressure. Thus, 84% of the students perceive their fathers as exerting an amount of pressure equal to their mothers. Although the data are not present in tabular form, we also found that (1) 90% (346 out of 386) of the mothers reported that their husbands exerted a degree of pressure similar to their own and (2) that 67% (251 out of 375) of the students and mothers agree upon the amount of paternal pressure exerted.

Returning to Table 8.5A we note that the lowest (35%) and the highest (58%) rates of cheating are found, respectively, among the student-mother pairs that agree upon "little or no" maternal pressure and "a lot or some" maternal pressure. An observation of the student-mother pairs that denote dissensus reveals that the students' perception of mothers' pressure is a somewhat stronger determinant of cheating than the mothers' report of their own behavior. Of those students who perceive "a little or no" maternal pressure but whose mothers report "a lot or some" pressure, 45% cheat. But 50% cheat among those students who perceive "a lot or some" maternal pressure and whose mothers report "a little or no" pressure. The percentage differences in Table 8.5A (8% and 10% for mothers' own reports as opposed to 13% and 15% for students' perception of maternal pressure) also indicate that students' perception of maternal pressure are stronger predictors of cheating rates than mothers' report of their own behavior.

In Table 8.5B, however, the percentage differences indicate that students' perceptions of paternal pressure account for almost none of the variance in cheating rates when we control for the student's perception of maternal pressure. Among those students who perceive their mothers as exerting "little or no" pressure, the same proportion cheat (38%), regardless of the degree of perceived pressure from the father. And among those students who perceive their mothers as exerting "a lot or some" pressure, perceived paternal pressure accounts for only a 4% difference in cheating rates. Thus, it is the student's perception of his mother's pressure--not his father's--that is the better predictor of cheating behavior. It is for this reason that we

have used the student's perceptions of maternal pressure--and not the mothers' reports of their own behavior nor the students' perception of paternal pressure--as our indicator of role strain in this section.

Since perceived parental pressure is strongly correlated with students' grades, we will now turn our attention to the relationships between perceived parental pressure, students' grades, and cheating rates.

In Table 8.6A we see that grades remain inversely related to perceived parental pressure, whereas cheating is, of course, positively related to perceived parental pressure. Slightly less than two-thirds (63%) of the students who perceived "little or no" maternal pressure have grades of B or higher, whereas only one-third (35%) of the students who perceive "a lot or some" maternal pressure have grades of B or more. Since grades decline as parental pressure increases, it is clear that grades should be viewed as antecedent to parental pressure. In other words, the degree of parental pressure should be considered dependent upon students' grades. If this is the case, then it is possible that the relationship between parental pressure and cheating is spurious and that once grades are controlled for this relationship will disappear; the data in Table 8.6B, however, do not support this contention. On the contrary, perceived maternal pressure appears to have a stronger independent effect upon cheating rates than grades. Among those students with B or higher grades, for example, only one-third (35%) of those who perceive "little or no" maternal pressure cheat, whereas over half (54%) of those brighter students who perceive "a lot or some" maternal pressure cheat. Perceived parental pressure

has less of an impact, however, upon the cheating behavior of the poorer students. Although 48% of the "C or lower" students who perceive "little or no" parental pressure cheat, 56% of these students who perceive "a lot or some" parental pressure cheat.

Table 8.6

Cheating, Parental Pressure and Grades

A

Grades and Cheating by Parental Pressure

Student's Perception of Maternal Pressure

(Per Cent A or B)	
A Lot or Some	A Little or None
35% (356)	63% (135)

(Per Cent Cheated)	
A Lot or Some	A Little or None
56% (361)	40% (136)

B

Cheating by Grades and Parental Pressure

Student's Perception of Maternal Pressure

Current Grade Average	A Lot or Some	A Little or None
A or B	54% (125)	35% (85)
C or lower	56 (230)	48 (50)

Grades have almost no effect upon the cheating rates of students who perceive "a lot or some" parental pressure: 54% of the "A or B" students cheat, whereas 56% of the "C or lower" students cheat. Grades do have a strong effect, however, upon the cheating behavior of the

students who perceive "little or no" maternal pressure; for 35% of these students who have grades of B or higher cheat, compared with 48% of them with "C or lower" grades.

In Table 8.7 we also see that perceived parental pressure is strongly related to cheating independent of I.Q., father's occupation or family income. Perceived maternal pressure, for example, has about the same effect upon students' cheating rates regardless of their I.Q.'s. It accounts for percentage differences that range from 12% for the 100-110 I.Q. students to 16% for the 61-99 I.Q. group. Student I.Q. also has independent effects on cheating rates. Among the students who perceive "a lot or some" maternal pressure, 47% of those with 121-164 I.Q.'s cheat, but 62% of the 111-120 I.Q. students cheat. It is interesting to note that among both categories of parental pressure, I.Q. is curvilinearly related to cheating. The highest rates of cheating can be found among both of the two intermediate I.Q. categories, 111-120 and 100-110. A curvilinear relation between father's occupational level and cheating is also suggested in Table 8.7B; the highest rates of cheating for both categories of parental pressure is to be found among those students from families whose fathers have medium status jobs.

Of the students who perceive "a lot" or "some" parental pressure and whose fathers have low status occupations, 50% cheat, whereas almost two-thirds (63%) of these students whose fathers have medium level occupations cheat. Perceived parental pressure has the strongest impact upon the cheating behavior of the students whose fathers have high level occupations: Less than a third (30%) of those students who

Table 8.7

Proportion Cheating by Parental Pressure, I.Q. and Father's Occupation

A

Cheating by I.Q. and Parental Pressure

Perception of Maternal Pressure	(Per Cent Cheated) High School I.Q. 121-164	111-120	100-110	61-99
A lot or some	47% (53)	62% (92)	57% (96)	54% (99)
A little or none	33 (43)	46 (39)	45 (20)	38 (24)

B

Cheating by Father's Occupation and Parental Pressure

Perception of Maternal Pressure	(Per Cent Cheated) Father's Occupation High	Medium	Low
A lot or some	52% (100)	63% (134)	50% (103)
A little or none	30 (56)	49 (43)	46 (28)

C

Cheating by Family Income and Parental Pressure

Perception of Maternal Pressure	(Per Cent Cheated) Family Income (in $1,000's) High ($15+)	Medium ($6-14)	Low (Under $6)
A lot or some	46% (57)	59% (132)	60% (75)
A little or none	15 (20)	51 (57)	37 (27)

perceive "a little or no" pressure cheat, but more than half (52%) of those who perceive "a lot or some" maternal pressure cheat--a difference of 22%. At the same time, perceived parental pressure has almost no effect upon the cheating rates of those students whose fathers have low level occupations; it accounts for only a 4% variance (50% minus 46%) among them.

Similar results are obtained in Table 8.7C, which substitutes family income as an indicator of family socio-economic level. Perceived parental pressure has the strongest effect on the cheating rates of the high income and the low income students. For example, whereas only 15% of the high income students who perceive "a little" or "none" maternal pressure cheat, 46% of the high income students who perceive "a lot or some" maternal pressure cheat.

Thus, the sub-tables of Table 8.7 reveal that cheating rates are a function not only of direct role pressures, but also of indirect predisposition factors such as I.Q., grades and family SES.

III. Peer Group Pressures and Cheating

In this sub-section we will attempt to show how the role pressures from the students' peers influence their cheating rates.

That the peer group has a stronger impact than the family on much of the behavior and attitudes of adolescents has been confirmed by numerous investigations. But the implication has usually been that the peer group pulls the student in one direction--away from academic and intellectual pursuits. This view has gained widespread currency because it is based upon the popular assumption that a high degree of value consensus exists among adolescents. However, as Gross observes, normative consensus should be treated as a variable for empirical verification and not assumed to be a constant.[6] Thus, it appears fruitful--and more realistic--to hypothesize that students are pulled by their peers in at least two conflicting directions--toward and away from academic values. All schools have academically-oriented groups of

students as well as the socially-oriented groups. Depending upon their desire for acceptance by members of a particular "crowd," students will be subjected to varying degrees of pressure to conform to the dominant norms of that group. It cannot be overemphasized that students experience pressures to achieve scholastically from their peers as well as from their parents and teachers. In fact, there is strong empirical evidence to support our contention that the majority of students internalize many of the academic norms of the larger society.

The tenth graders in our sample were asked three questions about their orientation to academic values. The first was, "About how much schooling do you think most young men need these days to get along well in the world?" More than half of the students (54%) responded either "four years of college" or "graduate school," 18% responded "some college," and the remaining 25% said either "finish high school" or less. Thus, 75% of the students felt that the minimum amount of education that young men needed today was some college education.

With the second question, "A person who wants to get ahead today has to do well in school," 83% of the students "strongly agreed," 14% "somewhat agreed," and 2% "somewhat disagreed." It is clear that the norm "one should do well in school" is widely held by adolescents.

Almost three-fourths (73%) of the students replied "very important" to the third question, "How important would you say getting good marks in school is to you?" One-fourth of the students responded "somewhat important," and only 2% said that getting good grades was "not important at all" to them. It appears then that the attainment of good grades is a strongly-held value among most students.

The skewedness of the responses to these three questions reveals that the overwhelming majority of adolescents internalize the academic norms of the adult society. Thus, their high rates of deviant behavior cannot be explained in terms of their failure to internalize adult academic norms. This behavior persists in spite of the fact that they have internalized these norms.

In his study of academic dishonesty among college students, Bowers also found that most of the students who cheat do not approve of cheating. Bowers asked the students to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements about cheating that included the following:

(1) the individual's personal integrity or self-respect should be the basis for the decision not to cheat;

(2) students are morally obliged not to cheat;

(3) cheating directly contradicts the goals of education; and

(4) under no circumstances is cheating justified.[7]

The proportions of students "strongly agreeing" with these four items were, respectively, 75%, 69%, 68%, and 63%. On the basis of these responses, Bowers concluded:

> As the data clearly show, college students overwhelmingly disapprove of academic dishonesty. . . . More than four out of five students agree with these statements and, just as significantly, more than three in five express a strong agreement. . . .[8]

Realizing that 50% of the college students cheat, Bowers goes on to note:

> The almost unanimous disapproval of cheating on the part of the students in our sample . . . is quite startling in view of the sizable proportion who admit to cheating. Apparently, many students who think cheating is morally wrong nonetheless do so.

> Several conclusions seem justified. First, it is clear that the widespread cheating that occurs on many college campuses does not mean that students hold values that are contrary to those underlying our system of higher education. If college students cheat, it is not because they do not think cheating is wrong. The second conclusion that follows is that there must be powerful forces at work leading students to cheat in spite of their negative attitude toward such behavior.[9]

Bowers' findings that the overwhelmingly majority of college students disapprove of cheating would appear to apply to our high school students as well, since it was shown above that they overwhelmingly internalize the academic norms of the dominant society. The near unanimity of the students' norms against cheating sharply contradicts the popular image of the existence of sizable student subcultures that approve of cheating.

This high degree of personal disapproval does not deter them from cheating. As the personal norms of students toward cheating failed to account for their own cheating behavior, Bowers sought an explanation in the degree to which they perceived their peers as disapproving of cheating. And, indeed, he found the perceived peer disapproval of cheating to be a very powerful determinant of cheating behavior.[10]

To get at the perceived disapproval of the peers or our tenth graders we used this item from the Bowers study: "If you had cheated in a course and the following people knew about it, how do you think they would feel about it?"[11] The students were then asked to indicate the degree to which "your close friend," "most students in school," "your teachers," and "your parents" would disapprove of cheating. Ninety and 93% of the students said their parents and teachers, respectively, would "strongly" disapprove of cheating. At the same time,

only 8% and 16%, respectively, felt that "most students" or their "closest friend" would "strongly" disapprove of cheating. These findings are presented in Table 8.8 below.

Table 8.8

Students' Perceptions of Role-Partners' Disapproval of Cheating

Role-Partners	They Would Disapprove: Very Strongly	Fairly Strongly	Not Very Strongly	Not at All	N
Your closest friend	16%	20%	36%	28%	(492)
Most students in school	8	23	39	30	(488)
Your teachers	93	6	1	--	(494)
Your parents	90	8	1	1	(493)

The data in Table 8.8 sharply contradict the popular notion that there is a high degree of consensus among adolescents with regard to normative approval of deviant behavior. On the contrary, the data suggest a marked degree of overall dissensus or "anomie" among students with regard to their attitudes toward instances of cheating. If one combines the "very" and "fairly" strongly disapprove responses, the percentages for "your closest friend" and "most students" divide roughly into equal thirds. While 36% of the students, for example, perceive of their closest friends as "very" or "fairly" strongly disapproving of cheating, 36% perceive of their closest friends as "not very strongly" disapproving, and only 28% feel that their closest friends would "not at all" disapprove of their cheating. The responses for "most students in school" follow a similar pattern.

We contend therefore that it would be inaccurate to view the high school environment as one "anti-intellectual" adolescent subculture. Instead, it appears that there are at least three significant adolescent groupings in school systems: (a) an academically-oriented subculture that strongly disapproves of deviant behavior, (b) a socially-oriented subculture that either approves of or tolerates deviance, and (c) a less cohesive group of academically and socially-oriented students who have an ambivalent attitude toward deviance. We intend to demonstrate later in this section that the majority of students fall into the third group. Thus, if there is a dominant value-orientation to be identified for the majority of high school students, we suggest that it is an ambivalent orientation which stresses both academic and "non-academic" (or "social") values. It is among this segment of the high school population that role strain is likely to be most intense--and the rate of cheating highest--because it is not possible for such students to fulfill these conflicting role expectations without resorting to deviant means because of their limited time and resources. In Table 8.9 we present data showing the extent to which the perceived disapproval from peers influences rates of cheating among students.

The totals for Table 8.9A indicate that cheating is inversely related to perceived peer (i.e., "your closest friend") disapproval: the stronger the degree of perceived peer disapproval the lower the rate of cheating. Almost three-fourths (71%) of those students who perceive no disapproval from their closest friends cheat, whereas only about one-fourth (27%) of those students who perceive "very strong" peer disapproval cheat. For the most part, this strong correlation

Table 8.9

Peer Group Influence and Cheating Rates

A

Proportions Cheating by Grades and Peer Disapproval

Perceived Peer Disapproval	Grades		Totals
	A or B	C or Lower	
Very strong	28% (36)	27% (41)	27% (78)
Fairly strong	38 (50)	43 (47)	41 (98)
Not strong	43 (83)	59 (94)	53 (180)
None at all	77 (43)	68 (101)	71 (146)

B

Proportions Cheating by Peer Group Associations

Degree of Participation	Peer Group Associations			
	Studies	Extra-Curricular	Athletics	Dates, Parties
More	31% (122)	48% (113)	57% (133)	64% (87)
Same	57 (325)	49 (290)	49 (234)	50 (278)
Less	68 (54)	62 (101)	49 (138)	44 (138)

C

Proportions Cheating by Popularity and Parental Pressure

Named Most Popular by Classmates	Students' Perception of Maternal Pressure		
	A Lot or Some	A Little or None	Totals
Twice or more	64% (121)	44% (41)	59% (163)
None or once	51 (240)	38 (95)	48 (343)

between perceived peer disapproval and cheating remains unchanged when grades are controlled for.

As a means of determining the different patterns of peer group associations among adolescents, students were asked this question (which was also taken from the Bowers study):

> Compared to other students in your class, do you and your close friends participate in extra-curricular activities: more than others, about the same, or less than others?

This question was repeated three more times with the substitution of "take an interest in your studies and make good grades," "in athletics," and "date and have parties" for "in extra-curricular activities." We hypothesized that students whose friends took an interest in studies and extra-curricular activities "more than others" belonged to an academically-oriented crowd; those with friends who participated in athletics, dated or had parties "more than others" belonged to a socially-oriented crowd. Thus, we would expect the students with socially-oriented peer group associations to exhibit higher rates of cheating than students with academically-oriented peers.

The data in Table 8.9B clearly support our expectations. The rate of cheating increases: (a) as the degree of participation in athletics and dates and parties increase, and (b) as the degree of participation in studies and extra-curricular activities decline. For example, 44% of those students whose peers participate "less" in dates and parties cheat, but almost two-thirds (65%) of those students whose peers participate "more" in dates and parties cheat. Similarly, while only one-third (31%) of those students whose peers participate "more" in their studies cheat, two-thirds (68%) of those students whose peers participate "less" in their studies cheat. Among those students who participate "more" in each activity, the rate of cheating steadily increases as the social orientation of the activity increases; it ranges from 31% for the "studious" crowd to 65% for the "dates and parties" crowd.

In each of the 22 classrooms, all students were asked to name the two "most popular" students in their English class. The totals in Table 8.9C indicate that popularity is positively related to cheating: 48% of those named as most popular by less than two classmates cheat, but 59% of those named as most popular by two or more classmates cheat. This relationship persists when we control for perceived maternal pressure. Popularity among one's peers accounts more for the cheating behavior of those students under "a lot or some" pressure than for those perceiving only "a little or no" maternal pressure. For example, about half (51%) of the students who perceive "a lot or some" pressure, but were less popular among their peers cheat, while almost two-thirds (64%) of those students who are more popular among their peers cheat. Popularity has less of an impact upon the cheating behavior of those under little parental pressure. In fact, the data in Table 8.9C indicates the relative impact of parental versus peer pressure upon student cheating behavior. And perceived parental pressure appears to account for more of the variance of cheating than does peer group popularity. Among the more popular students, for example, perceived maternal pressure accounts for a difference of 20% (64% minus 44%) in their cheating rates, while popularity accounts for a difference of only 13% (64% minus 51%) among the students under "a lot or some" maternal pressure. Thus the cumulative effect of parental and peer group pressure accounts for a difference of 26% (64% minus 38%) in the cheating rates of the students.

IV. Alienation, Role Pressure and Cheating

In his 1938 essay, "Social Structure and Anomie," Merton developed a typology of individual role adaptations to describe the various kinds of adaptive responses to anomie (or states of "normlessness") in society.[12] We have presented this typology below in Table 10.

Table 8.10

Merton's Typology of Individual Role Adaptations[a]

Modes of Adaptations	Culture Goals	Institutionalized Means
I. Conformity	+	+
II. Innovation	+	-
III. Ritualism	-	+
IV. Retreatism	-	-
V. Rebellion	±	±

[a]Source: Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), p. 140.

The adaptation of conformity involves a high degree of commitment to the culture goals and a high degree of utilization of institutionalized or prescribed means; innovation, a high commitment to culturally approved goals but low utilization of culturally approved means; ritualism, low commitment to culture goals but high utilization of prescribed means; retreatism, low commitment to culture goals and low utilization of prescribed means; and rebellion, a sub-type of retreatism which also involves a high commitment to an alternative culture goal and high utilization of alternative means. This typology of role adaptations has been cited frequently in the literature on deviant behavior. Thus, it is surprising to realize that, despite its

popularity, not once in its more than 25 years of existence has this typology been empirically operationalized. Most of the studies that have employed this typology have been theoretical expositions. But even the descriptions of the role adaptations in the empirical investigations have been unsystematic, impressionistic and qualitative. Since Merton originally conceived of the role adaptations as one means by which aspects of his "middle-range" theory of social structure and anomie could be tested, the fact that they have not yet been systematically employed indicates a serious dificiency in the empirical investigations of anomie and deviant behavior thus far. In fact, after reviewing an inventory of 169 empirical and theoretical studies of anomie from 1940 to 1964, Merton concluded:

> There is not a single empirical investigation of anomie and deviant behavior . . . that has succeeded in mounting a research design that systematically, rather than impressionistically and qualitatively, includes simultaneous analysis of collectivity, subgroup, and individual attributes in relation to deviant behavior. . . . Instead, this exacting requirement of research tends to be by-passed and . . . replaced by clinical, qualitative descriptions of the interaction among deviants and of their selection of adaptive responses to anomie[13] [second underlining is ours].

In what was probably the first systematic use of Merton's typology of role adaptations in an empirical investigation, the author has demonstrated that the concept of role adaptation is a more powerful predictor of student deviance than the background variables (such as grades, I.Q. and family SES) traditionally employed in analyses of student behavior.[14] That work showed that Merton's role adaptations might well measure individual anomia just as effectively, if not more, than Srole's scale of anomia; and it also found that this concept

could be employed as a measure of the "academic orientation" of students in analyses not explicitly dealing with anomie. Thus, for the purpose of this analysis the concept of role adaptations will be used as a measure of the degree of "student alienation" or "lack of commitment to educational values." Students making the adaptations of innovation or retreatism will be defined as being less committed to educational values than those students making the adaptations of conformity or ritualism. It will be expected, therefore, that innovators and retreatists will exhibit greater role strain and higher rates of cheating than conformists and ritualists. But we also predict that role strain will be greater and cheating rates higher among the innovators than the retreatists since the former are more ambivalent about educational values than the latter.

In order to operationalize Merton's typology, students were classified along two dimensions: (1) their degree of commitment to the cultural goal of academic success and (2) their degree of utilization of institutionalized or prescribed means for attaining that goal.

Only one item was used as an indicator of the first dimension, "the degree of commitment to the goal of academic success." The question was, "How important would you say getting good marks in school is to you--very important, somewhat important, or not important at all?" Those students replying "very important" (that is, 73% of 505) were classified as placing a "high" (+) emphasis upon the goal of academic success, while all other respondents were characterized as having a "low" (-) commitment to this goal.

With respect to the second dimension, it was decided to construct an index of the degree of utilization of institutional means by scoring responses to the following two questions (the marginal percentages are also presented next to each category):

A) "In general, how hard do you try to get good grades?"
(1) Very hard or Quite a bit--76% or (0) A little, Not at all--24%

B) "About how much time do you spend on homework altogether each night on all your subjects?"
(1) Two or more hours--48% or (0) Less than two hours--52%

Those students who responded "very hard" or "quite a bit" to question A, received a score of "1." The students who responded "two hours or more" to question B also received scores of "1." All other responses to both questions received "0" scores. Thus, the total scores ranged from 0-2. Those students who received scores of 0-1 (58% of 494) were characterized as having a "low" (-) degree of utilization of institutional means. The remaining students (42% of 494) who received a score of 2 were characterized as having a "high" (+) degree of utilization of institutional means. This index when cross-tabulated with our indicator for the goals dimension yielded the following typology:

Table 8.11

A Typology of Student Role Adaptations

Degree of Commitment to Goal of Academic Success	Degree of Utilization of Institutional Means	
	High (+)	Low (-)
High (+)	Academic conformists (++) 35% (175)	Academic innovators (+-) 38% (189)
Low (-)	Academic ritualists (-+) 7% (35)	Academic retreatists (--) 19% (95)

Thus, we were able to classify 494 students into the four role adaptations. The largest number (189) were classified as "innovators," the second larges (175) as "conformists," the third largest (95) as "retreatists," and the smallest group (35) as "ritualists." It should be realized, as Merton has made quite clear, that these role types do not refer to student personality types, but to types of "role behavior" exhibited by individuals in certain social situations while occupying the status of "student." Thus, it is possible for a "conformist" in one setting to be a "retreatist" in another setting, and vice versa.

In order to validate our typology of role adaptations as an indicator of "student alienation," we have correlated it with several "external" measures of alienation in Table 8.12. The first correlation reveals that conformists and ritualists obtain higher grades than innovators and retreatists. For example, 58% of the conformists, but only one-fourth (24%) of the retreatists have grades of B or better. Similarly, about half (49%) of the ritualists, but only slightly more than a third (37%) of the innovators have grades of B or better.

Innovators and retreatists have lower college aspirations than conformists and ritualists. The proportions wanting four years of college were: 76% of the conformists, 70% of the ritualists, 62% of the innovators and only 47% of the retreatists.

Students making the adaptation of innovation and retreatism get enthusiastic less often about their classwork (38% and 23%, respectively) than students making the adaptation of conformist and ritualist (43% and 54%, respectively).

As would be expected, innovators and retreatists more often: (1) are satisfied with low grades, (2) cut school, and (3) want to drop out of school than conformists and ritualists. (See Table 8.12 for exact percentages.)

All of the tenth graders were also asked to name two students in their English classes who best fit the description of one or more of the following six student types:

1) Student #1 is well-behaved in class, pays attention to the teacher, works hard, and tries to do well.

2) Student #2 is smart, able to come up with answers, grasps things quickly and gets high grades.

3) Student #3 is cooperative, is liked by others, and is friendly, good-natured, and well-adjusted.

4) Student #4 is creative, has original ideas and a good imagination, and likes to figure things out himself.

5) Student #5 is not very interested in schoolwork, doesn't try very hard to get good marks, just does enough work to get by.

6) Student #6 doesn't like most schoolwork, doesn't do his (her) assignment, and is uncooperative.

Since student types #3 and #4 are not necessarily related to orientation to educational values, we have not included the percentages for these two types in Table 8.12 as an external validation of the typology of role adaptations. If our typology is a valid indicator of student alienation from educational values, we would expect the conformists and ritualists to be perceived by their classmates as more often fitting the descriptions of students type #1 ("well-behaved") and type #2 ("smart") than innovators and retreatists. On the other hand, if innovators and retreatists are indeed more alienated from school, we

would expect them to be perceived more often by their classmates as fitting the descriptions of student type #5 ("uninterested in school-work") and type #6 ("not cooperative") than conformists and ritualists.

Table 8.12

Validation of Student Role Types

Percentages of students:	Conformists (175)	Ritualists (35)	Innovators (189)	Retreatists (95)
A or B	58%	49%	37%	24%
wanting 4 years of college	76	70	62	47
"often" getting enthusiastic in class	43	54	38	23
satisfied with C or lower	59	65	77	87
having cut school	11	24	29	34
wanted to drop out of school	6	9	11	23

Mean Number of Times Named by Classmates as Student Behavior Types

Student Behavior Types	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists
"Well-behaved" (#1)	2.62	2.08	1.77	1.08
"Smart" (#2)	2.20	1.83	1.83	1.22
"Not interested" (#5)	0.87	1.14	1.80	2.40
"Not cooperative" (#6)	0.37	0.72	1.18	1.69
"Most popular"	1.44	1.53	1.78	2.13

Both of these expectations are borne out in the data presented in Table 8.12. Conformists and ritualists were more often named by their

classmates (2.62 and 2.08 mean number of times, respectively) as fitting the description of student type #1 ("well-behaved") than innovators and retreatists (with means of 1.77 and 1.08, respectively). While innovators were named just as often as ritualists (1.83 mean) as fitting student type #2 ("smart"), conformists were seen as fitting this description much more frequently (2.20) than retreatists (1.22).

At the same time, innovators (with a mean of 1.80) and retreatists (with a mean of 2.40) were more often perceived by their classmates as fitting student type #5 ("not interested") than conformists (0.87 mean) and ritualists (1.14 mean).

Although the data are not presented in this analysis, similar results were obtained when (1) the students were asked to place themselves and (2) the students' mothers were asked to place their children into one or more of the six student types. The conformists and ritualists more frequently placed themselves in student types #1 and #2 and less frequently in student types #5 and #6 than the innovators and retreatists. Similarly, the mothers of conformists and ritualists more often placed their children in student types #1 and #2 and less often in student types #5 and #6 than mothers of innovators and retreatists.

One final method of validating our typology was to rank order the 22 English classrooms in terms of their percentage of students who cheat. Thus, the proportion of cheaters in the classrooms ranged from 11.1% to 92.9%. This ranking was correlated with the classroom's rank based upon its percentage of conformists. The proportion of conformists in various classes ranged from 0% to 61.1%. We obtained a statistically

significant Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient of .654. (It should be pointed out that we obtained a very low correlation between ranking on per cent cheating and ranking on per cent conformists when we used high school or community as the unit of analysis. This indicates that classroom context is a more appropriate unit for the analysis of these types of student behavior than either high school or community context.) We conclude, therefore, that the above data clearly suggest that our typology of role adaptations is a valid measure of student alienation or degree of commitment to educational values.

The students were also asked to name the two most popular students in their classrooms. It is interesting to note (in Table 8.12) that, although innovators and retreatists were more frequently identified as being "alienated" from official school values, they were also more often named as "most popular" by their classmates. The retreatists were most frequently named as "most popular" (with a mean of 2.13), innovators were next frequently named (with a mean of 1.78), ritualists third (with a mean of 1.53) and conformists last (with a mean of 1.44). Thus, it appears that the lack of commitment to educational values by innovators and retreatists is rewarded by popularity among their peers, while the high commitment to education on the part of conformists and ritualists causes them to sacrifice their status among their peers. In terms of Goode's economic conception of role relationships as "role bargains," we can state this situation as follows: innovators and retreatists trade the plaudits for academic success from their parents and teachers for the commendation of their peers for

social success, while conformists and ritualists make the reverse transaction.[15] We will return to this point later in this paper.

At this point, we will examine the relationship of role adaptation (or "alienation"), parental pressure (or "role strain") and cheating as depicted in Table 8.13. The totals in Table 8.13A reveal that innovators most frequently report receiving "a lot or some" pressure from their mothers. But, unexpectedly, they also reveal that the conformists--not the retreatists--are next most likely to report parental pressure. Eighty per cent of the innovators, 72% of the conformists, 63% of the retreatists, and 60% of the ritualists perceive "a lot or some" maternal pressure. And, even more surprising, when we control for grades not only do the conformists remain second most likely to experience maternal pressure, but the retreatists are least likely to report receiving much parental pressure. Among the students with averages of B or better, for example, two-thirds of the innovators, 60% of the conformists, 47% of the ritualists, and only 36% of the retreatists report receiving "a lot or some" maternal pressure. Similar, but less strong, relationships hold among the students with C grades or lower.

The findings in Table 8.13A are even more startling when we compare them to the data in Table 8.13B. For while the conformists are second most likely to report intense maternal pressure, they are least likely to cheat. The innovators, on the other hand, are not only most likely to report much maternal pressure, but are second most likely to cheat. And the retreatists, who are least likely to report receiving much maternal pressure, are most likely to cheat. Even when grades are

Table 8.13

Cheating, Grades, Parental Pressure and Role Types

A

Maternal Pressure by Grades and Role Types

(Per cent "A lot or some")

Current Grades	Student Role Types			
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists
A or B	60% (98)	47% (17)	67% (69)	36% (22)
C or lower	85 (71)	72 (18)	88 (115)	71 (68)
Totals	72 (171)	60 (35)	80 (187)	63 (93)

B

Cheating by Grades and Role Types

(Per cent cheated)

Current Grades	Student Role Types			
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists
A or B	37% (101)	41% (17)	58% (69)	46% (22)
C or lower	41 (71)	56 (18)	60 (117)	68 (70)
Totals	39 (175)	49 (35)	59 (189)	62 (95)

C

Cheating by Maternal Pressure and Role Types

(Per cent cheated)

Students' Report of Maternal Pressure	Student Role Types			
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists
A lot or some	42% (122)	52% (21)	62% (149)	66% (59)
A little or none	25 (48)	43 (14)	50 (38)	53 (34)

controlled for, the rates of cheating among the role types relative to one another do not change significantly. How do we explain these unexpected findings? Since our expectations were, for the most part, confirmed with respect to the ritualists and innovators, it is for the

conformists and retreatists that we seek answers to the following questions. Why should the conformists, who obtain the highest grades and are most committed to educational goals, perceive almost as much pressure from their parents as the innovators--and yet have the lowest rates of cheating? Similarly, why should the retreatists, who obtain the lowest grades and the highest cheating rates, perceive little or no parental pressure? One possible explanation could be that maternal pressure is not correlated with cheating rates for these two role types. But the data in Table 8.13C reveal that this is not the case. In fact, maternal pressure has its greatest impact upon the cheating behavior of conformists and retreatists. Although only 25% of the conformists who perceive "a little or no" pressure cheat, 42% of the conformists who perceive "a lot or some" pressure cheat. Similarly, degree of maternal pressure accounts for a difference of 13% (66% minus 53%) in the cheating rates of retreatists, but a difference of 12% and 9%, respectively, among the innovators and ritualists. Table 8.13C also indicates that role adaptation and maternal pressure both have strong effects upon rates of cheating that are independent.

