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ABSTRACT
IDENTIFICATION OF TENNESSEE
TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL BELIEFS ABOUT
NATIONAL STANDARDS AND NATIONAL GOALS IN EDUCATION

by
Shirley Rose Waycaster Ellis

The purpose of this study was to determine the beliefs of Tennessee principals and teachers in relation to national standards and national goals. This was a descriptive study, which utilized a survey methodology. The population under study was limited to 232 principals and 268 teachers randomly selected from the 1992-1993 membership of the Tennessee Education Association.

The instrument, developed by the researcher for this study, was the National Standards/National Goals Questionnaire. The 32 item instrument was designed to determine the level of belief of national goals and national standards. Descriptive statements were used to analyze the data gathered from the 32 position statements, with the t-test for independent groups and a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). When the overall F-test was significant, a Student-Newman Keuls Post-Hoc Multiple Comparisons Test was used to identify pairwise differences.

The descriptive analysis of the 11 null hypotheses warranted the following conclusions:

1. The key to the success of the national standards/national goals program lies within the hands of the local community.

2. National goals will enforce the idea that Tennessee students can learn as well and as much as any student in the world.

3. National goals would cause school curricula to be redesigned.

4. The school system's goals must be in line with national goals.

5. Educators have a high level of commitment to national standards and national goals.
6. National standards would have a positive influence on the quality of public education.

7. National standards would enhance instructional improvement.

8. National standards would not decrease paperwork for educators.

9. National standards would offer a vision of excellence and raise the expectations of all children.

10. By the year 2000, schools would not be free of drugs and violence and offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

In 1991, Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander, introduced a package of school reform proposals to the Congress of the United States. The package of national standards, known as America 2000, was developed to offer a vision of excellence to policymakers, teachers, parents, and students. These national standards were created by independent, non-governmental organizations and described what American students should know, as well as what they should be able to do, in each area of study.

The idea of developing national standards in education was not entirely new. For example, efforts of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) had demonstrated the power of voluntary standards to improve education. The NCTM math standards became the basis for changing the teaching of math in nearly every state (Ravitch, 1992). In 1991, the National Academy of Sciences was funded to establish what American students should know and be able to do in science. The National Endowment for the Humanities will eventually produce a document describing what all American students should know about American and world history. The success of the humanities standards will depend upon how much acceptance they find among teachers,
state and local boards of education, and individual schools (Ravitch, 1992).

This recent surge of thinking in relation to national standards had been precipitated by global competitiveness, upskilling of job requirements and the ranking of American students. In an information society, where resources come out of people's heads rather than out of the ground, the quality of a nation's school system has become a measure of its wealth (Fiske, 1992). Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, argued that it is no coincidence that the industrialized nations with superior school systems have well defined national standards.

According to Shanker,

> each of our states and 15,000 school districts is more or less doing its own thing when it comes to curriculum. So our money and efforts are spread thin, and some districts have much better curriculums than others. With national curriculums, resources and talent can be concentrated, so children in every school district can benefit from excellent materials. (Fiske, 1992, p. 18)

Although the standards set by the National Council of Mathematics Teachers have gained widespread acceptance, much opposition to national standards remains. Many argue that standards are a threat to local control of schools, schools and school districts are not ready to meet the standards, and that the cost would be exorbitant (Fiske, 1992). What form or forms of assessment would be used? The use of traditional multiple-choice tests would cause an outcry by modern-day researchers, who are testing new assessment
techniques of portfolios, projects, media presentations, and other methods which have been entitled "authentic assessments."

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The United States has been one of the few major countries without national educational standards. In 1989, President Bush and the nation's governors adopted six National Education Goals. The success of the standards will depend upon how much acceptance they find among teachers, state and local boards of education, and individual schools. National standards may offer a vision of excellence and raise expectations for all children. Yet, little is known about how committed teachers and principals are to the concept of national standards and national goals.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to investigate the beliefs of teachers and principals in Tennessee public schools, who are members of the Tennessee Education Association (TEA), regarding the fundamental principles and beliefs and other related aspects of six national goals and national standards. This descriptive study was designed to examine the beliefs of Tennessee principals as compared to the beliefs of Tennessee teachers regarding national goals and national standards.
Research Questions

1. Is there a difference in the beliefs of principals in county systems and those in city systems toward national standards and national goals?

2. Is there a difference in the beliefs of teachers in county systems and those in city systems toward national standards and national goals?

3. Is there a difference in the beliefs of principals and teachers toward national goals and national standards?

Significance of the Study

Tifft (1992) reported business leaders as needing creative problem solvers, analytical thinkers, and integrators of knowledge. Tifft further stressed that educators feel they have been singled out for corporate lectures on restructuring. Principals and teachers feel that business leaders do not understand the issues they face on a day to day basis. Educators, in the past, have not responded with their greatest level of ability to programs that have been given to and demanded of them without their input and understanding. The goal of national standards is nothing less than creation of a new school culture—a culture of universal high expectations and shared responsibility for student achievement (Goddy, 1991). Do Tennessee educators have a shared vision of how to put it all together?
This study may be significant because it will determine the beliefs of Tennessee TEA teachers and principals concerning national standards and national goals. This study may be an aid to national standard developers in identifying factors which contribute to the success of certain aspects of national standards and in identifying negative factors which result in a lack of teacher and principal approval and acceptance of national standards. In addition, the study may add to the existing literature on national standards. Finally, it is believed that the results of this research study may offer significant insights to key decision makers of the state as to whether national standards will be accepted by Tennessee educators or if more strategies need to be developed to ensure the success of national standards in Tennessee.

Limitations of the Study

This study was confined to TEA principals (1,549) and teachers (45,438) in the state of Tennessee and the findings are relevant and applicable only to Tennessee educators. This study included as its target population only the principals and classroom teachers in the public schools in the state of Tennessee. Classroom teachers were those K-12 TEA instructional personnel employed during the school year of 1992-1993. The study included neither the non-instructional personnel in the public schools, except TEA school principals, nor any school personnel at the non-
public institutions. Further, those approximately 4,000 public school teachers not belonging to the TEA limited the generalizability to the total population of Tennessee public school educators.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made:

1. The measurement device developed from the fundamental principles and beliefs upon which national standards and national goals are constructed was appropriate for the study.

2. The research instrument accurately measured principals' and teachers' beliefs about national standards and national goals.

3. All respondents to the instrument answered the questionnaire with accurate responses.

4. The research subjects responded seriously and candidly to the questionnaire.

5. The participants of the study were representative of the total population of public school educators in the TEA.

Hypotheses

For this study the investigator submitted the following null hypotheses:
HI: There will be no significant difference in the beliefs of principals in county systems and those in city systems toward national standards and national goals.

H2: There will be no significant difference in the beliefs of teachers in county systems and those in city systems toward national standards and national goals.

H3: There will be no significant difference between teachers and principals in their beliefs toward national goals and national standards.

H4: There will be no significant difference in the beliefs of principals and teachers in county and principals and teachers in city school systems toward national standards and national goals.

H5: There will be no significant difference between male and female teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

H6: There will be no significant difference between degree levels of teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

H7: There will be no significant difference between high school, middle school and elementary principals and teachers in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

H8: There will be no significant difference between Career Ladder levels of teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.
H9: There will be no significant difference between Caucasian and minority teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

H10: There will be no significant difference between years of experience of teachers and principals regarding national standards and national goals.

H11: There will be no significant difference between younger and older teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms were defined.

National Goals

National goals refer to the ends that must be reached in order to be internationally competitive. (America 2000: An Education Strategy [America 2000], 1991). The specific national goals are:

1. By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn.

2. By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90%.

3. By the year 2000, American students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history and geography, and every school in America
will ensure that all students will learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in the modern economy.

4. By the year 2000, United States students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.

5. By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

6. By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

National Standards

National standards refer to the educative, specific examples of excellence on the tasks that are valued, an exemplary performance serving as a benchmark (Wiggins, 1991).

Principal

Any person employed on a full-time basis by a local public educational agency and endorsed as a principal of any public school in the state of Tennessee.
School District

School district is an area within specific geographic limits established for administering a local school or schools (Knezevich, 1969).

School System

School system is defined as any educational entity formulated for the legal arbitration of a school or a group of schools (Knezevich, 1969).

The Tennessee Career Ladder Teacher Evaluation System

The Tennessee Career Ladder Teacher Evaluation System refers to a career teacher program which was implemented in Tennessee in 1984 as a result of the Comprehensive Education Reform Act (CERA). The system is composed of three positions: Career Level I teacher, Career Level II teacher, and Career Level III teacher. This evaluation system is more commonly known as the Tennessee Career Ladder Program. The system was designed to promote professionalism among teachers and to reward financially those teachers who are evaluated as being outstanding in teacher performance and who are willing to accept certain additional responsibilities.

Tennessee Education Association (TEA)

The TEA is the professional organization of the Tennessee educational system.
Organization of the Study

This study was organized and presented in five chapters. Chapter 1 contains the introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, the assumptions, the research questions, 11 hypotheses, seven definitions of terms, and a discussion on the organization of the study.

A review of the literature regarding the 1980s American educational reform movement is presented in Chapter 2. The literature review deals in particular with national goals and national standards in education as they were in 1992.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology by which the study was done. It includes a description of the target population and the selection of the study sample, the instrument, and the treatment of the data.

Chapter 4 contains statistical treatment of the data, demographic characteristics of research subjects, and tables showing statistical results.

Chapter 5 includes the summary, findings, and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER 2
Review of Related Literature

Introduction

The review of literature covers several topics that are closely related to this study. The first part attempts to present a general picture of the National Goals American educational reform movement. The second part deals with setting national standards. The third section reviews the position of advocates. In turn, the fourth section reviews the position of non-advocates. The fifth section relates strategies at the national, regional and state levels. The sixth section reviews Tennessee's plan for the 21st century. The seventh section presents educator concerns. The eighth section presents specific steps Tennessee has taken to meet the national goals. The last part of the chapter provides a summary of the review of literature.

National Goals: American Educational Reform Movement

Since the 1984 publication of A Nation in Crisis, the public school systems of the United States have seen three specific movements of educational reform. The first response to the aforementioned report came in the form of demands for control of educational outputs via testing in order to raise student achievement. The research of the literature revealed this response caused teacher morale to
decrease and more students than ever to drop out of school. A second response occurred as reformers demanded higher degrees of accountability on the part of teachers through skills testing of educators and competency-based evaluation of their performance in the classroom. Finally, by the last year of the decade, when it had become all too clear that legislated mandates were not the answer to the ills of the nation's public schools, a third response of reform was initiated, which drew on the resources of business and industry, along with other interest groups in the community, to initiate massive reform in the ways in which American schools do business.

This movement toward a collaborative effort for the improvement of the nation's educational system was led by the Governors' Summit Conference of 1989 and later, the Governors' Commission of the States, whose reported findings formed the basis of the national thrust which culminated in the America 2000 Project (America 2000, 1991). By 1990 a national outline was formulated for redesigning American education toward the achievement of these goals through the utilization of a National Report Card of Progress with periodic progress reports by a National Education Goals Panel. Also, the use of a corollary in the form of the National Assessment of Educational Progress, whose underlying premise would be a state-by-state testing program, would be used (Haertel, 1987). All these
procedures, and more, were part of a sweeping effort to reform existing schools, launch massive research and develop collaboratives with business and industry, encourage life-long learning, and provide parental choice in designating the school which one's children would attend. The key to the success of the America 2000 Program was viewed as lying within the hands of the local community and its ability to initiate meaningful collaboration for the improvement of each individual school within its jurisdiction.

The literature on national goals continually stressed that American students need skills to be employed in the 1990s and the future. Karlowicz (1992) postulated that education suffers from the continued influence of the 19th century organizational theory of F. W. Taylor in its decision-making structure. The result is that schools give students in the 1990s the skills to be employable in the 1890s. Karlowicz further suggested that education must get rid of the Taylorist Model and give decision-making authority to the education "front line"—that is, to the school—so that schools will be responsive to community needs (Karlowicz, 1992, p. 38).

