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Teacher Expectations, Their Articulation and Communication:

A comparison of children's classroom experience in relation to the perceptions of their teachers.

ABSTRACT

This study attempts to illustrate the potency of the self-fulfilling prophecy effect by comparing teachers' perceptions with the incidence of certain highly significant aspects of their day-to-day interactions with their pupils. For this purpose a class of twenty-four twelve year old children and their teachers were continuously observed during every lesson attended for a period of five weeks. Certain necessary conditions for the successful communication of teacher expectations were identified, and a clear qualitative difference in teacher-pupil contacts demonstrated between those pupils most favourably perceived and those least favourably perceived.

The teachers' personal constructs, obtained using a triadic elicitation technique, formed the basis of three independent pupil-rating exercises based upon: (i) the teachers' individual construct systems, (ii) a common set of the ten most commonly occurring constructs, and (iii) pupil self-rating using the same criteria as in (ii).

Analysis of the teachers' ratings revealed an incomplete, though statistically significant degree of concordance between individual teachers' ratings. It is suggested that while the combined expectations of the whole teacher group may have a greater effect than those of any individual, the amount of disagreement may serve to reduce their effectiveness.

Comparison of the teachers' ratings in the first two rating exercises revealed a high degree of similarity, suggesting that the relative frequency of occurrence of individual teachers' personal constructs constitutes a firm and valid basis for the selection of constructs in supplied lists, particularly if they are to be used by those same teachers.

Significant correlations between teacher ratings, the pupils' self-ratings and their scores on Self-Esteem and Academic Self-Image scales indicate a significant and positive relationship between teacher perceptions on the one hand and the children's views of themselves on the other. However, the imperfect nature of that relationship indicates that the transmission of teachers' expectations to the children is in many instances only partially successful.

Cluster analysis of the teachers' ratings revealed those constructs which each teacher perceived as being most alike, while examination of the most commonly occurring construct pairings indicated that, on a day-to-day basis, the teachers' made judgements according to three general groups of criteria: (i) "Maturity and attitude to school work", (ii) "Personality factors" and (iii) "Academic ability".
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I. Introduction

This is a study about teachers' expectations and their effect upon the performance of their pupils. In the light of research evidence concerning the necessary conditions under which educational self-fulfilling prophecies operate, ethnographic evidence and normative and systematic data are compared in an attempt to illustrate the potency of the self-fulfilling prophecy effect in the day-to-day life of pupils and their teachers.

The investigation can be viewed in two distinct parts:

(i) A series of pilot investigations involving the intermittent observation of five teachers with six small groups of children in a variety of secondary schools for one or two double periods per week for five or six weeks each. Spanning the period 1976-81 this series of individual observational studies served the important function of the testing and investigation of methods of recording information and clarifying what would become the focus of the subsequent main observation study.

(ii) The main observation study involving the continuous pursuit of one group of 24 second year pupils and 12 of their teachers in a Leicestershire high school, through every lesson attended, for five consecutive weeks during the spring term of 1982.

In every case a sample of the teachers' individual perceptions of their pupils was obtained through a triadic elicitation technique thus facilitating a comparison of the teachers' views about their individual pupils with their observed behaviour towards them. In particular, the continuous pursuit of one tutor group for an extended period of time
enabled the investigation of the degree of cumulative effect of the combined perceptions of the whole set of teachers with whom the children came into contact.

The major questions raised by this investigation are:

1) From available research evidence, what are the necessary conditions under which educational self-fulfilling prophecies are a potent force in the classroom?

2) To what extent is there a qualitative difference in classroom experience between those children who are very favourably perceived and those who are less favourably perceived by their teachers, and to what extent are the necessary conditions for successful transmission present?

3) To what extent can it be demonstrated that there is a relationship between the teachers' perceptions and their pupils' self-image?

4) Is the degree of similarity between the teachers' perceptions of the children sufficiently significant to support the view that they may have a cumulative effect upon the children's self-images?

5) Which are the most common and highly valued personal constructs used by the teachers in making day-to-day judgements about the children? Is it feasible to use these as the basis of an 'average' set of 'provided' rating criteria to facilitate comparative analysis?

6) To what extent is it possible to subsume the teachers' most commonly occurring personal constructs under a smaller number of general headings more accurately representing the day-to-day judgement criteria employed by the teachers?
II. Choice of Observation Technique

The formation of educational self-fulfilling prophecies relies very much upon the view that teachers rapidly form unique and personal views or perceptions of individual children, which determine the ways in which those children are treated in school. If the teacher's behaviour is consistent over time, children are more likely to conform to the teacher's expectations of them which, in turn, only serves to reinforce the teacher's view. If similar expectations are consistently communicated by all or most of the teachers with whom a child comes into contact, this cumulative effect could be expected to be more potent than that of any one individual teacher.

Many experiments have been conducted to investigate the outcome of manipulating teachers' perceptions, in an attempt to establish the self-fulfilling prophecy effect as a potent, and hitherto underestimated, influence in our schools. (See Chapter 3.)

This study is an attempt to illustrate an aspect of the process whereby such expectations are communicated, and under what conditions they are effective. The most appropriate method of observation in this case is participant observation since the process to be observed is one which occurs over an extended period of time and is very much dependent upon an understanding of the subjective perceptions of the pupils and teachers involved.

III Participant Observation - its theoretical rationale

The methodology of ethnographic techniques employing participant observation arises from a small, though methodologically well grounded, school of sociological enquiry. (Ball, 1981).
Its origins can be traced through the Manchester school of Hargreaves (1967) and Lacey (1970), and the influence of Gluckman and Frankenberg to the Chicago school and the work of Robert Park, and ultimately to Weber's Verstehen sociology. In Britain, a study by Sharp and Green (1976) of a single primary school, Nash's (1973) study of the influence of teachers' expectations upon the performance of pupils in the classroom, and Keddie's (1971) study of a comprehensive school humanities department, together with Ball's own study of a comprehensive school, all form the basis of a growing interest in investigations of this kind.

The rationale underlying the methodology of ethnographic techniques is based upon two sets of hypotheses about human behaviour, Wilson (1977):

(i) The naturalistic-ecological hypothesis.
(ii) The qualitative-phenomenological hypothesis.

The Naturalistic-ecological hypothesis

"Human behaviour is significantly influenced by the settings in which it occurs. It is therefore believed that it is essential to study psychological events in natural settings. If one hopes to generalise research findings to the everyday world where most human events occur, then the research must be conducted in settings similar to those the researcher hopes to generalise about."

The Qualitative-Phenomenological hypothesis

"The social scientist cannot understand human behaviour without understanding the framework within which the subjects interpret their thoughts, feelings and actions."

This view leads researchers to abandon traditional deductive processes such as a-priori hypothesis formation and to adopt an initial atheoretical
approach in the sense that theory arises out of observation, being constantly refined in the light of further illuminative experience. Glaser and Strauss (1967) describe this 'grounded theory' approach as "allowing substantive concepts and hypotheses to emerge first, on their own, enabling the analyst to ascertain which, if any, existing formal theory may help him generate his substantive theories. He can then be more objective and less theoretically biased." (p.34)

The inherent problems of 'tuning-in' to the everyday meanings of classroom life have been met in an interesting way. Woods (1977) describes the "participant observer par-excellence" as a teacher who has moved into higher education from the classroom, returning there to research in an area with which he is familiar:

"Thus in witnessing again similar events and occurrences, and listening to similar accounts to those he was previously a full party to, he can both enrich the present scene with his own past experiences, and bring new light to bear on it from his discipline."

However, such familiarity could easily have a de-sensitising effect upon the observer, Robinson (1974), Becker (1971). To counteract this effect the observer must, from time to time, stand back from the situation in which he has become absorbed, and adopt a stance of 'anthropological strangeness', Garfinkel and Sachs (1970), Wilson (1977). This strategy provides that "interpretation be conducted whilst holding a position of official neutrality towards the belief that the objects of the world are as they appear."

The observer engaged in the present study had a number of years experience as a teacher in both primary and secondary schools as both remedial teacher and normal class teacher. Consequently, the small group
and whole class teaching observed throughout the course of the study presented situations with which he was very familiar. In this way the chances of the observer sharing the realities of the teachers and their groups, and understanding them in their own terms were potentially greater than in the more common participant observation study.

IV. A critical view of participant observation

Like all branches of social investigation participant observation is not without its critics. McNamara (1980) challenges the validity of participant observation data and subsequent explanatory claims when he says that many participant observers:

"... by their own evidence ... fail significantly to understand and appreciate the realities of classroom life as seen from the point of view of the practitioner."

The basis of this claim being that participant observers do not make available for scrutiny all of their classroom experience, but select only those parts which suit their purposes, and that while they subject the views and actions of those being observed to scrutiny they treat their own assumptions as beyond question, and not in need of explanation. While this claim may be partially true in the case of many branches of sociological enquiry, it is argued, Hammersley (1981), that this is a tendency found rather less among ethnographers than among other kinds of sociologists. Furthermore, even if on occasions ethnographic data do not fully support the observer's explanatory claims it is not sufficient to argue that a competing explanation is more likely to be correct; it is only comparatively, against alternative interpretations that validity can be judged. McNamara's view is that the ethnographer's work is of no theoretical and practical value to the teaching profession and that in any event teachers
already know all about the phenomena ethnographers seek to describe. Hammersley (1981), dismisses this argument as unconvincing since it implies a privileged epistemological position to a particular type of person or group:

"Both the outsider and the insider ... have their insights and their blind spots. The key feature of participant observation is an attempt to be both insider and outsider, to understand participant perspectives and yet at the same time to maintain enough distance to subject them to scrutiny and to locate them in a wider or comparative social context." (p.169)

In the present study all reasonable efforts have been made to meet the above mentioned criticisms. The basic hypotheses which underpin participant observation techniques have been previously discussed, and those more specifically relating to the operation of educational self-fulfilling prophecies are fully discussed in Chapter 2. The possibility of presenting a "patronising and naive view" of classrooms is particularly unlikely following the extensive first-hand classroom experience of the observer. Furthermore particular attention has been given to the need for the use of a triangulated research design, facilitating the constant comparison of many 'slices' of data taken from a variety of viewpoints. At every stage data were taken back to those under observation for comments and suggestions, a practice which constantly confirmed both the validity of the observer's interpretations and the high degree of value attached to the exercise by the teachers being observed.

V. Criteria for selection of qualitative data

A lesson learned very early in the pilot fieldwork was that, even with the sophisticated help of a radio-microphone and tape recorder, it was
impossible, indeed unrealistic, to try to record on paper every aspect of every event which occurred in the classroom. And while, initially observations were made of a very general nature, certain categories of behaviour were soon identified which appeared to bear particular relation to the process of transmission of teachers' expectations of their pupils. Consequently a distinction was made between three types of meanings and expectations. Blease (1978):

**Type 1. Public, whole group meanings and expectations**

Those which apply generally between teachers and pupils in schools, being non-specific, and relating to what is generally expected of all children and all teachers in a given situation.

**Type 2. Public, one-to-one meanings and expectations**

Those which are specific to one particular class or group. They include class jokes and relationships being shared by the whole group.

**Type 3. Private, one-to-one meanings and expectations**

Those which are very specific to one particular teacher and one particular child, relating to the teacher's own personal view of, and relationship with, that child. Such relationships exist between each individual child and the teacher, although its meaning may, or may not, be available to the rest of the group.

Clearly, type 3 meanings and expectations are the most significant for the purpose of this study, since it is when expressing these that the teacher can most effectively influence the self-images of individual children. However, type 2 is also significant since type 3 is almost always articulated within the wider context of type 2.
During the pilot studies and subsequently the main observation study period of this investigation the scope of observation was therefore narrowed down to concentrate on types 2 and 3, recording those incidents, during the course of a lesson, when the teacher addressed an individual or group in such a way that they received information about themselves rather than about the work they were doing. It was soon noted that this most often occurred at times when something had gone wrong, or normal communication had broken down, a time when the teacher's views were made most clearly available to both children and observer.

Garfinkel (1967) and Stubbs (1976) note that incidents of "miscommunication", points when communication breaks down, lead to insights about routine structures of behaviour. Such incidents could be discussed with the teacher at the end of the lesson for further clarification. Furthermore, it was soon realised that such incidents tended to occur relatively infrequently, allowing time between incidents for further note-writing and explanation in the field-notes, and also making an extended period of observation essential.

VI. The effect of an observer in the classroom

Concern over the possible effect of an observer on the behaviour of those being observed might be expected to cast doubt upon the validity of initial observations made before both teachers and pupils become accustomed to the observer's presence. However, it is commonly assumed by researchers that, while the effect upon teacher behaviour merits some careful consideration, modifications of pupil behaviour are only short-lived and can, in the main, be ignored. Heyns and Zander (1953) argue that the most realistic approach is to keep an observer in the observational setting for long enough to be perceived as a "piece of the furniture". But how long is long enough?
Ryans (1960) notes that it would be useful to control observer effects but is unable to suggest how, whereas Medley and Mitzel (1962) have assumed that the observer's presence does not significantly influence the behaviour of those being observed. In a comparison with early units of observation with later units, Masling and Stern (1969) were unable to show any consistent pattern over time.

Investigators who assume 'no effect' cannot reasonably claim that they are measuring what a teacher normally says in class - only what a teacher says when an observer is present. Samph's (1976) investigation of observer effects indicated that teachers' verbal classroom behaviour was more like their perceived ideal when an observer was present.

One factor which deserves careful consideration is the need for observers to attain a degree of credibility in the eyes of those being observed. Hargreaves (1967) notes that a lack of adequate explanation by the head to his staff created a certain degree of misunderstanding and suspicion, something which he managed to dispel, in part, by taking on a certain amount of teaching within the school, and involving himself in various informal discussions of educational issues. The idea of doing some teaching in the school as well as observing seems to be a fairly common way to try to allay fears or suspicion on the part of the school staff - an attempt to attain a degree of credibility in the eyes of the teachers being observed, without whose co-operation the whole exercise would become impossible. Similar strategies were adopted by Ball (1981), Lacy (1970), and Nash (1973) but in no case is the resultant effect upon the pupils under observation given serious consideration. Clearly there is much to be gained by convincing the teachers that the observer has some teaching experience and is therefore likely to see things from their point of view, but no one seriously considers the effects upon the pupils of having what
amounts to another teacher sitting passively at the back of the room, day in, day out for weeks on end.

In a comprehensive discussion of the problems of participant observation, Hargreaves (1967, Appendix I), notes that different teachers adopted various strategies of their own in order that they could cope with being observed. These strategies seemed to range from setting the class some work and then engaging the observer in conversation, to reading to the class or organising some other activity whereby the pupils were compelled to adopt a completely passive role. Even those teachers who appeared to act naturally when observed felt that their behaviour was influenced to a certain extent, as was indicated by their comments, and those of some of their pupils.

However, in common with other writers, Hargreaves assumes that after an initial change in the pupils' behaviour they became accustomed to him and behaved normally, the difference between teacher and pupil behaviour being attributed to his relative lack of observability by the pupils compared to that of the teachers who faced him from the front of the class. This is all very well if the lessons to be observed are organised along strictly formal lines.

As a part of the present investigation all twelve teachers observed were asked how much they felt the observer's presence affected both their behaviour, and that of the children. The replies were far from conclusive but included a wide range of responses which, to a certain extent revealed a degree of subject specificity. Mrs Jones, a science teacher, replied:

"No, not really, I suppose if I'd had time to think about it then I might have. But quite honestly the amount of practical work in most of the lessons is so great you haven't really got
time to think about it. If I was just standing in front of the class and doing a lesson that way then probably yes I might have."

The high level of practical work and freedom to move about the laboratory created a very different situation to the formal teaching described by Hargreaves. Mrs Jones felt that this accounted for a very small reaction on the part of the pupils also, despite the higher degree of observability of the observer.

Similarly in music, a very free and easy practical lesson with much individual music-making and virtually no formal teaching, the observer effect was felt by the teacher, Mr Davies, to be negligible. In lessons that were more formally taught the reported observer effects were greater. Mrs Lindsay, a French teacher, felt that it was probably true that, while being observed, she behaved in a way closer to her view of the ideal teacher:

"... take this lad over here for instance, I think I probably would have treated him a lot more sharply than I did. I also think I would have been a lot less tolerant. I think I also probably went round a bit more than I might have done."

Mrs Cartwright, another French teacher, admitted that she had actually suppressed certain behaviour which she perceived to have resulted from the observer's presence:

"I was very conscious that for two or three lessons they really were bubbly and uppity. And I'm afraid I tried to quash it down without letting rip thinking he'll not be wanting to listen to that on the tape."
Mr Peters, a mathematics teacher, claimed that he was never able to fully relax, and that certain children were affected much more than others. His own performance was quite considerably modified whilst being observed:

"I was in some respects perhaps more patient, more tolerant almost, whilst under observation. And to a certain extent I found it a little bit restrictive really. Perhaps I oughtn't have been quite so kind to some!"

One teacher, in particular, experienced tremendous problems as a result of being observed. The result being, that on one occasion, she confessed to the feeling that she was losing control of the class altogether:

"... a feeling I haven't experienced for fifteen years."

"Yes I probably talked to the children quite a bit, I maybe talked to them more than in normal lessons really."

In this instance the children knew the teacher particularly well as she had been their first-year tutor. This familiarity, coupled with her apparent change in teaching style could well have contributed to their behaviour being particularly atypical throughout the five week observation period. Evidence from sources other than the teachers actually observed indicate the general feelings throughout the school and give some hint of how other teachers perceive the behaviour of the pupils on moving around the school from lesson to lesson.

"You're ruining that class!" was one particularly bitter comment directed at me following a rowdy incident in one of the school corridors.

Evidence from the children clearly supports the view that both teachers and pupils are all affected, but to varying degrees.
"When you've gone the teachers will start being nice to us again."

or, more humorously,

"When you've gone the teachers will start torturing us again."

Many children noted that they had found it difficult to forget that I was sitting at the back of the room, and although they acknowledged a diminishing effect over time, they never felt free of it. Some children, it was claimed, "played to the gallery" more than others, something which was plainly evident from the observers point of view also. However, apart from the more obvious effects like bad behaviour, inability to concentrate and the need to constantly check what the observer was doing, it was clear that the observer as a personality, rather than as an object was having a profound effect upon the children. Despite all attempts to avoid all interactions with the children in the classroom, one would inevitably be approached outside the classroom. Although the children were initially urged to ignore me, many attempts were made during lesson time to draw me into conversation - attempting to test me out in a similar way that children test out new teachers to see if they really mean what they say. Although, by and large, attempts to remain detached in this way appeared to be successful, it eventually became evident that, in some way my personality was having a profound effect on the children. Up to a point one might claim that this indicated acceptance as 'part of the furniture', but at the same time it led to events which would never have occurred had I not been there.

For example, one group of girls confessed to a teacher that they liked talking to me, "He's so easy to talk to!" As a result one of them planned
to send me a Valentine card but was regrettably absent from school on the appropriate day. Another child confided in a teacher to say that, "if they are all like that at his University, I'd like to go there when I'm old enough." Two boys, in collusion with the drama teacher, Mr Lomas, staged a mock fight in one lesson in order to test my reactions, which were, as one might expect, to write copious notes on the incident, only to be the subject of much 'leg-pulling' when the deception was made public. On the final day of observation a small deputation of girls approached me with a small package tied with ribbon. It contained two polo mints and a collection of pens and pencils in case my own pen ran out (which it frequently had) together with a poem. They had often been reminded by their teachers to treat me as if I were "a fly on the wall, just pretend he isn't there." The poem read:

"Goodbye
Dear Mr Flyee
Goodbye
For now
Mr Fly."

Taken in isolation many of these events could be viewed as of little significance but for the fact that it was clearly asserted by a teacher who knew the class well that their reactions to me were more a result of my particular personality, and that she felt certain that they did not react in this way to other visitors. This being the case, it reveals a factor hitherto unexplored in the field of participant observation. Namely that observer effects on children may be more profound than most researchers have assumed, and to complicate the issue further, those observer effects may vary according to who is doing the observing. This poses the unanswerable question that, if somebody else had been observing instead of me, to what extent would the behaviour to be
observed have been different?

Clearly, no fully satisfactory conclusion can be reached from the above evidence. What is certain is that an observer's presence will at least have some effect, and in the absence of any conclusive evidence to the contrary, it seems reasonable to assume that this may diminish, though not disappear, over time. The only real alternative, save the use of expensive hidden cameras, is not to observe at all. But then some carefully interpreted data obtained with an observer in the classroom is preferable to having no data at all.

It is customary, in participant observation studies, for early observations to be discounted in an attempt to allow for participants to become accustomed to the observer's presence. As the more obvious observer effects are allowed to diminish the observer is able to become more fully acquainted with names, procedures and relationships which exist in the observational setting. In the present study it was in this sense, particularly, that the observer was a participant since in every other respect, during lessons, every effort was made to remain uninvolved. Discussion with the children was carefully avoided in order to minimise disturbance, although it is recognised that possibly the only way to fully determine what events were most significant to all parties was to interview the children at regular intervals. The amount of disruption of both pupil and teacher activities that this course of action would have created was, in balance, considered to be unacceptable.

Unlike participant observation studies which attempt to portray the reality of classroom life as it normally is, the present study has a somewhat sharper focus; its prime interest being individual teachers' personal and previously formed perceptions of the children in the class. For all
practical purposes it has been assumed that, even though these teachers' perceptions are subject to revision in the light of consistent contrary evidence, their formation pre-dates the period of observation. Furthermore, since particular care was taken to avoid the passing of judgements which might influence the teachers' views of the children, these perceptions were unlikely to be subject to significant change over the relatively short five week observation period. This being the case unexpected incidents, which may or may not be attributable to observer effects, but which create situations whereby teachers' perceptions are made more readily available for recording and analysis warrant inclusion as valid data, whereas in a more general participant observation study they would not. For this reason, incidents which occurred in the early days of observation have been included when, in the light of subsequently observed incidents, they have proved to be consistent with the particular attitudes held by the teachers concerned.

The question of when to stop observing in studies of this kind depends largely upon the observer's judgement, a skill which can only be developed by experience in the field. Glaser and Strauss (1967) comment that:

"Learning this skill takes time, analysis and flexibility, since making the theoretically sensitive judgement about saturation of categories is never precise."

Experience of the pilot observations during the period 1976-1981 indicated that as the observer became more and more accustomed to the ways of those being observed it became increasingly possible to predict the outcome of a wider range of incidents, and increasingly unnecessary to constantly verify the meaning of incidents by discussion with the participants. Although the five week duration of the main study was largely
determined by the need to negotiate a period acceptable to both the school and the Leicestershire Education Authority, the original suggestion arose from the experiences of the pilot studies. It was clear, through constant referral of interpretations and observations to the teachers concerned, that a high degree of acceptance of the observer, by the teachers as "one of the team", was achieved long before the five week period was concluded.

VII Eliciting the teachers' personal constructs

The teachers' individual perceptions or personal constructs concerning the children in the class were obtained using a modified form of George Kelly's repertory-grid technique. Kelly (1955) proposes a view of man actively engaged in making sense of and extending his experience of the world. The dimensions that man uses to conceptualise aspects of his day-to-day world Kelly called Personal Constructs. Furthermore, the theory assumes that, in making sense of the significant events in their lives, people employ their own individual personal constructs in the form of bi-polar criteria against which judgements are made. For Kelly, one gains little understanding of a person by placing him in a category. The important task is to understand the personal construct system of the specific individual. Thus one does not bring to the assessment setting an a priori set of categories. The assessment task must be content-free, in the sense that the researcher must try to subsume the subject's personal construct system, to find out how the subject sees the world. The repertory-grid technique elicits from each subject a representative sample of the personal constructs which he customarily employs to interpret and predict the behaviour of important persons in his life. Normally the subject nominates a list of his personal acquaintances and then assembles them into distinctive categories separately on the basis of each of a set of bi-polar dimensions of judgement (e.g. friendly - aloof) which he himself provides.
The modification of this technique for use with teachers, Nash (1973) requires the names of pupils in the group under study to be used instead of a list of personal acquaintances. The constructs thus elicited are more specifically a representative sample of those used by the teacher in forming judgements about children in school. The importance of the context in which the elements (in this case the children's names) are to be construed is raised by Yorke (1978) in that failure to specify this at the outset may well allow the respondent to switch contexts during the elicitation procedure. Hargreaves (1977) criticises Nash (1973) on this very point on the grounds that teachers may see their pupils as very different individuals on moving between classroom and playground. In an attempt to minimise this possibility in the present study teachers were interviewed in the room where they normally taught the children under observation, wherever this was possible, and were clearly instructed to describe the children using any criteria they chose but strictly in relation to the children's performance and behaviour in class.

Each teacher was presented with cards, in groups of three, each bearing the name and photograph of a pupil from the group under observation. On each occasion the teacher was asked, "In what way are two of these pupils the same and one different?" In this way, by going through all of the pupils in the group, ensuring that each child's name appeared on several occasions, one or both ends of each teacher's set of bi-polar constructs was noted. Where both ends were not evident on any one occasion the pairs could often be completed by taking elements which arose when discussing subsequent groups of three pupils. All twelve triadic elicitation interviews were tape recorded and subsequently transcribed as a source of specific comments made by each teacher about individual children. Each interview lasted for approximately one hour, being terminated once the
teacher was seen to be regularly repeating earlier comments to the extent that nothing new could be said about subsequent groups.

Following the transcription of the interviews the list of bi-polar constructs were taken back to the teachers for checking, at which point two further questions were asked. In order to ascertain each teacher's rank order of importance of his or her own personal-construct set they were asked, "If you were going to take over a new class and had the opportunity to talk to the person who had been their teacher up to that time, what would be the rank-order of importance to you of your set of constructs?" Secondly, to determine which end of each construct pair was seen positively and which negatively by each teacher they were asked, "Which end of these constructs do you see as being most conducive to a child doing well in school?"

On the basis of the answers to these two questions, each teacher's ten most highly valued construct pairs was placed on a five point scale. So that, for instance Well behaved - Badly behaved became Very well behaved - fairly well behaved - 50/50 - fairly badly behaved - Very badly behaved. Although both Nash (1973, 1976) and Ball (1981) employed four point scales it was felt that a fifth category, to allow for a teacher having no strong views about a particular child, or where a child was not particularly described by one or the other end of bi-pole was of considerable value.

VIII The first pupil-rating exercise

All twelve teachers rated each child, from the class that they had taught on a regular basis throughout the five week period of observation, on the five point scale for each of their ten most highly valued construct pairs. Scores were assigned to each rating ranging from 5 - most favourable
to 1 - least favourable. The scores were then weighted to take account, albeit crudely, of the greater importance attached to judgements made on the most highly valued construct pairs. (Full details of the weightings are included with the discussion of results.) In reality there is no satisfactory way of assigning quantitative differential values to construct ranks but it would be unrealistic to assume that judgements based upon the construct-pair ranked low on the scale would be as influential in the formation of a teacher's overall view of a child, as those made on the basis of construct-pairs ranked more highly.

The final weighted scores were added together to determine each teacher's average rank order of pupils, the lowest overall scores representing the children most favourably perceived and the highest scores representing those children least favourably perceived. Any tied ranks were resolved by reference to individual scores perceived on the teacher's highest ranked construct pairs. Finally, the rankings of the six teachers who taught the whole class together throughout the five week observation period were added together to obtain an overall pupil rank-order, being representative of the overall or average view of the children by the teachers as a group. This rank-order formed the basis for the comparison of the qualitative-observation data, with the first quartile, children ranked from 1 to 6, being compared with those in the fourth quartile, those ranked from 19 to 24.

IV The second pupil-rating exercise

By way of contrast to the idiographic approach employed in the first rating exercise, several forms of repertory grid test have relied upon providing all subjects with the same pre-selected list of bi-polar constructs rather than eliciting personal constructs from each subject individually,
notes that the advantage of this procedural modification permits a higher degree of standardisation in administering the grid to groups of subjects facilitating systematic, nomothetic comparisons. Whilst constituting a serious departure from Kelly's emphasis upon the personal nature of each individual's system of dimensions for construing behaviour, there is substantial evidence to suggest, Warr and Coffman (1970) that normal subjects, at least, exhibit approximately the same degree of differentiation in using carefully selected supplied lists of bi-polar constructs as when they employ their own elicited personal constructs. Ryle (1975) observes that, "Kelly paid rather little attention to developmental and social processes", and that, "... his own concern was with the personal and not the social". For Ryle, "persons resemble each other in their construction of events". In his analysis of a wide range of evidence Adams-Webber (1970) concludes:

"A plausible working assumption is that most normal subjects may be highly practised in communicating their social judgements to others in terms of a fairly wide variety of common adjective labels, and thus they may make approximately the same range of discriminations in describing themselves and others, within limits, whether they use their own verbal labels or supplied lists of adjectives."

However, the need for caution is emphasised in Hargreaves' (1977) criticism of Nash (1963, 1976) "Where respondents provide differently labelled, but apparently similar, constructs it is tempting to fall into a trap ... and to treat them as meaning much the same."

This is an important issue when supplying sets of adjectives to different groups of people although for groups of teachers in one school
who share many of the realities of day-to-day school life, through the proximity of their work, regular 'progress meetings', and staffroom life, are in a stronger position to jointly negotiate and sustain a whole range of common meanings and understandings.

For the purposes of the second rating exercise an average set of the ten most commonly occurring construct pairs was obtained by reference to the teachers' individual sets of elicited constructs. These ten construct pairs were then arranged in rank order, any ties being eliminated by reference to the rank order positions occupied in the individual teachers' rankings. In order to avoid over simplification, elements were expressed in the form of multi-word, polar phrases rather than single word, polar adjectives thus making allowance for minor differences in interpretation.

To provide a significantly different rating exercise to the first, and as part of the triangulated research design, the teachers were asked to simply place the whole class in rank order from 1 to 24 for each 'given' construct pair. They were urged to avoid tied rankings wherever possible by making full use of everything they knew about the children. Where a 'given' construct pair was clearly inappropriate to the subject taught, e.g. academic ability in physical education, it was suggested that no ranking should be attempted.

Finally a comparison was made between the ratings of the six teachers, who taught the whole class for the whole observation period, obtained from the 'elicited' and the 'given' constructs, and coefficients of concordance were calculated on both sets of data to ascertain the degree of agreement between individual teachers' ratings.
X The third pupil-rating exercise - Self-rating

As the third element for the comparative analysis of the teachers' perceptions and the children's views of themselves the children each completed three rating scales.

a) The Coopersmith self-esteem inventory. (1967). A short form, Cohen (1976) of this inventory was used on two occasions.

b) The Academic self-image scale, Barker-Lunn (1970), also administered twice.

c) A simple self-rating scale based upon the ten most commonly occurring bi-polar constructs obtained from the teachers in the first pupil-rating exercise and used by the teachers themselves in the second pupil-rating exercise. The construction of this scale and the consequent problems of the comparison of results obtained from similar, but different, rating scales are discussed alongside the results in Chapter 4.

XI Elementary Linkage Analysis

An Elementary Linkage Analysis technique, McQuitty (1957, 1961) was applied to the teachers' rankings obtained from the second pupil-rating exercise to determine which of the ten 'given' construct pairs each teacher saw as being most alike. Although all teachers in the sample had been expected to experience little difficulty in rating the children according to the ten 'given' construct pairs there was a strong feeling that, for everyday purposes, many of the construct pairs provided could be grouped together under a smaller number of more general headings.

Using twelve psychological traits chosen from reports and record cards, Hallworth (1962) suggests that teachers tend to judge and classify
their pupils according to two main criteria:

"One criterion relates to success in school work and ability to get on with school staff; it apparently represents the teachers approval or disapproval of a pupil.

The second criterion relates to the child's activity, particularly his social activity or extraversion."

There is a degree of similarity between Hallworth's dimension of "social activity or extraversion" and Eysenck's "introversion - extraversion" (1953), and between Hallworth's "reliability and conscientiousness" which includes the trait of "emotional stability", and Eysenck's "neuroticism". Osgood (1957) obtained two factors which are directly comparable to those described by Hallworth, an "evaluative" factor and a "dynamism" factor. The conclusion was that, "when people make judgements of other people they behave as if they ask themselves two main questions: first, 'Is he good or bad? Do I approve or disapprove?'; and second, 'How strong and active or weak and passive is he?'".

Within the context of the school, Hallworth suggests that the two questions could be interpreted as part of the teacher-pupil relationship. "The first question became, 'How much do I approve or disapprove of him as a pupil (i.e. is he conscientious, persistent, etc.)?'. The second question became, 'Is he strong and active socially in the school (i.e. is he extraverted)?'".

Nash (1973), in his study of junior school teachers and their pupils determined from the frequency of occurrence of certain construct-pairs that:

"Junior school teachers in this school perceived their pupils
primarily in terms of their work habits, their maturity and their classroom behaviour, all three constructs relating to the child’s personality."

Only occasionally did he elicit constructs concerning the quality of work, although he did find these later in other schools. His explanation of this phenomenon serves as a timely reminder of the importance of the particular school ‘climate’ since it was felt that the lack of such constructs in the one school was due mainly to those particular teachers’ commitment to the "child centred" ideal. In a study of the frequency and percentage of constructs employed by forty-eight primary school teachers, Taylor (1976) isolated seven construct categories from a total of 446 constructs. These categories were produced from a preliminary sort by the experimenter and were carefully defined for two judges, who were then asked to sort the construct labels again according to the defined taxonomy. The seven categories were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic achievement.</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personality characteristics.</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behaviour and relationships with the teacher.</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Home background.</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interests and hobbies.</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Physical.</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Miscellaneous.</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical technique employed in the present study provides a simple and objective method of determining the number of types or clusters of construct pairs together with their membership without the need for the opinions of independent judges.
For this purpose a 'type' is defined as:

"... a category of (construct pairs) of such a nature that everyone in the category is in some way more like some other (construct pair) than it is like any one not in the category." (McQuitty 1957 p.213).

The technique depends upon the comparison of the rank order correlation coefficients, in this case Spearman's Rho, between all possible combinations of teacher rankings on the ten 'given' construct pairs employed in the second pupil-rating exercise. Every construct pair in a 'type' or cluster would have a higher correlation with some other construct pair in the 'type' than it would with any construct pair not in the 'type'.

XII The schools, the teachers and the children

(i) The Pilot Schools

During the period 1976-1981 observations were made of four teachers with five groups of children in three Leicestershire secondary schools. With the exception of one third-year group the children were all in their second year of secondary schooling. Initially the children selected were all in remedial groups receiving regular remedial teaching from a specialist teacher. The major reason for this choice was that these groups were small, constant in size and composition, and recording of teacher-pupil interactions would be more manageable.

Starting from the general hypothesis that it should be possible to demonstrate a qualitative difference between the classroom experience of those children who are favourably perceived compared to that of those who are less favourably perceived by their teachers the pilot studies served specifically to:
a) Try out and improve techniques of recording classroom activity.

b) To make general observations with a view to developing specific categories of behaviour for more detailed study.

c) As a source of data to test the basic hypotheses thus developed.

Initially tape recordings were made using a single microphone situated on the teacher's desk but problems arising when the teacher moved around the room led to experiments with multiple microphones which proved to be marginally more successful. However, the most successful recording method proved to be the use of a radio-microphone permanently attached to the teacher. In this way everything the teacher said, both inside and outside the classroom was clearly audible, as was anything said by children who were near to the teacher at the time of speaking. Although the problem remained of recording pupil responses at a distance, the subsequent observations clearly indicated that, for the purposes of this study, teacher comments were most important, and that very often, the most significant teacher comments were made in the proximity of the recipient when, for example, the teacher was moving around the room dealing with individual problems. At all times the observer remained seated at the back of the room, in a position where he was thought to be least visible to the greatest number of children. In the main study this often meant sitting just inside the doorway of a convenient stock room situated at the back of the classroom. Throughout the periods of observation detailed notes were made of all significant incidents alongside a time scale divided into five minute bands. Tape counter positions were also noted to facilitate quick and easy reference during transcription.