Since we have the mothers' reports of their own behavior, we obtain some interesting results when we relate their report of pressure to the role adaptation of their children. The retreatists had the largest proportion of mothers (74%) asserting that they exert "a lot or some" pressure upon their children, while the conformists had the smallest proportion of mothers (59%) reporting that they exert much pressure upon their children. Seventy-one per cent of the mothers of innovators and 70% of the mothers of ritualists reported they exert

"a lot or some" pressure. Thus, we have a situation among the conformists where the mothers report exerting "little pressure, but the students report experiencing a lot of pressure. Similarly, among the retreatists where the mothers report exerting much pressure, but the students report experiencing little pressure. If we assume that both role partners are reporting what they believe to be the truth, then the following conclusions might be drawn. The intense pressures perceived by the conformists from their mothers do not result in high cheating rates, but in greater utilization of the institutionalized channels (e.g., doing one's homework and assignments diligently) for academic success. And the high cheating rates among the retreatists are not primarily due to the maternal pressure exerted, but to other role pressures in or outside of the school environment.

While the retreatists were least likely to report experiencing maternal pressure, they were most likely to report being dissatisfied with their school performance. Eighteen per cent of the conformists, 23% of the ritualists, 31% of the innovators and 41% of the retreatists said that they were "not satisfied" with their school achievement. Thus, it is clear that the retreatists are experiencing a great deal of role strain about their inadequate school performance, even if the primary source of the strain is not from their parents. And it is this role pressure that probably accounts for the high cheating rates of the retreatists.

Another important source of role strain for students is the role pressure exerted by their peers. We noted above the effect of peer group associations and peer group status upon cheating rates. Now we

will examine the independent and simultaneous effects of the peer group and role adaptations upon student rates of deviance. The students were asked the following question (taken from Coleman's study, The Adolescent Society):[16]

> Would you say you are a member of the leading crowd in the tenth grade?

Fifty per cent of the (383) students who acknowledged the existence of a leading crowd claimed membership in it. The students' self-reports of their peer group status proved to be reliable measures of their popularity since they strongly correlated with the frequency with which they were named as most popular by their classmates. For example, 43% of those who claimed leading crowd membership were named two or more times as most popular by their peers, but only 24% of those who claimed not to be a member of the leading crowd were so named.

Because we demonstrated above that popularity was positively related to student alienation and cheating, does it follow that the more popular students among the various role types are also more alienated from educational values? The data in Table 14 reveal that the findings vary depending upon the particular role adaptation in question.

In Table 8.14A we find that the leading crowd members among the conformists, ritualists and innovators tend to obtain higher grades than the non-members. Among the ritualists, for example, 57% of those who claim leading crowd membership have B grades or better, while 43% of those who deny leading crowd membership have grades of B or better. This relationship is reversed, however, among the retreatists.

Although about a third (31%) of the retreatists who deny leading crowd membership have B grades or better, only one-fifth (19%) of the retreatists who claim leading crowd membership have grades of B or better. Thus, while good grades appear to be an important criterion for awarding peer group status among the conformists, ritualists, and even among the innovators. They confer no such status among the retreatists. In fact, those with good grades appear to be denied membership in the leading crowd of the retreatists.

In Table 8.14B the findings indicate that leading crowd membership has almost no effect on the cheating rates of conformists, a slight effect upon the cheating behavior of ritualists and innovators, and a strong impact upon the cheating of retreatists. Almost the same proportion of conformists cheat whether they belong to the leading crowd (40%) or not (42%). While the leading crowd members among the ritualists are less likely to cheat (50%) than the nonmembers (57%), the leading crowd members among the innovators are more likely to cheat (64%) than the non-members (57%). And, whereas half (53%) of the retreatists who deny leading crowd membership cheat, three-fourths (76%) of the retreatists who claim leading crowd membership cheat. Thus, the retreatists appear to be most influenced by peer group status while the conformists are least influenced. It should not go unnoticed, however, that the adaptation of innovation is the only role type where the group that has the highest grades (42%) also has the highest rates of cheating (64%). This further suggests that innovators are ambivalent toward the goals of academic success and social success, and probably experience great role strain in trying to achieve both

goals. This ambivalence among the innovators is demonstrated further in Table 8.14C. There we find that the leading crowd members among the innovators participate more often in "intermediate" pursuits such as extra-curricular activities and athletics than in clear-cut academically-oriented "studies" or socially-oriented "dates and parties."

Most of the leading crowd members among the innovators report participating "more" in either athletics (39%) or extra-curricular activities (42%). Such am ambivalence does not exist, however, among either the conformists or retreatists. For most of the leading crowd members among the conformists report participating "more" in studies (40%) or extra-curricular activities (42%); their academic orientation is quite evident. Among the retreatists, however, most of the leading crowd members report participating "more" in athletics (40%) or dates and parties (42%); their social orientation and alienation from educational values are also equally clear. While the ritualists' leading crowd members most often report participating in extra-curricular activities (57%) and athletics (50%), other data clearly demonstrate that ritualists are not ambivalent about the goal of academic success. It appears that the close integration of the conformists into the educational system is facilitated by their membership in a student sub-culture that is highly committed to the academic goals of the system. At the same time, the alienation of the retreatists from educational values is reinforced by membership in a sub-culture which is highly committed to the alternative goal of social success. The value hierarchy of these student sub-cultures assists the conformists and retreatists in making their role allocation decisions. Since the

Table 8.14

Grades, Cheating, Role Types and Peer Group Pressures

A

Grades by Role Types and Crowd Membership

(Per Cent A or B)

Membership in Leading Crowd	Student Role Types			
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists
Yes	67% (73)	57% (14)	42% (66)	19% (37)
No	61 (59)	54 (14)	33 (80)	31 (36)

B

Cheating by Role Types and Crowd Membership

(Per Cent Cheated)

Membership in Leading Crowd	Student Role Types			
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists
Yes	40% (74)	50% (14)	63% (67)	76% (38)
No	42 (59)	57 (14)	57 (80)	53 (36)

C

Peer Associations of Leading Crowd Members ONLY

(Per Cent Participating "More Than Others")

Peer Group Associations	Student Role Types			
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists
Studies	40% (73)	36% (14)	22% (67)	8% (38)
Extra-curricular	42 (74)	57 (14)	32 (66)	21 (38)
Athletics	28 (74)	50 (14)	39 (67)	40 (38)
Dates, parties	18 (74)	29 (14)	25 (67)	42 (38)

D

Cheating by Role Types and Peer Associations

(Per Cent Cheated)

Peer Group Associations (Only of Those Participating "More Than Others")	Student Role Types			
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists
Studies	27% (64)	36% (14)	38% (34)	30% (10)
Extra-curricular	33 (49)	54 (11)	64 (39)	50 (14)
Athletics	28 (43)	73 (11)	72 (51)	69 (26)
Dates, parties	44 (16)	60 (5)	81 (36)	74 (23)

conformists crowd ranks academic success over social success, their time and resources are directed toward achieving scholastic success. The retreatists, on the other hand, direct most of their time and resources toward achieving the goal of social success and peer group popularity. Since the ritualists so closely approximate the orientation of the conformists, their role allocation decisions are quite similar. It is only among the innovators--who are pulled in opposite directions by these conflicting student sub-cultures--that the decisions about allocation of role obligations are most difficult to make. In fact, the data in Table 8.14D indicate that the innovators--no matter what their peer group associations--exhibit the highest rates of cheating among those committed to these activities.

A final means of demonstrating the role ambivalence of innovators is to observe the rank distribution of the responses to the following question (taken from Coleman's adolescent sub-culture study) among the four role adaptations (for boys only):

> If you could be remembered at school for one of the three things below, which one would you want it to be: brilliant student, athletic star, or most popular?

The mothers of the boys in our sample were also asked this question. Seventy-five per cent of the 215 mothers said that they would want their son to be most remembered as a "brilliant student," 17% as "most popular," and 8% as an "athletic star." The boys, however, had somewhat different value-preferences. Thirty-nine per cent (of 259 boys) wanted to be remembered as an "athletic star," 34% as a "brilliant student," and 27% as "most popular." Thus, while the mothers ranked brilliant students first, the students ranked it second; and,

while the mothers ranked athletic star third, the boys ranked it first. Coleman obtained rankings among the mothers and students identical to those we obtained.[17] What accounts for this "ambivalent" ranking among the boys of athletic star first and brilliant student, a close second? The answer can be found in Table 8.15 below, when student value-preference is distributed according to individual role adaptation.

Looking first at the rank-ordering within each role type we see that the conformists and ritualists have identical rankings: "brilliant student" is ranked first, "most popular," second, and "athletic star," third and last. This is the same rank-ordering as that of the mothers of the students. Thus, the value-orientation of the conformists and ritualists closely approximate the value-orientation of most parents.

Table 8.15

Boys' Value-Preference by Role Types

Total Rank Order	Boys Want to Be Remembered as	Student Role Types: Conformists Rank Order	Conformists Per Cent	Ritualists Rank Order	Ritualists Per Cent	Innovators Rank Order	Innovators Per Cent	Retreatists Rank Order	Retreatists Per Cent
2	Brilliant student	1	45%	1	50%	2	37%	3	14%
3	Most popular	2	29	2	38	3	20	2	32
1	Athletic star	3	26	3	12	1	43	1	54
	N =		(73)		(16)		(124)		(56)

The retreatists, on the other hand, have a rank-ordering that is the inverse of the ranking by the conformists and ritualists: that is, athletic star ranks first, followed by most popular, and brilliant

student, last. The innovators, however, express their ambivalence by ranking athletic star first and brilliant student, second. Again, we have further empirical confirmation that: (1) in the value hierarchy of conformists and ritualists, the goal of academic success is more highly evaluated than the goal of social success; (2) in the value hierarchy of retreatists, however, the goal of social success is given priority over academic success; and (3) in the value system of innovators, academic and social success are of equal high rank. Since the largest number of boys are innovators (124), they set an "ambivalent" tone for the students as a whole. This explains why the students, in general, ranked brilliant student second to athletic star instead of third.

Throughout this fourth sub-section we have attempted to demonstrate the utility of employing Merton's concept of individual role adaptations as a research tool in analyses of deviant behavior. Since role adaptation is an attribute of an individual, it can be argued that the rate of cheating is determined by group, and not individual adaptations. In other words, do individuals exhibit deviant behavior because of their own role adaptation or because of the large number of individuals in their immediate environment who have made deviant adaptations? This is the type of question that Blau says must be asked in order to distinguish "structural" group effects from "individual" effects.[18]

In order to determine the relative impact of individual as opposed to collective adaptations upon rates of cheating, we created an aggregated measure of "classroom adaptations" based upon the proportion of

conformists present in a classroom. Each of the twenty-two classroom units was classified as "conformist-oriented" or "deviant-oriented," respectively, depending on whether its proportion of conformists was above or below the mean of 35%. In Table 8.16 we present the independent and simultaneous effects of classroom adaptations and individual adaptations upon rates of cheating.

Table 8.16

Proportions Cheating by Role Type and Classroom Adaptations

Classroom Adaptations	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	Totals
Conformist-oriented	32% (91)	45% (20)	53% (40)	32% (25)	38% (176)
Deviant-oriented	46 (83)	53 (15)	61 (149)	73 (70)	59 (317)

The totals in Table 8.16 indicate, as might be expected, that a strong relationship exists between classroom adaptations and cheating: whereas 38% of the students in "conformist-oriented" classrooms cheat, 59% of those in "deviant-oriented" classrooms cheat. When role type is introduced, this relationship is specified for certain role types. Although its impact upon the cheating rates of retreatists is doubled (a 41% difference), its effect on the cheating of the other three role types is much less. Nevertheless, among every role type, an increase in the proportion of deviant adaptations in the classroom context results in an increase in the amount of cheating in that context. Although the effect of role type on cheating has been reduced slightly for these students situated in "conformist-oriented" classrooms, it is

evident that individual and group adaptations have strong independent effects on deviant behavior.

Consequently, to account for rates of deviant behavior one must assess the relative effects of both collective and individual orientations. For a conformist placed in a deviant environment will cheat more (46%) than if located in a conformist context (32%). Similarly, with the retreatists, who exhibit the same cheating rates (32%) as conformists who are also located in conformists-oriented contexts. On the whole, however, our data tend to indicate that individual adaptations have a greater impact upon deviance rates than group adaptations.

V. Visibility of Cheating

In the preceding sub-sections we tried to demonstrate that both parental and peer group pressures were important sources of role strain which, for many students, led to high rates of cheating. But cheating, by its very nature, is much more difficult to observe than other forms of deviance such as cutting school, disruptive classroom behavior, or fighting with one's peers. How do parents, for example, know whether or not their children cheat on tests or examinations--when they are not in the classroom to observe their behavior? Even more to the point, to what extent are teachers aware of the incidence of cheating occurring in their classroom? What kinds of students are more likely to have accurate (or inaccurate) perception of the amount of cheating going on around them? Are cheaters more aware of the incidence of cheating in their immediate environment than non-cheaters? We will

attempt to obtain answers to these questions in this final sub-section.

The mothers of the tenth graders in our sample were asked whether their children ever cheated on tests or examinations. Almost seven out of eight mothers (83% of 384) reported that their children never cheated on exams--or, 17% reported that their children did cheat. When we compare this result to their children's own report that 51% of the 384 students whose mothers were interviewed cheat on exams, we realize how ignorant the parents are of the cheating behavior of their children. The parents are under-estimating the cheating rates by at least 34%.

> The English teachers in our study were asked the following question:
>
> About how many of the students in your English class ever cheat on tests or exams in any of their subjects: all or almost all, more than half, about half, less than half, or very few or none?
>
> Similarly, all of the students were asked:
>
> About how many of the students in your English class ever cheat on tests or exams in any of their subjects: all of them, most, some, a few, or none?

In order to determine the accuracy of perception of each of the three role partners (parents, teachers and students) with regard to the incidence of cheating, we ranked the 22 classroom units along several dimensions. First, the classes were ranked in terms of the per cent of students reporting their own cheating behavior; the percentage cheating ranged from 11.1% to 92.9%. Three rank-order correlations were made: 1) the first, correlated the percentage self-reported cheating with the cheating rates reported by the mothers of the students; 2) the second, correlated self-reported cheating with the cheating rates perceived by the teachers; and 3) the third, correlated

self-reported cheating with the cheating rates perceived by the students.

The Spearman rank-order correlations for the first two role partners were statistically insignificant. We obtained a coefficient of .246 for the mothers' report of cheating behavior and .301 for the teachers' perception of the incidence of cheating. Thus, what the mother or teacher reported had little or no relationship to the reality of the situation. In the classroom where 92.9% of the students reported that they cheated, for example, only 21% of the mothers said that their children ever cheat, while the English teacher of that class reported that "very few or none" of the children in that class ever cheat.

Among the students, however, we obtained a statistically significant coefficient of .657 for the correlation between self-reported cheating and perceived incidence of cheating by the classroom peers. Thus, as the actual rate of cheating increased, the students perceived a larger proportion of students who cheated. We will now attempt to briefly examine some of the factors that affect students' accuracy of perception of the cheating behavior of their peers. In Table 8.17 we can observe the correlation of perceived incidence of cheating to various individual attributes.

Table 8.17A reveals that students' grades are not important determinants of their accuracy of perception of cheating behavior. For almost the same proportion of students (62% as opposed to 58%) report that only "a few or none" cheat regardless of whether they, themselves, have high or low grades.

Table 8.17

Perceived Incidence of Cheating

A

Perceived Incidence by Grades
(Per Cent "A Few or None")

A or B	C or Lower
62% (194)	58% (266)

B

Perceived Incidence by Peer Disapproval
(Per Cent "A Few or None")

Very Strong	Fairly Strong	Not Strong	Not at All Strong
69% (70)	69% (89)	57% (169)	53% (135)

C

Perceived Incidence by Role Types
(Per Cent "A Few or None")

Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists
65% (159)	67% (33)	60% (173)	49% (90)

D

Perceived Incidence by Cheating
(Per Cent "A Few or None")

Never Cheated	Cheated
74% (222)	47% (243)

In Table 8.17B, however, we see that the stronger the degree of perceived peer disapproval of cheating, the more likely are students to perceive fewer students cheating. Among the students who say their peers do not disapprove of cheating at all, 53% report that only "a few or none" cheat, but 69% of the students whose peers "very strongly" disapprove of cheating report "a few or none" cheat.

A similar relationship can be found in Table 8.17C, where there is little difference in the perception of cheating among the conformists, ritualists, and innovators. Sixty per cent of the innovators, 67% of the ritualists, and 65% of the conformists perceive only "a few or none" cheating. The retreatists, on the other hand, are more likely to perceive a larger number of students cheating. For only 49% of the retreatists perceive "a few or none" cheating.

Since it is also possible that students are projecting their own behavior in Table 8.17D we correlate ever cheating with perceived incidence of cheating. This variable appears to account for the largest variance in perception of cheating thus far. While less than half (47%) of the cheaters perceive "a few or none" cheating, three-fourths (74%) of the non-cheaters perceive "a few or none" cheating. Thus, it appears that own cheating behavior is a primary determinant of students' perception of cheating among their peers.

In Tables 8.18A and 8.18B we again relate peer disapproval and role type to perceived incidence of cheating, but this time controlling for own cheating behavior. We find that among the non-cheaters, neither perceived peer disapproval nor role type determines the incidence of cheating perceived. Non-cheating conformists, for example, perceive the same incidence (74%) of cheating as non-cheating retreatists (73%). On the other hand, peer disapproval and role type do have a slight effect upon the incidence of cheating perceived by students who themselves are cheaters.

In order to determine whether perceived incidence of cheating was solely a function of one's own cheating behavior or a result of the

cheating environment in which one is located, we constructed an aggregated variable of "classroom cheating context." This was constructed by ranking the 22 classroom units in terms of percentage self-reported cheating and separating the classrooms that had cheating rates over 50% from those with lower cheating rates.

Table 8.18

Perceived Incidence by Own Cheating and Other Factors

A

Perceived Incidence by Peer Disapproval and Cheating
(Per Cent "A Few or None")

Cheating Behavior	Very Strong	Fairly Strong	Not Strong	Not at All Strong
Never cheated	72% (50)	77% (52)	75% (79)	71% (38)
Cheated	58 (19)	57 (37)	42 (90)	45 (97)

B

Perceived Incidence by Role Type and Cheating
(Per Cent "A Few or None")

Cheating Behavior	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists
Never cheated	74% (98)	77% (17)	74% (66)	73% (33)
Cheated	50 (60)	56 (16)	51 (107)	35 (57)

C

Perceived Incidence by Own Cheating and Cheating Context
(Per Cent "A Few or None")

Classroom Cheating Behavior	Never Cheated	Cheated	Totals
Up to 50% cheat	80% (156)	57% (102)	71% (258)
Over 50% cheat	61 (66)	40 (141)	46 (207)

In Table 8.18C we correlate this aggregated variable with students own cheating behavior. We find that perceived incidence of cheating among one's peers is not merely a projection of one's own behavior, but also

a function of the actual incidence of cheating in one's environment. In fact, individual cheating behavior and classroom cheating context have about the same independent effects upon the incidence of cheating perceived. For example, non-cheating students in a high cheating environment perceive about the same incidence of cheating (61%) as a cheater in a low cheating environment (57%). The cumulative effects of individual and group cheating behavior account for a 40% difference (80% minus 40%) in the perceived incidence of cheating among one's peers.

VI. Summary

In this section we have attempted to determine the degree to which role strain and alienation are correlated with student deviant behavior. Our primary indicator of role strain was the degree of perceived maternal pressure, and the role pressures exerted by the students' peers provided additional measures of role strain among the students. For the purposes of this analysis we defined student alienation as the "lack of commitment to educational values." Our measure of alienation resulted from an operationalization of Merton's four modes of individual adaptations--conformity, ritualism, innovation and retreatism.

The theoretical framework for this analysis was based largely upon Goode's theory of role strain. Our thesis was as follows: All students are subjected to conflicting role pressures from their parents, teachers, and peers to attain either the goal of academic success or social success, or both. But in order to be academically successful,

one must devote many hours to classroom work, homework assignments and outside reading. Similarly, to be socially successful or popular, one must spend a lot of time attending dances and parties and/or going out for some sports activity. All students, therefore, must decide how they will allocate their limited time and resources between these two alternative ends.

We also attempted to show that the more alienated students (i.e., the innovators and retreatists) are more likely to resort to cheating as a mechanism for reducing role strain than the less alienated students (like the conformists and ritualists). Some of the more significant findings of this study are as follows:

1) Students' perceived maternal pressure was a more powerful predictor of cheating than were the mothers' own reports of the amount of pressure exerted, or the perceived paternal pressure.

2) Perceived peer disapproval and peer group associations were significantly correlated with cheating behavior of students. Furthermore, the more popular students were more likely to cheat than the less popular students.

3) Both parental and peer group pressures have strong independent effects upon the cheating behavior.

4) Merton's typology of role adaptations proved to be a useful measure of student alienation and a powerful predictor of cheating rates.

5) Innovators and conformists perceived a higher degree of maternal pressure than ritualists or retreatists. Yet, while the innovators resorted to cheating to reduce their role strain, the

conformists adhered to institutionalized channels to attain the goal of academic success.

6) While the retreatists perceived little maternal pressure, they were most dissatisfied with their inadequate school performance. Retreatists, who were most popular among the students, appeared to be more responsive to the pressures of their peers than to those exerted by their parents.

7) The retreatists and innovators exhibited the highest rates of cheating. The innovators, who were highly committed to the goals of academic success as well as the goal of social success exhibited a high degree of role ambivalence.

8) Both individual and group role adaptations have independent effects upon cheating rates.

9) The perceived incidence of cheating among one's peers is a function of (a) the individual's own cheating behavior and (b) the incidence of cheating in the individual's immediate environment.

10) The low visibility of cheating among the parents and teachers appears to serve the function of integrating the roles and statuses in school systems. It provides a means of insulating student behavior so that the role expectations of all three significant role partners--their teachers, their parents and their peers--can be satisfactorily met.

FOOTNOTES

1. William J. Goode, "A Theory of Role Strain," American Sociological Review, August, 1960, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 483-496.

2. Ibid., p. 483.

3. Robert K. Merton, "Social Structure and Anomie," Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press, 1957), pp. 131-194, revised edition.

4. William J. Bowers, Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964.

5. Ibid., p. 73.

6. Neal Gross, et al., Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: Wiley, 1958).

7. Bowers, op. cit., p. 69.

8. Ibid., pp. 68-69.

9. Ibid., pp. 69-70.

10. Ibid., pp. 146-150.

11. Ibid., p. 144.

12. Merton, op. cit., pp. 131-194.

13. Robert K. Merton, "Anomie, Anomia, and Social Interaction: Contexts of Deviant Behavior," in Marshall B. Clinard (ed.), Anomie and Deviant Behavior (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), pp. 213-242.

14. Robert B. Hill, Merton's Role Types and Paradigm of Deviance, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1967.

15. Goode, op. cit., pp. 487-489.

16. James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society (New York: Free Press, 1961).

17. Ibid., pp. 30, 33.

18. Peter M. Blau, "Structural Effects," American Sociological Review, XXV (April, 1960), pp. 178-193.

SECTION IX

CONCLUSION

We began this report by pointing out that there is a series of exchanges that routinely take place between the home and the school about which we have very little systematic information. Accordingly, we designed a study that would enable us to explore the mutual perceptions, behavior, and attitudes of the role partners who are the key participants in this continuing drama of mutual dependence.

The general framework around which this report has been organized is based on the discussion of social integration presented in the introductory section. However, the findings that we have reported can be viewed from at least three different perspectives: (1) the relationship of these findings to the general orientation in Section I; (2) substantive issues of education related to the major topics of the individual sections; and (3) suggestions for further research. This section will touch briefly upon each of these topics.

Social Integration Revisited

In the Introductory section of this report we pointed out that there are three key elements of social integration: shared norms, coordinated behavior, and mutual attraction. Since these elements may be inaccurately perceived by group members, it is necessary for the researcher to distinguish actual norms, behavior, and attraction from those that are perceived by various actors in the system. A structural characteristic of social organization that greatly impedes or facilitates

the accuracy of these perceptions is observability, and the effects of differing amounts of agreement or disagreement among the key elements are also contingent upon the importance that is attached to them by group members. A number of propositions were then stated about the relationships among the elements of social integration and their consequences under differing conditions of accuracy of perception, observability, and importance. Let us begin this section by reviewing a few of the findings that would seem to illustrate each of these propositions.

(1) Perceived dissensus, non-conformity, or negative affects will be more disruptive when importance is high, and more tolerable when importance is low.

The impact on mothers of the belief that the school does not emphasize the goals they most prefer is more pronounced than the impact on students and teachers, who assign higher importance to less general aspects of the school situation. Teachers and students do, however, consider the goal orientation of the mother to be important.

Students who do not consider grades very important are more satisfied with their own performance when grades are low than students who consider grades very important.

(2) Perceptions are more likely to be accurate when actors are in positions of high observability.

Mothers' knowledge of school practices is more accurate when schools provide opportunities for them to visit and interact with school staff.

Teachers and mothers tend to have a symmetrical observability such that teachers are often aware of the preferences of mothers but mothers seldom know much about the teachers' orientations.

Students more often agree with teachers in their description of the teacher than the mothers, who have usually not been in the classroom.

(3) Actors are more likely to perceive consensus, conformity, and positive affect when these are especially important.

Mothers and teachers perceive more positive affect among students toward the school and toward teachers when the students are younger and thus more dependent on adults and external controls.

Mothers, more often than teachers and students, perceive the school as the type they most prefer; and perceived organizational nonconformity is more disruptive to them.

(4) Actors are more likely to misperceive consensus, conformity and positive affect when importance is high and observability is low.

Mothers and teachers perceive students as not cheating even in situations where cheating is common, but students are aware of higher cheating rates.

Mothers perceive teachers as being the type they prefer and the school as the type they prefer even though they are usually in a poor position to make these judgments.

Mothers and teachers are aware that older children like school and teachers less than younger children, but they underestimate the extent of dislike among the older children by a considerable margin.

(5) Actors are likely to make special efforts to obtain accurate information when importance is high and observability is low.

Mothers make special efforts to obtain information about the school when this is not provided routinely.

Mothers continue to talk with their children about school regularly even when the children are older and more independent.

(6) Actors are more likely to make special efforts to conceal behavior or affect that they perceive as opposing expectations important to their role partners.

Students perceive the mothers and teachers as disapproving of cheating, and they successfully conceal their own cheating behavior.

Teachers in school settings where they accurately perceive mothers as wanting more authoritarian teaching styles, successfully conceal their own preferences from the mothers and are less often described accurately by the mothers.

(7) Perceived dissensus, conformity, and negative affect are more disruptive than actual, but unknown dissensus, nonconformity and negative affect.

Perceived disagreement with mothers produces more role strain among teachers than actual disagreements of which they are unaware.

Students seldom expect to complete college unless they perceive their mothers as wanting them to, but they frequently expect to complete college when their mothers actually do not expect them to because they misperceive their mothers' aspirations.

It is clear from the above that we have been able to find a number of illustrations for each of the propositions about social

integration that were offered tentatively at the beginning of the report. But it is also clear that these illustrations do not capture many of the interesting and provocative aspects of the educational system that our investigations have revealed. It seems appropriate, therefore, to remind the reader that the introductory discussion of the concept of integration was undertaken with the limited intention of locating and clarifying the general set of problems with which the study deals. Accordingly, while we have attempted to remain relatively close to the taxonomic elements presented in the initial discussion of social integration, we have also allowed the empirical evidence to take us rather far away from the constraints of the propositions themselves.

Many of the topics that we have covered represent areas that heretofore have not been explored appreciably by empirical research. As a result, the findings we have presented have been, in effect, descriptive "discoveries" about the educational system, and these are interesting and worthy of consideration in and of themselves. Despite the exploratory nature of much of this material, we have been guided by three general questions in these undertakings: (1) whether teachers, parents, and students agree or think they agree; (2) the conditions under which they tend to agree or think they agree; and (3) what difference it makes whether they agree or think they agree. Let us briefly review some of the more salient findings of the individual sections keeping these questions in mind.

A Review of Findings

We began by considering the most general topic of the study, the goals of education; and we found that given their choice among four general orientations of schools, majorities of mothers and teachers prefer an intellectual emphasis. This preference is more pronounced among the mothers, but there is some movement toward the practical emphasis among mothers when their children reach high school. The teachers tend to prefer the personal orientation second most frequently, but the high school students prefer the intellectual and practical school with equal frequency. As a result, there is far more actual consensus on goals among mothers and teachers connected with elementary schools than among those connected with high schools.

The preference of mothers for an intellectual emphasis in the schools is strongly related to the educational level of the mothers and their husbands, which suggests that as educational levels rise in our society, this preference may well become even more pronounced.

Despite the lack of overall agreement on educational goals between teachers and mothers, there appear to be several reasons why this seldom results in open controversy. First of all, the goals are themselves rather diffuse and ill-defined, and mothers, by virtue of their low observability, find it difficult to adequately monitor the school. At the same time, most participants in the system are willing to concede that a number of school goals are important, and thus evidence that school activities are at any given moment devoted to any one of these goals makes that activity legitimate. Moreover, majorities of mothers, teachers, and students believe that the school

is most like the type they prefer. This belief is strongest amongst the mothers, and they are the ones for whom this belief is most important. However, satisfaction with the performance of the students in school has a far greater impact on mothers, teachers, and students alike, than any other factor in the system that we identified; and hence anything that reflects performance levels will have strong potential for disruption of the system. We shall return to this problem below.

In considering the preferences of mothers among four general teaching styles, we found these were also related to both the ages of their children and to the level of educational origins. But while there is no overall consensus on any particular style of teacher among the mothers, the teachers overwhelmingly describe themselves as discovery oriented. This was interpreted as reflecting a professional normative orientation about teaching, and it was also found to be shared by the principals.

Mothers with less education were found to have a higher preference for authoritarian styles of teaching in contrast with the more highly educated, who frequently share with the teachers a preference for the discovery style. But mothers are heavily content-oriented regardless of whether they are authoritarian or permissive. Students prefer the discovery style of teacher more often than their mothers, and they more often agree with the teachers' self-descriptions. Both mothers and students express dissatisfaction when they perceive the teacher to be most like a type they do not most prefer. But teachers report their jobs as more rewarding when they perceive

disagreement with the mothers over teaching styles, and this was interpreted as reflecting a need among teachers for both expertise and autonomy.

We next turned to the problem of the observability of school systems by mothers. We found that the formal arrangements provided by schools for parents to visit and to interact with the staff are more prevelant in both suburban and in more middle-class areas, but the interest expressed by mothers in these matters is relatively high regardless of the opportunities provided. Moreover, mothers tend to utilize opportunities more frequently the more they are offered. But high school mothers are less often provided with as many opportunities to participate in school affairs as elementary school mothers, and they do not take advantage of these opportunities as frequently when they are offered. Mothers from college level homes also tend to utilize opportunities to visit the school more frequently than non-college mothers, but the latter will visit frequently when the opportunities are adequately provided.

Mothers' knowledge about school practices tends to be considerably lower than their knowledge about school personnel. Both educational level of the home and opportunities offered by the school are related to level of knowledge, and elementary school mothers tend to know more about personnel while high school mothers know more about practices. Moreover, open-door policy is associated with a reduction of the gap between middle-class and working-class involvement and knowledge, and a by-product of such a policy seems to be that mothers vote more frequently in school elections and are generally more supportive of the schools.