Hanson (1991) wrote that the mid-1980s saw a new crop of reform reports that brought a new focus to the challenges of improving American education. A bottom-up approach to reform was common among the most influential of these reports, which were produced by The Holmes Group (Tomorrow's
Since the publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983, a rash of studies and reports have been issued cataloging the ills of schooling in America and recommending reforms (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

In 1989, President George Bush, called a meeting of the nation’s governors on the campus of the University of Virginia. This meeting became known as the 1989 Education Summit. The purpose of the meeting was to plan for the future of education in the United States. Six national goals were set. These state that by the year 2000:

1. All children in America will start school ready to learn.
2. The high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90%.
3. American students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well; so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in the modern economy.
4. United States students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.
5. Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.
6. Every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning. (Karlowicz, 1992, p. 38)
The following specific objectives were further defined under each goal:

1. Goal I
   a. All disadvantaged and disabled children will have access to high quality and developmentally appropriate pre-school programs that help prepare children for school.
   b. Every parent in America will be a child's first teacher and devote time each day to helping his or her preschool child learn; parents will have access to the training and support they need.
   c. Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies, and the number of low birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.

2. Goal II
   a. The nation must dramatically reduce its dropout rate and 75% of those students who do drop out will successfully complete a high school degree or its equivalent.
   b. The gap in high school graduation rates between American students from minority backgrounds and their non-minority counter-parts will be eliminated.

3. Goal III
   a. The academic performance of elementary and secondary students will increase significantly in every quartile, and the distribution of minority students in each level will more closely reflect the student population as a whole.
   b. The percentage of students who demonstrate the ability to reason, solve problems, apply knowledge, and write and communicate effectively will substantially increase.
   c. All students will be involved in activities that promote and demonstrate good citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility.
   d. The percentage of students who are competent in more than one language will substantially increase.
   e. All students will be knowledgeable about the diverse cultural heritage of this nation and about the world community.

4. Goal IV
   a. Math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades.
b. The number of teachers with a substantive background in mathematics and science will increase by 50%.

c. The number of United States undergraduate and graduate students, especially women and minorities, who complete degrees in mathematics, science, and engineering will increase significantly.

5. Goal V

a. Every major American business will be involved in strengthening the connection between education and work.

b. All workers will have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills, from basic to highly technical, needed to adapt to emerging new technologies, work methods, and markets through public and private educational, vocational, technical, workplace, or other programs.

c. The number of quality programs, including those at libraries, that are designed to serve more effectively the needs of the growing number of part-time and mid-career students will increase substantially.

d. The proportion of those qualified students, especially minorities, who enter college; who complete at least 2 years; and who complete their degree programs will increase substantially.

e. The proportion of college graduates who demonstrate an advanced ability to think critically, communicate effectively, and solve problems will increase substantially.

6. Goal VI

a. Every school will implement a firm and fair policy on use, possession, and distribution of drugs and alcohol.

b. Parents, business, and community organizations will work together to ensure that schools are a safe haven for all children.

c. Every school district will develop a comprehensive K-12 drug and alcohol prevention education program. Drug and alcohol curriculum should be taught as an integral part of health education. In addition, community-based teams should be organized to provide students and teachers with needed support. (Katz, 1992, pp. 2-6)

President Bush selected Governor Roy Romer of Colorado and a panel of experts to work on methods to "chart
progress" toward meeting the six goals (Brandt, 1991). Ravitch (1992) reported that the Department of Education was convinced that if groups do their jobs well, their efforts will be a powerful stimulus for educational reform. Far from subverting state and local control of education, Ravitch indicated that these new standards will rely on state and local efforts to succeed. The new standards will provide new hope by raising expectations and by establishing a vision of what is possible for all children. The best way to start a journey is to know where one wants to go, and that vision of success holds promise for every student, every teacher, and every school in the United States.

Setting National Standards

Trotter (1991) summarized the work of the New Standards Project held in Snowmass, Colorado, in October of 1991. A group of 450 teachers, administrators, policymakers, business leaders and child advocates met to discuss national standards and the basic elements of a multistate examination system.

Participants reportedly acknowledged many of the flaws of traditional testing and vowed their proposed examination system would help all children achieve at higher levels. The new examinations would measure performance by assessing portfolios of students' actual work--projects they have produced. They added that students' answers on a new generation of tests would show the depth of their knowledge
and their ability to apply it. Marc Tucker, president of
the National Center on Education and the Economy and co-
director of the New Standards Project, said:

In a nation that has long acted as if only a few
students can learn, our schools have often functioned
as sorting machines. The people who came to the
Snowmass Conference believe all of our students can
learn, and they can learn as well and as much as any
students in the world. (Trotter, 1991, p. 44)

The organizers of the New Standards Project hoped to
meet President Bush's timetable of having a first test for
fourth-graders ready by September 1993, with tests in
reading, writing, and mathematics available in 1994. Acting
as a prodding stick, bad news came in August of 1991 in the
form of verbal scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT).
Sewall (1991) reported that the average score fell to a
record low of 422, another indication of the continuing, if
gradual, atrophy of literacy and fluency among all
Americans, not just the young. The newly released scores
also showed a "disturbing pattern" suggesting a general
decline in academic quality and study habits.

Another report was issued in 1991 by the Labor
Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills
(SCANS), which called for basic changes in the way America's
youth are prepared for the world of work. American College
Testing (ACT) President R. L. Ferguson said "the SCANS
report calls for nothing less than the transformation of the
American school and the American workplace to meet the needs
of the 21st century" (American College Testing Program,
The report identified five workplace competencies which are essential to successful performance in virtually any job:

1. Allocating resources such as time, money and materials,
2. Using interpersonal skills,
3. Using information,
4. Understanding systems, and
5. Using technology.

New tests from ACT will form the centerpiece of the government's effort to keep the American workforce competitive in the emerging global economy. ACT will develop specifications and test items for use in a national assessment to determine what American young adults know and can do in each of these five competencies. These exercises will make it possible to assess young Americans' workplace skills in the same way that their academic performance is currently monitored by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Ferguson noted:

For the first time, we will have a chance to see what America's young people can and cannot do with respect to some very significant workforce skills. Traditionally our schools have focused on those students who plan to go to college. They have neglected the majority of our young people, who enter the workforce directly after high school often with inadequate preparation. Our educational system must do more for these youngsters if the nation is to prosper in the coming decades. (American College Testing Program, 1992, p. 5)
Although 53% of the 1992 ACT tested seniors reported taking a core program in high school, 47% did not. This means that nearly half these seniors will be entering college with less than the preparation ACT research shows they will need to be successful college freshmen. As ACT's research shows, regardless of racial/ethnic background and family income, students who take a demanding high school program consistently earn better scores on the ACT Assessment than students who take less rigorous courses.

For ACT's President Ferguson, the message is clear:

We must find ways to motivate all students to take the high school coursework that relates rationally and meaningfully to their post-high school plans. For college-bound students, this means completing a strong program of courses in the subjects that are integral to success in college: English, mathematics, and the sciences. If we do less, we will continue to graduate nearly half our college-bound seniors without the tools they need for success in college. (American College Testing Program, 1992, p. 2)

So, the push was on for uniform standards for what United States' students should know and be able to do in key subject areas. Previously, each state had decided what went into their school curricula. There had been no national curriculum. An effort was underway to develop detailed content standards and to make those standards applicable nationwide. Needham (1992) discussed two concerns that had produced the call for national standards. These two concerns, education quality and international competitiveness, were the same concerns that had led the nation's governors to adopt the six national goals. Trotter
(1991) reported part of the strategy for achieving the national educational goals involved developing national standards for five core subjects and a new voluntary nationwide examination system to help achieve those standards. The tests, to be called the American Achievement Tests, were intended to foster good teaching and learning as well as to track students' progress.

Needham (1992) advocated national standards as coinciding with the revolution in the technology of assessment. Due to the limitations of paper-and-pencil tests, test reformers are turning to so-called "authentic assessment" techniques, such as portfolios and projects. These methods would be used for assessing how well students are meeting national standards.

Subject matter groups have begun work on national standards. So far, standards have been completed for only one subject, mathematics. Needham (1992) outlined four concerns about how the national standards process plays out:

1. **Budget crunch.** The persistent shortfalls in state and local education budgets could mean that not enough money would be available to make use of the new technologies of authentic assessment.

2. **Restructuring.** State legislatures and boards of education and local school boards could easily end up imposing standards, curriculums, and tests on schools, in
the process uprooting fragile efforts at site-based decision making.

3. **Local participation.** To make the standards reflect local standards, local communities would need to participate in developing and implementing curriculum and assessment practices.

4. **Equity.** It would not be fair to establish standards for student achievement without also creating equity in the educational resources available to children.

"America 2000 efforts to formulate higher standards of academic learning suggests the degree of official concern for a nation estranged from its intellect," commented Sewall (1991, p. 209). Sewall further explained that if successful, these standards and tests could bring broader and deeper learning to children of all regions and backgrounds. He promised "America 2000 will then have helped to strengthen the future for all citizens. It will have created a national mechanism for quality control in education, a mechanism that the recent education reform movement has strived so hard to achieve" (Sewall, 1991, p. 209).

Lauren Resnick, Director of the University of Pittsburgh's Learning Research and Development Center, insisted that assessments should be designed so that if teachers have prepared their students to do well, they will exercise the kinds of abilities and develop the skills and
knowledge that are the real goals of educational reform (Resnick & Resnick, 1989). O'Neil (1991) described the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce's support for a national examination. The commission recommended an examination-based assessment system under which students would have to earn a certificate of initial mastery by age 16 (or shortly thereafter) to continue on to college, professional or technical schools, or paying jobs.

Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, proposed spending $200-300 million to begin developing a set of national exams in several subjects. According to the 1989 Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa poll, 73% of the American public support a common national exam for graduation, a figure that had risen from 50% when the question was first asked in 1958 (O'Neil, 1991).

Issues of assessments, especially national assessment, are commonly framed in terms of what young people need to know and be able to do. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards posed the same questions about teachers. This board demands that those who would improve schools must give the same attention to establishing standards for schools that they devote to establishing standards for children. Their belief is that if standards for schools and communities are not set, it will simply result in one more round of "blaming the victim." The philosophy of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards concerns
the way schools ought to be. They advocate that unless those who set standards are clear about their beliefs, they are likely to set inappropriate standards or to fall back on using individual measures of student performance. Schools must become knowledge-work organizations; they must be organized to encourage children to use knowledge to solve problems rather than to passively absorb knowledge to be used at a later time (Wiggins, 1991).

Roy Romer, governor of Colorado, and Carroll A. Campbell, Jr., governor of South Carolina, sent a letter stating their concerns about education to Congress, the Secretary of Education, the National Education Goals Panel, and the American people. Serving as co-chairs of the National Council on Education Standards and Testing, they presented a report entitled Raising Standards for American Education. Through deliberations, the council found that the absence of explicit national standards keyed to world-class levels of performance severely hampered the ability to monitor the nation's progress toward the National Education Goals. They indicated that most measurement cannot tell whether students are actually acquiring the skills and knowledge they will need to prosper in the future. They cannot tell how good is "good enough." Most current assessment methods reinforced the emphasis on developing low-level skills and processing bits of information rather than on problem solving and critical thinking. They
advocated the adoption of world-class standards that would force the nation to confront today's educational performance expectations that are simply too low. They promoted explicit and high performance standards to provide an appropriate yardstick against which students, teachers, parents, and others could measure individual and system progress toward the goals. Standards would provide the basic understandings that all students needed to acquire, but not everything a student should learn. Romer and Campbell strongly endorsed national education standards and a voluntary system of assessments as appropriate focal points in ongoing education reform (National Council on Education Standards and Testing, 1992).