In every case the teachers only performed the first pupil-rating exercise, i.e. rating each child on a 5 point scale according to their
own elicited construct pairs, since on no occasion was a single group of children observed with more than one teacher. Clearly therefore, it is not possible to make any valid comparisons, except in the case of one teacher who was observed teaching two separate groups of children. It is from the observations of this one teacher that examples will be drawn to illustrate the value of the pilot studies in the formulation of the hypotheses to be examined in the main study.

The children were taught in two groups, one of eleven pupils and the other of 12. Both groups were taught in the same room, both receiving essentially the same lesson. During the course of the repertory-grid interview some twenty-eight bi-polar constructs were elicited. The teacher then picked out the twelve that she considered most important and ranked them in order of importance. Of the twelve construct pairs, (later reduced to 10 in the main study) four were of a cognitive nature, seven related to aspects of personality and one to home background. In most cases it was not difficult to predict which the teacher thought most likely to lead to success at school, however, it was very clear that she associated extroversion with being open, co-operative and lively, something which she valued highly, and introversion with being quiet and unwilling to contribute to class discussions, which she valued less highly. Consequently the extrovert was viewed more favourably, and in some cases better liked by the teacher.

As a brief example of the qualitative difference in classroom experience of children in these groups the case of David (Rank order No.1) and James (Rank order No.22) will be considered.

"David will always add to discussions he has a wealth of general knowledge ... his reading is improving and I think if I keep pushing him
he might make it ... I think he'll do it eventually ... he's got more about him, more go."

During lessons he was often observed volunteering extra information. The teacher would wait patiently while he searched for the right words and would be more willing to accept digressions from him than from any of the others.

The point can be further illustrated by reference to the lesson transcripts:

TEACHER: Is this your book then?
DAVID: Yes.

TEACHERS: I can see now where you get all your general knowledge from, good lad! If you read that your reading will improve tremendously.

Then later:

CHILD: Do you believe in mermaids?

TEACHER: Do I believe in them? Well it would be nice wouldn't it.

David starts to explain about the sea elephant or sea cow, he's not sure, the teacher lets him continue. She perceives him as being knowledgeable.

DAVID: There's an animal what looks like a mermaid ...

OTHERS: Sea horse!

DAVID: No it's like er ...

He is allowed to talk around the subject for some time before the teacher continues with her story.
Other children who tried this received short answers from the teacher, and were not allowed to talk around the subject. Compare this case with that of James who is less favourably perceived, being number 22 on the rank order. The teacher describes him as a "funny one, can't co-ordinate, not in touch with his surroundings.... He's completely on his own, in a world of his own. He never comes to class prepared for a lesson, always late, always forgotten something, never completes his work ... and yet he's a good reader, he never ought to be in this group."

In the same lesson described above, the teacher is searching for some other words to describe the foam which can be found on the sea shore. Several children try to answer, but she seems more disposed to accept answers from some than from others. It is very unusual for James to join in at all, but on this occasion he gives a very good word "Bubbly", but the teacher does not accept it and goes on to allow David to make another contribution to the discussion. It seems that David is constantly learning that his contributions are highly valued, while James learns that even when he has got something worthwhile to say he might as well not bother, thus reinforcing the teacher's view of him.

Cluster analysis of the teacher's ratings of the two separate groups revealed two different, although similar sets of clusters. For the first group two clusters emerged and for the second group, three. In both cases construct pairs concerned with academic ability occurred together as did those concerned with personality characteristics and attitude towards school work. Since the two sets of clusters were not identical it may well be that the choices of criteria made by the teacher from her repertoire of personal constructs is variable dependent upon the composition of the group being evaluated.
Since the possibility of making comparisons between the ratings of several teachers was not possible because a) they all rated the children according to their own and unique sets of personal constructs, and b) they all rated different groups of children, it was clear that the main study should provide for these comparisons by concentrating upon a whole group of teachers who taught the same class or groups of children over an extended period of time.

(ii) The Main Study

Following negotiations with the Leicestershire Education Committee it was arranged to spend five consecutive weeks observing in a Junior High School where there was a tradition of small scale educational research on the part of both headteacher and his staff. Before selecting the group of children for observation the observer was invited to meet the whole school staff to discuss the proposed research and every teacher was given the option not to take part if they wished. In the event no teacher refused to co-operate, and the class to be observed was selected simply upon the basis of administrative convenience. That a second year class was finally chosen was due to the fact that the first year children were taught in a different way to the rest of the school, in the first year base, and third and fourth year classes spent the greater part of their time working in sets. The second year, however, spent the greatest amount of time together as a class. Sets were in operation, however, for mathematics, French and science. No observations were made in Design, however, since the course involved a change round of groups and teachers midway through the observation period, leading to a breakdown in continuity of teacher-pupil contact.

Each day was divided into eight periods of approximately 35 minutes duration although most lessons were taught as double periods. Each week's
observations comprised of

Mathematics - 3 double periods
English - 3 double periods
Science - 2 double periods
French - 1 double period and 1 single period
Health Education - 2 double periods
Humanities - 2 double periods and 1 single period
Drama - 1 single period
Physical Education - 2 double periods
Music - 2 single periods

The group observed contained twenty-four children, eleven boys and thirteen girls. Twelve teachers were involved. When the children were taught in sets, only the experiences of those children from the main group were recorded.

XIII The research design - a summary

The overall research design embodies the technique of multiple triangulation throughout, employing both qualitative and quantitative comparative analysis. This summary sets out the various research elements in the order in which they were performed.

a) Continuous participant observation of 24 twelve year old children and 12 of their teachers through every lesson attended for a period of five weeks. All lessons were tape recorded using a radio-microphone attached to the teacher. The observer made detailed field notes of context and content of every incident where a teacher passed on some information to a child or group of children about themselves rather than about the content of the lesson. (Known as 'significant incidents'.)
b) All 24 children completed the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Form SE 1) and the Barker-Lunn Academic Self-Image Scale for the first time.

c) Triadic elicitation interviews were conducted to obtain all 12 teachers' personal constructs, using the childrens' names as subjects. These were ranked by the teachers and the first 10 of each teacher's construct pairs were used to rate the children on a semantic differential. (1st rating exercise.) Teachers' individual comments about children were retained for further comparative analysis.

d) An average set of the 10 most commonly occurring construct pairs was constructed from the teachers' individual sets of personal constructs. All 24 children were ranked by all 12 teachers according to these 'top ten' provided constructs. (2nd rating exercise.)

e) Children completed the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Form SE 1) and Barker-Lunn Academic Self-Image Scale for the second time, also a self-rating exercise on a modified version of the teacher's 'top ten' constructs. (3rd rating exercise.)

f) Construct rankings from the 2nd rating exercise were used in elementary linkage analysis to determine which construct pairs the teachers saw as being most alike.

g) Overall construct clusters, representing the twelve teachers as a group, were constructed by reference to the frequency of occurrence of associated constructs in individual teachers' construct clusters.

The research design is related to the six questions posed at the beginning of the present chapter in the following ways:
1. Necessary conditions for the successful transmission of teachers' expectations to their pupils.

Details obtained from published research. See Chapter 3.

2. Relationship between teachers' perceptions and children's classroom experiences - the degree to which the 'necessary conditions' for successful transmission are present.

Comparison of children's experiences, through 'significant incidents', based on the 1st and 4th quartiles of the teachers' average rank order resulting from the 1st pupil-rating exercise. (Teachers' individual personal constructs) Various categories of teacher-behaviour and pupil-experience isolated.

3. Relationship between teachers' perceptions and pupils' self-images.

Comparison of teacher ratings on the 'top ten' provided constructs with pupil self-ratings on a modified version of the same scale. Comparison of teacher ratings on both elicited personal constructs and 'top ten' provided constructs with the children's Academic Self-Image and Self-Esteem scores.

4. Degree of Similarity between individual teachers' views of individual children, and the degree of possibility of a cumulative effect in the transmission of expectations.

Coefficients of concordance (Kendall's W) calculated between teacher ratings of pupils on both elicited and provided constructs.

5. Feasibility of using sets of 'average' provided constructs in rating exercises, in place of individually elicited constructs, to facilitate comparative analysis.

Comparison of teachers' average rankings on ratings using elicited and
provided constructs. (Including development of a method of constructing average sets of constructs from several sets of teachers' individually elicited personal constructs.)

6. The extent to which teachers make judgements about children on the basis of a smaller number of broad categories rather than a larger number of more specific constructs.

Elementary linkage analysis was employed to produce:

a) Each teacher's individual construct clusters.

b) Average clusters representing the collective feelings of the teachers as a group. (Including the development of a method for constructing such a set of clusters from individual teachers' construct clusters.)
Chapter 2

The Concept of the Self-fulfilling Prophecy

The Self-fulfilling Prophecy effect was first defined in a systematic way by Merton (1949) and, although he did not use it to describe classroom behaviour, his definition constituted a milestone in the evolution of the concept as it is used today. Drawing upon Thomas's (1928), statement that:

"If men define situations as real, they are real. in their consequences."

Merton noted that this view:

"provides an increasing reminder that men respond not only to the objective features of a situation, but also, and at times primarily to the meaning this situation has for them. And once they have assigned some meaning to the situation, their consequent behaviour and some of the consequences of that behaviour are determined by the ascribed meaning." (pp.421-22)

Merton goes on to argue that:

"The self-fulfilling prophecy is, in the beginning a 'false' definition of the situation evoking a new behaviour which makes the originally false conception come 'true'. This specious validity of the self-fulfilling prophecy perpetuates a reign of error. For the prophet will cite the actual course of events as proof that he was right from the very beginning."

It is unfortunate that Merton restricts the use of the concept to original misconceptions, creating the impression that the quality of falseness is somehow 'out there' and potentially easily recognisable by all concerned, Leigh (1977). "It would be more accurate to note that reality is
better regarded as being subjective and inter-subjective than objective.

Indeed, misconceptions are not always easy to see, as such, since they are defined by their holders as being true. Teachers are led to believe, through their professional training, that they are able to make accurate judgements about children. They occupy a status in society whereby it is thought legitimate for them to make such judgements. In the heat of the moment they may more readily accept their own first impressions or the judgements of others without question - myth becomes reality.

A refinement of Merton's definition forms the basis of a most influential and controversial study. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968), define the self-fulfilling prophecy as:

"How one person's expectation for another person's behaviour can quite unwittingly become a more accurate prediction simply for its having been made."

It is important to emphasise that the expectations, so formed, must be seen within a framework of interaction. Indeed, they exist at all only in as much as one person not only has expectations of another person's behaviour, but that those expectations are communicated. It is, however, unrealistic to assume that self-fulfilling prophecies come into being simply as a result of one person's expectations. It is precisely such a "truncated frame of reference" which underlies Rosenthal and Jacobson's empirical work. (Brameld, 1972).

Leigh (1977) suggests a suitable modification taking this into account:

"How one or more persons expectations for another persons behaviour can quite unwittingly become a more accurate prediction simply for its having been made."
While being a more satisfactory definition, the addition of a small acknowledgement of the possible influence of the combined expectations of several people doesn't go nearly far enough. A more comprehensive view of the self-fulfilling prophecy is required. Dusek (1975) suggests that experimental studies of the self-fulfilling prophecy have taken one of two forms. Firstly, and most commonly, there are experiments where the teacher's expectations have been manipulated by a principal investigator in a laboratory or classroom. These will be referred to as studies of 'induced teacher bias'. Secondly, there are studies of significant effects due to the teacher's own self-generated expectations of student performance in the natural classroom setting. These will be referred to as studies of 'teacher expectancy'.

In order that the role of teachers' naturally formed expectations can be fully understood, account must be taken of the more diverse aspects of the educational environment. In comparing experimentally induced bias with naturally-formed expectations, Finn (1972) suggests that expectations formed by teachers, pupils and others over time are constantly being reinforced and/or modified through the daily events of both classroom and elsewhere, and that they "play a more formidable role in shaping the individual's behaviour". This 'expectation set' consists of a "conscious or unconscious expectation which one person forms of another, or of himself, which leads the evaluator to treat the person evaluated as though the assessment were correct. Further, he anticipates that the person evaluated will act in a manner consistent with the assessment:' Deliberate use is made here of 'anticipation' in order to distinguish the concept from aspirations, hopes and desires which do not incorporate "... an additional estimation of reality factors". However, it is what Finn calls the "expectation network", which constitutes the most significant part of the child's educational environment, being:
"the totality of all aspects of the milieu which set expectations for an individual's educational attainment."

In addition to the teacher, it includes other children, the physical and psychological "givens" of the classroom, and the quantity and types of curricular materials and learning activities presented to the pupils. Outside the classroom the expectation network includes parents, siblings and peers.

This expectation network is represented diagrammatically in Fig.1. The child's self-expectation and consequent achievement is seen to be in a reciprocal relationship with the expectations of peers, parents and teachers, and, to a lesser extent, others as well. All of which function within the framework of cultural traditions and demands.

The Mechanism of the Self-fulfilling Prophecy


"... a learned structure, growing mainly from comments made by other people and from inferences drawn by children out of their experiences in home, school and other social groups."

The concept of self-expectancy relates to the pupil's expectations of his own performance. Successfully communicated teacher expectations may reinforce, modify or change the pupil's own view of his capability, which, in turn, may reinforce, modify or change the pupil's performance. One useful suggestion as to the mechanism of this change owes much to the theory of cognitive dissonance. (Katz, 1968). Achievement which does not conform to self expectations is hypothesised to produce a state of anxiety, or
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tension, which is reduced by bringing the expectations closer to actual achievement, and achievement closer to expectations. At the same time the pupil's performance provides feedback for both pupil and teacher. Clearly children do integrate data from other individuals and groups as well as from their own achievements to form their own behaviour-regulating concepts of potential and achievement level. Past feedback has been demonstrated to affect expectancies in a predictable direction. (Crandall, 1951, 1963, Crandall et al. 1964, Feather 1966). Positive reinforcement raises expectancies, while negative reinforcement or failure lowers expectations. Both Feather (1963) and Battle (1965) argue that expectancy itself can be demonstrated to be one of the motivational factors which determine the amount of "approach behaviour", Crandall and McGhee (1968), toward a relevant goal. For those pupils for whom good academic performance has some positive value, the child who holds a strong expectancy that his endeavours are capable of producing good results would be more likely to spend more time and effort in studying than would the child who does not expect to be able to do well. The converse applies to those who do not value good academic performance. Their lack of application may be amply reinforced by poor attainment and feedback.

Over time the teacher's views of the pupil become more firm as more and more congruent information becomes available. (Cahan, 1966). Consequently, as information accumulates throughout a child's school career, the expectations held by the members of his expectation network are likely to become more firmly established and more resistant to change brought about by any single inconsistent piece of behaviour.

In addition to this, (particularly in the case of ethnic and social class differences) the bases for false definitions and consequent self-fulfilling prophecies are deeply rooted in the individual or group norms and
are subsequently difficult to recognise and change.

An Alternative Interpretation

It would be wrong to assume that studies of the self-fulfilling prophecy are open to only one interpretation. West and Anderson (1976) based their reinterpretation of studies of induced teacher bias upon the view that expectations were the result of previously observed behaviour. This prior contact, it is argued, leads to contamination. Furthermore, in cases where no prior contact was made, the teachers used were inexperienced and contact was so short that no significant time was allowed for reflection. While drawing attention towards the possibility of alternative interpretations, no distinction is drawn between studies of induced teacher bias, on one hand, and less common studies of teachers' naturally formed expectations in real classrooms, on the other. Indeed evidence is only drawn from the former. Clearly, laboratory studies of induced bias can only go part way in simulating what goes on every day in real classrooms with real teachers and their pupils.

There is no reason to believe that expectations are automatically self-fulfilling. Many of the studies reviewed in chapter 3 clearly indicate that unless certain necessary conditions are met by both teacher and pupil, the expectations in question may never even be successfully communicated.

In Fig. 2 the pupil's performance is constantly being monitored by himself and the teacher. At the same time both the teacher's expectations of the pupil, and the pupil's own self-expectations are subject to other inputs from the wider expectation network. The successful communication of expectations and the resultant effect on the pupil's self-expectations only occur if all necessary conditions are fulfilled. If they are not, then a
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consistent discrepancy between pupil performance and teacher expectations over a period of time may lead to the modification of the teacher's expectations.

For the successful communication of expectations to occur it is important that the teacher forms expectations of a specific child, and that he is consistent in his belief. In addition, the teacher must behave consistently towards the pupil over a period of time by both verbal and non-verbal means. Meanwhile, positive expectancy effects depend upon the pupil viewing the teacher as a significant other, being competent to make judgements about him, and the pupil valuing the educative process in the belief that school will do him good. However, negative expectancy effects may not necessarily depend upon these things. Placing a low value on the educative process may lead to the pupil's own prophecy of failure, the fulfillment of which may be reinforced by negative comments from the teacher.
Chapter 3

Review of Selected Literature on Teacher-Bias and Teacher Expectancy

It is inevitable in selecting literature for review in a field as large as this one that some things have to be left out. At best a balance must be struck between giving a fair and comprehensive appraisal of published research relating to the topic under discussion while specifically choosing those studies which best illustrate the points to be raised. A major problem in the field of Teacher-Bias and Teacher-Expectancy is that almost all published material is American in origin and pertains specifically to American schools, teachers and children. There are obvious differences in terminology and, more importantly, in the organisation and demands of the American and British school systems. However, the cultural demands and attitudes towards schooling of American and British societies are sufficiently similar, and the mechanisms of interpersonal communication sufficiently universal, to allow parallels to be drawn when considering the transmission of teachers' expectations to their pupils.

This review is in three major parts:

Part 1 establishes the "educational self-fulfilling prophecy" as a reality by looking at studies of both Teacher-Bias and Teacher-Expectancy. Although studies are included which fail to demonstrate the 'bias' or 'expectancy' effect, they serve to illustrate the commonly held view among researchers in the field that such effects are only operative when certain essential conditions are fulfilled.

Part 2 examines a number of social factors which have been shown, particularly when in combination, to influence teachers' perceptions and
expectations of the children in their care. As such these factors can be seen as having an important influence upon whether positive or negative expectations are likely to be communicated.

Part 3 specifically examines teacher-behaviour to illustrate the view that the quality of interaction is more important than its quantity in the effective communication of teachers' expectations, and, drawing upon the previous two sections, brings together a number of conditions thought to be essential to the successful communication of teachers' expectations to their pupils.

1. **Attempts to demonstrate the effect of teachers' expectations on pupil performance**

   (i) **Laboratory studies of teacher bias giving positive results**

   It is a common feature of studies of this kind to use students of psychology or education as subjects rather than practising teachers. The only exception to be included in this review is that of Mason and Larimore (1974), who used 33 practising teachers and 27 students. In all cases the subjects were presented with biased information, on the basis of which they were requested to rate the performance of fellow students or children on a variety of tasks.

   One of the earliest studies to examine teacher-bias effects was that of Beez (1968). Sixty graduate students in education each taught a symbol learning task to one child in a summer "Headstart" programme. Half the tutors were told that the child they would teach would probably have trouble adjusting to, and doing well, in school. Half the tutors were told the opposite about their children. Each tutor spent 10 minutes teaching the child the meaning of 20 different symbols. Teachers of 'favoured' pupils taught more symbols (10.4) than the teachers of
'unfavoured' pupils (5.7). 77% of 'favoured' pupils learned more than eight symbols whereas only 13% of 'unfavoured' pupils learned so many. Tape recordings were made of the teaching sessions, the subsequent analysis of which revealed that the teachers of 'unfavoured' pupils spent more time explaining and giving examples. Nearly two-thirds of these teachers considered the tasks to be too difficult whereas only one teacher of a 'favoured' pupil thought this.

A photo-rating experiment conducted by Rosenthal (1968) presented such clear-cut results (so uncommon in 'behavioural research), that two replications were conducted. Both fully supported the findings of the original experiment. Ten psychological students, all of whom had experience in doing psychological research, were each given a group of about 20 inexperienced students. The task was to show each member of the group a series of 10 photographs of faces, and to elicit a rating of the degree of success or failure shown in the face, -10 meaning extreme failure and +10 meaning extreme success. The photographs had been selected to be quite neutral with an average numerical score of zero. All experimenters were given identical instructions on how to present the photographs and identical instructions to read to their subjects. The experimenters were given biased information on how subjects had rated the photographs in previous experiments and were told that the findings were well established. Half were told that people generally rated the photographs as typifying successful people (+5) and half were told the opposite (-5). In all three experiments each experimenter who had been led to expect ratings of people as successful, obtained a higher average rating of success than did an experimenter expecting ratings of people as unsuccessful.

A further replication of Rosenthal's photo-rating experiments was conducted by Minor (1970). An added refinement was that within each
condition some subjects were made to feel apprehensive or ego-involved in their performance, while the remaining subjects were assured that their performance would not be utilized to evaluate their functioning. The findings revealed that the expectation held by an experimenter only led to confirmatory responses from the subjects when they felt personally concerned with their performance.

In a study of scorer-bias Simon (1969) set 72 students the task of scoring 20 responses to items on the vocabulary sub-test of the Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children (W.I.S.C.). In the bright condition \( n = 37 \) subjects were informed that the responses were those of a child reading far above his age level; in the dull condition \( n = 35 \) subjects were informed that the responses were those of a child reading far below his age level. The specific prediction was that examinees who were regarded as having a reading level far above their age level would, content of responses held constant, consistently be given higher scores than examinees who were regarded as having a reading level far below their age level.

The subjects' vocabulary scores were computed in the normal way by summing the scores given to the 20 responses. A t test was then used to evaluate the difference between the 'bright' group's mean score (23.0) and that of the 'dull' group (20.8). The difference was found to be statistically different \( (p < .05) \). Among the members of the 'bright' group 26 scored above the overall mean score and 11 below. A similar examination of the 'dull' group scores revealed only 13 above the overall mean, and 22 below. It was concluded that although the results indicate a powerful influence of scorer's expectancies upon the scoring process, generalisation to other types of vocabulary items which are less dependent upon subjective judgement like multiple choice tests might prove hazardous.
The effect of experimenter bias on the ability of children to perform a marble-dropping task led Dusek (1971) to conclude that the experimenter bias effect reported by Rosenthal (1968) with adults may also be obtained with children. 54 boys and 72 girls (aged 6-7 years) were tested by neutral experimenters or experimenters biased to expect boys (or girls) to drop marbles faster than girls (boys) in a marble-dropping task. Although the predicted bias effect was not obtained for boys it was obtained for girls. While the exact explanation of this sex difference is not fully understood, Maccoby (1967) suggests that girls may be more likely than boys to pick up cues given by others and use them in evaluating their performance. Furthermore, in the light of Minor's (1970) photo-rating experiment, it could be that girls tend to be more ego-involved than boys in the performance of such tasks.

Korman (1971), in two studies of peer-expectations, discovered that higher intelligence in experimental subjects tend to decrease the effects of expectancy manipulation. The first study was designed to test whether expectancy effects occurred where the expectancy of competence came from peers rather than from authority figures. The second study was identical but with the addition of the hypothesis that high intelligence individuals might be less likely to accept such influence. 64 psychology students were separated into one group of high performance expectancy (n = 22) and one group of low performance expectancy (n = 42). The subjects were set four creative tasks as part of a proposed new type of intelligence test. The tasks were:

a) How many uses can you think of for a brick?

b) How many things can you describe by the word sweet?

c) How many ways can you think of to attract tourists to the United States?
d) How many different implications can you think of if a Federal Law were passed providing for a free college education for everybody?

Actual levels of performance were previously standardised on the basis of work done with college students who had, in addition, been asked to indicate an appropriate level of performance for college students. Subjects were given biased information concerning these results differing for the high-expectancy group and the low-expectancy group. In the second experiment subjects also completed a Wonderlie Personnel test before responding to the creative tasks. Results, in general, provided strong support for the hypotheses. For all four tasks in the first experiment the results were in the direction predicted, with two of the four being significant, (c, p < .05, d, p < .01). All results in the second experiment were significant in the direction predicted (a, b and c, p < .01 and d, p < .05). As were those for the medium intelligence group (a, b and c, p < .01, c, p < .05). The higher intelligence groups, however, produced only three out of four significant results, and gave lower values in each case, (a, p < .05, b and c, p < .01).

In the only experiment to be included in this review using practising teachers as subjects, Mason and Larimore (1974) investigated the effects of biased psychological reports on teachers' behavioural and expectations ratings of a Kindergarten child seen on a video-tape. The subjects consisted of 33 practising teachers and 27 graduate and undergraduate college of education students. Biases were produced by randomly distributing to one-third of the subjects a fictitious favourable psychological report, while one-third read a fictitious unfavourable version. The remaining third read a short fable and acted as a control group. The
subjects were informed that the study was intended to validate judges' ratings of a readiness test, and were told that some of the reading material distributed to them might be useful to them in performing the task. Subjects watched a 12 minute video-tape of the child being interviewed and taking a short paper and pencil test. They were asked to say whether the child passed or failed each item - this judgement constituting the observational dependent measure. In addition, subjects completed an expectancy instrument containing 27 scales of affective and cognitive content.

Each scale contained positive and negative choices (e.g. smart - stupid, clean - dirty, etc.). They were asked to select one or the other which they felt best described the child in the video-tape. This constituted the expectancy variable.

While the performance means tended to be in the direction suggested by the bias conveyed in the psychological reports, they were not significant. However, the psychological report produced significant effects upon the expectancy ratings ($p < .05$). There appeared to be no significant relationship between the two sets of ratings. The implications of these results may be that teachers are influenced in the way they form expectations of children by biased psychological reports but that these do not significantly affect the way that they rate children's observed performance. It was also noted that this experiment was too far removed from the classroom and that similar investigations in classroom settings are urgently needed. Even though a little more than half the subjects were practising teachers the authors enlarged the group with students of education. It has been common practice to use students of psychology or education as the subjects of teacher bias experiments, as is evident from all of the other studies reviewed. Not only are such students unlike real teachers in real classrooms with real children, but they are probably not even representative
of the student body as a whole. Furthermore, as a result of their particular interests and training they are more likely to be suspicious of the stated purpose of experiments in which they take part. It is argued by Schultz (1969) and Friedman (1967), that this could be the cause of potentially serious and uncontrolled bias in such studies. Only one of the experiments reviewed, Simon (1969), included a post-experimental enquiry to check the subjects' awareness of the expectancy manipulation. Of 72 students taking part, 38 reported feeling that it was precisely what it had purported to be, 27 reported various degrees of suspicion, and 7 were able to offer alternative hypotheses, but none of them were accurate. This high level of inaccurate suspicion could be seen as the cause of bias, but at the same time, in this case, it could be seen as the result of the post-experimental enquiry itself.

Despite the inherent problems of laboratory studies and their lack of generalizability to real classroom situations, the evidence suggests that bias effects can be reproduced in the laboratory which are characterised by qualitative differences in the judgements and performance of the experimental subjects. Two conditions emerge from these studies, however, which may need to be satisfied before such differences become significant.

Firstly that expectations may only be successfully communicated when the subjects feel personally concerned with their performance; and secondly that expectations may be most susceptible to change only when their formation is largely dependent upon subjective judgement.

(ii) The "Pygmalion experiment": A classroom study of teacher bias giving positive results.

The laboratory studies of the experimenter-bias effect during the early 1960's of Rosenthal and Halas (1962), Rosenthal and Fode (1963) and Rosenthal and Lawson (1964), indicated that the performance of rats in
simple learning tasks could be affected by the expectations of their handlers. Typically, the handlers were divided into two groups, an experimental group, who were told that they would be working with "superior" rats, and a control group, who were told nothing, or that their rats were of a "less able" variety. It was claimed that following this, the experimental group rats performed significantly better in maze-running exercises than did the controls. The suggestion was that the experimental group handlers in some way, perhaps through increased petting, communicated their higher expectations to the rats, which in turn caused the rats to do well.

Following these experiments Rosenthal and Jacobson (1966, 1968), conducted what has become one of the most widely publicised studies in the field of educational research. Indeed the "Pygmalion effect" has become one of the most common and well known labels for what is more formally called the teacher-bias or teacher-expectancy effect.

The researchers chose a public elementary school in a lower-class community of a medium sized American city. From a theoretical standpoint, it would have been desirable to investigate whether teachers' favourable or unfavourable expectations could result in a corresponding increase or decrease in pupils' intellectual competence. On ethical grounds, however, the investigators decided to restrict their experiment to the proposition that favourable expectations by teachers could lead to an increase in intellectual competence. Within each of eighteen classrooms some 20% of the children were reported to their classroom teachers as showing unusual potential for intellectual gains. Eight months later those "unusual" children appeared to show significantly greater gains in IQ than did the remaining children of the control group. In all, 382 children from each of three classes in grades 1 to 6 performed the Test of General Ability (T.O.G.A.) (Flannagan, 1960), a non-verbal intelligence test, following
which the experimental group was assigned by means of a table of random numbers. Eight months later the test was re-administered and the mean IQ gains between the experimental and control groups were compared for each grade level. Although the authors concluded that for the school as a whole, those children from whom teachers had been led to expect greater intellectual gain showed a significantly greater gain ($p \leq .02$), it was, in fact, only the first and second grades which showed gains that were statistically significant. (1st grade mean difference $= 15.4, p < .002$, 2nd grade mean difference $= 9.5, p < .02$). Furthermore, the 3rd grade showed no difference at all between experimental and control groups, while the 5th and 6th grades showed very slight decreases. (5th grade mean difference $= -0.1$, 6th grade mean difference $= -0.7$). It was further claimed that the gains made by the experimental group could not have been at the expense of the control group since the classes with the highest experimental group gains also exhibited the highest control group gains. A number of explanations were offered as to why the only significant gains were observed in grades 1 and 2, and these form the basis of subsequent research. For example, it was argued that perhaps younger children have less well established reputations thus making new expectations more credible, while being more susceptible to unintended social influences. It was also suggested that the younger children may have been more recent arrivals in the school's neighbourhood and may have differed from the older ones in characteristics other than age. Finally, it was argued that the teachers of the lower grades may have been different from the teachers of higher grades.

The findings of the "Pygmalion experiment" received a very mixed reaction. On the one hand many workers felt that it provided conclusive evidence for a phenomenon which, at the common-sense level, teachers had known about for many years. On the other hand it was met with serious methodological criticism. Snow (1969), raised some important objections.
to the statistical interpretation employed, particularly with respect to the
nature of the intelligence test scores used in the research. The tests were
administered by the class teachers themselves who did not take into account
the fact that some first grade pupils had scored below the norms appropriate
for that particular test. The Test of General Ability has no norms below 60
although the mean pretest reasoning IQs for two out of the three 1st grade
classes were claimed to be below 60. Thorndike (1968), made similar
criticisms and concluded that:

"it is so defective technically that one can only regret that it
ever got beyond the eyes of the original investigators."

Although such criticism casts serious doubts upon the overall validity
of the statistics used in the experiment, there is certainly no doubt as to
its influence on educational research in general. Many researchers have
subsequently tried to replicate the experiment, and others have devised
similar experiments employing more respectable statistical techniques, some
of which will be reviewed in the next section. As a general conclusion
Nash (1976) comments that:

"'Pygmalion in the classroom' is perhaps best accepted as a pioneer
study - a way of saying that although it was far from perfect it
stimulated a lot of activity."

(iii) Classroom Studies of Teacher-Bias giving positive results

Many studies of the teacher-bias and teacher-expectancy effects have
concentrated upon the classrooms of the educable mentally retarded in the
hope that some way might be found to improve the low performance of such
children. In one study by Haskett (1968), reported by Gozali and Meyen
(1970), 267 educable mentally retarded children (C.A. 10-15 years, IQ 55-80)
were tested using the Metropolitan Achievement Tests and the Syracuse Scales of Social Relations. The S.S.S.R. scores for half the classes were adjusted up or down and reported to the 32 co-operating teachers. The M.A.T. scores were reported accurately. After an experimental period of five months all of the children were re-tested using the same tests as before. Significant correlations were reported between teacher expectancy and student social development. In general, it was concluded that teacher expectancy and pupil performance were closely related, in that pupil performance tended to fulfill teacher expectancy. Independently, a similar study was performed by Gozali and Meyen (1970), which differed in at least two ways: first it was restricted to the area of academic performance, and second, the experimental period involved an entire academic year. Sixteen special classes were involved with 162 educable mentally retarded children (mean age 11 years 2 months, mean IQ 69). After administering the Stanford Achievement Test in word reading, vocabulary, spelling and arithmetic, 20% of the children were randomly assigned to the experimental condition, and identified to their teachers as having "hidden potential" relative to academic performance. In the case of this study, however, none of the comparisons between the experimental condition and the controls were statistically significant for any of the four sub-tests (at the .05 level). However, the value for the vocabulary sub-test was approaching significance, thereby suggesting a possible influence of expectancy on vocabulary achievement. It was suggested that this might be explained by the fact that vocabulary and verbal communication skills receive considerable attention in the special class curriculum. Teachers and pupils interact more during instruction in this area providing a greater opportunity for the expectancy phenomenon to emerge.

In a study of teacher-bias in relation to the educational environment of the school, Finn (1972), suggests that attempts to replicate the
'Pygmalion experiment' are likely to fail as a result of the narrow perspective from which the problem has been attacked. Failure to replicate in such cases would not necessarily refute the functioning of expectations since the experimental treatment employed would be essentially weak and unable to alter the teachers' expectations. An alternative set of starting points is suggested which depict the influence of expectations as part of a wide variety of diverse aspects of the educational environment, making expectation a potent determinant of educational attainment.

The object of Finn's experiment was to test whether teachers hold differential expectations for pupils by sex, race and ability. 113 5th grade teachers from 55 schools in a large urban district and 187 teachers in 66 suburban schools, (71% of the teachers were female) were each sent a set of essays (judged to be average 5th grade attainment) together with biased information about the sex, racial and ability characteristics of the pupil authors. The subjective rating of such essays would, it was argued, provide sufficient freedom to allow the teachers to express differences in expectation, should they exist. The rating consisted of marking each essay on a ten point scale according to the following ten criteria: spelling and punctuation, grammar, sentence structure, organisation, neatness, relevance of idea, appropriate word usage, clarity, creativity and imagination and completeness of thought.

When the urban teachers perceived that the essays were written by high-intelligence, high achievement pupils, mean ratings were invariably higher for these than for those purporting to come from low ability, low achievement authors. These differences did not appear in the suburban schools. This finding, it is claimed, can only be explained in terms of gross environmental effects.
"Differences between facilities and working conditions of the two major areas became an important part of the more complex environmental network which helps to set the teacher's reactions to the pupils."

The explanation is taken further to add:

"If the overall expectations and self-esteem of teachers is higher in the suburban schools, and facilities for dealing with pupils of varying abilities are better, it may be that the teachers respond more directly to the written material and less to other, perhaps unrelated, characteristics of the pupils."

In the suburban schools high expectations for white female students led to a low average rating since the "average" essay did not meet those expectations. This effect was accentuated by the preponderance of female teachers in the sample who scored girls' essays even more harshly. In the urban sample there were significant mean differences in favour of white males above white females. For blacks, no such sex differences occurred. Emerging from the findings of this study is a conclusion which focuses attention on a need to investigate the necessary conditions in which the expectancy effect is most likely to operate, namely, that in certain settings, teachers do hold differential expectations for the achievement of student groups having common non-achievement characteristics. Support for this idea is further provided by Rosenthal (1973), in an attempt to answer the many critics of the Pygmalion experiment. In a survey of 242 studies of bias and expectancy, 84 studies were found to have reported significant results, 57 of which were conducted in the natural settings of classrooms, offices and factories, yielding similar proportions of significant results (37% in the field, 34% in the laboratory). Although bibliographic details are not provided, Rosenthal's conclusion is worthy of note. Under certain conditions,
he asserts, the Pygmalion effect is a reality.

In contrast to the significant IQ gains of the 1st and 2nd grade pupils in Rosenthal and Jacobson's original experiment, Rosenthal, Baratz and Hall's (1974) study of teachers' expectations in relation to pupils' creativity noted significant increases in the 5th grade only. The design was similar to the original experiment except that, in order to avert the suspicion of the teachers who might have heard of the Pygmalion experiment, the researchers purported to measure potential creativity instead of IQ. A sample of 416 children in a predominantly black school situated in a low income black neighbourhood completed Flanagan's (1960) Test of General Ability and were asked to draw a picture of a person on one side of a sheet of paper and as many different things as possible on the other. Following this, 20% were randomly assigned to the experimental group. Their names were made known to teachers as children likely to bloom in creativity sometime in the near future. Once again the researchers waited eight months before re-testing the children. The test papers were judged independently by a panel comprising of four black and four white creative artists. (Gains in creativity as rated by the black and white judges correlated +.56.)