In the section on socialization, achievement and alienation, a number of findings were seen to be highly related to age and sex of the child. In addition, very similar patterns were found in the responses of mothers, teachers, and students alike.

First we found that mothers and teachers both reported more frequent use of expressive, affective, and sanctioning responses with younger children and more frequent assigning of chores and discussion of controversial events with older children. Mothers also reported losing their tempers more often, having fun less often, and more often punishing their sons than their daughters.

When marks the children received from school were taken into consideration, boys were found to receive fewer high marks than girls, and older children fewer than younger children. Mothers' attitudes toward their children and toward the school were seen to be strongly related to the marks received, and this was especially pronounced in the higher grades. Moreover, the students' attitudes were also seen to be linked to their academic performance levels. Mothers and teachers both saw the older students as liking school and teachers less than the younger students, and the higher prevalence of negative attitudes among boys than girls was confirmed by mothers and students alike. In short, there was strong evidence that feedback from the school concerning the child's performance is a major determinant of parents' orientations toward their children and school, and of childrens' orientations toward the school, teachers, and themselves. Virtually all participants in the system concede the very high importance of marks, and boys, older children and children from lower

educational origins are thus seen to be more often associated with negative attitudes and experiences among mothers, teachers, and students alike.

We next turned to the question of the extent of agreement or consensus on educational plans between mothers and the tenth grade students. We found that agreement between the mothers and their children is extremely high regardless of whether one considers the aspirations and expectations of mothers and students or the perceptions the students held of their mothers' aspirations. The same general factors seem to be related to each of these variables with socio-educational origin, I.Q. of student and student's performance and placement in school playing especially important roles.

Agreement between mothers and their children is generally higher on college plans and aspirations than on lower levels of ambition. Disagreement is higher under circumstances that rarely occur or circumstances that consist of factors some of which are associated with high plans and aspirations and others of which are associated with low plans and ambitions. However, the perception by students that their mothers want them to complete college was seen to be essential to the students' having such plans and aspirations themselves regardless of whether this perception is accurate.

In the final substantive section, we undertook an examination and analysis of the extent to which role strain and alienation among high school students is related to deviant behavior. Students were seen as subjected to conflicting role pressures from their parents, teachers, and peers in order to attain goals of academic success,

social success, or both. Alienation was measured in relation to the amount of commitment to educational values.

The more alienated students were seen to be more likely to cheat as a mechanism for reducing role strain. Perceived maternal pressure, perceived peer disapproval, and an operationalization of four major role adaptations developed by Merton were each found to be highly and independently related to cheating rates, and both individual and group characteristics were seen to have independent effects upon cheating rates. The low visibility of cheating rates among parents and teachers was seen as facilitating integration of the system by allowing students to satisfactorily meet the role expectations of parents, teachers, and students alike.

A brief overview of the more salient findings also suggests additional generalizations that cut across the boundaries of the individual sections. A few of these are briefly presented below.

Elementary schools and schools in suburbs and in higher socio-educational settings would seem to be more highly integrated with their constituents than high schools, schools in cities, or schools in lower socio-economic areas according to a number of different measures. For example, majorities of both teachers and mothers have a preference for intellectual goals at the elementary school level, but mothers move toward the practical goals at the high school level while teachers move toward the personal. The preference for intellectual goals among mothers is also somewhat higher in suburbs and among the more highly educated. There is also higher agreement between the preferences of mothers for specific styles of teachers and the

self-description of teachers in elementary schools and suburban schools, and among mothers from college homes. Both observability and knowledge among constituencies of mothers tend to be higher in the same settings. As a result, it seems safe to assume that when crises occur in elementary schools, suburban schools, or schools that serve more highly educated mothers, the teachers and mothers will have a number of underlying values and beliefs in common to form the basis of new agreements or understanding. However, when crises occur in high schools, city schools, or schools serving mothers with lower educational attainment, mothers may become aware of disagreements with school personnel that they did not know existed. One implication of this would seem to be that the current stress on decentralization of schools and greater parental involvement in schools in the cities will serve to accentuate many of these latent differences in orientations of the school personnel and the mothers and the resulting disputes will be difficult to resolve.

The above differences between the home and the school are reinforced by the fact that all participants in the system are oriented toward achieving maximum performance levels from the students; but high performance is distributed unevenly in the system, and the rewards are allocated according to a sliding scale that obscures objective difference more severely at the elementary school level. Thus while I.Q. scores and achievement levels are higher in more middle-class settings, feedback from the school about the performance level of children tends to hide this fact in working-class areas of the elementary school level where just as many A's and B's are given

as in the more affluent areas. In this way, the mothers are deluded into believing that the academic achievement and potential of their children is higher than it actually is. The elementary schools in the working-class areas are able to maintain harmonious relations with their constituencies by denying mothers the information that would have enabled them to attempt to correct the situation before the child is allocated to a slower or non-academic group in the high school.

There would seem to be little doubt that the recent wide publicity and publication of standardized reading test scores in our major cities such as Washington, D.C. and New York have made many parents aware for the first time that their children are performing below grade level in the elementary schools. Given their high initial educational aspiration for their children and their strong orientation toward the performance of their children in school, it is not surprising that parents in these settings are now demanding that the schools do something about this situation. Whether this is a corrective response from mothers that will have any ultimate impact on the actual performance levels of the children is an open question at this point. But the fact that this response has occurred suggests that our finding that the tendency of working-class mothers to blame the young child more frequently for his own failures rather than blaming themselves or the teachers may have been partly a result of a lack of adequate information, pluralistic ignorance, and low observability among these mothers. The release of standardized test scores that reveal whole schools where average reading achievement is well below grade level seems to have redefined the situation for many mothers

in these areas, and these schools will have to find a new means of maintaining harmony with mothers who are so sensitive to the performance levels of their children.

Another structural characteristic of the schools that is highly related to the level of integration with students, mothers, and teachers is the tracking system. We have seen that there is higher consensus on educational goals and teaching style preferences among all role partners in the faster track classes, and every indicator of role strain, dissatisfaction, and low affect is more heavily concentrated among the students in the slower track groups. Given the fact that success in school is considered very important by the vast majority of participants at all levels, the high schools must confront the consequences of clustering the less successful together into a lower stratum. The fact that the slower track also recruits disproportionately from the lower socio-economic groups in cities tends to reinforce the lower integration that already exists with these constituencies; and recently the accusation that the system was discriminating along racial lines led to the abolition of tracking by court order in the Washington, D.C. schools. Regardless of whether the tracking system in the high schools in our study was discriminatory, it is obvious that the slower groups and non-college oriented groups present serious problems to our educational system in all social settings; and as proportionsattending college continue to increase, these problems may well become even more pronounced.

Perhaps the most anomalous finding that recurs at several different points in our analysis is the fact that the integration of

boys into the system is lower than the integration of girls. That is to say, with success in the occupational structure of our society becoming increasingly linked with academic achievement, it is curious that we perpetuate an educational system that is less successful with those who will be most active in the occupational structure. It is clear from our data that mothers show evidence of more stress in raising sons than daughters and that it takes higher levels of school performance from sons to satisfy both the mothers and their sons. Yet boys perform less satisfactorily in school according to the grades they earn and they are clearly more alienated from the school and more frequently dislike teachers. Whether this is an inevitable consequence of sending boys to elementary schools where feminine authority prevails, a result of a system that rewards compliance and conformity while punishing independence and creativity, a commentary on an unimaginative curriculum, or a result of some combination of these or other factors is not ascertainable from our data. But the fact that the system does a poorer job with the boys is undeniable. Yet we are not aware of any significant efforts to better understand this problem or to alter the schools in order to correct it.

Suggestions for Further Research

The findings and analysis contained in this report do not begin to exhaust the potential of the data we have collected. As noted earlier, some of the data contained in this report are analyzed in greater detail in the dissertations written by Drs. Friedman, Hill and Sandis. However, a cursory inspection of the instruments in

Appendix B will reveal that there are many substantive issues and refinements about which we have considerable data that are not analyzed at all in this report. We are continuing to analyze these data and will briefly indicate some of our plans below. In addition, there are a number of findings that raise questions which we are unable to answer given the limitations of our study design and data. We shall conclude with a few remarks about these.

Plans for Further Analysis

Perhaps the most potentially productive and yet frustrating aspect of this study has been the unusual design that it employs. The clustering of socially related respondents allowed us to ask a number of relational questions of each role partner, and there are examples of these in each section of the report. However, the procedures of survey research have emerged from a tradition of sampling isolated individuals as respondents, and there was little guidance to be found for selecting the most appropriate or fruitful ways of analyzing data of the type we had collected. We made a number of errors as we proceeded, and we found, for example, that we had to place the data on tape in a number of different ways in order to analyze it using different units of analysis. We were not, however, able to fully exploit all the options available to us. Thus there is a heavy methodological component to one of the directions that we plan to take in our future analysis of the data. There are two especially interesting units of analysis that are not used appreciably in this report: the triad of mother, teacher and student, and the classrooms of students. We hope to explore both of these more fully in the near future.

Secondly, there are many items in our instruments that will permit far more consideration of consensus between role partners than we have undertaken up to this point. Our preliminary analysis of these reveal that agreement is very high on some issues and quite low on others. We hope that further analysis will allow more systematic specification of the conditions and consequences of these situations.

Thirdly, most of this report has been based on pre-coded responses to highly structured items. There are, however, many questions that are open-ended in the interview schedules, and the responses are now fully coded. Thus, for example, we can now go beyond saying that mothers are dissatisfied with schools in certain communities, and explore in greater depth their own explanations for dissatisfaction. These open-ended questions may also help to confirm or refute the interpretations we have offered for some of the patterns revealed by the closed responses.

The design of our study has, of course, allowed us to do analysis and to make statements that most surveys would not permit, but it has also placed limitations on the confidence with which we can make certain generalizations from our findings. The most obvious limitation stems from the fact that our respondents are not a sample from any definable population, and thus we cannot generalize the responses obtained as accurate estimates or descriptions of any known population in the larger society. Since our purpose in doing the study was not descriptive, we do not consider this a serious limitation. There are, however, two limitations of the design that we do think are important to note.

First, we did not include elementary school students in the sample although the first and fifth grade mothers and teachers were included. As a result, when we find very high agreement or disagreement with students at the high school level, or pronounced changes in responses associated with age of the child, we cannot help but wonder what additional information could be gotten from the responses of the younger children. Would the younger students, for example, really like school and teachers as much as the mothers and teachers think, or does negative affect set in long before the adults perceive it? Are there some issues where mother-child agreement is very high at an early age and very low later, and vice versa? Such questions must be answered if we are to enrich our understanding of socialization beyond the fragmentary knowledge that we now possess. But such questions can only be answered by including the younger children in the sample.

The second major limitation of the study design is the fact that it is cross-sectional rather than longitudinal. Survey researchers have learned to tread a very narrow path through the pitfalls of causal analysis based on data collected at only one point in time, and we sometimes make assumptions about the time order of variables that are highly suspect. This point was continually on our minds when we dealt with the problem of parental persuasion of their children on educational plans in Section VII. Ironically we felt compelled to be more conservative about the assumptions we made about the direction of causality in this section, where our data were relatively complete, than in other sections, where our reasoning had to be based on far more fragmentary evidence. However, educational plans is an "over-researched"

area compared with most of those that we have discussed. Our evidence that parental plans for their children were seriously altered by the experience of the child in school ran contrary to an assumption about the time order of variables that is contained in much of the survey research on this issue, and we felt it was necessary to offer our contrary evidence as a possible antedote. Clearly we need detailed longitudinal data to move on beyond the point of understanding that we have now reached in this area. But it is equally clear that longitudinal data are needed to substantiate a number of generalizations that we have made about changes that take place over time. Inclusion of the younger children in the design and better record-keeping as social bookkeeping on the part of the schools would increase our knowledge considerably, but in the final analysis there is no adequate substitute for systematic longitudinal data, if we are to make generalizations about social process. Thus while our design has been complex, it will doubtless appear simple in comparison with the designs that future research will require.

APPENDIX A

SELECTING IDEAL-TYPICAL COMMUNITIES AND GAINING ACCESS TO THEIR SCHOOLS FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH PURPOSES*

I. Introduction

This appendix is an attempt to make explicit the procedures utilized and the major problems involved in selecting and gaining access to communities for the New Jersey Study. It includes descriptions of the slow, tedious, and sometimes painful steps that had to be taken to ensure the selection of communities which would conform to an abstract model and hence reduce the possibility of introducing unknown variables that might influence results. The procedures employed follow in the tradition of studies that attempt to select ideal-typical communities. However, unlike most such studies, we have made a self-conscious attempt to document the specific manner in which census and other available published data were combined with more qualitative and visual checks in the belief that these procedures will be interesting and useful to other researchers. In addition, we have included a description of some of the problems we encountered in attempting to gain access to schools, since refusal of access poses a serious threat to those sociologists who consider schools strategic research sites.[1]

---

*This appendix was co-authored by Nathalie S. Friedman.

[1]It should be noted that Coleman had considerable difficulty gaining cooperation from large city school systems for his impressive study of racial inequalities in education. Indeed, his batting average was so poor in the Northeastern States that he was apparently forced to include Washington, D.C. as a Northeastern city. (James S. Coleman and others, Equality of Educational Opportunity, Washington, D.C.: U.S.O.E., 1966). For a description of Washington, D.C. school characteristics see Anna Lee Hopson and David E. Wilder, A Study of Teachers in The Public Schools of Washington, D.C., N.Y., BASR, 1967.

One of the major aims of the design of the New Jersey study was to maximize the opportunity for identifying structural features of communities which affect school-parent relationships. In a general sense we were interested in the extent to which there are differences in the way in which people in contrasting community settings react to the schools which their children are attending, and whether school goals and practices are colored by community features such as composition of the labor force, size, commutation rate, and educational level. These concerns dictated a sampling technique somewhat different from that of the usual survey. Although we were interested in variations among individuals and subgroups within communities, we were also concerned with differences which might exist from one community to another. Accordingly, it was decided to choose eight communities which would each represent a kind of "ideal type" in terms of the characteristics which had been judged relevant. Clusters of respondents would be selected from within each of these contextual types.

While it was found that a variety of studies had touched upon one or another aspect of this study, these studies tended to be of little value in understanding the basic forces affecting educational beliefs and attitudes. This was largely because community context was ignored, and only the most obvious social factors were related to public attitudes. Single case community studies, area studies, and national surveys were all found to be deficient in this sense; and with the exception of Coleman,[1] the few comparative community studies that existed used only five or less communities and did not select these from carefully designated types.

---

[1] Coleman, James Samuel. The Adolescent Society, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961) 368pp.

A survey of the literature convinced us that community-school relations differed according to the size of the community, the socio-economic level and racial composition of the population, and the degree of isolation or distance from a large metropolitan center.[1] In addition, communities which are undergoing "growing pains" tend to experience defeat of school bond issues and complaints of increased tax burdens due to the constant construction of additional school buildings and facilities to meet the needs of a growing community. For these reasons it was decided at the very start to select our sample from eight different communities. These were to include one rural town, two small towns (one middle-class and one working-class), four suburbs (two settled and two growing, and one middle and one working-class within these types), and one city which would be located near New York City.

Eleven school attendance areas were to be selected for the study, one in each of the seven smaller communities, and four in the large city. The four in the city were to be 1) a middle-class , 2) a working-class white, 3) a Negro, and 4) a mixed neighborhood. One elementary school and one high school were to be taken from each attendance area. In these schools, two first grade, two fifth grade, and two tenth grade classes were to be selected.[2] (The tenth grade classes would be English classes.) All parents of the students in these classes were to be interviewed. All teachers in each elementary school, all English teachers in each high school, and the

---

[1] See "Actual and Perceived Consensus on Educational Goals Between School and Community", BASR, June 1964 (Proposal), especially items #1, 2, 4, 7, 19, 20, 21, 30, 43, 53, 54, 64.

[2] It was proposed that the sample classes on the elementary level include a relatively "fast" and a relatively "slow" track, while on the high school level one class was to be a college preparatory and one a "general" or "commercial" track.

principals of each school were also to be interviewed, as were the students in the tenth grade English classes. In sum, we proposed to select our respondents from eleven school attendance areas, no two of which would resemble each other on all of the criteria which had been judged as relevant.

The area within which our communities would be selected was restricted to include only those counties in New Jersey which lay within a 75-mile radius of Times Square in New York City. This decision was made for convenience's sake so that a trip to any community would take no more than two hours, and to facilitate negotiations with Elmo Roper and Associates whose subcontract fee had to be settled before the actual communities were selected. Of the 21 counties in New Jersey, nine were eliminated from the outset on this basis.

II. The Selection Process

A. Operationalizing General Community Descriptions Using Census and Other Available Data

1. General Problems

There are many different stances from which American sociologists have studied communities. These range from the intensive in-depth single community studies starting with the Lynds in the 1920's to the highly statistical multi-community approaches characteristic of the more recent Michigan sociologists. At the same time, urban and rural sociology have continued to be somewhat separate specialities, each dealing with its own special collection of communities. Meanwhile, no generally accepted definitions of different kinds of communities have emerged, and sociologists as well as laymen talk about towns, suburbs, and cities without concerning themselves very much with the lack of precision of such terms.

Unfortunately, the U.S. Census has done very little to clarify the situation since it has shifted the criteria for classifying communities as urbanization has taken place. As testimony to the lack of utility of traditional community designations, the census now includes as sub-categories in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas communities which are variously identified as towns, suburbs, and cities by other observers.

The initial problem in the selection process was that of operationalizing the types of communities called for in the design of the study by establishing concrete criteria for each category. For example, it was decided that a rural community would be defined as one which was located outside of what the census calls the "New York-Northeastern New Jersey Urbanized Area", and with a population of 1,000 - 2,500 in 1960. In addition, the terms "middle-class," "working-class," "stable," "growing," "suburb," "small town," "mixed neighborhood," etc. had to be operationalized by establishing specific criteria and definitions for each. As our investigations progressed, it frequently became necessary to modify the criteria we had established or to employ new criteria in this operationalizing process, since we discovered that our theoretical types did not always exist in reality. For example, as will be seen later in the report, the number of "rich" small towns in the state was negligible; there was no such thing as an all-white middle-class school in our large city as a result of increasingly rapid movement of Negroes into white neighborhoods; and 10th grade English classes were frequently not separated into college preparatory and "general" tracks. In each of these and other instances criteria had to be revised and sometimes compromises made in the process of operationally defining and selecting the communities.

September and October, 1964, were spent in intensive scrutiny of 1960 New Jersey census data. Systematically, every city, urbanized area, incorporated place, and unincorporated place of 1,000 or more inhabitants in each of the 12 counties within our radius was listed. These were first broken down according to size -- our first criterion. Rural communities would be selected only from places of 1,000 - 2,500; small towns from places of 2,500 - 10,000; suburbs from places of 10,000 -25,000, and the city would have to be a place of over 100,000. Places with a 1960 population of 26,000 to 99,000 were excluded as being too large and differentiated for utilization as suburban units, but too small to yield the four types of urban sub-areas in which we were interested.

2. Selecting a Rural Community

In our search for a rural community we found that the 1960 census listed 78 places of 1,000 - 2,500, 10 of which were immediately eliminated because they were located in the "New York - Northeastern New Jersey Urbanized Area." Places with a population of less than 1,000 which on the basis of the 1950-1960 increase in population would have probably reached the 1,000 mark by 1965 were included, while those with a population of less than 2,500 were excluded when projection of 1950-1960 increases made it probable that by 1965 their population would have exceeded the 2,500 mark. Forty-five more "rural" places were eliminated because according to 1962-63 figures in the State of New Jersey's "Financial Statistics of School Districts" they sent their children out of the district both for elementary and high school. Five communities in a resort county were eliminated because it was felt that inclusion of a resort town in the sample would add a new and possibly complicating

variable to the study. This left 18 communities in 7 counties, each with a population of between 1,000 and 2,500, and each far enough from the area classified as "New York - Northeastern New Jersey Urbanized Area" to be considered as rural. Only 3 of these communities had not only their own grade schools, but also their own high school in town. These were selected as our prime choices for inclusion in the sample.[1]

3. Selecting the Small Towns

The next category of community was the relatively isolated small town, two of which were to be included in the sample, one working- and one middle-class. All towns with a 1960 population of 2,500 - 10,000 were listed. Of 162 towns in this category which were listed in the census, 54 were eliminated since they fell outside the 75-mile radius of New York City; another 72 were eliminated since they fell inside the "New York - Northeastern New Jersey Urbanized Area." This left us with 36 small towns in 6 counties.

The next step was to divide these towns into two categories, middle-class and working-class. It was decided since the median family income for the state of New Jersey as a whole was almost $7,000, that towns with median incomes of less than $6,000 would be called "working-class" and over $8,000, "middle-class." Those between $6,000 and $8,000 were eliminated. This approach proved to be unfeasible since outside of several towns in one county we had already rejected, because it was located in a resort area, only one small town fell into the "rich" category. If this town were chosen, there would be no middle-class town in the northern tier of the state to use for

---

[1] Even though most rural places do not have high schools within their village limits, we selected from the minority that did so that we would not have to consider different community context variables for the elementary and high school students from the same village. This problem came up again in selecting small towns, which also tend to have elementary but not high schools within their boundaries.

pretesting purposes. It was decided therefore to combine median family income with percent white-collar workers in the labor force in order to categorize the 36 towns. Accordingly towns with a median family income of over $6,500 and with more than 50% white-collar occupations were classified as middle-class, while towns with $6,500 or less median family income and less than 50% white-collar occupations were put in the working-class category. We were still unable to locate a second small town in the northern tier of counties which would fulfill our criteria for "middle-class." The wealthy small towns seemed to be concentrated in the resort counties. We had already rejected the idea of drawing the one rural community in the sample from a resort area, and we felt it would be risky to compare a middle-class small town from a resort area with a working-class one from another type of area, since this would involve the addition of a set of obvious uncontrolled variables. The decision was made, therefore, to select both small towns (middle- and working-class) from a county with a resort area, thus facilitating comparisons between them.

It was at this point that other data were utilized in our selection of the communities. The State of New Jersey "Financial Statistics of School Districts" for 1960-61 and 1962-63 had been made available to us by the New Jersey Commissioner of Education. These volumes contained, for each community in New Jersey in which there was at least one elementary school, data regarding costs per pupil, assessed valuation on real property, school debt, total expenditures, total funds available, as well as number of students by grade, number of teachers and other staff, and school data. Since scrutiny of these school statistics revealed differences between middle- and working-class communities in

items such as "expenditures per pupil" or "assessed valuation on real property," the school data were utilized to corroborate the selections we had made on the basis of census data.

Examination of school data revealed however, that none of the towns which had been tentatively selected as middle-class on the basis of census data, had their own high school; all sent their students into regional high schools in other communities.[1] Upon re-examination of list of towns with a population of 2,500 - 10,000 in search of a middle-class town with its own high school, we found one, Resort Town, which had previously been eliminated from consideration since its median family income, although slightly higher than that of the one which had tentatively been selected as our working-class town, was considerably lower than that of the average middle-class town. Census data had revealed, however, that 50% of this community's working force were in white-collar occupations, compared to only 39% in the working-class town, and median years of schooling in Resort Town was approximately 12, compared to 10 in Working Town.[2] Scrutiny of school financial data substantiated the differences between the two towns, for while costs per pupil were about $350 in the working-class town, they were over $500 in Resort Town; and while "total funds available" in the former were less than $1 million, in the latter they were closer to $2 million.

---

[1] As already mentioned, for purposes of contextual analyses we had hoped to restrict the sample to communities with their own high school, rather than to include any which sent their children to regional high schools in other towns.

[2] Although median years of schooling was not one of the original criteria used to differentiate middle- from working-class small towns, we discovered in the course of the selection process that it was more powerful than income in distinguishing the two types of communities.

In addition, as we were subsequently informed by personnel at the State Department of Education, the relatively low median income in Resort Town was partially due to the fact that a substantial proportion of the population was widows living on pensions or social security benefits. We were also advised that Resort Town High School had a primarily middle-class student body as a result of the fact that some of the surrounding communities which fed students into it were among the wealthiest in the county. On the basis of this additional information, Resort Town was selected as our middle-class small town.

4. Selecting the Suburbs

Choosing our suburban communities was the next step in the selection of the sample. The study design called for the inclusion of 4 suburbs, two growing and two relatively stable, and within each category a middle- and a working-class suburb. The problem was to operationalize 1) suburb, 2) growing vs. stable, and 3) middle- vs. working-class.

In order to qualify as a suburb, a community had to be one:

1) which was part of the "New York - Northeastern New Jersey Urbanized Area" designated by the 1960 census,

2) in which at least 30% of the working population was employed outside of the county of residence, and

3) the population of which was between 10,000 and 25,000 according to 1960 census data.[1]

---

[1]As was noted previously we used 10,000 and 25,000 as cutting points as we discovered that most suburbs with a population of under 10,000 did not have their own high school. We felt that those larger than 25,000 might be too differentiated to serve as units for contextual analysis.

The 1960 census includes a list of all urbanized areas which are part of the "New York - Northeastern New Jersey Urbanized Area" by 1950 and 1960 population. This list yielded 58 communities with populations of between 10,000 and 25,000 in 1960. Each of these was first rated either high, medium, or low on the percent of the working force which was employed outside of the county of residence. A community in which less than 25% of the working force was employed outside of the county was characterized as having a low commutation rate, while if 30% or more worked outside of the county, the community was ranked as "high" regarding commutation. Those areas which fell between the two cutting points on either of these two criteria were classified as "medium" for the criterion of commutation. Next, those with high commutation rates were rated for 1950-1960 population increase in order to determine whether they were "growing" or "stable" suburbs.[1] Since the population increase for the state of New Jersey as a whole was 25% during this 10-year period, any community with an increase of less than 30% was classified as "relatively stable"[2] while an area with a population increase of 40% or more was placed in the "growing" category. In addition the percent increase in school population between 1960-61 and 1962-63 was computed for each community in order to see whether general population increase was associated with school population increase.

---

[1] "Stable" was operationally defined to mean relative non-growth in population size, rather than absence of internal population shifts. It appears that there have been relatively large internal population shifts in most wealthy New Jersey suburbs.

[2] Our definition of stable is relative to the state as a whole rather than an absolute designation. New Jersey is such a fast growing state that it is almost impossible to find suburbs in the state that saw no population increase whatsoever during recent years. Nevertheless, we were able to select contrasting suburbs of each socio-economic type where the growth rate during the decade 1950-1960 was over 100% larger in the growing than in the stable communities. See Appendix A.

Once these communities had been established as being either growing or stable suburbs, the next step was to categorize them as either middle- or working-class. A listing of median family income for each community told us that even the poorer suburbs had median incomes higher than our wealthier small towns so that we would have to establish cutting points independent of those used for the isolated towns. As a general rule of thumb $7,500 per year was set as the dividing point for our income criterion.

We next examined the percent of white-collar workers in the labor force, and ranked communities, using 50% as our cutting point. It was here that we found it necessary to add a third and later a fourth variable in order to "explain" the fact that even though a town might have as high as 65% blue-collar workers, its median income was often well over $7,000. This appeared to be especially true in "growing" suburbs.

We hypothesized that the newer suburbs were attracting younger and therefore more educated workers. These younger workers would have completed high school, obtained more skilled jobs, and earned more money than their peers who may have been partly high school dropouts. Accordingly we checked the census data on median age and median years of schooling and found that our hypothesis was confirmed; that is, in those suburbs where median age was lower, median education and median family income were higher even though a majority of the working force was in blue-collar occupations. In addition, age was found to be highly related to stability of population size. In both poorer and wealthier suburbs, a lower median age was associated with more rapid population growth. By ranking our growing and stable suburbs on each of the four variables (median family income, percent white-collar, median years of schooling and median age) we were able to separate the growing middle-

class from the growing working-class suburbs, and the relatively stable middle-class from the relatively stable working-class suburbs. In the course of this operation we eliminated a number of suburbs which seemed to fall into a "low" category for percent working outside of the county of residence, or a "medium" category for percent population growth between 1950 and 1960, percent white-collar, or for median family income. We also eliminated several suburbs in which the percent attending parochial schools was relatively high (over 40%) as well as a few which did not have a high school in town.

At this point a problem arose. Several communities fulfilled all of the criteria for <u>middle-class</u> growing and stable suburbs. None, however, met all of the criteria for growing <u>working-class</u> suburbs. The data indicated that the growing suburbs in the state were primarily middle-class in composition, while the working-class suburbs were mostly settled in nature. For this reason we decided to extend our definition of "suburb" to include places with a 1960 population of between 25,000 and 35,000. This yielded eleven more suburbs: one stable middle-class
five growing middle-class
four stable working-class
one growing working-class

The growing working-class suburb appeared to fulfill all of the criteria we had established for this category.[1]

5. Selecting the Four City Neighborhoods

The final community type was the large city within which an elementary school and high school would be chosen from four neighborhoods:

a middle-class white neighborhood
a working-class white neighborhood
a mixed neighborhood
a Negro neighborhood

---

[1] It was subsequently rejected for inclusion in the sample since, according to our informants at the State Department of Education, it was currently undergoing radical changes in school administrative personnel.

Only six cities within our 75-mile radius appeared to be large enough (100,000 or more) to contain four neighborhoods which would fulfill these criteria, and one appeared to be ideal for our purposes since it would afford a sufficient number of neighborhoods of each type for us to find both sample and pretesting districts which could be matched. Accordingly we turned to the 1960 census volume devoted entirely to this city and for each of the census tracts obtained the following data.

1) percent of the population which is Negro
2) dominant ethnic group
3) median family income
4) percent in parochial school
5) percent white-collar

We separated our tracts first by the percent of the population which was Negro. "White" tracts were those with less than 20% Negroes; mixed tracts those with 30-50% Negroes; and Negro tracts those in which 80% or more of the population was Negro. We eliminated those tracts with a 50-80% Negro population in 1960 since it was uncertain as to whether by 1965 these would still be mixed areas or have become "all-Negro" neighborhoods.

We then divided the "white" tracts into middle-class and working-class types on the basis of median family income and percent in white-collar occupations, eliminating those with parochial school attendance rates of over 30%. Mixed tracts were next selected to correspond as closely as possible with the white working-class neighborhoods on all criteria except racial distribution. Negro tracts were selected which appeared to be neither extremely depressed areas not atypical wealthier areas. We also attempted to select mixed and Negro neighborhoods in which the difference between the elementary school and high school attendance was neither very great nor very small. This comparison was made in lieu of actual dropout information. In addition, sample

and pre-testing districts were matched for the country of origin of residents of foreign stock. In this way we were able to select 4 or 5 tracts of each type which could be used either in the sample or for pre-testing purposes.[1]

B. The Use of Informants for Obtaining Additional Relevant Information

By the middle of October 1964, we had, on the basis of available published data, compiled a list of several communities of each type called for in the study design. We then went to the State Department of Education in Trenton with our list and asked them to evaluate our choices and to assist us in the final selection by providing us with qualitative information which was unavailable to us at the BASR. We were gratified that their reaction to our choices was one of surprise that purely on the basis of census data we had been able to select communities which, with no exceptions, were highly appropriate in terms of the types called for by the study design. They were able, however, to provide us with certain additional information on the basis of which it was jointly decided to eliminate several of our towns.

