Graduate Research Papers   **Student Work**

1981

The effect of teachers' expectations, attitudes, and managerial abilities on student achievement

Catherine Tremblay Allison
University of Northern Iowa

The effect of teachers' expectations, attitudes, and managerial abilities on student achievement

Abstract

Success in school is presumably thought to be a function of both internal and external stimuli that impinge upon the student (Breen, 1979). In recent years, more attention has been given to the internal stimuli. These affective and attitudinal factors are beginning to play an increasingly important role in the educational process.

THE EFFECT OF TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS,

ATTITUDES, AND MANAGERIAL ABILITIES

ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

A Research Paper

Submitted to

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

by

Catherine Tremblay Allison

July 1981

This Research Paper by: Catherine Tremblay Allison

Entitled: THE EFFECTS OF TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS, ATTITUDES, AND

    MANAGERIAL ABILITIES ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement for the Degree

of Master of Arts in Education.

_7/20/81_
Date Approved

_7/21/81_
Date Approved

_7/21/81_
Date Received

_7/21/81_
Date Received

Ernest K. Dishner
Director of Research Paper

Catherine W. Hatcher
Reader of Research Paper

Catherine W. Hatcher
Graduate Faculty Advisor

Ernest K. Dishner
Head, Department of
Curriculum and Instruction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Success in school is presumably thought to be a function of both internal and external stimuli that impinge upon the student (Breen, 1979). In recent years, more attention has been given to the internal stimuli. These affective and attitudinal factors are beginning to play an increasingly important role in the educational process.

It is the teachers' role to create an atmosphere or environment that facilitates learning, with major concern for the development of external conditions as well as the attitudinal factors. Teachers are faced with many decisions throughout the day concerning what areas of instruction are to be emphasized and the various types of teaching activities to be employed. Although these overt factors are an integral component in the overall educational process, other factors such as the teacher's personality, the behaviors and attitudes toward the students, and the subject matter taught play a key role in the process of the students' education.

The responsibility on the part of the school relative to the affective growth of the students has recently increased, making the teacher's role more important and pronounced. Various personality traits exhibited by the teacher in the classroom have been shown to have a very definite effect on the academic personality development of the student (Amatora, 1950; Collopy, 1957). The influence can have a facilitating effect or act as an inhibiting factor on the student's attitude toward learning.

The students' attitudes toward the teacher and subject matter in many ways determine what is learned and retained (Breen, 1979). This suggests that the development of attitudes toward school may either hinder or facilitate students' overall school performance. Research has supported the premise that there is a positive relationship between the interests or attitudes that teachers possess and the attitudes their pupils acquire (Banks, 1964; Stedman & Breen, 1977). The amount of enthusiasm, knowledge, and interest that the teacher conveys to the students is influential in the development of the students' attitude toward the task.

There is not a more potent force in the classroom than the teacher. If that person is able to project a sincere, positive attitude toward learning, toward reading, and toward students, the chances of positive attitude development are greatly enhanced (Estes, 1975). Classroom teachers therefore need to be alert to the developing attitudes of their students because attitudes are not innate; they are learned, they are developed, and they are organized through experience.

The teachers' adaptation to students is the heart of the teaching-learning process. Adaptation refers to the constant shifts in teacher behavior in response to an individual student, a group of students, or an entire class. The teachers' adaptation varies. Some teachers change their approaches to suit the student more readily than other teachers; some adapt more effectively than others; and some adapt to students in relation to immediate circumstances, while others adapt in relation to long-term development (Hunt, 1976).

The teacher is without question the key to a successful classroom learning experience. A learner's attitude may vary with his/her personal predispositions and may be affected in unique ways by variables within the learner and his or her environment (Alexander, 1975). Although research suggests that attitudes tend to be unique, personal, and highly unpredictable, there is little disagreement relative to the importance of positive attitudes in assuring maximal success in school (Squire, 1969).

Teaching is defined by Smith (1961) as a "system of actions intended to induce learning" (p. 88). According to this definition, teaching is characterized as an activity aimed at the achievement of learning. Teacher effectiveness is also usually defined as the effect of the teacher on some educational objective, defined in terms of desired pupil behaviors, abilities, habits, or characteristics. The ultimate criterion of a teacher's effectiveness is usually considered to be his/her effect on his/her pupils' achievement of certain educational objectives (Gage, 1963). Teaching is therefore seen as a distinctive goal-oriented activity aimed at expediting learning.

Although the effect of the teacher on pupils' attitudes and achievement is generally recognized, the teacher characteristics that make a difference and the relationship between the teachers' behaviors and pupils' achievement are poorly understood. The following review of research deals with some of the most influential teacher factors that have been found to differentially influence the performance of students in the classroom, particularly in the area of reading.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this research paper is to assess what effect teachers' attitudes and behaviors have on student achievement in general and the implications for reading teachers in particular. An attempt will be made to review critically the research which has been conducted supporting the conclusion that teachers' behavior does differentially influence student performance. The following questions will be addressed:

1. What research has been conducted on teachers' expectations, attitudes, and managerial abilities and how do these factors affect student achievement?

2. What specific characteristics seem to make teachers more effective?

3. What are the implication of this research for reading teachers?

Significance of the Problem

The importance of this research paper is threefold. One, if teachers are to be more effective in fostering positive attitudes toward learning and increasing student achievement, more needs to be known about what characteristics will help to increase the learner's ability to grasp, to transform and to transfer what he or she is learning. Two, teachers need to be made more aware of the overwhelming influence their behaviors have on students' self-concepts. Three, generalizations can be made from the information presented in the areas of teachers' expectations, attitudes, and managerial abilities, and thus, provide input for reading teachers and future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the research in the area

of teacher effectiveness in order to assess what effect teachers' atti-

tudes and behaviors have on student achievement, particularly in the

area of reading. The research will be reviewed in four specific

sections including a background of process-product research, the

effect of teachers' expectations on student achievement, the effect

of teachers' attitudes on student achievement, and the effect of

teachers' managerial abilities on student achievement.

It is generally agreed upon that some teachers are more effective

in fostering children's achievement in the classroom than others. Dif-

ferences have been found even when many important classroom variables

such as instructional methods, size and socioeconomic composition of

the class, reading materials, and level of education of teachers are

held constant (Emans & Fox, 1973). This fact has led to a recent resur-

gence of interest in the behaviors and attitudes of effective and suc-

cessful teachers (Brophy, 1979).

Teachers do not communicate to children at an intuitive level but

through their behaviors. The teaching behaviors which influence chil-

dren in the classroom are not chance occurrences but recur with sufficient

regularity within a variety of contexts to be learned by the children.

This fact leads us to conclude that it is possible to observe, to group,

and to analyze teaching behaviors, to focus on the differences in the

behaviors between good and poor teachers, and to explore the influence

of various trends of educational experiences and resources on teacher classroom behaviors.

Brophy (1979) pointed out that until recently there were virtually no clear research results linking aspects of teacher behavior to student learning. Much of the pioneering research dealt with process-product research. This type of research attempts to relate observed teacher behaviors to student outcome measures (Mitzel, 1960). These studies are best labeled as correlational because only naturally occurring behaviors are observed, although some investigators have used statistical procedures ordinarily associated with experiments to analyze their results.

Background of Process-Product Research

In process-product studies the independent variables are the teacher behaviors which are recorded using observational category systems or rating systems. Categories are classified as low-inference measures because the items focus on specific, relatively objective behaviors and because such events are recorded as frequency counts (Gage, 1979; Rosenshine, 1970). Rating systems are classified as high-inference items because the items on rating instruments require the observer to infer constructs such as warmth, clarity, task-orientation, and class cohesiveness from a series of events. The dependent variables in process-product studies are student performance measures, such as testing instruments used to determine student gain (Rosenshine & Furst, 1979). These studies are correlational, not experimental, and therefore the results do not determine causation and should be interpreted with some caution.

Rosenshine and Furst (1971) reviewed 50 process-product studies that had been conducted on the relationship between teacher behavior and student achievement. In most of the studies the teacher was the sampling unit, and in all of the studies naturally occurring teacher behavior was observed.