A significant increase in creativity was obtained in the 5th grade (p < .02), where the only significant increase in IQ scores was also noted. (p < .02). However, since the correlation between the gain scores in creativity and in IQ was essentially zero (r = .01) it is clear that the two gains for the 5th grade were independent and indicative of an actual change in behaviour. It was also noted that, in general, greater gains in creativity scores were made by children whose teachers behaved in a more motivated, more child-centred, more professional and more encouraging manner, something which might explain why the 5th grade results were different from the rest. However, no indication is given as to why the 5th grade teachers might have
been different from the teachers in the other five grades.

Rappaport and Rappaport (1975), in a study of the communication of positive expectancies in the classroom on reading performance, found that within a successful and highly motivating compensatory programme, significant increases occurred for both experimental and control groups. However, the control group score increase was less than that achieved by the experimental group. The investigation sought to determine the effects on intellectual achievement of independently varying positive expectancy with the teacher only, the pupils only, and with a combination of teacher and pupils. It was anticipated that the joint manipulation of both the teacher's and pupil's expectations would produce greater improvement than when pupils' or teachers' expectations were induced separately. Forty-five black children (aged 5-6 years), from an inner city school were randomly allocated to one of five groups. The three teachers selected had been matched for similar qualifications and experience, and were each allocated to one of the three experimental conditions, i) teacher-expectancy manipulation, ii) pupil-expectancy manipulation, and iii) teacher and pupil expectancy manipulation. The fourth group was the interaction control where the children had the same contact with a researcher but without any expectancy manipulation, and the fifth group was a straight control, having no contact with a researcher at all. Each child completed the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test (M.R.R.T.) Form A, Hildreth et al. (1965), twice over a 12 week experimental period having contact with the experimenters for one hour per week. Significant differences occurred between pre and post-test scores in all cases, but to a lesser extent for the two control groups.

A series of t tests performed on group means before and after the experimental period indicated that although significant increases were obtained in all conditions, the increases were greatest in the experimental
conditions, and that the combined pupil and teacher expectancy condition was the most potent. (Teacher expectancy, t = 4.25, p < .001; Pupil expectancy, t = 4.41, p < .001; Pupil and teacher expectancy, t = 4.59, p < .001; Interaction control, t = 2.35, p < .05; Control, t = 2.21, p < .10)

The important conclusion arising from this research is that although the teachers did not know which children had received extra positive feedback from the researchers, the pupil expectancy manipulation group mean score increase was greater than that obtained by the teacher expectancy manipulation group. Although the sample was small this result adds weight to the view that once pupils' expectations for their own performance are raised, significant improvements in performance are likely to follow. Whether this occurs in practice will be determined, in part, by the degree to which the teachers' positive expectations for children are effectively communicated to them. The other side of the argument, however, is more depressing. Whatever may be true of the effect of teachers' positive expectations on pupil performance may equally be true of their negative expectations.

It is those studies whose perspectives are sufficiently comprehensive to take account of the wider educational environment that will provide the most fruitful clues as to the necessary conditions in which teachers' expectations may be successfully communicated. Clearly such factors as the location of the school, and the sex, race and social class of both teachers and pupils may be important variables to be considered. Even if differential expectations for the achievement of student groups having common non-achievement characteristics can be demonstrated, it is not a foregone conclusion that they will be successfully communicated. However, what is clear is that once pupils' expectations for their own performance are raised...
by the successful communication of teachers' expectations, significant improvements in performance are likely to follow. Also, work done with groups of less able children indicates, for those children at least, that expectancy phenomena are more likely to emerge during teaching which involves a high degree of verbal communication.

(iv) Classroom studies of teacher expectancy giving positive results

Classroom studies of teachers' naturally formed expectations have generally compared childrens' performance over a period of time with some previously obtained measure of the teachers' expectations of them. They differ from studies of teacher bias in that no attempts are made to manipulate teachers' views.

Palardy (1969) demonstrated that when 1st grade teachers reported the belief that boys were less successful than girls in learning to read, the boys in their classes did achieve less well on a standardized reading test, compared to similar groups of boys whose teachers did not hold such a belief. The main hypothesis was that there was no significant difference in mean scores in reading achievement between pupils classified according to sex and according to their teachers' beliefs concerning the probable success of first grade boys in learning to read. 42 teachers reported their beliefs regarding the probable success of first grade boys in learning to read in comparison with first grade girls. The teachers were placed into one of two groups depending upon whether they thought boys and girls to be the same or whether they thought that the boys had a 20% less chance of being as successful as girls.

The two groups of teachers were matched according to sex, experience, qualifications, school neighbourhood and class organisation. The children were controlled for age, reading readiness and IQ. After approximately five
months the children's reading achievement was measured. The boys taught by teachers who believed their potential to be almost as good as girls did in fact, learn as well as girls. However, the boys who had been taught by teachers who believed their potential to be greatly below that of girls, achieved noticeably less well than girls in their classes, and less well than boys whose teachers believed in them, \( p < .05 \). By defining the situation as real, the teachers actually set up a situation whereby boys did less well, and the situation became real in its consequences.

Taking a wider view of expectations, Palfrey (1973), suggests that through continuous communication with the pupils and staff, headteachers not only serve to enhance or diminish a child's evaluation of himself, but also impart to pupils in their charge a self image which reflects the headteacher's highly subjective evaluation of pupils both as 'clients' and also as human beings. Three fourth year classes in a girls' school were compared with three fourth year classes in a boys' school, both situated in the same locality in South Wales. No statistical analysis was undertaken because of the small sample size and the decision to employ participant observation techniques. Headteachers' attitudes towards their pupils in the respective schools were compared using a non-standardised questionnaire. Aspects of pupils' self-concepts were compared in a similar fashion. Because the two samples were closely matched it was argued that these instruments would constitute satisfactory means for comparison. Palfrey asserted that the girl's school was run on more authoritarian lines with the headteacher having higher academic, social and behavioural expectations of the girls than did the headmaster of the boys, whose school organisation approached the laissez-faire. Although it might be argued that the latter headmaster held more realistic expectations for boys in light of the depressed employment prospects for young men in South Wales, it was the girls who were found to
have more positive self concepts with respect to school work and subsequent employment.

The suggestion that teachers' own naturally established expectations of pupils' performance related to the way they treat different groups of pupils and influence students' self concepts and classroom performance is again raised by Dusek and O'Connell (1973). Following the work of Becker (1952), Meyer and Thompson (1956), and Brophy and Good (1970), an experiment was designed to investigate the effect of both induced teacher bias, and self-generated teacher expectancy on childrens' academic performance. While the induced teacher bias failed to produce significant improvements, the self-generated expectancies did. It was hypothesised that children ranked high by the teacher would have higher post-test scores than children ranked low. Thirty-two second grade and thirty-two fourth grade children in a primarily lower-class neighbourhood were tested using the Stanford Achievement Tests. At the same time, teachers were asked to rank children on the basis of their expectations of pupils' year-end performance level in language and arithmetic skills. All children were re-tested after four and eight months. Post-tests revealed a strong and consistent effect due to the teacher ranking ($p < .001$).

In a replication of the previous experiment, O'Connell, Dusek and Wheeler (1974) used thirty-eight of the original sixty-four subjects who had moved up a grade since last being tested. Both findings were consistent with the results previously reported. Because the children were at new grade levels, with new teachers, the data were interpreted as indicating that teachers do not bias children's learning but serve as good long-term predictors of children's academic capabilities.

Following the earlier work of Finn (1972) on the effect of the educational environment and teachers' expectations, Finn, Gaier, Peng and Banks (1975)
identified a 'filter of association' at work, distorting data according to school and class setting, and the teacher's perceptions of his own skill. Unlike most other studies, Finn et al (1975) sought to examine the teacher's expectations for the whole class rather than for individuals, and to explore the relationship of teachers' naturally formed expectations for class achievement with cognitive outcomes and growth during the school year. 438 5th grade pupils (231 male, 207 female aged 8-12 years), with 22 teachers (7 male and 15 female) from nine schools took part. The pupils were tested on seven scales of the Stanford Achievement Test, Kelly et al (1964), word meaning, paragraph meaning, Arithmetic computation, Arithmetic concepts, Arithmetic application, social studies and science.

A specially-designed expectation questionnaire was administered to teachers, consisting of five separate scales reflecting:

a) Teachers' assessments of the level of academic preparation of the new year's class, and readiness for 5th grade material.

b) The degree of confidence teachers had that they would effect change during the school year.

c) Ratings of comparative intellectual competence of pupils in the current class.

d) The extent to which the teacher expected the pupils to achieve cognitively in specific content areas.

e) The extent to which teachers expected pupils to enjoy the material of those content areas.

The pupils were re-tested eight months later. Despite significant achievement differences between all black and all white schools, class expectations did not correlate significantly with the racial variable. It was argued that teachers may set expectations relative to a particular school setting. That is to say, being well prepared for 5th grade work may have
a different meaning in assessing a group of Negro children, than a group of Whites. When they were asked to compare the class to some external standard e.g. the item concerning the proportion of children likely to go on to college, the scale brought to light the largest difference between all-White and all-Black schools.

The most interesting conclusion of this experiment was that a primary component of teachers' general expectations is their assessment of the verbal skills of the pupils. It is argued that the role of the filter of association is to, "focus the teachers' perceptions on the verbal variables. The routine information gleaned from the pupils in their classwork undoubtedly plays a large role in providing expectation-setting data." (p.195) The authors suggest that by "reducing the verbal screen" through which learning is accomplished, teachers of the verbally-handicapped should be able to render low or negative expectations inoperative.

Gozali and Meyen (1970) also noted the importance of children's verbal skills in the formation of teachers' expectations of their academic performance. It could well be that the very thing upon which teachers of such children concentrate is the one factor which has the greatest influence on their expectancy formation. However, to suggest that teachers of the educable mentally retarded should therefore concentrate on less verbal means of communication would be unacceptable. Finn et al concluded by saying that teachers do form expectations for their class's performance, which relate to mean pupil achievement, especially in relation to the pupils' verbal skills. Furthermore, the situational nature of the teachers' expectations may be modified by the 'filter of association', with its emphasis upon verbal variables.

In a study of Scottish schools, Nash (1973) demonstrated the effects of
teachers' expectations in two ways. First, by comparing teachers' rank orders of ability for their classes with the children's own subjectively-perceived views of their class position, Nash was able to show that even when the children were never deliberately told their position by the teacher, there was a close association between the two rank orders. The orders of ability were obtained from three teachers on reading, writing and number, and the children's self-perceived class positions were obtained by asking the pupils who they thought were better or worse than them in the same three subject areas. With the exception of the writing score for one group of 10 year olds, all correlations were significant at the .01 level. Second, using a repertory-grid procedure adapted from the work of Kelly (1955), the teachers' perceptions of 213 children in six senior classes were measured in terms of bi-polar constructs. The children were subsequently listed under one of three headings depending upon whether they were favourably perceived, moderately-favourably perceived or unfavourably perceived by their teachers. By observing classrooms and interviewing teachers and children, the membership of friendship cliques was established for all five primary schools. The following data were obtained from school records: Moray House verbal IQ (at 7 years of age), a measure of ability derived from teachers' grades, father's occupation, number of brothers and sisters and position in family, and a list of classroom friends. Comparisons were made between friendship group membership and IQ at age 7; and between social class, and teachers' perceptions of each child. Although it was found that within a population where there is a sufficient spread of IQ and social class these factors would be reflected in the pupils' friendship choices, the overwhelming determinant of friendship groups appeared to be whether the children were favourably or unfavourably perceived by their teachers. The suggestion was that teachers, through their methods of class organization, marking and grouping, together with more subtle aspects of teacher-pupil interaction, communicated their perceptions to the children in such a way that it influ-
enced their friendship choices. This suggestion was further tested by observing the children with their new teachers after moving into the local comprehensive school. When the cliques formed in the secondary school were examined according to the construct ranks given by the primary teachers, there was no significant relationship between this order and social class and IQ. However, when the construct ranks given by the secondary school teachers were used to re-order the cliques, the expected associations were identified once more. This suggests that having moved from primary to secondary school, clique membership underwent a change which was related more to the perceptions of the new teachers than to those of the teachers in the original primary schools.

Clearly, however, the influence of a new teacher cannot appear immediately. It needs time to develop. Gregg (1978) argues that pupils cannot correctly infer their class position from the teacher in the first days and weeks of classroom interaction. The relationship takes many weeks to become complex and full enough for this to take place. In an attempt to replicate part of Nash's work Gregg obtained strongest correlations between teachers' academic and personal preference ranks and children's perceived class positions in both writing and arithmetic for children who had spent almost a whole academic year with their teacher. Following a change of teacher in the Autumn term the degree of correlation was much lower. (Summer academic-preference $r = 0.68$, personal preference $r = 0.57$, Autumn academic-preference $r = 0.37$, personal preference $r = 0.12$).

It is the classroom studies of naturally formed expectations which come closest to everyday classroom reality. Unlike the laboratory studies the expectations to be communicated are not imposed by the researcher but are determined by those diverse factors which constitute the educational environment. The evidence reviewed in this section not only confirms the existence
of a self-fulfilling prophecy effect. It goes further, to suggest some factors which influence the way in which teachers select data upon which to base their perceptions, and some factors which may determine how successfully those perceptions might be communicated. Through the mediation of a "filter of association" teachers' perceptions appear to be particularly influenced by childrens' verbal skills. Similarly, studies of the Educable Mentally Retarded reviewed in the previous section would suggest that a reciprocal "filter of association" may be in operation, such that methods of class organisation, marking and grouping are less effective means of transmitting expectancies than teachers' verbal activity.

In addition, three important conditions emerge in this section. Firstly, for a teacher's expectations to be successfully communicated, the situation must be defined as real, that is to say, the participants must believe it to be true whether it is or not, before it may become real in its consequences. Secondly, that such a process takes time. Teachers need time to get to know the children, to observe them and to make judgements on the basis of what they see and hear. Similarly, children need time to establish the credibility of their teachers before they come to sufficiently value what those teachers say. A teacher's attitude towards a child must therefore be seen to be consistent over time before it has any chance of being successfully communicated. Thirdly, that if teachers do set their expectations relative to a particular school setting, then it may follow that expectations set which are inappropriate to a particular school setting may be rejected.

(v) Studies of teacher bias and teacher expectancy producing negative results

Of the nine studies reviewed in this section six are deliberate attempts to bias teachers' expectations, one attempts to bias both teachers and students,
one investigates the naturally formed expectations of teachers of retarded children, and one deliberately attempts to change teaching behaviour without introducing bias at all. In all but two cases the experimental period is less than Rosenthal and Jacobson's (1968) eight months, even in cases where an attempt is made to replicate the "Pygmalion" experiment. Even though none of the studies is able to demonstrate the teacher-bias or teacher expectancy effects there exists the implication, in each one that, under certain conditions, teachers' expectations can influence children's performance. In two cases the strong recommendation is made that the identification of such necessary conditions should be the main focus of future research.

In a rather limited study using teachers and college students, Haberman (1970) attempted to substantiate the contention that informing teachers of their students' high potential does influence their expectations. Furthermore, he attempted to show that if students are told that their teachers are outstanding they will subsequently rate them more highly than students not so informed. One hundred and twenty pre-course female student teachers were randomly assigned to one of four groups: (i) Students were told that their teacher would be of above average ability, (ii) the teachers were told of certain above average students in the group, (iii) a combination of (i) and (ii), and (iv) no information was given at all. At the conclusion of the "student-teaching period" teachers were asked to rate student achievement on a nine point scale. Students were asked to rate their teachers as above or below average. The results indicated no significant differences between the ratings of teachers and students for all four groups. It was concluded that trying to bias both teachers' and students' expectations simply by telling them incorrect information is insufficient. It should be noted however that college students were used instead of children, and although not specifically stated, the assumption is that the experimental
period was short. By contrast, Fleming and Anttonen (1971 a,b,c) attempted a test of the self-fulfilling prophecy in an on-going school setting over the period of a whole academic year. They presented intelligence test results in three different ways to three groups of teachers and gave no test information to a fourth. The groups were randomly selected from 1087 children in 39 second grade classrooms of middle and low socioeconomic levels. Each of the four groups was represented in each class. An intelligence test was administered at the beginning and the end of the academic year, and IQ gains were calculated for each pupil. Following the first test the teachers had been given different information for each of the groups: (i) IQ results as tested, (ii) primary mental abilities percentiles on verbal, numerical, spatial and perceptual factors, (iii) no IQ information at all, and (iv) IQ's inflated by 16 points. It was clear that following the second test, the group with inflated scores did not gain significantly more than any other group. The average gain for all groups was 7 points. When the results of the four groups were compared with two other groups not taking part in the study, no significant difference was observed. Teacher-ratings of the accuracy of the IQ scores revealed that they identified the inflated group as having less accurate scores than the others. Of the gains in IQ noted, the highest were from those teachers who placed the highest value on intelligence testing and would therefore be more willing to accept an IQ score without question. It was the author's conclusion that teachers evaluate children, reject discrepant information, and operate on the basis of previously developed attitudes toward, and knowledge about, children and tests. The suggestion is made that while teachers influence children, the process and conditions underlying this interaction need more intensive study. This view constitutes a common theme in studies of this kind. Barber and Silver (1968 a,b) who question the generalizability of the expectancy effect phenomenon, strongly recommend that future attention be directed toward
isolating the conditions under which it may operate. One such condition which might be important to studies of teacher-bias is the time in the academic year when the research is conducted. Fielder, Cohen and Feeney (1971) unsuccessfully attempted to replicate the "Pygmalion experiment" during the spring semester, whereas Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) started their experiment in the fall. It is possible that as the academic year progresses, teachers form more definite expectations of their own and are less susceptible to bias. However, this was but one of several variables that were not held constant in Fielder et al's (1971) attempt to replicate the "Pygmalion" findings. The experimental period was only four months as compared with eight, and even though some slight advantage on the part of the experimental group was reported by Rosenthal and Jacobson after four months, no significant advantage was noted in either case.

In the studies discussed so far, little attention has been paid to any changes in teacher behaviour which might take place as a result of the introduction of bias. Jose and Cody (1971) included the use of Bales (1950) interaction analysis scale in their study of induced teacher bias, in the hope that they might discover whether teachers' behaviour did change towards students about whom they had been given false information. 144 first and second grade children were tested using Flanagan's Test of General Ability. Four children were randomly selected from each of the eighteen classes, and their teachers were told that these children were potential "academic bloomers". Before the experiment commenced a measure of each teacher's verbal and non-verbal behaviour was made using the interaction analysis schedule. During the experiment further observations of teacher behaviour were made after one week and every four weeks thereafter for a period of 16 weeks. The post-test was then conducted using the same material as before, and each teacher completed a questionnaire concerning changes in students' behaviour and grades in arithmetic and reading.
The only significant difference found was in grade level scores. With respect to the interaction analysis scale there appeared to be little consistency in direction of change in the teachers' behaviour. In fact, any change in behaviour tended to be in the same direction for both groups. Eleven of the teachers claimed that they had not expected more from the children in the experimental group, seven said that they did, while only four felt that these children actually had improved. It must be remembered, however, that eighteen teachers constitute a very small sample, and no hard and fast conclusions may be drawn from these figures, except perhaps that the attempt to bias the teachers' expectations was largely unsuccessful.

A similar experiment by Kester and Letchworth (1972) used the same interaction analysis technique as part of a study of induced teacher bias on 23 English and maths teachers and 150 seventh grade pupils of average ability. Although there were no significant differences in achievement between the experimental and control groups over the short experimental period (nine weeks), the interaction analysis did provide some interesting results. Having been given the names of certain students, who, it was claimed, had done well on the initial test, the teachers did appear to communicate with those students in a more positive, accepting and supportive manner.

Studies of teachers' naturally formed expectations tend to rely upon the accuracy and truthfulness of teachers' reports of their expectations for particular children in their classes. The "favoured" pupils cannot be carefully selected by the researcher to represent the class average. One such study by Schwarz and Cook (1972) investigated teachers' expectations of 136 educable mentally retarded pupils, age 6.0 - 12.8 years. The teachers were asked to rate individual pupils with respect to academic, social and language skills. Wide Range Achievement Test scores were obtained
for the pupils at three points during the academic year. There were no significant differences in scores for reading, writing or spelling over the experimental period. This study differs to that of Haskett (1968) in that it attempts to measure differences in achievement instead of social development. When Gozali and Meyen (1970) also tried to measure differences in achievement, they too were unable to obtain any significant results. This may not be so surprising if one accepts that much more emphasis is placed upon social development rather than academic achievement in classes for the educable mentally retarded.

Beggs, Mayer and Lewis (1972) attempted to investigate changes in achievement and IQ scores among experimental and control groups by varying the ways in which intelligence test scores were interpreted for the participating teachers. 990 second grade students in 33 classes were initially tested using the Test of General Ability and the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. Within each class pupils were then randomly assigned to one of six treatment conditions corresponding to the different ways in which test results were to be interpreted for the teachers. The six conditions were:

(i) IQ scores given in alphabetical order with no discussion, (ii) IQ scores given together with a discussion of their validity and reliability, (iii) IQ scores given together with a prediction of future performance, (iv) IQ scores given arranged in percentile bands with a discussion of validity and reliability, (v) a list of pupil names in alphabetical order with a discussion of predicted future performance, (vi) no scores at all. After an experimental period of six months a comparison of pre- and post-test scores indicated that the teachers did seem to be influenced by a knowledge of the IQ results. Comparison of conditions (i) to (v) with condition (vi) revealed a difference significant at the .05 level. Individually, however, no systematic pattern in the difference between means was noted, and no significant changes were
found with regard to IQ scores in any of the treatment conditions. Once again the question arises as to whether these attempts to modify the teachers' expectations were successful. Only in treatment (iii), where the scores were interpreted in terms of how well or badly the student would do in the future, was there any real indication of a change in teacher attitude. Even this, however, was insufficient to significantly modify pupil performance over the six month experimental period. It is always possible that in the case of treatment (iii) a longer period of time would have produced significant results.

Following the major criticisms voiced by Snow (1969) and Thorndike (1968) of the "Pygmalion experiment" it might be expected that any attempts at replication would include certain modifications, particularly in the use of a more appropriate test for the age groups in question. In one such replication attempt Mendels and Flanders (1973) tested 120 first grade pupils from 10 classes with the Cognitive Abilities Test. Thorndike et al. (1968). Half of the pupils were randomly assigned to the experimental group, and their teachers informed of their "hidden academic potential". At this point the design deviated from the original experiment by re-testing after only six instead of eight months. Although the experimental group tended to make greater gains in IQ scores (p < .10), no significant differences were found with respect to reading grade, arithmetic grade and social skills. The authors' conclusion, however, was that given more credible naturalistic inputs, differences in overt teacher-pupil interactions would be evident as a result of differential teacher expectations.

In an attempt to modify the teaching behaviour of a group of reading teachers without influencing expectations, Alpert (1975) enlisted a panel of 39 "experts" to identify a number of "good" teacher behaviours in reading groups. The list included such things as positive verbal behaviours as well
as more reading group time, with more material and smaller reading groups. Of the 17 second grade classes used, approximately half were assigned to the experimental condition, where the teachers were given a list of "good teacher behaviours" and asked to cooperate by modifying their teaching to suit. The teachers also kept a daily log of their activities. The control condition teachers received the same number of visits from the researchers to avoid the possibility of the Hawthorne effect. All children were tested before and after the 11 week experimental period with a standardised reading test. The results indicated that the intervention did not affect the vocabulary or comprehension performance of the experimental group in relation to the control group. However, the question does arise as to whether the intervention was effective. No attempt was made to ascertain whether the teachers themselves felt that the changes in teaching behaviour were likely to be better than those which they had already voluntarily adopted. Furthermore, the choice of "good teacher behaviours" was a subjective one, dependent more upon the choice and experience of the, so called, "panel of experts" than on any objective assessment of what constitutes the best way to organise the teaching of reading in any given social context.

In most cases, the failure to gain positive results seems to arise from too short an experimental period, or the failure to put a convincing enough case for the modification of teachers' views to occur. Biased IQ results seem to be convincing only to those teachers who place great value upon the use of IQ tests in the first place, and in the last case, it is likely that having successfully persuaded teachers to change their teaching styles, the performance was not convincing enough to the children, not being accompanied by the necessary conviction on the part of the teachers. What is most important, however, is that failure to obtain positive results has not led to the total rejection of the expectancy effect. On the contrary,
the view has been expressed that if the conditions are right then the expectancy effect will be a reality. These studies failed partly because they were unable to fulfil those conditions.

2. The influence of social factors on the formation of teachers' expectations

One of the most striking features of much of the literature on teacher expectations is that those expectations are a social as well as an educational problem. Much of the evidence included in this section demonstrates a close association between teacher expectations and certain racial and socio-economic characteristics of students.

Teachers' subjective predictions regarding students' future academic success seem to be based on characteristics associated with the race of the student and the income-level of the student's families as well as a number of other factors such as students' sex, physical attractiveness and name. Whereas, individually, several of these factors may have little effect upon teachers' expectations, their combined effect could well be significant. This view is best illustrated by Kell et al's (1974) attempt to establish whether information concerning students' sex, race, intelligence and attractiveness influence teacher ratings of pupils' personality and essay performance. Each of 96 fifth grade teachers (62 white female, 28 black female, 4 black male, 2 white male) rated students' expected performance based on identical essays and psychological evaluations which only varied according to sex, race, intelligence and physical attractiveness as depicted by colour photographs. Of the 16 possible treatment combinations, only the sex of the child produced a main effect \( p < .025 \), and while the remaining variables did not produce significant bias effects when considered alone, the biasing effect of their combination was stronger. Significant effects were obtained
for the sex X attractiveness interaction \( (p < .044) \), and the sex X intelligence X race X attractiveness interaction \( (p < .036) \).

Main biasing effects have, of course, been observed. Rubovits and Maehr (1973) when observing teacher expectancy effects on black students and white students obtained results which they described as:

"results that can be interpreted as a paradigmatic instance of 'white racism'."

White, female, undergraduate education students each taught a group of two white and two black children in a micro-teaching situation. Each child was labelled 'gifted' or 'non-gifted'. In addition, each teacher's level of dogmatism was assessed. The teaching situations were carefully observed and coded using an interaction analysis technique. The results indicated that the teachers treated students labelled as 'gifted' differently from those described as 'non-gifted'. Although there was no observable difference in the amount of attention, there were differences in the quality of that attention. 'Gifted' students were called on more, and were also criticised more. In addition, 'gifted' white students were given more attention than the 'non-gifted' whites, were called on more, praised more and also criticised more. During informal interviews with the teachers, the 'gifted' white students were more frequently chosen as "most liked", "brightest" and "certain leader of the class". Black students were given less attention, were ignored more, praised less and criticised more. The 'gifted' black were given the least attention, were least praised and most criticised. Of all the teachers in the study, those who scored highly on the measure of dogmatism were more inclined toward a prejudicial pattern than those who had a low score. Whilst these findings might sound somewhat alarming it is important to emphasise that the subjects were student teachers who were relatively inexperienced in the classroom, and that micro-teaching is no substitute for real class-
room teaching. For these two reasons alone the research findings should be interpreted with care as they give little indication of how experienced teachers might behave in the total environment of real classrooms. However, that the black children labelled as 'gifted' received the least attention is still in need of explanation. It is very likely that, of all the children taught, those who were black and labelled 'gifted' least matched the student teachers' preconceived views of their pupils.

Immigrant boys emerged as a particularly ill-favoured group in Ingleby and Cooper's (1974) survey of the categories considered relevant by British teachers when judging first year school children. Using a 'repertory grid' technique the following six main categories were elicited from the teachers: character, brightness, work, sociability, home, and language. When applied to 180 children in a multiracial urban area, results indicated that girls received more favourable ratings than boys, although this advantage diminished over the first year - except in "work". It was argued that this may be because infant schoolteachers (mostly women) have a greater liking for girls. In fact, even the ratings of children's homes revealed a difference in favour of the girls, although both boys and girls did not differ much in home background.

In a comparison of social class factors and teacher expectations, Harvey and Slatin (1975) demonstrated that white children were more often expected to succeed in school than black children, regardless of perceived social class position of the family. Ninety-six elementary school teachers judged social class and expected performance from photographs of black children and white children. Analysis of relationships between perceived class and eight performance categories revealed significant results at the .01 level indicating that the teachers' expectations were positively related to the perceived social class of the children in the photographs.
Teachers' evaluations of orally presented material were shown to be influenced by the pupils' dialect. Woodworth and Salzer (1971) attempted to establish whether negro dialects were perceived negatively by teachers. In two 45 minute sessions, three weeks apart, 119 elementary school teachers listened to and evaluated a series of reports read alternately by black and white 6th grade boys. Differences in teachers' evaluations for black and white students were statistically significant \( (p > 0.01) \) for seven of the ten variables used in the evaluation. The remaining three were more concerned with the content of the reports, factors which would not be expected to be influenced by student dialect. In addition, it was noted that the lowest ratings for black students were more likely to come from teachers in suburban schools whose experience of teaching black children was limited.

Even racial differences in people's names appear to have some effect upon evaluations. In an adaptation of the "lost letter technique", Milgram et al (1965), Howitt et al. (1977), sent letters addressed to either Mr Singh or Mr Edwards to a sample of English and Asian households. Each letter bore a return address. Differences between rates of return from Asian households for both "Singh" and "Edwards" were not significant, but a significant difference did occur for rates of return from English households. (88.1% white households returned "Edwards" while only 55.8% returned "Singh".) It was concluded that the "lost letter technique" was sufficiently sensitive to detect "prejudice in the native community".

In a study of the importance of both race and social class factors in the formation of teachers' expectancies, Cooper, Baron and Lowe (1975), obtained performance ratings of samples of both black and white children. 128 female students of psychology and education assessed the relative importance of ability, luck, effort, task difficulty and quality of instruction upon academic performance. The results indicated that middle-
class children were expected to receive higher grades than lower class children (p < .001) and that white middle-class children were held more internally responsible for failure than any other group. (p < .01). While interesting, it must be remembered that these results were obtained using students of psychology and education as subjects, and might therefore be subject to forms of bias not present when experienced teachers are used as subjects. However, some precautions were taken. All of the subjects chosen were white, middle-class and caucasian. Furthermore, all women were chosen since most elementary school teachers are women.

Unlike the studies discussed so far, Rist (1970) based his investigation of student social class and teacher expectations on a longitudinal study spanning 2½ years with a single group of black children. Data were collected by means of twice weekly 1½ hour observations of a single group of black children in an urban ghetto school. Further information was obtained separately from the teachers through informal interviews. The study began at the kindergarten level. Each kindergarten teacher had several sources of information available before students came to school, although none of these related directly to the academic potential of incoming students. The information was of a more social kind dealing with matters such as the financial status of families, medical care of the children, family size and family structure.

Within eight days of starting school students had been placed in "ability" reading groups which were shown to remain basically the same in composition until the end of the second grade, nearly three years later. Rist discovered that those children who best fitted the teacher's own view of the "ideal" student, that is, conformed most to the values and attitudes of the teacher's own white/black, well-educated, middle-class reference group, were grouped together on table 1. The remaining children were assigned to
tables 2 and 3. Other differences between table 1 and tables 2 and 3 were also evident. Students' physical appearances were noticeably different. Those with the darkest skin, shabbiest clothes and worst body-odour were all at table 3. Students at table 1 seemed most at ease in their interactions with one another and the teacher. They were most verbal and used more standard English; those at table 3 were least verbal and used more dialect. Finally, differences between the children on the three tables appeared to be related to those social factors which were known to the teacher prior to her seating the children, table 1 students coming from the highest income group, the best educated and smallest families, table 3 children coming from the lowest income (including welfare payments), least educated and largest families. By the time the children reached 2nd grade, grouping assignments appeared to be based not on the teacher's expectations of how an individual child might perform, but rather on the basis of the child's past performance. It was Rist's contention that, within the system of segregation established by the teachers, the groups perceived as slow learners were ascribed a caste position that sought to keep them apart from the other students.

Several of the factors which assume greatest importance in teachers' minds when rating pupils have been found to vary according to the age and experience of the teacher. In a study of 34 teachers of 11-12 year olds in a Scottish city, McIntyre, Morrison and Sutherland (1966) obtained the teachers ratings of boys and girls independently on 25 traits. Three further measures were also included for analysis: socioeconomic status, intelligence and school attendance. In addition all teachers completed the revised form of the Manchester Scales of Opinions about Education, Oliver and Butcher (1962). The results indicated that the assessments were made on two main dimensions, but that the traits defining these dimensions differed according to the pupils' social class, their sex, and the age and experience of their
teachers. Assessments for girls were largely uniform across the different analyses, the first factor emphasising traits indicative of good behaviour. For boys, however, there were considerable social class differences both in the relative importance of factors and in the traits descriptive of the kind of pupils most worth taking trouble over. Teachers in middle-class and mixed social class schools laid stress on traits descriptive of the pleasant and trustworthy pupil whilst those in urban and suburban working-class schools showed particular concern for pupils' attainments and attitudes to school. Assessments by older and more experienced teachers emphasised attainment and attitudes to work; those of younger teachers were primarily concerned with the good behaviour of pupils.

Mazer (1971) involved 157 white, caucasian female elementary and secondary school teachers in a social class stereotyping laboratory experiment. Each teacher rated four hypothetical students on a five-point rating scale according to 12 school-related attributes which included "educational attainment", "self-image appearance and grooming", "attendance", "co-operative attitude", and "mental ability". Each set of four descriptions was identical except for the systematic insertion of one of the following labels: "Black middle-class", "White middle-class", "Black disadvantaged", "White disadvantaged". Teacher ratings were differentiated markedly by differences in the social class designations on ten of the twelve attributes, but not by those that referred to racial differences. The mean ratings for both black and white middle-class students consistently differed from those for black and white "disadvantaged" students at the .01 level. Similarly, the decisions made by school counsellors may be influenced by their perception of the clients' social class. Garfield, Weiss and Pollack (1973) gave two groups of elementary school counsellors identical descriptions of a child presenting typical school behaviour problems, only the designated social class
being varied. Counsellors were then asked to rate the severity of the problem, to give a prognosis, and to make management recommendations to teacher and parents. The responses of the two groups suggested that when the child is identified as having upper-class status, the counsellor is more willing to become ego-involved in the management of the child who is seen as "more important" and worthier of attention than when a client comes from the lower class. Not only did the responses of the low status group reflect a lack of willingness to become involved in the case but there was also a suggestion of a more punitive attitude.

In recent years much concern has been expressed about the effect of sexist attitudes in education. School text books and reading schemes have come under the close scrutiny of sociologists intent upon revealing the sex role stereotypes implicit in such texts. According to Calabrese (1974),

"Even the most dedicated of non-sexist teachers can have a residue of sexist attitudes. These attitudes are often conveyed in the words we use and the expectations we express."

The more favourable ratings of girls compared with boys in the same class identified by Ingleby and Cooper (1974) are not untypical of many of the studies reviewed in this section. In a study of induced teacher bias with respect to teachers' knowledge of standardised text information, Sorotzkin, Fleming and Anttonen (1974) discovered significant differences between experimental and control groups attributable to student sex. Although analysis of covariance of final IQ and achievement test scores for 567 2nd grade pupils in 23 classes revealed no significant differences as a function of test information distributed to the teachers, those students whose teachers had high to middle opinions of tests did score significantly higher on final vocabulary achievement and arithmetic achievement.
Significant differences in favour of female students were obtained at the .05 level with respect to IQ, paragraph meaning, word study and arithmetic, and at the .01 level for word meaning and spelling. It was only in the case of vocabulary that the performance of the male group exceeded that of the female group. As with Ingleby and Cooper (1974) it was concluded that in the early primary school setting the female student is at a known advantage in terms of school-appropriate behaviour and conformity to the teacher's (mostly female) model of academic behaviour.