For example, one of our rural towns had just closed its high school and become part of a regional high school district. Another rural town was one which was surrounded by regional high schools and had a somewhat "peculiar set-up" so we decided to eliminate it. The third (and only other rural town on our list with its own high school), Farmville , was satisfactory but we

---

[1]The above account refers to the criteria utilized in the selection of four neighborhoods in Big City to which we were eventually refused access. It wasn't until May, 1965, that access was finally granted to Metropolis in which the four appropriate neighborhoods were located by means of census tract data together with more qualitative information supplied by Metropolis' Superintendent of Schools and his staff. See Table 1 for description of the four urban neighborhoods based on the criteria utilized.

still needed one more for pretesting purposes. The State Department people suggested Green Hollow, a town with its one high school in the same county as Farmville, but one which had not appeared on our list because its 1960 population was 2,600 and we had drawn our line at 2,500. On the basis of their qualitative description of Green Hollow, however, we decided that it fulfilled all of our criteria and that the 100 more people would hardly be enough to invalidate our results. Green Hollow thus became our rural sample town and Farmville the alternative for pretesting. While it is possible that accepting suggestions of the personnel in the State Department of Education involved the danger of loading our sample with communities with model school systems, this risk was unavoidable, but minimized by the fact that all but three communities selected, were on our original list, and careful comparison of census data revealed no relevant differences existing between these three communities and those on our list.

The State Department people concurred with our choice of Working Town as a typical relatively isolated working-class town. But they suggested Resort Town, rather than the communities which had been our choices for middle-class towns for reasons which were discussed previously. They also felt that although inclusion of two resort area towns might possibly add new dimensions to the communities, these would not influence our results.

From our list of suburban communities the staff at the State Department of Education were able to help us select suburbs for the sample and for pretesting in all categories without unforeseen difficulties.

They did suggest eliminating from consideration several of our choices either because other studies had recently been conducted in the schools, because there had been several recent turnovers in administrative personnel,

or because some other unusual factors existed which might influence our findings. One suggestion they made which we adopted was to include New Home in the sample as our growing working-class suburb. This suggestion arose during the course of a discussion in which we stated that we were particularly interested (for our growing suburbs) in recent population increase which might be reflected in school problems. We were told there had been more than a 200% increase in the population of New Home, most of which had taken place in the last five years, that the community was composed mainly of commuting blue-collar workers, and that it was plagued by school problems due to its extremely rapid growth. This was the chief instance where we found it necessary to supplement census data with the more up-to-date information which could be provided by those in constant contact with school problems in the state.

At the meeting in the New Jersey Department of Education we did not attempt to make a final selection of urban neighborhoods to be included in the sample. It was decided that the local school superintendent of whatever city was chosen would be better qualified to help us do this. The problem of the selection of the city was primarily one of "access" and will be discussed in the final section of this report.

C. Visual Confirmation

In addition to the collection of all available published data and its supplementation with the more qualified and experiential data supplied by the staff at the State Department, it was decided to do a quick "visual survey" of all of the communities. The Project Director and his assistant visited each of the communities by car to see whether they appeared to "fit" their census descriptions. Since we had found it necessary at several points to compromise with our a priori assumptions about what constituted criteria

for the various types of communities, we had certain misgivings about some parameters and cutting points and we felt it would be useful to verify qualitatively our sampling framework. In addition we were curious to see these communities with which we had become so familiar on the basis of census data.

In general, the tours served to confirm our expectations. Schools in settled towns were often of pre-1900 vintage, while in growing communities they were either new or had new additions. Homes and people in middle-class communities "looked" middle-class and shops displayed quality merchandise. In the working-class towns homes were smaller, lawns were tiny or non-existent, Methodist churches were predominant. Boxy developments were mushrooming in the growing working-class suburb, while more expensive split-level developments abounded in the growing middle-class suburb. The trips served to convince us that the communities we had selected on the basis of the available published data did indeed "fit" their census descriptions. The final list of communities (not including the city) selected on the basis of census and other available published figures, on the basis of the more qualitative information supplied by the people at the State Department, and on the basis of visual survey, is as follows:[1]

1)	rural community	Green Hollow
2)	small town, middle-class	Resort Town
3)	small town, working-class	Working Town
4)	suburb, stable, middle-class	Suburban Estates
5)	suburb, growing, middle-class	Nouveau Heights
6)	suburb, stable, working-class	Old Home
7)	suburb, growing, working-class	New Home

Since it was felt that pretesting in the sample communities might prove to have a "contaminating" effect on our results, one community of each type, matching the sample town on all relevant criteria, was also selected for pretesting purposes.

---

[1] See Table 1 for description of communities based on criteria utilized for each community type.

III. The Problem of Access

A. To the Sample Communities

Access to the local communities and schools was considerably facilitated by the fact that the study had been initiated by and had the complete support of the State Department of Education. The American tradition of local school autonomy dictated, however, that permission for the study to be conducted in any school system be obtained from the local superintendent of schools and from the principals of the schools in which the actual interviewing would be conducted. In addition, it was necessary to secure the support of the county superintendents of education in whose bailiwicks the communities were located. Accordingly, the State Commissioner of Education wrote to the superintendents of education for the six counties involved in the study asking them to cooperate with us. In addition, the Project Director and his assistants were invited to attend the next monthly meeting of all the county superintendents to acquaint them with the nature and purpose of the study. Much to our surprise, at this meeting several of the superintendents from the southern counties appeared to be somewhat slighted by the fact that no communities from the southern tier had been included in the study. When the Project Director asked them whether they felt that outside of racial problems and attitudes there were any significant differences between northern and southern towns or suburbs or rural areas, they readily stated that there were none. As a matter of fact, one superintendent from the northern tier, who had held the same position in a southern county, soundly attested to the fact that the only new dimension which would be added to the design by including southern communities was that of racial problems and attitudes. It was necessary to explain to the county superinten-

dents that the study was not designed to obtain an "overall" representative picture of school-community relationships in New Jersey, but rather to enable us to do an intensive system analysis in several "ideal" community types.

Permission was readily obtained from each of the six county superintendents who in turn wrote to the local town superintendents in our 14 sample and pretest communities advising them of the study and urging them to participate. We in turn arranged an appointment with each of the local superintendents to explain the nature, purpose, and projected time schedule of the study. In addition, in communities with more than one elementary school, we asked the assistance of the superintendent in selecting a school in that neighborhood which was most appropriate in terms of the criteria on the basis of which the community had been selected. For example, in a growing middle-class suburb we felt that the school chosen could not be one which was located in the old, more settled section of town, even though information regarding attitudes and possible resentment of the original "natives" would have to be sacrificed.

There was no problem of access to the sample schools themselves since the local superintendents had been coopted to enlist the support of their elementary and high school principals. In those cases where formal approval of the Board of Education was not required, the superintendent either had his elementary and high school principals attend our meeting with him, or else called them in our presence to arrange appointments for us. We found all of the principals most cooperative and interested. It appeared that the time and money involved in making these visits to each community and in holding meetings with each superintendent and principal were amply justified and that

they greatly enhanced the ease with which the interviewing itself proceeded in the schools and in the communities. It is likely that the high response of the mothers was in part the result of the rapport we had established with school administrative personnel.[1] In all cases the superintendents were most cooperative, but in some communities they advised us that they would have to obtain approval from their Board of Education before we could proceed. Although in most cases the superintendent indicated that this was just a formality, in Suburban Estates, our stable wealthy suburb, the superintendent asked us to send him a memo which he could present at the next Board meeting.[2] He appeared somewhat concerned that there might be opposition from some Board members but apparently there was none, and we were informed soon afterwards that we could proceed.

B. The Special Problem of the City

Although resistance to our study was detectable on the part of the superintendents in some of the communities selected for study, nowhere was this made as explicit as it was when we first visited Big City. By the time we actually visited local superintendents they had already heard from the State Commissioner of Education as well as from the county superintendent. Some local superintendents told us that they had had unfortunate experiences with previous studies conducted in their schools, and others expressed the fear that we might stir up trouble where none existed. However, none went beyond asking that we prepare special memoranda for the members of their school

---

[1] It is interesting and possibly significant that the response rate of mothers was generally lower in those schools whose principals we were unable to meet before the interviewing proceeded.

[2] The Superintendent in Resort Town also asked for such a memo.

boards.[1] The most important thing from the standpoint of the project was that the power positions of the communities vis-a-vis the State Department of Education was relatively weak. Thus even though some superintendents would have liked to have refused to cooperate with our study, none in fact did this, with the conspicuous exception of Big City. Most studies conducted in school systems by outside agencies do encounter refusals from some prospective systems,[2] and often they find it helpful to show instruments to school superintendents at the time when access is requested. The fact that this study was approved in all communities except for Big City is very impressive in light of the fact that we had no final interview instruments to show until just prior to the actual interviewing, and judgement as to the nature of the questions that would be asked had to be made on the basis of rather general statements contained in the research proposal.

Even the initial face-to-face contact with the Superintendent in Big City was much more difficult to obtain than in any other community. There are many reasons for this, but they can be summarized in terms of the fact that the school superintendent in a large city i an important and busy man. (Indeed, the superintendent of schools is usually the highest paid civil employee in the community, and in a large city this means his salary is well over $20,000 per year.) Although phone and mail contact were made much earlier, we were unable to obtain an appointment with the Big City superintendent until December 7, 1964. On that date the Project Director and one

---

[1] It was our impression that there was more resistance from superintendents in communities that were larger and more affluent, and we included questions in our interviews with superintendents which would allow us to check on this later.

[2] See, for instance, the report by Coleman in Sociologists at Work, edited by P.E. Hammond. (New York: Basic Books, 1964), pp. 184-211, "Research Chronicle: The Adolescent Society." Three of the original ten school systems selected for study, plus the Chicago system, refused to participate in the Coleman study.

of his assistants visited the superintendent's office. The superintendent had two of his chief assistants at this meeting, one of whom was director of research for the local school system. Much of the meeting was carried on over lunch at a nearby restaurant, and throughout this encounter, the superintendent and his assistants seemed most interested in our study. They expressed some concern over whether one could interview Negro working-class mothers using the same questions as were used with upper-middle-class white suburban mothers, and they mentioned the fact that a recent study by sociologists from a different university had caused some difficulty in the community. The superintendent also asked whether he would be given the option to veto any questions that he found objectionable in our interviews. This we granted. These were the only negative comments made. On departing, the superintendent requested that extra copies of the research proposal be sent to him along with any pretest interviewing material that we developed. He said that he would need approval of his Board of Education before our study could be approved and that he would try to bring up the study at the next board meeting the following week.

During the next few weeks, the Project Director sent extra copies of the proposal to Big City and early pretest versions of interview forms for mothers. He called the superintendent's office on at least five occasions and sent two personal letters. No replies were received from the letters, but it was possible to reach the superintendent by phone on two occasions and he indicated that he had simply not had the opportunity to bring up the study with his board.

On February 5, 1965 a letter was received from the superintendent stating that he had met with his staff again to discuss the study, and that it was not being approved since it would not be of immediate value to the

local schools and it would interfere with normal school functioning. At this point the Project Director called the State Department of Education and asked for assistance. The State Department did apply pressure to the city during the next few weeks, but approval was never secured. Final refusal did not come, however, until March 12, and interviewing was scheduled to begin in April.

A somewhat similar prolonged refusal of access was then negotiated with a second big city during the following month. In this case we were told that the subject of the study was actually brought up before the Board of Education which rejected it along with the Mayor, and the City Council, on the grounds that the study was "indiscrete, dangerous, and loaded". This refusal was not received until April 16, 1965. Interviews with teachers and students had to be completed before school let out for the summer, and it appeared for a while that the design of our study would have to be faulted as far as the city was concerned.

Fortunately we were able to gain access to another city system in the weeks that followed, and interviews were completed on time. However, it should be pointed out that we would probably not have gained access to this community except for some particularistic relationships existing between the local school administration and the State Department of Education.

In retrospect it appears that there are a few key factors making access to large city school systems a near impossible goal for sociologists today. If the researcher is from the college or university that has nearly exclusive rights for training teachers for the state in which the city is located his chances are probably better than otherwise. But this situation no longer exists in many states. Where the state department of education is

behind the study, as in our case, one would think that chances should be improved also. But here there appears to be a delicate balance of relative power, the amount of support the state provides for the local system, and the particular local situation. In some cities, superintendents and their staffs have higher salaries than their counterparts in the state department of education, and they usually have their own research departments as well. Invasion by the state department or other outside researchers is not taken easily under the circumstances. This is partly a simple matter of local pride and jurisdictional perogatives. In addition, it is no secret that part of the difficulty between large cities and the state governments under which they they are found springs from the rural bias in state legislatures and the consequent funding patterns. Cities usually contribute far more proportionately to state taxes than they get back in aid for their schools compared with small communities. Sometimes this generates overt hostility, but even when it doesn't, it makes requests by the state a tenuous matter.

As for the local situation affecting the granting of access, it is almost uniformly bad in all northern cities today. This, of course, means there are problems surrounding the education of Negroes from lower socio-economic backgrounds. It is well known that a situation with gross inequalities has developed in most cities over the years largely as a direct result of neighborhood segregation patterns. School superintendents are being asked to do something about this situation today, and it is costing them their jobs in many cases.[1] Since our study was designed to take racial balance

---

[1]The recent departure of Superintendent Gross from New York and the current plight of Superintendent Willis in Chicago are the two most highly publicized examples.

into consideration in selecting the city schools, there was no way we could disguise our concern with this problem even though there were no "racial questions" asked of respondents.[1] It is doubtful that many city superintendents would go along with our study design without worrying about racial problems that might result and the light in which our findings would place their schools. As evidence of the salience of racial issues in these school systems, one of the two cities in which we were refused access recently refused to cooperate with a government sponsored national survey of schools directed at racial matters, and the superintendent has since resigned.

In addition to racial problems, there are other local situations in big cities which make gaining access to schools a problem for sociologists today. For instance, it appeared in one of the two cities which refused us, that the superintendent was contending with a board from which he could not have gotten approval for the study even if he had wished. The prejudices of just one highly placed individual can often be decisive in such situations, and we were given hints that this situation existed as well. Recent educational controversies were also discussed in passing along with the feeling that these events made it unwise to "go around asking a lot of questions" just yet. Perhaps the most annoying local situation for researchers is another one we confronted in more than one community, the claim that something unethical, dishonest or inconsiderate was done by the last researcher who came to town. This is particularly unpleasant when the complaints appear to be quite legitimate. If what we were told is correct, social researchers are contributing to their own failure to gain access as investigators in some school systems.

---

[1] We unfortunately, did have some questions relating to racial matters in the early pretest questionnaires sent to the first city superintendent and these undoubtedly hurt our chances.

If nothing else, our experiences with near failure in obtaining a city for the study alerted us to the highly political nature of the superintendent's position. It was clear from the way superintendents in the big cities were able to prolong the act of refusal by using a wide variety of bureaucratic devices, that they did not feel free to say no to a request that involved both state and federal support without going through the motions of "giving the matter careful consideration".

Fortunately, as already noted, we were able to find a city willing to cooperate with the study. This city, like most northern cities, had the required Negro neighborhoods, and we were able to fill our design requirements with one minor exception. Instead of using four different high schools that corresponded to the four neighborhood elementary schools, we were able to find a large high school which was fed into by all four of the different kinds of elementary schools. We took eight 10th grade English classes from this school.

C. Selection of the Sample Classes

Our original study design called for the inclusion of two 1st and two 5th grade classes in each elementary school, and two 10th grade English classes on the high school level. We left the selection of the sample classes to the principal asking, however, that on the 10th grade level he include one college preparatory and one "general" or "commercial" English class. In some schools where these distinctions did not exist -- another instance of reality not conforming to our theoretical model -- the principal selected a relatively "fast" English class which was made up of mostly college-prep students and a relatively "slow" class composed in the main of students taking a terminal program. On the elementary school

level, where the tracks were usually nonexistent our sample classes also included one faster and one slower group for each grade. The principals supplied us with the names of the children, parents and teachers of the sample classes, as well as the names of all other teachers who were to be interviewed so that we could send personal letters informing them of the study.

We encountered only minor difficulties in obtaining appropriate class lists and parents' addresses. One school secretary, who we later found objected to the study and withheld school records from us, sent second grade lists instead of first grade. This caused minor delays but was easily remedied. We have since discovered that in this same community, New Home, we were given two college preparatory 10th grade English classes and as a result have only a few isolated class members from the terminal curriculum. We feel that this error is another symptom of the newness of the school system involved. Although we carefully stressed the two kinds of classes we wanted in the proposal,in correspondance,and in preliminary interviews in each locality, this rapidly expanding system was the only one unable to come forth with the proper classes.

Fortunately, from the standpoint of budget limitations, our estimates of thirty students per classroom was larger than what we actually encountered. These estimates, the actual class sizes found, and numbers of interviews completed can be found in Table 2.

IV. Conclusions

It is clear from the above that the usual survey descriptions which differentiate communities on the basis of region and size obscure a great many finer distinctions of sociological importance. Through the use of census

data alone, it is possible to generate many categories of communities from which samples or strategic research sites may be selected. In cases where census data are felt to be too dated to reveal recent or rapid changes in population, it is often possible to find local informants who can supplement the census data. In addition, when school related information is desired, this information may be routinely collected on a state-wide basis, as we found in New Jersey.

Whatever categories of communities are hypothesized as required for study, it will probably be found that all the different logical types do not exist in pure form by virtue of the fact that sub-criteria are related to one another. However, by slightly altering cutting points from one general category of community to another, it will often be possible to approximate the original model. The manner in which criteria were applied to the selection of communities for this study is shown in Table 1.

In summary, the following nine compromises were made in the original study design:

1) Only one state, New Jersey, was used for the sampling frame since the study was originally sought by the state and local school cooperation was insured.

2) A "stable" suburb had to be defined as one with less than 30% growth between 1950 and 1960 because the overall population increase in the state was so high.

3) A resort county area was used for small towns in order to provide socio-economic contrasts between small towns.

4) Income criteria had to be lowered for the middle-class small town since none have high incomes.

5) Income was higher than desired in the growing working-class suburb because of the uniformly young working population.

6) Suburb size allowable had to be raised to 30,000 in order to find enough cases of all four types.

7) A different city than the one originally selected had to be substituted because of the access problem.

8) Only one high school was needed in the city since all elementary schools selected fed into it.

9) Schools did not divide students into tracks solely on the basis of college plans.

The problem of school access for research purposes has turned out to be of major importance in the sociology of education. There exist no general guidelines or strategies for the uninitiated researcher seeking information, and there is no code of ethics to guide him once access has been gained. The lack of clear procedures for gaining access and the decentralization of our educational system mean that each project director must spend a great deal of time and effort traveling to and communicating with the personnel in various school systems. In addition, the sensitive political situation of school personnel combined with apparent abuses by prior social researchers mean that once contact has been made, school personnel need to be reassured that no misuse of privilege or breach of confidence will result. School access would undoubtedly be easier if the social researcher had a general code of ethics to present to school administrators, and if there were professional bodies to whom school administrators could make complaints in cases where violations occur.

TABLE I
SUMMARY AND APPLICATION OF CRITERIA UTILIZED
IN THE SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE COMMUNITIES

	Small Towns			Suburbs				City Neighborhoods			
Criteria	Rural Community	Middle-class	Working-class	Stable Middle Class	Growing Middle Class	Stable Working Class	Growing Working Class	White Middle Class	White Working Class	Mixed	Negro
1960 population	2,500*	4,000	6,000	20,000	25,000	30,000	25,000	Population of city in 1960 was 100,000+			
Within 75 miles of Times Square											
Own elementary school											
Own high school								one high school used			
Qualitative information											
Visual check											
Median family income		$6,300	$6,200	$15,000	$10,000	$6,000	$7,000	$10,000	$6,000	$4,500	$4,500
Percent in white-collar occupations	50	40		75	70	30	35	55	40	20	15
Median years of schooling	12	10		13	13	9	11	12	8	8	8
Percent attending private or parochial schools				15	25	35	15	15	40	30	10
School financial statistics											
Percent increase in population, 1950-60				25	125	5	200				
Percent school growth, 1960-61 to 1962-63				5	15	1	45				
Percent working outside county of residence				35	30	45	45				
Median age				35	25	35	25				
Percent of population which is Negro								**	**	40	90

* All figures are approximate in order to preserve community anonymity. **less than 5%

TABLE II

NUMBER OF ESTIMATED, ASSIGNED, AND COMPLETED INTERVIEWS FOR EACH STATUS

STATUS	Rural Community	Small Towns		Suburbs				Large City	TOTAL
		Middle-class	Working-class	Stable middle class	Growing middle-class	Stable working-class	Growing working-class		
Mothers									
Estimated	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	720	1980
Assigned[1]	139	173	169	146	146	145	173	591	1682
Interviewed	127	155	126	132	128	113	142	472	1395
									(83%)[3]
Teachers									
Estimated	22	22	22	23	23	23	23	129	278
Assigned[2]	19	23	30	22	31	25	48	86	284
Interviewed	19	23	30	22	31	25	48	85	283
									(99%)[3]
Students									
Estimated	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	240	660
Assigned[1]	50	45	56	60	49	48	45	169	552
Interviewed	49	45	56	59	48	49	45	157	508
									(97%)[3]
Principals									
Estimated[4]	2	5	5	10	10	10	10	26	78
Assigned	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	5	19
Interviewed	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	5	19
									(100%)

[1]On basis of actual number of children in sample classes.

[2]All sample class teachers, all English teachers in the High School, and all 1-6 grade teachers in the elementary school.

[3]Percent of assigned interviews which were completed.

[4]Figures are estimates of principals of all elementary and high schools in each community. It was decided subsequently to interview only principals of the sample schools.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY

Columbia University in the City of New York | *New York, N.Y. 10025*

BUREAU OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH 605 WEST 115th STREET

April 23, 1965

Dear Mrs _____:

The Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University has obtained a grant to study problems of communication and understanding between the public schools and the people they serve. You are one of the two thousand mothers we hope to interview in connection with this study.

Yours is one of the communities in which the study is being conducted. Your school superintendent has given permission for his staff members to be interviewed, and he has provided us with the names and addresses of parents. Your name and address were obtained along with the names and addresses of ALL of the mothers of children in the first grade at the _____ Elementary School, _____.

In the very near future you will be contacted by someone from Elmo Roper and Associates to arrange a time when you can be interviewed by them. The interview should take about one hour. It will be held in your home at your convenience. Any answers you give or statements you make during the interview are confidential.

The principal at your child's school knows about this study, and he and his staff are also being interviewed. You can call him if you have any questions.

We expect that this study will contribute to our understanding of the problems shared by schools and parents. Your cooperation will help to let us know the attitudes and needs of mothers in your community, and how the schools of _____ can better serve the people.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. WILDER
Project Director

Columbia University in the City of New York | *New York, N.Y. 10025*

BUREAU OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH 605 WEST 115th STREET

May 10, 1965

Dear Teacher:

The Bureau of Applied Social Research* at Columbia University has obtained a grant to study patterns of communication and understanding between the public schools and the people they serve. You are one of the teachers we plan to interview in connection with this study.

Because the relationships between schools and the parents of school children differ from one type of community to another, we have selected eleven different school attendance areas in _____ for intensive study on the basis of their census characteristics. In each of these eleven communities, all of the mothers and teachers of children in selected first grade, fifth grade, and tenth grade English classes will be interviewed. In addition, ALL of the elementary school teachers and high school English teachers in the sample schools will be interviewed.

_____ is one of the communities in which the study is being conducted, and yours is one of the elementary schools which has been selected for intensive study. In the very near future arrangements will be made by your principal for you to be interviewed by someone from Elmo Roper and Associates. This private interview will take less than an hour and will be held at the school. We should like to assure you that this is a sociological study which in no way attempts to evaluate teachers. Any answers you give or any statements you make during the interview are confidential and will not be disclosed to anyone other than the professional staff at Columbia.

We expect that this study will contribute to our understanding of the problems shared by teachers and parents. Your cooperation will ensure that our results reflect the attitudes and needs of teachers in your school.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. WILDER
Project Director

---

*The Bureau of Applied Social Research, an instrument of Columbia University's Graduate Faculties, carries out a program of basic and applied research under grants from government agencies, philanthropic foundations, social welfare and other non-profit organizations, and from business and industrial firms.

HM
HIGH SCHOOL

April 9, 1965

NEW JERSEY STUDY

High School
Mothers' Questionnaire

INTERVIEWER: As you have heard, we are doing a study of what the parents, teachers, and students in several New Jersey communities think about public elementary and high school education. You have been selected for an interview along with all the mothers of children in the 10th grade, at _____ school. The answers you give to the questions we ask are confidential, and no one will be told what you have said as an individual. There are no right or wrong answers to most of these questions; we are interested in your own opinions so we may help the schools serve the community better.

Time Began:_____ ____ Respondent's Name:_____

Child's Name:_____

1. First, what is your relationship to (child)?

Mother	_____	(ASK 2A)
Stepmother	_____	
Grandmother	_____	(SKIP TO 2D)
Aunt	_____	
Sibling	_____	
Other (specify)	_____	

2. A. Are you presently:

Married and living with your husband_____ (ASK B)

Separated, Divorced, or Widowed _____ (SKIP TO C)

B. Is he (child's) father or step father?

Father _____
Stepfather _____ (SKIP TO 3)

C. (IF SEPARATED, DIVORCED, OR WIDOWED): How long ago was this?

Months ago _____ No.

Years ago _____ No. (SKIP TO 3)

D. Does (child's) father (or stepfather) live here?

Yes _____ (Skip to 3)

No _____ (ASK E)

E. Well, is there any other male relative living here who helps take care of (child)?

Yes _____ Who is that? (RECORD RELATIONSHIP): _____

No _____

3. A. Does (child) have any brothers or sisters?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 4)

B. Would you give me the name of each child, starting with the youngest? (RECORD NAME, AGE, SEX, AND GRADE IN SCHOOL OF EACH CHILD, INCLUDING SAMPLE CHILD. IF ANY CHILD IS NO LONGER IN SCHOOL, RECORD LAST GRADE COMPLETED.)

	B				C	D	E
						OLDER CHILDREN ONLY	
	Name (write in)	Age (write in)	Sex (write in)	Grade in school (or last grade completed) (write in)	Attending private or parochial schl.	Attend(ed) (school)?	Same English teacher?
1)							
2)							
3)							
4)							
5)							
6)							

C. Are any of your children attending a private or parochial school?

Yes _____ (RECORD WITH AN (X) ABOVE)
No _____

(IF ANY CHILDREN OLDER THAN SAMPLE CHILD, ASK D. IF NO OLDER CHILDREN, SKIP TO 4)

D. Did any of your older children attend (school)?

Yes _____ (RECORD WHICH WITH AN (X) ABOVE.
No _____ (SKIP TO 4)

E. Did any of them have the same English teacher that (child) now has?

Yes _____ (RECORD WITH AN (X) ABOVE)
No _____ (SKIP TO 4)

4. Generally, how interested would you say you are in what goes on in (school):

Very interested, _____
Somewhat interested, _____
Only a little interested, or _____
Not at all interested? _____
Don't know _____

5. A. Can you tell me the name of (child's) English teacher?

Yes _____ (WRITE IN NAME, AND ASK C) Name: _____
No _____ (ASK B)

B. According to my information, it is Miss (Mr.) _____. Does that sound familiar to you?

Yes _____
No _____

C. Did you happen to attend a school gathering or an Open-School night this school year--that is, where teachers spoke to groups of mothers?

Yes _____
No _____

6. A. Have you met or had any contact at all with (English teacher) this school year?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 7)

B. Could you tell me...how many contacts were:
(ENTER NUMBER IN SPACE PROVIDED)

(1) "Open-school" contacts? _____

(2) Casual or accidental contacts with the English teacher at school or elsewhere? _____

(3) Private conferences with the English teacher scheduled by the school for all parents? _____

(4) Private conferences requested by you or the English teacher? _____ (IF NONE, SKIP TO 7)

C. When was this (the last) conference:

Within the past week, _____
2-4 weeks ago, _____
A month or two ago, or _____
Longer ago than that? _____

D. Who contacted whom?

6. E. What did you discuss and how did the discussion come out?

7. A. Do you think a mother should have at least one private conference a year with her child's major subject teachers, even if the child has no special problems?

Yes _____
No _____
DK _____

B. Do you think a mother should have at least one conference a year with the guidance counsellor?

Yes _____
No _____
DK _____

8. A. Generally, how comfortable do you feel talking with teachers:

Very comfortable, _____ (SKIP TO 9)

Somewhat comfortable, _____
Somewhat uncomfortable, or _____ (ASK B)
Very uncomfortable? _____

B. Why don't you feel more comfortable?

9. A. Could you tell me the name of the principal at (school)?

_____

B. Have you spoken with him (her) since last September for any reason?

Yes _____
No _____

10. A. Now we'd like to know about some of the other people over at (school). Does the school have a (an):

	A			B	
	Yes (ASK B)	No (GO TO NEXT ON LIST)	D.K.	Have you ever spoken to him (her) this school year?	
				Yes	No
1. Assistant Principal?	___	___	___	___	___
2. Gym teacher or coach?	___	___	___	___	___
3. School psychologist?	___	___	___	___	___
4. Librarian?	___	___	___	___	___
5. School nurse?	___	___	___	___	___
6. Music teacher?	___	___	___	___	___

B. Have you ever spoken to him (her) this school year? (RECORD ABOVE)

11. A. Have you had a conference with the guidance counsellor this school year?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 12)

B. Was the conference about (child)?

Yes _____ (ASK C)
No _____ (SKIP TO 12)

C. What did you talk about?

12. A. Have you had conferences with any of (child's) other teachers this school year?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 13)

B. Which ones? (RECORD SUBJECT MATTER TAUGHT BY TEACHER)

(ALL MOTHERS LIVING WITH HUSBANDS: ASK Q. 13; OTHER MOTHERS, SKIP TO Q. 14).

*13. Has your husband had any conferences with anyone at (school) during this school year?

Yes _____
No _____

(ALL MOTHERS:)

14. A. We know some mothers find it difficult to visit their children's schools. Do you find it at all difficult to visit (school)?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 15)

B. In what ways is it difficult?

15. A. As far as giving a good education is concerned, compared with other public schools in the United States, do you think (school) is:

Better than most, _____
About the same as most, or _____
Not as good as most? _____
Don't know _____
(Vol.) Better in some ways, worse in others _____

16. How do you think (school) compares with the schools you attended as far as giving a good education is concerned? Would you say it is on the whole:

Better, _____
About the same, or _____
Worse? _____
Don't know _____
(Vol.) Better in some ways, but worse in others _____

17. In general, how satisfied are you with (school):

Very satisfied, _____
Somewhat satisfied, _____
Somewhat dissatisfied, _____
or Very dissatisfied? _____

18. A. If you had to choose one thing about (school) that you like the most, what would it be?

B. If you had to choose one thing about (school) that you dislike the most, what would it be?

19. A. In your opinion, are there some kinds of children in (community) who are not getting as good an education as others?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 20)
Don't know _____

	B Kinds of children	C Why not getting as good education
1)	_____	_____
2)	_____	_____

B. What kinds of children? (RECORD ABOVE).

C. Why do you think these children are not getting as good an education as others? (RECORD ABOVE).

20. About how much schooling do you think most young men need these days to get along well in the world? (OPEN-ENDED: DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS).

Finish grade school _____

Some high school _____

Finish high school _____

Some college _____

Finish 4 years college _____

Graduate school _____

Other (business school,etc.) Describe: _____

Don't know _____

21. A. Although all schools teach children more or less the same things, some schools emphasize different aspects of education. Suppose that there were four high schools in (community) and that you could choose the one you wanted to send (child) to:
Which one of these schools would you choose first? Which would be your second choice? Third choice?

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #1).