Advocates of National Standards

Finn (1989) stated "across America, local control has lessened in elementary and secondary education as the states are now in main control of school financing, education norms, regulations, and procedures" (p. 3). Finn noted this historic shift and reported local control did not even put up much of a fight as the states took charge.

Finn defined national educational standards as a sort of nationwide consensus regarding what an adequately educated young American, a high school graduate, would know and be able to do on entry into adulthood. This meant a nationwide minimum, a core of knowledge and skills that everybody needed to have. He said "this national standard
needed to be expressed in terms of outcomes, the actual skills and knowledge to be acquired, not just intentions, exposure, time spent studying, or courses taken" (Finn, 1989, p. 6).

Finn recalled what the National Commission of Excellence in Education in 1983 recommended as the new "basics" for high school:

The new "basics" will consist of 4 years of English, 3 years each of math, social studies, and science, half a year of computers, and 2 years of foreign language. Then look at the high school graduating class of 1987 and ask yourself, How many of the graduates actually met these standards? The answer is that 13% actually took that package of courses or better, while 87% took something less than that. If you lop off foreign language and computers and confine yourself to 4 years of English and 3 years each of math, science, and social studies, 30% of the graduates took this reduced package and 70% took something else. The distribution is not equal across society either. About 30% of the white students, about 22% of the black and Hispanic students, and about 54% of the Asian students took that lesser package. It seems that a lot of students are not being exposed to the things that we hope they will learn. If we are not prepared to go through with the exposure, we are plainly not going to achieve the standards. (Finn, 1989, p. 7)

Finn argued for a national core curriculum. He emphasized "it will make up a large faction of the entire curriculum. It will change; it will evolve; it should" (Finn, 1989, p. 8).

Greene (1989) pondered the question of standards in relation to the hope of interplay, conversation, and the possibility of a learning community. She saw the challenge as devising the kind of pedagogues that might provoke young people to develop a sense of "oughtness," to think (if
things were otherwise) about the kinds of human beings they would like to be (Greene, 1989, p. 9). She argued for standards to be significant in individual lives. People do indeed have to adopt them, to choose them, to decide to live and work with what they mean to them. They have to perceive themselves as participants in a community identified by what have been called acceptable criteria or by distinguishable norms. Greene's point was that persons are more likely to be norm-governed, to choose or to adopt standards, if they see themselves as members of a community marked by certain commitments and always in the process of renewing itself (Greene, 1989, p. 13). Lofty (1990) agreed with Greene concerning the kind of society people wish to live in. Questions about the aims and broad content of education are intimately connected with views of what the world should be like. These questions are therefore political questions, to be resolved by the citizens as a whole, not a sectional group within it.

S. L. Lightfoot (1989) suggested the need to construct national standards that encourage and inspire school people, that allow for a pluralistic response to the pursuit of goals, and standards need to be systematically reviewed and renewed in order to avoid typical bureaucratic anachronisms. She further suggested that the authors of standard-setting needed to represent this country's diverse population and that the national standards needed to reflect a broad range
of educational commitments and goals. Lightfoot believed that institutional change and educational improvement are dynamic, complex processes that must be negotiated and sustained at the local level. She was convinced that unless school people feel as if they are the primary shapers of school reform—vital, respected, and knowledgeable participants—they will resist external interventions through inertia, passivity, or sabotage (Lightfoot, 1989, pp. 14-15). Lightfoot represented school people when she said that they are not oblivious to the public discourse about education. They listen with critical and discerning ears. As they hear the national expectations and proclamations, they must fashion their own local interpretations of them. Their receptivity and their interpretations will reflect the history, the ecology, the culture, and the personalities of the school's inhabitants (Lightfoot, 1989, p. 15).

Zais (1976) took a stand for standards pointing out that curricula that provide for evaluation of the degree for which stated aims, goals, and objectives are attained are abundant; those, however, that also include procedures for the evaluation of the goals themselves are conspicuous by their rarity. He admonished curriculum writers by saying that the situation was astonishing since it seemed very clear that those responsible for school curricula should
certainly be held accountable for the outcomes that they said their curricula should produce (Zais, 1976, p. 382).

**Non-Advocates of National Standards**

Eisner (1991) raised the question of whether it would be educationally enhancing for America to have a national curriculum. Would the educational experiences of students in our schools be enriched? Would we better serve students now referred to as "at risk"?

The Gallup Poll (Gallup, 1989) indicated that most Americans believe standardized goals and standardized curricula are desirable. The same Gallup Poll, which incidentally provided solid, positive ratings for local schools, indicated that for schools as a whole the public is less than content. The assumption was that competition and the positive and negative reinforcement coming from the public display of test scores would be the carrot and stick that would give the kind of school the nation wanted and children deserved.

It was ironic that at the same time national prescriptions for reform were emanating from the White House and the state house, there was increased interest in and acknowledgment of the nation's cultural diversity and the need for site-specific planning. In addition, America has had a long tradition of state and local control of schools. The United States Constitution says nothing about education,
and what does not belong to the Federal government becomes the province of each of the states.

Noah (1989) presented his arguments in relation to national standards in other countries. He said that the basic questions about the nature of the curriculum and appropriate standards in education have been present for a long time. It is important, as movement progresses toward the establishment of national standards, to avoid the rigidities that have been associated with them in many other countries. He listed three costs of national standards:

1. **Noncomparability.** There have been myriad different educational standards. Decisions to admit or hire, based on the evidence of high school grade averages, will say "yes" to many who should have been told "no." Worse still, decisions will say "no" to many who should have received a "yes" answer.

2. **Increase in cost of testing.** National standards help to raise the cost of acquiring valid and reliable information about the characteristics of candidates needed to make judgments. Employers do not have the money for acquiring and administering ad hoc tests, interpreting the results, etc.

3. **Private substitutes.** The SAT and ACT were invented to fill the gap left by the educational system.

4. **Types of teaching and learning.** The national standards established by the ministries of education in
France, the Soviet Union, and Japan are enshrined in the centrally administered end-of-school examinations that lock teachers and students into curricula and methods that are very difficult to change. However skillfully a nation chooses the standards it wishes to enforce today, it is quite difficult to prevent those standards from becoming solid obstacles to the changes that may be needed tomorrow (Noah, 1989).

Noah's sense was that national standards are no panacea. National standards may be useful in helping teachers lead youngsters to learn, but here as in other countries, they are neither the necessary nor sufficient condition for generating the quality schooling that students deserve (Noah, 1989).

The proposals the administration would like to have enacted in the attempt to bring the national goals closer to reality have met resistance, indifference, and hostility from some education organizations. Two parts of the America 2000 package have touched a nerve with education: the first is the development of national standards and voluntary national examinations in five "core" subjects; the second is an effort to expand parental choice to include private schools in the competition.

Rigorous academic testing has been the norm in industrialized nations other than the United States. The United States already has a kind of national curriculum.
Mass market textbooks are one of the driving motors of this uniformity since most teaching and testing derive from them and their supplementary material. Sewall (1991) proclaimed that criticisms of national standards comes from many quarters. Those devoted to educational pluralism and diversity warn of lock-step learning, of a nation's automations, and of intellectual homogenization. Centralized curricular planning raises the specter of Orwellian thought and control, and some educators reject the kind of curriculum likely to result.

Kantrowitz and Wingert (1992) wrote that American reformers expect a national curriculum to be more flexible than those in foreign countries. All proposals seen thus far have left room for regional differences and allowed teachers to come up with their own methods of interpreting the material. All students would be expected to master a core body of material. Districts would probably still be autonomous, but there would be tremendous pressure to get with the program. Reformers expect the tests that will be created to be powerful incentives. The new exams that have been developed are very different from current standardized tests and include much more essay work. In order to get good results, schools will have to teach the new curriculum. If a form of national curriculum takes hold, it may not be in place until today's first graders are in college. There are many obstacles ahead: creating new tests, training
teachers, and convincing local districts to go along. The hard part is turning momentum into schools that work.

Dealing with the idea of choice, Clinchy (1991) was convinced the almost inevitable end would be two separate, thoroughly unequal, and de facto racially and economically segregated school systems. One of these would be a well-funded public, private, and parochial system, serving a primarily white (though with some minorities) middle-class and largely suburban student body. The other would be a minimally funded public system, serving largely urban poor and minority students. Such a dual system of schooling would be unlikely to pass either constitutional muster or the political scrutiny of a civil-rights-minded Congress.

When it is decided that excellence is achieved by obtaining a set of universal standards, the risk exists of falling into two fundamental traps: the first trap occurs when standards of excellence become ends in themselves rather than means to an end. The second trap is unintentional discouragement, rather than challenge, for those who are farthest from and closest to the standards (Faidley & Musser, 1991).

It has been a commonly known and widely studied phenomenon in organizations that when people are given a specific objective, they will reach that objective at the expense of the overall purpose the objective was established to attain. So, most people will attempt to reach
established standards. In doing so, however, the standards may become so important that they are viewed as ends rather than means. To prevent this, it is necessary that local level educational leaders take the initiative to define the proper function of national standards in the improvement process. Educators at every level must understand that national standards are only a small part of the excellence process (Faidley & Musser, 1991).

An advocate of President Bush's six national goals at the time of their announcement, Brandt (1991) began to think that the goals would just provide another opportunity to blame the schools for not living up to expectations. He pointed to the fact that educators know they could be more effective if every child came to school "ready to learn." They also know the enormous changes that would be required in the values, living patterns, and support structures of American families to make that a reality. Brandt asked the reader to assume for a moment that it was truly intended that American students should be "first in the world in science and mathematics" by the year 2000. This calls for teacher retraining and recruitment, major improvements in working conditions, and extensive curriculum revisions.

Regardless of what presidents and governors do, educators will determine what actually happens. Many of these same educators are concerned about the decrease in local control of the curriculum. Yet, educators realize
that student achievement is marginal. Daniel Koretz, an assessment expert with the Rand Corporation, admitted "educational standards in this country are embarrassingly low" (O'Neil, 1991, p. 8). Marshall Smith, education dean at Stanford University, noted

the idea of setting standards and making progress to higher education and top jobs dependent on test scores--common practice in some other nations--also runs counter to United States philosophy. We pride ourselves, as a nation, on giving second, third, or fourth chances. (O'Neil, 1991, p. 8)

Elam, Rose and Gallup (1993) in the 25th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools tracked opinion about various aspects of the goals. They concluded people were very skeptical about the possibility of realizing the goals by the year 2000 and public awareness was still low. The resounding conclusion was that only about a quarter of the respondents said they had heard of each of the goals.

Pipho (1993) lauded the National Education Goals Panel for beginning each of its yearly reports with a look at each goal and baseline data for each goal, by state. However, these reports do not tell how far the country has progressed toward the 2000 deadline. Even worse, it does report that "progress is wholly inadequate" if goals are to be met by the year 2000.
Strategies to Meet National Goals

What strategies to use to meet the goals has been the greatest problem school districts have had to face. Katz (1992) advocated the most important strategy for addressing the school readiness goal was to prepare the school to be responsive to the wide range of experiences, backgrounds, and needs of the children expected to come to the school. She further detailed the aspects of school practices to be considered in this effort to include the curriculum, staffing patterns, and age considerations.

The achievement of literacy for all adult Americans has been a part of a larger, worldwide interest in literacy, which led the United Nations to declare 1990 as International Literacy Year and to set as a goal the eradication of illiteracy by the end of the century (Crandall & Imel, 1991). Crandall and Imel reported the findings of a study conducted by the United States Census Bureau in 1979 in which about 0.5% of the population was found to be illiterate. The results were based on a sixth grade education and may not be appropriate for the tasks confronting adults today; a 12th grade standard is probably more appropriate. Crandall and Imel stated that from a historical perspective, the literacy situation in the United States has improved. However, basic reading and writing skills are insufficient for the increasing demands made on individuals in this technological information-based society.
For this reason, literacy should be considered as a continuum and the goals of adult literacy programs to be less than those of combating illiteracy and more expanding literacy (Crandall & Imel, 1991).