Among the determinants of the initial impression of a stranger are his overt stimulus characteristics and the subjects' expectancies concerning them. Byrne, London and Reeves (1968) suggest that cues to physical attractiveness and unattractiveness possess differential reward value in that, in a given culture, learning to like a particular stimulus person is essentially learning to anticipate reward when that person is present. Eighty-nine subjects were asked to evaluate strangers of the same or opposite sex who were either physically attractive or unattractive. It was found (p < .05) that interpersonal attraction was greater towards physically attractive strangers regardless of sex. Other researchers have attempted to demonstrate the influence of physical attractiveness on the judgements of teachers, Seligman, Tucker and Lambert (1970) used speech samples, drawings and compositions obtained from grade 3 boys, as stimulus materials. These were randomly combined and presented to 19 Canadian female student teachers as examples of the personal characteristics and school work of certain pupils. The subjects were asked to form subjective impressions of the pupils and to evaluate them on various characteristics using semantic differential scales. The results indicated that the voice and photograph cues significantly affected their judgements of the students' intelligence and personal characteristics. (p < .05 to .01). In a similar experiment, Clifford and Walster (1973)
found that the child's attractiveness was significantly associated with the teacher's expectations about how intelligent the child was, (p < .01), how interested in education his parents were, (p < .01), how far he was likely to progress in school (p < .001), and how popular he would be with his peers (p < .001). However, in a number of cases, physical attractiveness was only seen as a significant factor when in combination with other factors. As previously discussed, Kehle, Bramble and Mason (1974) obtained significant results for the sex X attractiveness interaction and the sex X intelligence X race X attractiveness interaction.

Rich (1975) argues that it is unwarranted to postulate a general physical attractiveness stereotype. After viewing the photograph of a physically attractive or unattractive child and a vignette depicting a misbehaviour possibly committed by the child, 144 female teachers evaluated the pupil for blame, personality and punishment before and after reading a report card characterising the child as a good, satisfactory or poor student. Though attractive children generally received more desirable personality ratings, a misbehaviour was deemed less undesirable if attributed to unattractive rather than attractive children. Furthermore unattractive girls were blamed less frequently and received more lenient recommendations for punishment than did unattractive boys. These results combine to suggest that the physical attractiveness stereotype differs in form, rather than in degree, as a function of the sex of the stimulus person. Rich concludes:

"Thus while hypothesizing a general stereotype for adult evaluations of other adults may continue to be tenable, it is no longer appropriate to suggest 'what is beautiful is good' in regard to adult evaluations of children, especially when the evaluating adult is a female teacher."
Although attractive physical appearance can significantly affect teachers' evaluations, especially when in combination with other factors, so too can attractive sounding names. Buchanan and Bruning (1971) and Lawson (1971) suggest that interpersonal relations are considerably influenced by stereotypes associated with names. In an investigation of the effect of teachers' stereotyped perceptions of first names and their evaluations of pupils' performance, Harari and McDavid (1973) presented, for evaluation, essays actually written by 5th grade students to 80 female elementary school teachers and 80 female college students. Authorship of the essays was randomly linked with boys and girls with common, popular and unattractive names. The attributed quality of each essay was judged higher when essays were written by children with names associated with positive stereotypes. This stereotype bias was more pronounced for experienced teachers \((p < .05)\) than for inexperienced college students (not significant), and the effect was clearer for boys' names than for girls' names. It is unusual for a study to provide the opportunity for direct comparison of results between a set of experienced teacher subjects and a set of college student subjects. However, in this case it is clear that it is the experienced teachers who are most subject to bias.

Finally, the laboratory studies of Foster et al (1975) and Ysseldyke et al (1978), using simulation techniques have reported negative expectancies as a result of externally imposed labels. These studies exposed teacher trainees to a labelling condition and then attempted to measure their expectancies. Typically the subjects had no, or only brief exposure to the labelled student. Under these circumstances, the label has been shown to exert large effects on expectancies. Further, people with more knowledge relating to the labels were influenced more by the label than persons with less knowledge relating to the label. Dusek and O'Connell
(1973) and Humphreys and Stubbs (1977), studied labelling effects in natural classrooms with teachers who had opportunities to interact with the labelled child, producing only negative results. It seems that the teachers were able to develop expectancies more from observation of the child's actual behaviour than from the label introduced by the experimenters.

Using the methodology of the more successful studies, Reschley and Lamprecht (1979) attempted to simulate the natural classroom environment by monitoring changes in teachers' induced expectations over a period of 40 minutes from the time when the initial label was applied. While the overall initial effect of labelling was highly significant \( (p < .0001) \), so was the interaction of label and length of exposure \( (p < .0001) \). After the labels "gifted", "normal" or "educable mentally retarded" had been applied the subjects were asked to indicate their level of expectation at 10 minute intervals. The initial prediction made with no observation reflected a large expectancy effect. After 10 minutes the second prediction reflected some reduction in expectancy due to exposure to the child. At the 3rd and 4th predictions further reductions were evident, and finally the expectancy effects were eliminated altogether. It must be remembered, however, that this diminution of expectancy effects was in response to an externally imposed label which received no periodic reinforcement from other colleagues and children in the class. Where such re-inforcement is available, argues Fuchs (1968), labels can more easily form the basis of self-fulfilling prophecies.

The evidence reviewed in this section serves to illustrate the wide and diverse aspects of the total educational environment which may influence teachers' judgements about their pupils. Race, colour, dialect, intelligence, socio-economic level, sex and other physical attributes like attractiveness along with such ascribed attributes as the attractiveness of ones name,
even the age and experience of the teacher all, individually or collectively, have been shown to relate in some way to teachers' expectations of their pupils. In many cases this can be seen to lead to the most highly favoured children being those who best fit the teachers' own view of the "ideal" student, conforming most to the values and attitudes of the teacher's own White/Black, well educated, middle-class reference group.

3. Teacher behaviour: Ways in which expectations are communicated

For many years the most central issue in the discussion of teacher behaviour is whether it is the quantity or the quality of interaction which counts most in the transmission of teachers' expectations. While classroom interaction most commonly involves a combination of both verbal and non-verbal communication these two aspects will be treated separately for the purposes of this discussion. However, it is essential to point out that non-verbal cues are often so inextricably linked to verbal interaction that it would be impractical to pursue the distinction too far.

(i) Teachers' verbal behaviour

As early as 1938, Olson and Wilkinson (1938) had claimed that when teachers dealt with matters of classroom discipline the quantity of interaction was less important than its quality. They found that directive, approving, specific statements were more efficacious in obtaining compliance and co-operation than negative, blanket and non-specific statements or requests.

In contrast to this Chapple (1949) argued that the total amount of time spent in communication represented the quality of that communication. An unfortunate result of adopting this view is that it is all too easy to confuse total time engaged in all forms of communication per se, and the
total time engaged in, so called, positive communication. A good example of this confusion can be seen in a study of induced teacher bias by Kester and Letchworth (1972). Using a category system to measure teacher-student interaction with a pre-test - post-test design, a significant change in interaction was evident. Quite clearly the teachers spent more time with their ostensibly superior students but, at the same time, the interaction was described as becoming more positive. In addition, this positive interaction was described as being accepting and supportive, an analysis of which revealed a significant difference in favour of those students expected to be intellectually superior ($p < .01$).

This raises the important question of what actually constitutes positive interaction and how does it differ from neutral and negative varieties. Very much a part of the continuing debate on what constitutes good teaching, this question has been tackled by many writers. While one approach has been to consult panels of so called experts to elicit a checklist by which teachers' performance can be judged, the alternative approach has been to observe teachers at work and to attempt to make correlations between observed behaviour and pupil success as measured against some external criteria.

Wright and Nuthall (1970) attempted to identify the short term effects of teacher behaviours in a set of three subject-matter controlled lessons of the discussion or recitation type common in most elementary school classrooms. Their systematic observation revealed five aspects of teacher behaviour which correlated ($p < .1$) with higher levels of pupil performance. Within the context of their study those points were:

a) Teachers asked relatively direct (closed rather than open) questions allowing for pupil responses not requiring additional information or rephrasing of the question.
b) Summarized in an informative way at the end of each episode.

c) Involved more pupils by re-directing each question to several pupils.

d) Frequently thanked pupils for their responses.

e) Provided comprehensive revision at the end of lessons.

Everston et al's (1980) study of 29 mathematics teachers used a low inference coding system revealing that the more effective teachers were active, well-organised and strongly academically oriented. They tended to emphasise whole group instruction but with some time also devoted to seat work. They managed their classes efficiently and tended to 'nip trouble in the bud', stopping a disturbance before it could seriously disrupt a class. They asked many questions during class discussions, mostly lower order product questions, but higher order process questions were also fairly common. They were also rated as more enthusiastic, nurturant and were more likely to encourage and accept student contributions than their less successful colleagues.

Although the examples discussed so far do not relate to the communication of specific expectations to individual pupils they are of interest because they illustrate ways in which teachers are able to positively influence pupil performance. The only difference between these and studies of teacher expectations lies not in the kinds of things which teachers say and do but simply to whom they are directed.

Rothbart, Dalfen and Barrett (1971) simulated a classroom teaching situation using thirteen student teachers. A form of bias was introduced by designating half the children in each class as "lacking in intellectual potential". Using one-way mirrors and video techniques it was demonstrated
that the student teachers were more attentive toward their high-expectation pupils, \( (p < .06) \) while they directed the same amount of reinforcement to both groups. When asked to evaluate their pupils after the exercise the low-expectation pupils were rated as less intelligent \( (p < .08) \), and as having less potential \( (p < .02) \), and a higher need for approval \( (p < .01) \).

It is interesting to note here that although the student teachers perceived this need in their low-expectation pupils, the observation data would seem to indicate that they were unable or perhaps even unwilling to fulfil that need. However, in common with many other laboratory-type studies, the subjects of the experiment were not experienced teachers in real classrooms and so these findings must be interpreted with care. While laboratory studies of this kind would seem to indicate that teachers spend more time overall communicating with their favoured students, some studies of experienced teachers in their natural settings have provided similar results. Even the most casual observation of whole class discussions would indicate that some children seem to be given more opportunities to respond and contribute than others. Good (1970) used the rank order of academic achievement obtained from four experienced first grade teachers as a simple measure of their expectations for the children in their classes. Two independent observers kept tallies of every opportunity for individual children to respond, irrespective of whether it lead to a correct response or not.

The results clearly indicated that opportunities to respond were closely related to pupil achievement as rated by their teacher. The high achievers received a greater number of opportunities to respond than the lower achievers did. \( (p < .02 \text{ reading responses, } p < .001 \text{ academic responses}) \)

Since all opportunities to respond were counted, and not just those leading to a correct response, it is reasonable to suggest that over a period of time teachers may come to call more often upon those children who are
known to give "correct" responses, thus leading, eventually, to a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Rosenthal (1973) proposed a four factor theory of good teacher behaviours based upon an undisclosed bibliography of 262 studies of the "Pygmalion effect" in industry, commerce and education. His analysis suggested that people who have been led to expect good things from their students, children, clients or employees appear to:

a) Create a warmer social-emotional mood around their "special" students (Climate)

b) Give more feedback to those students about their performance (Feedback)

c) Teach more material, and more difficult material to their special students (Input)

d) Give their special students more opportunities to respond and question (Output).

Of the four factors proposed, only two (b) and (d) refer specifically to straightforward differences in quantity of interaction, the remaining two (a) and (c) both contain an important qualitative element, in that the social-emotional mood is "warmer" rather than "cooler", and more difficult material is taught.

Other studies illustrating the qualitative differences in teacher-pupil interaction are fairly common, a previously mentioned study by Rosenthal, Baratz and Hall (1974), is particularly worthy of note. It indicates that the qualitative differences in teacher behaviour could be affected by ethnic factors. In a study of induced teacher bias the greater gains in performance of the children occurred where teachers behaved in a more
motivated, more child-centred, more professional and encouraging manner. However, in common with other research concerning black children, the teachers tended to become relatively more negative towards those black students of whom they had been led to expect more.

What appears to have set out as a study of quantitative elements of interaction by looking at the frequency of teacher-pupil contacts, Garner and Bing (1973) reveal a number of qualitative differences in contacts received by clusters of children who are perceived by the teacher as being active, bright, personable children, or active, duller, miscreants. Of Cluster 1 the authors comment:

"They tend to be rated rather highly on items concerned with 'personality' and are thought to be amusing, stable, sociable and imaginative. Their teachers tend to like them and interact with them at above average levels. Their conduct is rated as below average, they spend a below average amount of time at their prescribed work, and (possibly as a result) receive relatively high numbers of disciplinary contacts."

By way of contrast they refer to children in Cluster 2 as follows:

"These children are seen to be bright, outgoing, hard-working and well behaved."

"The teacher initiates a high proportion of procedural contacts - possibly because they are reliable children - and also provides them with a high frequency of response opportunities. In contrast, the teachers do not initiate many work contacts or ask many direct questions; this is possibly due to the high level of pupil initiated work contacts and the apparent tendency for teacher initiated work contacts and direct questions to be
associated with children whose work output and attitudes are low."

If these qualitative differences in teacher-pupil interaction continue for any length of time they become institutionalised; the children come to expect to be treated differently and thus conform more and more to their teachers' views of what they are like.

Not only can positive expectations lead to positive interaction, but negative expectations can be shown to lead to negative aspects of interaction. In the study of Meichenbaum, Bowers and Ross (1969), induced teacher bias was created in the teachers of 14 institutionalised adolescent girls over a period of five weeks. Six of the girls were labelled "late bloomers". In some cases the teachers were observed to increase positive interactions (p < .05); at the same time other teachers were observed to have decreased negative interactions (p < .05) with respect to the designated "late bloomers". The positive teacher behaviours observed included: conveying encouragement, praise or any attribute of the teacher's satisfaction with the girls' classroom behaviour, while negative behaviours included: conveying disapproval, castigation or any attribute of the teachers' dissatisfaction with the girls' classroom behaviour.

Alpert, (1974), elicited a list of "good teacher behaviours" from a panel of 39, so called, experts. Relating specifically to the organisation of high and low ability reading groups the list included:

a) more reading group time
b) best reading group time
c) more materials available
d) smaller reading group size
e) a list of 20 good verbal behaviours.
Fifteen 2nd grade reading teachers were observed on three occasions with their top and bottom reading groups. While the only significant difference occurred with respect to group size ($p < .01$) in favour of the bottom groups, the tendency was for all differences to be in favour of the bottom groups. The conclusion drawn from these results was that teacher behaviour may not be adversely affected by teacher expectations. However, on the basis of such a small sample it would be unwise to place too much reliance on such a conclusion.

One of the major problems encountered by researchers wishing to replicate studies of induced teacher bias has always been the possibility that the subjects of the experiment would be aware of what the researchers were really trying to do, resulting in less than innocent responses on the part of the participants. This being the case, it could be argued that teachers who are made aware of the workings of the expectancy effect might be better equipped to guard against its negative consequences, and perhaps even encourage its positive ones.

Smith and Luginbuhl (1976) used a group of 80 introductory psychology students, some of whom had been instructed on the mechanism and possible consequences of the expectancy effect. In a simulated teacher exercise the teachers who were aware of the effects provided greater overall attention to all students than those who were not ($p < .05$). The teachers who were unaware of the possible expectancy effects gave more evaluative feedback (both encouragement and criticism) to "bright" than to "dull" students. Those who were aware of the effects showed no marked differences to the use of evaluative feedback with either group. It was also noticed that the aware teachers directed more qualitative feedback to the student designated as "dull" than did unaware teachers.
Taking the idea of encouraging positive expectancy effects a stage further, Roueche (1976) reports an attempt to create a "therapeutic climate" in twelve American colleges whereby low achieving students stayed in college, achieved passing marks in courses, and, he claims, enjoyed the experience. Over the three years of the study the key figures in setting up the "therapeutic climate" were the college presidents who were encouraged to insist that college teachers be committed to the notion that students can learn and that teaching and counselling success would be measured against such student success. It is suggested that these results were achieved through teachers getting to know their students as individuals, by demonstrating their caring and expectations by attending to each student, making themselves accessible to them and by monitoring student achievement daily.

(ii) Teachers' non-verbal behaviour

It is generally agreed, by observers of classroom behaviour, that non-verbal cues form an important part of the communication process. However, for reasons of convenience and ease of coding the verbal aspects of teaching have received a disproportionate amount of attention. Cassette tape recorders are common in classrooms and the cost of a small radio-microphone is not beyond the budget of all but the most basic classroom research project. Non-verbal communication, however, requires the more sophisticated techniques of video or film to capture every subtle expression and gesture, and it is almost inevitable that the camera will be situated in the wrong position for at least some of the time. The difficulties involved in coding aspects of non-verbal communication are best illustrated in a definition by Halpin (1960) who describes it as:

"... the language of eyes and hands, of gesture, of time and of status symbols, of unconscious slips which betray the very words we use."
and the importance of aspects of non-verbal communication to serious studies of classroom life in the words of Garner (1970), who writes:

"Many times in the non-verbal method the communicator does not desire to communicate and does not consciously encode his ideas into symbols."

Goffman (1959) emphasises the importance of what he calls expressions that we "give off", when he writes:

"In our society, some unmeant gestures occur in such a wide variety of performances and convey impressions that are in general so incompatible with the ones being fostered that these inopportune events have acquired collective symbolic status."

Clearly the implications for teachers, who engage in many thousands of non-verbal contacts every day, have far reaching consequences, particularly if they are to be encouraged to repress negative or low expectations and display positive and high but realistic ones.

The major problem for researchers has been one of coding rather than identification. The earliest and most detailed work was pioneered by the ethologists whose interests in animal behaviour developed into attempts to record and code the non-verbal behaviour of mothers with very young children.

Brannigan and Humphries (1972) discuss the use made of facial expressions and body gestures in human communication, as a signalling system optionally independent of speech, and on other occasions influencing, and itself modified by, speech.

"It is a well known fact of everyday life that smiles, frowns, gestures and other non-verbal behaviours of our acquaintances provide useful cues about their moment to moment attitudes to our-
selves and others. Much of their non-verbal behaviour is generally accepted to be a means of communication. However, the scientific study of this everyday fact is still in its infancy, despite the ubiquity of the phenomenon and despite the obvious practical advantages to be gained from its scientific understanding.”

The authors describe a system of 136 categories covering a wide range of bodily communication using the face, head, hands and arms, and trunk. However, such a large number of categories of behaviour would be impossible to handle in a classroom without the aid of stop-frame cine or video techniques.

The mechanism for the differential distribution of self-fulfilling expectations in classrooms via non-verbal interaction is well illustrated in a study by Loss (1973). A more manageable 13 category instrument was devised, based upon the Flanders Interaction category system, and enables observers to encode the non-verbal behaviour of both teacher and pupils. Divided into two parts the schedule recorded such aspects of teacher behaviour as:

- orientation, physical position, locomotion, affective facial attitude, body-torso positions, physical contact, voice and gesture.

While student behaviour was limited to:

- locomotion, affective facial attitude, body-torso positions, orientation and physical setting.

A study of 17 home economics teachers using this schedule revealed a high degree of agreement between the non-verbal behaviours of the teachers
and those of their students. A teacher's smile could evoke smiles from the class (or individuals), but just as clearly, the class could evoke that smile from the teacher. The same interdependence was shown in negative expressions, movements and gestures. Taking this as an example, it is not unreasonable to argue that the very act of acknowledgement of a gesture with a similar one, could imply acceptance of the implied definition of the situation. It is as if a meaning has been bargained for, and agreement reached.

Video techniques were used, to record the behaviour of 56 sixth grade tutors in a study by Feldman and Allen (1979). To control the performance of the tutees, confederates were used who acted in a predetermined manner, either to appear as successful or as very poor. It was expected that the performance of the learners would be reflected in both the verbal and non-verbal behaviour of the tutors. Using a 20 category observation system the mean scores for non-verbal behaviour under conditions of success and failure were compared, revealing significant differences for the following three categories at the $p < .05$ level:

- pursing lips, nodding head, leaning forward,
- fidgeting at the $p < .01$ level and the following three at the $p < 0.001$ level:
  - shaking head, reaching toward tutees, and erect posture.

Focusing on just one aspect of non-verbal communication, Cooper (1971) attempted to test the hypothesis that subjects who received consistent and frequent eye-contact from experimenters feel more positively about themselves than subjects who receive very little eye contact. Assistant experimenters, unaware of the hypothesis, administered a picture rating task to the 40 subjects, all of whom were high school students. Half were instructed to make frequent eye contact with the subjects while the others were instructed to avoid eye contact. To test the hypothesis, subjects'
self evaluations were assessed. Those subjects in the high eye-contact condition felt more positively about themselves than subjects in the low eye-contact group ($p < .05$). Cooper suggests that it would be unwise to claim that expectations are necessarily transmitted in this way, but that the link established between expectation of success and eye contact would suggest that this is a fruitful area for further research.

Woolfolk and Woolfolk (1974) attempted to extend to the classroom the findings of previous basic research on non-verbal communication. They examined the effects of both verbal and non-verbal dimensions of teacher behaviour upon students' perceptions of that teacher's feelings and attitudes towards them. Eighty fourth-grade pupils were subdivided into four groups each containing a similar distribution of self-esteem types ranging from high to low. Following each work period, during which pupils had been given vocabulary words with which they had to construct sentences, the teachers were instructed to evaluate pupils according to a number of conditions ranging from both positive verbal and non-verbal cues to both negative verbal and non-verbal cues. Subsequent measurement of student perceptions of the teacher's feelings and attitudes towards them revealed significant effects due to both verbal and non-verbal communication. ($p < .0001$). Furthermore, the effect was seen to be strongest for the positive verbal and non-verbal condition, and weakest for the negative verbal and non-verbal condition.

The outstanding feature of studies concerned with the transmission of teachers' expectations is the view that quality of interaction is more important than quantity. It has been clearly demonstrated that teachers behave differently towards individuals and groups of pupils in ways which are dependent upon how favourably they are perceived. Studies which have isolated teacher behaviour facilitating higher levels of attainment generally,
have tended to suggest similar teacher behaviour to that arising from studies concerned with the transmission of positive expectations to favoured pupils. With respect to non-verbal aspects of behaviour, a condition of successful communication of teacher expectations is that expressions "given off" must match those which are intended in order that the "performance" be convincing. If the expectations are the result of firmly held beliefs then there is little problem. The difficulty arises if teachers try to manipulate their behaviour to imply expectations which are somewhat more positive than those actually held.

**Necessary conditions for teachers' expectations to be successfully communicated**

An essential feature of the successful communication of teachers' expectations, whether positive or negative, is that the situation as defined by the teacher becomes accepted and defined as real by the pupil or pupils concerned. The research evidence so far reviewed suggests that for this to occur, certain conditions must be fulfilled. For the purposes of convenience these have been organised under five separate but inter-related sub-headings:

1. External conditions of the school.
2. Teacher values and expectations.
3. Pupil values and expectations.
4. Teacher behaviour.
5. Pupil behaviour.

1. **External conditions of the school**

The school itself must provide an appropriate arena in which expectations may be formed and articulated. Sufficient time must be allowed for children to spend relatively long periods with individual teachers, facilitating activities involving a relatively high degree of verbal activity,
and the opportunity for the teachers to make regular subjective judgements about the children.

2. **Teachers' values and expectations**

   Over a period of time, and through contact with the pupils and/or other members of the "expectation set", teachers must form specific expectations of individuals and/or groups which they define as real. The situation, as defined by the teacher must be appropriate to the particular school setting, otherwise it will be out of line with the general school climate of expectations.

   If all teachers share similar perceptions of particular children there is likely to be a cumulative effect and those expectations are more likely to be transmitted. In such a case, teachers whose views are out of line with the general climate may have minimal effect.

3. **Pupil values and expectations**

   For teachers to have fulfilled the above conditions is not sufficient since it is important that the pupils are receptive to the signals being transmitted. For this purpose it is necessary that pupils value school and believe that their teachers are legitimate and competent judges of their behaviour and performance. This being so it follows that pupils must feel personally concerned with their performance. The only exception to this would be the case where a child placed little or no value on school and the opinions of his teachers, in which case positive expectations may be despised and rejected, and negative ones interpreted as further confirmation of the child's negative attitudes.

4. **Teacher behaviour**

   To be effective in the transmission of expectations teachers must be seen to be providing qualitatively different classroom experiences for
children depending upon their expectations of them. However, this in itself is not sufficient, since it is particularly important that the teacher's behaviour is consistent over an extended period of time, and that the messages conveyed verbally are supported by the appropriate non-verbal cues. If several teachers share the same expectations then the consistency condition may be strengthened.

5. Pupil behaviour

The pupil's behaviour and performance is important in this analysis since it completes the cycle of the expectancy phenomenon. It is through constant monitoring of the pupil's performance that both teacher and pupil are able to maintain or change their shared definitions of the situation, regular feedback is essential to the successful transmission of the teacher's expectations.
CHAPTER 4

Results and discussion I

The Teachers and their Pupils

(i) The teachers' personal constructs (ELICITED)

The individual personal construct system of each teacher was obtained using the triadic elicitation technique. The interviews each lasted for approximately one hour and were tape recorded for convenience and ease of transcription.

Although some previous researchers, (Nash 1973, Taylor 1976, Ball 1981) have attempted to subsume all similar construct elements under a single heading, this has not been the convention adopted in this study. Analysis of the interview transcripts revealed that, within the context of the interview, the teachers used a whole variety of terms to explain and illustrate the concepts they were using, and that to condense these under a general heading of two or three words would only serve to obscure their meaning. The general lack of precision in the use of socio-psychological and educational concepts points to the view that, for many of the teachers interviewed, the interview itself was as much an opportunity for them to explore aloud their feelings about children as it was an opportunity for the interviewer to record and analyse those feelings. In addition to this it was important to present the elicited constructs to the teachers in the subsequent pupil rating exercises as familiar and unmodified form as possible.

The number of distinct construct pairs elicited varied from teacher to teacher, the least number elicited was six, from Mrs Cartwright who taught French set 2 containing only nine of the twenty-four children. It is very likely that this relatively small number of constructs was partly
due to the small number of children available for comparison in her case. The greatest number of elicited constructs was twenty-seven from Mrs Betworth, an English teacher who taught the whole class together for a total of three double periods per week. In addition, Mrs Betworth was very active in the pastoral side of school life and claimed to know many of the children more intimately than many of her colleagues. The average number of elicited construct pairs was around ten or twelve. Each teacher ranked the elicited construct pairs in response to the question:

"If you were about to take on a new class and were able to obtain certain pieces of information about the children from their previous teacher, what would be their order of importance or value to you?"

The responses to this question came together with a number of reservations from those teachers who felt that it was in the childrens' interest for them not to have such information until they had had time to come to their own conclusions and formed their own opinions about the children. This view was perhaps best articulated by Mr Rogers, the head of mathematics, who wrote:

"I prefer not to have this kind of information, certainly not until I have formed my own opinions. The creation of good attitudes etc., is very much my job and childrens' reactions reflect their relationship with me. This is a pretty meaningless exercise for me."

Mrs Betworth put it another way:

"Please remember that I never claim to need any of this knowledge before I teach the children and would only consider some of the points pertinent to my knowledge
about their ability and disposition prior to meeting them. Secondly, as they are my personal 'chatting' criteria then most of my responses are likely to be towards the positive rather than the negative: or am I deceiving myself?"

The issue provoked much staffroom discussion, the most illuminating conclusion of which was that the teachers felt that, as professionals teachers may try with all sincerity to make considered and rational judgements about children upon which they can base decisions about teaching and learning. But that as human beings, and in common with all human beings, teachers form opinions and develop attitudes towards others as a result of more basic and non-rational feelings which, at times of crisis when they feel somewhat under pressure, may override their more rational and carefully considered judgements.

Only the first ten construct pairs (six in the case of Mrs Cartwright) were used in the subsequent pupil rating exercise, these are listed below in each individual teacher's order of importance.

It is interesting to note that concepts like extravert-intravert were commonly used by the teachers in a different way to that normally used by educational psychologists. In the context of the interviews the so-called extravert child was outgoing and positive, he was co-operative and his contribution was highly valued. Hence to be labelled an extravert was to be perceived in very positive terms indeed. Similarly the intravert was seen merely to be quiet and retiring.

Mrs James. Health Education. Former first year form tutor.

(10 out of 17 elicited)

1. Happy at school. - Unhappy at school.
2. Academically able. - Academically limited.
4. Able to get on, single-minded, can concentrate. - Lack application, need to be encouraged.
5. Good reader. - Poor reader.
8. Can record ideas well. - Has difficulty recording ideas.
10. Articulates well. Orally responsive. - Quiet, doesn't participate orally.

Mrs Cartwright. French. (6 elicited)

1. Good oral contribution, willing - Unwilling or needs encouragement in to take part orally, forthcoming.
   oral work.
2. Committed to work, enthusiastic - Lacking enthusiasm and interest.
5. Intelligent. - Dull.
6. Good at written work, Adventurous written work, well presented, accurate.
   Poor written work, inaccurate, badly presented.

Mrs Betworth. English (10 out of 27 elicited)

1. Good reader. - Poor reader.
2. Good at spelling. - Poor at spelling.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Positive trait</th>
<th>Negative trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cares about achieving.</td>
<td>Doesn't care about achieving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sensitive.</td>
<td>Insensitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Able, clever, bright, intelligent.</td>
<td>Dull, not very able.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Good at written work.</td>
<td>Poor at written work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mr Johnson. Humanities (10 out of 18 elicited)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Positive trait</th>
<th>Negative trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Highly intelligent, very able.</td>
<td>Not very bright.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Good all rounder.</td>
<td>Standards of oral and written work do not match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Finds work easy.</td>
<td>Finds work harder than would like to admit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Expresses ideas well on paper.</td>
<td>Quality of written work is very poor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Davies. Music (10 elicited).

3. Receptive, picks things up quickly. - Slow on the uptake.
5. Intelligent, clever, musically able. - Lacking in ability.
6. Confident. - Feels inadequate/inferior, likes constant assurances.
8. Leader. - Follower, easily led.
9. Extrovert, noisy, strong personality. - Introvert, quiet, shy.
10. Steady worker. - Erratic worker.

Mr Danby. Second year form tutor and Set 1 mathematics. (10 out of 12 elicited)

1. Stable, well adjusted personality. - Moody, emotional.
2. Amenable to suggestion. - Unwilling to co-operate.
3. Well behaved. - Badly behaved, sly, mischievous, underhand.
4. Sociable, popular. - Outcast, isolated, loner, unpopular, doesn't mix well.
5. Able, intelligent, bright. - Low ability.
7. Supportive home background. - Home background appears not to be supportive.
8. Extravert.
10. Willing to take part orally.

Confident, communicative.

Mrs Lindsay. French (10 elicited)

1. Keen and enthusiastic, gets on with her work. Hard worker.

2. Gets on well orally, has plenty to say.

3. Good written work.


5. Prepared to ask for help.

6. Able, good academically.

7. Self-confident, outspoken.

8. Well behaved.


Miss Shiels. Physical Education (10 elicited)

1. Physically able, talented.

2. Listens to instructions, Attentive.

3. Hard worker, tries hard.


5. Well behaved.

- Intravert.

- Easily led.

- Unwilling to take part orally. Shy.

- Slow, reluctant worker.

- Unwilling to contribute orally.

- Poor/inaccurate written work.

- Immature.

- Unwilling to ask for help.

- Poor academically.

- Needs constant reassurance, nervous, timid.

- Badly behaved, attention seeker, noisy, volatile, talkative.

- Quiet, unassuming.

- Unpopular/unsociable.
6. Mentally able, intelligent. - Dull, unintelligent.
8. Outgoing, forceful. - Quiet, shy.
10. Popular. - Doesn't seem to have any friends. Loner.

Mr Peters. Mathematics (10 elicited)

1. Positive attitude to work. - Poor attitude to work.
2. Always performs at level of potential. - Doesn't perform at level of potential.
3. Able, capable. - Least able.
4. Well behaved. - Naughty, badly behaved, attention seeker.
5. Family background appears to be supportive of school work. - Family background does not appear to be supportive of school work.
7. Quiet, gets on with work. - Talkative.
8. Self confident. - Lacking in confidence, needs constant reassurance.
9. Good reader. - Poor reader.
10. Willing to answer questions, makes a good verbal contribution. - Unwilling to participate orally.

Mr Lomas. Drama (10 out of 15 elicited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Confident, secure, well-behaved</th>
<th>Insecure, worried.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Outgoing, strong character, friendly.</td>
<td>Difficult to come close to, quiet, retiring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bright, intelligent, academically able.</td>
<td>Dull, unintelligent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Supportive home background.</td>
<td>Home background appears not to be supportive of school work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Deep thinking, aware of the implications of discussions, thinks things through.</td>
<td>Unaware of the implications of topics under discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Mature personality, poised.</td>
<td>Immature personality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mr Johnson. Humanities (10 elicited)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Able.</th>
<th>Lacks ability.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Has potential.</td>
<td>Lacks potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Has good concentration.</td>
<td>Lacks concentration, dreamer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Co-operative with others, works well with a group.</td>
<td>Doesn't work well with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Willing to ask questions and contribute orally.</td>
<td>Doesn't ask questions or contribute orally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr Rogers. Mathematics (10 out of 14 elicited)

1. Has potential (not necessarily academic).  - Lacks potential.
2. Able, capable.  - Lacking in ability.
3. Willing to communicate and ask for help.  - Unwilling to communicate and ask for help. Shy.
4. Happy at school.  - Unhappy at school.
5. Confident, positive character.  - Reluctant to move without reassurance.
8. Good attitude to work.  - Poor attitude to work.
10. Appears to have a supportive home background.  - Home background does not appear to be supportive.

Even though each teacher's set of construct pairs represents their own personal repertoire of criteria used in making judgements about children, there were many similarities being the result of the shared realities of being a teacher. However, unlike the primary teachers' constructs elicited by Nash (1973) and Taylor (1976) some of the differences between individual teachers' construct systems could be accounted for in terms of the specific requirements dictated by the teaching of different curriculum subjects. Teachers of the more traditional academic subjects like mathematics, science, English and humanities (mainly geography during the period of observation)
tended to place greater emphasis upon ability constructs, either in a general sense like able, capable - lacking in ability, or as in the case of English, more specific constructs like good reader - poor reader (R/O 1) and good speller - poor speller (R/O 2). The only teacher to emphasise children's ability to work together in groups was Mrs Jones, the science teacher, specifically because this was her first year of using the "Insight Into Science" integrated science scheme which depends almost exclusively upon group practical work using work cards. Those subjects normally demanding a high degree of pupil participation, such as English and French placed emphasis upon children's willingness and ability to participate verbally, together with such criteria as confidence and motivation. A distinction between intelligence, verbal ability and ability to express ideas well on paper was also common, whereas in physical education the major distinction in the ability construct was between 'physically able, talented - physically unable to do anything' (R/O 1) on the one hand and 'mentally able, intelligent - dull unintelligent' (R/O 6) on the other. Of all twelve sets of elicited constructs, probably the most interesting case of subject specificity was that of drama. Mr Lomas, the drama teacher, was also the deputy headmaster and although he only taught the class for one single period per week he had gained a wide range of information about the children through his pastoral and administrative duties. The theme of his drama course throughout the second year was the exploration of personal feelings and relationships. Consequently he tended to compare and contrast the children more often in terms of personality and motivation criteria and was one out of only four teachers who mentioned the influence of the children's home backgrounds.

(ii) The first pupil rating exercise. (elicited constructs)

All twelve teachers rated the children on a five point scale according to each of their ten elicited personal construct pairs. In each case the
highest score being awarded to that attribute thought by the teacher to be the most conducive to a child doing well at school. In addition the scores were weighted taking into account each teacher's order of importance or preference of construct criteria. For example, in the case of Mrs Betworth the English teacher, the marks available for her first and last construct pairs were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Fairly so</th>
<th>50:50</th>
<th>Fairly so</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Good reader</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hard working, Industrious.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intermediate values were assigned on a pro-rata basis. It is not intended to imply that differences in importance of rating criteria can be in any way quantified but since the more highly valued criteria are likely to play a more important part in the overall perceptions that the teachers have of individual children it is important that this be reflected in the results of the pupil rating exercise. For the purpose of easier comparability of rating scores, only those scores obtained from the six teachers who taught the class as a whole were used in the preparation of the teachers' preferred rank order of pupils.