A number of limitations should be noted in relation to the studies. All of the studies were conducted with "normal" children, in most of the studies only the class mean was used in the analysis, and few attempts were made to determine the relationship between teacher behavior and student achievement for subgroups of students differing in achievement, aptitude, or personality. The studies focused on general teaching behaviors that would be effective across all subject areas and types of curriculum, and the studies only covered the relationship between teacher behaviors and student achievement. Other important outcome variables, such as student attitudes toward self, school, and subject area were not considered. The five variables that yielded the strongest relationships with measures of student achievement were clarity, variability, enthusiasm, task orientation or businesslike behavior, and student opportunity to learn.

The cognitive clarity of a teacher's presentation was studied in seven investigations in which student or observer ratings were used. The investigations used different descriptions of clarity. First, whether the points the teacher made were clear and easy to understand (Solomon, Bezdek, & Rosenburg, 1963). Second, if the teacher was able to explain the concepts introduced clearly and answer the children's

questions intelligently (Wallen, 1966). Third, if the teacher's

initial presentation of concepts was clear (Belgard, Rosenshine, & Gage,

1968; Fortune, Gage, & Shutes, 1966). Lastly, whether the cognitive

level of the teacher's lesson appeared to be appropriate most of the

time (Chall & Feldman, 1966). Significant results were obtained in

all seven studies linking teacher clarity to student achievement;

however, future research is needed to determine the specific behaviors

which compromise clarity.

A number of studies focused on the teachers' use of variety and

variability during lessons. Anthony (1967) counted the variety of

instructional materials, tests, and devices used by the teacher. Lea

(1964) asked teachers to mark daily checklists of the different activi-

ties and materials used during lessons. Furst (1976) and Thompson and

Bowers (1968) coded the cognitive level of classroom discourse, and

those who used more variation received higher cognitive scores. Signifi-

cant results favoring variability were obtained in all four studies.

These studies indicated that student achievement was positively related

to classrooms that employed a variety of instructional procedures

and materials and where the teacher varied the cognitive level of dis-

course.

Teacher enthusiasm was assessed by both observer ratings and

student ratings. Three studies used observer ratings on paired adjec-

tives such as "stimulating versus dull", "original versus stereotyped",

or "alert versus apathetic" (Fortune, 1967; Kleinman, 1964; Wallen,

1966). In another study, observer estimation of the amount of vigor

and power exhibited by the teacher during classroom presentation as well as student ratings of the teachers' involvement, excitement, or interest regarding the subject matter were used (Solomon, Bezdek, & Rosenburg, 1963). Significant results relating enthusiasm to student achievement were obtained in all four studies; however, the specific low-inference behaviors which comprise enthusiasm have not yet been identified.

Rating scales were used in six investigations to estimate the degree to which a teacher was task-oriented, achievement-oriented, and/or businesslike. Fortune (1967) and Kleinman (1964) asked observers to rate the teachers using the paired adjectives which Ryans (1960) identified as comprising "businesslike behavior". The categories included evading-responsible, erratic-steady, disorganized-systematic, and excitable-poised. In another study by Chall and Feldman (1966) teachers of high achieving classes were rated by observers as emphasizing thought stimulation rather than information and skills. In two studies by Wallen (1966) with first and third graders, "achievement-oriented teachers" were rated as being concerned that students learn something rather than that students enjoy themselves. In the sixth study, Torrance and Parent (1966) had students rate their teacher on the extent to which the teacher encouraged the class to work hard and do independent, creative work. Significant results linking task orientation to student achievement were obtained in all six studies. Teachers who focused on the learning of cognitive tasks, rather than on other activities hoping that cognitive growth would be obtained indirectly, were more successful in obtaining higher student achievement.

In order to investigate student opportunity to learn, three investigators assessed the relationship between the material covered in the classroom and the score on a criterion test. When students are given a standardized pretest and posttest in a subject area and the behaviors of the teacher are correlated with adjusted gain scores, the investigators seldom know whether the material on the posttest was covered in the lessons. Rosenshine (1968) and Shutes (1969) inspected typescripts of lessons to determine the extent to which material required to answer the posttest questions was covered in the lesson. Bellack (1966) related the amount of time spent on various topics within lessons to student achievement on these topics. Significant correlations between opportunity to learn and student achievement were obtained in all three studies.

Although these variables were all linked to increased student achievement, many researchers and educators felt the need to conduct more experimentally sound studies that were not marred by the limitations associated with earlier correlational investigations. Educators felt that other important outcome variables, including student and teacher attitudes toward themselves, and teachers' attitudes toward their students and the subject matter were also areas that should be considered. In response to these needs, a growing body of research has recently focused on teacher effectiveness in the area of instruction, particularly reading. The importance of the teachers' attitudes toward the student, the acquisition of basic skills and how the teachers' attitudes and behaviors can influence these factors were all found to be areas of vital importance to effective instruction.

Effect of Teacher Expectations on Student Achievement

The expectations that a teacher holds regarding a student's performance can affect some aspects of the actual performance of the student (Beez, 1968; Feldman, 1979). Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) suggested that teachers' expectancies may have an important effect on a student's intellectual development. They presented research in Pygmalion in the Classroom that suggests teachers' expectations for student performance function as self-fulfilling prophecies. A randomly selected group of students from grades K-6 who were described to their teachers as likely to show marked intellectual gains, evidenced a significantly higher gain on a group-administered intelligence test than did control subjects. This research received much criticism on methodological grounds such as inadequate data analysis and test administration by teachers adding uncertainty to the standardizations and reliance on tests inadequate for young and low socioeconomic children. It was merely a demonstration of the existence of expectancy effects. However, it spurred many other researchers to clarify the process linking teachers' expectations with changes in the students' behavior (Jensen, 1968; Snow, 1969; Thorndike, 1968). Rothbart, Dalfen, and Barrett (1971) conducted a study to determine how teachers in a classroom setting behave differently toward "bright" than toward "dull" students. An attempt was made to observe (a) the teachers' allocation of time between bright and dull students, (b) the amount of reinforcement (encouragement) directed toward the two groups, and (c) the resulting verbal output of the bright and dull students.

Thirteen female seniors at McGill University served as teachers, and 27 male and 25 female students from Montreal High School participated as the students in the experiment. Four subjects were randomly assigned to a high expectancy or low expectancy condition, two to each group. Teachers were told they were interested in the way in which students interact with one another in a classroom setting, especially the way they react to material they encounter in class. Students were informed that they were interested in studying different approaches to English literature. The teacher was given written instructions just prior to the experiment that explained that the students were to read a passage and the teacher was to direct three questions to each one and then conduct a 15-minute group discussion. Two students' names were given as having greater academic ability than the other two who lacked intellectual potential.

The teachers were videotaped and a record was made of the total amount of time they spent attending to the high expectancy and low expectancy students. Two observers unaware of the purpose of the experiment were asked to judge the teachers' behaviors and record the number of positive and negative reinforcements. Following the session, the teacher rated each student on several attributes such as intelligence, appeal, and cooperation.

Results suggested that teachers paid more attention to the high expectation students and these students in turn responded by talking more. Although the teachers did not give more verbal or positive reinforcement to the high expectation groups, they did rate the

high expectation students as being more intelligent and as having greater potential for future success.

Brophy and Good (1970) found similar results in a study they conducted in four first-grade classrooms. Teachers were not informed of the actual intent of the experiment. They were asked to rank the children in the class in order of their achievement. Only subjective criteria, e.g. the opinion of the teachers, were used and these lists were used as a measure of the taechers' expectations for the performance of their students. Six high achievers and six low achievers were chosen from each class list for observation. Observations were made by two observers on four separate days in each of the four classrooms. The observers coded only the interactions involving the selected high and low rated students. The source of each interaction was always coded so it could be determined whether the interaction was initiated by the teacher or the child.

Results found that the high achieving students received more teacher praise and support and that teachers directed more evaluative comments toward the boys. Teachers systematically discriminated in favor of highs over lows in demanding and reinforcing quality perform- ance. These teachers did communicate differential performance expecta- tions to different children through their behavior, confirming the hypothesis that teachers' expectations function as self-fulfilling phrophecies and identifying some of the behaviors involved in the process.