	A Mother's Choice (1st)	(2nd)	(3rd)	B Best Describes
(1) School #1 feels that the most important task of the high schools is primarily intellectual, that is, to provide children with information, teach them reading, writing, and arithmetic, give them the ability to figure things out for themselves, and a desire to learn more.	___	___	___	___
(2) School #2 is primarily interested in social things like teaching students how to get along with others and be good citizens who are loyal to America.	___	___	___	___
(3) School #3 is concerned with the personal development of students, that is, seeing that they possess a sense of right and wrong, develop into mature and stable persons who are in good physical condition, and learn to enjoy things like music and hobbies.	___	___	___	___
(4) School #4 is most concerned about the more practical things like helping students choose the right occupation or college, giving them specialized job training, and preparing them for marriage and family living.	___	___	___	___
(5) Don't know	___	___	___	___

B. Which of these best describes (school)? (RECORD ABOVE)

22. A. What is (child's) favorite subject in school this year?

B. What subject does he (she) like least?

23. We have a list of things that parents sometimes do. We would like to know about how often you do each. *We'd also like to know about how often your husband does each.

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #2)

About how often do you (does your *husband):	Often,	Sometimes,	Rarely,	or Never?	Don't Know
A. Talk with (child) about what he (she) is doing at school.					
a. You do	___	___	___	___	___
*b. Husband does	___	___	___	___	___
B. Encourage (child) to read books at home.					
a. You do	___	___	___	___	___
*b. Husband does	___	___	___	___	___
C. Talk with other parents about what goes on at school.					
a. You do	___	___	___	___	___
*b. Husband does	___	___	___	___	___
D. Give (child) chores to do at home.					
a. You do	___	___	___	___	___
*b. Husband does	___	___	___	___	___
E. Lose your temper or get mad at (child).					
a. You do	___	___	___	___	___
*b. Husband does	___	___	___	___	___
F. Praise (child)					
a. You do	___	___	___	___	___
*b. Husband does	___	___	___	___	___
G. Talk with (child) about current events like what's going on down South or in Vietnam.					
a. You do	___	___	___	___	___
*b. Husband does	___	___	___	___	___
H. Do something with(child) that's fun for both (of you).					
a. You do	___	___	___	___	___
*b. Husband does	___	___	___	___	___
	(2 times a week or more)	(once a week to once a month)			

24. A. Are there any things at all that you think it is important for you to be doing differently than you are in order to help (child) get the most out of school?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 25)

B. What things?

25. A. Are there any things you think (English teacher) would like you to be doing differently than you are?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____
Don't know _____ (SKIP TO 26)

B. What things?

26. A. Are there any things you've done to encourage (child) to be interested in school or in learning?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 27)

B. What, for instance, have you done?

27. Have you *(or your husband) ever:

	Yes	No	(Vol.) Child went with someone else
(a) Taken (child) to the World's Fair?	___	___	___
(b) Taken (child) to a museum?	___	___	___
(c) Taken (child) to the zoo?	___	___	___
(d) Taken (child) to a professional baseball game?	___	___	___
(e) Taken (child) to a concert, ballet, opera or the theater?	___	___	___

28. How much pressure would you say you put on (child) to do well in his (her) schoolwork:

A lot of pressure, _____
Some pressure, _____
Little pressure, or _____
No pressure? _____

*29. How about your husband, how much pressure would you say he puts on (child) to do well in his (her) schoolwork:

A lot of pressure, _____
Some pressure, _____
Little pressure, or _____
No pressure? _____

30. We know many parents are more familiar with other teachers than the English teacher. However, we are particularly interested in this teacher and therefore are asking a number of questions about him (her). We have a list of things that teachers sometimes do. We would like to know about how often you think (child's English teacher) does each.
(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #2)

About how often do you think (English teacher):	Often,	Some-times,	Rarely,	or Never?	Don't know
A: Gives special help to a student who is having difficulty with his schoolwork.	____	____	____	____	____
B: Gives special help to a student who is ahead of the rest of the class.	____	____	____	____	____
C: Loses her (his) temper in front of the class.	____	____	____	____	____
D: Encourages the students to read books at home.	____	____	____	____	____
E: Talks with the students about current events like what's going on down South or in Vietnam.	____	____	____	____	____
F: Show favoritism toward a particular child.	____	____	____	____	____
G: Punishes the class as a whole by having them do an extra assignment.	____	____	____	____	____
H: Punishes a student by keeping him (her) after school or giving him (her) an extra assignment.	____	____	____	____	____

31. A. Are there any things that you think it is important for (English teacher) to be doing differently than he (she) is in order to help (child) get the most out of school?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 32)

B. What things?

32. A. Although teachers have to concern themselves with many different things in their jobs, some teachers emphasize certain things more than others. Suppose there were four 10th grade English teachers in (school) and you could choose the one you wanted to be (child's) teacher. Which of these would be your first choice?
(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #3)

	A 1st Choice	B 2nd Choice	C Best Describes English Teacher
(1) Teacher #1 is most concerned with maintaining discipline, seeing that students work hard, and teaching them to follow directions.	____	____	____
(2) Teacher #2 feels it's most important that students know their subject matter well, and that she (he) cover the material thoroughly and test their progress regularly.	____	____	____
(3) Teacher #3 stresses making the class interesting and encourages students to be creative and to figure things out for themselves.	____	____	____
(4) Teacher #4 thinks it's most important that a teacher be friendly and well-liked by children and able to understand and to handle their problems.	____	____	____
(5) Don't know	____	____	____

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Which of these best describes (English teacher)? (RECORD ABOVE)

33. A. About how many children are there in (child's) English class?

_____(Number)

B. About how many do you think there should be?

_____(Number)

34. How much do you think (child) likes (English teacher)? Does he (she) like (English teacher):

Very much, _____
Somewhat, _____
Not so much, _____
or
Not at all? _____
Don't know _____

35. How much would you say (English teacher) likes (child) compared with the others in the class:

Better than most, _____
About the same as most, _____
or
Less than most? _____
Don't know _____

36. In general, do you prefer men or women teachers at the high school level, or doesn't it matter to you?

Men _____
Women _____
Doesn't matter _____

37. How about the first few grades of elementary school? Do you prefer men or women teachers there, or doesn't it matter to you?

Men _____
Women _____
Doesn't matter _____

38. Are any of your personal friends either elementary or high school teachers?

Yes _____
No _____

39. Taking into account both teaching in the classroom and school work outside the classroom, about how many hours would you guess (English teacher) puts in a week? (IF RESPONDENT SAYS DON'T KNOW, TRY TO GET ESTIMATE, STARTING WITH THE SMALLEST CATEGORY BELOW.)

Less than 30 hours _____
Around 30 hours _____
31 - 35 hours _____
36 - 40 hours _____
41 - 45 hours _____
Over 45 hours _____
Don't know _____

40. A. Can you think of any things that teachers should or shouldn't do in their private lives that don't apply to most other people?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 41)

B. What things?

41. Do you think teachers should be allowed to go on strike for better pay or working conditions?

Yes _____
No _____
Don't know _____

42. A. Given their training and experience, would you say that teachers' salaries in (school) are:

Too high, _____
About right, _____
or
Too low? _____
Don't know _____

B. Roughly, about how much do you think the average teacher in (school) earns a year?

$_____

43. We have a list of things that children sometimes do. We would like to know about how often (child) does each of the following things.
(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #2)

How often does (child):	Often,	Some-times,	Rarely,	or Never?	Don't know
A. Ask (English teacher) a question in class.	____	____	____	____	____
B. Get bored or restless in English class.	____	____	____	____	____
C. Get very interested or enthusiastic about something in English class.	____	____	____	____	____
D. Get fun out of something he (she) does in English class.	____	____	____	____	____
E. Talk out of turn or interrupt (English teacher).	____	____	____	____	____
F. Read a book, other than a comic book, not assigned or required.	____	____	____	____	____
G. Lie to you.	____	____	____	____	____
H. Cheat on tests or exams in any of his (her) subjects.	____	____	____	____	____
I. Smoke.	____	____	____	____	____

44. A. Are there any things you think it is important for (child) to be doing differently in order to get the most out of school?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 45)

B. What things?

45. A. Are there any things (English teacher) thinks it is important for (child) to be doing differently in order to get the most out of school?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No
Don't know _____ (SKIP TO 46)

B. What things?

46. A. Children have many different qualities, but in school, some qualities stand out more than others. We would like to know which one of the following six types of students best describes (child)?
(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #4)

	A Best Describes	B Next Best	C Teacher Prefers
(1) Student #1 is well behaved in class, pays attention to the teacher, works hard and tries to do well.	____	____	____
(2) Student #2 is smart, able to come up with answers, grasps things quickly and gets high grades.	____	____	____
(3) Student #3 is cooperative, is liked by others, and is friendly, good-natured and well adjusted.	____	____	____
(4) Student #4 is creative, has original ideas and a good imagination, and likes to figure things out himself.	____	____	____
(5) Student #5 is not very interested in school work, doesn't try very hard to get good marks, just does enough work to get by.	____	____	____
(6) Student #6 doesn't like most schoolwork, doesn't do his assignments, and is not cooperative.	____	____	____
(7) Don't know	____	____	____

B. Which of these describes (child) next best? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Which of these types do you think (English teacher) most prefers to teach? (RECORD ABOVE)

47. How much do you think (child) likes school this year? Does he (she) like it:

Very much,	_____
Quite a bit,	_____
Somewhat,	_____
or	
Not at all?	_____
Don't know	_____

48. A. Generally, how well would you say (child) is doing in school:

Above average,	_____	
Average,	_____	(SKIP TO 49)
or Below Average?	_____	(ASK B)
Don't know	_____	(SKIP TO 50)

B. What do you think are the main reasons why (child) is doing below average in school?

49. How can you tell how well he (she) is doing?

50. A. Do you know whether (school) gives IQ tests?

They do	_____
They don't	_____
Don't know	_____

B. Do you think IQ test scores are a good measure of (child's) ability?

Yes	_____
No	_____
Depends, Yes and No	_____
Don't know	_____

51. A. Do you know whether or not (school) gives achievement tests?

They do	_____
They don't	_____
Don't know	_____

B. Do you think achievement test scores are a good measure of (child's) ability?

Yes	_____
No	_____
Depends, Yes and No	_____
Don't know	_____

52. How satisfied are you with the way (child) is doing in school:

Very satisfied, _____
Somewhat satisfied, or _____
Not at all satisfied? _____
Don't know _____

53. Every child does some things better than others. As far as school is concerned, what do you think (child) does best?

54. Did (child) have any difficulty learning how to read?

Yes _____
No _____
Don't know _____

55. Do you recall -- did you have any difficulty learning to read when you were a child?

Yes _____
No _____
Don't remember _____
Don't know _____

56. How well would you say (child) reads for a person his (her) age:

Above average, _____
Average, or _____
Below average? _____
Don't know _____

57. How well would you say (child) can write compositions for a person his (her) age:

Above average, _____
Average, or _____
Below average? _____
Don't know _____

58. How well would you say (child) does mathematics for a person his (her) age:

Above average, _____
Average, or _____
Below average? _____
Don't know _____

59. A. About how many nights during the week does (child) do English homework? (CIRCLE ANSWER GIVEN)

0 1 2 3 4 5 (ASK B) DK (SKIP TO 60)

B. On the average, about how much time does he (she) spend on English homework on the nights when it is given? (CIRCLE ANSWER GIVEN)

0 $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ 3/4 1 $1\frac{1}{4}$ $1\frac{1}{2}$ 1-3/4 More than 2 hrs. DK

60. A. About how much time does he (she) spend on homework altogether each night on all his (her) subjects? (CIRCLE ANSWER GIVEN)

0 $\frac{1}{2}$hr. 1 $1\frac{1}{2}$ 2 $2\frac{1}{2}$ 3 $3\frac{1}{2}$ 4 $4\frac{1}{2}$hrs. DK

B. Do you think the total amount of homework (child) is assigned is:

Too much, _____
About right, _____
or Not enough? _____
Don't know _____

61. A. Does anyone ever help (child) with homework?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 62)

B. Who? (RECORD RELATIONSHIP AND SUBJECT MATTER).

62. Do you think (English teacher) expects you to help (child) with his (her) homework?

Yes _____
No _____
Don't know _____

63. Does (child) usually do all the homework assigned in all his (her) subjects?

Yes _____
No _____
Don't know _____

64. How well would you say (child) behaves at school compared with the other students in the tenth grade:

Better than most, _____
About the same as most, or _____
Not as well as most? _____
Don't know _____

65. While they are growing up, most children vary from year to year in their popularity. How popular would you say (child) is with the students in the tenth grade:

More popular than most, _____
About as popular as most, _____
or Not as popular as most? _____
Don't know _____

66. A. Compared with other children his (her) age, how well would you say (child) behaves at home:

Better than most, _____
About the same as most, or _____
Not as well as most? _____
Don't know _____

B. How often do you or your husband find you have to punish (child):

More than once a week, _____ } (ASK C)
Once a week to once a month, _____ }
Rarely, _____ } (SKIP TO 67)
or Never? _____ }

C. What kinds of things do you punish (child) for?

D. How do you usually punish (child)?

67. Compared with most mothers, how strict would you say you are with (child):

More strict than most, _____
About as strict as most, or _____
Less strict than most? _____
Don't know _____

*68. What about your husband -- compared with most fathers -- how strict would you say he is with (child):

More strict than most, _____
About as strict as most, or _____
Less strict than most? _____
Don't know _____

*69. Who is stricter, you or your husband?

I am _____
Both about the same _____
Husband is stricter _____
Don't know _____

7C. A. If your (child) goes out with friends at night, do you tell him (her) when you expect him (her) back home?

Yes _____
No _____

B. What time do you usually expect him (her) home on week nights?

_____(TIME) _____ Doesn't go out on week nights

C. What time do you usually expect him (her) home on weekend nights?

_____(TIME)

D. Suppose he (she) got home more than an hour late, what would you do?

E. Has this ever happened -- that he (she) got home more than an hour late?

Yes _____
No _____

71. Compared to two or three years ago, do you let (child) decide things for himself (herself):

Much more, _____
A little more, _____
About the same, _____
or Less? _____
Don't know _____

72. A. Suppose (child) did not want to finish high school and wanted to get a job instead. What would you do?

B. Has this ever come up -- that (child) didn't want to finish high school and wanted to get a job instead?

Yes _____
No _____

73. A. Suppose (child) came home with a bad report card, what would you do?

B. Has this ever happened -- that he (she) came home with a bad report card?

Yes _____
No _____

74. A. Suppose (child) came home with a very good report card, what would you do?

B. Has this ever happened -- that he (she) came home with a very good report card?

Yes _____
No _____

75. A. Suppose a teacher punished (child) for something (child) says he (she) didn't do. What would you do?

B. Has this ever happened -- that a teacher punished (child) for something (child) said he (she) didn't do?

Yes _____
No _____

76. How far in school do you want (child) to go? (OPEN-ENDED: DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS).

	76 Would like	77 Will actually	78 Friends will
Finish elementary school	___	___	___
Some high school	___	___	___
Finish high school	___	___	___
Some college	___	___	___
Finish 4 years college	___	___	___
Graduate school	___	___	___
Other (business school, etc.)DESCRIBE: _____	___	___	___
Don't know	___	___	___

77. Realistically, how far do you think (child) will actually go in school? (RECORD ABOVE)

78. How about his (her) close friends, how far do you think most of them will go in school? (RECORD ABOVE)

(IF CHILD IS A BOY, ASK 79 THROUGH 82).

(IF CHILD IS A GIRL, SKIP TO 83.)

79. A. If (child) could be remembered in high school for one of these things, which one would you most want it to be:

	A 1st choice	B 2nd choice	C Son's choice
A brilliant student,	____	____	____
An athletic star, or	____	____	____
Most popular?	____	____	____
Don't know	____	____	____

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. How about your son -- if he could be remembered as one of these three things, which would he want it to be? (RECORD ABOVE)

80. What kind of job would you like (child) to have when he grows up?

81. What kind of job do you think he would like to have?

82. A. Now, if (child) could be any of these things, which would be your first choice?
(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #5)

	A 1st Choice	B 2nd Choice	C Don't Want	
Policeman	____	____	____	(SKIP TO 88)
Lawyer	____	____	____	
Airplane pilot	____	____	____	
Doctor	____	____	____	
Bus driver	____	____	____	
Professional athlete	____	____	____	
College professor	____	____	____	
Garage mechanic	____	____	____	
Missionary	____	____	____	
Electrician	____	____	____	
Businessman	____	____	____	
Elevator operator	____	____	____	
Scientist	____	____	____	
Insurance salesman	____	____	____	
None or don't know	____	____	____	

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Are there any of these things that you definitely don't want him to be? (RECORD ABOVE)

MOTHERS OF DAUGHTERS ONLY (QUESTIONS 83 THROUGH 87)

83. A. If (child) could be remembered in high school for one of these things, which one would you want it to be:

	A 1st choice	B 2nd choice	C Daughter's choice
A brilliant student,	____	____	____
A leader in activities,	____	____	____
or Most popular?	____	____	____
Don't know	____	____	____

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. How about your daughter -- if she could be remembered for one of these things, which would she want it to be? (RECORD ABOVE)

84. What do you want (child) to do when she finishes her schooling? (IF WORK MENTIONED, BUT NO SPECIFIC JOB, ASK: What kind of job do you want her to have?)

85. What do you think your daughter wants to do when she finishes her schooling?

86. A. Now, if (child) could be any of these things, which would be your first choice?
(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #6)

	A 1st Choice	B 2nd Choice	C Don't Want
Actress	____	____	____
Artist	____	____	____
Nurse	____	____	____
Waitress	____	____	____
Model	____	____	____
Teacher	____	____	____
Saleslady in store	____	____	____
Beautician	____	____	____
Secretary	____	____	____
Airline stewardess	____	____	____
Full-time housewife	____	____	____
Scientist	____	____	____
Social worker	____	____	____
Woman's magazine editor	____	____	____
None or don't know	____	____	____

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Are there any of these things that you definitely don't want her to be? (RECORD ABOVE)

87. What is the least amount of education you'd be satisfied for your daughter's husband to have? (OPEN ENDED QUESTION, DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE IS MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS.)

Finish elementary school	_____
Some high school	_____
Finish high school	_____
Some college	_____
Finish 4 years of college	_____
Graduate school	_____
Other (business school, etc.)DESCRIBE: _____	_____
Don't know	_____

(ALL MOTHERS):

88. Have any of your children ever been members of the Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts, including Cubs, Brownies, and Campfire girls?

	Sample child	One or more Other Children
Yes	____	____
No	____	____

89. Have any of your children ever taken lessons outside of school in art, dancing, dramatics, or music?

	Sample child	One or More Other Children
Yes	____	____
No	____	____

90. Have any of your children ever attended Sunday School regularly?

	Sample Child	One or More Other Children
Yes	____	____
No	____	____

91. What does (child) do after school most afternoons?

92. Generally, do you think the schools here have about as much money as they need to do a good job?

Yes	_____
No	_____
Don't know	_____

HM

93. Would you say the taxes paid in (community) in order to support your schools are:

Too high,	_____
About right, or	_____
Too low?	_____
Don't know	_____

94. A. Do you think there are any things the local schools are spending too much money on?

Yes	_____	(ASK B)
No	_____	(SKIP TO 95)
Don't know	_____	

B. What things?

95. A. Do you think there are any things that the local schools should spend more money on, even if this meant an increase in your taxes?

Yes	_____	(ASK B)
No	_____	(SKIP TO 96)
Don't know	_____	

B. What things?

96. Suppose you felt that (school) was not doing as good a job of teaching basic subjects as other schools in New Jersey. How much do you think that you could do to bring about a change:

A great deal,	_____	(ASK 97)
Something,	_____	
Only a little, or	_____	
Nothing at all?	_____	(SKIP TO 98)
Don't know	_____	

97. What, for example, could you do?

98. A. How much emphasis is placed on athletic activities and team sports like football in(school):

A great deal,	_____
Some, or	_____
Little or none?	_____
Don't know	_____

98. B. Do you think the emphasis placed on team sports in (school) is:

Too much, _____
About right, _____
or Not enough? _____
Don't know _____

99. Here are things that some schools do and others don't. We would like to know whether you think it is a good idea or a bad idea to do each of these things, and also, whether they are being done or not in the school system in (community):

	A			B		
A. Do you think it is a good idea or a bad idea for a school to: (each item) and B. Is this being done in the school system here? (each item)	Good Idea	Bad Idea	DK	Yes	No	DK
(a) Put slow learning children together in the same group for special instruction?	___	___	___	___	___	___
(b) Put especially bright children into a group for special instruction?	___	___	___	___	___	___
(c) Promote a child who has not been able to keep up with the rest of the class, rather than have him repeat with a younger group?	___	___	___	___	___	___
(d) Skip a particularly bright child to a higher grade, even though he may be younger than others in his new class?	___	___	___	___	___	___
(e) Teach children the new mathematics?	___	___	___	___	___	___
(f) Use programmed materials or teaching machines in the classroom?	___	___	___	___	___	___
(g) Teach a foreign language in the elementary school grades?	___	___	___	___	___	___
(h) Use TV in the classroom?	___	___	___	___	___	___

100. Now I'd like to know which of these comes closest to your feelings about some statements I'm going to read to you.
(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #7 AND READ THE FIRST STATEMENT. THEN ASK: DO YOU STRONGLY AGREE, SOMEWHAT AGREE, ETC.)

Do you:	Strongly Agree,	Some-what Agree,	Somewhat Disagree,	or Strongly Disagree?	(Vol.) Neither Agree nor dis-agree, don't know
1. Schools will do better in the long run using tried and tested ways of teaching, rather than new, untested ways.	___	___	___	___	___
2. The amount of money a family has often determines how the child will be treated in the local schools.	___	___	___	___	___
3. Teachers generally are well prepared to handle the personal problems of children.	___	___	___	___	___
4. Teachers too often think they "know it all."	___	___	___	___	___
5. In general, teachers work harder than most people.	___	___	___	___	___
6. Teachers who have children of their own are better able to handle students.	___	___	___	___	___
7. The(school) is doing a very good job helping the students plan for their future.	___	___	___	___	___
8. A person who wants to get ahead today has to do well in school.	___	___	___	___	___
9. A principal should visit classes regularly to see how well teachers are doing.	___	___	___	___	___
10. Generally, when parents get into arguments with teachers, the principal should support the teachers.	___	___	___	___	___
11. Most of the students at (school) are more interested in sports or dating than in their studies.	___	___	___	___	___

(GET CARD #7 BACK FROM RESPONDENT)

101. A. Do you think the school board in (community) pays too much attention to what certain groups think and not enough to the rest of the community?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____
Don't know _____ (SKIP TO 102)

B. Which groups do they pay too much attention to?

102. A. How often do people ever ask you your opinion about school or community affairs:

Often, _____
Sometimes, _____
Rarely, _____
or Never? _____

103. How many people in this neighborhood do you know well enough to spend half an hour or so with them now and then?

_____ (Number)

104. Not counting relatives who may live around here, how often do you get together with your neighbors either at your home or theirs:

Almost every day, _____
Once or twice a week, _____
Once or twice a month, _____
A few times a year or less, or _____
Never? _____

105. About how much time do you spend watching TV on an average weekday counting daytime and evening viewing? (CIRCLE ANSWER)

0 $\frac{1}{2}$hr. 1 $1\frac{1}{2}$ 2 $2\frac{1}{2}$ 3 $3\frac{1}{2}$ 4 $4\frac{1}{2}$ 5 or more hrs. Don't know

106. About how much time does (child) spend watching TV on an average weekday counting daytime and evening viewing? (CIRCLE ANSWER)

0 $\frac{1}{2}$hr. 1 $1\frac{1}{2}$ 2 $2\frac{1}{2}$ 3 $3\frac{1}{2}$ 4 $4\frac{1}{2}$ 5 or more hrs. Don't know

107. A. Do you have any rules about watching TV that (child) has to follow?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 108)

B. What rules?

108. A. Do you read any newspapers regularly?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 109)

B. Which ones?

109. A. Do you read any magazines regularly?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 110)

B. Which one(s)?

110. What about books? About how many books for adults do you have in the home? (IF RESPONDENT SAYS DON'T KNOW, TRY TO GET ESTIMATE, STARTING WITH THE SMALLEST CATEGORY BELOW.)

less than 10	____	201 - 300	____
10 - 25	____	301 - 500	____
26 - 50	____	501 - 1000	____
51 - 100	____	over 1000	____
101 - 200	____	Don't know	____

111. A. Do you belong to the PTA at (school)?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO C)
No PTA _____ (SKIP TO 113)

B. How many meetings have you attended this school year?

_____Number

*C. How about your husband? Does he belong to the PTA at (school)?

Yes _____ (ASK D)
No _____ (SKIP TO 112)

*D. How many meetings has he attended this school year?

_____Number

112. A. What kinds of things does the PTA at (school) do?

112. B. How good a job overall do you think the (school) PTA is doing:

Excellent,	_____
Good,	_____
Only Fair,	_____
or Poor?	_____
Don't know	_____

113. A. How long have you lived at this address? _____years

B. How long have you lived in (community)? _____years

(IF RESPONDENT HAS LIVED IN (COMMUNITY) ALL HER LIFE, SKIP TO 114)

C. Where did you live before moving to (community)? _____
(city) (state)

114. Do you own or rent this house (apartment)?

Own	_____
Rent	_____
Other (write in)	_____

115. How many rooms do you have? _____

116. How much do you like living here in this neighborhood:

Very much,	_____
Somewhat,	_____
Not much, or	_____
Not at all?	_____

117. Do you expect to move from this neighborhood within the next five years?

Yes	_____
No	_____
Don't know	_____

118. When it comes to money, compared with other families in this neighborhood, would you say you are:

Better off than most,	_____
About as well off as most, or	_____
Not as well off as most?	_____
Don't know	_____

119. A. In the last few years, have there been any changes in the type of people living in this neighborhood -- that is, more people of one religion, nationality, race, income group, or things like that?

Yes	_____	(ASK B)
No	_____	
Don't know	_____	(SKIP TO 120)

B. What changes?

C. Has this caused any special problems or difficulty?

HM

IF RESPONDENT IS MARRIED AND LIVING WITH HUSBAND, ASK 120. IF RESPONDENT IS DIVORCED, SEPARATED, OR WIDOWED, SKIP TO 127.

*120. How far in school did your husband go? (OPEN-ENDED, DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE IS MENTIONED, ASK NUMBER OF YEARS)

Finished elementary school _____
Some high school _____
Finished high school _____
Some college _____
Finished 4 years college _____
Graduate school _____
Other: DESCRIBE:
_____ _____
Don't know _____

*121. A. Is your husband working at the present time?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 124)

B. What kind of work does he do? (DESCRIBE FULLY POSITION AND BUSINESS OR FIELD)

C. In what town does he work? (RECORD TOWN AND STATE)

*122. Does he have his own business or does he work for someone else?

Self _____ (ASK 123A)
Else _____ (SKIP TO 123C)

*123. A. Does he employ anyone?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 125)

B. About how many people does he employ?

_____ (SKIP TO 125)
Number

C. Does he supervise anyone?

Yes _____ (ASK D)
No _____ (SKIP TO 125)

D. About how many people does he supervise?

_____ (SKIP TO 125)
Number

*124. What kind of work does your husband usually do? (DESCRIBE FULLY POSITION AND FIELD AND WHETHER USUALLY SELF-EMPLOYED OR WORKING FOR OTHERS.)

*125. Where was your husband born?

_____ City or Town _____ State _____ Country (if not U.S.A.)

*126. Where did he live mostly when he was growing up?

_____ City or Town _____ State _____ Country (if not U.S.A.)

127. How old are you? _____ (years)

128. Where were you born?

_____ City or Town _____ State _____ Country (if not U.S.A.)

129. Where did you live mostly when you were growing up?

_____ City or Town _____ State _____ Country (if not U.S.A.)

130. How far in school did you go? (OPEN-ENDED, DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS)

Finished elementary school	_____
Some high school	_____
Finished high school	_____
Some college	_____
Finished four years college	_____
Graduate school	_____
Other: DESCRIBE:	
_____	_____

131. A. Are you working at the present time?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 132)

B. What kind of work do you do? (DESCRIBE FULLY POSITION AND BUSINESS OR FIELD)

C. About how many hours per week do you work? _____ Number (SKIP TO 133) (AND SEE DIRECTIONS)

132. A. When was the last time you did work?

Never worked _____ (SKIP TO 133 AND SEE DIRECTIONS)

B. What kind of work did you do then? (DESCRIBE FULLY POSITION AND BUSINESS OR FIELD)

(IF WIFE SEPARATED, WIDOWED OR DIVORCED, ASK 133. IF MARRIED AND LIVING WITH HUSBAND, SKIP TO 134)

133. What was your husband's usual occupation? (DESCRIBE FULLY POSITION AND BUSINESS OR FIELD)

(ALL MOTHERS):

134. A. What category best represents your total family income before taxes? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD #8)

a) Less than $3000	_____	(ASK B)
b) $3000 - $3999	_____	
c) $4000 - $4999	_____	
d) $5000 - $5999	_____	(SKIP TO 135)
e) $6000 - $7999	_____	
f) $8000 - $9999	_____	
g) $10,000 - $14,999	_____	
h) $15,000 - $19,999	_____	
i) Over $20,000	_____	
Don't know	_____	
Refusal	_____	

B. Do you receive any public assistance?

YES _____

NO _____

135. A. What is your religion?

Protestant	_____	(ASK B)
Catholic	_____	
Jewish	_____	(SKIP TO 136)
Other	_____	
None	_____	(SKIP TO 137)
Refusal	_____	

B. What denomination?

Baptist	_____
Congregational	_____
Episcopal	_____
Lutheran	_____
Methodist	_____
Presbyterian	_____
Other	_____
Don't know	_____

136. How often do you usually attend church (or synagogue):

Once a week or more, _____
A few times a month, _____
Once a month, _____
Less than once a month, _____
or Very rarely or never? _____
Don't know _____

137. Regardless of how you have voted in the past, what do you usually consider yourself:

A Democrat, _____
A Republican, _____
Some other party, _____
Or what? (SPECIFY): _____
_____ _____
Refusal _____

138. A. Did you vote last November for President?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____
Don't remember _____ (SKIP TO 139)

B. Did you vote for:

Johnson, _____
Goldwater, _____
or Someone Else? _____
(Vol.) Don't remember _____
Refusal _____

139. Did you vote in a school election during the past school year?

Yes _____
No _____
Not eligible _____
Don't remember _____

140. People often talk about different classes in America -- like the middle class, the lower class, the working class, or the upper class. Which of these would you say you belong to -- the middle, lower, working, or upper class?

Upper _____
Middle _____
Working _____
Lower _____
(Vol.)There are no classes _____
Don't know _____

141. Where was your mother born?

_____ _____ _____
City or Town State Country (if not U.S.A.)

HM

142. How about your father? Where was he born?

_____ _____ _____
City or Town State Country (if not U.S.A.)

143. What was your father's usual occupation? (DESCRIBE POSITION AND BUSINESS OR FIELD)

144. How far in school did your father go? (OPEN-ENDED, DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS)

Finished elementary school	____
Some high school	____
Finished high school	____
Some college	____
Finished 4 years college	____
Graduate school	____
Other (business school etc.) DESCRIBE:	
_____	____
Don't know	____

Time Completed: _____

Date: _____ Interviewer: _____

HM

FOR INTERVIEWER ONLY

A. Address (include apartment number) of respondent's household.

_____

_____

_____ _____
(Apartment Number)

B. Type of structure:

Single-family home detached	____
Single-family home attached	____
Two-family house detached	____
Two-family house attached	____
Multiple dwelling-unit building	____
Approximate number of dwelling units	____
Rooming house	____
Other (SPECIFY)	_____

C. Respondent's race:

White	____
Negro	____
Puerto Rican	____
Other (SPECIFY)	_____

D. Cooperation of respondent:

Very cooperative	____
Somewhat cooperative	____
Not cooperative	____

E. Interest of respondent:

Very interested	____
Somewhat interested	____
Uninterested	____

F. Other comments:

(Interruptions. Anyone else present during interview? Who? Overall reactions or respondent, etc.)