The weighted scores for each child were added together to produce an overall score, and the overall rank order positions determined. (Table 1).

As a measure of the degree of similarity or agreement between the six individual teachers' average rankings a Kendall coefficient of concordance was calculated giving a result significant at the .001 level. \( W = .58 \) (corrected for ties). Maximum possible value is 1.0. \( \chi^2 = 80.35 \), \( p < .001 \). This highly significant result indicates that even when the six teachers independently rate the same group of twenty-four children according
Table 1. Average rank-order positions for all 24 children for all six teachers who teach the whole class using each teachers 'elicited' construct pairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Form Tutor</th>
<th>P.E.</th>
<th>Health Edcn.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Av. R/O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Andrews</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Berwick</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Benson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Buxton</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Howes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lipscomb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Pearson</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Perry</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ross</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Stevens</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Woods</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Anderson</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Barnes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Barnett</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Davies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Dobson</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Frost</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Feeney</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Morris</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Roberts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Sanders</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Waters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma Wilson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan West</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall coefficient of concordance between all six sets of ratings

\[ W = .58 \] (corrected for ties)
\[ N = 24 \]
\[ \text{Chi Square} = 80.34 \]
\[ P < .001 \]
to their own individual elicited personal constructs, they share very similar views of those children.

Table 2 lists the twenty-four children according to their average rank-order positions obtained from the teachers' ratings. The first quartile representing the six most favourably perceived children, and the fourth quartile the least favourably perceived children. It is these two groups which form the basis for comparison of the children's classroom experience later in this study.

(iii) The teachers' 'Top Ten' construct pairs (given) : A basis for comparison

Analysis of the twelve sets of elicited personal constructs revealed many similarities. By reference to the context of discussion in the elicitation interview transcripts it was possible to group together those construct pairs from individual teachers that were most alike in meaning to determine which of them occurred most often. When placed in order of frequency they formed the basis of an average list of ten construct pairs which could be considered broadly representative of the group of twelve teachers as a whole. Any tied rankings of construct pairs were resolved by reference to the sum of the rank order positions of the individual elements as they occurred in the original individual teachers' stated rank orders. It has been assumed that those construct pairs which occur most often would be considered to be of greatest importance by the teachers as a whole. This assumption was verified on June 21st 1982 when put to the teachers themselves who agreed that the content and order of elements in the 'Top Ten' construct list was in accordance with their views as a group.

The teachers 'Top Ten' constructs are listed in rank order of frequency in Table 3. The most commonly occurring construct pair was the academic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R/O Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Favourably perceived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>James Benson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dean Berwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jane Barnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Valerie Barnett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Deborah Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Susan West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dawn Roberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Susan Feeney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Anthony Pearson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Peter Lipscomb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rosemary Davies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Linda Frost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Brian Buxton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rosemary Morris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Derek Stevens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Norma Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Stephen Howes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Linda Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Peter Ross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Angela Dobson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jillian Sanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>John Andrews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Norman Woods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>John Perry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3. The Teacher's 'Top Ten' constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Stable, well adjusted personality. Strong character. Friendly. (Forceful, Extrovert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Good organiser. (Domineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Well behaved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ten most commonly occurring constructs (in order of frequency of occurrence). Taken from each teachers' individual list of the ten pieces of information thought most useful when taking on a new class.

All constructs were elicited as bi-polar constructs but are listed above in terms of that end of each continuum thought, by the teachers, to be most conducive to "doing well at school".
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ability construct followed by verbal ability. Unlike the findings of Taylor (1976), Ball (1981) and Nash (1973), who all noted the high value placed upon good behaviour in class, the behaviour construct 'Well behaved - badly behaved' construct was only ranked 10th. However, this particular school is one noted for its absence of discipline and behaviour problems thus relegating the behaviour construct to a less prominent position in the teachers' minds.

(iv) The second pupil rating exercise (given constructs)

In the second pupil rating exercise the teachers were asked to directly place the children in rank order for each of the ten given construct pairs. In this way it was less likely for them to see the two rating exercises as being similar. The teachers were particularly urged to avoid tied ranks by making reference to everything they knew and felt about each of the children. To facilitate more direct comparison of results the six teachers who taught the whole class were once again used as the basis of the analysis. Table 4 lists the average rank orders for each of the six teachers.

As a measure of the degree of similarity or agreement between the teachers ratings a Kendall coefficient of concordance was calculated. This revealed an even higher value than that obtained from the rankings arising from the original elicited construct pairs. $W = 0.66$. Chi Squared $= 91.42$ $p > .001$.

A direct comparison of the average rankings (elicited-v-given) for each of the six teachers produced results significant at the 0.01 level in every case with Spearman rank-order correlation coefficients ranging from 0.73 to 0.92.
Table 4. Average rank-order positions for all twenty-four children for all six teachers who teach the whole class using the 'Top Ten' given construct pairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Form Tutor</th>
<th>P.E.</th>
<th>Health Edcn.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Andrews</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Berwick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Benson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Buxton</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Howes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lipscomb</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Pearson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Perry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ross</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Stevens</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Woods</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Anderson</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Barnes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Barnett</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Davies</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Dobson</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Frost</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Feeney</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Morris</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Roberts</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Sanders</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Waters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma Wilson</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan West</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall coefficient of concordance between all six sets of ratings:

\[ W = 0.66 \] (No ties)
\[ N = 24 \]
\[ \text{Chi Square} = 91.42 \]
\[ P < .001 \]
TABLE 5. Comparison of teachers' average rank orders (elicited-v-given)
Spearman $r_s$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>$r_s$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs James</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Lomas</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Shiels</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Johnson</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Betworth</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Danby</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(All significant at the .01 level)

(v) The third pupil-rating exercise (Self-rating)

Finally, all twenty-four children were asked to rate themselves according to a simplified version of their teachers' 'Top Ten' construct pairs. The decision to simplify the content of the ten items created problems of its own. On the one hand the items would have to be meaningful to the group of twelve-year old children who would not share their teachers' more technical understanding of psychological terminology. On the other hand, however, any changes or modifications automatically introduce problems of comparability of results since the teachers' rankings and the pupils' self-ratings would be taken from two similar, but nevertheless different, rating scales. Clearly, whether changes are made or not the problem of meaning still remains, researchers can never be absolutely sure that teachers attach the same
meanings to the same words, and to expect their pupils to share those meanings also is a problem one step further removed from that. However, the need for some kind of comparison between the teachers' feelings about the children and the children's feelings about themselves in the school context led to the use of such a modified scale with the reservation that only rank order positions would be compared instead of discrete scores.

The two rating scales were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>PUPILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils ranked according to positive pole of 'given' construct pair.</td>
<td>Pupils rate themselves by ticking one of 5 boxes ranging from TRUE — UNTRUE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Intelligent, able, bright, capable, clever, talented, academically able, mentally able.</td>
<td>On the whole I see myself as clever at school work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Good oral contribution, can articulate well, expressive, verbally fluent. Willing to communicate and ask questions.</td>
<td>I am good at asking questions and expressing my ideas out loud in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Highly motivated, cares about achieving, committed to work, enthusiastic, attentive.</td>
<td>I am very interested in my school work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strong character, forceful, outgoing (extravert). Friendly, well adjusted personality.</td>
<td>I get on well with others in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Leader, good organiser, domineering.</td>
<td>I am a good organiser and like to take the lead in group work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expresses ideas well on paper, good written work, can record ideas well.</td>
<td>I produce good written work in school. (This does not mean good handwriting.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Well behaved.</td>
<td>I am well behaved in class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of items 1, 4 and 7, the difficulties arising from the translation into meaningful language for twelve year olds, whilst retaining the original meaning were minimal, a point confirmed by an independent judge. In item 1 the pupils' version depends upon the meaning attached to the phrase "clever at school work" which was felt to embody, for a child, what teachers might mean by such phrases as "academically able", "talented", "intelligent", etc. In item 4 it is important to be aware that, within the context of the triadic elicitation interviews, the word "confident" was used synonymously with "positive character", "outgoing", "forthcoming" and "outspoken" to describe a child who might feel confident enough about his work to display such characteristics. Of all the terms used, it was judged that "confident" would be most meaningful to the children in this context. Item 7 depends particularly upon the teachers' use of the word extravert, which, unlike the strict psychological use of the word, was used to describe a particularly likeable kind of child who, because of his well adjusted personality and friendly, outgoing manner, was able to get on well with others in school. For this reason "I get on well with others in school" was felt to be the most appropriate in the circumstances.

A Rank-order correlation coefficient (Spearman's Rho) was calculated between the teachers' average rank order on the 'Top Ten' given constructs and the average rank order derived from the pupils' self-rating on the modified scale revealing a significant result at the 0.01 level. (Table 6)
TABLE 6. Children's self-rating according to the teachers' 'Top Ten' constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>R/O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Andrews</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Berwick</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Benson</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Buxton</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Howes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lipscomb</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Pearson</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Perry</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ross</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Stevens</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Woods</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Anderson</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Barnes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Barnett</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Davies</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Dobson</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Frost</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Feeney</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Morris</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Roberts</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Sanders</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Waters</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma Wilson</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan West</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman R/O correlation coefficient between children's self-ratings and teachers' average ratings according to teachers' 'Top Ten' criteria.

\[ r_s = 0.48 \] (correcting for ties)

\[ t = 2.5 \]

\[ p < 0.01 \] (one tailed)
Two further tests were twice administered to the children approximately 18 weeks apart, the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Table 7) and the Barker-Lunn Academic Self-Image Scale. (Table 8). As a test of reliability a Pearson-Bravais product moment correlation coefficient was calculated for the two sets of scores for both tests. For the Coopersmith Inventory \( r = 0.54, p < .05 \) and for the Barker-Lunn Scale \( r = 0.92, p < .01 \). While both are significant results and both tests designed for children of approximately the same age as those in the sample, the higher level of agreement between the scores for the Barker-Lunn test could possibly indicate its greater suitability, being a test originally designed for, and standardised on a population of British rather than American children.

Significant correlations were calculated between the teachers' ratings according to the 'Top Ten' given constructs and Academic self-image score ranks \( (r_s = 0.53, t = 2.29, p < .01) \) and also Self-Esteem score rankings \( (r_s = 0.46, t = 2.4, p < .05) \), while the same correlations with the teacher's ratings according to their own elicited criteria were not significant.

(vi) Cluster analysis of the teachers' ratings using the 'Top Ten' given constructs

An elementary linkage analysis technique (McQuitty, 1957) was applied to all twelve teachers' sets of rankings, according to the ten given construct pairs, to determine which constructs were seen by the teachers as being most alike. Spearman rank-order correlation coefficients were calculated for all combinations of rankings for each teacher. (Appendix 2). Linkage analysis of the results revealed that three teachers treated the ten construct pairs in terms of four clusters, five teachers in terms of three clusters and four teachers in terms of only two clusters.
TABLE 7. Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17/2/82 Raw Score</th>
<th>R/O</th>
<th>24/6/82 Raw Score</th>
<th>R/O</th>
<th>Form Tutors Estimated Score</th>
<th>Estimated R/O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Andrews</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Berwick</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Benson</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Buxton</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Howes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lipscorn</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Pearson</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Perry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ross</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Stevens</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Woods</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Anderson</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Barnes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Barnett</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Davies</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Dobson</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Frost</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Feeney</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Morris</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Roberts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Sanders</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Waters</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma Wilson</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan West</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson-Bravais correlation coefficient between 17/2/82 and 24/6/82 raw scores $r = 0.54 \ p < .05$
TABLE 8. Academic Self-Image (Barker-Lunn)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>17/2/82 Raw Score</th>
<th>R/O</th>
<th>24/6/82 Raw Score</th>
<th>R/O</th>
<th>Form Tutor Estimated Score</th>
<th>Estimated R/O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Andrews</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Berwick</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Benson</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Buxton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Howes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lipscomb</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Pearson</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Perry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ross</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Stevens</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Woods</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Anderson</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Barnes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Barnett</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Davies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Dobson</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Frost</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Feeney</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Morris</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Roberts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Sanders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Waters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma Wilson</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan West</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson-Bravais correlation coefficient between 17/2/82 and 24/6/82 raw scores $r = 0.92$, $p < .01$
All twelve teachers' clusters of construct pairs are listed in Table 9. It should be noted that not all teachers rated the children on all ten construct pairs since in a few cases the construct in question was not appropriate to the subject taught. For example, Miss Shiels, Physical Education, did not rate the children on construct No.2 the verbal ability construct or on construct No.9 the written ability construct. Mr Davies, Music, did not rate the children on construct No.10 the behaviour construct as he thought it inappropriate to his free and easy style of teaching. Finally, Mr Lomas, Drama, did not rate the children on construct No.9 the written ability construct, since his drama work never involved any written work. Most often the strongest links between constructs occur where the cluster analysis reveals a two-way association, for example construct No.2 associated with construct No.4 while at the same time construct No.4 associated with construct No.2. These are denoted by double arrows in Table 9. In addition, those pairings which occur in cluster 1 are more closely associated, having higher correlations than in the other clusters, cluster No.4 pairings having the lowest correlations. However it is also possible for a weaker, one-way linkage in cluster 1 to have a higher correlation than a two-way linkage in a lower cluster. For example, Mr Danby's cluster 1 consists of a two-way link between construct No.2 and No.4 with a correlation of 0.94, whereas his cluster 4 contains another two-way link between construct No.1 and No.9 with a correlation of 0.81. However, Mr Lomas' cluster 1 contains a one-way link between construct No.4 and No.7 with a correlation of 0.89 whereas the two-way link between construct No.5 and No.6 in his cluster 3 has the lower correlation of 0.79.

All correlations for two-way and one-way relationships were significant at the .01 level with the exception of four one-way links which were significant at the .05 level. (Mr Danby 5-10, Mrs Lindsay 7-10 and 8-10, Mr Peters 7-9). Indirect relationships between constructs which occur in
TABLE 9. Construct clusters for each of twelve teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Danby. Second Year Form Tutor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Shiels. Physical Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Davies. Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Cartwright. French</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Lindsay. French</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Betworth. English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Lomas. Drama</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Rogers. Mathematics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Johnson. Humanities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Jones. Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Peters. Mathematics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs James. Health Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Double arrows denote strong (two-way) relationships. Single lines denote weaker (one-way) relationships.
the same cluster, but are not joined by two-way or one-way links also had significant correlations at the .01 level except four which were significant at the .05 level (Mrs Cartwright 7-9 and 1-6, Mr Peters 8-9 and Mrs James 1-10). Only five indirect links had correlations that were not significant, (Mr Danby 1-10 and 9-10, Mrs Lindsay 4-10 and 2-10, Mr Peters 4-9).

All direct links are listed in Table 10 together with their frequency of occurrence, and details of numbers of two-way and one-way relationships. Of all the relationships between construct pairs the most common was between construct No.3 (hard worker, steady worker, tries hard, keen enthusiastic worker) and construct No.6 (highly motivated, cares about doing well, attentive, committed to work) which occurred nine times, all of which were two-way relationships indicating the strength of association between the two constructs. The second most common pairing was between construct No.2 (good orally, willing to communicate, forthcoming, contributes well, willing to ask questions, expressive, verbally fluent) and construct No.4 (confident, outgoing, positive character, outspoken), which occurred eight times with seven two-way relationships and one one-way relationship. The overall frequencies of occurrence of associated constructs is listed in Table 11.

It can be seen from Table 11 that it is not necessary to fall below a frequency of five to account for all ten constructs, and with the exception of 3-5, 6-10, 2-7, and 2-8 it is possible to construct three mutually exclusive clusters which account for all ten constructs, each being associated with at least one other in its cluster on at least five occasions. (3-5, 6-10, 2-7 and 2-8 do not form the major connections in any cluster but serve to provide additional evidence of association within two of the three clusters.) Those pairings which only occurred once were ignored. The three clusters and their constituent constructs (listing the positive half of the bi-pole in each case) are shown in Table 12.
TABLE 10. Overall association between constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (1) (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: total frequency
Strong associations
Weak associations

N/1
Nil

TABLE 11. Frequency of occurrence of associated constructs in Rank Order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Associated constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/7 4/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1/9 7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/10 5/6 5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1/2 6/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/8 3/5 6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/3 2/7 7/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/5 1/6 2/5 2/6 2/9 3/4 4/6 5/9 7/10 8/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12. The three principal clusters of Bi-polar constructs.

Numbers in brackets represent frequency of association.

| Cluster A (Maturity and attitude to school work) | 3  | Hard worker, steady worker, tries hard, keen, enthusiastic worker. |
|                                               | 5  | Mature, serious minded, sensible, poised. |
|                                               | 6  | Highly motivated, cares about doing well, attentive, committed to work. |
|                                               | 10 | Well behaved. |

| Cluster B (Personality factors) | 2  | Good orally, willing to communicate, forthcoming, contributes well, willing to ask questions, expressive, verbally fluent. |
|                                | 4  | Confident, outgoing, positive character, outspoken. |
|                                | 7  | Stable, well adjusted personality, strong character, friendly. (forceful, extravert) |
|                                | 8  | Good organiser, leader. (domineering) |

| Cluster C (Academic ability) | 1  | Intelligent, bright, clever, able, capable, talented, academically able, mentally able, picks things up quickly. |
|                             | 9  | Expresses ideas well on paper, good written work, can record ideas well, accurate written work. |
The constituent constructs of cluster A were construct No.3, (hard worker, steady worker, tries hard, keen, enthusiastic worker), construct No.5, (mature, serious minded, sensible, poised), construct No.6 (highly motivated, cares about doing well, attentive, committed to work), and construct No.10 (well behaved). When taken together, in the context of the discussion arising from the triadic elicitation exercise, they can be seen as expressing ideas concerned with the childrens' maturity and attitude to school work. A twelve year old who is seen as mature for his age, having a positive attitude towards school might well be expected to work hard, not to be erratic but at the same time display enthusiasm about his work. This implies that he will be motivated to do well and will therefore be attentive and committed to his work. In order to achieve this, and at the same time to win the approval of his teachers, it would be reasonable to expect that he will also be well behaved. It is also true, of course, that the child who is perceived by his teachers more in terms of the opposite ends of these bi-polar constructs, the reverse will be true, and he might be expected to do badly at school.

The constructs forming cluster B were construct No.2 (good orally, willing to communicate, forthcoming, contributes well, willing to ask questions, expressive, verbally fluent), construct No.4 (confident, outgoing, positive character, outspoken), construct No.7 (stable, well adjusted personality, strong character, friendly, forceful, extrovert) and construct No.8 (good organiser, leader, domineering). Similarly, when they are viewed together within the context of the teachers' discussions they may be seen as concerned with ideas about aspects of the childrens' personalities. The teachers almost universally used the concepts of extravert-intravert in a lay, non-psychological way. The extraverts were described as being positive, confident and outgoing. They were outspoken only in the sense that their
oral contributions to lessons were clear, well thought out and, what is most important, highly valued. Using the concept in this sense it would be reasonable to expect such children to be stable and well adjusted personalities who were easy to get along with and who were, in some ways looked up to by their peers for ideas and leadership.

Cluster C contained the two remaining constructs, construct No.1 (intelligent, bright, clever, able, capable, talented, academically able, mentally able, picks things up quickly) and construct No.9 (expresses ideas well on paper, good written work, can record ideas well, accurate written work). Of the three clusters this one is the most straightforward since it combines the two most obvious ability constructs. While it was clearly important for many of the teachers to make a distinction between intelligence and academic ability on the one hand, and the ability to express ideas well on paper, in the final analysis these two factors form an integral part of one criterion by which the children are judged, namely that of academic ability.

(vii) Summary and discussion

Personal construct systems ranging from six to twenty-seven bi-polar constructs were elicited, using the Kelly repertory grid technique, from all twelve teachers. Each teacher rated each child on a five point scale for each of their ten most highly valued constructs (six in one case). On the basis of the ratings of the six teachers who always taught the class as a whole an average rank order of pupils was constructed ranging from those most favourably perceived at one end to those least favourably perceived at the other. The first and fourth quartiles of this rank order form the basis for comparison of the classroom observation data.
While extreme caution must be taken in the interpretation of statistical data arising from such a small sample (N (Children) = 24, N (Teacher) = 6) the highly significant coefficient of concordance (p < .001) calculated from the average rankings obtained from all six teachers who taught the class as a whole indicates that, for that group of teachers and children at least, the teachers share significantly similar views about the children even though the ratings employed were based upon each 'teachers' individual and unique set of personal constructs. There are many reasons why this might be the case since teachers share many realities arising from their professional training and the everyday common experiences of school life. In a school where open and frank discussion is encouraged through frequent staff seminars and progress meetings, and a warm and friendly staffroom atmosphere is conducive to the day-to-day exchange of information and opinion teachers may rapidly acquire common perceptions of children, including those whom they never actually teach. Even as an observer, over a period of five weeks in the school, it was far from easy to resist being drawn into such a process. The temptation to pass a casual observation about a particular child whilst in conversation with several of his teachers was often very strong, and had to be quickly modified to a question of the type: "What do you think about so and so?" or "Did so and so present you with any particular problems today?" Above all it was important to avoid the contribution of my own subjectively formed perceptions of the children under observation to those already shared by many of their teachers. However, it is interesting to note that, possibly as a result of my own considerable teaching experience of this age group, even my own privately held views of the children would, in most cases, conform very closely to those stated by their teachers.

The second pupil rating exercise was based upon an average set of "given" constructs which were the ten most commonly occurring constructs in
the twelve teachers elicited personal construct systems. In this case each teacher placed the children into a rank order for each of the ten constructs. Since all teachers rankings were carried out on the same set of criteria a much greater degree of comparability was possible. A higher degree of concordance was achieved in the second rating exercise than in the first thus confirming the view that the teachers shared significantly similar views of the children, while at the same time being of a greater magnitude since, on this occasion, the children were rated according to identical sets of criteria. The major implication of these two highly significant concordance results is that, for this group at least, there is a strong possibility that a significant cumulative effect of teachers perceptions and expectations exists whereby self-fulfilling prophecies may be operative within the school. In other words, since a major factor in the formation of self-fulfilling prophecy effects is that of consistency over a period of time, if, as in this case, it can be shown that a whole group of teachers who teach one particular class share significantly similar perceptions of individual children in that class, the overall effect will be stronger than that of any one individual teacher.

The remarkably high correlations achieved between the average rankings on both rating exercises for the six teachers who taught the whole class confirm the view that highly significant ratings are obtainable using common sets of given as opposed to individually elicited criteria. However, it is important to note that the given criteria were selected from that particular group of teachers' individually elicited criteria. A further significant point arose from discussions with the teachers themselves about the process of rating children against any set of criteria since it was commonly remarked that if they were to perform either of the rating exercises on another day they were sure that their results would be quite different. The high degree
of correlation between the results of the two rating exercises, performed on two separate occasions at least one week apart, would seem to imply that, on average, the teachers were mistaken about the reliability of their ratings. However, some correlations were higher than others and discussion with the group of teachers concerned revealed a general consensus of opinion that the highest value of ($r_s = 0.92$), Mrs James, was to be expected since she probably knew the children better than any other teacher in the school, having been their first year teacher with wide responsibility for many aspects of their school work during the previous year. Furthermore, it was agreed that the lowest value for Mr Danby ($r_s = 0.73$) was consistent with this view since, although he was their second year form tutor, they now followed a more traditional type secondary school timetable and his contact with them was restricted to registration and form periods (two twenty minute sessions per week) and only ten of the twenty-four children in his maths set. It is important, however, to remember that all six correlations were significant at the 0.01 level.

The significant correlations arising from the third pupil rating exercise establish an important link between the teachers' perceptions on the one hand and the children's feelings about themselves on the other. When the children rated themselves on their teachers modified set of ten given criteria the ratings gave a significant correlation at the .01 level in comparison with the teachers' ratings on the original criteria, even though the scales were not identical. In addition significant correlations were established between the teachers' ratings on the given criteria and the children's scores on the Coopersmith self-esteem inventory ($p < 0.05$) and the Barker-Lunn Academic self-image scale ($p < .01$). All these results indicate that, for this group, a significant and positive relationship exists between the teachers' perceptions of the children and the children's views of them-
selves. However, the correlations between the teachers' ratings on their own individually elicited sets of criteria and the self-esteem and academic self-image scales were not statistically significant and indicate the need for caution. Children's self-esteem and academic self-images are not solely dependent upon interaction with their teachers, and are likely to be significantly influenced by pressures outside the school. A particularly supportive home background, for example, might help to bolster a child's academic self-image despite the evidence of an average or poor performance in school. A consistently high level of performance and success in an out of school activity such as sport, music, or scouting might do much to enhance the self-esteem of a child who is perceived as being undistinguished by his teachers. It is therefore likely that, in order to observe any statistically significant relationship between the teachers' ratings and the children's scores, it is necessary to ensure that the teachers' combined perceptions are maximised by the use of a common set of rating criteria. In other words, the relationship is only an important one when the teachers are all talking about the same thing.

Elementary linkage analysis of the teachers' rankings on the ten given criteria revealed that many ranking were sufficiently alike to indicate that the teachers treated several of the given constructs as similar to one another. The number of construct clusters varied between two (four teachers), three (five teachers) and four (three teachers). Closer examination of the frequencies of occurrence of several pairings of associated construct revealed all ten constructs could be arranged into three mutually exclusive clusters concerned with a) Maturity and attitude to school work, b) Personality factors, and c) Academic ability. Discussion with the teachers concerned revealed the view that, whilst they accepted that the larger numbers of constructs elicited from them individually were representative of their
feelings about the children, it was more usual for them to employ a smaller number of three or four major criteria.
Results and Discussion II

Classroom Observation and the Pupils' Experience

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. Firstly it aims to illustrate the qualitative differences in pupil-teacher interactions of those children in the first and fourth quartiles of the teachers' average rank order. Secondly it aims to highlight some of the categories of teacher-behaviour and pupil-experience which, in that particular observational setting, seem to be the most potent means by which teacher expectations are communicated.

For this purpose, discussion will be confined, in the main, to those incidents when a teacher tells a child or group of children something about themselves rather than about the subject of the lesson. In many instances, however, the two are very closely related. Therefore some incidents concerning subject matter are included wherever it is felt that they make an important contribution to the overall experience of the child or children concerned. Full accounts of all recorded incidents involving children in the first and fourth quartiles are contained in Appendix I.

Close examination of the lesson transcripts and accompanying field notes revealed a number of distinct categories of experience within which teachers created significant incidents, i.e. where information was passed to children about themselves rather than about the subject of the lesson. The six most distinct categories, which also form the basis of the comparative analysis of pupil experiences, are as follows:

1. The relative frequency of significant incidents.
2. Grouping within the class.
4. Being allowed to work alone.
5. Direct praise or criticism.
6. Dealing with minor misbehaviour.

Due to the complex nature of many classroom incidents, any one incident may contain elements which exemplify several of the above categories of experience at the same time. For this reason some incidents will be used on more than one occasion to illustrate different points, unnecessary repetition being avoided wherever other suitable examples are available. In order to protect the anonymity of all participants in this study, and in accordance with the agreement reached with the Leicestershire Education Authority, all names have been changed.

1. The relative frequency of significant incidents

Throughout the five week observation period it was clear that all twelve teachers went to a great deal of trouble to ensure that all children received their fair share of teacher-pupil contact. This took a variety of forms ranging from opportunities to question and answer in class discussions, to one-to-one contacts when the teacher was moving around the class during individual work sessions. It was evident that the teachers could quite accurately monitor these contacts and ensure that children who had little or no individual contact with the teacher in one lesson would receive a little extra in the next. On several occasions teachers would reveal their mild anxiety about the forms of my attentions by pointing this out to me, and adding that they took care to ensure that, over the period of a week, every child got his or her fair share of attention. However, much of this teacher pupil contact was of a neutral kind being specifically related to the particular task in hand and conveying no evident hidden messages about the teachers expectations.
By comparison, the significant incidents, where the teacher conveyed information to children which revealed or reinforced specific expectations, occurred relatively infrequently. In addition they were distributed unevenly in two interesting ways. Firstly, significant incidents were more common with some teachers than others, a distribution which appeared to be largely dependent upon the demands of the subject taught on the one hand, and the particular style of the teacher on the other. This is not to say that those teachers for whom very few incidents were recorded did not convey their expectations to the children. They certainly shared similar perceptions to their colleagues. However, if such incidents did occur they were of a more subtle nature and of a non-verbal kind. The possibility that some of these teachers could skillfully avoid anything but interactions of a neutral kind, however, cannot be ruled out. Those teachers whose teaching style was particularly dependent upon close personal relationships with the children were the most likely sources of significant incidents. Coupled with a subject demanding a high degree of class discussion and collective activity, where children had ample opportunities for spontaneous self expression, their lessons provided the most potent arenas for the expression and transmission of teachers' expectations. By far the largest number of recorded incidents occurred in English with Mrs Betworth, a teacher of many years experience whose lively teaching style was greatly dependent upon her extensive knowledge of the children arising from her involvement in the pastoral life of the school. Environmental studies with Mrs James proved to be a further source of frequent significant incidents. Of all twelve teachers Mrs James was most familiar with the children since she had been their first year tutor. In common with many Leicestershire high schools, children are taken into the first year base at age 10+ and taught in a more sheltered atmosphere by a smaller number of teachers for the first year.
Although Mrs James was nominally teaching environmental studies throughout the period of observation, this was just a part of an attempt to retain a link between the more traditional secondary school type curriculum of the second year and the more personal approach of the first year base. As a consequence, however, several teachers remarked upon what they perceived as a degree of resentment on the part of the children in "going back to the first year". Coupled with their high degree of familiarity with Mrs James and her surroundings, and the transitional style of teaching employed there, many of the children reacted by behaving badly.

In contrast to this the science teaching of Mrs Jones was so dependent upon the use of workcards and individual or group practical work that few opportunities ever arose for the public expression of expectations, the teacher more frequently having to respond to the demands of inadequate apparatus and materials than the sharing of knowledge. Mr Peters, Mathematics, employed a very neutral style of teaching, it was clear from the beginning that he would stand no nonsense from the children and he managed to conduct his lessons without reference to personal relationships at all. Mr Rogers, Mathematics, however, stated on many occasions that it was his deliberate policy to avoid making derogatory comments about children and their work, and that he attempted at all times to handle problems in a positive way.

Secondly, significant incidents were unevenly distributed in the sense that while those children in the first quartile received a relatively small number of significantly positive contacts along with an average number of neutral ones, those children in the fourth quartile received a relatively large number of significantly negative contacts. This in itself is significant since the majority of recorded contacts with the three least favourably perceived children in the class occurred in
response to problems of a disciplinary nature, when the normal routine of classroom life had broken down in some way. The very fact that those who are most highly perceived are also well behaved in class is not surprising, and the fact that they receive no negative contacts and their minor misdemeanors are dealt with in a significantly different way to other children in the class might only serve to reinforce the effect of the teacher's positive view of them.

2. Grouping within the class

The way in which the children formed friendship and working groups within the class is of interest for three reasons. Firstly in terms of the teachers' reactions to those groups and the way they differentiate between group members, and secondly the teachers' positive attempts to split up and separate group members for either pedagogic or disciplinary purposes. Thirdly, since not all children in the class could be said to be members of any distinct group, the teachers' reactions to those on the periphery of several groups, and to the isolates, are important.

One particular group of girls stands out as having been mentioned by several teachers as the "gossips". These are Deborah Anderson (R/O.5 1st quartile), Norma Wilson (R/O.16), Susan West (R/O.6 1st quartile), Rosemary Morris (R/O.14) and Linda Waters (R/O.18). Although they occupy a wide range of positions in the teachers' average rank order they most commonly sit together and are often referred to as a group. For example on day 1 (periods 1 & 2 English) Mrs Betworth picks them out as not having completed their work:

"Now I'm going to have to ask who hasn't yet finished writing their instructions inside the tummy of their snowman? (SEVERAL HANDS GO UP)

They're all girls! Oh no they're not.

(POINTING TO THE FIVE GIRLS)
One, two, three, four, five chattery, gossipy ladies haven't finished ..... "

However, on day 12 (periods 3 & 4 English) Mrs Betworth picks out the same group for chattering but, at the same time, differentiates between her expectations of each of them.

MRS BETWORTH: (approaching Linda Waters R/O.18)

Now the interesting thing is I know exactly how much work you've done today, now you tell me how I know.

CHORUS: You've marked our books!

MRS BETWORTH: Because I've marked your previous work, (A BLUFF) right, exactly. Now it looks to me as if you've written one, two, three, four and a half sentences, and I don't think four and a half sentences is a great deal in the length of time you've had.

(TURNING TO DEBORAH ANDERSON R/O.5, FIRST QUARTILE)

You have done about a page of work haven't you?

(TURNING TO SUSAN WEST, R/O.6, FIRST QUARTILE; BUT WITHOUT LOOKING AT HER BOOK)

and I imagine you have done more than a page.

(TURNING TO NORMA WILSON, R/O.16)

Ah, Norma, you've only done, you ought to be able to get more done than that, but the person who's been chinwagging the most, who is it Linda?

LINDA: Me!

Note how she compares the girls' work and indicates that she expects Susan West to have done the most without actually seeing it. Also that Deborah
has done a reasonable amount but that she would normally expect more from Norma. Linda, however, seems to be expected to chat a lot and not get quite as much work done.

Although Susan is ranked lower than Deborah both overall and individually by Mrs Betworth, her descriptions of the two girls indicate a clear distinction in her mind. Susan is seen as being a very hard worker though somewhat shy and retiring, while Deborah is seen as bright but liable to waste her time if not carefully supervised. Linda is rated 20th in Mrs Betworth's individual rank order and is described as not being terribly bright. "I could not trust Linda to behave in a ladylike manner a great deal of the time. She is not particularly able. I don't think Linda tells the truth half the time." The major distinction arising from this incident is between the two girls in or near the first quartile, and the rest. Finally perhaps a clue to the reason for these particular four girls being such firm friends lies in their relatively similar levels of self esteem, and particularly in the case of Deborah Anderson, Norma Wilson and Linda Waters, their academic self images, none of which falls below three in the rank order.

The view that they form a nucleus of gossips is further illustrated on day 20 (periods 1 & 2 Science) when Mrs Jones notices that Deborah Anderson (R/O.5), Norma Wilson (R/O.16) and Dawn Roberts (R/O.7) are working together and seem to be following each other around the lab.

MRS JONES: You don't need to follow each other around, you don't need to go around in a three! I don't think you've been working hard enough, really, Neil managed to finish it in one lesson. All of the people in set three finished it in one lesson, and three of you working together
have taken two lessons over it. Maybe you should work individually and you'd get on much faster, little gossipers, you want to start wearing rollers and a hair net!

Mrs Jones sees Deborah as a girl who doesn't generally work well in a group.

Probably the most highly perceived group in the whole class is that of James Benson (R/0.1) and Dean Berwick (R/0.2) who sit together and work, co-operatively most of the time. On occasions they are accompanied by other boys, and are seen as having a positive influence over them. On one occasion, day 7 (periods 5 & 6 Health Education) Norman Woods (R/0.23) is working with them and produces much more than his usual amount of work. So much so that Mrs James comments:

MRS JAMES: Oh (TO JAMES AND DEAN) do you know it's a great deal for him to achieve two completed things isn't it.

(NORMAN MAKES A GREAT SHOW OF BEING WORN OUT)

Is he tired now, old man?

NORMAN: I had three days off last week!

MRS JAMES: It's quite an achievement isn't it. But don't you think it's quite nice to finish two things? And if you started a third and you finished that on Thursday it would be even more satisfying. Think about something you could write 'cos your writing has so much improved hasn't it?

While Mrs James is praising Norman it is also clear that she is comparing his work with that produced by the other two. She praises and encourages
him but at the same time verbally pats James and Dean on the back for having such an influence on him.

On day 16 (periods 1 & 2 English) James and Dean are once again used as an example of a pair of highly perceived boys who produce good work. When, during the preparation of a scene for a small play, Mrs Betworth is working with Jillian Sanders (R/O.21) who cannot find any other children who want to work with her.