Browne (1971) found similar findings to support Brophy and Good's conclusions that teachers provided different response opportunities

for high and low groups according to their perception of their students' abilities. High ability children were allowed to give open answers, applying divergent and reflective independent thought. Children perceived as low ability had to be specific and literal in response, providing objective answers. Thus children in high ability groups have opportunities to develop their thinking abilities, while those in low ability groups do not. Browne also found that teachers place children in low, medium, and high ability groups on the basis of little objective evidence so that it is often true that teachers' judgments of children's abilities are not always based on learning ability. Therefore, teachers must be assigning children to ability groups solely on the basis of their subjective observations of the students' behaviors.

Rosenthal (1974) provided a typology for summarizing behaviors found to be associated with teacher expectations. The typology contains four factors: climate, input, output, and feedback. In relation to the first factor, climate, teachers appear to create a warmer socio-economic climate for brighter students. In relation to the input factor, there is also evidence indicating that teachers' verbal inputs to students are dependent on performance expectations. Students labeled as slow have been found to receive fewer opportunities to learn new material than students labeled as bright. The third factor of verbal output is defined as the frequency with which academic interactions take place and the teachers' persistence in pursuing interactions to a satisfactory conclusion. Teachers often show more willingness to pursue an answer with highs than with lows. The final factor, feedback,

involves the teachers use of praise and criticism after an academic
exchange. Teachers tend to praise highs more for correct responses,
and lows are criticized more for incorrect responses.

Cooper (1979) also felt that certain behaviors were associated
with teacher expectations of students' ability and that these behaviors
were communicated to students and influenced their performance in the
classroom. He proposed a causal process theory to explain teacher
performance expectation communication and the influence it has on
student behavior. The steps in Cooper's model are as follows:

1. Variations in student ability and background lead
    teachers to form differential expectations for
    student performance.

2. These expectations, in conjunction with the inter-
    action context, influence teacher perceptions of
    control over student performance. Interactions
    initiated by low-expectation students, especially
    in public, are found least controllable and less
    likely to succeed.

3. Teacher perceptions of personal control influence
    classroom climate and choice of feedback contin-
    gencies. Teachers may be increasing personal
    control by creating a negative climate and
    feedback pattern for lows, and thus inhibiting
    low initiations. This means that lows are
    more often praised and criticized for control
    purposes (external to student performance) and
    highs are more often evaluated with effort as the
    criterion (a personal cause).

4. Negative climate and feedback patterns may decrease
    student initiations. The negative patterns employed
    with low-expectation students then result in
    increased teacher control over interaction content,
    timing, and duration.

5. Feedback contingencies also may influence student
    effort-outcome covariation beliefs. A stronger
    belief on the part of lows than highs that

reinforcements are controlled by external factors was
proposed as a consequence of using a control feedback
contingency. It was pointed out that a belief in
personal efficacy is a prerequisite for achievement
motivation.

6. Finally, effort-outcome covariation beliefs may
influence student performance. Noncontingent
reinforcement was seen as causing negative
affect and attitudes, less persistence at tasks,
and more frequent failure. (p. 406)

Cooper therefore felt that not only do the teachers' expectations of

students differentially influence their achievement, but also that

students perceive this differential treatment by teachers.

Weinstein and Middlestat (1979) agreed with this hypothesis and

conducted an investigation to determine what effect these different

teacher expectations of high and low achievers had on student perform-

ance. The intent of their study was to explore whether: (a) students

perceive teachers' differential treatment of high and low achievers

in the classroom, (b) students perceive differences in learner attri-

butes between high and low achievers, (c) perceptions of teachers'

differential treatment are shared across students and are moderated by

characteristics of the perceiver, and (d) consistencies in perception

appear across grade levels.

The study included 102 children from grades one through six.

Each student rated 60 teacher behaviors as descriptive of a hypothetical

male high or low achiever. Information about the sex and the self-concept

of each rater was also collected. Results showed that students did

perceive differences between male high and low achievers on academic

qualities such as being attentive or successful, as well as differences

extending into the social realm of popularity and friendship.

Student-perceived teacher treatment of male high achievers reflected

high expectations, academic demand and special privileges. Male low

achievers were viewed as receiving fewer chances, but greater teacher

concern and vigilance.

This awareness of differential treatment was shared by the students

regardless of their grade level, sex, or self-concept of academic

achievement. These results suggest that teacher behavior toward indi-

vidual students can be seen as providng information about achievement

status to the student as well as to peers. This suggests that students'

perceptions of their peers are related to the teachers' differential

treatment of high and low achievers. Because classrooms are social

settings, other students may contribute a great deal to an individual's

perception of himself as a learner, which in turn will influence effort

and achievement.

Brophy and Good (1970) suggest a possible sequence of behaviors

that may offer at least an explanation of how expectation cues are

transmitted from the teacher to the learner:

1. The teacher forms differential expectations for student
    performance;

2. He then begins to treat children differently in accordance
    with his differential expectations;

3. The children respond differentially to the teacher
    because they are being treated differently by him;

4. In responding to the teacher, each child tends to
    exhibit behavior which complements and reinforces
    the teacher's particular expectations for him;

5. As a result, the general academic performance of some
    children will be enhanced while that of others will

be depressed, with changes being in the direction of
teacher expectations;

6. These effects will show up in the achievement tests
    given at the end of the year, providing support for
    the self-fulfilling prophecy notion. (p. 365-366)

Thus, teachers appear to respond differently to students according to

the expectations they hold regarding the students' ability. In turn,

these differential behaviors seem to promote student performance that

is congruent with their expectations.

In the same manner in which teachers' expectations of student

performance can be transmitted to students by the teachers' behaviors,

it has been found that students also form their own expectations about

their teachers based on their expectations of the teachers' performance.

Subsequently, in much the same way as teachers' expectations are trans-

mitted to students, the attitudes and expectations students have for

their teachers can also be communicated to the teacher and lead to

the expected behaviors.

Feldman (1979) hypothesized that the expectation the student holds

regarding the teacher would be reflected in differential student behavior

and that such differential student behavior would affect the teacher's

behavior. He conducted two separate studies in an effort to test this

hypothesis. The first investigation was done to determine the effect

of the student's expectation about the teacher's competence on the

student. The subjects who were to act as the students were informed by

a confederate, who supposedly had participated in a prior experiment,

that the teacher was either quite effective or incompetent. The

experiement was videotaped and teachers taught two lessons and administered

a posttest. Three measures were obtained: (a) subjects' attitudes toward the teacher after the lesson, (b) the test on the lesson content, and (c) the nonverbal behavior of the students.

Results showed that subjects rated the lesson as more difficult, less interesting, and less effective when they expected a poor teacher than when they expected a good one. They also rated them as less intelligent, less liked, and less enthusiastic. Subjects also scored significantly higher on the posttest when they expected the teacher to be good. Subjects also leaned forward toward the teacher more often when she was good and tended to have greater eye contact.

A second experiment was conducted to determine if the students' responses affected the teacher. In this study subjects were recruited to act as teachers and confederates played students who were either nonverbally positive or negative. The same two lessons were taught. The results showed that the adequacy of performance of the teachers differed significantly according to the nonverbal behavior of the student. Teachers who were exposed to positive students were rated as significantly more adequate teachers. Thus, the students' nonverbal behavior seems to have been reflected in differential teacher performance. This evidence supports the hypothesis that a student's expectations about his or her teacher could be transmitted to the teacher and bring about behavior congruent with the expectation.

In summary, it seems that teachers usually form expectations about their students based on their students' ability to perform in the classroom and that these expectations are overtly transmitted to the

students by the teacher's behavior. The results have demonstrated consistently that the behaviors teachers exhibit are far more reinforcing to the high achievers than to the low achievers. The expectations that a teacher has about a student or that a student has about a teacher have also been found to bring about behaviors that are consistent with the expectations. Considering the fact that the teachers' expectations can have such an influential effect on students, teachers need to realize that they are a critical factor and learn to use their influence to promote positive expectations about their students. Teachers must not allow their perceptions of individual differences to be overtly displayed to their students through their behavior.