The disintegration of the traditional family and its ability to cope with societal problems has both broadened the role of the school to deal with social issues and encouraged the development of government programs to spur parents to become involved in the educational process of their children. Parental involvement is now a major component of efforts to restructure or improve schools nationally. President Bush's administration reviewed proposals that would give parents vouchers to use in "shopping" for a school of their choice. Under restructuring proposals for school-based management, the principals, teachers, and parents together manage the school and solve its unique problems. Schools will have to become flexible enough to innovate and change old models and practices long proved ineffective.

In the 1950s, the public cited gum chewing as the most serious school problem (Gallup, 1989). Times and opinions have changed. By 1985, and for every year after that, American adults ranked student drug use as the number one problem in the nation's schools. Furthermore, 1 out of 3 teens say they are aware of drug use or sales near their homes, and 4 out of 10 teenage students report drug use and
sales to be fairly widespread in their schools (Gallup, 1989).

Today's schools have become the focal point of federal and community efforts to end illegal drug use. With the adoption of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986, the United States Department of Education was charged with administering a variety of programs to help local schools become drug free. It is at the local level where many of the real solutions will be developed and carried out, since that is where both the causes and effects of illegal drug use are most often seen. The task also requires reforming national ethos and heightening the commitment to standards (Fustukjian, 1990).

Tennessee's Plan for the 21st Century

The dream of Governor McWherter and education officials has been and is to bring the classroom of the 21st century to Tennessee's schools (Sandoval, 1992). Sandoval stated that it will remain a dream unless some conceptual changes are made in the present school structure. During the next decade, Tennessee must make available an educational system which will support a changing economy, improve the quality of life, and meet the aspirations of its citizens. The State Board of Education and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission have affirmed their resolve to provide the necessary policy leadership to attain the goals contained in
the respective Master Plans for public schools and higher education institutions to meet these challenges.

Tennessee entered the last decade of the 20th century with cautious optimism, but with excitement about a rare opportunity to make a significant difference in education. National and state leaders have championed changes in education with reborn optimism and renewed faith in the value of educating the populace, but with the keen realization that the entire education system, preschool through graduate school, must be restructured. The 96th Tennessee General Assembly passed legislation in 1989 establishing Tennessee Challenge 2000 for the purpose of setting goals for Tennessee public schools and higher education institutions.

In response to the legislation, the Commissioner of Education, the State Board of Education, and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission developed quantifiable statewide education goals and long-range plans. As a result of the goals established at the state, regional, and national levels, measurable objectives for restructuring education at all levels have been established and strategies have been put in place to ensure improvement. Performance will be monitored in such critically important areas as student readiness and achievement, teacher education preparation and induction, high school graduation and college degree completion rates, minority recruitment and retention,

By planning and working together, the board and the commission were confident that the goals would be achieved by the year 2000. The Master Plan for Tennessee Schools: Preparing for the Twenty-First Century, and the Tennessee Challenge 2000 have been implemented into the systems. These plans are critical to the future of all Tennesseans.

To meet The 21st Century Challenge Plan, objectives were developed as follows:

1. A 25% increase in those who receive GED credentials each year.

2. A 15% increase in the number of high school graduates who go on to postsecondary education each year.

3. A 10% increase in the graduation rate each year of full-time degree-seeking college students.

4. An improved participation rate in postsecondary education rate from all geographic areas of the state equal to the current state mean participation rate.

5. An increase in the participation rate of Black citizens in Tennessee higher education.

6. An increase in the number of high school students completing Algebra I and II.

7. An increase in the high school graduation rate to 85% of those students who enter the ninth grade.
8. A decrease in the number of recent high school graduates who need remedial course work in postsecondary education programs.

9. An increase in the enrollment in graduate and professional programs in accordance with state and national needs.

10. A statewide technology network in place to serve the teaching, learning, and management needs of schools, institutions, and state agencies.

11. An increase in state-of-the-art technology located in every public school classroom and supported by a comprehensive professional development system for teachers and school leaders.

12. A decrease in the grade-level retention rates of elementary and secondary students.

13. An increase to 100% of the 4-year-old at-risk children and their families enrolled in comprehensive early childhood education and parent involvement programs.

14. An increase in the achievement levels of students at each grade level, grades 2-8 and 10, on the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) test.

15. An increase in the percentage of high school graduates going on to postsecondary education who have completed the ACT core curriculum.

16. An increase in the average ACT score of 12th grade students.
17. An increase in the number of high school students each year who complete advanced placement courses and score 3 or above in the advanced placement examinations.

18. An increase in the number of individuals each year who become licensed teachers in Tennessee.

19. An increase in the percentage of minorities entering the teaching profession.

20. An increase in the number of adults served in adult literacy programs and who progress from one level to another.

21. An increase in the number of school/business and private sector/university or college partnerships.

22. An increase in school-based decision making in public schools.

23. Adequate and sustained funding levels for pre K-12 and higher education.

24. An increase in university research, including applied research which contributes to economic growth.


The nation's six goals and the Tennessee Master Plan have been joined by the goals for education set up by the Southern Regional Education Board. This Board demands that by the year 2000:

1. All children will be ready for the first grade.
2. Student achievement for elementary and secondary students will be at national levels or higher.

3. The school dropout rate will be reduced by one-half.

4. Ninety percent (90%) of adults will have a high school diploma or equivalency.

5. Four out of 5 students entering college will be ready to begin college-level work.

6. Significant gains will be achieved in mathematics, sciences, and communications competencies of vocational education students.

7. The percentage of adults who have attended college or earned 2-year, 4-year, and graduate degrees will be at the national averages or higher.

8. The quality and effectiveness of all colleges and universities will be regularly assessed, with particular emphasis on the knowledge and performance of graduates.

9. All states and localities will have schools with improved performance and productivity demonstrated by results.

10. Salaries for teachers and faculty will be competitive in the marketplace, will reach important benchmarks, and will be linked to performance measures and standards.

11. States will maintain or increase the proportion of state tax dollars for schools and colleges while emphasizing

Tennessee State Department of Education Commissioner C. E. Smith released the following state goals and objectives for educational excellence. The goals and objectives were prefaced with "by no later than the first day of the 21st century."

1. All entering first grade students—rich and poor, black and white, urban and rural, gifted and disabled—shall be prepared to achieve at the first grade level.

2. Every child who completes the third grade shall be prepared to read and write and solve mathematical problems effectively at the fourth grade level.

3. Achievement levels of Tennessee students shall exceed the national average and be in the top one-third of the states in the Southeast.

4. The statewide high school completion rate shall be at least 80%.

5. Teaching shall be a profession of choice for a significant portion of the best and brightest graduates of the states' colleges and universities.

6. No less than 90% of the Tennessee adult population shall be literate.

7. All students graduating with an emphasis in vocational education shall possess the competencies required to compete effectively in the job market within their
geographical area of choice and/or to succeed in postsecondary technical education.

8. All local school districts shall be prepared to demonstrate conclusively improved performance and productivity.

9. All students admitted to state universities shall be prepared to begin college-level work.

10. A comprehensive approach to funding schools shall be in place and such an approach shall be linked directly to goals and tied to accountability standards for quality and productivity.

11. School-based decision making shall be the rule rather than the exception in all school districts of the state.

12. The Tennessee school curriculum shall be on the cutting edge of knowledge and fully responsive to the vocational, academic, and special education needs of all students as well as the employment needs of this state's businesses and industries (Tennessee State Department of Education, 1991).

**Educator Concerns About National Standards**

History has proven that the acceptance of any innovation in education takes about 30 years. That is how long it took television and foreign language laboratories to move into American classrooms. The classroom teacher must be involved in the process of decision making. Training
must involve the overall philosophy of the proposed change. The 21st century classroom is a technological paradigm. Teacher acceptance of new technology can only be achieved when teachers understand the reasons for the use of technology and are well trained in its operation. Educational planners and administrators must be retrained as well. They must learn not to base educational planning on their experiences but on the present reality of today's family and economy. Family structures of today and of the future require a new technological structure and roles that are radically different.

Wasserman (1992) promoted the idea that if teachers believe they are being left out of the reform, that they cannot be expected to be fully behind it. The review of the literature revealed that teachers feel they do not "own" the reform that is happening all around them. Teachers and experts agree that if teachers are not on board, reform cannot succeed where it counts the most—in the classroom. Teachers do not think reform is a "bad" idea. They are concerned they will be blamed if education goals are not met (Wasserman, 1992).

Industrial corporations have been working at restructuring for more than a decade, and they are only partway there. In the July-August 1990 issue of Harvard Business Review, Wigginhorn traced Motorola's determined efforts over the course of 11 years to restructure the firm.
It was a story of unrelenting frustration and persistence. It had to create a new corporate culture and motivate people at every level of the corporation to learn. Motorola still had plants and operations that were barely touched by the process (Tucker, 1991).

This company's experience offered many parallels to efforts to restructure schools. In both cases, participants are dealing with efforts to set clear goals, create clear measures of progress toward these goals, and push decisions about how to reach these goals down to the service-delivery levels of the organization. In both cases, there is a need to eliminate as many of the rules and as much of the bureaucracy as possible and to hold people responsible for the results (Tucker, 1991).

Vanterpool (1987) conducted a study entitled Concerns of Training Managers About the National Standards Prescribed by the American Society for Training and Development. The study concerned implementation of innovations. She stressed "concerns" of individuals are hypothesized to influence adoption of innovations. The stages of concern ranged from awareness (little interest or involvement with the innovation) to refocusing (interest in exploring universal benefits of the innovation). Vanterpool investigated concerns of training managers which may impede or facilitate their adoption of the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) Competency Model. The findings of this
study supported the concerns theory. Concerns varied depending upon knowledge about, experience with and use/nonuse of the innovation. In relation to the innovation of national norms, this study supported the views of those who feel that teachers are concerned due to their inexperience with national norms.

**Specific Tennessee Steps to Meet National Goals**

Tom Cannon, Tennessee State Department of Education, reiterated the following steps the State Department has instituted to ensure reaching the national goals by the year 2000.

1. All children will start school ready to learn.
   a. Kindergarten has been mandated for all students prior to entering first grade.

2. The dropout rate will decrease so that at least 9 out of 10 students will graduate.
   a. Compulsory attendance age has been raised to the 18th birthday.
   b. Tennessee's Student At Risk program has been implemented.
   c. Alternative Schools have been set up.

3. American students will show competency in challenging subjects.
   a. Redesigning the high school curriculum so that the general path which has prepared students
for neither college nor the work place will be eliminated.

4. American students will be first in the world in math and science.
   a. The requirement of every student to complete a full year of computer education prior to high school graduation has been mandated.
   b. High school graduation requirements have been increased in math and science.
   c. College entrance requirements have been increased in math and science.

5. Every American adult will be literate and be able to perform skillfully in the workplace.
   a. Adult basic education classes have been increased.

6. Schools will be free from drugs and violence.
   a. Alternative school programs have been provided for students who have been suspended or expelled from the regular classroom.
   b. Just Say No Programs have been encouraged.

General comments from public testimony and proposed future indicators (PFIs) were presented at the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP) Regional Forums concerning recommendations by the six NEGP Resource Groups. The Resource Groups focused on ways of measuring/monitoring the nation's/states' progress toward meeting the President's and
governors' six national education goals. These forums were conducted between April 12 and May 17, 1991. Preliminary recommendations were presented concerning each goal.