March 30, 1965

NEW JERSEY STUDY

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR

HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

(MAKE SURE YOU HAVE CLASS ROLL BEFORE STARTING INTERVIEW)

INTERVIEWER: As you have heard, we are doing a study of what the teachers, parents, and students in several New Jersey communities think about public elementary and high school education. You have been selected for an interview as the teacher of (period) 10th grade English class at (High School). The answers you give to the questions we ask are confidential, and no one will be told what you have said as an individual. There are no right or wrong answers to most of these questions. We are interested in your opinions and perceptions so we may help the community better understand how the schools are trying to serve them.

Time began: _____ Teacher's Name: _____

1. A. How long have you been teaching altogether? # _____ years

   B. How long have you been teaching in (school) ? # _____ years

   C. Aside from being a home room teacher, do you have any positions in school other than teaching classes?

      Yes ____ (ask D)

      No ____ (skip to 2A)

   D. Would you please describe the position(s):

2. A. With about how many of the mothers of your _(period)_ students have you had private conferences this school year?

_____

B. With about how many of the fathers of these students have you had private conferences this school year at the same time as with the mothers, and with how many separately?

number conferred with at same time as with mothers: # ____

number conferred with separately: # _____

3. When was the last time you had a private conference with a mother of one of the students in your _(period)_ English class:

within the last week, ____
2 to 4 weeks ago, ____
a month or two ago, ____
or longer ago than that? ____ (ask B)

Or haven't you spoken with any this school year? ____ (skip to 4)

B. Who contacted whom? (How?)

C. Where did you speak with her?

On the phone ____
At school ____
Other (write in): _____

D. What did you talk about? Were there any problems that came up and how did the discussion come out?

E. Is this the sort of thing you usually discuss in conferences with the parents of these students, or was this unusual?

This was usual ____ (ask F)
This was unusual ____ (skip to G)

F. What are some of the other kinds of things that sometimes come up in these conferences?

4. Of all the conferences with mothers you have had this year, how many would you estimate have resulted from initiative on the part of the mothers themselves:

All or most of them, ____
more than half, ____
about half, ____
less than half, ____
or few or none? ____

5. Do you think a mother should always have at least one conference with each of her child's major subject teachers, even if the child has no special problems?

Yes ____
No ____

6. A. About how many of the mothers of your students do you think find it difficult to visit the school for conferences with teachers?

None ____ (skip to 7A)
a few, ____
about half, ____ (ask B)
or most? ____
Don't know ____ (skip to 7A)

B. Why do you think some find it difficult? (Any other reason?)

7. A. Generally, how many of the mothers of your (period) students feel uncomfortable talking to teachers?

None ____ (skip to C)
a few, ____
about half, ____ (ask B)
or most? ____
Don't know ____ (skip to C)

B. Why do you think they are uncomfortable?

C. Generally, how comfortable do you feel talking to most parents:

Very comfortable, ____ (skip to 8A)
somewhat comfortable, ____
somewhat uncomfortable, ____ (ask D)
or very uncomfortable? ____

D. Why do you feel uncomfortable?

8. As far as giving a good education is concerned, compared with other public schools in the United States, do you think (school) is:

Better than most, ____

about the same as most, ____

or not as good as most? ____

Don't know ____

Qualified answer ____

9. How do you think the schools in (community) compare with those you attended as far as giving a good education is concerned? Would you say they are on the whole:

Better, ____

about the same, ____

or not as good? ____

Don't know ____

Qualified answer ____

10. A. If you had to choose one thing about (school) that you like the most, what would it be?

B. What do you think is the one thing about (school) that the mothers of your students like the most?

11. A. If you had to choose one thing about (school) that you dislike the most, what would it be?

B. What do you think is the one thing about (school) that the mothers of your students dislike the most?

12. A. In your opinion, are there some children in this community who are not getting as good an education as others?

Yes ____ (ask B)

No ____] (skip to 13A)

Don't know ____]

B. What kinds of children? (RECORD BELOW)

	B (kinds of children)	C (why not getting as good education)
1)		
2)		
3)		

C. Why do you think (each kind mentioned) are not getting as good an education as others? (RECORD ABOVE)

13. A. In your opinion, are there any special teachers or other kinds of staff members that (school) should have, but doesn't?

Yes ____ (ask B)

No ____] (skip to 14)

Don't know ____]

B. What kinds?

14. About how much schooling do you think most young men need these days to get along well in the world? (OPEN-ENDED; DO NOT READ CATEGORIES)

a) finish grade school ____

b) some high school ____

c) finish high school ____

d) some college ____

e) finish four years college ____

f) some graduate school ____

g) finish graduate school ____

h) other (business school, etc.) ____
Describe:

_____

i) Don't know ____

15. A. Although all schools teach students more of less the same things, some schools emphasize different aspects of education. Suppose that there were four high schools in (community) and that you had to choose the one you wanted to teach in:

Which of these schools would you most want to teach in? Which would be your second choice? Your third choice?

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD)

	A (Prefer to teach in) 1st 2nd 3rd	B Mothers prefer	C Most like (school)
School #1 feels that the most important task of the high school is primarily intellectual, that is, to provide students with information, to teach them reading, writing, and arithmetic, give them the ability to figure things out for themselves and a desire to learn more.	___ ___ ___	___	___
School #2 is primarily interested in social things like teaching students how to get along with others, and to be good citizens who are loyal to America.	___ ___ ___	___	___
School #3 is concerned with the personal development of the student, that is, seeing that they possess a sense of right and wrong, develop into mature and stable persons who are in good physical condition, and learn to enjoy things like music and hobbies.	___ ___ ___	___	___
School #4 is most concerned about the more practical things like helping students choose the right occupation or college, giving them specialized job training, and preparing them for marriage and family living.	___ ___ ___	___	___

B. Which of these schools would most mothers here in (community) want to send their children to? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Which of these schools is most like (high school) ? (RECORD ABOVE)

16. We have a list of things that teachers sometimes do. Can you tell me about how often you do each of them in your (period) English class? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD)

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Can't say or DK
A) Praise a student in front of the class for doing a lesson or answering a question well.	___	___	___	___	___
B) Scold or "bawl out" students in front of the class.	___	___	___	___	___
C) Give special help to a student who is having difficulty with his schoolwork.	___	___	___	___	___
D) Give special help to a student who is ahead of the rest of the class.	___	___	___	___	___
E) Lose your temper in front of the class.	___	___	___	___	___
F) Help a student with a personal problem not connected with school.	___	___	___	___	___
G) Encourage the students to read books at home.	___	___	___	___	___
H) Talk with students about events like what is happening in the South or in Vietnam.	___	___	___	___	___
I) Show favoritism toward a particular student.	___	___	___	___	___
J) Get fun out of what you are doing with the class.	___	___	___	___	___

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD)

17. A. Are there any of these things that you think you should be doing differently than you are?

Yes ___ (ask B)

No ___] (skip to 18A)

Don't know ___]

B. What things?

18. A. Are there any of these things that the mothers of your (period) students think you should be doing differently?

Yes ____ (ask B)

No ____

Don't know ____ (skip to 19)

B. What things?

19. A. Although teachers have to concern themselves with many different things in their jobs, some teachers emphasize certain things more than others. We would like to know which one of the following four types of teachers you think is most like yourself.

	A Most like teacher 1st	B 2nd	C Mothers prefer	D Principal prefers	E (period) students prefer
Teacher #1 is most concerned with maintaining discipline, seeing that students work hard, and teaching them to follow directions.	___	___	___	___	___
Teacher #2 feels it's most important that students know their subject matter well, and that she cover the material thoroughly and test their progress regularly.	___	___	___	___	___
Teacher #3 stresses making the class interesting and encourages students to be creative and to figure things out for themselves.	___	___	___	___	___
Teacher #4 thinks it's most important that a teacher be friendly and well liked by children and able to understand and to handle their problems.	___	___	___	___	___

B. Which do you think is next most like yourself? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Which of these four types of teacher do you think most of the mothers of the students in your (period) class prefer? (RECORD ABOVE)

D. How about your principal? Which type do you think he (she) prefers? (RECORD ABOVE)

E. Which type of teacher do you think most of the students in your (period) class prefer? (RECORD ABOVE)

20. We have some things that mothers sometimes do. Can you tell me how many of the mothers of the students in your (period) English class do each of these?

(INTERVIEWER: IF TEACHER ANSWERS "DON'T KNOW" ON ANY ITEM, RECORD IN "DON T KNOW" COLUMN AND THEN ASK: "WELL, THINKING OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS, HOW MANY OF THEIR MOTHERS DO YOU THINK SHOULD DO THIS?" RECORD ANSWER ON SAME LINE TOGETHER WITH THE "DON'T KNOW" AND GO ON TO THE NEXT ITEM)

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD) How many of the mothers ever:	All or almost all	More than half	About half	Less than half	Very few or none	Don't know
A) Talk with child about what he is doing at school	___	___	___	___	___	___
B) How many encourage child to read books at home	___	___	___	___	___	___
C) How many talk with other parents about what is going on at school	___	___	___	___	___	___
D) How many give child chores to do at home	___	___	___	___	___	___
E) How many praise child	___	___	___	___	___	___
F) How many talk with their child about events like what is going on in the South or Vietnam?	___	___	___	___	___	___
G) How many do something with child that's fun for both	___	___	___	___	___	___
H) How many help their child with his English homework	___	___	___	___	___	___

21. We'd like to know if there are any things at all that you think it is important for the mothers of the students in your (period) English class to do differently than they are in order to help the students get the most benefit from your class. Anything else? (FOR ANYTHING MENTIONED, TRY TO FIND OUT HOW MANY MOTHERS THIS APPLIES TO)

22. A. How concerned do you think most of the mothers of your (period) students are in seeing that their children get a good education:

Very concerned, _____
Somewhat concerned, _____
or
Not too concerned? _____

B. Do you think most mothers of your students are too strict or not strict enough with their children?

Too strict _____
About right _____
Not strict enough _____
Don't know _____

23. A. Do parents ever put pressure on you to do things that you think you should not be doing?

Yes_____ (Ask B and C)

No _____ (Skip to 24A)

B. What kinds of things?

C. How do they put pressure on you?

24. A. Do parents ever put pressure on you not to do things you think you should be doing?

Yes_____ (Ask B and C)

No _____ (Skip to 25)

B. What kinds of things?

C. How do they put pressure on you?

25. Here are some things that students sometimes do. Can you tell me about how many students in your (period) English class do this.

(CARD TO RESPONDENT)	All or almost all	More than half	About half	Less than half	Very few or none	Don't know
How many of the students ever:						
A) Ask you a question in class	___	___	___	___	___	___
B) How many get bored or restless in class	___	___	___	___	___	___
C) How many get very interested or enthusiastic about something in class	___	___	___	___	___	___
D) How many get fun out of something you do with the class	___	___	___	___	___	___
E) How many talk out of turn or interrupt you	___	___	___	___	___	___
F) How many read a book, other than a comic book, not assigned by you	___	___	___	___	___	___
Probe: How many of the students like to read	___	___	___	___	___	___
G) How many fail to do their English homework	___	___	___	___	___	___
H) How many get into a physical fight with another student in or out of the classrcom	___	___	___	___	___	___
I) How many remain after school sometimes to talk with you or ask you questions	___	___	___	___	___	___

26. We'd like to know if there are any things at all that you think it is important for the students in your (period) English class to be doing differently than they are in order for them to get the most benefit from class. Anything else? (FOR ANYTHING MENTIONED, TRY TO FIND OUT HOW MANY OF THE STUDENTS THIS APPLIES TO)

27. A. How many students are there in your (period) class? _____

B. How many children do you think there should be in a 10th grade English class? _____

28. A. Would you say most of the students in your (period) English class think school is:

A lot of fun, _____
Some fun, _____
Somewhat unpleasant, _____
or
Very unpleasant? _____
Don't know _____

B. How do you think most of these students feel about you -- would you say most of them like you:

Very much. _____
Somewhat, _____
A little, _____
or
Not at all? _____
Don't know _____

29. Generally, compared with other 10th grade students in the United States, would you say most of the students in your (period) class are doing:

Below average work, _____
Average work, _____
or
Above average work? _____
Don't know _____

30. What do you think are some of the main reasons why some students don't do as well as others in your class?

31. A. Does the school give IQ tests?

Yes_____ (Ask B)
No _____ (Skip to C)

B. What sort of use do you personally make of these?

C. In general, do you think IQ scores are a good measure of the ability of your students?

Yes_____(skip to 32A)
No _____)
Other (write in)_____) (Ask D)

D. In what ways are they not a good measure of students' ability?

32. A. Does the school give achievement tests?

Yes_____ (Ask B)
No _____ (Skip to C)

B. What sort of use do you personally make of these?

C. In general, do you think achievement test scores are a good measure of the ability of your students?

Yes_____ (Skip to 33)
No_____)
Other (write in):_____)(Ask D)

D. In what ways are they not a good measure of student's ability?

33. How satisfied are you with the way most of the students in the (period) class are doing:

Very satisfied, _____
Somewhat satisfied, _____
or
Not at all satisfied? _____
Don't know _____

34. About how many of the students in your (period) class have a reading problem?

Number_____

35. About how many nights during the week do you assign homework? (CIRCLE ANSWER)

None _____ (Skip to 37)

1 2 3 4 5 (Ask 36A)

36. A. About how many hours of homework do you assign on the nights when it is given?

$\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ 3/4 1 $1\frac{1}{4}$ $1\frac{1}{2}$ 1-3/4 2 More than 2 hrs

B. About how many hours are assigned altogether by all the teachers for all the subjects?

1 $\frac{1}{2}$ 1 $1\frac{1}{2}$ 2 $2\frac{1}{2}$ 3 $3\frac{1}{2}$ 4 $4\frac{1}{2}$ DK

cont. .....

36. C. What about the total amount of homework in all subjects the students in your (period) class are assigned -- do you think it is:

	C you	D most mothers
Too much,	___	___
About right,	___	___
or		
Too little?	___	___

D. Do you think most mothers of these students think this is too much, about right, or too little? (RECORD ABOVE)

37. A. Children tend to have many different qualities, but certain qualities seem to stand out more than others. We would like to know which one of the following six types of students you most prefer to teach.

	A Most prefer to teach 1st	B 2nd	C Two students most like each type
1) Student #1 is well behaved in class, pays attention to the teacher, works hard and tries to do well	___	___	1)_____ 2)_____
2) Student #2 is smart, able to come up with answers, grasps things quickly and gets high hardes	___	___	1)_____ 2)_____
3) Student #3 is cooperative, is liked by others, and is friendly, good-natured and well adjusted	___	___	1)_____ 2)_____
4) Student #4 is creative, has original ideas and a gocd imagination, and likes to figure things out himself	___	___	1)_____ 2)_____
5) Student #5 is not very interested in school work, doesn't try very hard to get good marks, just dces enough to get by	___	___	1)_____ 2)_____
6) Student #6 dcesn't like schook work, doesn't do his assignments, and is not cooperative	___	___	1)_____ 2)_____

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Could you give me the names of the two students in your class who are most like student #1? (ASK FOR EACH TYPE AND RECORD ABOVE)

38. Now, I'd like you to think of the students in your (period) class and tell me which two you think: (WRITE IN NAMES)

	1.	2.
A) Like you ths most		
B) Like you the least		
C) Are most popular with their classmates		
D) Are least popular with their classmates		
E) Are best behaved		
F) Are worst behaved		
G) Will most likely drop out of high school		

(IF NO ONE IS LIKELY TO DROP OUT, SKIP TO 40)

39. How many students in your (period) class do you think will drop out before completing high school?

Number_____

40. About how many of the students do you think will complete 4 years of college?

Number_____

41. Which group of occupations do you think most of the boys in your (period) class will go into? Will most become?

Professionals, _____
Businessmen, _____
Sales or office workers, _____
Skilled labor, _____
Factory workers, or other semi-skilled laborers, _____
Unskilled laborers _____
or Farmers? _____
Don't know _____

42. A. If their sons could be remembered in high school for just one thing, what do you think most mothers of the students in your (period) class would like them to be remembered as:

	A (Mothers)	B (Boys)
A brilliant student,		
An athletic star,		
or the Most popular?		
Don't know		

B. What do you think most of the boys in the class would like to be remembered as? (RECORD ABOVE)

43. A. If their daugh rs could be remembered in high school for just one thing, what do you think most mothers would like them to be remembered as:

	A (Mothers)	B (Girls)
A brilliant student,	____	____
A leader in activities,	____	____
or the Most popular?	____	____
Don't know	____	____

B. What do you think most of the girls in the (period) class would like to be remembered as? (RECORD ABOVE)

44. About how many hours do you think most of the students watch TV on an average weekday counting daytime and evening viewing?

0 ½ 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5or more DK

45. About how many hours do you watch TV on an average weekday counting daytime and evening viewing?

1 ½ 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5or more DK

46. A. What do you think the mothers of your students should do when their children come home with bad report cards? (Anything else?)

B. Do most mothers do this when their children come home with bad report cords?

Yes_____
No _____
DK _____

47. Some parents reward their children with money when they get good report cards. Do you think it's a good idea to do that?

Yes_____
No _____
Conditional_____
DK _____

48. Suppose their child wanted to quit school and get a job instead -- what would most mothers do about this? (Anything else?)

49. Suppose a child went home and said you had punished him (her) -- for something he (she) didn't do -- what do you think most mothers of your students would do about it?

50. Do you find your present job to be:

Very rewarding, _____
Fairly rewarding, _____
Not very rewarding, _____
or
Unrewarding? _____

51. A. On the average, what is the total amount of time per week that you spend working at school?

Hours_____

B. How many additional hours do you spend at home on school work? _____ Hours

C. How do you feel about the total amount of time connected with your teaching duties? Is it:

Quite light, _____
A reasonable amount, _____
Somewhat too much, _____
or
A very heavy load? _____

52. A. About how much do you think the average teacher in this school makes a year?

$_____
Don't know_____

B. Do you think the average teacher's pay here is:

Too high, _____
About right, _____
or
Too low? _____

53. How do you think that teachers' pay at the present time compares with the pay levels in other professions which require a similar educational background? Is it:

Much higher, _____
Somewhat higher, _____
About the same, _____
Somewhat Lower, _____
or Much lower? _____
Don't know _____

54. A. Can you think of any rules that teachers ought to follow in their private lives that don't apply to most other people?

Yes_____(Ask B)
No _____(Skip to 55)

B. What, for instance?

55. Do you think teachers should be allowed to go on strike for better pay or working conditions?

Yes_____
No _____
DK _____

56. A. Although principals have to concern themselves with many different things in their jobs, some principals emphasize certain things more than others. Which of these four types would you most prefer as principal in a school in which you were a teacher?
(HAND RESPONDENT CARD)

	A Choice to work under 1st	B to 2nd	C Most like present Principal
1) Principal #1 encourages teachers to try out new methods, keeps up with the latest developments in educational practice, and likes to try new things in the school	___	___	___
2) Principal #2 is popular with mothers, teachers, and students, is friendly and cooperative, and promotes good relations between school and community	___	___	___
3) Principal #3 runs the school efficiently, knows what's going on in most classrooms during the day and maintains clear rules and regulations	___	___	___
4) Principal #4 is especially well-educated, interested in intellectual things, and stresses high academic standards	___	___	___

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Which is most like your principal? (RECORD ABOVE)

57. A. Do you think the PTA is doing a good job here in _____ ?
community

No _____
Conditional _____
Yes _____
Don't know _____

B. What kinds of things does the PTA in this school do?

C. Do you belong to the PTA?

Yes _____
No _____

58. Do you think in general the schools here have about as much money as they need to do a good job?

Yes _____
No _____
DK _____

59. A. Do you think there are any things that the local schools are spending too much money on?

Yes _____ (Ask B)

No _____)
Don't know _____) (Skip to 60A)

B. What things?

60. A. Do you think there are any things that the local schools should spend more money on, even though this meant an increase in taxes?

Yes _____ (Ask B)

No _____)
Don't know _____) (Skip to 61A)

What kinds of things?

61. A. How much emphasis does the local high school place on athletic activities and team sports like football:

A great deal, _____
Some, _____
or
Little or none? _____
Don't know _____

B. Do you think the emphasis placed by the school on team sports is:

Too much, _____
About right, _____
or
Not enough? _____
Don't know _____

62. What would you estimate to be the average yearly income of most of the families of your students?

$_____/year Don't know_____

63. A. What is the most common occupation of the fathers of your pupils:

	A	B	
Professionals,	___	___	
Businessmen,	___	___	
Sales or office workers,	___	___	
Factory workers or other semi-skilled laborers,	___	___	
Unskilled laborers,	___	___	
or Farmers?	___	___	
Don't know	___	___	(Skip to 64A)

B. What is the second most common occupation? (RECORD ABOVE)

64. A. In the last five years, have there been any changes in the type of people going to this school -- that is, more people of one religion, nationality, race, income group, or things like that?

Yes _____ (Ask B and C)

No _____)
Don't know_____) (Skip to 65)

B. What groups?

C. Has this caused any special problems or difficulty?

Yes _____ (Ask D)
No _____) Skip to 65
Don't know ___)

D. What problems or difficulties?

65. Here are some things that some schools do and others don't. We would like to know if you think it's a good idea or a bad idea for a school to do these, and if any of them are being done in the local school system?

	Good Idea	Bad Idea	Don't know	Conditional (volunteer)	Being Done: Yes	Being Done: No	Being Done: Don't know
For example, is it a good idea or a bad idea to:							
A) Put slow learning children together in the same group for special instruction?	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Is this being done in your school system?							
B) Put especially bright children into a group for special instruction	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
C) Promote a child who has not been able to keep up with the rest of the class, rather than making him repeat with a younger group	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
D) Skip a particularly bright child to a higher grade, even though he may be younger than others in his new class	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
E) Teach children the new mathematics	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
F) Use programmed materials or teaching machines in the classroom	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
G) Teach a foreign language in the elementary school grades	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
H) Use TV in the classroom	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

66. Now I have a list of statements and I'd like to know how much you agre or disagree with each: (HAND RESPONDENT CARD)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The first statement is:					
1) Schools will do better in the long run using tried and tested ways of teaching, rather than new untested ways	___	___	___	___	___
2) The amount of money a family has often determines how the child will be treated in the local schools	___	___	___	___	___
3) Teachers generally are well prepared to handle the personal problems of children better than most people	___	___	___	___	___
4) In general, teachers work harder than most people	___	___	___	___	___
5) Teachers who have children of their own are better able to handle students	___	___	___	___	___
6) A principal should visit classes regularly to see how well teachers are doing	___	___	___	___	___
7) A person who wants to get ahead today has to do well in school	___	___	___	___	___
8) Parents too often think they have all the right answers	___	___	___	___	___
9) Principals should support teachers when they get into disputes with parents	___	___	___	___	___

67. A. Do you think the school board in (community) pays too much attention to what certain groups think and not enough to the rest of the community?

Yes_____ (Ask B)

No _____)
Don't know_____) (Skip to 68A)

B. Which groups do they pay too much attention to?

68. A. Do you belong to any teachers associations, unions, or other educational organizations?

Yes_____ (Ask B and C)
No _____ (Skip to 69)

B. Which ones?

	B Organization	C Officer or Committee Member Yes	No
1)	_____	___	___
2)	_____	___	___
3)	_____	___	___
4)	_____	___	___

C. Are you, or were you ever an officer or committee member of _____? (RECORD ABOVE) (organization)

69. How many, if any, of the faculty members at your school are close social friends of yours?

Number_____

70. A. Suppose a mother felt that (school) was not doing as good a job of teaching basic subjects as other schools. How much do you think that she could do bring about a change:

A great deal, _____)
Something, _____) (Ask B)
A little, _____)
or
Nothing at all?_____)
Don't know _____) (Skip to 71A)

B. What, for example, could she do?

71. A. Suppose you felt that (school) was not doing as good a job of teaching basic subjects as other schools. How much do you think that you could do to bring about a change:

A great deal, _____)
Something, _____) (Ask B)
A little, _____)
or
Nothing at all?_____)
Don't know _____) (Skip to 72

B. What, for example, could you do?

72. What newspapers do you read regularly?

73. What magazines do you read regularly? (Any others?)

74. A. How about professional journals? Are there any that you read regularly?

No _____ (Skip to 75)
Yes_____ (Ask B)

B. Which ones?

75. What about books? What is your best estimate of the number of books for adults you have in your home? (IF RESPONDENT SAYS DON'T KNOW, TRY TO GET ESTIMATE, STARTING WITH THE SMALLEST CATEGORY BELOW.)

Less than 50	_____	301-500	_____
51-100	_____	501-1000	_____
100-200	_____	Over 1000	_____
201-300	_____	Don't know	_____

76. Do you recall -- did you have any difficulty learning to read when you were a child?

Yes _____
No _____
Don't remember _____

77. A. If you could start over again, beginning with your college preparation, which of the following would you prefer:

To prepare again for the position you are now in, _____
for a specialty in the field of education, _____
to become an educational administrator, _____
or
for some field not connected with education?_____(Ask B)

Or what?_____

B. Which field?

78. A. Which one of these things would you most like to be ten years from now?

A classroom teacher in this district, _____
A classroom teacher elsewhere, _____
An educational specialist (curriculum, guidance, etc.), _____
A school administrator, _____
Teaching at a college or university, _____
A full-time housewife, _____
Retired, _____
or
In some field other than education? _____ (Ask B)

B. Which field?

79. Where do you live presently? _____
(town or city)

80. On the average, how long does it take for you to get to school each morning?

_____

81. Do you live in:

A house you own, _____
A house you rent, _____
An apartment, _____
or
A rooming house? _____
Other (Describe) _____

82. How old are you? _____
age

83. Are you:

Single, _____ (Skip to 86)

Married, _____)
Divorced, _____)
Separated, _____) (Ask 84)
or
Widowed? _____

84. How many children do you have: (CIRCLE NUMBER)

None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7plus

85. A. IF MARRIED:
Does your husband (wife) work?

Yes_____(Ask B)
No _____(Skip to 86)

B. Is this part-time or full-time?

Part-time_____
Full-time_____

C. What kind of work does he (she) do? (DESCIBE FULLY POSITION AND FIELD)

D. What was the last year of school your husband (wife) completed?_____

86. A. What colleges and universities have you attended?

	A School	B Degree	C Year of Degree	D Department-Division
1)	_____	_____	_____	_____
2)	_____	_____	_____	_____
3)	_____	_____	_____	_____

B. What degrees were you awarded? (Match with schools) (RECORD ABOVE)

C. What year were you awarded this (these) degree(s)? (RECORD ABOVE)

D. Was the degree from a division or department of education, or from a liberal arts department? (RECORD ABOVE)

87. Can you tell me, which category best represents <u>your</u> yearly income from teaching? (CARD TO RESPONDENT)

1)	Under $4,000 _____	6)	8,000 - 8,999 _____
2)	$4,000-4,999 _____	7)	9,000 - 9,999 _____
3)	5,000-5,999 _____	8)	10,000-14,999 _____
4)	6,000-6,999 _____	9)	15,000-19,999 _____
5)	7,000-7,999 _____	10)	Over 20,000 _____

88. IF SPOUSE WORKING: Can you tell me which category best represents the total yearly income for your family?

1)	Under $4,000 _____	6)	8,000 - 8,999 _____
2)	$4,000-4,999 _____	7)	9,000 - 9,999 _____
3)	5,000-5,999 _____	8)	10,000-14,999 _____
4)	6,000-6,999 _____	9)	15,000-19,999 _____
5)	7,000-7,999 _____	10)	Over 20,000 _____

89. A. What is your religion?

Protestant _____(Ask B)

Catholic _____)
Jewish _____) (Skip to 90)
Other _____)

None _____ (Skip to 91)

B. What denomination?

Baptist _____
Congregational _____
Episcopal _____
Lutheran _____
Methodist _____
Presbyterian _____
Other _____
"Refused" _____

90. How often do you usually attend church (or synagogue):

Once a week or more, _____
Few times a month, _____
Once a month, _____
Lessthan once a month, _____
or
Very rarely or never? _____

91. How about politics? Do you consider yourself a Democrat, a Republican, another party, or what?

Democrat _____
Republican _____
Other (write in) _____
Independent _____
Refused _____

92. Where were you born:

_____ _____ _____
city or town state country (if not USA)

93. Where did you live mostly when you were growing up?

_____ _____ _____
city or town state country (if not USA)

94. What was your father's main occupation when you were in high school?

_____

95. What was the last year of school your father completed? _____

Time Ended: _____

Date: _____

April 22, 1965 S

NEW JERSEY STUDY

(MAKE SURE YOU HAVE CLASS ROLL BEFORE STARTING INTERVIEW)

10th Grade
Students' Questionnaire

INTERVIEWER: As you may know, we are doing a study of what the students, teachers, and parents in several New Jersey communities think about public high school education. You have been chosen for an interview as a student in the 10th grade at _____ High School. We are interviewing all students in your English class. The answers you give to the questions we ask are confidential. Your teachers, parents, or fellow students will not be told what you have said as an individual. There are no right or wrong answers to most of these questions. We are interested in your opinions so we may help the schools give you a good education.

Time Began: _____

Student's Name: _____

Mother's Name: _____

English Teacher's Name: _____

1. How old are you? _____ years

2. Would you please tell me all the adults who are living at home with you? (CHECK ALL APPROPRIATE CATEGORIES).

Mother	_____	Father	_____
Stepmother	_____	Stepfather	_____
Grandmother	_____	Grandfather	_____
Aunt	_____	Uncle	_____

Other (RECORD RELATIONSHIP) _____

(IF FATHER NOT MENTIONED ABOVE, ASK 3; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO 4.)

3. Is your father living?

Yes _____

No _____

4. Have you lived with your father most of your life?

Yes _____

No _____

5. What about your mother - have you lived with her most of your life?

Yes _____

No _____

6. A. Do you have any brothers and sisters?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (SKIP TO 7)

B. How many brothers and sisters do you have? (RECORD SEX AS "M" OR "F")

	B Sex (Write in)	C Age (Write in)
1)	_____	_____
2)	_____	_____
3)	_____	_____
4)	_____	_____
5)	_____	_____

C. How old are they (RECORD ABOVE).

7. What high school program are you enrolled in? Is it:

college preparatory, _____

general, _____

vocational, _____

commercial, or _____

some other? (WRITE IN) _____

8. Generally, how much do you like school this year:

very much, _____

quite a bit, _____

somewhat, or _____

not at all? _____

Don't know _____

9. If you had to choose one thing about (school) that you like the most, what would it be?

10. If you had to choose one thing about (school) that you dislike the most, what would it be?

11. A. What is your favorite subject in school this year?

B. What subject do you like least?

12. As far as giving a good education is concerned, compared with other public schools in the United States, do you think (school) is:

better than most _____

about the same, or _____

not as good as most? _____

(vol.) Better in some ways, worse in others _____

Don't know _____

13. A. In your opinion, are there some kinds of boys and girls in (community) who are not getting as good an education as others?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (SKIP TO 14)

Don't know _____

	B Kind of boys and girls	C Why not getting as good education
1)	_____	_____
2)	_____	_____

B. What kinds of boys and girls? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Why do you think these boys and girls are not getting as good an education as others? (RECORD ABOVE)

14. About how much schooling do you think most young men need these days to get along well in the world? (OPEN-ENDED: DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE IS MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS).

a) Finish grade school _____

b) some high school _____

c) finish high school _____

d) some college _____

e) finish 4-years college _____

f) graduate school _____

g) Other (business school, etc.)
Describe:

_____ _____

h) Don't know _____

15. A. Although all schools teach students more or less the same things, some schools emphasize different aspects of education. Suppose that there were four high schools in (community) and you could choose the one you wanted to go to. Which would you choose first? Which would be your second choice? Third choice?