The Effect of Teacher Attitudes on Student Achievement

Another aspect that researchers have found to be a critical factor in influencing student achievement are the attitudes teachers have about themselves and their students. Most of the research that has been done in the area of attitudes, both teachers' and students', toward what occurs in the classroom has dealt specifically with reading. This is most likely due to the fact that teachers allocate a major portion of their instructional time to the teaching of reading. According to Harris (1970), a noted reading specialist, reading ability is recognized as centrally important since without it very little academic learning can take place. A positive attitude is essential for successful mastery of the written page (Alexander & Filler, 1976). Two basic assumptions seem to be the basis for the recent research in the affective dimensions of reading: (1) that attitudes toward reading influence achievement

in reading, and (2) that teachers' attitudes toward reading affect

the pupils' attitudes toward reading (Schofield, 1980).

Research studies attempting to identify the key variables in

classroom reading instruction have repeatedly reached the conclusion

that it is the teacher not the instructional approach, material, or

grouping pattern used, which most clearly accounts for the variance

in progress among students (Artley, 1969; Bond & Dykstra, 1967; Harris

& Morrison, 1969; Rutherford, 1971). Although the influence of the

teacher variable on an individual's academic achievement has been

demonstrated, that variable has seldom been investigated in terms of

the teachers' own perceptions of general self-worth and consequent

effectiveness in the classroom (Rosenshine & Furst, 1971).

Apsy and Buhler (1975) found a positive relationship between

teachers' self-concepts and the cognitive growth of their students.

Murray and Staebler (1974) found that teachers who feel they are capable

of controlling events in their lives and accept responsibility for

this control produce more favorable results in the classroom than those

teachers who do not. Self-accepting teachers are critical to the

development of the self-concepts of their students.

Seaton (1978) conducted a study to determine the relationship

of self-concept, knowledge of reading, and teacher effectiveness. The

study included 102 teachers from grades one through three in 12 schools.

Each teacher was given the Tennessee Self-Concept Test and the Inventory

of Teacher Knowledge of Reading. Each teacher was also evaluated by a

reading supervisor and the building principal using a 58-item instrument

designed to determine competency in reading instruction. Each teacher was also asked to rate themselves using the same instrument.

Results indicated that teachers' knowledge of skill for teaching reading are strongly related to teacher perceptions of themselves as worthy individuals who are confident of their ability and who act in accordance with confidence. Knowledge of skill for teaching reading and the teachers' self-concepts seem to be strongly related to the teachers' overall effectiveness in teaching reading.

Murray and Staebler (1974) found in a study with 80 fifth-grade students and ten teachers that regardless of the students' locus of control, or the degree to which they accept personal responsibility for what happens to them, that all students gained more on an achievement measure when they had been taught by an internal rather than an external teacher. Internal control refers to teachers who usually attribute their success and/or failure to themselves rather than to chance, fate, or powerful others as do externally controlled teachers.

Keisler (1979) found similar results in an investigation with 130 student teachers who took a special test developed to measure success orientation versus failure-avoidance orientation. He found that high-achievement motivated teachers attributed their students' failures to their own lack of effort in teaching, while low-achievement motivated teachers did not.

Also of importance is the teachers' attitude toward the students in different reading groups and more specifically how they convey their perceptions of their pupils' ability through their grouping procedures.

Kibby (1977) conducted a study with second graders to determine if the status as a reader within a group affects a child's concept of himself as a reader and his attitude toward reading, irrespective of actual reading ability. Two classrooms were selected, one with the highest achievers and one with the lowest achievers. Children were placed by ability in these separate classrooms at the beginning of the school year. The six poorest readers in the highest achieving room and the six best readers in the lowest achieving group were selected for the investigation. Two measures of attitude toward reading were used, an attitude inventory and a self-concept inventory, as well as a structured interview with each child.

Results showed that even though the high achievers had higher mean scores in reading than the low achievers, they were the poorest readers in their classroom and manifested poorer self-concepts as readers and more negative attitudes toward reading both verbally and behaviorally. The low achievers had significantly less reading ability and were able to read almost nothing, but they were the best readers in their classroom. They evidenced a more positive self-image and a more positive attitude toward reading both verbally and behaviorally than the high achievers. Hence, it follows that teachers who convey to their pupils an unfavorable perception of the pupils' reading ability are likely to have pupils with less favorable attitudes toward reading than teachers who convey a favorable perception of their pupils' reading ability. The students' self-perceptions seem to be a more influential factor in influencing their attitudes toward reading than their actual reading ability.

Roettger (1980) found similar results in a study with 75 fourth, fifth, and sixth graders. The students were all given the Estes Attitude Scale as well as personal interviews. Thirty-six of the students scored low on the attitude inventory and were considred to have negative attitudes toward reading, yet these students had scored above the 75th percentile on the comprehension subtest of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. On the other hand, 39 of the students had scored high on the attitude scale, but fell below the 25th percentile on the comprehension subtest of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

Through the interviews it was also found that these students have different expectations of reading. The high attitude/low performance group viewed reading as an important tool for survival. Reading was important to their self-concept, it made them "smarter". Without reading skills they thought they could not function in school. Reading gave them a "good feeling". For students in the low attitude/high performance group, reading was viewed as a means of gaining specific information to help them get good grades, do their school work, and learn more about the world. They used their reading skills for specialized interests.

Martin (1979) conducted a study with 20 first-grade teachers and 309 students to examine the relationship between teacher behaviors, their classification of their students, and student reading achievement. Teachers ranked students on six characteristics: confidence, obedience, extroversion, good seat-work habits, teacher liking, and teacher concern for students. These ratings were compared to teacher behaviors during

one school year to determine if teachers were treating students differently on the basis of these characteristics.

All of the teachers were observed between 15 and 20 times during the year. Four teacher characteristics were consistently and positively related to student reading achievment: confidence, obedience, good seat-work habits, and teacher liking. Teacher concern was negatively related to achievement, and extroversion was not related at all. It seems that confident, obedient students with good seat-work habits who were liked by their teachers tended to achieve more and would probably have more opportunity to learn.

Silberman (1969) conducted a study to examine to what extent, and in what ways, teachers' attitudes toward their students are revealed in the teachers' classroom behaviors. Four attitudes held by teachers toward their students were identified by the author from an analysis of the teachers' descriptions of their students. The attitudes include the categories of attachment, concern, indifference, and rejection. Attachment is defined as an affectionate tie to students which is derived from the pleasure that they bring to the teachers' work. Concern signifies sympathy and support for the students' academic and/or emotional problems. Indifference refers to a lack of involvement in students because of their failure to excite or dismay their teacher. Rejection indicates a refusal to consider students as worthy recipients of the teachers' professional energies.

This investigation was concerned with the overt behaviors through which the teachers expressed their attitudes. The behaviors were categorized as contact, positive or negative evaluation, and the extent to

which the teacher was receptive to students' initiated appeals for permission, guidance, or information. The teachers were expected to exhibit these behaviors with varying frequency toward students who were objects of the attitudes which had been identified.

The subjects included ten third-grade teachers with classes of 24-30 students. All of the teachers had had at least three years of teaching experience. Teachers were asked to identify three students for each category by questions designed to reveal each attitudinal behavior in taped interviews. Two control students, one boy and one girl, were also randomly selected. Each classroom was visited for a total of 20 hours. Student interviews were also done to determine, by specific question, whether or not students were aware of their teachers' behavior toward them.

Results indicated that attachment students were "model" students, high achievers who conformed to the teachers' wishes and fulfilled their personal needs. Concern students tended to be dependent, low-achieving students who made extensive but approved and appropriate demands on the teachers. Teachers interacted most frequently with these students in ways constant with their expressed concern about their achievement levels. The indifference students did not have any particular identifying characteristics except for their low frequency of interaction with the teachers. The contacts were also briefer and less emotionally involving than those with other students. The rejection students tended to be behavior problems who made demands that the teachers saw as overwhelming. Teachers had frequent contacts with

these students, but mostly to control their behavior. Yet, these students received much teacher praise, as if they were attempting to "make up for" generally negative interactions with them. It was also found that students were able to predict the type of behaviors they received. Again, it seems that teachers' attitudes are generally revealed in their actions, that different attitudes are translated into action in different ways, and that students are aware of most of the behavioral expressions of their teachers' attitudes.