MRS BETWORTH: The King's court scene, that's you Jillian, have you changed your mind?

JILLIAN: No.

MRS BETWORTH: Right, well is it you and I left to do that one by ourselves? Which one is it, the court scene? Oh, blimey, we can't write that one ourselves can we! We could have done with James and Dean to help us couldn't we?

Mrs Betworth describes James as "... the most valuable person in that class. He's got a lovely influence on a lot of people." Whereas she sees Dean as being under James' influence. She sees him as mature in outlook "He reads with clarity. Dean works hard, but only because he's near James, but he turns out quite a lot of work."

A stark contrast to James and Dean in the first quartile is the small group of boys John Andrews (R/O.22), Norman Woods (R/O.23) and John Perry (R/O.24) in the fourth quartile who have more contacts, both collectively and individually, of a disciplinary nature than anyone else in the class. Typically, as a group, their contacts with teachers are very different to those of James and Dean, being of a negative rather than a positive kind. For example, on day 2 (periods 3 & 4 English) they are publicly labelled
as time wasters. Three of the girls have been playing with pens which are dressed as dolls. Mrs Betworth suggests to them that they might like to plan a little puppet play for them. John Andrews, Norman Woods and John Perry are sitting together directly behind the three girls. Mrs Betworth makes her next comment loudly enough for the whole class to hear:

MRS BETWORTH: We could do a play about that daft lot sitting behind (GIGGLES)
They're always wasting their time, don't you think!

In a less lighthearted way, on the same day, day 2 (periods 5 & 6 Health Education) the three boys are once again publicly reminded that they waste time. Mrs James has been trying to conduct a demonstration of her cigarette smoking apparatus which has excited some of the children creating a rather noisy environment. A little later on, Mrs James changes the subject in order to discuss some of their past work on food and nutrition:

MRS JAMES: I'd like some of these charts to make a new second year display.

(JOHN PERRY IS STANDING AT HER SIDE)
John go away! Sit down, I am tired of you walking around.

(HER VOICE IS FIRM AND SHE LOOKS RUFFLED)
If you haven't got your own things then you're going to have to do without. Because if anybody's walked around this afternoon, you people

(POINTING TO JOHN PERRY, JOHN ANDREWS AND NORMAN WOODS)
have done more of it than anybody else!
It's just proving to me that you can't do something a little bit different without you losing track of what you're supposed to be doing altogether.

Once again, in a more lighthearted way, day 17 (periods 3 & 4 English) Mrs Betworth makes a reference to John Andrews and Norman Woods (John Perry is outside in a remedial reading class). She is preparing the class for some choral speaking, and arranges a number of small groups of children to recite different parts of the poem. The poem is about a dog, and when she comes to the line "I'm a mad dog ..." she gives it to John and Norman adding:

"Most appropriate. What a coincidence!"

On day 20 (periods 3 & 4 P.E.) the same two boys respond automatically to the suggestion that Miss Shiels wants two rogues for a demonstration. They are all in the school hall for basketball:

MISS SHIELS: Come on I want to show you one more thing and then I'll play a game with you.

All sit down here.

(THEY SIT AROUND IN A GROUP)

I'll have the two rogues demonstrating this!

John Andrews and Norman Woods get up and walk out in front of the group.

MISS SHIELS: Come on, look you know who you are without having to ask. (MUCH LAUGHTER)

The teachers' descriptions of the three boys have a number of things in common. Both John Andrews and John Perry have been described as mischievous, even "downright devious" (Mr Johnson). Mrs James describes
both Norman and John Andrews as fly-by-nights "... who can switch on and off at the flick of a switch .." Miss Shiels describes all three boys as being rather "silly".

"John (Perry) is a very silly boy, just stupid. John (Andrews) is silly, follows his friends, tries to make a fool of himself. I think he likes everybody to look at him, to see what he's doing."

In the same vein:

"Norman is very easily influenced by his friends, quite shy but when he's with a lot of the boys tends to be silly. On his own he behaves well and works quite hard."

This differentiation between the two Johns on the one hand and Norman on the other was commonly voiced by various teachers in casual conversation, but is best expressed by the comment of Mrs Betworth:

"I like Norman, he's easy going, he does his work but he does it as briefly and as quickly as he possibly can. He's also got the charming way of honestly letting you know he's awfully glad he's done it and can he sit there and do nothing for a minute or two? I think he's honest, thoroughly honest.

(SHE STRESSES THIS IN DIRECT CONTRAST TO THE OTHER TWO)

He's honestly being a bit lazy at times but he doesn't upset me. He's not particularly clever, he's not particularly bright, but he does join in quite well. Norman has a great deal of common sense."
This distinction between Norman and the two Johns becomes evident in class when minor misdemeanors are dealt with. For example, on day 17 (periods 5 & 6 Health Education) all three boys are being noisy and fidgety to the extent that many other children are being disturbed. However, it seems that only the two Johns are managing to provoke Mrs James who becomes so angry that she publicly accuses John Andrews of being a "silly boy".

**MRS JAMES:** John Andrews (PAUSE) you really are a silly boy aren't you?

**(HER VOICE IS FIRM AND SERIOUS)**

It's a pity you waste your time because that's the most accurately drawn clock I've seen. When you can do some things so well why do you make such a mess of them in other regions?

**(JOHN SHRUGS HIS SHOULDERS AND GRINS. HE IS SLOUCHED IN HIS CHAIR)**

'Sit up! If you tidied yourself up you might have a different attitude altogether!'

In addition, John Perry is accused of being "stupid".

Do you have to prove that you're even more stupid than you were before? ....

And a little later:

You are quite stupid aren't you! ..... 

Meanwhile, Norman is clearly larking around, giggling and wandering around the room. From time to time he turns round in his seat, in full view of Mrs James, and bashes Peter Ross and Derek Stevens, but she chooses to ignore it. When he takes his work to her she simply and calmly helps him without reference to his behaviour at all.
Finally the distinction made between Norman, who is seen as mischievous but honest on the one hand, and the two Johns who are seen as devious arose on many occasions when it was stated that both Johns seemed to get more out of being told off than from being praised.

On some occasions teachers were observed to deliberately engineer group membership in order to facilitate some end, usually more work. For example, on day 7 (periods 3 & 4 English) Mrs Betworth wants the children to judge the quality of some stories written for homework. She decides to have them working in small groups and sets about dictating who goes where in a very deliberate way. In each group she puts "... one child who is good, to keep the group going." The selected group leaders are James Benson (R/O.1), Jane Barnes (R/O.3), Dean Berwick (R/O.2), all of whom are first quartile members, and Susan Feeney whose average rank order position is 8th, but Mrs Betworth rates her individually as 2nd.

Of particular interest was the separation of children from two friendship groups, John Andrews and Norman Woods were placed in separate groups (John Perry was absent), and the group of "gossipy girls" was distributed with Deborah Anderson, Norma Wilson and Linda Waters in separate groups, and Rosemary Morris and Susan West together in the same group.

Other separations, usually on disciplinary grounds happened most commonly to the three boys already discussed, and on some occasions, happening on more than one occasion in any one day. Day 6 (periods 1 & 2 English) Norman, John Perry and John Andrews:

MRS BETWORTH: ... you will not sit together next time you come to this room. You will sit at one side of the room, one of you, and the other side of the room, the other of you. You will not sit near Brian (R/O.13)
who works, and you will not sit near John Andrews (who doesn't) either.

Day 6 (periods 3 & 4 Mathematics) Mr Rogers separates John Perry and John Andrews because they keep talking.

MR ROGERS: (to John Andrews) Well I'm going to let you carry on and get some work done at 12 o'clock 'cos you're a time-waster aren't you ......

Day 6 (period 8 Humanities) Norman and John Andrews are separated by Mr Johnson for talking instead of working.

Day 10 (periods 1 & 2 Science) John Andrews is moved from his usual position at the back of the lab. to a front bench where Mrs Jones can keep an eye on him.

Day 11 (periods 1 & 2 English) John Andrews, Norman Woods and John Perry are all separated.

MRS BETWORTH: .... in places that won't inconvenience any of us.

Day 11 (periods 5 & 6) Health Education) John Perry is separated from Anthony Pearson having already been separated from John Andrews and Norman Woods. John Perry is sent to a table occupied by a group of girls.

MRS JAMES: (to Linda Waters) Linda, do your best to ignore that silly boy, because really this is beyond a joke.

Of the children in the class who are not easily assigned to any one friendship group Jane Barnes (R/0.3) and Jillian Sanders (R/O.21) provide an interesting contrast. While Jane does not always fit naturally into working groups, her high ability and industriousness, coupled with the
very positive perceptions of her teachers she is an acceptable member of most groups. Jillian, however, always seems to be the odd one out, left without a group or partner. Although the children never refused a teacher’s request to include her, they would never spontaneously offer a place for her.

Some clues to why Jane is not fully a member of any group emerge in her teachers' comments:

MRS JONES: Has tremendous ability, but has had some problems with her temper, and really lost her self-control.

MRS LINDSAY: Jane I find a very nervous character indeed. Quite volatile as well on occasions, and she can be argumentative as well ...

MISS SHIELS: ... very shy and insecure and doesn't seem to have many friends.

MR DANBY: Jane is a very able girl. She can be very moody, very emotional. She can fly off the handle, she's got a real temper.

Jane tends to be a loner, she'll sit with one or two people, tends to isolate herself and sit with Susan Feeney. She has a lot of pressure from home to do very well.

It was most commonly agreed that it was Jane's fluctuations in mood and temper which made her unacceptable for some of the time but when she was chosen to lead a work group, for example, she would be a popular choice. The best example of this was on day 7 (periods 3 & 4 English) when Jane was chosen by Mrs Betworth to lead a small group. Each group had to judge stories written by their members, the winners in each group to be read out
to the whole class. Jane's story was judged by her group to be the best, a result which had been anticipated by Mrs Betworth herself:

**MRS BETWORTH:** Now we're going to have a lovely time in a moment, because we're going to listen to all these good stories. I've asked Jane to stay there

(MRS BETWORTH GIGGLES)
because I guessed she'd win, because it seemed silly asking her to go back to her place when she was so near to where she's actually going to sit in a moment.

Jillian, on the other hand, is typically described in a very different way:

**MR DANBY:** Jillian is always on her own, the only time that she ever gets taken in with another group is if they are feeling sorry for her .... She is of low ability but I don't think as low as some people think when they look at her.

**MRS BETWORTH:** Physically Jillian looks unattractive, she is shy and she worries a great deal. I can't decide whether she hasn't got a friend in the class or whether she's so independent that she doesn't specially want a friend in the class. She has a very strongly independent streak. She doesn't find it easy to join a group and yet some of the groups are quite nice with her.

Working in groups always presented problems for Jillian, who would almost invariably be left out:
Day 1 (period 7 Drama) Mr Lomas has to approach a group of girls to take Jillian under their wing.

Day 4 (periods 1 & 2 P.E.) This is their first mixed hockey lesson in the playground. When Miss Shiels tells them to get into pairs to practice dribbling the ball, Jillian is left out, a pathetic picture holding the tattiest hockey stick with a length of tape flapping in the breeze. Miss Shiels puts her with two other girls.

Day 4 (periods 5 & 6 Health Education) Jillian is sitting with a group of girls, everyone is writing and drawing and chattering, but Jillian is not a part of the conversation:

MRS JAMES: Now Jillian I'll spend some time with you. A quiet young lady at this very noisy table.

In a way the comment of Mrs James, while intended as a compliment, also serves to draw attention to the fact that, whether willingly or unwillingly, Jillian is not a part of that group.

On four other occasions similar events occurred where a teacher tried to find Jillian a place in a group. (Day 5, day 12, day 16). On day 12 (periods 3 & 4 English) Mrs Betworth suggests that Jillian might join a group but she declines. Instead of insisting, as she might with most children, or allowing Jillian to work alone, as she sometimes did with some children, she gave Jillian a simple task to perform instead of doing the work. She simply suggested that Jillian might like to go around collecting the reading books for her. Jillian was happy to do so. On no other occasion was a child allowed to miss doing work in this way, and by way of contrast, in similar conditions Jane Barnes would be encouraged to work alone.
3. Public Comparisons

Of all the points raised for discussion with the teachers, it was that of public comparisons which provoked the greatest reaction of surprise and initial disbelief. The subsequent discussion led to a general consensus of opinion, however, that, particularly when under pressure, teachers do publicly compare the performance or behaviour of one child with that of another. In every case observed the child used as the 'good example' occupied a higher position in the teachers' average rank order than the child used as the 'bad example', however, it was not necessarily the case that the teacher was under pressure. On day 5 John Perry (R/0.24) was the subject of public comparison in two consecutive lessons. On the first occasion, (periods 3 & 4 P.E.) his performance is compared to that of Dean Berwick (R/0.2). Miss Shiels gets ready to demonstrate dribbling a basketball and chooses John Perry as her helper. He has to stand in front of her with his hand in the air counting, with his fingers, the number of times she bounces the ball. He has great difficulty doing this:

MISS SHIELS: ... now there's no fingers there (BOUNCE) there's no fingers there. (BOUNCE)

(GIGGLES FROM THE CLASS WHO ARE ALL SITTING ROUND WATCHING)

There's still five fingers there (BOUNCE) still five (BOUNCE). There's four (BOUNCE) still four (BOUNCE) three, yes good (BOUNCE) two, yes good, (BOUNCE) one. (SHE LAUGHS) Is he always like this?

THE CLASS IN CHORUS: Yes. (LAUGHTER)

MISS SHIELS: Remind me to pick Dean Berwick next time, he usually manages to do what I ask!
In the following lesson (periods 5 & 6 English), both John Perry (R/O.24) and John Andrews (R/O.22) are publicly compared to Brian Buxton (R/O.13). The children are working in small groups reading aloud but the two Johns are not doing much reading. Every few minutes they turn around to see what I (the observer) am doing. Finally Mrs Betworth decides that it is time to do something about it.

MRS BETWORTH: I am going to say before I stop you, that I am interested to know -

(SHE IS INTERRUPTED BY JOHN PERRY WHO IS PLAYING AROUND)

- John Perry - you - really - are - being - very silly, aren't you.

(SPOKEN SLOWLY AND DELIBERATELY)

Now just stop your giggling. I am interested to know what page your group has got up to. There's a couple of groups around 31, 30. John?

JOHN ANDREWS: Page 28.

MRS BETWORTH: I thought somebody in your group had already said 31 actually. See you're being a bit silly again. I'm so glad Brian's been reading all the time. I am a little uncertain as to what you other two have been doing all this time, but I'm determined I'm not spending all my time with you.

(VOICE TO CRESCENDO)

There are other people in the room who deserve my time as well as you, and you don't always deserve a great deal of anything except people to get, er, what shall I say, a little bit annoyed with you at times.
Brian Buxton becomes the subject of a further comparison on day 6 (periods 1 & 2 English), this time with John Perry, John Andrews and Norman Woods when they are separated for bad behaviour.

**MRS BETWORTH:** .... you will not sit together next time you come to this room, you will sit at one side of the room, one of you, and the other side of the room, the other of you. You will not sit near Brian, who works, and you will not sit near John Andrews (who doesn't) either.

In a slightly more lighthearted way on day 7 (periods 3 & 4 English) John Andrews and Norman Woods are compared to Anthony Pearson (R/O.9). All three boys have not completed a story for homework and so Mrs Betworth suggests that they should all do it and come prepared to read it to the whole class, then she changes her mind:

**MRS BETWORTH:** (TO THE CLASS) I think that they ought to learn it so that they can tell it to us. Actually John and Norman are very good at gassing and talking, aren't they? They're past masters. I know you're much quieter Anthony, but I think we'll ask these two to do a gassbag on us and tell us the story without actually reading it. 'Cos they're very skilled at talking. Never met anybody better, specially out of the side of their mouths!

(SHE MAKES MUCH OF THIS POINT WITH THE APPROPRIATE GESTURES)

A further example occurs on day 16 (periods 1 & 2 English) when a comparison is made between James and Dean, both in the first quartile, and Jillian, in the fourth quartile. Mrs Betworth has read the class a story
and has asked for groups to volunteer to write scripts of scenes from the
story to act. As is quite common, Jillian is on her own with no one to
work with, and on this occasion Mrs Betworth doesn't want to impose her
on any other group.

MRS BETWORTH: The King's court scene. That's you Jillian,
have you changed your mind?

JILLIAN: No.

MRS BETWORTH: No, right. Now is it you and I left to do that
one by ourselves? Which one is it, the court
scene? Oh, blimey, we can't write that one our­selves can we! We could have done with James and
Dean to help us couldn't we.

While not as direct a comparison as some of the previous examples it
is clear that Mrs Betworth feels that Jillian cannot cope alone. In fact
the court scene involves several characters and would have been more
suitable for a larger group. Mrs Betworth was aware of this but, instead
of mentioning several girls who could have helped (Jillian rarely, if ever
worked with groups of boys), she chose to name the two boys who occupied
first and second positions in the teachers' average rank order.

4. Being allowed to work alone

A very common feature of Mrs Betworth's English lessons was small
group work. Usually children were allowed to work together with their
friends except when particular children were separated for bad behaviour,
or groups were deliberately organised for a specific purpose. On some
occasions, however, children would ask if they could work alone or, in the
case of Jillian, have no one to work with. Most commonly Mrs Betworth
would insist on group work and deny requests to work alone. However, a few
children would occasionally be allowed the privilege whereas others who tried it would be made to work together again. For example, on day 5 (periods 5 & 6 English) Mrs Betworth suggests that the class read aloud in small groups. She goes around the room arranging the groups on the grounds of friendship and proximity until she reaches Stephen Howes (R/O.17), Peter Lipscombe (R/O.10) and Anthony Pearson (R/O.9) all of whom are good readers.

MRS BETWORTH: Em, gentlemen?
PETER: I would prefer to read mine on my own.

MRS BETWORTH: Read all by yourself? You'd prefer? Well in that case you'd perhaps like to have a chair and go at the back by yourself.

(SHE HAS AGREED TO HIS REQUEST WITHOUT QUESTION)

When Mrs Betworth reaches Jillian, however, she makes a special effort to fit her into a group even though she has described Jillian as quite a good reader.

MRS BETWORTH: Now Jillian which group would you like to go to, 'cos I'm sure they'll have you?

(JILLIAN DELIBERATES AND CAN'T MAKE UP HER MIND)

You can't sit here by yourself my love it's not much fun is it?

(SHE POINTS TO A NEARBY GROUP OF GIRLS)

What about that group, if I come with you?

JILLIAN: Yes, all right.

Mrs Betworth then looks around the room and notices John Andrews, John Perry and Norman Woods in a group together. She approaches them and grabs John Andrews playfully from behind.
MRS BETWORTH: Now who's reading here?

JOHN ANDREWS: We all are!

MRS BETWORTH: I wanted one of you to read at a time, and the others listen. O.K.?

ALL TOGETHER: Yes!

They then proceed to read as a group. Finally she approaches Stephen Howes and Anthony Pearson, who have given up group work and are reading alone.

MRS BETWORTH: I presume that you've decided that instead of reading in a group you'd rather sit like this?

PETER LIPSCOMBE answers for them: Yes

MRS BETWORTH: O.K. well where are you then?

She has fully accepted their desire to read alone and allows them to continue. It is interesting to note that the children whose requests to read silently alone were turned down were all in the fourth quartile, despite the fact that, with the exception of John Perry, they were all reasonable readers. Those who were allowed to work alone were all in the second and third quartile and therefore were perceived more favourably than the others. The fact that no requests were made by first quartile children is not surprising, however, since they would eagerly take part in such group activities and derive great pleasure from the opportunity to display their skills at reading aloud, particularly Jane Barnes (R/0.3) who Mrs Betworth described as "..... one of the best readers I've ever had."

5. Direct praise or criticism

The most common use of praise and criticism was, in all cases, of a neutral kind. Teachers would try to make sure that their comments about
children's work were suited to their previous levels of attainment. Such things as effort were regularly rewarded with such comments as "good" or "well done" irrespective of the actual quality of the work compared to the rest of the class. In this way the slower or less able workers were encouraged just as much as the quicker or brighter ones. In addition to this, however, praise and criticism were used in qualitatively different ways depending upon whether a child was more or less favourably perceived. Whereas for the most favourably perceived children praise was positive and criticism encouraging in tone, for the least favourably perceived, praise was outwardly encouraging but often contained an additional comment of discouragement, and criticism was pointed and positively discouraging in tone.

For a favourably perceived child like Jane Barnes (R/0.3) public praise was always a straightforward verbal pat on the back. For example, on day 7 (periods 3 & 4 English) when Jane's story on the subject of 'Determination' had been voted best in her group Mrs Betworth made much of the fact that she had expected Jane's story to win.

James Benson (R/0.1) was often described by his teachers as a boy who could be expected to be sensible and set a good example to the others. When Miss Shiels tried to organise some mixed basketball teams, day 5 (periods 3 & 4 P.E.) the boys all sat as far away from the girls as they could. Finally James moved and was praised for it even though, initially he had behaved in the same way as all the other boys.

MISS SHIELS: Right back in everybody.

(THEY ALL RUN IN)

Sit down. What's wrong with the girls you boys?

You always sit miles away, come one, this is a mixed group in P.E. Move up Peter!
(AMONG THE GENERAL CHATTER AND MOVEMENT
JAMES MOVES INTO A CENTRAL POSITION
AMONGST THE GIRLS)

Very sensible James, well done James.

(THE OTHER BOYS FOLLOW HIS EXAMPLE)

Even the content of James' written work clearly reflects his experience and the aspirations of both his parents and teachers. On day 7 (periods 3 & 4 English) he was praised highly by Mrs Betworth for his story entitled 'Determination'. The story contained reference to passing exams and going to University. While he was reading it Mrs Betworth attracted my attention and signalled that she thought it was good, and after the lesson she confirmed that the aspirations expressed in the story were quite realistic.

(The full story is contained in Appendix I.)

MRS BETWORTH: James comes from a good home, father is very bright. He isn't quite as bright as his father thinks, his parents expectations are clearly represented in the content of his story ... He could stand a chance of going to University.

MRS JAMES: James is a bright boy, mature. A thinking boy, able to get on.

James stands out as being a mature character.

Really an educated child, but fun as well.

MR DAVIES: James is probably going to be quite brilliant.

There is so much of him wanting to come out. His perception is very quick.

For the favourably perceived, criticism was most commonly expressed in an encouraging way. The suggestion would be that it is a pity that an error has occurred, and what can we do to turn this to our advantage.

When Mrs Betworth approached Susan West (R/0.6) on day 6 (periods 1 & 2
English) it was with an air of anticipation:

MRS BETWORTH: These are very good Susan, you're very accurate.

(GIGGLES) I've just said that and then what do I find, look you've missed that and that out (GIGGLES AGAIN WHILE POINTING TO SUSAN'S BOOK) I think you must have had a chinwag session at that point.

She attaches no serious blame for this omission, it is just put down to a temporary and excusable lapse in concentration.

When Susan and Jane are struggling with their illustrations on day 19 (periods 5 & 6 Health Education) Mrs James makes useful suggestions to help them make the most out of the mistakes they have already made. They have been trying to draw a 24 hour clock in order to illustrate the typical mealtimes in any one day:

MRS JAMES: Now girls, how are you getting on, are you almost through?

SUSAN: I keep making mistakes on this!

MRS JAMES: Well that's all right, but I shouldn't do it too many times.

(SHE LOOKS THROUGH SOME OF THEIR WORK)

Is this yours? (JANE NODS)

Whose is this one?

JANE: Susan's.

MRS JAMES: Well instead of colouring all these blue (REFERRING TO SECTIONS ON THE PIE CHART) why don't you just colour in the sections that are just for eating, and leave the others blank? That would probably be better now wouldn't it? And it certainly would be quicker.
For the least favourably perceived children in the class the situation was often quite different. The encouraging remark made about some good work or good behaviour often carried an additional message which conveyed the teacher's true expectations. For example, on day 5 (periods 3 & 4 P.E.) John Andrews (R/0.22) does particularly well in P.E. but Miss Shiels doesn't stop at simple praise:

**MISS SHIELS:** Only three left, who's going to be the 2B champ?

Peaches! *(THE TEAM NAME. THREE BOYS RUN ACROSS THE HALL, ONE IS ELIMINATED)*

Two left, John and Dean, who will it be?

Plums! *(THEY RUN, JOHN WINS)*

Oh well done John Andrews, the only good thing he's done to date!

On day 9 (periods 5 & 6 Health Education) having completed a piece of work, John Andrews takes it to Mrs James who does a little more than just praise him:

**MRS JAMES:** I must say it makes a change, John, to say, for you to be able to say - mine's finished, because when I looked at your folder I was positively *(PAUSE)* well, I don't know, words fail me. I was really disappointed.

The implication of her opening statement could well be that she doesn't normally expect him to complete his work properly, a view which she backs up with her subsequent statements about his folder. She follows this up by suggesting that he is an intelligent boy but never applies his ability:

**MRS JAMES:** For an intelligent boy sometimes I just wonder what you use all day. Or whether you even think about it. Do you? Do you ever think about it
and think - well I care?

(JOHN JUST SHRUGS HIS SHOULDERS AND SMILES)

An interesting contrast with the straight praise of James Benson in P.E. for sensible behaviour, Norman Woods (R/O.23) receives an extra message. On day 10 (periods 3 & 4 P.E.) Miss Shiels has been teaching them various moves in basketball and has now got them all ready to play an actual game. Most of the team are bunched up in one place waiting for the ball, but Norman positions himself to one side allowing himself more space to move. Miss Shiels notices this and quickly praises him, but adds a further comment:

MISS SHIELS: There's one sensible person in this team, amazingly it's Norman!

John Perry (R/O.24) proves another interesting example when Mrs Betworth tries to encourage him with his homework, day 10 (periods 5 & 6 English). John is the poorest reader in the class, receiving regular remedial help. On occasions it has been clear that his father has helped him with his homework, something which Mrs Betworth has tried to encourage.

MRS BETWORTH: John is an immature little boy in some ways. He does try so desperately hard with his homework. It's obvious that he's had a great deal of help at home, but I wrote on his report thanking his parents for helping him, but I'm pleased because I put any support that he can get can only be positive.

On this particular occasion she praises John for his work and the neatness of his writing.

MRS BETWORTH: Did it take you a long time to do it?

JOHN: Yes it did. (SMILES)
MRS BETWORTH: Well it was very good indeed. Did your Dad help you with some of your spellings?

JOHN: Yes.

She then goes on to suggest that she is happy for his father to help:

MRS BETWORTH: Not everybody's dad will bother you know.

However, finally and with the best of intentions, she adds a comment presumably designed to show him how he might maintain the improvement. But at the same time implying that his problem is that he doesn't concentrate on what he is doing.

MRS BETWORTH: Now you take your time and you'll come on if you concentrate.

The message is once again expressed a little later in the lesson when she is helping him find a picture of a bicycle. What is intended as an encouraging remark could easily be interpreted as an expression of John's lack of ability:

MRS BETWORTH: Look at this old fashioned one eh?

JOHN: That's not what I want really.

MRS BETWORTH: Well at least it gives you an idea of the arrangement of the wheels and the handlebars doesn't it. Now keep going, you never know what you might manage.

Further descriptions of John by Mrs Betworth accurately represent the collective feelings of her colleagues:

"John always sticks out like a sore thumb in most situations because he's so physically awkward. He wriggles and fiddles, because I think he must be self-conscious about something or other. His ability is quite
remedial in some areas. He also finds it difficult to communicate with some people. He's what I call bashful. John's vocabulary is almost bereft of anything interesting."

The most pointed and negative messages were directed at those children who were least favourably perceived. Direct verbal attacks would leave the unfortunate recipient in no doubt as to the teachers feelings.

On day 4 (periods 5 & 6 Health Education) John Andrews (R/O.22) is sitting slouched in his chair trying to put his feet up on a chair at the other side of the table. Mrs James thumbs through his file:

MRS JAMES: Do you care about the presentation of your work?
(PAUSE) Do you have any feelings at all?
(PAUSE) Come on, be honest for once!
(SHE CHECKS HIS SPELLINGS)
Now check your spelling - I seem to remember when you did spelling tests in the first year you got them all right.

Although she refers to his better work in the first year there is no tone of friendliness in her voice, she puts him down but doesn't offer any help to recover.

After separating John Andrews (R/O.22) and John Perry (R/O.24) for talking day 6 (periods 3 & 4 Mathematics) Mr Rogers clearly tells John Perry what he thinks of him, while at the same time imposing a detention on him:

MR ROGERS: Well I'm going to let you carry on and get some work done at 12 o'clock 'cos you're a time waster aren't you? You're one of those clever gentlemen who likes to play about while my back's turned.
John Andrews (R/0.22) is the recipient of a similar message on day 14 (periods 5 & 6 Health Education). Mrs James has previously sent John outside to wash some red ink off his face. When he returns Mrs James takes a chair and sits by his side:

MRS JAMES: You're a devious young man, aren't you?
If I look round I don't see you doing anything.
But as soon as I turn around or go out of the room to do whatever, you find something to do to annoy somebody. Now what's got into you?

In a more lighthearted way, attempts to ridicule children can convey teachers' feelings. On day 10 (period 7 French) the children are all completing a crossword puzzle in French. One answer in the puzzle is 'DES', but Norman Woods (R/0.23) has misspelt it as 'DAY'.

MRS CARTWRIGHT: What's this DAY? Mayday in your case I should think, a distress signal. (WITH EMPHASIS)
D-E-S! Have you seen it before Norman? DES!

Mrs Cartwright comments that she has been

"... very pleased with (him) actually, this year because from being totally out in the wilds, not knowing what was going off at all, at least we've picked the oral side of him up this year. He will take part, he can remember, will try and take part. On the written side Norman's books are absolutely atrocious to look at and he doesn't seem capable of tidying them up or being able to put anything worthwhile accurately down. Poor old Norman, either doesn't get it done or can't read it when it has been done."

During an oral lesson, day 15 (periods 7 & 8 French) Mrs Cartwright goes around the class asking children to say which sports they like and do
not like. She has a set of picture cards which depict a whole variety of things they have been learning about. Her attempt to involve Norman does little for his French but could be interpreted as confirming and legitimating his view of himself as someone who does not like school.

MRS CARTWRIGHT: Right, Dawn, le football?
DAWN: Il aime le football.
MRS CARTWRIGHT: Il aime le football. Le tennis? Oui Peter?
PETER: Il déteste le tennis.
MRS CARTWRIGHT: Et le golf? Le golf Martin?
MARTIN: Il déteste le golf.

She then holds up a picture of a school:

MRS CARTWRIGHT: L'école, where's l'école?

(HOLDS UP THE PICTURE)

What is it?
NORMAN: Ice hockey.

MRS CARTWRIGHT: (SURPRISED) Ice hockey?

(LAUGHTER FROM THE CLASS)

L'école, put an 's' instead of the e-acute.
It's not the lager! (LONG PAUSE)
I think you'll have seen one in your time.

(MORE LAUGHTER FROM THE CLASS)

I may be wrong. (MORE LAUGHTER)

Put an 's' where that first 'e' is in école.

(Finally she gives in and tells him)

School, have you seen a school in your life?

(Norman grins)

Unfortunately, yes! (She turns to the class)
And so il déteste l'école.
After a few minutes when she revises the responses to all of the previous questions she returns to l'ecole.

MRS CARTWRIGHT: L'ecole, I'd better ask Norman now he's found out what it is. (LAUGHTER) Tu aime l'ecole? Tu deteste l'ecole?

NORMAN: Je deteste l'ecole. (LAUGHTER)

MRS CARTWRIGHT: Tu deteste l'ecole. I had a feeling.

It is during periods of extreme provocation that teachers are likely to make their most unguarded comments, at times when the normal classroom order is seen to be breaking down. The teacher may give vent to feelings which, in more rational moments, would be suppressed or suitably modified.

On one such occasion, day 17 (periods 5 & 6 Health Education) both John Perry (R/O.24) and John Andrews (R/O.22) have provoked Mrs James beyond endurance. They continually chatter when she is trying to conduct a class discussion, they wriggle about in their seats, turn around, and distract others in the class. First she separates them, and then later she allows them to sit together again in the hope that, having been separated once, they might behave. Despite this they both continue to provoke her until she becomes very angry.

MRS JAMES: Get on! (PAUSE) hurry up and fill that chart in, and when you've thought exactly what we talked about then you can tell me.

JOHN PERRY: What have I got to fill it in with?

(HE HAS A CHEEKY TONE OF VOICE AND A SILLY GRIN ON HIS FACE)

MRS JAMES: Do you have to prove that you're even more stupid than you were before? Em? ....

She later moves him to a table occupied by girls.
MRS JAMES: You are quite stupid aren't you!
Get that finished, and I want to see both
of you tomorrow: break time.....

During the same lesson John Andrews receives a similar message:

MRS JAMES: John Andrews (PAUSE) You really are a silly
boy aren't you!
(HER VOICE IS FIRM AND SERIOUS)

A common feature of the behaviour of both John Perry and John Andrews
was the apparent ineffectiveness of the teachers' attempts to reprimand
them. Several teachers commented upon their apparent need to constantly
project themselves as a means of covering up their feelings of insecurity
and inferiority:

MRS JAMES: He's (John Andrews) almost overconcerned about
being brought to the fore and yet, for some
reason, he needs to project himself. It's some
sort of inferiority thing.
John (Perry) needs to be noticed and yet he has
a certain hesitancy.

MR LOMAS: John (Andrews) has got very great difficulty with
his own identity really, who he's supposed to be.
In the early days of my dealing with him he was
obviously coming up to be told off, it was where he
got his kicks. We've changed that situation a bit
now but he's a long way behind. John has many an-
social tendencies.
John (Perry) is not very highly motivated in drama
although he's made a lot of strides since the start
of the year in his attitude towards the subject. He is very insecure about taking a role, constantly glancing across at me to see if he's not going to be told off 'cos he's doing something in role that he'd not normally be allowed to do. John is turned in on himself. He's almost masochistic in his need to be torn off a strip now and again. Better than being ignored I suppose.

These comments from Mr Lomas are of particular interest since the bulk of the drama work done with the class is geared to the exploration of personal identities and relationships thus facilitating observation of the children both in and out of role. One further example may serve to illustrate the need to be noticed and the ineffectiveness of disciplinary measures on John Perry. The incident occurred on day 2 (periods 5 & 6 Health Education) at a time when I, the observer, had barely spent long enough with the class to become fully acquainted with them. However, the incident stood out at the time as a classic example of a child who was in no way perturbed by his teacher's anger, turning the situation to his own advantage by increasing his stature in the eyes of his friends.

The class have been very noisy throughout the lesson, quite possibly a reaction to having an observer present and their teacher equipped with a radio microphone. John Perry has been constantly fidgeting and turning round to distract others and Mrs James has found it necessary to speak to him about it on several occasions. As the lesson draws to a close she takes up the question of the bad behaviour of the whole class, and the two Johns in particular:

MRS JAMES: I've just had enough! In fact I'm quite appalled with some of the behaviour this afternoon. It's
been silly in the extreme for some people.

(SHE TAKES A LONG HARD LOOK AT THE TWO JOHNS)

And you, young man, can see me for a few minutes before you actually go, John Perry

(HE IGNORES HER, SHE SHOUTS VERY LOUDLY)

John! get out here.

(SHE DIRECTS HIM TO THE FRONT OF THE ROOM AND MAKES HIM FACE THE WALL)

Stand there until I've got the patience to speak to you. And get your hands out of your pockets and face the other way.

John faces the wall but takes sly peeps and grins at his friends when he thinks Mrs James is not looking. He clearly isn't ashamed of being treated like this, he seems to be enjoying it. When questioned about the incident Mrs James added:

"Well they (the two Johns) certainly strive to achieve an extra amount of adverse attention. I think that's changed a bit now since John Andrews is on report and is striving to please just now. Yes, I think maybe they have tried to make themselves more noticable. Also, to them, I think it's a sign of success amongst their buddies if they are really the ones who have to be cracked down on and the ones who are the focus of attention."