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #1)

	A Student's choice 1st	2nd	3rd	B Best describes (school)	C Mother's choice
1) School #1 feels that the most important task of the high school is primarily intellectual, that is, to provide students with information, teach them reading, writing, and arithmetic, give them the ability to figure things out for themselves and a desire to learn more.	___	___	___	___	___
2) School #2 is primarily interested in social things like teaching students how to get along with others, to know about people in other countries, and to be good citizens who are loyal to America.	___	___	___	___	___
3) School #3 is concerned with the personal development of the students, seeing that they possess a sense of right and wrong, develop into mature and stable persons who are in good physical condition, and learn to enjoy things like music and hobbies.	___	___	___	___	___
4) School #4 is most concerned about the more practical things like helping students choose the right occupation or college, giving them specialized job training, and preparing them for marriage and family living.	___	___	___	___	___
5) Don't know	___	___	___	___	___

B. Which of these best describes (school)? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Which school do you think your mother would most want you to go to? (RECORD ABOVE)

16. We have a list of things that students sometimes do. We would like to know how often you do each of the following things:

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #2)

	Often,	Sometimes,	Rarely,	or Never?	Don't Know
How often do you:					
A. Ask (English teacher) a question in class:	____	____	____	____	____
B. Get bored or restless in English class:	____	____	____	____	____
C. Get very interested or enthusiastic about something in English class:	____	____	____	____	____
D. Get fun out of something you do in English class:	____	____	____	____	____
E. Talk out of turn or interrupt (English teacher):	____	____	____	____	____
F. Read a book, other than a comic book, not assigned or required by your teachers:	____	____	____	____	____
	(2 times a week or more)	(once a week to once a month)			

17. Do you like to read?

Yes _____ (ASK 18)

No _____ (SKIP TO 19)

18. What kinds of books do you like to read?

19. Compared with other students your age, would you say you get along with your mother:

better than most, _____

about the same as most, or _____

less well than most students? _____

Don't know _____

*20. What about your father - compared with other students your age, would you say you get along with your father:

better than most, _____

about the same as most, or _____

less well than most students? _____

Don't know _____

21. How well would you say you behave at school, compared with the other students in the tenth grade:

better than most, _____

about the same as most, or _____

less well than most students? _____

Don't know _____

22. A. Students tend to have many different qualities, but sometimes, especially in school, certain qualities seem to stand out more than others. Here are six different types of high school students; we would like to know which of these types best describes you.

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #3)

	A Best Describes You	B Next Best	C (English teacher) prefers	D Two students who best fit Description
1) Student #1 is well behaved in class, pays attention to the teacher, works hard, and tries to do well	____	____	____	1) _____ 2) _____
2) Student #2 is smart, able to come up with answers, grasps things quickly and gets high grades.	____	____	____	1) _____ 2) _____
3) Student #3 is cooperative, is liked by others, and is friendly, good-natured, and well-adjusted.	____	____	____	1) _____ 2) _____
4) Student #4 is creative, has original ideas and a good imagination, and likes to figure things out himself.	____	____	____	1) _____ 2) _____
5) Student #5 is not very interested in school work, doesn't try very hard to get good marks, just does enough work to get by.	____	____	____	1) _____ 2) _____
6) Student #6 doesn't like most schoolwork, doesn't do his (her) assignments, and is not cooperative.	____	____	____	1) _____ 2) _____
7) Don't know				

B. Which describes you next best? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Which of these six types of students do you think (English teacher) prefers to teach? (RECORD ABOVE)

D. Now I'd like you to give me the names of the two students in your English class who best fit the description of student #1. (ASK FOR EACH TYPE AND RECORD ABOVE. HAND RESPONDENT CLASS ROLL.)

23. We have a list of things that teachers sometimes do. Can you tell me about how often (English teacher) does each one?
(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #2)

How often does (English teacher):	Often, (2 times a week or more)	Sometimes, (Once a week to once a month)	Rarely,	or Never?	Don't Know
A. Praise students in front of the class for doing a lesson or answering a question well:	____	____	____	____	____
B. Scold or "bawl out" students in front of class:	____	____	____	____	____
C. Give special help to a student who is having difficulty with his schoolwork:	____	____	____	____	____
D. Give special help to a student who is ahead of the rest of the class:	____	____	____	____	____
E. Lose his (her) temper in front of the class:	____	____	____	____	____
F. Help a student with a personal problem not connected with school:	____	____	____	____	____
G. Get fun out of something he (she) is doing with the class:	____	____	____	____	____
H. Encourage students to read books at home:	____	____	____	____	____
I. Talk with students about current events like what's going on down South or in Viet-Nam:	____	____	____	____	____
J. Show favoritism toward a particular student:	____	____	____	____	____
K. Punish the class as a whole by having them do an extra assignment:	____	____	____	____	____
L. Punish a student by keeping him after school or giving him an extra assignment:	____	____	____	____	____

24. A. Although teachers have to do many different things in their jobs, some teachers emphasize certain things more than others. Suppose there were four teachers in (school) and you could choose the one you would most want to be your 10th grade English teacher. Which would be your first choice?

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #4)

	A 1st Choice	B 2nd Choice	C Best describes (English teacher)
1) Teacher #1 is most concerned with maintaining discipline, seeing that students work hard, and teaching them to follow directions.	____	____	____
2) Teacher #2 feels it's most important that students know their subject matter well and that he (she) cover the material thoroughly and test their progress regularly.	____	____	____
3) Teacher #3 stresses making the class interesting and encourages students to be creative and to figure things out for themselves.	____	____	____
4) Teacher #4 thinks it's most important that a teacher be friendly and well liked by students and able to understand and to handle their problems.	____	____	____
5) Don't know	____	____	____

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Which of these four types best describes (English teacher)? (RECORD ABOVE)

25. A. How much do you like your teachers generally:

Very much, _____

somewhat, _____

not so much, or _____

not at all? _____

Don't know _____

B. What are the things that make you like some teachers?

C. What are the things that make you dislike some teachers?

26. How about (English teacher) - would you say you like him (her):

Very much, _____

Somewhat, _____

Not so much, or _____

Not at all? _____

27. How much would you say (English teacher) likes you, compared with the other students in the class:

Better than most, _____

About the same as most, or _____

Not as much as most? _____

Don't know _____

28. A. Are there any teachers here who have been especially nice or helpful to you?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (SKIP TO 29)

	B Which teachers?	C In what ways?
1)	_____	_____
2)	_____	_____
3)	_____	_____

B. Which teachers? (RECORD ABOVE THE TEACHER'S NAME AND THE SUBJECT MATTER TAUGHT).

C. In what ways has he (she) been especially nice or helpful? (RECORD ABOVE)

29. In general, do you prefer to be taught by men or women teachers in high school, or doesn't it matter to you?

Men _____

Women _____

Doesn't matter _____

30. We have a list of things that parents sometimes do. We would like to know about how often your mother does each. *We'd also like to know about how often your father does each.

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #2)

How often does your mother (father):	Often, (2 times a week or more)	Sometimes, (once a week to once a month)	Rarely,	or Never?	Don't Know
A. Talk with you about what you're doing at school.					
a) mother does:	____	____	____	____	____
*b) father does:	____	____	____	____	____
B. Encourage you to read books at home.					
a) mother does:	____	____	____	____	____
*b) father does:	____	____	____	____	____
C. Talk with other parents about what is going on at school.					
a) mother does:	____	____	____	____	____
*b) father does:	____	____	____	____	____
D. Give you chores to do at home.					
a) mother does:	____	____	____	____	____
*b) father does:	____	____	____	____	____
E. Lose her (his) temper or get mad at you.					
a) mother does:	____	____	____	____	____
*b) father does:	____	____	____	____	____
F. Praise you.					
a) mother does:	____	____	____	____	____
*b) father does:	____	____	____	____	____
G. Talk with you about current events like what's going on down South or in Vietnam.					
a) mother does:	____	____	____	____	____
*b) father does:	____	____	____	____	____
H. Do something with you that is fun for both of you.					
a) mother does:	____	____	____	____	____
*b) father does:	____	____	____	____	____

31. A. Has your mother*(or father) done anything to encourage you to be interested in school or in learning?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (SKIP TO 32)

B. What things?

32. How much pressure would you say your mother puts on you to do well in your schoolwork:

A lot of pressure, _____

Some pressure, _____

Little pressure, or _____

No pressure? _____

*33. What about your father - how much pressure would you say he puts on you to do well in your schoolwork:

A lot of pressure, _____

Some pressure, _____

Little pressure, or _____

No pressure? _____

34. In general, whose approval means most to you? The approval of your:

Mother, _____

*Your father, _____

The teacher you like most, or _____

Your best friend? _____

(vol.) Others (Who?) _____

(vol.) Mother and father _____

35. Whose disapproval do you find hardest to take? The disapproval of your:

Mother, _____

*Your father, _____

The teacher you like most, or _____

Your best friend? _____

(vol.) Others (Who?) _____

(vol.) Mother and father _____

36. A. About how often does your mother punish you:

More than once a week, _____

Once a week to once a month, _____

Rarely, or _____

Never? _____ (SKIP TO 37)

B. What kinds of things does your mother punish you for?

C. How does she usually punish you?

37. A. If you go out with your friends at night, is there a definite time that your parent(s) expect you back home?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (SKIP TO 38)

B. What time is that usually on week nights?

Time: _____ Doesn't go out on week nights: _____

C. What time is that usually on weekend nights? Time: _____

Doesn't go out on weekend nights. _____

D. Suppose you got home more than an hour late, what would your parents do?

E. Has this ever happened - that you came home more than an hour late?

Yes _____ No _____

38. A. Suppose you decided you didn't want to finish high school and wanted to get a job instead. What do you think your parent(s) would do about this?

B. Has this ever happened - that you didn't want to finish school, and wanted to get a job instead?

Yes _____

No _____

39. A. Suppose you came home with a very good report card, what do you think your mother would do?

B. Has this ever happened - that you came home with a very good report card?

Yes _____

No _____

40. A. Suppose you came home with a very bad report card, what would your mother do?

B. Has this ever happened - that you came home with a very bad report card?

Yes _____

No _____

41. A. Suppose you came home and told your mother that a teacher punished you for something you didn't do. What do you think your mother would do?

B. Has this ever happened - that a teacher punished you for something you did not do?

Yes _____

No _____

*42. Who is more strict, your mother or father?

Mother, _____

Father _____

About the same_____

43. Compared with most mothers, would you say your mother is:

More strict than most, _____

About as strict as most, or _____

Less strict than most? _____

Don't know _____

*44. Compared with most fathers, would you say your father is:

More strict than most, _____

About as strict as most, or _____

Less strict than most? _____

Don't know _____

45. Compared to two or three years ago, does your mother let you decide things by yourself now:

Much more, _____

A little more, _____

About the same, or _____

Less? _____

Don't know _____

46.A.Generally, how well would you say you are doing in school:

Above average, _____ (SKIP TO 47)

Average or Below average? _____ (ASK B)

Don't know _____ (SKIP TO 47)

B. What do you think are the main reasons why you are doing below average work in school?

47. How satisfied are you with the way you are doing in school:

Very satisfied, _____

Somewhat satisfied, or _____

Not at all satisfied? _____

Don't know _____

48. Every student does some things better than others. As far as school is concerned, what do you think you do best?

49. Did you have any difficulty learning to read?

Yes _____

No _____

Don't know _____

50. How well would you say you can read for someone your age:

Above average, _____

Average, or _____

Below average? _____

Don't know _____

51. How well would you say you can write compositions for someone your age:

Above average, _____

Average, or _____

Below average? _____

Don't know _____

52. How well would you say you do mathematics for someone your age:

Above average, _____

Average, or _____

Below average? _____

Don't know _____

53. How interested would you say you are in most of your schoolwork:

Very interested, _____

Fairly interested, _____

A little interested, or _____

Not at all interested? _____

54. How important would you say getting good marks in school is to you:

Very important, _____

Somewhat important, or _____

Not important at all? _____

55. Generally, what is the lowest mark that you would really be satisfied with?

56. In general, how hard do you try to get good grades:

Very hard, _____

Quite a bit, _____

A little, or _____

Not at all? _____

57. A. About how many nights during the week do you do English homework? (CIRCLE ANSWER)

0 1 2 3 4 5 (ASK B) Don't know (SKIP TO 58)

B. About how much time do you spend on it on the nights it is given? (CIRCLE ANSWER)

0 1/4 hr. 1/2 3/4 1 1¼ 1½ 1-3/4 2 hrs. or more Dont know

58. A. About how much time do you spend on homework altogether each night on all your subjects? (CIRCLE ANSWER)

0 ½ hr. 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ hrs. or more Don't know

B. Do you think the total amount of homework you are assigned is:

Too much, _____

About right,or _____

Not enough? _____

Don't know _____

59. A. Does anyone ever help you with homework in any of your subjects?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (SKIP TO 60)

B. Who? (RECORD RELATIONSHIP AND SUBJECT MATTER)

60. Do you usually do all of the homework assigned in all your subjects?

Yes _____

No _____

61. About how often this school year have you done each of the following? For example, how often have you cut school - never, once, a few times, several times, or often? (ASK FOR EACH ITEM)

How often have you:	Never,	Once,	A few times,	Several times,	or Often?
A) Cut school:	____	____	____	____	____
B) Cheated on tests or exams:	____	____	____	____	____
C) Lied to a teacher:	____	____	____	____	____
D) Lied to your mother:	____	____	____	____	____

62. If you had cheated in a course and the following people knew about it, how do you think they would feel about it? For example, if (your closest friend, etc.) knew about it, would he (she) disapprove very strongly, disapprove fairly strongly, disapprove but not strongly, or wouldn't he (she) disapprove at all? (CONTINUE SAME WAY FOR OTHERS)

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #5)

How strongly would(each person below) disapprove:	Disapprove Very Strongly,	Disapprove Fairly Strongly,	Disapprove But Not Strongly,	or Not Disapprove at all?	Don't Know
A) Your closest friend:	____	____	____	____	____
B) Most students in school:	____	____	____	____	____
C) Your teachers:	____	____	____	____	____
D) Your parent(s):	____	____	____	____	____

63. About how many of the students in your English class ever cheat on tests or exams in any of their subjects:

All of them, _____

Most, _____

Some, _____ (ASK 64)

A few, or _____

None? _____ (SKIP TO 65)

Don't know _____ (ASK 64)

64. About how many do you think cheat often:

All of them, _____

Most, _____

Some, _____

A few, or _____

None? _____

Don't know _____

65. A. How much emphasis does (school) place on athletic activities and team sports like football:

A great deal, _____

Some, or _____

Little or none? _____

Don't know _____

B. Do you think the emphasis placed on team sports in (school) is:

Too much, _____

About right, or _____

Not enough? _____

Don't know _____

66. A. How far do you want to go in school? (OPEN-ENDED QUESTION: DO NOT READ CATEGORIES TO RESPONDENT. IF COLLEGE IS MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS).

	Wants (66)	Expects (67)	Mother Wants (68B)	Father Wants (69B)
a) Some high school	____	____	____	____
b) Finish high school	____	____	____	____
c) Some college	____	____	____	____
d) Finish four years college	____	____	____	____
e) Graduate school	____	____	____	____
f) Other: Business school, etc. (DESCRIBE) _____	____	____	____	____
g) Don't know	____	____	____	____

67. How far do you really think you will go in school? (RECORD ABOVE)

68. A. Have you ever talked with your mother about your school plans?

Yes _____

No _____

B. How far do you think your mother wants you to go in school? (RECORD ABOVE)

*69. A. What about your father - have you ever talked with him about your school plans?

Yes _____

No _____

B. How far do you think your father wants you to go in school? (RECORD ABOVE)

70. Of all the people you know, who has influenced you most regarding your school plans?

(IF RESPONDENT IS A GIRL, SKIP TO 77)

(BOYS ONLY)

71. A. If you could be remembered in high school for one of these things, which one would you most want it to be:

	A 1st Choice	B 2nd Choice	C Mother's Choice
A brilliant student,	____	____	____
An athletic star, or	____	____	____
Most popular?	____	____	____
Don't know	____	____	____

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Which would your mother most want you to be remembered as in high school? (RECORD ABOVE)

72. What kind of job would you most like to have as an adult?

73. A. Have you ever talked with your mother about your job plans?

Yes _____

No _____

B. What kind of job do you think your mother wants you to have?

*74. A. Have you ever talked with your father about your job plans?

Yes _____

No _____

B. What kind of job do you think your father wants you to have?

75. Of all the people you know, who has influenced you most regarding your job plans?

76. A. If you could be any of these things, which would be your first choice?

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #6)

	A 1st Choice	B 2nd Choice	C Don't Want	
Policeman	____	____	____	
Lawyer	____	____	____	
Airplane pilot	____	____	____	
Doctor	____	____	____	
Bus driver	____	____	____	
Professional athlete	____	____	____	(SKIP TO 84)
Insurance salesman	____	____	____	
Electrician	____	____	____	
College professor	____	____	____	
Missionary	____	____	____	
Garage mechanic	____	____	____	
Factory worker	____	____	____	
Business man	____	____	____	
Scientist	____	____	____	
Don't know	____	____	____	

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Are there any of these things which you definitely <u>don't</u> want to be? (RECORD ABOVE)

(GIRLS ONLY)

77. A. If you could be remembered in high school for one of these things, which <u>one</u> would <u>you</u> most want it to be:

	A 1st Choice	B 2nd Choice	C Mother's Choice
A brilliant student,	____	____	____
A leader in activities, or	____	____	____
Most popular?	____	____	____
Don't know	____	____	____

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Which would your mother most want you to be remembered as in high school? (RECORD ABOVE)

78. What do you want to do, when you finish your schooling? (IF JOB MENTIONED, WHAT KIND?)

S

79. A. Have you ever talked with your mother about your plans after you finish your schooling?

Yes _____

No _____

B. What do you think she wants you to do, after you finish your schooling?

*80. A. Have you ever talked with your father about your plans after you finish your schooling?

Yes _____

No _____

B. What do you think he wants you to do, after you finish your schooling?

81. Of all the people you know, who has influenced you most regarding your plans after you finish your schooling?

82. A. If you could be any of these things, which would be your first choice?

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #7)

	A 1st Choice	B 2nd Choice	C Don't Want
Actress	____	____	____
Artist	____	____	____
Nurse	____	____	____
Waitress	____	____	____
Model	____	____	____
Teacher	____	____	____
Secretary	____	____	____
Airline stewardess	____	____	____
Full time housewife	____	____	____
Scientist	____	____	____
Saleslady in store	____	____	____
Social worker	____	____	____
Beautician	____	____	____
Women's magazine editor	____	____	____
Don't know	____	____	____

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Are there any of these things which you definitely <u>don't</u> want to be? (RECORD ABOVE)

83. What is the least amount of education you'd be satisfied for your husband to have? (OPEN-ENDED: DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE IS MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS).

a) Finish grade school _____

b) Some high school _____

c) Finish high school _____

d) Some college _____

e) Finish four years college _____

f) Graduate school _____

g) Other: (business school,etc.)
DESCRIBE:

_____ _____

h) Don't know _____

(ALL STUDENTS)

84. How popular would you say you are with the other students in the tenth grade:

More popular than most, _____

About as popular as most, or _____

Not as popular as most? _____

Don't know _____

85. A. In which clubs or activities in or out of school do you take part?

None _____ (SKIP TO 86)

	A	B	
	Club or Activity	Officer: Yes	No
a)	_____	____	____
b)	_____	____	____
c)	_____	____	____
d)	_____	____	____

IF ANY CLUB OR ACTIVITY, ASK:

B. Do you hold an office or any other position in these clubs or activities? (RECORD ABOVE)

86. Do most of your close friends think school is:

A lot of fun, _____

Some fun, _____

Somewhat unpleasant, or _____

Very unpleasant? _____

(vol.) Neither fun nor unpleasant _____

Don't know _____

87. A. How far do you think your close friends plan on going in school? (OPEN-ENDED: DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE IS MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS).

	A Close Friends	B Most Classmates
a) Some high school	____	____
b) Finish high school	____	____
c) Some college	____	____
d) Finish four years college	____	____
e) Graduate school	____	____
f) Other (Business school, etc.) DESCRIBE: _____	____	____
g) Don't know	____	____

B. How far do you think most of your classmates plan on going in school? (RECORD ABOVE)

88. How would your close friends feel about it if you decided to drop out of high school?

(BOYS ONLY)

89. What kind of job do your close friends at school plan on?

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #8)

Professional jobs, like doctor and lawyer, accountant or engineer,	____
White collar jobs, like insurance salesman or office worker,	____
Skilled trades, like electrician or garage mechanic, or Semi-skilled jobs, like bus driver or factory worker?	____
Don't know	____
(vol.) Other (DESCRIBE.): _____)	____

SKIP TO 91

(GIRLS ONLY)

90. What do your best girl friends at school plan on doing when they finish their schooling? (IF WORK, WHAT KIND?)

(ALL STUDENTS)

91. What kind of job do you think most boys in your class plan on?

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #8)

Professional jobs, like doctor and lawyer, accountant or engineer,	____
White collar jobs, like insurance salesman or office worker,	____
Skilled trades, like electrician or garage mechanic, or Semi-skilled jobs like bus driver or factory worker?	____
Don't know	____
(vol.) Other (DESCRIBE): _____)	____

92. What do you think most girls in your class plan on doing when they finish their schooling? (IF WORK: WHAT KIND?)

93. Now we'd like you to think of the students in your English class and tell me the names of the two who:

(HAND RESPONDENT CLASS ROLL)

a) Are your closest friends? _____ _____

b) Are the most popular? _____ _____

c) Are the least popular? _____ _____

94. A. What does it take to become a member of the leading crowd in the tenth grade?

(vol.) No leading crowd _____ (SKIP TO 95)

B. Would you say you are a member of the leading crowd in the tenth grade?

Yes _____

No _____

Not sure _____

95. Compared to other students in your class, do you and your close friends: (participate in extra-curricular activities, etc.) more than others, about the same, or less than others?

	More than Others,	About Same,	or Less than Others?	Don't Know
a) Participate in extra-curricular activities	____	____	____	____
b) Participate in athletics	____	____	____	____
c) Take an interest in your studies and make good grades	____	____	____	____
d) Stir up action or excitement	____	____	____	____
e) Date and have parties	____	____	____	____

96. Now I'd like to know which of these comes closest to your feelings about some statements I'm going to read to you.

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #9 AND READ THE FIRST STATEMENT. THEN ASK: DO YOU STRONGLY AGREE, SOMEWHAT AGREE, SOMEWHAT DISAGREE, OR STRONGLY DISAGREE?)

Do you:	Strongly Agree,	Somewhat Agree,	Somewhat Disagree,	or Strongly Disagree?	(vol.) Neither Agree nor Disagree Don't know
1) Most of the students here are more interested in sports or dating than in their studies.	___	___	___	___	___
2) Teachers too often think they have all the "right" answers.	___	___	___	___	___
3) The amount of money a family has often determines how the student will be treated in the local schools.	___	___	___	___	___
4) The school here is doing a very good job in helping the students plan for their future.	___	___	___	___	___
5) A person who wants to get ahead today has to do well in school.	___	___	___	___	___
6) Parents too often think they have all the "right" answers.	___	___	___	___	___

(TAKE BACK CARD #9 FROM RESPONDENT)

97. A. Do you get an allowance from your parents?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (ASK C)

B. How much do you get a week? _____(SKIP TO D)

C. Where do you get your spending money from?

D. What do you usually spend your money on?

98. A. Do you smoke at all?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (SKIP TO 99)

B. About how much?

C. Do you smoke in front of your parents?

Yes _____

No _____

99. What do you do after school most afternoons?

100. About how much time do you spend watching TV on an average weekday, counting; daytime and evening viewing? (CIRCLE ANSWER)

0 ½ hr. 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5 or more hours

101. A. Do you date?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (SKIP TO 102)

B. How many times a month?

C. Are you going steady?

Yes _____

No _____

102. When it comes to money, compared with other families in this town, would you say your family is:

Better off than most, _____

About as well off as most, or _____

Not as well off as most? _____

Don't know _____

103. A. Do you earn money by working outside the home (not counting summer work)?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (SKIP TO 104)

B. How many hours a week do you work? _____ hours.

C. What kind of work do you do?

D. How old were you when you started earning money by working outside the home?

Age _____

104. A. Did you work last summer?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (SKIP TO 105)

B. What kind of work did you do?

105. Where were you born? _____ Town _____ State

106. Where have you lived most of your life?

_____ Town _____ State

*107. A. What is (was) your father's occupation - what type of work does (did) he do? (DESCRIBE POSITION AND BUSINESS OR FIELD).

B. Is (was) he self-employed or does (did) he work for someone else?

Self _____

Else _____

C. Where does (did) he work? _____ Town _____ State

108. A. Is your mother employed?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (SKIP TO 109)

B. What kind of work does she do? (DESCRIBE POSITION AND BUSINESS OR FIELD).

C. Has your mother worked most of the time during the past ten years?

Yes _____

No _____

109. A. How far in school did your mother go? (OPEN-ENDED: DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS).

	A Mother	B Father
a) Some elementary school	____	____
b) Finished elementary school	____	____
c) Some high school	____	____
d) Finished high school	____	____
e) Some college	____	____
f) Finished four years college	____	____
g) Graduate school	____	____
h) Other (Business school, etc.)DESCRIBE: _____	____	____
i) Don't know	____	____

*B. How far in school did your father go? (RECORD ABOVE).

Time ended: _____

Date: _____

Interviewer: _____

GM

April 9, 1965

NEW JERSEY STUDY

Grade School
Mothers' Questionnaire

INTERVIEWER: As you have heard, we are doing a study of what the parents, teachers, and students in several New Jersey communities think about public elementary and high school education. You have been selected for an interview along with all the mothers of children in the 1st (or 5th) grades, at (schcol). The answers you give to the questions we ask are confidential, and no one will be told what you have said as an individual. There are no right or wrong answers to most of these questions: we are interested in your own opinions so we may help the schools serve the community better.

Time Began: _____ Respondent's Name: _____

Child's Name: _____

1. First, what is your relationship to (child)?

Mother	_____	(ASK 2A.)
Stepmother	_____	
Grandmother	_____	(SKIP TO 2D.)
Aunt	_____	
Sibling	_____	
Other (specify)	_____	

GM

2. A. Are you presently:

Married and living with your husband, _____(ASK B)

Separated, Divorced, or Widowed? _____ } (SKIP TO C)

B. Is he (child)'s father or stepfather?

Father _____
Stepfather _____ } (SKIP TO 3)

C. (IF SEPARATED, DIVORCED, OR WIDOWED:) How long ago was this?

Months ago _____ No. }
Years ago _____ No. } (SKIP TO 3)

D. Does (child)'s father (or stepfather) live here?

Yes _____ } (SKIP TO 3)
No _____ (ASK E)

E. Well, is there any other male relative living here who helps take care of (child)?

Yes _____ Who is that? (RECORD RELATIONSHIP) _____
No _____

3. A. Does (child) have any brothers or sisters?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 4)

B. Would you give me the name of each child, starting with the youngest? RECORD NAME, AGE, SEX, AND GRADE IN SCHOOL OF EACH CHILD, INCLUDING SAMPIE CHILD. IF ANY CHILD IS NO LONGER IN SCHOOL, RECORD LAST GRADE COMPIETED.)

	B				C	D	E
						OLDER CHILDREN ONLY	
	Name (WRITE IN)	Age	Sex	Grade in school (or last grade completed	Attending private or parochial school	Attend(ed) (school)	Same teacher?
1)							
2)							
3)							
4)							
5)							
6)							

C. Are any of your children attending a private or parochial school?

Yes _____ (RECORD WITH AN (X) ABOVE)
No _____

(IF ANY CHILDREN OLDER THAN SAMPIE CHILD, ASK D. IF NO OLDER CHILDREN, SKIP TO 4)

D. Did any of your older children attend (school)?

Yes _____ (RECORD WHICH WITH AN (X) ABOVE)
No _____ (SKIP TO 4)

E. Did any of them have the same teacher that (child) now has?

Yes _____ (RECORD WITH AN (X) ABOVE)
No _____ (SKIP TO 4)

4. Generally, how interested would you say you are in what goes on in (school):

Very interested, _____
Somewhat interested, _____
Only a little interested, or _____
Not at all interested? _____
Don't know _____

5. A. Can you tell me the name of (child)'s teacher?

Yes _____ (WRITE IN NAME AND ASK C) Name: _____
No _____ (ASK B)

B. According to my information it is Miss (Mr.) _____. Does that sound familiar to you?

Yes _____
No _____

C. Did you happen to attend a school gathering or an Open School Night this school year -- that is, where teachers spoke to groups of mothers?

Yes _____
No _____

6. A. Have you met or had any contact at all with (teacher) this school year?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 7)

B. Could you tell me ... how many contacts were:

(ENTER NUMBER IN SPACE PROVIDED)

(1) "Open-school" contacts? _____
(2) Casual or accidental contacts with the teacher at school or elsewhere? _____
(3) Private conferences with the teacher scheduled by the school for all parents? _____
(4) Private conferences requested by you or the teacher? _____ (IF NONE, SKIP TO 7)

C. When was this (the last) conference:

Within the past week, _____
2 - 4 weeks ago, _____
A month or two ago, or _____
Longer ago than that? _____

D. Who contacted whom?

E. What did you discuss and how did the discussion come out?

7. A. Do you think a mother should have private conferences with her child's teacher even if the child has no special problem?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____
Don't know _____ (SKIP TO 8)

B. How many conferences should a mother have? (CIRCLE ANSWER)

1 2 3 4 5 6 or more Don't know

8. A. Generally, how comfortable do you feel talking with teachers:

Very comfortable, _____ (SKIP TO 9)

Somewhat comfortable, _____
Somewhat uncomfortable, or _____ (ASK B)
Very uncomfortable? _____

B. Why don't you feel more comfortable?

9. A. Could you tell me the name of the principal at (school)?

_____

B. Have you spoken with him (her) since last September for any reason?

Yes _____
No _____

10. A. Now we'd like to know about some of the other people over at (school). Does (school) have a (an):

	Yes (ASK B)	No (GO TO NEXT ON LIST)	DK	B. Have you ever spoken to him (her) this school year? Yes	No
1) Assistant Principal?	____	____	____	____	____
2) Gym teacher or coach?	____	____	____	____	____
3) Librarian?	____	____	____	____	____
4) School psychologist?	____	____	____	____	____
5) School nurse?	____	____	____	____	____
6) Music teacher?	____	____	____	____	____

B. Have you ever spoken to him (her) this school year? (RECORD ABOVE)

(ALL MOTHERS LIVING WITH HUSBANDS:)

*11. Has your husband had any conferences with anyone at (school) during this school year?

Yes _____
No _____

(ALL MOTHERS)

12. A. We know some mothers find it difficult to visit their children's schools. Do you find it at all difficult to visit (school)?

Yes _____ (ASK B.)
No _____ (SKIP TO 13)

B. In what ways is it difficult?

13. As far as giving a good education is concerned, compared with other public schools in the United States, do you think (school) is:

Better than most, _____
About the same as most, or _____
Not as good as most? _____
(Vol.) Don't know _____
(Vol.) Better in some ways, but worse in others? _____

14. How do you think (school) compares with the schools you attended as far as giving a good education is concerned? Would you say they are on the whole:

Better, _____
About the same, or _____
Worse? _____
Don't know _____
(Vol.) Better in some ways, but worse in others? _____

15. In general, how satisfied are you with (school):

Very satisfied, _____
Somewhat satisfied, _____
Somewhat dissatisfied, or _____
Very dissatisfied? _____

16. If you had to choose one thing about (school) that you like the most, what would it be?

17. If you had to choose one thing about (school) that you dislike the most, what would it be?

18. A. In your opinion, are there some kinds of children in (community) who are not getting as good an education as others?