Additional research on the student characteristics and teacher-student interaction patterns involving students in Silberman's four attitude groups was done by Jenkins (1972), Good and Brophy (1972), and Brophy and Good (1974). All of these studies generally support Silberman's results and impressions.

Willis and Brophy (1974) further explored these four attitude groups to try to identify the student characteristics that trigger these four attitudinal responses in teachers. More specifically their study sought to identify some of the descriptive characteristics of the indifference group students and some of the difference between the concern and rejection group students to help explain the strongly contrasting teacher reactions to these groups.

Subjects were 28 female first-grade teachers and their students. None of the children had attended kindergarten so teachers had no information or records about prior student performance. Interviews were set up at three points during the first two weeks of school, one to two weeks after the Metropolitan Readiness Test was administered, and during the second and third weeks in January.

Teachers were asked to respond to each child in terms of what they had noticed about him/her. After each interview, the teachers were asked to rank the students in order of their achievement levels. After the third interview, they were asked to nominate three students to each of the four attitude groups by the questioning method used by Silberman (1969). Teacher reactions to the four types of students studied in this research are readily explainable on the basis of the behavior of the students themselves (as perceived by the teachers). The three major variables involved seemed to be the students' general level of school success, the degree to which they reward teachers in their personal contacts with them, and the degree to which they conform to classroom rules. Attachment students were compliant and successful in school, and they apparently rewarded teachers in their interactions with them. Concern students had difficulty in school, but were compliant and personally rewarding to teachers so they spent time providing help to them.

The teachers' negative attitudes toward indifference and rejection children led them to underestimate these pupils' ability and learning potential. The indifference students responded negatively to teachers, did not provide personal reward, so teachers spent less time with them. The rejection students not only failed to provide rewarding experiences but caused frequent classroom disturbances.

Across attitude groups, a major conclusion of this research is that the particular relationship between a teacher and a student is crucial in affecting the teacher's attitude toward the student, and is independent of general student characteristics such as achievement, race, or sex.

It appears that children who do not reward teachers are avoided and/or rejected by them. Expectations are quite closely tied to student achievement, but attitudes appear to be more closely related to the personal qualities of the student and to his/her reaction to the teacher. Thus, a high achiever is not necessarily going to be liked nor is a low achiever going to be rejected. Depending on the student's response to the teacher, a high achiever can just as easily be treated with indifference, and a low achiever can just as easily become the object of teacher concern rather than rejection.

To summarize, the teachers' attitudes and behaviors toward students, not the specific techniques or materials that they use during reading instruction in the classroom, seem to be the most powerful elements in the educational process. Many educators feel that a positive classroom social climate enhances a child's self-perception and academic learning. The warm support, encouragement, and respect which teachers and pupils show for one another also seems to facilitate high self-esteem and utilization of intellectual abilities. The teacher's behaviors can influence the degree of competence a pupils sees himself as possessing in reading as well as the other subject areas, his/her relation to peers and social standing in the classroom, and his/her feeling toward school and involvement in classroom tasks.

The Effect of Teachers' Managerial Abilities

on Student Achievement

The manner in which teachers organize and manage their classrooms, in terms of the behaviors involved, has recently become another area

of interest in attempting to determine how teachers can more effectively influence student achievement. Teachers' managerial abilities have been found to relate positively to student achievement in every process-product study conducted to date (Good, 1979).

Evertson and Anderson (1978) explored the specifics involved in organizing and managing the classroom and the interactions between management and instruction. These researchers observed 28 third-grade classrooms during the first three weeks of school, and periodically thereafter, gathering information on what rules and procedures the teachers introduced and how they did so. Preliminary results from the study strongly support two major generalizations: (1) classroom organization and management skills are intimately related to instructional skills, or good instructors tend to be good managers, and (2) good organization and management lead to good instruction, or successful classroom managers spend a great deal of time early in the year conducting semi-formal lessons to familiarize students with rules and procedures.

A product that has recently received much attention is achievement in the basic skills. Researchers are therefore interested in defining what teachers do that contributes to their students' learning of math, reading, and language.

Anderson, Evertson, and Brophy (1979) conducted a study in which research results about effective teaching practices at the early elementary level, in small group instruction, were integrated into an instructional model presenting 22 specific principles of effective reading group instruction. The model had as its underlying rationale an emphasis on

getting and maintaining students' attention, sequencing information

clearly, and providing instructive feedback to students' answers to

questions. The model did not focus on the content or the materials

used in teaching reading, but only on the teacher behaviors involved

in managing the group as a whole or the responses of individual

students.

The effects of the use of the model on teacher behavior and stu-

dent reading achievement were investigated, using 27 first-grade

classrooms. In ten of the classrooms (treatment-observed group),

teachers were presented with the instructional model in the fall and

the classes were observed between 10 and 20 times during the school

year. In seven classrooms (the treatment-unobserved group), teachers

were given the model but were not observed. In ten classrooms (the

control group), the model was not presented but the classrooms were

observed. At the end of the school year, the students in all 27 classes

were given standardized reading tests, and their scores on reading

readiness tests given at the beginning of the year were used as covari-

ates in analyzing their achievement.

Analysis of the results indicated that the classes in the two treat-

ment groups had significantly higher mean reading achievement scores

than classes in the control group, indicating that the treatment had a

beneficial effect. Overall analysis of the data led to the conclusion

that the treatment had influenced teachers to behave in ways that were

related to achievement. Drawing on the findings of this study, Anderson

and her colleagues (1979) suggested that the following principles are

valuable in fostering student achievement.

1. Students achieve more when they are given more
    instructional time with the teacher.

2. It is important that students be given opportunities
    to practice skills so that the teacher can monitor
    their understanding, provide feedback, and adjust
    teaching techniques accordingly.

3. The teachers should provide information about the
    structure of the skills involved rather than focusing
    only on memorized rules or labels, but such infor-
    mation should be presented in a way that does not
    interrupt the pace of the lesson.

4. Underlying all the other principles must be the
    implementation of an effective classroom management
    structure.

Berliner (1975) found that reading teachers at both the
second- and fifth-grade levels who had been classified as more effective
were found to be more satisfied, accepting, attentive, aware of develop-
mental levels, consistent in controlling the class, democratic, encourag-
ing, tolerant of race and class, flexible, optimistic, equitable in
dividing time among students, and knowledgeable of the subject matter.
These variables were generated from written protocols describing life
in classrooms of teachers selected as more or less effective or ineffective,
depending on their success in bringing about student improvement in
reading and math.

Blair (1975) identified effective and less effective teachers of
reading at the primary and middle school grade levels and then

investigated the amount of effort these teachers exerted in teaching reading. The results indicated that teachers who put forth more effort to secure and to utilize supplementary materials, to provide differential instruction, to keep accurate record of pupils' progress, and to arrange conferences dealing with each individual's progress had pupils with higher achievement in reading than those who put forth less effort in these areas.

Medley (1977) reviewed 289 studies that had been conducted with primary students to assess student achievement gains in reading and math, as well as student attitudes. He reported that effective teachers were found to differ from ineffective teachers in the following ways: (1) they engaged pupils in more lesson-related activities, (2) they spent more time with large groups and less with small groups, (3) they maintained a supportive environment, free from disruptive pupil behavior, with little apparent effort or expression of negative effect, and (4) when pupils worked independently, the effective teachers actively supervised them, giving attention to those who appeared to need it.