6. Dealing with minor misbehaviour

A comparative analysis of ways in which teachers handle minor misbehaviour is complicated by the fact that the most favourably perceived children rarely misbehave, or if they do, it is often simply ignored. The best comparisons of all would be where similar kinds of misbehaviour
receive different treatment in the same lesson, but such occasions over a five week period of observation would be rare. Many incidents involving the least favourably perceived children in the class have been described in previous sections of this chapter, the straight telling-off, being separated from one's friends or the threat of detention, all delivered in a firm and serious tone of voice. For the favourably perceived child, however, the misbehaviour is more likely to be treated in a positive way, as a temporary lapse, and the teacher's comment is often followed by a positive statement about the child's normal behaviour. In some cases some additional task is set which can serve to reinforce the view that the child is able. "It serves you right, but I know you'll enjoy doing it really!" might, for example, be the sentiment behind giving a good reader an extra task which involves reading aloud to the class. Let us take, for example, the case of Dean Berwick (R/0.2) who Mrs James describes as:

"A bright boy needing to aerate at times in a fairly uncontrolled way. A thinking boy, able to get on."

On day 7 (periods 5 & 6, Health Education) Dean is working in a small group of boys on some charts and diagrams to illustrate the content of a typical diet. While quite a lot of good work is being done Dean is tending also to be a bit noisy. Mrs James calls to him so that everyone else can hear.

MRS JAMES: Do you think young man, you could cut out these silly noises? I've not known Dean Berwick make so many peculiar noises for a long time!

The next time they have Mrs James on day 9 (periods 5 & 6 Health Education) she finds it necessary to reinforce the point:

MRS JAMES: Em, Dean, would you like me to find something for you to do for me because if you're going to get
silly I think it might be better if you came and did something quietly for me. If not, just settle down and finish that off quickly, sensibly. Now you're normally a very sensible boy!

Finally, on day 12 (periods 3 & 4 English) Mrs Betworth gives him some extra work. Towards the end of a lesson working with the 'Spelling Workshop' Mrs Betworth collects in the workcards and books and prepares them to read a further chapter of a story called 'My Side of the Mountain'. Dean has achieved quite a lot of work but has, at the same time, been rather noisy. As a consequence he is given the task of reading the first section aloud to "... quieten him down for being a bit noisy". While several other children in the class had been equally as noisy as Dean, they did not receive this kind of treatment. In essence Dean is given a task which, in comparison with less favourably perceived children, might reinforce the view that he is a superior reader. In any event, for this particular class, the opportunity to read aloud was eagerly sought by most of the more favourably perceived children at any time. Dean Berwick was no exception to this.

Summary and Discussion

Following the close examination of lesson transcripts of five weeks continuous observation of one group of twenty-four children and twelve of their teachers, six categories of teacher-behaviour and pupil-experience were isolated as being potentially powerful means whereby teacher expectations are communicated. For each category, comparative analysis of significant incidents revealed qualitative differences between the experiences of those children who were favourably perceived by their teachers, and those who were not.
The six categories were: (i) The relative frequency of significant incidents; (ii) Grouping within the class; (iii) Public comparisons; (iv) Being allowed to work alone; (v) Direct praise or criticism, and (vi) Dealing with minor misbehaviour.

As indicated by the pilot studies significant incidents occurred relatively infrequently but, in addition, were distributed unevenly according to a) Subject demands and teaching style. Those subjects demanding a high degree of class discussion and collective activity coupled with a teacher whose teaching style relied heavily upon close personal relationships with the children were the most likely sources of significant incidents.

b) Significant incidents were unevenly distributed between the children themselves, those most favourably perceived receiving a relatively small number of positive contacts, while those least favourably perceived receiving a relatively large number of negative contacts, being most commonly in response to problems of a disciplinary nature.

Teachers' reactions to friendship groups varied according to whether their members were collectively perceived more or less favourably. The members of any one group being referred to collectively in positive or negative terms depending upon how favourably the group was perceived. Where individual group members occupied a wider range of rank-order positions, however, teachers sometimes differentiated between individual group members whilst, at the same time, reacting towards them as a group, e.g. a group of "gossipy girls" who were all expected to produce different qualities and quantities of work. On occasions when group membership was manipulated by the teacher it was more common for the most favourably perceived children to be spread around to raise the level of work and to keep things going, while the least favourably perceived children were
separated to prevent time wasting and bad behaviour. Of the children who were not naturally members of any one friendship group, the more favourably perceived would be allowed to work alone whereas the least favourably perceived would be encouraged and finally compelled to join an existing group.

Public comparisons proved to be a very potent means of expressing expectations since they clearly reveal the teachers hierarchical view of the class membership. In making such comparisons of the performance or behaviour of one child with that of another, the child used as the 'good example' was always more favourably perceived than the child used as the 'bad example'.

Direct praise and criticism were used in qualitatively different ways depending upon whether a child was more or less favourably perceived. Praise was positive and criticism encouraging in tone for the most favourably perceived, whereas for the least favourably perceived, praise was outwardly encouraging but usually accompanied by a more negative statement of the teacher's true feelings. Criticism was pointed and positively discouraging in tone.

Teachers' reactions to minor misbehaviour problems were, in similar circumstances, different depending upon whether the child concerned was more or less favourably perceived. Whereas least favourably perceived children would receive a straight telling-off, be separated from their friends or threatened with detention, those more favourably perceived would be handled in a more positive and encouraging way, treating the incident as a temporary lapse from the normal, and often stated, level of good behaviour.
Chapter 5

Conclusions

This study has attempted to illustrate the potency of the self-fulfilling prophecy effect by comparing teachers' perceptions with the incidence of certain highly significant aspects of their day-to-day interactions with their pupils. Within the particular observational setting it has attempted to demonstrate the existence of a number of necessary conditions under which teachers' expectations are generally accepted to be successfully communicated, and to illustrate a clear qualitative difference in teacher-pupil contacts between those pupils most favourably perceived and those least favourably perceived.

The research design has two unique features which enable it to extend beyond the demonstration of expectancy effects per se. Firstly, the observations, being confined to "significant incidents", i.e. those occasions when a teacher tells a child or group of children something about themselves rather than about the subject of the lesson, create a sharper focus than in most participant observation studies. This facilitates a more detailed study of the means whereby teachers' expectations are articulated as well as the necessary conditions under which they may be successfully communicated. Secondly, the continuous and intensive pursuit of one group of children and their teachers through every lesson attended for five weeks constitutes an unusual level of intensity of observation. It has been more common for participant observers to concentrate their attentions on a small number of teachers with several different classes, interspersed by periods of teaching. Since this study is concerned with one single group of children, it has been possible to compare their experiences with each of their teachers and to determine the degree to
which those teachers share similar perceptions of the same children, the context of the total school environment being held constant.

In common with Nash (1973), and Ball (1981), the teachers' perceptions of the children were obtained using a modified version of Kelly's (1955) repertory grid technique. However, the construction of an average set of "Top Ten" provided constructs based upon the teachers' individually elicited personal constructs constitutes a more radical departure from this approach in two ways: First, it provides a more realistic basis for the comparison of the teachers' ratings of the children. Second, it provides a unique opportunity to determine the reliability of teachers' ratings on such a "provided" scale by comparing the ratings with those obtained from the same teachers when rating the same children using their own sets of individually elicited personal constructs.

The high degree of comparability of teacher ratings facilitated by the use of a common set of rating criteria has enabled the detailed study of the teachers' construct clusters to be extended. The production of three mutually exclusive principal clusters, representative of the collective perceptions of one group of teachers, without the use of independent judges, constitutes a novel departure. This is particularly so since the principal clusters obtained confirm results reported by other researchers using more laborious and subjective methods.

As in most case-study researches the inherent problems of generalising from the particular to teacher and pupil behaviour in general deserves serious attention. In statistical terms, the sample size in the present study is small and unlikely to be representative of the population as a whole. In addition, the statistical analysis is essentially non-parametric. While there is a strong case for the argument that the findings of this
study can only hold true for the particular teachers and children observed, there is a valid case to be made for the careful and limited generalisation of certain findings to similar populations. First, on the grounds that both the observer, as an experienced teacher, and the observed teachers, on the basis of wide and varied experience, were able on many occasions to agree that the behaviour observed and the conclusions reached were typical of both the school observed and of schools in general. Second, that certain findings of the present study show a high degree of similarity to findings of other research working in different schools with different children and different teachers.

The six major questions raised in Chapter 1 represent the hypotheses arising from the theoretical sampling of the pilot observation studies. They are as follows:

(1) From available research evidence, what are the necessary conditions under which educational self-fulfilling prophecies are a potent force in the classroom?

(2) To what extent is there a qualitative difference in classroom experience between those children who are very favourably perceived and those who are less favourably perceived by their teachers? To what extent are the necessary conditions for successful transmission present?

(3) To what extent can it be demonstrated that there is a relationship between teachers' perceptions and pupils' self-images?

(4) Is the degree of similarity between teachers' views of children sufficiently significant to support the view that they may have a cumulative effect upon children's self-images?
(5) Which are the most common and highly valued personal constructs used by teachers in making day-to-day judgements about children? Is it feasible to use these as the basis for an "average" set of "provided" rating criteria to facilitate comparative analysis?

(6) To what extent is it possible to subsume teachers' most commonly-occurring personal constructs under a smaller number of general headings more accurately representing the day-to-day judgemental criteria employed by teachers?

Detailed discussions of each of the findings of this study appear in appropriate parts of the text. However, to provide readers with an overall view, and to establish the link between the quantitative data, on the one hand and the qualitative data on the other, the major findings and conclusions are summarised below.

1. Communication of teachers' expectations: the necessary conditions.

It has been suggested in this study that to demonstrate the existence of teachers' differential expectations towards their pupils is insufficient evidence for the existence of teacher expectancy effects. By reference to the findings of a wide range of published research, this study suggests that certain necessary conditions must be fulfilled in order that teachers' expectations may be successfully communicated. These conditions are best categorised under five main headings: (i) External conditions of the school, whereby children and teachers spend relatively long periods of time together involving a relatively high degree of verbal activity and the opportunity for teachers to make regular subjective judgements about children. (ii) Teachers' values and expectations, whereby teachers form specific expectations of children which they define as real. Those expectations must be appropriate to the school setting. Expectations shared by
several teachers are likely to have a cumulative effect. (iii) Pupil values and expectations - must be such that they value school and believe their teachers to be legitimate and competent judges of their behaviour and performance. Pupils, therefore, must feel personally concerned with their performance. (iv) Teacher behaviour - must provide qualitatively different classroom experience for different children which is consistent over time. Verbal messages must be supported by non-verbal cues. (v) Pupil behaviour - this completes the expectancy cycle since it provides the feedback for both pupil and teacher. It is on the basis of this feedback system that expectations and subsequent behaviour are maintained or changed.

2. Qualitative differences in children's classroom experience

It is in demonstrating a clear qualitative difference in classroom experience between those children who are favourably perceived and those who are not, that the relationship is established between those observed experiences on the one hand and the teachers' expectations on the other. The two groups of children chosen for comparison constituted the first and fourth quartiles of the teachers' average rank order, and as such, their choice was totally independent of any prior observations. Six categories of teacher behaviour and pupil experience were noted:

(i) Relative frequency of significant incidents.
(ii) Grouping within the class.
(iii) Public comparisons.
(iv) Being allowed to work alone.
(v) Direct praise or criticism.
(vi) Dealing with minor misbehaviour.
Observations made under each of these headings revealed clear and consistent evidence of qualitatively different teacher behaviour and pupil experience between the two groups of children representing those most highly perceived and those least highly perceived by their teachers. It is suggested that, while they do not represent all possible ways in which teachers' expectations are articulated, they do represent some potentially powerful means of their expression.

The extent to which the necessary conditions for the successful communication of the teachers expectations were present in the observational setting is difficult to gauge accurately. Observations would indicate that they were probably present in varying degrees for most of the time. However the absence of perfect correlations between any of the items of quantitative data throughout the study would indicate, to varying degrees, that the effects of the teachers' expectations were being filtered out and weakened. In some cases, of course, situations defined as real by the teachers would not be accepted by the pupils since, being the result of some passing incident, they did not satisfy the consistency condition.

3. **Teachers' perceptions and their pupils' self-images.**

Significant correlations between the teachers' ratings and the pupil scores on the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, the Barker-Lunn Academic Self Image Scale and the modified form of the teachers "Top Ten" constructs establish the important link between the classroom observation data on the one hand and the self-images of the pupils on the other. It is argued that, for the group observed at least, a significant and positive relationship exists between the teachers' perceptions of the children and the childrens' views of themselves. However, the imperfect nature of that relationship indicates that the transmission of teachers' expectations to the children
is in many instances only partially successful. While it is possible to infer a direct, though imperfect, relationship between teachers' actual observed behaviour towards specific children, and their self-image scores from the above data, the direct verification of this relationship was not attempted in the present study.

4. The degree of similarity between the teachers' views.

Discussions with the teachers and detailed study of the lesson transcripts indicate that it is a commonly-held belief that, although teachers have their differences of opinion, they share similar views of their pupils for most of the time. Nash (1973) attempted to verify this view by calculating coefficients of concordance separately for boys and girls, based upon the rankings of three teachers. His results (Boys $W = 0.67$, girls $W = 0.53$, $p < .05$) led him to the somewhat guarded conclusion that "There is enough agreement here to show that the teachers are talking about the same thing but it is clear that they are by no means in total agreement."

In the present study there were no separate calculations for boys and girls but two calculations were performed: First on the rankings of six teachers according to their own elicited personal constructs, ($W = 0.58$, $p < .001$), and second on the rankings of the same six teachers according to the average set of "provided" constructs. ($W = 0.66$, $p < .001$). As anticipated, the value obtained from the common rating criteria was the larger. Clearly these results are close to those obtained by Nash except that the larger number of ratings available and the larger group of children (24 compared to 15 and 20) facilitated a higher significance level ($0.001$ compared to $0.05$). While it is clear from these results that total agreement does not exist, it is also true to say that a significant amount of agreement exists for a good deal of the time. This being the case it is not unreasonable to
suggest that the combined or cumulative effect of teachers' agreement about particular children will be greater than that of the perceptions of any one individual. However, at the same time the amount of disagreement between teachers may serve to reduce the effectiveness of individual or collective expectations by failing to satisfy the consistency condition.

5. Elicited-v-provided constructs - a comparison

Comparison of the average rankings of six teachers from two separate rating exercises revealed highly significant and positive results. The first rating exercise involved the use of each teacher's individually elicited set of personal constructs while the second was performed using a common set of rating criteria derived from the most commonly occurring personal constructs elicited individually from the whole teacher group. Correlations ranged from $r = 0.73$ to $r = 0.92$ ($p < .01$), and while all values were highly significant, discussions with the teachers concerned clearly indicated that the differences conformed to the varying degrees to which individual teacher-pupil contact satisfied the time condition. That is to say, the teacher with the strongest relationship between the two sets of ratings had spent most time with the children as a whole class, and the teacher with the relatively weakest relationship had spent the least amount of time with the group. These results confirm the view expressed by Adams-Webber (1970) and Warr and Coffman (1970), that

"Normal subjects exhibit approximately the same degree of differentiation in using carefully selected supplied lists of constructs as when they employ their own elicited personal constructs."

In addition these results confirm the view that the relative frequency of occurrence of individual teachers' most highly valued personal constructs constitutes a firm and valid basis for the selection of constructs in
supplied lists, particularly if that list is to be used by those same teachers.

6. Cluster analysis and teachers' personal constructs.

Elementary linkage analysis of the teachers' rankings on the ten given criteria revealed that many rankings were sufficiently alike to indicate that the teachers treated several of the given constructs as similar to one another. The greatest number of clusters was four and the least was two, every member of which had a higher correlation with another construct in that cluster than with any other construct in any other cluster. Several researchers have attempted to identify clusters of this kind, Osgood (1957) identified clusters in two dimensions, what he called "evaluative" and "dynamism" factors. Hallworth (1962) identified two similar dimensions of psychological traits which he labelled "success in school work and ability to get on with school staff" and "social activity or extraversion". Nash (1973) simply identified the three groups of constructs which occurred most frequently, separating them into three dimensions, "work habits", "maturity" and "classroom behaviour". Finally Taylor (1976) identified seven categories of teachers' constructs, and with the help of two independent judges constructed a rank order of frequency of occurrence, and therefore by inference, order of importance. Taylor's top three categories are of particular interest since they are similar to those of Osgood, Hallworth and Nash, namely "academic achievement", "personality characteristics" and "behaviour and relationships with the teacher", accounting for over 75% of the constructs elicited. In the present study the need for independent judges has been avoided since all necessary decisions concerning the rank order of importance of individual teachers personal constructs were made earlier in the study by the teachers
from whom they were elicited. Close analysis of the frequency of occurrence of associated construct pairs in the teachers' individual construct clusters revealed three mutually exclusive principal clusters which bear a close relation to those previously cited. The findings of the present study suggest, therefore, that in accordance with results of previous research, and in accordance with their own subjective judgements, the teachers in this study tended to view their personal construct systems under the three general headings of "maturity and attitude to school work", "personality factors" and "academic ability" in their day-to-day judgements of children in their care.
APPENDIX I

A complete account of all significant incidents recorded for the first and fourth quartiles of the teachers' average rank-order.
JAMES BENSON

Rank order No.1

James was absent from school during the first few days of observation, consequently the first incident occurred on day 5.

Day 5 Periods 3 & 4. P.E. Minor games in the hall.

Following a warming up exercise, Miss Shiels calls them all back into the centre of the hall and tells them to sit down. The boys all sit as far away from the girls as they can. James sets a good example to the others and is clearly praised for it.

MISS SHIELS: Right, back in everybody.

(THEY ALL RUN IN)

Sit down. What's wrong with the girls you boys? You always sit miles away, come on, this is a mixed group in P.E. Move up Peter!

(AMONG THE GENERAL CHATTER AND MOVEMENT JAMES MOVES INTO A CENTRAL POSITION AMONGST THE GIRLS)

Very sensible James, well done James.

(THE OTHER BOYS FOLLOW HIS EXAMPLE)

Day 7 Periods 3 & 4. English

The class have written stories on the theme of 'determination' for homework and Mrs Betworth wants them to work in small groups to judge the merits of each other's stories. She sets about arranging them into groups by dictating who goes where in a very deliberate way. In each group she puts - "... one child who is good, to keep the group going". James is selected as a group leader along with Susan, Jane and Dean. The best stories in each group then go forward to be read to the whole class.
James' story is one of the winners, and Mrs Betworth asks him to read it to the class first. While he does so she looks across at me and smiles to indicate that she thinks it is good. His story is particularly interesting since it seems to reflect both the expectations of his parents and his teachers. A point which Mrs Betworth confirmed after the lesson. (Remember that this boy is 12 years old.)

JAMES: Determination. I was on the second try for my exams in dolphin training. I was at Brighton University studying Marine Biology so I could be close to the dolphins. At the Dolphinarium I could study the dolphins. The day came when I got my exam papers. The result was very bad, I needed to study a lot more. I was so disappointed. I read night and day and travelled a lot. I was determined to pass next time. This was the last time I could try to pass my exams. I never went outside, I worked all the time, I was so determined. The day came when the results were read out. I had passed, I was so excited. I got used to my job soon, and I loved it.

MRS BETWORTH: Well that was interesting, and I didn't know things about dolphinariums. It sounded most convincing, well done.

(Note the reference to travel, his parents are American and he has travelled a lot, particularly to Florida where his grandparents live.)

Day 14. Periods 1 & 2 P.E. (Hockey)

During the changing-room briefing Miss Shiels tells the class what they are going to do in their first game of 7-a-side hockey. She tells them that there must be at least three girls in every team to make things
fair, however, the girls all bunch together and the boys all bunch together. Once again James sets a good example and is publicly praised for it.

MISS SHIELS: Goodness me - three girls come here.

(SHE POINTS TO A TEAM OF BOYS)

Three girls come here in this team.

(THEY MOVE RELUCTANTLY)

Ho, hum! ho, hum! we seem to have one team of eight, one team of seven and one team of six. Who's got four boys in their team?

(NOT ALL THE TEAMS)

You all have except these. Right, I want one boy from this group

(POINTS TO A TEAM)

to move over there. Please!

(NOBODY MOVES)

Thank you.

(Finally after a great deal of nudging, James gets up and moves over)

Some people are so sensible and some are so silly!

Day 16 Periods 1 & 2 English

Mrs Betworth has read the class a story about an Egyptian King and a white crocodile in order that they can write and act a play about it. After some discussion about the various scenes they will need in the play Mrs Betworth asks which children would like to work on each scene in turn. As various children raise their hands she puts them into groups so that they can discuss and write the script. Eventually everyone is placed in a group except Jillian, who, as is often the case, is left alone. The
subsequent discussion between Jillian and Mrs Betworth leads to a significant public comparison between Jillian on the one hand, and James and Dean on the other.

MRS BETWORTH: What about this gorgeous scene at the King's court?

(JILLIAN RAISES HER HAND. ONCE AGAIN SHE IS ALONE)

You'd like to do that Jillian, but you can't do it by yourself pet, can you!

Mrs Betworth then moves the children around so that the groups can work together. She calls out each scene until she reaches the King's court scene.

MRS BETWORTH: The King's court scene. That's you Jillian, have you changed your mind?

JILLIAN: No.

MRS BETWORTH: Right, well is it you and I left to do that one by ourselves? Which one is it, the court scene? Oh blimey, we can't write that one ourselves can we? We could have done with James and Dean to help us couldn't we!

Teachers' remarks made about James Benson

Science: Mrs Jones

"Works well with others and is very jolly. He always has a lot to say about everything. Always asking questions about his work and anything else which crops up. He is very forward coming and not embarrassed to ask anything. He has very good ability and is very confident."
"He is a leader in an organised way, he leads because he is confident."

"James is jolly and outgoing."

Music: Mr Davies

"James is probably going to be quite brilliant. There is so much of him wanting to come out. His perception is very quick."

"James is the kind who will suddenly go off at a tangent and do something quite clever without following the normal step-ladder."

French: Mrs Lindsay

"An able boy, very sociable, fairly broad-minded, a mature boy. Full of self-confidence, very outgoing and outspoken."

"James is very keen and enthusiastic about anything that he does, and he does things not even dreaming that he might be wrong."

"James gets on well orally and answers as much as he possibly can. He has plenty to say but he's always very keen. His written work is all very nicely presented and pretty accurate, and each time I point out anything wrong, he'll usually know and sort of kick himself for having made the errors."

"James is a strong personality and is very popular amongst the boys."

Health Education: Mrs James. (Former 1st year tutor)

"James is a bright boy, mature. A thinking boy, able to get on."

"James stands out as being a mature character. Really an educated child, but fun as well."

"James is something of a 'diplomat'. I know from his background that
he's always been brought up to be an equal with adults and therefore I think this rubs off in his social attitudes."

"James has an enquiring mind and is able to articulate well about the things that he finds out, having the confidence to do so."

Drama: Mr Lomas

"James is a very outgoing boy, full of ideas and never hesitant about coming out with those ideas. Very mature and poised for his age."

P.E.: Miss Shiels

"James is a very sensible boy, you could give him anything to do and he'd go and do it, and do it well. Very physically able and mentally able. Very personable and mature for his age."

"James is very confident and sure of himself. Not cocky, he listens and understands and gets on with it."

2nd Year Form Tutor: Mr Danby

"James responds well in tutor periods, he has plenty to say for himself, he seems to know a lot about a fairly wide range of subjects."

"James takes his work very seriously and is very keen to take part in any activities."

English: Mrs Betworth

"James is the most valuable person in that class. He's got a lovely influence on a lot of people. It's a very kind, gentle sort of influence. I know he talks quite a lot and so on but he's exceedingly hard-working. He's industrious, happily industrious. He likes doing a lot and he's a very positive boy, having a marvellous effect on Dean Berwick. James has acquired an excellent vocabulary. He does almost impeccable work at times."
Some mistakes do creep in at times. He's quite successful, he's very adaptable too. He can write and converse about all of things. He's had a tremendous lot of experience in his life, he retains a great deal of what's happened to him.

"James is very supportive of what is going on in the room. He has a very mature attitude."

"James comes from a good home, father is very bright. He isn't quite as bright as his father thinks, his parents expectations are clearly represented in the content of his story on 'determination'. (Day 7, periods 3 & 4, English.) He could stand a chance of going to University."

**Humanities: Mr Johnson**

"James is a good talker, always there with his hand up, he's got the answers and they're usually right."
DEAN BERWICK

Rank order No.2

Day 1 Periods 1 & 2. English

Mrs Betworth decides to have a go at some choral speaking with the class. She divides them up into groups giving each group a different part of the poem to recite. The question about level of volume has arisen and she wants somebody to tell her the meaning of the word 'audible'. The response comes so quick that all she knows is that it came from a boy, so she picks upon the two who she thinks are most likely to have been correct.

MRS BETWORTH: .... we'll have the girls whispering their chorus, you know, just so that it's audible. What's the word audible mean?

ANTHONY: Hearable!

MRS BETWORTH: Hearable, well done. It can be heard. Somebody belted it out very quickly then, was it you Dean, or was it Anthony?

Day 5 Periods 3 & 4. P.E. Minor games

Miss Shiels gets ready to demonstrate dribbling a basketball and chooses John Perry as her helper. He has to stand in front of her with his hand in the air counting, with his fingers, the number of times she bounces the ball. He has great difficulty doing this which provides Miss Shiels with the opportunity to make a direct comparison between him and Dean.
MISS SHIELS: .... Now there's no fingers there, (BOUNCE) there's no fingers there, (BOUNCE) there's five fingers there, (BOUNCE) (GIGGLES FROM THE CLASS WHO ARE ALL SITTING ROUND WATCHING)
There's still five fingers there (BOUNCE) still five (BOUNCE) there's four, (BOUNCE) still four, (BOUNCE) three, yes good (BOUNCE) two, yes, good (BOUNCE) one. (SHE LAUGHS)
Is he always like this?

THE CLASS IN CHORUS: Yes. (LAUGHTER)

MISS SHIELS: Remind me to pick Dean Berwick next time, he usually manages to do what I ask!
O.K., that is to stop you looking at the ball.

Day 7 Periods 3 & 4. English

The class have written stories on the theme of 'determination' for homework and Mrs Betworth wants them to work in small groups to judge the merits of each other's stories. She sets about arranging them into groups by dictating who goes where in a very deliberate way. In each group she puts "... one child who is good, to keep the group going". Dean is selected as a group leader along with James, Susan and Jane. The best stories in each group then go forward to be read to the whole class. Dean's story is one of the winners.

Day 7 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

The children are working in small groups on a project about nutrition. Some are writing about diet while others prepare charts and diagrams to form part of an overall display on the 'typical diet'. Mrs James circulates
and discusses work with individuals and groups. From time to time she makes comments addressed to the whole class.

Dean is working with Norman, James and Stephen, and while quite a lot of good work is being done Dean is tending also to be a bit noisy. Mrs James calls to him so that everyone else can hear:

MRS JAMES: Do you think young man, you could 'cut out these silly noises? I've not known Dean Berwick make so many peculiar noises for a long time!

Day 9 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

Working again in groups like last time Dean is being a bit noisy. Mrs James once again takes up the theme that this is not the sort of behaviour she expects of him:

MRS JAMES: Er, Dean, would you like me to find something for you to do for me, because if you're going to get silly I think it might be better if you came and did something quietly for me. If not, just settle down and finish that off quickly, sensibly. Now you're normally a very sensible boy!

Day 12 Periods 3 & 4. English

Towards the end of a lesson working with the 'spelling workshop', Mrs Betworth collects in the workcards and books and prepares them to read a further chapter of a story called 'My side of the mountain'. Dean has achieved quite a lot of work but has, at the same time, been rather noisy. As a consequence Dean is given the task of reading the first section aloud to "... quieten him down for being a bit noisy." It is interesting to note that although Norman, John Andrews and John Perry behaved in a similar, and
certainly no worse, fashion during the lesson, Dean is given a task to perform which might, in comparison with the other three, reinforce the view that he is a superior reader.

Day 16  Periods 1 & 2.  English

Mrs Betworth has read the class a story about an Egyptian King and a white crocodile in order that they can write and act a play about it. After some discussion about the various scenes they will need in the play Mrs Betworth asks which children would like to work on each scene in turn. As various children raise their hands she puts them into groups so that they can discuss and write the script. Eventually everyone is placed in a group except Jillian who, as is often the case, is left alone. The subsequent discussion between Jillian and Mrs Betworth leads to a significant public comparison between Jillian on the one hand, and Dean and James on the other.

MRS BETWORTH: What about this gorgeous scene at the King's court?

(JILLIAN RAISES HER HAND.  ONCE AGAIN SHE IS ALONE)

You'd like to do that Jillian, but you can't do it by yourself pet, can you?

Mrs Betworth then moves the children around so that the groups can work together. She calls out each scene until she reaches the King's court scene.

MRS BETWORTH: The King's court scene, that's you Jillian, have you changed your mind?

JILLIAN: No.

MRS BETWORTH: Right, well is it you and I left to do that one by ourselves?  Which one is it, the court scene?  Oh,
blimey we can't write that one ourselves can we? We could have done with James and Dean to help us couldn't we?

Teachers’ remarks made about Dean Berwick

Science: Mrs Jones

"Dean works well with others, and is very jolly. He always has a lot to say about everything. Always asking questions about his work and anything else which crops up. He is very forward coming and not embarrassed to ask anything. Very good ability, very confident."

"Dean could be a leader if he were in a larger group." (In science they work in small groups of two or three.)

"Dean is jolly and outgoing."

"Dean has so much enthusiasm and has the ability which he uses to best advantage."

Music: Mr Davies

"Dean likes to hide his light under a bushel."

"Dean aims to please and successfully does so. He's one of those kids who goes through the class quite happily and you'd never notice him because he never does anything sufficiently extreme one way or the other."

French: Mrs Lindsay

"An able boy all round. A very sociable person, fairly broad-minded, a mature boy. Full of self-confidence, outgoing and outspoken."

"Dean is a strong personality and is very popular amongst the boys."
Health Education: Mrs James (Former 1st year Tutor)

"A bright boy needing to aerate at times in a fairly uncontrolled way. A thinking boy, able to get on."

"Dean is a bright boy with lots of go-ahead."

"Dean is single-minded enough to pursue something through without needing to be encouraged or helped."

Drama: Mr Lomas

"Dean is a very outgoing boy, full of ideas and never hesitant about coming out with those ideas. Very mature and poised for his age."

"Dean is a well adjusted lad, especially towards adults. He is able to put forward his ideas well."

P.E.: Miss Shiels

"Dean is a very sensible boy, you can give him anything to do and he'll go and do it, and do it well. Very physically able and mentally able. Very personable and mature for his age."

Second Year Form Tutor: Mr Danby

"Dean hardly ever steps out of line. He's reasonably mature as well. People will turn to Dean for advice and leadership."

"Dean is very fluent in speaking. He has his own ideas."

"Dean takes his work very seriously and is very keen to take part in any activities."

English: Mrs Betworth

"The way Dean has overcome his minor speech impediment couldn't be more mature if he were a grown-up person. He reads with clarity. Dean works
hard, but only because he's near James, but he turns out quite a lot of work."

**Humanities: Mr Johnson**

"Dean is a good talker, always there with his hand up, got the answers that are usually right."
Day 7 Periods 3 & 4. English

The class have written stories on the theme of 'determination' for homework and Mrs Betworth wants them to work in small groups to judge the merits of each other's stories. She sets about arranging them into groups by dictating who goes where in a very deliberate way. In each group she puts "... one child who is good, to keep the group going." Jane is selected as a group leader along with Susan, James, and Dean. The best stories in each group then go forward to be read to the whole class. Jane's story is one of the winners. The group in which Jane was working was at the front of the class. When Mrs Betworth asks everyone to return to their places she suggests that Jane stays where she is because Mrs Betworth expects her to have won.

MRS BETWORTH: Now we're going to have a lovely time, in a moment, because we're going to listen to all these good stories. I've asked Jane to stay there, (MRS BETWORTH GIGGLES) because I guessed she'd win, because it seemed silly asking her to go back to her place when she was so near to where she's actually going to sit in a moment."

Day 19 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

Everyone is working individually in small groups on diet and nutrition. Some are writing, some drawing charts and diagrams to illustrate their work. One of the tasks which Mrs James has set is to draw a pie chart in the form of a 24 hour clock showing their own typical mealtimes over the whole 24
hour period. Several children have had problems with this and Mrs James is circulating from group to group and chatting about their work. Finally she approaches Jane and Susan. More often than not her interactions with them are quite neutral, however, her approach is altogether more positive even when they make mistakes.

MRS JAMES: Now girls, how are you getting on, are you almost through?

SUSAN: I keep making mistakes on this.

MRS JAMES: Well that's all right, but I shouldn't do it too many times.

(SHE LOOKS THROUGH SOME OF THEIR WORK)

Is that yours?

(JANE NODS)

Who's is this one?

JANE: Susans.

MRS JAMES: Well instead of colouring all these blue

(REFERRING TO THE SECTION OF THE PIE CHART)

Why don't you just colour in the sections that are just for eating, and leave the others blank? That would probably be better now wouldn't it, and it certainly would be quicker.

And which lists are you colouring?

JANE: I'm colouring the bits when I'm not eating.

(Laughs)

MRS JAMES: Well be careful how you do it then, because you're overlapping aren't you?
Day 21 Periods 1 & 2. English

The children are going to sit an English test so Mrs Betworth has separated all of the desks so that nobody can cheat. Jane is sitting in the second row from the front.

During the test Mrs Betworth is selective about who she approaches, but clearly she gives special attention to those who have need of remedial help and gives Jane extra attention.

When Jane has finished Mrs Betworth urges her to check that she has fully answered the paper. At this point Stephen raises his hand to say that he has read the passage in question and cannot find reference to the question. Mrs Betworth simply tells him to leave it and go onto another question.

MRS BETWORTH: Leave a space in case it clicks in your mind later on.

(Her facial expression and tone of voice seemed to convey "you silly boy; you ought to know better!")

Mrs Betworth then returns to Jane, reads her paper and proceeds to encourage her to rewrite one answer giving more detail. She encourages her to do better and more in a way that she hasn't done for anyone else. Her tone of voice seems to indicate that Jane is a star pupil and is worth taking the trouble over. This whole episode was clearly audible to the rest of the class.

When Rosemary raises her hand to ask a question, Mrs Betworth says:

MRS BETWORTH: I'm not going to answer you!

ROSEMARY: It's not about the question.

MRS BETWORTH: I don't care, I'm not going to answer you.
Teachers' remarks made about Jane Barnes

Science: Mrs Jones

"Quite quiet but not embarrassed to come forward in any way. Finds it very easy to come out and ask about things and talk about things to other people in the group and the teacher."

"Has tremendous ability but has had some problems with her temper and really lost her self-control. Her confidence is getting more and more as she's getting older and matures."

French: Mrs Lindsay

"Jane I find a very nervous character indeed. Quite volatile as well on occasions, and she can be argumentative as well, but it isn't arguing for arguing sake in so much as if she thinks she has a point to make I find that I can't maybe even brush her off. She'll keep coming back."

"Jane is quite a sociable girl. I think she enjoys company."

Music: Mr Davies

"Jane will wander off the straight line of development simply because she can pick things up quickly and she likes to play around and do things with things in her own way."

Health Education: Mrs James

"Jane is quietly spoken having good powers of concentration, being able to get on with work at her own pace without any fuss at all."

"Jane has a shy, almost sensitive withdrawal in certain areas of work. She does project in another way but it is usually when you want it there and it's drawn out for some particular reason."
"Jane is fairly serious-minded, although she's not averse to a giggle and a chatter now and then. She's quite single-minded and doesn't move about in a social sense as much as some of the others. She's also pressed at home academically."

**Drama: Mr Lomas**

"A pretty out-going girl, a strong character."

"Jane is much more aware of the implications going on in a discussion. She never dominates a discussion. She is able to verbalise well."

"Jane is much more likely to express her ideas in a large group. She has the ability to think things through."

**P.E.: Miss Shiels**

"Jane is a very nice girl, listens, works well, but is very shy and insecure and doesn't seem to have many friends."