The state of Tennessee has committed to follow the recommendations of the Regional Forums. The PFIs were presented as follows:

1. Goal One--Readiness for school
   a. School entry form
   b. Health screening form
   c. In-school assessment profile

2. Goal Two--High School Completion
   a. National student data reporting system

3. Goal Three--Student Achievement and Citizenship
   a. National standards
   b. Student assessment system

4. Goal Four--Science and Mathematics
   a. International Assessment of Educational Progress
   b. International Assessment of Educational Achievement
   c. Collection of data on policies and use of state curriculum and professional teaching standards

5. Goal Five--Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning
   a. National Adult Literacy Survey
   b. Target scores for National Adult Literacy performance
c. Use of data by the Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills

6. Goal Six--Safe, Disciplined and Drug-Free Schools
   a. Use/expansion of the Monitoring the Future Student Survey for the National Institute of Drug Abuse and the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System
   b. Good local data collection

In a draft entitled A Comprehensive State Strategy for the Restructuring of Education (Education Commission of the States, 1992), a message was sent to the states that they must create a coherent strategy to achieve effective, widespread restructuring of schools. Having a coherent strategy in mind would help insure that each proposed change had the maximum positive impact. The states' strategy should be planned upon the following assumptions:

1. All students can learn at significantly higher levels.

2. Policy makers, business leaders and the public do not yet understand what systemic change is. They are used to incremental change. Even when policies are made incrementally, they should be seen as interrelated and enacted in the context of a comprehensive, long term strategy.
3. No single change will solve problems that are ultimately caused by the system as a whole. The politics of such significant changes are difficult and require extraordinary leadership.

4. What is needed is a coherent strategy—coherence about where state efforts are going, why and how. Policies and programs should be linked to one another. Even then, change is difficult.

5. All policies should start from the need to support learning—particularly higher order learning.

6. Each state needs to cultivate a critical mass of schools and districts trying to restructure themselves.

7. Progress requires a change in attitudes and behavior of the American people. Much of the public does not yet understand the urgency of reform or the need for a systemic approach to it (Education Commission of the States, 1992).

Summary

This chapter has formed the conceptual framework for the study. Implementation of national goals and development of national standards as part of the national educational reform movement initiated an abundance of conflicting articles in the literature. Much of the literature about national goals and national standards was based upon arguments that schools were currently ineffective, and that national goals and standards, in and of themselves, would
result in more effective schools and higher achievement levels for learners. National goals and standards had a growing appeal among parents and some educators, although data has not been gathered to show a connection between setting national goals/standards and student learning. The success or failure of America 2000 should ultimately depend on the ways in which it is received, interpreted, and institutionalized or implemented in more than 15,000 school districts across the country.

Using this review of literature, a need was established to gather data concerning the beliefs of Tennessee principals and teachers concerning national goals and national standards. It was hoped that the data would be useful to education decision makers in the state as to the progress being made toward achieving these goals and standards by the year 2000.
CHAPTER 3
Methods and Procedures

This descriptive study was designed to determine whether any significant differences existed in current beliefs toward national standards and national goals reported by public school principals and teachers in Tennessee. A review of literature related to national standards and national goals was the first step needed for formulating a sound background for this study. This was accomplished by consulting the Education Index, Current Index to Journals in Education, and Dissertation Abstracts International. An ERIC computer search was also conducted.

A questionnaire was designed to collect data concerning the beliefs of Tennessee public school principals and teachers about national standards and national goals. The research hypotheses are stated in the null for testing purposes. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+) (Norusis, 1988).

Population

The principals and teachers utilized in this study were selected from information supplied by the Tennessee Education Association. The Tennessee Directory of Public Schools, 1992-93, was used to identify county and city school districts. The population was of adequate size to
obtain sufficient data to do a comparative analysis on the results.

Selection of Sample

The *Tennessee Directory of Public Schools, 1992-93*, the official listing of public schools throughout the state of Tennessee, prepared by the State Department of Education, was used to identify the sampling frame of all 139 school districts. A random sample was drawn by the research department of the TEA and supplied to the researcher. The sample was drawn from the membership list of the TEA for the year 1992-1993. Those principals and teachers not belonging to the TEA were not included in the sample. Due to the difference in the population of teachers and principals and to equalize the sample to some degree of accuracy, a random sample of 232 principals out of 1,549 and 268 teachers out of 45,438 was drawn. These numbers increased the possibility of a return rate of 60%. This sample size also increased the likelihood of drawing an approximately equal number of county and city school systems. The TEA used a table of random numbers (Borg & Gall, 1983). The sample estimates were at (±) .06 % of the true population value for each group.

Description of Sample

The sample surveyed included 232 principals and 268 teachers from county and city schools. Survey instruments
were sent to the principals and teachers from the random sample. The overall response rate was expressed in percentage.

**Procedures**

The first step to be completed in this study was to conduct a review of literature to ascertain whether sufficient research data could be located to support this study. Approval to conduct the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of East Tennessee State University. A survey questionnaire was developed with 32 items pertaining to national standards and national goals, along with demographic items.

Once approval for the study was given by the Institutional Review Board of East Tennessee State University, the collection of data began. Computer generated address labels of the 232 principals and 268 teachers were obtained from the TEA. After the selection of principals and teachers was completed, 500 questionnaires were mailed to the sample population. Included in each mailing were a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and soliciting cooperation and participation from the individual, a copy of the survey instrument, and a self-addressed stamped envelope (see Appendices A and B). An assessment form was also sent to each respondent (see Appendix C). A certain number of principals and teachers failed to respond to the questionnaire. Two weeks after the
initial contact with the individuals, a follow-up letter was mailed to those who had not responded.

A satisfactory return rate of 60% was established for this study. When 60% of all completed questionnaires had been received, the responses were scored and demographic information was tabulated. Frequency tabulations were calculated using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software program. Responses were further analyzed by the researcher.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument, National Goals/National Standards Belief Questionnaire, was designed to describe principal and teacher beliefs about national goals and national standards. Items for the instrument were generated from an extensive review of the literature and research relative to positions for and against national goals and national standards.

Based upon that review, a pool of 32 items, representing two constructs, were generated. One construct pertained to national standards and one to national goals. The 32 items were pilot tested at two schools in Johnson County, Tennessee, and at two schools in the Elizabethton, Tennessee City system. An assessment form with a request for comments and suggestions for improvement was attached to each questionnaire.

The purpose of the questionnaire was to survey the beliefs of Tennessee public school principals and teachers
regarding national standards and national goals. The demographic statements were developed to provide meaningful summaries of information concerning national standards and national goals. The survey instrument was reviewed for clarity and conciseness by Charles Burkett and Robert McElrath, members of the graduate committee considered to be experts in the field of national goals and national standards. These two members of the doctoral committee were asked to rate the relevance of each item as to what it was intended to measure. The responses aided in confirming or disconfirming data. The proposed questionnaire was reviewed by the East Tennessee State University Doctoral Seminar members for face validity.

It was assumed that the forms had content validity since the items of the instrument were designed from concepts reflected in the literature and from research on acceptance of innovations (Vanterpool, 1987). The factors that lacked desired clarity of description of national goals and national standards were revised or discarded. The remaining factors represented the research based, conceptual issues which statistically and logically evolved during the analysis of items related to national goals and national standards.

Field Testing

Before questionnaires were mailed to the sample population, the survey instrument was field tested by
administering it to principals and teachers at two schools in Johnson County, Tennessee, and two schools in the Elizabethton, Tennessee City System. The format of the questionnaire remained unchanged. The instrument was reviewed by the Institutional Review Board at East Tennessee State University in the fall of 1993. Responses and suggestions from these sources were used to validate the questionnaire and to improve the clarity of the items.

Research Design

The design of this study was descriptive, utilizing the questionnaire method of collecting data. Gay (1992) defined a descriptive study as one that determines and reports the way things are. Gay further reported that just as the historical researcher has no control over what was, the descriptive researcher has no control over what is, and can only measure what already exists.

The design of this study allowed the responses to the questionnaire to be separated into various groups as needed for comparison according to their position as principal or teacher, and the demographic data requested.

Data Analysis Procedures

In Chapter 1 of this study, the hypotheses were stated in the declarative form. For statistical treatment, however, the hypotheses were tested in the null. There are two techniques of statistical analysis: descriptive and
inferential (Best & Kahn, 1986; Borg & Gall, 1983).
Assumptions of descriptive analysis include the simple
reporting of facts and collective occurrences based on a
number of samples. With this type of analysis,
generalizations are limited to the groups being studied and
no inferences can be made to a larger population.

The study examined the strength of the differences
between independent variables (principals and teachers).
The test selected for evaluating differences between the two
independent samples was the t-test for independent groups.
It is necessary to utilize each of the two variables studied
as independent in relation to the other in order to evaluate
the predictive utility of each. The data gathered came from
the instrument National Standards/National Goals
Questionnaire and the demographic data.

Data from the completed instruments were entered into
an IBM-Model 60C equipped with the Statistical Package for
the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+) (Norusis, 1988). SPSS/PC+
was used for data processing. The t test for independent
samples was used to test for differences in each of the two
groups (teachers and principals). Borg and Gall (1983)
emphasized that the t test for independent samples is
generally used in comparing the means of two groups to
determine if they are significantly different. When more
than two groups were being compared using demographic data,
a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare
means on each item. When the overall F-test was significant, a Student-Newman Keuls Post-Hoc Multiple Comparisons Test was used to identify pairwise differences. All significance tests were conducted at the .05 level of significance.

Hypotheses

These hypotheses, stated in the null, were tested at the .05 level of significance.

$H_01$: There will be no significant difference in the beliefs of principals in city systems and those in county systems toward national standards and national goals.

$H_02$: There will be no significant difference in the beliefs of teachers in city systems and those in county systems toward national standards and national goals.

$H_03$: There will be no significant difference between principals and teachers as a group in their beliefs toward national standards and national goals.

$H_04$: There will be no significant difference in city principals' and teachers' beliefs and county principals' and teachers' beliefs toward national standards and national goals.

$H_05$: There will be no significant difference between male and female teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.
H_06: There will be no significant difference between degree levels of teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

H_07: There will be no significant difference between high school, middle school, and elementary principals and teachers in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

H_08: There will be no significant difference between Career Ladder levels of teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

H_09: There will be no significant difference between Caucasian and minority teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

H_10: There will be no significant difference between years of experience of teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

H_11: There will be no significant difference between younger and older teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

Summary

The research methodology and procedures were presented in this chapter. The instrument developed by the researcher for the study was the National Standards/National Goals Questionnaire.

A sample population of 232 principals and 268 teachers was randomly selected for the study from the 1992-93
membership of the Tennessee Education Association. When 60% of the questionnaires had been received, the data were analyzed using descriptive techniques of t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results of the analyses as they apply to hypotheses 1 through 11 are presented in Chapter 4, along with tables reporting demographic data.
CHAPTER 4

Presentation of Data and Analysis of Findings

Introduction

This chapter, which provides a detailed description of the setting for the study and an analysis of the findings, is divided into two parts:

1. A presentation of demographic data, taken from Part I of the instrument.

2. A report of the descriptive measures of the $t$-test for independent groups for research hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, and 11, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) for hypotheses 6, 7, 8, and 10 as related to the 32 belief items on the National Goals/National Standards Questionnaire.

The primary purpose of this study was concerned with analyzing and comparing the relationships of beliefs among principals and teachers randomly selected from the 1992-93 TEA membership. The data collected for this study were obtained from questionnaires sent to the randomly selected 232 principals and 268 teachers holding membership in the TEA. The questionnaire consisted of demographic data and 32 belief statements related to national goals and national standards.

Respondents

One hundred forty-six of the 232 principals returned the questionnaire. This figure represents a return rate for
principals of 62.93%. One hundred seventy-one of the 268 teachers returned the questionnaire at a return rate of 63.81%. The total population return rate was 63.40%. Table 1 indicates the numbers and percentages of questionnaires completed.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number surveyed</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number returned</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of returns</td>
<td>62.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information derived from the questionnaire demographic data indicated that of the 146 principals who returned the questionnaire, 111 were male and 35 were female. The teacher respondents were 47 male and 124 female. The gender of the respondents is shown in Table 2.
Table 2

Number and Percentage of Respondents by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position and Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>76.02</td>
<td>23.98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>27.49</td>
<td>72.51</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of returns</td>
<td>49.84</td>
<td>50.16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information derived from the questionnaire demographic data indicated that of the 146 principals, 1 was Asian (.68%), 24 were Black (16.44%), 1 was Latino (.68%), 119 were White (81.52%), and 1 was Other (.68%). Likewise, of the 171 teachers, 19 were Black (11.11%), 1 was Native American (.59%), 150 were White (87.71%), and 1 was Other (.59%). This information is presented in Table 3.