Yes	_____	(ASK B)
No	_____	(SKIP TO 19)
Don't know	_____	(SKIP TO 19)

	B. Kinds of children	C. Why not getting as good an education
1)	_____	_____
2)	_____	_____

B. What kinds of children? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Why do you think these children are not getting as good an education as others? (RECORD ABOVE)

19. About how much schooling do you think most young men need these days to get along well in the world? (OPEN ENDED: DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS)

Finish grade school	_____
Some high school	_____
Finish high school	_____
Some college	_____
Finish 4 years college	_____
Graduate school	_____
Other (business school, etc.): Describe:	_____
Don't know	_____

20. A. Although all schools teach children more or less the same things, some schools emphasize different aspects of education. Suppose that there were four elementary schools in (community) and that you could choose the one you wanted to send (child) to. Which one of these schools would you choose first? Which would be your second choice? Third choice?

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD # 1)

	A. Mother's Choice (1st)	(2nd)	(3rd)	B. Best describes (school)
1) School #1 feels that the most important task of the elementary schools is primarily intellectual, that is, to provide children with information, teach them reading, writing, and arithmetic, give them the ability to figure things out for themselves, and a desire to learn more.	____	____	____	____
2) School # 2 is primarily interested in social things like teaching students how to get along with others and be good citizens, who are loyal to America.	____	____	____	____
3) School # 3 is concerned with the personal development of students, that is, seeing that they possess a sense of right and wrong, develop into mature and stable persons, are in good physical condition, and learn to enjoy things like music and hobbies.	____	____	____	____
4) School # 4 is most concerned about the more practical things like helping students choose the right occupation or college, giving them specialized job training, and preparing them for marriage and family living.	____	____	____	____
5) Don't know	____	____	____	____

B. Which of these best describes (school)? (RECORD ABOVE)

21. We have a list of things that parents sometimes do. We would like to know about how often you do each. *We'd also like to know about how often your husband does each.

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD # 2)

How often do (does) you (your husband):	Often,	Sometimes,	Rarely,	or Never?	D.K.
A. Talk with (child) about what he (she) is doing at school.					
a. You do:	____	____	____	____	____
*b. Husband does:	____	____	____	____	____
B. Encourage (child) to read books at home.					
a. You do:	____	____	____	____	____
*b. Husband does:	____	____	____	____	____
C. Talk with other parents about what goes on at school.					
a. You do:	____	____	____	____	____
*b. Husband does:	____	____	____	____	____
D. Give (child) chores to do at home.					
a. You do:	____	____	____	____	____
*b. Husband does:	____	____	____	____	____
E. Lose your temper or get mad at (child).					
a. You do:	____	____	____	____	____
*b. Husband does:	____	____	____	____	____
F. Read to (child).					
a. You do:	____	____	____	____	____
*b. Husband does:	____	____	____	____	____
G. Praise (child).					
a. You do:	____	____	____	____	____
*b. Husband does:	____	____	____	____	____
H. Talk with (child) about current events like what's going on down South or in Vietnam.					
a. You do:	____	____	____	____	____
*b. Husband does:	____	____	____	____	____
I. Do something with your (child) that's fun for both (of you).					
a. You do:	____	____	____	____	____
b. Husband does:	____	____	____	____	____
	(2 times a week or more)	(once a week to once a month)			

22. A. Are there any things at all that you think it is important for you to be doing differently than you are in order to help (child) to get the most out of school?

Yes _____ (ASK B.)
No _____ (SKIP TO 23)

B. What things?

23. A. Are there any things you think (teacher) would like you to be doing differently than you are?

Yes _____ (ASK B.)

No _____
D.K. _____ } (SKIP TO 24)

B. What things?

24. A. Are there any things you've done to encourage (child) to be interested in school or in learning?

Yes _____ (ASK B.)
No (SKIP TO 25)

B. What, for instance, have you done?

25. Have you *(or your husband) ever:

	Yes	No	Vol. (child) went with someone else
a) Taken (child) to the World's Fair?	____	____	____
b) Taken (child) to a museum?	____	____	____
c) Taken (child) to a zoo?	____	____	____
d) Taken (child) to a professional baseball game?	____	____	____
e) Taken (child) to a concert, ballet, opera or the theater?	____	____	____

26. How much pressure would you say you put on (child) to do well in school:

A lot of pressure, _____
Some pressure, _____
Little pressure, or _____
No pressure? _____

*27. How about your husband, how much pressure would you say he puts on (child) to do well in school:

A lot of pressure, _____
Some pressure, _____
Little pressure, or _____
No pressure? _____

28. We have a list of things that teachers sometimes do. We would like to know about how often you think (child's teacher) does each.

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD # 2)

About how often do you think (teacher):	Often,	Sometimes,	Rarely,	or Never?	D.K.
A. Praises a child in front of the class for doing a lesson or answering a question well:	____	____	____	____	____
B. Scolds or "bawls out" children in front of class:	____	____	____	____	____
C. Gives special help to a student who is having difficulty with schoolwork:	____	____	____	____	____
D. Gives special help to a child who is ahead of the rest of the class:	____	____	____	____	____
E. Loses her (his) temper in front of the class:	____	____	____	____	____
F. Helps a child with a personal problem not connected with school:	____	____	____	____	____
G. Gets fun out of something he (she) is doing with the class:	____	____	____	____	____
H. Encourages the children to read books at home:	____	____	____	____	____
I. Talk with the students about current events like what's going on down South or in Vietnam:	____	____	____	____	____
J. Shows favoritism toward a particular child:	____	____	____	____	____

How often do you think (teacher):	Often,	Some-times,	Rarely,	or Never?	D.K.
K. Punishes the class as a whole by having them do an extra assignment.	____	____	____	____	____
L. Punishes a child by keeping him (her) after school or giving him (her) an extra assignment.	____	____	____	____	____

29. A. Are there any things that you think it is important for (teacher) to be doing differently than she (he) is in order to help (child) to get the most out of school:

Yes ____ (ASK B)
No ____ (SKIP TO 30)

B. What things?

30. A. Although teachers have to concern themselves with many different things in their jobs, some teachers emphasize certain things more than others. Suppose there were four first (fifth) grade teachers in (school) and you could choose the one you wanted to be (child's) teacher. Which of these would be your first choice?

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD # 3)

	1st choice	B. 2nd choice	C. Best describes (Teacher)
1) Teacher #1 is most concerned with maintaining discipline, seeing that students work hard, and teaching them to follow directions.	____	____	____
2) Teacher #2 feels it's most important that students know their subject matter well, and that she cover the material thoroughly and test their progress regularly.	____	____	____
3) Teacher #3 stresses making the class interesting and encourages students to be creative and to figure things out for themselves.	____	____	____
4) Teacher #4 thinks it's most important that a teacher be friendly and well liked by children and able to understand and to handle their problems.	____	____	____
5) Don't know	____	____	____

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Which of these best describes (child's teacher)? (RECORD ABOVE)

31. A. About how many children are there in (child)'s class?

Number _____

B. About how many do you think there should be?

Number _____

32. How much do you think (child) likes (teacher)? Does he (she) like (teacher):

Very much, _____
Somewhat, _____
Not so much, or _____
Not at all? _____
Don't know _____

33. How much would you say (teacher) likes (child) compared with others in the class:

Better than most, _____
About the same as most, or _____
Less than most? _____
Don't know _____

34. Do you prefer men or women teachers at the high school level, or doesn't it matter to you?

Men _____
Women _____
Doesn't matter _____

35. How about the first few grades of elementary school? Do you prefer men or women teachers there, or doesn't it matter to you?

Men _____
Women _____
Doesn't matter _____

36. Are any of your personal friends either elementary or high school teachers?

Yes _____
No _____

37. Taking into account both teaching in the classroom and school work outside the classroom, about how many hours would you guess (teacher) puts in a week? (IF RESPONDENT SAYS DON'T KNOW, TRY TO GET ESTIMATE STARTING WITH THE SMALLEST CATEGORY BELOW)

Less than 30 hours _____
Around 30 hours _____
31 - 35 hours _____
36 - 40 hours _____
41 - 45 hours _____
Over 45 hours _____
Don't know _____

38. A. Can you think of any things that teachers should or shouldn't do in their private lives that don't apply to most other people?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 39)

B. What things?

39. Do you think teachers should be allowed to go on strike for better pay or working conditions?

Yes _____
No _____
Don't know _____

40. A. Given their training and experience, would you say that teachers' salaries in (school) are:

Too high, _____
About right, or _____
Too low? _____
Don't know _____

B. Roughly, about how much do you think the average teacher in (school) earns a year?

Average salary $_____

41. Here is a list of things that children sometimes do. We would like to know about how often your child does each of the following things:

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD # 2)

How often does (child):	Often,	Some-times,	Rarely,	or Never?	D.K.
A. Ask the teacher a question?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Get bored or restless in class?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Get very interested or enthusiastic about something in class?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
D. Get fun out of something he (she) does in class?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
E. Talk out of turn or interrupt the teacher?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
F. Read a book, other than a comic book, not assigned or required?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
G. Lie to you?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

42. A. Are there any things you think it is important for (child) to be doing differently in order to get the most out of school?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO 43)

B. What things?

43. A. Are there any things the teacher thinks it is important for (child) to be doing differently in order to get the most out of school?

Yes _____ (ASK B.)
No _____ (SKIP TO 44)

B. What things?

44. A. Children have many different qualities, but in school, some qualities stand out more than others. We would like to know which one of the following six types of students best describes (child)?

(HAND RESPONDENT CARD # 4)

	A. Best describes	B. Next best	C. Teacher prefers
1) Student #1 is well behaved in class, pays attention to the teacher, works hard, and tries to do well.	____	____	____
2) Student #2 is smart, able to come up with answers, grasps things quickly and gets high grades.	____	____	____
3) Student #3 is cooperative, is liked by others, and is friendly, good-natured and well adjusted.	____	____	____
4) Student #4 is creative, has original ideas and a good imagination, and likes to figure things out himself.	____	____	____
5) Student #5 is not very interested in school work, doesn't try very hard to get good grades, just does enough work to get by.	____	____	____
6) Student #6 doesn't like most school-work, doesn't do his assignments and is not cooperative.	____	____	____
7) Don't know	____	____	____

B. Which of these describes (child) next best? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Which of these types do you think a 1st (or 5th) grade teacher most prefers to teach? (RECORD ABOVE)

45. How much do you think (child) likes school this year? Does he (she) like it:

Very much,	_____
Quite a bit,	_____
Somewhat, or	_____
Not at all?	_____
Don't know	_____

46. A. Generally, how well would you say (child) is doing in school:

Above average,	_____	(SKIP TO 47)
Average, or	_____	
Below average?	_____	(ASK B)
Don't know	_____	(SKIP TO 48)

B. What do you think are the main reasons why (child) is doing below average in school?

47. How can you tell how well he (she) is doing?

48. A. Do you know whether (school) gives IQ tests?

They do	_____
They don't	_____
Don't know	_____

B. Do you think IQ test scores are a good measure of (child)'s ability?

Yes	_____
No	_____
Depends, Yes and No	_____
Don't know	_____

49. A. Do you know whether or not (school) gives achievement tests?

They do _____
They don't _____
Don't know _____

B. Do you think achievement test scores are a good measure of (child)'s ability?

Yes _____
No _____
Depends, Yes and No _____
Don't know _____

50. How satisfied are you with the way (child) is doing in school:

Very satisfied, _____
Somewhat satisfied, or _____
Not at all satisfied? _____
Don't know _____

51. Every child does some things better than others. As far as school is concerned, what do you think (child) does best?

52. Did (child) have, or is he (she) having, any difficulty learning how to read?

Yes _____
No _____
Don't know _____

53. Do you recall -- did you have any difficulty learning to read when you were a child?

Yes _____
No _____
Don't remember _____

54. How well would you say (child) reads for a person his (her) age:

Above average, _____
Average, or _____
Below average? _____
Don't know _____

55. How well would you say (child) can write compositions for a person his (her) age:

Above average, _____
Average, or _____
Below average? _____
Don't know _____

56. How well would you say (child) does arithmetic (or mathematics) for a person his (her) age:

Above average, _____
Average, or _____
Below average? _____
Don't know _____

(MOTHERS OF 5th GRADERS ONLY: ASK Q. 57 THROUGH 61.
MOTHERS OF FIRST GRADERS: SKIP TO 62.)

57. About how many nights during the week does (child) do homework? (CIRCLE ANSWER GIVEN)

0 1 2 3 4 5 (ASK 58) D.K. (SKIP TO 60)

58. On the average, about how much time does he (she) spend on homework on the nights when it is given? (CIRCLE ANSWER GIVEN)

0 1/2 hr. 1 1=1/2 2 2=1/2 3 3=1/2 4 4-1/2 D.K.

59. Do you think the total amount of homework (child) is assigned is:

Too much, _____
About right, or _____
Not enough? _____
Don't know _____

60. A. Does anyone ever help (child) with homework?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ (SKIP TO C)

B. Who? (RECORD RELATIONSHIP AND SUBJECT MATTER)

C. Do you think (teacher) expects you to help (child) with homework?

Yes _____
No _____
Don't know _____

61. Does (child) usually do all of the homework which has been assigned?

Yes _____
No _____
Don't know _____

(ALL MOTHERS)

62. How well would you say (child) behaves at school compared with others in his (her) class:

Better than most, _____
About the same as most, or _____
Not as well as most? _____
Don't know _____

63. While they are growing up, most children vary from year to year in their popularity. How popular would you say (child) is with the students in his (her)class:

More popular than most, _____
About as popular as most, or _____
Not as popular as most. _____
Don't know _____

64. A. Compared with other children his (her) age, how well would you say (child) behaves at home:

Better than most, _____
About the same as most, or _____
Not as well as most? _____
Don't know _____

B. How often do you or your husband find you have to punish (child):

More than once a week, _____
Once a week to once a month, _____ (ASK C)
Rarely, or _____
Never? _____ (SKIP TO 65)

C. What kinds of things do you punish (child) for?

D. How do you usually punish (child)?

65. Compared with most mothers, how strict would you say you are with (child):

More strict than most, _____
About as strict as most, or _____
Less strict than most? _____
Don't know _____

66. What about your husband--compared with most fathers--how strict would you say he is with (child):

More strict than most, _____
About as strict as most, or _____
Less strict than most? _____
Don't know _____

67. Who is more strict, you or your husband?

I am _____
Both about the same _____
Husband is more strict _____
Don't know _____

68. A. Suppose (child) came home with a bad report card, what would you do?

B. Has this ever happened--that he (she) came home with a bad report card?
Yes _____
No _____

69. A. Suppose (child) came home with a very good report card, what would you do?

B. Has this ever happened--that he (she) came home with a very good report card?
Yes _____
No _____

70. A. Suppose the teacher punished (child) for something (child) said he (she) didn't do. What would you do?

B. Has this ever happened--that the teacher punished (child) for something (child) said he (she) didn't do?

Yes _____
No _____

71. How far in school do you want (child) to go? (OPEN ENDED: DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS).

	71 Would Like	72 Will Actually	73 Friends will
Finish elementary school	____	____	____
Some high school	____	____	____
Finish high school	____	____	____
Some college	____	____	____
Finish 4 years college	____	____	____
Graduate school	____	____	____
Other (Business school, etc.) Describe_____	____	____	____
Don't know	____	____	____

72. Realistically, how far do you think he (she) will actually go in school? (RECORD ABOVE)

73. How about his (her) close friends, how far do you think most of them will go in school? (RECORD ABOVE)

(IF CHILD IS A BOY, ASK 74 - 76

IF CHILD IS A GIRL, SKIP TO 77)

74. A. If (child) could be remembered in high school for one of these things, which one would you most want it to be:

	A. 1st Choice	B. 2nd Choice
As a brilliant student,	____	____
As an athletic star, or	____	____
As most popular?	____	____
Don't know	____	____

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

75. What kind of job would you like (child) to have when he grows up?

76. A. Now, if (child) could be any of these things, which would be your first choice? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD #5)

	A. 1st Choice	B. 2nd Choice	C. Don't want
Policeman			
Lawyer			
Airplane pilot			
Doctor			
Bus driver			
Professional athlete			
College professor			
Garage mechanic			
Missionary			
Electrician			
Businessman			
Elevator operator			
Scientist			
Insurance salesman			
None or don't know			

SKIP TO 81

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Are there any of these things that you definitely don't want him to be? (RECORD ABOVE)

(MOTHERS OF DAUGHTERS ONLY (QUESTIONS 77 - 81)

77. A. If (child) could be remembered in high school for one of these things, which one would you want it to be:

	A 1st Choice	B 2nd Choice
As a brilliant student,		
As a leader in activities, or		
As most popular?		
Don't know		

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

78. What do you want (child) to do when she finishes her schooling? (IF WORK MENTIONED, BUT NO SPECIFIC JOB, ASK: What kind of job do you want her to have?)

79. A. Now, if (child) could be any of these things, which would be your first choice?
(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #6)

	A 1st Choice	B 2nd Choice	C Don't want
Actress			
Artist			
Nurse			
Waitress			
Model			
Teacher			
Saleslady in store			
Beautician			
Secretary			
Airline stewardess			
Full-time housewife			
Scientist			
Social worker			
Woman's magazine editor			
None or Don't know			

B. Which would be your second choice? (RECORD ABOVE)

C. Are there any of these things that you definitely don't want her to be? (RECORD ABOVE)

80. What is the least amount of education you'd be satisfied for your daughter's husband to have? (OPEN ENDED, DO NOT READ CATEGORIES, IF COLLEGE IS MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS).

Finish elementary school	
Some high school	
Finish high school	
Some college	
Finish 4 years college	
Graduate school	
Don't know	
Other:	

(ALL MOTHERS)

81. Have any of your children ever been members of the Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts, including Cubs, Brownies, and Campfire Girls?

	Sample Child	One or More Other Children
Yes		
No		

82. Have any of your children even taken lessons outside of school in art, dancing, dramatics, or music?

	Sample Child	One or More Other Children
Yes		
No		

83. Have any of your children ever attended Sunday School regularly?

	Sample Child	One or More Other Children
Yes	____	____
No	____	____

84. What does (child) do after school most afternoons?

85. Generally, do you think the schools here have about as much money as they need to do a good job?

Yes ____
No ____
Don't know ____

86. Would you say the taxes paid in (community) in order to support your schools are:

Too high ____
About right, or ____
Too low? ____
Don't know ____

87. A. Do you think there are things the local schools are spending too much money on?

Yes ____ (ASK B)
No ____
Don't know ____ (SKIP TO 88)

B. What things?

88. A. Do you think there are any things that the local schools should spend more money on, even if this meant an increase in your taxes?

Yes ____ (ASK B)
No ____
Don't know ____ (SKIP TO 89)

B. What things?

89. A. Suppose you felt that (school) was not doing as good a job of teaching basic subjects as other schools in New Jersey. How much do you think that you could do to bring about such a change?

A great deal,	____	(ASK B)
Something,	____	
Only a little, or	____	
Nothing at all?	____	(SKIP TO 90)
Don't know	____	

B. What, for example, could you do?

90. A. How much emphasis does (do) the local high school(s) place on athletic activities and team sports like football:

A great deal,	____
Some, or	____
Little or none?	____
Don't know	____

B. Do you think the emphasis on team sports in the high school(s) is:

Too much,	____
About right, or	____
Not enough?	____
Don't know	____

91. Here are things that some schools do and others don't. We would like to know whether it is a good idea or a bad idea to do each of these things, and also whether they are being done or not in the school system in (community):

A. Do you think it is a good idea or a bad idea for schools to: (EACH ITEM)

B. Is this being done in the school system here? (EACH ITEM)

	A. Good Idea	A. Bad Idea	A. D.K.	B. Yes	B. No	B. D.K.
a) Put slow learning children together in the same group for special instruction?	___	___	___	___	___	___
b) Put especially bright children into a group for special instruction.	___	___	___	___	___	___
c) Promote a child who has not been able to keep up with the rest of the class, rather than having him repeat with a younger group.	___	___	___	___	___	___
d) Skip a particularly bright child to a higher grade, even though he may be younger than others in his new class.	___	___	___	___	___	___
e) Teach children the new mathematics.	___	___	___	___	___	___
f) Use programmed materials or teaching machines in the classroom.	___	___	___	___	___	___
g) Teach a foreign language in the elementary school grades.	___	___	___	___	___	___
h) Use TV in the classroom.	___	___	___	___	___	___

92. Now I'd like to know which of these comes closest to your feelings about some statements I'm going to read to you.
(HAND RESPONDENT CARD #7 AND READ THE FIRST STATEMENT. THEN ASK: DO YOU STRONGLY AGREE, SOMEWHAT AGREE, ETC.)

	Strongly Agree,	Somewhat Agree,	Somewhat Disagree,	or Strongly Disagree?	(Vol.) Neither Agree nor Disagree, Don't Know
1) Schools will do better in the long run using tried and tested ways of teaching, rather than new, untested ways.	___	___	___	___	___
2) The amount of money a family has often determines how the child will be treated in the local schools.	___	___	___	___	___
3) Teachers generally are well prepared to handle the personal problems of children.	___	___	___	___	___
4) Teachers too often think they "know it all."	___	___	___	___	___
5) In general, teachers work harder than most people.	___	___	___	___	___
6) Teachers who have children of their own are better able to handle students.	___	___	___	___	___
7) A person who wants to get ahead today has to do well in school.	___	___	___	___	___
8) A principal should visit classes regularly to see how well teachers are doing.	___	___	___	___	___
9) Generally, when parents get into arguments with teachers, the principal should support the teachers.	___	___	___	___	___

(GET CARD #7 BACK FROM RESPONDENT)

93. A. Do you think the school board in (community) pays too much attention to what certain groups think and not enough to the rest of the community?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ } (SKIP TO 94)
Don't Know _____ }

B. Which groups do they pay too much attention to?

94. How often do people ask you your opinion about school or community affairs:

Often, _____
Sometimes, _____
Rarely, or _____
Never? _____

95. How many people in this neighborhood do you know well enough to spend half an hour or so with them now and then?

Number _____

96. Not counting relatives who may live around here, how often do you get together with your neighbors either at your home or theirs:

Almost every day, _____
Once or twice a week, _____
Once or twice a month, _____
A few times a year or less, or _____
Never? _____

97. About how much time do you spend watching TV on an average weekday, counting daytime and evening viewing? (CIRCLE ANSWER)

0 ½ hr. 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5 hrs. or more Don't Know

98. About how much time does (child) spend watching TV on an average weekday counting daytime and evening viewing? (CIRCLE ANSWER)

0 ½ hr. 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5 hrs. or more Don't Know

89. A. Do you have any rules about watching TV that (child) has to follow?

Yes	_____	(ASK B)
No	_____	(SKIP TO 100)

B. What rules?

100. A. Do you read any newspapers regularly?

Yes	_____	(ASK B)
No	_____	(SKIP TO 101)

B. Which ones?

101. A. Do you read any magazines regularly?

Yes	_____	(ASK B)
No	_____	(SKIP TO 102)

B. Which ones?

102. What about books? About how many books for adults do you have in the home? (IF RESPONDENT SAYS DON'T KNOW, TRY TO GET ESTIMATE, STARTING WITH THE SMALLEST CATEGORY BELOW.)

Less than 10	_____	201 - 300	_____
10 - 25	_____	301 - 500	_____
26 - 50	_____	501 - 1000	_____
51 - 100	_____	Over 1000	_____
101 - 200	_____	Don't Know	_____

103. A. Do you belong to the PTA at (school)?

Yes _____ (ASK B)

No _____ (SKIP TO C)

No P.T.A. _____ (SKIP TO 105)

B. How many meetings have you attended this school year?

Number _____

*C. How about your husband? Does he belong to the PTA at (school)?

Yes _____ (ASK D)

No _____ (SKIP TO 104)

*D. How many meetings has he attended this school year?

Number _____

104. A. What kinds of things does the PTA at (school) do?

B. How good a job overall do you think the (school) PTA is doing:

Excellent, _____
Good, _____
Only fair, _____
or Poor? _____
Don't Know _____

105. A. How long have you lived at this address? _____ Years

B. How long have you lived in (community)? _____ Years
(IF RESPONDENT HAS LIVED IN (COMMUNITY) ALL HER LIFE, SKIP TO 106)

C. Where did you live before moving to (community)?

_____
CITY STATE

106. Do you own or rent this house (apartment)?

Own _____
Rent _____
Other (write in) _____

107. How many rooms do you have? _____ Rooms

108. How much do you like living here in this neighborhood:

Very much, _____
Somewhat, _____
Not much, or _____
Not at all? _____

109. Do you expect to move from this neighborhood within the next five years?

Yes _____
No _____
Don't Know _____

110. When it comes to money, compared with other families in this neighborhood, would you say you are:

Better off than most, _____
About as well off as most, or _____
Not as well off as most? _____
Don't Know _____

111. A. In the last few years, have there been any changes in the type of people living in this neighborhood -- that is, more people of one religion, nationality, race, income group, or things like that?

Yes _____ (ASK B)
No _____ } (SKIP TO 112)
Don't Know _____ }

B. What changes?

C. Has this caused any special problems or difficulty?

(IF RESPONDENT IS MARRIED AND LIVING WITH HUSBAND, ASK 112.
IF RESPONDENT IS DIVORCED, SEPARATED, OR WIDOWED, SKIP TO 119.)

*112. How far in school did your husband go? (OPEN ENDED, DO NCT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE IS MENTIONED, ASK NUMBER OF YEARS.)

Finished elementary school	_____
Some high school	_____
Finished high school	_____
Some college	_____
Finished 4 years college	_____
Graduate school	_____
Other: DESCRIBE	
_____	_____
Don't know	_____

*113. A. Is your husband working at the present time?

Yes	_____	(ASK B)
No	_____	(SKIP TO 116)

B. What kind of work does he do? (DESCRIBE FULLY POSITION AND FIELD.)

C. In what town does he work? (RECORD TOWN AND STATE)

*114. Does he have his own business or does he work for someone else?

Self	_____	(ASK 115A)
Else	_____	(SKIP TO 115C)

*115. A. Does he employ anyone?

Yes	_____	(ASK B)
No	_____	(SKIP TO 117)

B. About how many people does he employ?

_____ (SKIP TO 117)
(number)

C. Does he supervise anyone?

Yes	_____	(ASK D)
No	_____	(SKIP TO 117)

D. About how many people does he supervise?

_____ (SKIP TO 117)
(number)

*116. What kind of work does your husband usually do? (DESCRIBE FULLY POSITION AND FIELD AND WHETHER USUALLY SELF-EMPLOYED OR WORKING FOR OTHERS.)

*117. Where was your husband born?

City and Town	State	Country (if not U.S.A.)

*118. Where did he live mostly when he was growing up?

City or Town	State	Country (if not U.S.

119. How old are you? _____ (years)

120. Where were you born?

City or Town	State	Country (if not U.S.A

121. Where did you live mostly when you were growing up?

City or Town	State	Country (if not U.S.A.)

122. How far in school did you go? (OPEN ENDED. DO NOT READ CATEGORIES, IF COLLEGE MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS.)

Finished elementary school	_____
Some high school	_____
Finished high school	_____
Some college	_____
Finished four years college	_____
Graduate school	_____
Other: DESCRIBE:	
_____	_____

123. Are you working at the present time?

YES _____ (ASK B)
NO (SKIP TO 124)

B. What kind of work do you do? (DESCRIBE FULLY POSITION AND BUSINESS OR FIELD.)

C. About how many hours per week do you work? _____
(SKIP TO 125 AND SEE THE DIRECTIONS)

124. A. When was the last time you did work?

Never worked_____ (SKIP TO 125 AND SEE THE DIRECTIONS)

B. What kind of work did you do then? (DESCRIBE FULLY POSITION AND BUSINES OR FIELD.)

(IF WIFE SEPARATED, WIDOWED OR DIVORCED, ASK 125. IF MARRIED AND LIVING WITH HUSBAND, SKIP TO 126.)

125. What was your husband's usual occupation? (DESCRIBE POSITION AND BUSINESS OR FIELD.)

(ALL MOTHERS)

126. A. What category best represents your total family income before taxes? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD #8)

a)	Less than $3,000	_____	(ASK B)
b)	$3,000 - $3,999	_____	
c)	$4,000 - $4,999	_____	
d)	$5,000 - $5,999	_____	(SKIP TO 127)
e)	$6,000 - $7,999	_____	
f)	$8,000 - $9,999	_____	
g)	$10,000 - $14,999	_____	
h)	$15,000 - $19,999	_____	
i)	Over $20,000	_____	
	Don't know	_____	
	Refusal	_____	

B. Do you receive any public assistance?

Yes _____
No _____

127. A. What is your religion?

Protestant	_____	(ASK B)
Catholic	_____	(SKIP TO 128)
Jewish	_____	
Other	_____	
None	_____	(SKIP TO 129)

B. What denomination?

Baptist	_____
Congregational	_____
Episcopal	_____
Lutheran	_____
Methodist	_____
Presbyterian	_____
Other	_____
Don't know	_____

128. How often do you usually attend church (or synagogue):

Once a week or more,	_____
A few times a month,	_____
Once a month,	_____
Less than once a month, or	_____
Very rarely or never?	_____
Don't know	_____

129. Regardless of how you have voted in the past, what do you usually consider yourself:

A Democrat,	_____
A Republican,	_____
Some other party,	_____
Or what? (SPECIFY)_____	
Refusal	_____

130. A. Did you vote last November for President?

Yes	_____
No	_____
Don't remember	_____

B. Did you vote for:

Johnson,	_____
Goldwater, or	_____
Someone else?	_____
(vol.)Don't remember	_____
Refusal	_____

131. Did you vote in a school election during the past school year?

Yes	_____
No	_____
Not eligible	_____
Don't remember	_____

132. People often talk about different classes in America -- like the middle class, the lower class, the working class, or the upper class. Which of these would you say you belong to -- middle, lower, working, or upper class?

Upper	_____
Middle	_____
Working	_____
Lower	_____
(vol.) There are no classes	_____
Don't know	_____

133. Where was your mother born?

_____	_____	_____
City or Town	State	Country (if not U.S.A.)

134. How about your father? Where was he born?

_____	_____	_____
City or Town	State	Country (if not U.S.A.)

135. What was your father's usual occupation? (DESCRIBE POSITION AND BUSINESS OR FIELD.)

136. How far in school did your father go? (OPEN ENDED: DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. IF COLLEGE MENTIONED, ASK HOW MANY YEARS.)

Finished elementary school	_____
Some high school	_____
Finished high school	_____
Some college	_____
Finished 4 years college	_____
Graduate school	_____
Other (business school, etc.)	
DESCRIBE: _____	_____
Don't know	_____

TIME COMPLETED: _____

DATE: _____ INTERVIEWER: _____

FOR INTERVIEWERS ONLY

A. Address (include apartment number) of respondent's household.

_____

_____

_____ _____
(Apartment Number)

B. Type of structure:

Single-family home detached	_____
Single-family house attached	_____
Two-family house detached	_____
Two-family house attached	_____
Multiple dwelling-unit buildings	_____
Approximate number of dwelling units	_____
Rooming house	_____
Other (specify)	_____

C. Respondent's race

White	_____
Negro	_____
Puerto Rican	_____
Other (specify)	_____

D. Cooperation of respondent:

Very cooperative	_____
Somewhat cooperative	_____
Not cooperative	_____

E. Interest of respondent:

Very interested	_____
Somewhat interested	_____
Uninterested	_____

F. Other comments:

(Interruptions. Anyone else present during interview? Who? Over-all reactions of respondent, etc.)