A study was conducted by Lorentz (1978) to assess whether a number of the dimensions of classroom behavior derived from Medley's study were observable in ongoing classrooms and to determine whether the dimensions were significant predictors of reading achievement. From the elements of classroom behavior reported by Medley, Lorentz and his colleagues derived a teacher-effectiveness measure (The Georgia Assessment of Teacher Effectiveness, GATE). Trained observers visited 36 fifth- and sixth-grade classrooms six times each and obtained GATE records with each visit. Student reading achievement gains were measured by

standardized reading comprehension pretests and posttests administered
in the fall and spring. Of all the dimensions analyzed, five were
found to be significant predictors of reading gain. First, unstructured
student behavior was negatively related to student gain for given
learning tasks. A balance between teacher structuring and student
freedom provided the optimal setting for student gain. Second, when
students initiated verbal interactions, gain was more likely. Third,
when teachers worked with large groups rather than small groups, student
gain was more likely to occur. Fourth, when teachers amplified and
discussed student responses, high socioeconomic students tended to show
greater gain than did low socioeconomic students. And fifth, nonsub-
stantive interaction between the teacher and the students related nega-
tively to student gain. Lorentz and his colleagues concluded that
their results generally supported statements derived from Medley's
investigation.

The time teachers spend on actual instruction in the classroom
has also been found to be a factor that influences student learning.
In a study that compared four methods of teaching reading to innercity
black first graders, there was a significant positive relationship
between the time teachers spent in direct instruction and the average
achievement of their classes (Harris & Sewer, 1966). Cooley and Emrick
(1974) also found that the time teachers spent in teaching reading had
a significant effect on the reading achievement of first-grade children.

Guthrie, Martuza, and Seifert (1976) analyzed data from 931
instructional groups in second and sixth grades. They found that at

the second-grade level, classes that spent larger amounts of time on reading instruction made better gains than classes spending minimum time, for both high socioeconomic status children and low socioeconomic children. At the sixth-grade level, instructional time was positively related to the amount of gain in reading for low socioeconomic students, but had an inconsistent effect with high socioeconomic students. The investigators conjectured that this was due to the fact that middle and high socioeconomic students spent substantial amounts of time reading outside of school which increased their total reading practice and reduced the significance of differences in the amount of instructional reading time in school.

The students' attention to the tasks presented has also been found to influence student achievement. A substantial, positive relationship between the proportion of available time spent attending to the task and student gains was found in 15 studies in which student attention was compared with academic gain (Bloom, 1976).

Some of the characteristics that effective teachers possess that were revealed by many of these studies seem to establish a pattern of instruction that is associated with increased student learning. This pattern of instruction has been frequently labeled as direct instruction, which is most commonly defined as active teaching. A teacher sets and articulates the learning goals, actively assesses student progress, and frequently makes class presentations illustrating how to do assigned work (Rosenshine, 1976).

Some of the critical aspects of direct instruction suggested by Rosenshine (1976) include: (a) teachers place a clear focus on

academic goals, (b) teachers make an effort to promote extensive content coverage and high levels of student involvement in classroom tasks, (c) teachers select instructional goals and materials and actively monitor student progress toward those goals, (d) teachers structure learning activities and feedback is immediate and academically oriented, and (e) teachers create an environment that is task-oriented but relaxed.

An almost universal conclusion in recent research is that direct instruction is associated with increased learning gains (Good, 1979). Higher achievement gains are associated with orderly classrooms, persistent application to academic tasks, teachers' active involvement with students, and with a well organized and structured learning situation (Stallings & Hentzel, 1978). McDonald (1976) and Stallings (1976) both reported that any teaching performance that increases direct instructional time in subject matter areas tends to be associated with greater achievement gains in different subjects and across grade levels.

It is generally agreed upon that no single teaching behavior is universally effective and that many teacher behaviors will have differential effects on students (Good & Power, 1976). Direct instruction should not be viewed as a set of prescriptive rules. It should be seen as a conceptual orientation that values active teaching, expository learning, focused learning, and accountability. The degree of teaching structure should vary with the cognitive and social maturity of the students being instructed. A concept such as direct instruction can

serve as a guide that allows teachers to reconsider their behavior and perhaps improve instruction (Powell, 1978).

In summary, it seems that more effective teachers utilize some specific managerial behaviors in the classroom and that these behaviors in turn help to increase student learning. Some of these behaviors include being perceptive of individual and group needs during reading and general instruction, keeping a close watch over the progress of pupils, and providing help promptly when a difficulty becomes evident. Pupils' attitudes toward school and reading tend to be more favorable in an orderly classroom environment maintained by effective teachers who emphasize academic learning and who use frequent praise for effort and success. When these conditions are met, children seem to have a more positive attitude about reading and learning in general that can lead to increased academic achievement.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss and summarize the find-
ings of the review of research on the effect of teachers' attitudes
and behaviors on student achievement in general and the implications
for reading teachers and further research in particular.   The con-
clusions drawn are based on the review of four specific areas including
the background of process-product research, the effect of teachers'
expectations on student achievement, the effect of teachers' attitudes
on student achievement, and the effect of teachers' managerial abilities
on student achievement.

Discussion and Summary

The question of who is best qualified to teach has always been a
matter of major condern to all associated with the field of education.
The effectiveness of our schools revolves in a critical way around
the characteristics, competence, and dedication of the teachers, pupils,
and subject matter in a dynamic interaction that is obviously too
complex to be defined in terms of a simple set of teacher traits or
procedures.   Research into the distinctive features and characteristics
of good and poor teachers has consistently failed to provide a universal
profile of the "effective teacher".   Although certain teaching patterns
are undoubtedly better than others, there is not a single kind of good
teaching that fits all teaching situations, all teachers, and all students.

Teacher effectiveness is more productively defined in terms of the
relationship between teacher characteristics and student characteristics

and their effects on student performance. The teacher's task centers on motivating the child toward desirable goals and facilitating the attainment of these goals through the introduction of suitable learning experiences, while attending to the more personal aspects of total growth such as attitudes, values, and personal adjustment. Present-day education is based on the tenet that it is impossible to affect one aspect of the child's growth without affecting him as a whole (Mouly, 1973).

Teachers have a definite function to perform, that of stimulating, guiding, and generally facilitating the child's learning so as to assure the attainment of meaningful goals. The teachers' emotional stability, disposition, democratic and cooperative attitudes and behaviors, and ability to use sound personality patterns and professional insights in relating to children all have a profound influence on the child's total growth and development.

As a result of many early correlational studies conducted in an attempt to relate certain teacher behaviors to student performance, five variables have been found to be strongly related to student achievement: clarity, variability, enthusiasm, task orientation, and student opportunity to learn. Other important variables such as student attitudes toward themselves, the teacher, and the subject matter were not considered in these earlier studies.

Research studies in the area of teacher expectancies and how they affect students have consistently found that teachers give more verbal praise and reinforcement to those classified as high achievers.

Teachers create a warmer classroom climate for brighter students and are more outwardly friendly and supportive toward bright students. These overt teacher behaviors are also perceived by students in the classroom as being discriminatory in nature. The expectations which the teacher has, often based solely on subjective criteria, could be critical to the students' own developing self-perceptions and expectations. Although expectations are virtually impossible to avoid, they should be based on accurate perceptions of pupil behavior and ability and should avoid being either too rigid or too flexible.

The influence of teachers' attitudes toward themselves, their students, and the subject matter also seem to have much influence on the individuals' academic achievement. Teachers' self-perceptions or self-concepts and ability to control and take responsibility for their own lives as well as knowledge of the subject field have all been shown to be critical aspects in the affective development of their students.

Moreover, teachers' attitudes about their pupils are known to be reflected by certain behaviors and to have a definite influence on pupils' feelings about themselves and their ability. Children who had rewarded teachers in some way, such as exhibiting good working habits or classroom behavior or pleasing personal qualities, felt accepted to a much greater degree than those students who had not overtly rewarded their teachers.

The final aspects that seems to exert much influence over increasing student performance are the teacher behaviors involved in classroom

management. Achievement is positively related to instructional time
on task, good management techniques and control over the class, the
creation of an accepting and flexible atmosphere in the classroom,
and active teaching or direct instruction. These techniques help
provide a positive motivational source that encourages teachers to
plan their days fully, to take their responsibilities seriously,
and to fulfill their expectations while maintaining a clear focus
on the goals they wish to emphasize, thus providing a practical
system of instruction (Good, 1979). Close monitoring of pupil prog-
ress, specifying objectives related to observable outcomes, using
periodic testing in making instructional decisions, and teaching to
the identified needs of the children were also types of teaching
behavior that have been identified as effective (Rupley, 1976).