Information related to level of job is presented in Table 4. Of the 146 principals, 69 were elementary principals (47.26%), 36 were middle school principals (24.66%), and 41 were secondary principals (28.08%). Of the 171 teachers responding, 93 were elementary teachers...
(54.39%), 30 were middle school teachers (17.54%), and 48 were secondary teachers (28.07%).

Table 3

**Number and Percentage of Respondents by Race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position and Race</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total respondents</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of returns</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

**Number and Percentage of Respondents by Level of Job**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position and Job</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total respondents</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of returns</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each respondent was asked to indicate the total number of years spent in education. Table 5 indicates an interesting number of principals (1) as compared to teachers (50) in their first 10 years in education. On the other side of the scale, the numbers show that principals (25) in this survey have spent more years than teachers (13) in education.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and Percentage of Respondents by Years in Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position and Years in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of returns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All principals and teachers were asked to indicate the highest level of educational attainment. The highest educational level attained is shown in Table 6. The survey returns indicate that only one (.68%) principal is employed with less than a Master's degree and 68 (39.77%) of the teachers are employed with a Bachelor's degree. At the
other end of the scale, a greater percentage of principals hold Educational Specialist and Doctorate degrees than teachers.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position and Highest educational level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>39.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of returns</td>
<td>21.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to indicate their Career Ladder status (Level I, II, or III) or non-Career Ladder status. Table 7 shows that a greater percentage of teachers are Level I (71.93%) than principals (47.26%).

Table 8 presents the respondent's ages. The table indicates that principals (6.85%) remain in their jobs at a greater age than teachers (.58%).
Table 7

Number and Percentage of Respondents by Career Ladder Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position and Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>47.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>71.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of returns</td>
<td>60.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

Number and Percentage of Respondents by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position and Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>9.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of returns</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 indicates a larger percentage of county principals (73.97%) and teachers (70.76%) returned the survey questionnaire than city principals (26.03%) and teachers (29.24%).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position and System</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals % of returns</td>
<td>73.97</td>
<td>26.03</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers % of returns</td>
<td>70.76</td>
<td>29.24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of returns</td>
<td>72.24</td>
<td>27.76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 reports the percentage of respondents in three categories of student population. The survey results indicate a relatively equal distribution of respondents in each category. In the 0-500 population range, 37.67% principal returns and 39.77% teacher returns are indicated. In the 501-900 population range, 39.73% principal and 33.92% teacher returns are indicated. In the 901+ range of student population, 22.60% principal and 26.31% teacher returns are shown.
Table 10

Number and Percentage of Respondents by Student Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position and Student population</th>
<th>0-500</th>
<th>501-900</th>
<th>901+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.67</td>
<td>39.73</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of returns</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.77</td>
<td>33.92</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total respondents</strong></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of returns</td>
<td>38.80</td>
<td>36.59</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of the frequency percentages of responses for the 32 belief statements from principals is shown in Table 11. The most frequently selected response is indicated with an asterisk (*). Of the 32 statements, no statement elicited a predominately "strongly agree" response. At the other end of the scale, no statements received a predominately "strongly disagree" response.

Table 11

Number and Percentage of Responses to 32 Belief Statements from Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ready to learn Percentage</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduation rate Percentage</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subject competency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>38.36</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>39.04*</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of minds</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>47.26*</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. First in academics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>40.41*</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literate adults</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>55.48*</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free of drugs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>39.73</td>
<td>45.89*</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Key to success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>52.06*</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning ability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>56.85*</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Blame the schools</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>30.82*</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Redesigned curricula</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>61.64*</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>88*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>60.27*</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>91*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>62.33*</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>26.03</td>
<td>54.11*</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>45.21*</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goal commitment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>84*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>57.53*</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>54.80*</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>44.52*</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Instruction improvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>55.48*</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>41.10*</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>50.00*</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>50.00*</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51*</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>34.93*</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Professional incentive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>35.62*</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>42.47*</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>28.08</td>
<td>35.62*</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61*</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>41.78*</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>45.89*</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>34.25*</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision of excellence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>51.37*</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality of schooling</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44*</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>28.08</td>
<td>30.14*</td>
<td>28.08</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standards commitment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>56.16*</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; N = Neutral/No Opinion; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree; M = Mean.
A review of the frequency percentages of responses for the 32 belief statements from teachers is shown in Table 12. The most frequently selected response is indicated with an asterisk (*). Of the 32 statements, no statement elicited a predominately "strongly agree" answer.

At the other end of the scale, one statement received a predominately "strongly disagree" response: Statement 7 (By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning).

Table 12
Number and Percentage of Responses to 32 Belief Statements from Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ready to learn</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>91*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>27.49</td>
<td>53.22*</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduation rate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>53.22*</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subject competency</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>43.86*</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of minds</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>50.88*</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. First in academics</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>48.54*</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literate adults</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>28.66</td>
<td>57.31*</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free of drugs</td>
<td>82*</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>47.95*</td>
<td>37.43</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Key to success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>93*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Blame the schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Redesigned curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>99*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Process of renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goal commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>93*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70*</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>89*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>52.05*</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Advocate standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>29.24</td>
<td>32.75*</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Professional incentive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>30.41</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>35.67*</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>38.60*</td>
<td>27.49</td>
<td>14.62</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>37.43*</td>
<td>28.66</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>107*</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>62.57*</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68*</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>39.77*</td>
<td>30.41</td>
<td>23.98</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>37.43*</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>23.39</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision of excellence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>49.12*</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality of schooling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>29.24</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>38.60*</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standards commitment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>86*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>50.29*</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; N = Neutral/No Opinion; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree; M = Mean.

A review of the frequency percentages of responses for the 32 belief statements from principals and teachers as a group are shown in Table 13. The most frequently selected response is indicated with an asterisk (*). Of the 32
statements, no statement elicited a predominately "strongly agree" response.

At the other end of the scale, one statement received a predominately "strongly disagree" response: Statement 7 (By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning).

Table 13
Number and Percentage of Responses to 32 Belief Statements by Principals and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ready to learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>156*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.81</td>
<td>49.21*</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduation rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>151*</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>47.63*</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subject competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>131*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>41.33*</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>34.06</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of minds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>156*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>49.21*</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. First in academics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>142*</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>44.80*</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literate adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>179*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.81</td>
<td>56.47*</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free of drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>140*</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.16*</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Key to success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>161*</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>50.79*</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>176*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>55.52*</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Blame the schools</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>101*</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>31.86*</td>
<td>23.34</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Redesigned curricula</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>190*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>59.94*</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>164*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>51.73*</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>190*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>59.94*</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>159*</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>50.16*</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Process of renewal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>144*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>21.77</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>45.43*</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goal commitment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>179*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>56.47*</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>173*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>54.58*</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>135*</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>42.58*</td>
<td>31.23</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Instruction improvement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>170*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>53.63*</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>118*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>37.22*</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Advocate standards</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>147*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>46.37*</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>163*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>20.82</td>
<td>51.42*</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>104*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>28.08</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>32.81*</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Professional incentive</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>113*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>35.65*</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>128*</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>40.36*</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>105*</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>33.13*</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>168*</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>53.00*</td>
<td>26.81</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>135*</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>42.58*</td>
<td>28.71</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>114*</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>35.96*</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision of excellence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>159*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>50.16*</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality of schooling</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>107*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>28.71</td>
<td>28.39</td>
<td>33.75*</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standards commitment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>168*</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>53.00*</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; N = Neutral/No Opinion; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree; M = Mean.

Reporting Analysis of the Hypotheses

The t-test for independent samples was used to test hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, and 11. A one-way analysis of variance was used to test hypotheses 6, 7, 8, and 10. This statistical analysis was completed using the SPSS-X computer package. The test was administered at the .05 level of significance.
Null Hypothesis 1

Null hypothesis 1 was stated as follows:

$$H_0:$$ There will be no significant difference in the beliefs of principals in city systems and those in county systems toward national standards and national goals.

The 108 county principals who responded and their mean scores are shown for all 32 items in Table 14. Likewise, the responses of the 38 city principals are shown. For this test, $$n = 146$$.

One statement (Statement 9—learning ability) out of 32 showed a significant difference and is indicated in Table 14. County principals rated learning ability significantly higher than city principals. The null hypothesis was retained with the exception of the previous statement.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to learn</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Competency</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of minds</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First in academics</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate adults</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free of drugs</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Key to success</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning ability</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Blame the schools</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Curricula change</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Process of renewal</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goals commitment</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Improve instruction</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Advocate standards</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teacher incentive</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>County</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision excellence</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality schooling</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standard commitment</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

Null Hypothesis 2

Null hypothesis 2 was stated as follows:

H₂: There will be no significant difference in the beliefs of teachers in city systems and those in county systems toward national standards and national goals.

The 121 county teachers who responded and their mean scores are shown for all 32 items in Table 15. Likewise, the responses of the 50 city teachers are shown. For this test, n = 171.

Statement 29 (meet standards) was the only statement out of 32 that showed a significant difference and is indicated in Table 15. City teachers rated meet the standards significantly higher than county teachers. The null hypothesis was retained for the remaining statements.
### Table 15

**Mean Belief Scores of County and City Teachers on National Standards and National Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ready to learn</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduation rate</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subject competency</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of minds</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. First in academics</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literate adults</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free of drugs</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Key to success</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning ability</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Blame the schools</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Curricula change</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Process of renewal</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goals commitment</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Improve instruction</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 15 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>County</th>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Advocate standards</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teacher incentive</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision excellence</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality schooling</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standard commitment</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05.

**Null Hypothesis 3**

Null hypothesis 3 was stated as follows:

\( H_0^3 \): There will be no significant difference between principals and teachers as a group in their beliefs toward national standards and national goals.

The 146 principals who responded and their mean scores are shown for all 32 items in Table 16. Likewise, the responses of the 171 teachers are shown. For this test,
n = 317. Statements 2 (graduation rate), 3 (demonstrating competency), 5 (first in academics), 9 (learning ability), 12 (appropriate goals), 13 (broad goals), 20 (teacher behavior), and 21 (advocate standards) were rated significantly higher by principals. Teachers rated Statement 18 (morale effect) and 28 (threat to control) significantly higher than principals. The null hypothesis was retained for the remaining statements.

Table 16
Mean Belief Scores of Principals and Teachers on National Standards and National Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ready to learn</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduation rate</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subject competency</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of minds</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. First in academics</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literate adults</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free of drugs</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Key to success</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning ability</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Blame the schools</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Curricula change</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Process of renewal</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goals commitment</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Improve instruction</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Advocate standards</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teacher incentive</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision excellence</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality schooling</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standard commitment</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
Null Hypothesis 4

Null hypothesis 4 was stated as follows:

$H_0^4$: There will be no significant difference in city principals' and teachers' beliefs and county principals' and teachers' beliefs toward national standards and national goals.

Table 17 shows no statements as being significantly different. The null hypothesis was retained for all statements.

Table 17

Mean Belief Scores of County Principals and Teachers and City Principals and Teachers on National Standards and National Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to learn</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject competency</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of minds</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First in academics</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate adults</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free of drugs</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key to success</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning ability</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame the schools</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricula change</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>County</th>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Process of renewal</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goals commitment</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Improve instruction</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Advocate standards</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teacher incentive</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision excellence</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality schooling</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standard commitment</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
Null Hypothesis 5

Null hypothesis 5 was stated as follows:

$H_0^5$: There will be no significant difference between male and female teachers and principals, in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

The $t$-test for independent means was administered to the means of males and females to determine sex differences in beliefs related to national goals and national standards. One statement (Statement 10: blame the schools) showed a significant difference in beliefs and is shown in Table 18. Males rated statement 10 (blame the schools) significantly higher than females. The null hypothesis was retained for the remaining statements.