In summarizing the findings of recent studies (Brophy, 1979) of
the relationships between teachers' behaviors and student learning,
strong support can be found for the following generalizations:

1. Teachers make a difference. Certain teachers elicit
    more student learning in all areas including reading
    than others, and their success is tied to consistent
    differences in teaching behavior.

2. Support is lacking for the notion of generic teaching
    skills. Few, if any specific teaching behaviors are
    appropriate for all contexts, although several clusters
    or patterns of behaviors are consistently related to
    learning gains, particularly in the area of reading.

3. Effective teachers allocate more of their time for teaching and spend more of the time actually teaching reading than do less effective teachers.

4. Effective teachers manage their classrooms in a manner that maximizes the time spent in productive activities and minimizes the time lost during the transitions between reading groups, periods of confusion, or disruptions that require disciplinary action.

5. The type of instruction that has been called direct instruction is effective for producing student learning of reading and other basic skills.

6. The components of effective teaching vary somewhat between different grade levels and different student reading and ability levels.

If teachers are going to be able to accommodate the diverse needs of students in both the cognitive and affective areas of learning and development, then they are going to have to modify their teaching styles so as to interact effectively with different student types. The teacher must choose a strategy that best complements the attention needs of a specific student or best maximizes the attention of a whole class. The teacher has to adjust the techniques used according to the particular set of learners in his/her classroom as well as adjust the pace of instruction to the differences in learning rate of groups and individuals.

General Implications

The implications that all of these factors have for reading teachers are very important for developing an effective reading program. First, teachers should not let their views of students' reading ability influence their attitude toward those students. Students in all reading groups, not just those with higher ability, should be given equal opportunities to answer challenging questions, should receive a variety of interesting supplementary materials on their levels, and should be given special privileges and projects to complete based on their interests and abilities. Reading teachers often assume that students in the lower reading groups in the classroom are only able to answer low-level questions most efficiently when discussing reading selections. If teachers learn to phrase questions correctly and develop the proper background concepts related to the reading selections, all students can benefit from and be successful in answering a variety of both high- and low-level questions. As students become more successful with the tasks presented during reading groups, they should begin to have a better attitude toward reading and exhibit better reading and work habits.

Secondly, teachers need to place students in reading groups on the basis of objective reading performance determined by both diagnostic testing and classroom observation, not just on their subjective attitudes about their students. After students are initially placed in groups for instruction, as often as their particular reading needs change, their placement in a reading group should also change. This

allows students to be continuously aware of their progress and to
be further challenged by other students on their level.

Thirdly, individualization should occur within reading groups
based on the students' different reading needs and learning rates.
It is of great importance for teachers to get to know each student's
strengths and weaknesses so that the methods, materials, and techniques
they select are the best in each situation. The ability of the teacher
to vary techniques for different student needs is a crucial aspect
of an effective reading program.

In summary, teachers need to be aware that the differential
behavior they exhibit toward students is perceived by the students
and appears to mediate student achievement. Teachers should be opti-
mistic about the learning potentialities of their pupils and not
allow their perceptions of individual differences to affect adversely
the morale of the pupils. Teachers need to work from the premise
that all students can learn and not be as interested in which behavioral
characteristics or instructional methods and techniques are best, but
which work the best under which circumstances. The recent research
on teacher effectiveness should help educators to discover what teach-
ing practices may be effective in different settings and for different
purposes.

Implications for Further Research

Educational writers continue to project concern for the quality
of instruction that teachers are providing students in the classroom.
Researchers are exploring the effectiveness of teacher education

programs, the attitudes and skills of teachers, and the relationship of these variables to the performance of students. However, little has been reported in the area of teachers' opinions of 1) their weaknesses in the art of teaching, particularly in the area of reading, 2) the major educational needs of students in small reading groups and in the classroom as a whole, and 3) the relationships which exist between the attitudes of specific groups of teachers toward their preservice teacher education programs.

In view of all the aspects that are of critical importance to obtaining student achievement, it seems that the instructional process variables as well as the affective dimensions of instruction employed by teachers should be focused upon in future research. Training institutions should center on improvement of learning situations and teacher characteristics, not expect a panacea in the form of materials (Bond & Dykstra, 1967). Teacher training should include a decision-making component that integrates the other basic skills. Any teaching act is a result of a decision, whether conscious or unconscious, that the teacher makes after processing all of the available information. Research on teaching should examine teachers' decisions so that teachers will better be able to use such skills as questioning, explaining, reinforcing, and probing in the most efficient manner both during reading and in other areas of instruction.

Consideration should be given at both the graduate and undergraduate levels to techniques for student placement in appropriate materials, in reading and the other instructional areas, and to sound procedures

for classroom management. Studies should also be made of teacher

education programs to determine their effectiveness in influencing

or modifying the immediate and delayed behavior of prospective

teachers. Finally, researchers need to conduct more studies directly

related to reading. While many studies produce results that can

be generalized to the reading area, there still exists a need for

more research not only on the elementary level but also at the

secondary level. This is due to the fact that, as the student prog-

resses through school, the demands on him/her change, the emphasis of

instruction changes, and the teachers' attitudes toward reading in

the content area changes.

Because the teacher is a crucial aspect of instruction, especially

reading instruction, and because it has been shown that certain atti-

tudes, behaviors, and management factors are critical to effective

teaching, it is necessary to help teachers acquire the necessary

skills that will enable them to become more effective teachers.

REFERENCES

Alexander, J. E., & Heathington, B. A crucial fourth component in
   reading instruction: Attitudes. Tennessee Education, 1975, 5,
   32-36.

Alexander, J. E. & Filler, R. C. Attitudes and reading. Reading Aids
   Series. Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 1976.

Amatora, M. Teacher personality: Its influence on pupils. Education,
   1950, 71, 154.

Anderson, L. M., Evertson, C. M., & Brophy, J. E. An experimental
   study of the effective teaching in first-grade reading groups.
   The Elementary School Journal, 1979, 79, 193-223.

Anthony, B. C. The identification and measurement of classroom environ-
   ment process variables related to academic achievement. Unpublished
   doctoral dissertation. University of Chicago, 1967.

Apsy, R., & Buhler, L. Teachers attributions of responsibility. Journal
   of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67, 668-676.

Artley, A. S. The teacher variable in the teaching of reading. The
   Reading Teacher, 1969, 22, 239-248.

Banks, J. Learning and teaching arithmetic. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1964.

Beez, W. V. Influence of biased psychological reports on teacher behavior
   and pupil performance. Proceedings of the 76th Psychological Associa-
   tion, 1968, 3, 605-606.

Belgard, M., Rosenshine, B., & Gage, N. L. The teacher's effectiveness
   in explaining: Evidence on its generality and correlation with pupils'
   ratings and attention scores. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Explorations of
   the teacher's effectiveness in explaining. Stanford, CA: Stanford
   University, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching,
   1968.

Bellack, A. A. The language of the classroom. New York: Columbia Univer-
   sity Press, 1966.

Berliner, D. C. Mandated competency-based teacher certification and the
   public interest. A paper presented at the American Educational Research
   Association. Washington, DC: 1975.

Blair, T. R. Relationship of teacher effort and student achievement in
   reading. Doctoral dissertation. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University
   of Illinois, 1975. (ED 109 654)

Bloom, B. Human characteristics and school learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Bond, G. L., & Dykstra, R. The cooperative research program in first grade. Reading Research Quarterly, 1967, 2, 5-142.

Breen, M. J. Teacher interest and student attitude toward four areas of elementary school curriculum. Education, 1979, 100, 62-66.

Brophy, J. E. Advances in teacher effectiveness research. Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Annual Meeting. Chicago, IL: 1979. (ED 173 340)

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 365-374.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1974.

Browne, M. P. An exploratory study of teacher-pupil interaction in primary reading groups. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: University of Alberta, 1971.

Chall, J. S., & Feldman, S. C. A study in depth of first grade reading. New York: The City College of the City University of New York. U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project No. 2728, 1966.

Collopy, L. The influence of the teacher's personality upon the personality growth of the student. Educational Leadership, 1957, 90-92.

Cooley, W. W., & Emrick, J. A. A model of classroom differences which explains variation in classroom achievement. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1974.

Cooper, H. M. Pygmalion grows up: A model for teacher expectation communication and performance influence. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49, 389-410.

Emans, R., & Fox, S. Teaching behaviors in reading instruction. The Reading Teacher, 1973, 27, 142-148.

Estes, T. H. Attitudes toward reading: Alternatives in assessment. Paper presented at the Annual Reading Conference at Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, 1975.

Evertson, C., & Anderson, L. The classroom organization study: Interim progress report. Report No. 600Z. Austin, TX: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1978.

Feldman, R. Attitudes, cognition, and nonverbal communicative behavior.
     Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association,
     San Francisco, 1979.

Fortune, J. The generality of presenting behaviors in teaching preschool
     children. Memphis, TN: Memphis State University, 1966.

Fortune, J. A study of the generality of presenting behaviors in teaching.
     Memphis, TN: Memphis State University, 1967. (U.S. Office of Education
     Project No. 6-8468)

Fortune, J., Gage, N., & Shutes, R. The generality of the ability to
     explain. Paper presented to the American Educational Research
     Association. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, College
     of Education, 1966.

Furst, N. The multiple languages of the classroom. Paper presented at
     the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago,
     1967.

Gage, N. Paradigms for research on teaching. In N. L. Gage (Ed.),
     Hankbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Gage, N. Teaching methods. In R. L. Ebel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of
     Educational research. London: The Macmillan Co., 1969.

Good, T. Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school. Journal of
     Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 52-64.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. Behavioral expression of teacher attitudes. Journal
     of Educational Psychology, 1972, 60, 126-132.

Good, T., & Power, C. Designing successful classroom environments for
     different types of students. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1976,
     8, 1-16.

Guthrie, J., Martuza, V., & Seifert, M. Impacts of instructional time in
     reading. Paper presented at the Conference on Theory and Practice in
     Beginning Reading. Learning Research and Development Center, University
     of Pittsburgh, 1976.

Harris, A. How to increase reading ability, 5th ed. New York: David
     McKay Co., Inc., 1970.

Harris, A., & Morrison, C. The CRAFT project: A final report. The Reading
     Teacher, 1969, 22, 335-340.

Harris, A., & Serwer, B. The CRAFT project: Instructional time in reading
     research. Reading Research Quarterly, 1966, 11, 227-234.

Hunt, D. Teacher's adaptation: Reading and flexing to students. _Journal of Teacher Education_, 1976, _27_, 268–275.

Jenkins, B. _Teachers' views of particular students and their attitudes_. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Chicago, 1972.

Jensen, A. Review of Pygmalion in the classroom. _American Scientist_, 1968, _51_, 44–45.

Keisler, E. _Attributions of the success-oriented teacher for students success and failures_. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979. (ED 177 129)

Kibby, M. The status and attitudes of homogeneously grouped second graders. _Elementary School Journal_, 1977, _78_, 13–21.

Kleinman, G. _General science teachers' questions, pupil and teacher behaviors, and pupils' understanding of science_. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1964.

Lea, H. _A study of some characteristics of the variability of teacher activities in the social studies and pupil response and achievement_. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1964.

Lorentz, J. _The Georgia assessment of teacher effectiveness (GATE) as a predictor of reading achievement_. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, FL, 1978. (ED 169 075)

Martin, J. _Differences in teacher-student interactions within reading groups_. Austin, TX: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. National Institute of Teacher Education, Washington, DC, 1979. (ED 188 128)

McDonald, F. Report on Phase II of the beginning teacher evaluation study. _Journal of Teacher Education_, 1976, _27_, 39–42.

Medley, D. _Teacher competence and teacher effectiveness: A review of process-product research_. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977. (ED 143 629)

Mitzel, H. Teacher effectiveness. In C. W. Harris (Ed.), _Encyclopedia of Educational Research_. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960.

Mouly, R. _Psychology for effective teaching_. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1973.

Murray, H., & Staebler, B. Teachers' locus of control and student achievement gains. _Journal of School Psychology_, 1974, _12_, 305–309.

Powell, M. Educational implications of current research in teaching. The Educational Forum, 1978, 43, 27-38.

Roettger, D. Elementary students' attitudes toward reading. The Reading Teacher, 1980, 33, 451-453.

Rosenshine, B. To explain: A review of research. Educational Leadership, 1968, 26, 303-309.

Rosenshine. B. Evaluation of instruction. Review of Educational Research, 1970, 40, 279-301.

Rosenshine, B. Classroom instruction. The Psychology of Teaching Methods, 75th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Rosenshine, B., & Furst, N. Research on teacher performance criteria. In O. B. Smith (Ed.), Research on teacher education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

Rosenthal, R. Teacher behavior, teacher expectations, and gains in pupils' rated creativity. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1974, 124, 115-121.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1968.

Rothbart, M., Dalfen, S., & Barrett, R. Effects of teachers expectancy on student-teacher interaction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1971, 62, 49-54.

Rupley, W. Effective reading programs. The Reading Teacher, 1976, 29, 616-621.

Rutherford, W. Teacher improvement in reading. In N. B. Smith (Ed.), Reading methods and teacher improvement. Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 1971.

Ryans, D. Characteristics of teachers. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1960.

Schofield, H. Reading attitude and achievement: Teacher-pupil relationships. Journal of Educational Research, 1980, 74, 111-119.

Seaton, H. The relationship of self-concept, knowledge of reading and teacher effectiveness. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of National Reading Conference, St. Petersburg, FL, 1978. (Ed 165 119)

Shutes, R. Verbal behaviors and instructional effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral disseration. Stanford University, 1969.

Silberman, M. Behavioral experesion of teachers' attitudes toward
    elementary school students. Journal of Educational Psychology,
    1969, 60, 402-407.

Smith, B. O. A concept of teaching. In B. O. Smith & R.H. Ennis (Eds.),
    Language and concepts in education. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1961.

Snow, R. Unfinished pygmalion. Contemporary Psychology, 1969, 14, 197-199.

Solomon, D., Bezdek, W., & Rosenberg, L. Teaching styles and learning.
    Chicago: Center for the Liberal Education for Adults, 1963. (ED 026 556)

Squire, J. What does research in reading reveal about attitudes toward
    reading. English Journal, 1969, 58, 523-533.

Stallings, J. How instructional processes relate to child outcomes in a
    national study of Follow Through. Journal of Teacher Education, 1976,
    27, 43-47.

Stallings, J., & Hentzell, S. Effective teaching and learning in urban
    schools. Paper presented at the National Conference on Urban Education,
    St. Louis, 1978.

Stedman, M., & Breen, M. Teacher interest and pupil attitude. Journal of
    Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1977, 37, 1091-1094.

Thompson, G., & Bowers, N. Fourth grade achievement as related to creativity
    intelligence, and teaching style. Paper presented at the American
    Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1968.

Thorndike, R. Review of R. Rosenthal and L. Jacobson Pygmalion in the
    Classroom. American Educational Research Journal, 1968, 5, 708-711.

Torrance, E. & Parent, E. Characteristics of mathematics teachers that
    affect students' learning. U. S. Office of Educational Cooperative
    Research Profject No. 1020. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota,
    Minnesota School Mathematics and Science Center, Institute of Technology,
    1966.

Wallen, N. Relationships between teacher characteristics and student behavio
    Part three. U. S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project No.
    SAE OE 5-10-181. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1966.

Weinstein, R., & Middlestadt, S. Student perceptions of teacher interactions
    with male high and low achievers. Journal of Educational Psychology,
    1979, 71, 421-431.

Willis, S., & Brophy, J. Origins of teachers' attitudes toward young childre
    Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 520-529.