Table 18

Mean Belief Scores of Teachers and Principals by Sex Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ready to learn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>- .52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduation rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subject competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of minds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. First in academics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literate adults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free of drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Key to success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning ability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Blame the schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Curricula change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Process of renewal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goals commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Improve instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Advocate standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teacher incentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision excellence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality schooling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standard commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** G = Groups (1 = Male) (2 = Female).

*p < .05.

**Null Hypothesis 6**

Null hypothesis 6 was stated as follows:

$H_{06}$: There will be no significant difference between degree levels of teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

One-way ANOVA tests for independent means were administered to the means of Group 1 (Bachelor's degree), Group 2 (Master's degree), and Group 3 (Educational Specialist and Doctorate degrees) to determine level of degree differences in their beliefs related to national standards and national goals. The Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure, a Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons Test was used. Table 19 indicates that Group 2 (Master's degree) rated statement 4 (use of minds) and statement 21 (advocated standards) significantly higher than Group 1 (Bachelor's degree) and Group 3 (Educational Specialist and Doctorate).
The null hypothesis was retained for the remaining statements.

Table 19

Mean Belief Scores of Teachers and Principals by Highest Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ready to learn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduation rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subject Competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of minds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. First in academics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literate adults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free of drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Key to success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning ability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Blame the schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Curricula change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Process of renewal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goals commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Improve instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Advocate standards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teacher incentive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teacher incentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision excellence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality schooling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standard commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  G = Groups: 1 = Bachelor's degree; 2 = Master's degree; 3 = Educational Specialist and Doctorate.

*p < .05.

Null Hypothesis 7

Null hypothesis 7 was stated as follows:

\( H_07: \) There will be no significant difference between high school, middle school and elementary principals and teachers in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

One-way ANOVA tests for independent means were administered to the means of Group 1 (elementary), Group 2 (middle), and Group 3 (secondary) to determine level of school differences in beliefs related to national goals and national standards. The Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure, a
Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons Test, was used. Statement 20 (teacher behavior) and 22 (paperwork increase) showed a significant difference between groups. Table 20 shows that Group 3 (secondary) rated statement 20 (teacher behavior) and 22 (paperwork increase) significantly higher than Group 1 (elementary) and Group 2 (middle school). The null hypothesis was retained for the remaining statements.

Table 20

Mean Belief Scores of Teachers and Principals by Level of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ready to learn</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduation rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subject Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of minds</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. First in academics</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literate adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free of drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Key to success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning ability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Blame the schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Curricula change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Process of renewal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goals commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Improve instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Advocate standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teacher incentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision excellence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality schooling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standard commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  G  = Groups; 1 = elementary; 2 = middle; 3 = secondary.
*p < .05.

Null Hypothesis 8

Null Hypothesis 8 was stated as follows:

Hₙ₈: There will be no significant difference between Career Ladder levels of teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

One-way ANOVA tests for independent means were administered to the means of Group 1 (Non-Career Ladder and Level I), Group 2 (Level II), and Group 3 (Level III) to determine level of Career Ladder differences in beliefs related to national goals and national standards. The Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure, a Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons Test was used. Table 21 indicates that Group 2 (Level II) principals and teachers rated statement 2 (graduation rate), statement 3 (competency demonstrated),
and statement 5 (first in academics) significantly higher than Group 1 (Non-Career Ladder and Level I) and Group 3 (Level III). The null hypothesis for the remaining statements was retained.

Table 21

Mean Belief Scores of Teachers and Principals by Career Ladder Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ready to learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduation rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>6.40*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subject Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.02*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of minds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. First in academics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>4.44*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literate adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free of drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Key to success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Blame the schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Curricula change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Process of renewal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goals commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Improve instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teacher incentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision excellence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality schooling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standard commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. G = Groups; 1 = Non-Career and Level I; 2 = Level II; 3 = Level III.

*p < .05.
Null Hypothesis 9

Null Hypothesis 9 was stated as follows:

\( H_0^9 \): There will be no significant difference between White and minority teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

The t-test for independent means was administered to the means of the White group and the minority group to determine ethnic differences in beliefs related to national goals and national standards. Statement 1 (ready to learn), Statement 4 (use of minds), Statement 14 (goals accomplished), Statement 15 (process of renewal), Statement 17 (education quality), Statement 19 (instructional improvement), Statement 20 (teacher diversity), Statement 25 (teacher esteem), Statement 26 (professional needs), Statement 27 (math standards), Statement 29 (meet standards), Statement 31 (quality of schooling), and Statement 32 (standards commitment) was rated significantly higher by the Minority group. The White group rated Statement 22 (paperwork increase) significantly higher as indicated in Table 22. The null hypothesis was retained for the remaining statements.
Table 22

Mean Belief Scores of Teachers and Principals by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ready to learn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-2.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduation rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subject Competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of minds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-2.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. First in academics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>- .37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literate adults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free of drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Key to success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning ability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Blame the schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Curricula change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-4.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goals commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-2.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Improve instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-2.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-2.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Advocate standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>- .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>2.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teacher incentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>- .87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-2.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-2.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-3.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-3.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null Hypothesis 10 was stated as follows:

$H_{0}^{10}$: There will be no significant difference between years of experience of teachers and principals regarding national standards and national goals.

One-way ANOVA tests for independent means were administered to the means of Group 1 (0-10 years experience), Group 2 (11-20 years experience), and Group 3 (21 years experience and above) to determine the level of experience difference in beliefs related to national goals and national standards. The Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure, a Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons Test, was used. No group showed a significant difference as indicated in Table 23.
### Table 23

**Mean Belief Scores of Teachers and Principals by Years of Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Ready to learn</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Graduation rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Subject Competency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Use of minds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. First in academics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Literate adults</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Free of drugs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Key to success</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Learning ability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Blame the schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Curricula change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Process of renewal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goals commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Improve instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Advocate standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teacher incentive</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality schooling</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standard commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  G = Groups; 1 = 1 – 10 years; 2 = 11 – 20 years; 3 = 21+ years.
*p < .05.
Null Hypothesis 11

Null Hypothesis 11 was stated as follows:

\[ H_{11} \]: There will be no significant difference between younger and older teachers and principals in their beliefs regarding national standards and national goals.

The \( t \)-test for independent means was administered to the means of younger and older teachers and principals to determine age differences in beliefs related to national goals and national standards. The significantly higher differences are shown in Table 24. Group 1 (principals and teachers below the age of 40) rated statements 4 (use of minds) and 31 (quality of schooling) significantly higher than Group 2 (principals and teachers above the age of 40). Group 2 rated statement 22 (paperwork increase) significantly higher than Group 1. The null hypothesis was retained for the remaining statements.

Table 24

Mean Belief Scores of Teachers and Principals by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ready to learn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduation rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subject Competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of minds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. First in academics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literate adults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free of drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Key to success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning ability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Blame the schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Curricula change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>- .63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriate goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Broad goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goals accomplished</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Process of renewal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goals commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>- .69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Morale effect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Improve instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Advocate standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Paperwork increase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-2.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pride promoted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teacher incentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher esteem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Professional needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Math standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Threat to control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>- .23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Meet standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vision excellence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>- .21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Quality schooling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Standard commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>- .11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. G = Groups; 1 = 20-39; 2 = 40+.  
*p < .05.
Summary

Chapter 4 described the characteristics of the respondents, tested seven null hypotheses through the use of the t-test for independent samples, and tested four null hypotheses by using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). These data gave evidence that there was agreement by principals and teachers on their commitment to national standards and national goals. Location of a school system, whether city or county, showed no significant difference. The demographic variables of sex, levels of degrees, classification of school, Career Ladder level, race, years of experience, and age showed no significance on the majority of the statements regarding national standards and national goals. All 11 null hypotheses were retained.
CHAPTER 5
Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary
No formal plan to determine how committed principals and teachers were to the concept of national goals and national standards was available in Tennessee at the time of this study. There were no current data available that described the status of national goals and national standards in Tennessee. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to obtain and analyze information about the beliefs of principals and teachers in Tennessee toward national goals and national standards. This study was designed to compare the beliefs of principals with those of teachers according to the city or county classification of each system.

The education population under study was limited to 232 public school principals and 268 public school teachers who held membership in the TEA in 1992-1993. All 500 randomly selected educators were sent a questionnaire. Of these, 63.4% returned the questionnaire. Data were organized and analyzed in county and city groupings. The t-test for independent groups was used to test seven hypotheses. Four hypotheses were tested using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare means on each item. Principal data, teacher data and personal data were reported to help the
reader determine the relationship between the respondents and their responses.

Questionnaires were received from 146 principals and 171 teachers. Responses from county principals totaled 108, and responses from city principals totaled 38. Likewise, responses from county teachers totaled 121, and responses from city teachers totaled 50. According to the data, there were few differences in the beliefs of public school principals and public school teachers in Tennessee concerning national goals and national standards. The beliefs of principals and teachers regarding national goals and national standards issues were not related to the location of the system. Although principals and teachers indicated their commitment level to be high, both groups expressed concern that the national goals and national standards would not be met by the year 2000.

Findings

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study, written in the declarative form, stated that there would be a significant difference in the beliefs of public school principals and teachers concerning national standards and national goals. All 11 null hypotheses were retained. Research question 1 was reported using hypotheses 1 and 4. Research question 2 was reported using hypotheses 2 and 4. Research question 3
was reported using hypotheses 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11. System size or location did not significantly affect the beliefs of principals or teachers. Responses to statements on the questionnaire indicated that principals and teachers "agreed" or "strongly agreed" to the following 12 statements.

Statement 8: The key to the success of the national goals program lies within the hands of the local community.

Statement 9: National goals will enforce the idea that all of our students can learn, and they can learn as well and as much as any student in the world.

Statement 11: National goals will cause school curricula to be redesigned.

Statement 12: The six national education goals are appropriate for school systems in Tennessee.

Statement 13: The six national goals are broad enough to encompass all of my system's goals.

Statement 16: My commitment level to the six national goals is high.

Statement 17: National standards will have a positive influence on the quality of public education in Tennessee.

Statement 19: National standards will enhance instructional improvement.

Statement 21: Most educators will advocate national standards.
Statement 22: National standards will entail more paperwork.

Statement 30: National standards will offer a vision of excellence and raise expectations of all children.

Statement 32: My commitment level to national standards is high.

**Hypothesis 1.** One statement on the questionnaire elicited a significant difference in belief between county and city principals. Statement 9 (learning ability) was rated significantly higher by county principals.

**Hypothesis 2.** One statement on the questionnaire elicited a significant difference in belief between county and city teachers. Statement 29 (meet standards) was rated significantly higher by city teachers.

**Hypothesis 3.** Ten statements on the questionnaire showed a significant difference in beliefs when principals and teachers were grouped disregarding type of system. Principals rated the following statements significantly higher: Statement 2 (graduation rate); Statement 3 (subject competency), Statement 5 (first in academics); Statement 9 (learning ability); Statement 12 (appropriate goals); Statement 13 (broad goals); Statement 20 (teacher behavior); and Statement 21 (advocate standards). Teachers
as a group rated Statement 18 (morale effect) and Statement 28 (threat to control) significantly higher.

**Hypothesis 4.** When teachers and principals were combined as to system, county vs. city, no statements showed a significant difference.

**Hypothesis 5.** One statement, Statement 10 (blame the schools), showed a significant difference in beliefs of principals and teachers regarding national standards and national goals when the variable sex was analyzed. Male teachers and principals rated Statement 10 significantly higher than female teachers and principals.

**Hypothesis 6.** The educational level of teachers and principals showed a significant difference on Statement 4 (use of minds) and on Statement 21 (advocate standards.) Those teachers and principals holding Master's degrees (Group 2) rated Statement 4 (use of minds) and Statement 21 (advocate standards) significantly higher than Group 1 and Group 3.

**Hypothesis 7.** The classification of school variable showed a significant difference in Statement 20 (teacher behavior) and 22 (paperwork increase) between the three groups. Group 3 (secondary) rated Statement 20 and Statement 22 significantly higher than Group 1 (elementary) and Group 2 (middle school).
Hypothesis 8. The variable Career Ladder level showed a significant difference in Statement 2 (graduation rate), Statement 3 (competency demonstrated), and Statement 5 (first in academics). Group 2 (Level II) principals and teachers rated Statement 2 (graduation rate), Statement 3 (competency demonstrated), and Statement 5 (first in academics) significantly higher than Group 1 (Non-Career Ladder and Level I) and Group 3 (Level III).

Hypothesis 9. The variable race showed 14 out of 32 belief statements to be significant. The Minority Group rated 13 statements as being significantly higher than the White group. These statements were: Statement 1 (ready to learn); Statement 4 (use of minds); Statement 14 (goals accomplished); Statement 15 (process of renewal); Statement 17 (education quality); Statement 19 (instructional improvement); Statement 20 (teacher diversity); Statement 25 (teacher esteem); Statement 26 (professional needs); Statement 27 (math standards); Statement 29 (meet standards); Statement 31 (quality of schooling); and Statement 32 (standards commitment). The White Group rated Statement 22 (paperwork increase) significantly higher than the minority group.

Hypothesis 10. Years of experience of teachers and principals regarding national standards and national goals showed no significant difference.
Hypothesis 11. The variable age showed a significant difference in Statement 4 (use of minds), Statement 22 (paperwork increase), and Statement 31 (quality schooling). Those teachers and principals under the age of 40 (Group 1) rated statement 4 (use of minds) and 31 (quality schooling) significantly higher than Group 2. Those teachers and principals over the age of 40 (Group 2) rated statement 22 (paperwork increase) significantly higher than Group 1.

Demographic Data of Public School Principals

1. The 146 respondents included 35 females and 111 males.

2. One hundred nineteen respondents were White, 24 were Black, 1 was Asian, 1 was Latino, and 1 was "other."

3. Sixty-nine respondents were elementary principals, 36 were middle school principals, and 41 were secondary principals.

4. One principal had spent 1-10 years in education, 41 had spent 11-20 years in education, 79 had spent 21-30 years in education, and 25 had spent over 30 years in education.

5. One respondent had a Bachelor's degree, 103 had a Master's degree, 31 had an Educational Specialist degree, and 8 had a Doctorate degree.

6. Sixty-nine respondents were Level I on the Career Ladder System, 15 were Level II, 57 were Level III, and 5 were non-Career Ladder.
7. Seventeen principals were from 30-39 years of age, 65 were 40-49 years of age, 54 were 50-59 years of age and 10 were over 60 years of age.

8. The 146 respondents included 108 county principals and 38 city principals.

9. Fifty-five of the respondents were from schools with 1-500 students, 58 were from schools with 501-900 students, and 33 were from schools with 901+ students.

10. Principals accounted for 146 of the total 317 returns.

Demographic Data of Public School Teachers

1. Teachers accounted for 171 of the total 317 returns.

2. Forty-seven respondents were male and 124 were female.

3. One respondent was Native American, 150 were White, 19 were Black and 1 was "other."

4. Ninety-three were elementary teachers, 30 were middle school teachers, and 48 were secondary teachers.

5. Fifty teachers had spent 1-10 years in education, 62 had spent 11-20 years in education, 46 had spent 21-30 years in education, and 13 had spent 30+ years in education.

6. Sixty-eight teachers had a Bachelor's degree, 89 had Master's degrees, 11 had Educational Specialist degrees, and 4 had a Doctorate.
7. One hundred twenty-three teachers had Career Ladder Level I status, 14 had Level II status, 19 had Level III status, and 15 had non-Career Ladder status.

8. Sixteen teachers were from 20-29 years of age, 35 were 30-39 years of age, 78 were 40-49 years of age, 41 were 50-59 of age, and 1 was 60+ years of age.

9. One hundred twenty-one teachers represented county systems and 50 represented city systems.

10. Sixty-eight teachers were from schools with student populations of 1-500, 58 were from schools with student populations of 501-900, and 45 were from schools with student populations of 900+.

Conclusions

Based upon the results of this study of the beliefs of Tennessee principals and teachers toward national goals and national standards, the following conclusions were made. Principals and teachers believe:

1. The key to the success of the national standards/national goals program lies within the hands of the local community.

2. National goals will enforce the idea that Tennessee students can learn as well and as much as any student in the world.

3. National goals would cause school curricula to be redesigned.
4. The school system's goals must be in line with national goals.

5. Educators have a high level of commitment to national goals and national standards.

6. National standards would have a positive influence on the quality of public education.

7. National standards would enhance instructional improvement.

8. National standards would not decrease paperwork for educators.

9. National standards would offer a vision of excellence and raise the expectations of all children.

10. By the year 2000, schools would not be free of drugs and violence and offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

Recommendations

Based upon the results of this study of the beliefs of Tennessee principals and teachers in relation to national standards and national goals, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Input should be solicited from teachers and principals when formulating national goals and standards.

2. All goals should be stated to promote a believable situation.

3. National standards should be piloted before placing in the hands of grass roots level teachers and principals.
4. Extensive staff development in national goals and national standards should be in effect in every school system in Tennessee.

5. Social programs should be in place to alleviate the ills of the school's environment before national goals and national standards are promoted.

6. Before any program is institutionalized, the commitment level of the participants should be determined.

7. Another study should be conducted as the year 2000 approaches to determine what, if any, beliefs have changed.
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APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER
Dear Colleague,

I am currently involved in the research and writing of my dissertation for a doctorate in education administration at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, Tennessee. The topic I have chosen addresses the level of belief held by Tennessee educators concerning the six National Goals for Education to be achieved by the year 2000 and the national standards being developed by various groups across the United States.

Since I have over 28 years teaching experience, I know you face an overwhelming daily work load. I would, however, greatly appreciate it if you could find the time to complete and return the instrument within ten days. It should take less than 15 minutes to complete the demographic sheet and the Likert Scaled questionnaire. Please return the entire instrument in the postage paid preaddressed envelope. All responses will be kept for a period of 10 years in my office at Hampton High School.

I must have a large return in order to generalize my findings to all educators in Tennessee. This is an opportunity for you to provide input regarding national standards and national goals, so please participate by returning the questionnaire promptly. Your responses will, of course, remain anonymous. If you have questions please call either me at 615-725-5201 or Dr. Anthony Delucia, Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, East Tennessee State University, 615-929-6134.

Thank you in advance for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Shirley R. Ellis

Enclosure

I ACKNOWLEDGE MY PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT AS VOLUNTARY.
APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Please respond to statements 1-10 by placing the appropriate number on the blank:

1. My sex is:
   _____ (1) male   _____ (2) female

2. My ethnic group is:
   _____ (1) Asian, Asian American
   _____ (2) Black
   _____ (3) Latino, Hispanic, Mexican American
   _____ (4) Native American, American Indian
   _____ (5) White, Caucasian
   _____ (6) Other (Please specify ______________________)

3. My school assignment is:
   _____ (1) Elementary
   _____ (2) Middle
   _____ (3) Secondary

4. My job title is:
   _____ (1) principal
   _____ (2) teacher

5. My school is located in a:
   _____ (1) county system
   _____ (2) city system

6. My total number of year(s) in education is/are?
   _____ year(s)
7. My highest educational level is:
   ___ (1) Bachelors
   ___ (2) Masters
   ___ (3) Educational Specialist
   ___ (4) Doctorate

8. My Career Ladder status is:
   ___ (1) Level I
   ___ (2) Level II
   ___ (3) Level III
   ___ (4) Non Career Ladder

9. My age at my last birthday was:
   ___ years

10. The student population of my school is approximately:
    ___ (1) 1-500
    ___ (2) 501-900
    ___ (3) 901+
PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT CAREFULLY. NUMBERS 1-7 ARE THE NATIONAL GOALS. CIRCLE APPROPRIATELY YOUR LEVEL OF BELIEF PERTAINING TO EACH STATEMENT. PLEASE RESPOND TO ITEMS 1-32 BASED ON THE FOLLOWING 5-POINT SCALE:

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Neutral/No Opinion  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree

NATIONAL GOALS

1. By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn.  
   1 2 3 4 5

2. By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90%.  
   1 2 3 4 5

3. By the year 2000, American students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history and geography.  
   1 2 3 4 5

4. Every school in America will ensure that all students will learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in the modern economy.  
   1 2 3 4 5

5. By the year 2000, United States students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.  
   1 2 3 4 5

6. By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.  
   1 2 3 4 5

7. By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.  
   1 2 3 4 5
8. The key to the success of the national goals program lies within the hands of the local community. 1 2 3 4 5

9. National goals will enforce the idea that all of our students can learn, and they can learn as well and as much as any students in the world. 1 2 3 4 5

10. National goals will provide another opportunity to blame the schools for not living up to expectations. 1 2 3 4 5

11. National goals will cause school curricula to be redesigned. 1 2 3 4 5

12. The six National Education Goals are appropriate for school systems in Tennessee. 1 2 3 4 5

13. The six National Goals are broad enough to encompass all of my system's goals. 1 2 3 4 5

14. The six national goals will be accomplished by the year 2000. 1 2 3 4 5

15. The six national goals will aid in causing my community to constantly be in the process of renewal. 1 2 3 4 5

16. My commitment level to the six national goals is high. 1 2 3 4 5

NATIONAL STANDARDS

17. National standards will have a positive influence on the quality of public education in Tennessee. 1 2 3 4 5

18. National standards will have a negative effect on the morale of teachers in my building. 1 2 3 4 5

19. National standards will enhance instructional improvement. 1 2 3 4 5
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral/No Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. National standards will encourage diversity in teacher behavior. 1 2 3 4 5

21. Most educators will advocate national standards. 1 2 3 4 5

22. National standards will entail more paperwork. 1 2 3 4 5

23. National standards will promote pride in the teaching profession. 1 2 3 4 5

24. National standards will be strong incentives for teachers to become better professionals. 1 2 3 4 5

25. National standards will cause the public to hold teachers in high esteem. 1 2 3 4 5

26. National standards will be most beneficial by identifying my professional needs. 1 2 3 4 5

27. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) math standards were avidly accepted by educators in my school district. 1 2 3 4 5

28. National standards will be a threat to local control of schools. 1 2 3 4 5

29. My school district will be ready to meet the standards by 2000. 1 2 3 4 5

30. National standards will offer a vision of excellence and raise expectations of all children. 1 2 3 4 5

31. National standards will generate the quality of schooling that students deserve. 1 2 3 4 5

32. My commitment level to national standards is high. 1 2 3 4 5
APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENT ASSESSMENT
ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Please respond to the following items relative to the clarity and format of the sample questionnaire instrument. Your comments are welcomed and encouraged.

1. Are there any statements which should be reworded? Please list number(s). ____________________________

2. Are there any statements which should be eliminated? Please list number(s). __________________________

3. Are the directions for completion adequate? Please suggest additional directions. ______________________

4. Is the format of statements adequate? If not, give an example. ______________________________________

5. Is the wording of statements clear? If not, please give an example. _________________________________

6. Is the scoring scale adequate to differentiate your beliefs? If not, give your suggestion. ______________

7. Is the time required for completion too long? If so, what is your suggestion for required time of completion? ________________________________
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