**Second Year Form Tutor: Mr Danby**

"Jane is a very able girl. She can be very moody, very emotional. She can fly off the handle, she's got a real temper."

"Jane tends to be a loner, she'll sit with one or two people, tends to isolate herself and sit with Susan Feeney. She has a lot of pressure from home to do very well. She has a lot to say for herself and is willing to push herself forward all the time."

**English: Mrs Betworth**

"Jane is a clever girl who achieves good results, she is exceedingly hardworking. The main thing about her is that there's a tremendous potential there, an absolutely superb way she reads to the class. She's got that"
marvellous timing, pace. She pitches her voice differently too. She's one of the best readers I've ever had."

**Humanities: Mr Johnson**

"Jane is another good talker, and a good organiser too. I had expected a very good folder from her, but it's not that good. She likes opinion-type discussions and answer rather than a factual answer. She doesn't bother so much with factual answers. Knowing her mother, I can see where she gets it from."
As a result of erratic attendance due to ill health and serious problems with her father's health, only one incident was recorded.

Day 10  Periods 5 & 6. English

The children are all doing individual work while Mrs Betworth circulates and discusses their work and some recently marked homework. While she is doing this she is interrupted by Valerie who seems unsure where to start her next piece of work in her exercise book.

VALERIE: Mrs Betworth, shall I start on there?
MRS BETWORTH: Please! You do with that one.
VALERIE: With that one?

(CHECKING TO MAKE SURE SHE'S GOT IT RIGHT)
MRS BETWORTH: (POINTING) That one!

(VALERIE STILL LOOKS UNSURE)

Is that the one you mean?

VALERIE: Yes. (SMILING)
MRS BETWORTH: You're right then. Don't worry Valerie, you'll get it right. You worry too much Valerie!

(VALERIE RETURNS TO HER SEAT)

Teachers' remarks made about Valerie Barnett

Music: Mr Davies

"Quite clever, but also quiet."

"Will only ask for help when she feels she needs it, being content to
press on when she knows what she is doing. Content to present a completed piece of work rather than have it checked every five minutes."

"Slightly quiet, introverted type. Can usually produce the goods."

**French: Mrs Cartwright**

"Valerie is wanting to have a go all the time. Her absence is, to a certain extent, hindering her progress, but she's quite willing to try and catch up and do what she can."

**Health Education: Mrs James**

"Valerie is quite sensitive."

"Valerie has a shy, almost sensitive withdrawal in certain areas of work."

**Drama: Mr Lomas**

"A pretty outgoing girl, a strong character. In drama she displays a somewhat destructive tendency, really sort of digging her heels in, being very difficult to deal with. (When in role.)"

"Valerie is quite socially aware and quite likely to get involved when there is a discussion of the implications of social relationships."

"Valerie is a pretty remarkable young lady. I've been extremely impressed by a lot of the things she's done in role and out. In terms of human potential, if you like, and I put her quite a bit ahead of ordinary mortals."

"Valerie can dominate a large group. She's always sweet and smiling as herself but I've seen her in a role as somebody very forceful and quite destructive."
Second Year Form Tutor: Mr Danby

"Valerie is reasonably intelligent and communicative. She can also be very moody, very emotional. Valerie, of course, because of her family background, she has her ups and downs because of the illness of her father."

English: Mrs Betworth

Valerie's father is a hopeless cripple, in a home at the moment, and whenever I look at her I remember seeing her wheeling him around in his wheelchair before he had to be taken into care. I can never look into her eyes without feeling that I admired her when she was a little girl. I think she's had a difficult life. Valerie has lovely ideas and writes marvellous stories, but they never have quite the sentence structure and they never quite have the vocabulary of the more able children in the class because she hasn't got that sort of ability. She's just above average."

"Valerie is a girl who is slightly above average who achieves slightly above average results. She works but I would never say she was exceedingly hardworking. When she reads, she rushes, she's lovely and warm and effusive."

Humanities: Mr Johnson

"Valerie is a good talker and a good organiser too. She's had a lot of family trouble recently and therefore some of her recent work is missing. She likes opinion type discussions and answer rather than a factual answer. She doesn't bother so much with factual answers."
DEBORAH ANDERSON

Rank order No.5

Day 1   Periods 1 & 2. English

The children are all working individually on writing a set of instructions on how to build a snowman. Some are writing and others are drawing a picture of a snowman to illustrate their work. Towards the end of the lesson Mrs Betworth notices that some children have finished while those who have been spending their time talking have not. She draws attention to one particular group of girls who are often described as the 'gossips'.

MRS BETWORTH: Now I'm going to have to ask who hasn't yet finished writing their instructions inside the tummy of their snowman?

(SEVERAL HANDS GO UP)

They're all girls! Oh, no they're not. One, two, three, four, five chattery gossipy ladies haven't finished. You've got a minute and a half or two minutes. Now write neatly and get on.

(CHUCKLE IN VOICE)

While she was counting she was pointing to five girls all sitting together along the front row, Deborah Anderson, Norma Wilson, Susan West, Rosemary Morris and Linda Waters.

Day 12   Periods 3 & 4. English

A small group of girls, Deborah Anderson, Linda Waters, Susan West and Norma Wilson, are all sitting together in their usual place along the front row of the classroom. They have a reputation for being rather
chattery, although some more than others. Mrs Betworth notices that Linda Waters is not working, and approaches them, making an interesting comparison.

MRS BETWORTH: Now, the interesting thing is I know exactly how much work you've done today. Now you tell me how I know.

CHORUS: You've marked our books!

MRS BETWORTH: Because I've marked the previous work, (A BLUFF) right, exactly. Now it looks to me as if you've written one, two, three, four and a half sentences, and I don't think four and a half sentences is a great deal in the length of time you've had.

(TURNING TO DEBORAH ANDERSON)

You have done about a page or work haven't you?

(TURNING TO SUSAN WEST BUT WITHOUT LOOKING AT HER BOOK)

And I imagine you have done more than a page.

(SHE THEN TURNS TO NORMA)

Ah, Norma, you've only done, you ought to be able to get more done than that. But the person who's been chin-wagging the most, who is it Linda?

LINDA WATERS: Me!

MRS BETWORTH: I know! Not chin-wagging about the work either I bet!

Note how she compares the girls' work and shows that she expects Susan West to have done the most without actually seeing it. Also that Deborah has
done a reasonable amount, and that she would normally expect more from Norma. Linda Waters, however, seems to be expected to chat a lot and not get quite as much work done.

Day 20  Periods 1 & 2. Science

The science lab. is a large room having fixed benches round the sides and large moveable tables arranged in the centre of the room suitable for group work. All services such as water and gas are only available on the side benches. This leads to a great deal of movement during the lesson. The class is working in small groups on the 'INSIGHT' combined science scheme which means that most of their work is of a practical nature and based upon a series of printed workcards. In this situation the major part of the teacher's work is with individuals and small groups. On this occasion Mrs Jones is walking around the room returning homework and checking children's work. The children are performing experiments on the purification of various substances. Mrs Jones notices that Deborah, Norma and Dawn are working together and seem to be following each other around everywhere.

MRS JONES: You don't need to follow each other around, you don't need to go around in a three!

(A LITTLE LATER)

MRS JONES: I don't think you've been working hard enough really. Neil managed to finish it in one lesson. All of the people in set three finished it in one lesson, and three of you working together have taken two lessons over it. Maybe you should work individually and you'd get on much faster, little gossipers, you want to start wearing rollers and a hair net!
Teachers' comments about Deborah Anderson

Music: Mr Davies

"Deborah doesn't like to push herself, doesn't like to go too far ahead off her own bat. She likes the constant assurances that things are all right."

"Slightly quiet, introverted type who can usually produce the goods."

French: Mrs Cartwright

"Deborah is very good orally, always willing to have a go orally, to practice new bits, to have a go on her own. She is also quite adventurous with her written work."

"Deborah seems to want to get as much out of every lesson as she can, and give as much as she can. She is certainly better than the rest of her family."

Drama: Mr Lomas

"Deborah is prepared to launch herself out in drama and has got the confidence to let go and take a role."

"Deborah is the one least likely to present negative aspects of herself."

P.E.: Miss Shiels

"Deborah is very quiet, she is the sort of girl I could go for a whole year without knowing who she was in a P.E. lesson, she sits in the background and doesn't stand out."
Second Year Form Tutor: Mr Danby

"Deborah has a reasonably serious attitude to her work. She comes from a background where she's being pushed from home all the time. Parents are interested, they come in."

"Deborah likes to gossip. She's however, very keen to get on. She's very confident, very sure of herself."

"Deborah is more studious, more serious about her work."

Science: Mrs Jones

"Deborah doesn't actually work very well with a group, she doesn't push herself forward. She doesn't ask questions and would rather just sit and wait until you go up to her."

"Very quiet, gets on with things in a quiet way. Doesn't shout out about anything."

"Just accepts everything you tell her, does it but slowly. Doesn't question anything at all."

Mathematics: Mr Peters

"Deborah has all the capabilities one would wish except that she doesn't always apply them as fully as she might do. She's quite capable mathematically, she's quite capable verbally. She has a fair amount of self-confidence."

"Deborah comes from a supportive family."

Mathematics: Mr Rogers

"When we did some freer work Deborah emerged very well and is a hard-working little girl. She has a fair amount of ability."
"Deborah doesn't talk to me much, she does ask for help a lot more than she used to."

Health Education: Mrs James

"Deborah is quite vociferous and tends to be a leader in her little group."

"Deborah is quite strong-minded and vociferous with leadership tendencies."

"Deborah is fairly volatile, a fairly dominant character."

English: Mrs Betworth

"Deborah keeps her light under a bushel. She's quite an able little girl, but I believe that if you didn't watch her quite carefully she'd chatter her time away. She comes up with some very creditable work indeed. Her comprehension is good, her essay writing is good and vocabulary is quite good. The sentence structure is pretty varied."

Humanities: Mr Johnson

"Deborah is rather gossipy and keen to talk and can be quite nasty in not particularly pleasant ways to people who are supposed to be her friends."
The children are all working individually on writing a set of instructions on how to build a snowman. Some are writing and others are drawing a picture of a snowman to illustrate their work. Towards the end of the lesson Mrs Betworth notices that some children have finished while those who have been spending their time talking have not. She draws attention to one particular group of girls who are often described as the 'gossips'.

MRS BETWORTH: Now I'm going to have to ask who hasn't yet finished writing their instructions inside the tummy of their snowman?

(SEVERAL HANDS GO UP)

They're all girls! Oh, no they're not. One, two, three, four, five chattery gossipy ladies haven't finished. You've got a minute and a half or two minutes. Now write neatly and get on.

(CHUCKLE IN VOICE)

While she was counting she was pointing to five girls all sitting together along the front row, Susan West, Deborah Anderson, Norma Wilson, Rosemary Morris and Linda Waters.

The class is working on 'spelling workshop' exercises while Mrs Betworth moves around from child to child checking their work. The
atmosphere is very informal with everyone getting along at their own pace. Mrs Betworth approaches Susan West.

MRS BETWORTH: These are very good Susan, you're very accurate.

(GIGGLES)

I've just said that and then what do I find, look you've missed that and that out.

(GIGGLES AGAIN; WHILE POINTING TO SUSAN'S BOOK)

I think you must have had a chinwag session at that point.

Day 12 Periods 3 & 4. English

A small group of girls, Susan West, Deborah Anderson, Linda Waters and Norma Wilson are all sitting together in their usual place along the front row of the classroom. They have a reputation for being rather chattery, although some more than others. Mrs Betworth notices that Linda Waters is not working, and approaches them, making an interesting comparison.

MRS BETWORTH: Now, the interesting thing is I know exactly how much work you've done today. Now you tell me how I know.

CHORUS: You've marked our books.

MRS BETWORTH: Because I've marked the previous work, (A BLUFF) right, exactly. Now it looks to me as if you've written one, two, three, four and a half sentences, and I don't think four and a half sentences is a great deal in the length of time you've had.

(TURNING TO DEBORAH ANDERSON)
You have done about a page of work haven't you, 

(TURNING TO SUSAN WEST, WITHOUT ACTUALLY LOOKING AT HER BOOK)

and I imagine you have done more than a page.

(TURNING TO NORMA WILSON)

Ah, Norma, you've only done, you ought to be able to get more done than that, but the person who's been chin-wagging the most, who is it Linda?

LINDA WATERS: Me!

MRS BETWORTH: I know! Not chin-wagging about the work either I bet!

Note how she compares the girls' work and shows that she expects Susan West to have done the most without actually seeing it.

Day 19 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

Everyone is working individually, or in small groups on diet and nutrition. Some are writing, some drawing charts and diagrams to illustrate their work. One of the tasks which Mrs James has set is to draw a pie chart in the form of a 24 hour clock showing their own typical meal times over the whole 24 hour period. Several children have had problems with this and Mrs James is circulating from group to group and chatting about their work. Finally she approaches Jane and Susan. More often than not her interactions with them are quite neutral, however, her approach is altogether more positive even when they make mistakes.

MRS JAMES: Now girls, how are you getting on, are you almost through?

SUSAN: I keep making mistakes on this!
MRS JAMES: Well that's all right, but I shouldn't do it too many times.

(SHE LOOKS THROUGH SOME OF THEIR WORK)

Is this yours? (JANE NODS)

Whose is this one?

JANE: Susan's.

MRS JAMES: Well instead of colouring all these blue

(REFERRING TO SECTION OF THE PIE CHART)

why don't you just colour in the sections that are just for eating, and leave the others blank?

That would probably be better now wouldn't it, and it certainly would be quicker.

---

Teachers' remarks about Susan West

Music: Mr Davies

"Susan enjoys not being too much in the limelight."

French: Mrs Lindsay

"Susan is pretty oral, this is something she never did last year. Perhaps she's gained in confidence. She is more academically able than you might have once thought. Her work is all very nicely presented and pretty accurate. If I point out anything she's done wrong she usually knows and sort of kicks herself for having made the error."

Health Education: Mrs James

"Susan is a perfectionist being dedicated to detail. She is a very careful worker taking great pride in the presentation and completion of her work. She produces very attractive artistic folders at all times. She is
a fairly quiet natured girl with a great deal of control over her emotions. She is able to inspire others in her group to get on with their work or be oblivious to the fact that others weren't."

"Susan was extremely quiet, subdued and withdrawn when she first came. Not very communicative verbally but quite a hard worker. This has changed and Susan has become much more responsive, and she often comes to tell me things."

"Susan is a fairly shy, unobtrusive girl, not terribly popular within a group."

Drama: Mr Lomas

"Susan was one of the girls whose name I learnt last because she's a pretty quiet sort of person. I was surprised when she was the first person to come and say 'can I faint in class?', which she promptly proceeded to do."

P.E.: Miss Shiels

"Susan is very quiet and shy, and likes to fade into the background."

Second Year Form Tutor: Mr Danby

"I'm not sure what Susan's interests are, to be honest. She's not been very forthcoming in talking about what she's doing at home, her hobbies or interests, anything like that. She is more academic than Linda Waters and Norma Wilson. Susan is intense about her work."

"Susan is a lot more intense and serious, she takes everything so seriously. Doesn't laugh."

"Susan is quiet, and I often think is thinking about something."
"Susan is a very long way towards the upper end of the class. She is almost inclined not to take verbal part quite enough, one has to feed things to her a little to draw her out. I think she thinks about what she's saying before she says it."

"Susan is not outgoing. She is quiet and withdrawn and pensive. She works exceedingly hard though and she's highly accurate, but she would love to be really clever, she is bright but she is not really clever."

"Susan is slightly an odd person out, she'll be sometimes left on her own by the others. She can be a bit odd sometimes in a way that I find difficult to express. She's a friendly enough girl."
After reading a story to the class about an Egyptian king and a white crocodile, Mrs Betworth arranges the children into groups to write and act selected scenes from the story. This exercise goes quite well, but at the end of the lesson, after the groups have all acted their scenes Mrs Betworth dismisses everyone except Peter Ross and Stephen Bowes who both appear to be upset. Peter is not at all happy because his fellow group members gave him a part that he didn't want to play, whereas Stephen just doesn't like acting, indeed he is most uneasy about any activity which involves him in having to speak in front of the whole class.

MRS BETWORTH: Now fellers, what's the matter?

(PETER IS IN TEARS)

Sit on that table a minute.

(SHE TRIES TO CALM HIM DOWN AND SITS ON A TABLE ALONGSIDE THEM)

Come on, what's the matter?

PETER ROSS: Well, I wanted to .. (SOBS)

MRS BETWORTH: You wanted to be a different person, and they wouldn't let you.

PETER ROSS: They did it on purpose so they could call me names.

MRS BETWORTH: Well lovvie, never mind. We probably won't do any more about this 'cos it's got two people upset. First time, by the way, it's ever upset anybody. But off you go, pick your bags up. Never mind,
fellers, see you another day.

(THE BOYS LEAVE)

MRS BETWORTH: (TO ME) Something new happens every time. It's a bit spiteful of them to call Peter Ross names and give him an unpopular part, but it's not surprising 'cos he's not a very popular person.

Teachere's remarks on Peter Ross

Science: Mrs Jones

"A very intense child, hasn't got much confidence at all but is quite able."

"Very quiet, gets on with things in a quiet way, doesn't shout out about anything."

"Fairly dedicated to his work and enjoys it."

"Has plenty of ability. Peter will ask but not in an outspoken way."

Health Education: Mrs James

"Peter has a certain degree of hesitancy."

"Peter likes to find things out but he's somewhat guarded about the way he writes it and also the way he's able to say it."

Drama: Mr Lomas

"Peter has quite a lot going on in his head about people and relationships. He is quite articulate but he is reluctant to be so bothered with it."
P.E.: Miss Shiels

"Peter is very quiet, very shy, very insecure, not very sure of himself."

Second Year Form Tutor: Mr Danby

I can't have spoken 50 or 100 words to Peter all term. He doesn't respond at all well. He's very introverted compared to some of the others."

English: Mrs Betworth:

"Poor old Peter is neither fluent with a pen nor particularly with his voice. In fact he's almost nervous. He's most hesitant. He looks awfully worried when he's speaking to you. His mother is a very overpowering woman. I think he's downtrodden. In addition, they don't turn that lad out all that well do they? He's a little introverted thing that sits there and does his own scrappy writing and his horrible little stories."

Humanities: Mr Johnson

"Peter strikes me as being fussy in that he seems to like quite a lot of attention and wants to know if everything is right all the time."
Day 9  Periods 5 & 6.  Health education

The children are all working in small groups on their food and nutrition projects while Mrs James circulates discussing various ideas and pieces of work with individuals and groups. She approaches Angela and looks through her folder.

MRS JAMES:  If you remember, at the beginning of the lesson, what did I ask you to do?

ANGELA:  Hurry up!

MRS JAMES:  Hurry up and finish, and what else, and most of all, what?

Think Angela, what did I ask you to do at the beginning of the lesson, part from getting on with your work and organising what you're doing? What did I ask you particularly to do?

(ANGELA IS STRUGGLING TO FIND AN ANSWER AMID WISERACKS FROM HER FRIENDS)

I really want you to answer and try to think about it, because otherwise I'm just wondering whether you bother to listen at all!  (PAUSE)

Are you thinking?  (NO REPLY)

What did I ask you particularly to do so that it would be quite peaceful and I would be able to talk to you?

ANGELA:  Don't shout?
MRS JAMES: Yes, and that's exactly what you were doing a minute ago. You may not think you were, but you were.

Day 21 Periods 1 & 2. English

The whole class is to sit an English test. Mrs Betworth has separated the desks so that there can be no cheating. Angela is sitting in the second row from the front. After the children have been working for about ten minutes Mrs Betworth begins to wander round looking over childrens' shoulders. However, she appears to be quite selective in who she goes to, and picks out those children who are at present having, or have had, some kind of remedial help. She quite deliberately visits Angela, Jillian and John Perry, leaning over each child's shoulder in turn whispering "Do your best won't you! All right?"

Teachers' remarks about Angela Dobson

Health Education: Mrs James

"Angela is not very able, but quite vociferous."

"Angela hasn't got the ability or facility to concentrate."

"Angela doesn't have a creative flair in English, she has always had a reading problem right through."

Drama: Mr Lomas

"Angela approaches on a one-to-one basis on personal things, things that haven't got much to do with what's going on."
P.E.: Miss Shiels

"Angela, silly little girl, giggly girl, when she gets with her friends she's a typical 11-12 year old."

Second Year Form Tutor: Mr Danby

"Angela is fairly quiet although she will respond if you ask her a direct question."

"Ability-wise Angela is average to below average."

English: Mrs Betworth

"Angela is not very fluent verbally. She is not very bright, her writing is exceedingly poor, both mechanically and what's written down is poor. She has quite a lot of illness. She very easily becomes muddled and lost. She can't recall or remember very well from time to time and you have to give her little props to keep her going. She is very careful who she is friends with, she's not very adaptable. She needs all the help she can possibly get and then she finds concentration difficult, she dreams a great deal of the time away."

Humanities: Mr Johnson

"Angela is sometimes in a bit of a world of her own. She's one of these children who you can say something to three times before it really registers what you want done, but then she'll try, she's quite hard-working."
JILLIAN SANDERS

Rank order No. 21

Day 1 Period 7. Drama

The theme of this series of drama lessons is the exploration of social relationships. Mr Lomas sits them all in a large circle and interviews various members of the group who have prepared their roles of father/daughter or father/son etc. A discussion then develops whereby the whole class explore the implied social relationships.

Mr Lomas sets a new task. They must stay in their former groups of two and prepare a situation where a parent discovers that a young child has been stealing. They all go off into corners to rehearse. Jillian is left out on her own. Mr Lomas has to help her approach a nearby pair of girls who take her under their wing.

Day 4 Periods 1 & 2. P.E. (Hockey)

A hockey lesson, Miss Shiels first of all shows the class how to dribble the ball around the playground, individually and then in pairs. It is once again Jillian who is left without a partner. She has even been left with the tattiest hockey stick with a length of handle tape flapping in the breeze.

Day 4 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

The class are all writing and drawing things for their projects on food and nutrition. The atmosphere is informal and relaxed with quite a lot of movement about the room. Mrs James is circulating and discussing items of work with individual children as she goes. She approaches Jillian
who is sitting quietly in her seat.

MRS JAMES: Now Jillian I'll spend some time with you.

A quiet young lady at this very noisy table.

(REFERS TO ROSEMARY, NORMA, LINDA WATERS AND DAWN)

Day 5 Periods 5 & 6. English

After settling the children down Mrs Betworth proceeds to read to the class. It is a book called 'My Side of the Mountain', and this particular chapter deals with the main character, a young boy called Rufus, when he tries to join the public library. Very soon the question arises as to how old Rufus is, and Mrs Betworth asks several children for ideas. She deals with this in a fairly routine way until she provides Jillian with an opportunity to answer.

MRS BETWORTH: How old do you think Rufus is, does it tell you anywhere, how old do you reckon he might be?

(HANDS GO UP)

Yes Valerie?

VALERIE: About 11 or 12.

MRS BETWORTH: About 11 or 12. What do you think?

(ANOTHER CHILD ANSWERS) About 7.

You think about 7, 8? There is a bit more clue than this. What do you think Jillian?

(LOWERS HER VOICE AND TALKS IN A SOFT, WARM WAY)

JILLIAN: I think he's about 4½ because he can't write.

(Now even though the rest of the story doesn't tally with an age as low as this, ie. the other things he is able to say and do, Mrs Betworth
MRS BETWORTH: You did jolly well, he can't write. He had
to learn to write his name. So Jillian said
about 4½ because he can't already write. I think
that's a jolly good answer. I think she's very
near.

Later on in the same lesson, Mrs Betworth suggests that the children
might like to arrange themselves into groups to continue reading the story
amongst themselves. She progresses around the class suggesting various
groupings mainly on the grounds of proximity and friendship. However,
when she reaches Stephen Howes, Peter Lipscomb and Anthony Pearson she
willingly accepts that each one would prefer to read alone, something
which she has not accepted from any other person. In fact Jillian is
specifically found a place in someone else's group because she had been
left out once again.

MRS BETWORTH: Now Jillian which group would you like to go to,
'cos I'm sure they'll have you.

(JILLIAN IS HESITANT AND CAN'T MAKE
UP HER MIND)

You can't sit here by yourself my love, it's not
much fun is it.

(SHE POINTS TO A NEARBY GROUP OF GIRLS)

What about that group, if I come with you?

JILLIAN: Yes all right.

MRS BETWORTH: Come on then. Now Jillian would like to come on
listening in your group. Is that all right?

GROUP: Yes.
MRS BETWORTH: And I'll come and join in in a minute. Let her go on the end there.

(THEY SHUFFLE THEIR CHAIRS ROUND TO MAKE ROOM FOR JILLIAN. THEY ARE REALLY VERY TOLERANT AND ACCEPT HER FAIRLY HAPPILY)

Day 12 Periods 3 & 4. English

The major part of the lesson has been spelling workshop time where the children work at their own pace using work cards. Towards the end of the lesson Mrs Betworth arranges them into small groups to discuss amongst themselves the "best thing to do in their spare time". She soon realises that, as usual, Jillian hasn't got a group of friends to work with. She asks Jillian if she would like to join any particular group but Jillian declines. Finally Mrs Betworth suggests that Jillian might go around and collect the reading books for her. Jillian happily does so.

Day 12 Periods 7 & 8. Humanities

The class is engaged in individual work based upon map references. Mr Johnson goes around checking the work of individuals. He notices that Jillian is not working.

MR JOHNSON: Now then Miss Jillian, what are you doing?

(NO REPLY)

What are you doing?

(STILL NO REPLY, SHE SEEMS A LITTLE LOST FOR WORDS)

Not very well at this precise moment are you?

JILLIAN: No!

MR JOHNSON: No! Just a moment then.

(HE ATTENDS TO SEVERAL MINOR QUERIES FROM OTHER CHILDREN AND THEN RETURNS)
Right Miss, let's give you a helping hand
and get you started shall we.

(ANOTHER CHILD SITTING NEARBY COMMENTS THAT
JILLIAN CAN DO THE WORK REALLY)

MR JOHNSON: I'm sure she could, she just needs a bit of
starting off don't you kid?

JILLIAN: Mm!

(MR JOHNSON HELPS HER GET HER MAP ORGANISED
AND SHOWS HER HOW TO DO THE EXERCISE)

Day 16  Periods 1 & 2. English

Mrs Betworth has read the class a story about an Egyptian king and a
white crocodile so that they can work in small groups preparing scripts
before acting selected parts of the story. As she goes through the list of
scenes various children volunteer to work together. When Jillian offers
to work on a scene no one else offers to help, which leads Mrs Betworth to
make an important comparison between Jillian and two of the boys.

MRS BETWORTH: What about this gorgeous scene at the King's
court?

(JILLIAN RAISES HER HAND, BUT IS ALONE)

You'd like to do that Jillian, but you can't do
it by yourself pet, can you!

(Mrs Betworth then moves the children around so that the groups can work
together. She calls out each scene, and then the children get together.
Then she gets to Jillian)

MRS BETWORTH: The King's court scene. That's you Jillian,
have you changed your mind?

JILLIAN: No.
MRS BETWORTH: No, right. Now is it you and I left to do that one by ourselves? Which one is it, the court scene? Oh, blimey, we can't write that one ourselves can we! We could have done with James and Dean to help us couldn't we?

(In fact Mrs Betworth does most of the work for Jillian, but eventually manages to leave her to continue alone)

MRS BETWORTH: You have a try on your own!

Day 16 Period 7. Drama

The theme for the series of drama lessons is the exploration of interpersonal relationships. The children have to imagine that they are blind, working in pairs, one child at a time is blindfolded and the other has to guide him or her through a series of obstacles with verbal instructions only. When Mr Lomas asks them all to find a partner, Jillian is left on her own again.

Teacher's remarks about Jillian Sanders

Health Education: Mrs James

"Jillian is a little case on her own. She is so different. She seems to be on the fringe, so socially speaking she is an outcast. She has a quiet nature. I don't think that she has any particular creative flair."

"Jillian stands our academically, she's very low."

"Jillian is a fairly shy unobtrusive girl, not terribly popular."
Drama: Mr Lomas

"Jillian has all kinds of difficulties and could be set apart from the rest of the class in many ways, might find a way to special education in some situations but in fact she belongs with us really. She's got enormous confidence and the others are beginning to treat her with more and more respect."

"I find it hard to talk about someone like Jillian who seems so restricted compared to a lot of people in the group and yet is much more aware of certain concerns than people with more facile mental ability."

"It is strange really that Jillian is, in a large group, easily the most articulated compared to Norma and Rosemary. And in a small group nearly always on the periphery because not fully accepted."

"I've never seen Jillian anything other than positive or neutral. I think she gets more security from home than she gets from - and perhaps from relationships with teachers than she gets from school. I was always very impressed when Jillian was in the first year, the concern with which she was looked after by her brother Colin. Perhaps that's a clue to the reasonable amount of security she has in relation to adults."

P.E.: Miss Shiels

"Jillian, oh a race apart. Insecure, quiet, physically unable to do anything, but has improved recently. Does try her best but ..."

Second Year Form Tutor: Mr Danby

"Jillian is something of an outcast. She shows no interest in boys whatsoever. She is of reasonably low ability but I don't think as low as some people think when they look at her."
"Jillian is always on her own, the only time that she ever gets taken in with another group is if they are feeling sorry for her. Jillian is very quiet."

"Jillian has got no friends in the group but she's not frightened to chat, even to the boys. She is very willing to take part in everything."

**English: Mrs Betworth**

"Physically Jillian looks unattractive, she is shy and she worries a great deal. I can't decide whether she hasn't got a friend in the class or whether she's so independent that she doesn't specially want a friend in the class. She has a very strongly independent streak. She doesn't find it easy to join a group and yet some of the groups are quite nice with her."

**Humanities: Mr Johnson**

"Jillian is very much an odd one out, I almost feel that she shouldn't be in the school. She's very much an outcast within the group and I have to go to quite a lot of trouble to even find her somewhere to sit. I have to insist. I can see why with Jillian, she's not an attractive girl to be with in any sense of the word."

"Jillian will daydream, she'll doodle, if you don't watch her she'll do nothing."
Susan West, Deborah Anderson and Linda Waters each have a pen which is dressed in the form of a doll. They keep bouncing them up and down along the desk like dancers.

MRS BETWORTH: You could write a little play one day like a puppet play and get them doing things. You could hide behind the table if we turned it sideways and have a little puppet play. Don't you think we could?

(The three girls all nod and giggle)

John Andrews, Norman Woods and John Perry are sitting together directly behind the three girls. Mrs Betworth makes her next comment loudly enough for the whole class to hear.

MRS BETWORTH: We could do a play about that daft lot sitting behind. (GIGGLES) They're always wasting their time, don't you think!

Following this incident Mrs Betworth tells the whole class that they have just five minutes left, she then approaches the same three boys.

MRS BETWORTH: Are you actually doing any work in this row?

(EACH REPLIES: I am!)

Mrs James has constructed a simple apparatus to demonstrate the collection of wood tar from cigarette smoke. It consists of a collapsible plastic bottle filled with cotton wool with a lighted cigarette placed into
a small hole in the cap. As the bottle is squeezed, cigarette smoke passes through the cotton wool leaving a brown stain. She has the class all sitting watching as the first cigarette is lit and the bottle is passed round so that everyone can have a try at working it. While this goes on Mrs James, a non-smoker herself, makes several references to the fact that she knows who smokes.

At one point Mrs James introduces the idea of high and low tar cigarettes and confesses that she doesn't know which ones are which. She asks if anyone knows.

PETER LIPSCOMB: Show Andrews; he'll know what kind it is!

NORMAN WOODS: What is it, what's the name of it?

MRS JAMES: Gold Leaf.

JOHN ANDREWS: That's middle tar!

MRS JAMES: And what's this one John, what would this one be?

(HOLDS UP ANOTHER CIGARETTE)

JOHN: Middle tar.

MRS JAMES: What are people recommended to smoke then?

JOHN: Low tar.

MRS JAMES: Low tar, I suppose preferably.

Clearly, Mrs James has accepted John as an expert on a taboo practice.

When it is time to replace the cigarette next time John Andrews hands her one of his own.

MRS JAMES: And is this one of yours? (HE NODS)

How many times have you been caught in school with a cigarette?
JOHN: Not once!

MRS JAMES: Not once, now what a position you've put me into young man. Because I know now that you've got a cigarette in school .... the point is that no matter how many times cigarettes are taken from you or you're caught, it's only you yourselves who've got to come to some realisation about how dangerous it is, and how objectionable it is. My goodness!

A little later in the lesson Mrs James changes the subject in order to discuss some of their past work on food and nutrition.

MRS JAMES: I'd like some of these charts to make a new second year display.

(JOHN PERRY IS STANDING AT HER SIDE)

John, go away! Sit down, I am tired of you walking around.

(HER VOICE IS FIRM AND SHE LOOKS RUFFLED)

If you haven't got your own things then you're going to have to do without. Because if anybody's walking around this afternoon, you people

(POINTS TO JOHN ANDREWS, JOHN PERRY AND NORMAN WOODS)

have done more of it than anybody else! It's just proving to me that you can't do something a little bit different without you losing attention and losing track of what you're supposed to be doing altogether.
Day 3 Periods 5 & 6. Science

The whole class is working in small groups on experiments concerned with the growing of crystals from saturated solutions of common substances. Mrs Jones has prepared several such solutions which are available at various points in the lab. Due to the practical nature of the work and the fact that gas and water are only available on the side benches, a great deal of movement is normal throughout the lesson. During the course of the lesson two different solutions become mixed, Mrs Jones believes, deliberately. In trying to find the culprit she lists those who she expect to be most likely.

MRS JONES: You never mix chemicals because they react with each other. You do not know what reaction is going to occur. I wonder who was responsible?

(At this point she goes through her list of 'rogues')

Stuart?

STUART: I haven't been over there!

MRS JONES: John? (Andrews)

JOHN: Not me!

MRS JONES: Please don't waste the chemicals, they are very expensive and they do take a long time to prepare for you!

Day 3 Periods 7 & 8. Mathematics

Mr Peters is conducting a question and answer session on the subject of compass bearings arising from some difficulties experienced by some of the children when working on SMP Maths. In this incident it is not what he says that is important, it is the implication of the tone of his voice which is significant.
MR PETERS: Right, I'm facing north and I face east-north-east, how many degrees is that?

LUCY: Sixty seven and a half.

MR PETERS: Sixty seven and a half, all right? How did she work that out John?

(John Andrews has been fidgeting and chattering and not paying full attention to what is going on. Mr Peters has noticed this)

JOHN ANDREWS: (SHRUGGING HIS SHOULDERS AND GRINNING) Don't know!

MR PETERS: You don't know, no.

It is simply the way Mr Peters pronounces the word 'no'; together with a look of despair on his face that conveys the non-verbal message that John spends too much time not paying attention.

Day 4 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

The class are all working individually or in small groups on their food and nutrition projects while Mrs James circulates discussing work with individuals. She approaches John Andrews who is sitting alone at a table near the front of the room. He is sitting slouched in his chair trying to put his feet up on a chair at the other side of the table. Mrs James thumbs through his file.

MRS JAMES: Do you care about the presentation of your work?

(PAUSE)

Do you have any feelings at all?

(PAUSE)

Come on, be honest for once!

(SHE CHECKS HIS SPELLINGS)
Now check your spelling - I seem to remember when you did spelling tests in the first year you got them all right.

Day 5 Periods 3 & 4. P.E. (Minor games)

The lesson begins as usual with a warming-up exercise in which the class is divided into four teams. When a team is called the children have to run across the hall and back. The last one each time is out. John Andrews is the last one left and is therefore the winner. Miss Shiels praises him but adds a comment which seems to indicate that this is a rare event for him to do anything worthy of praise.

MISS SHIELS: Only three left, who's it going to be, who will be 2B champ?

Peaches! (THE TEAM NAME)
Two left, John and Dean, who will it be?
Plums! (THEY RUN, JOHN WINS)
Oh well done John Andrews, the only good thing he's done to date!

Day 5 Periods 5 & 6. English

The class is organised into small groups each reading aloud from a story called 'My Side of the Mountain'. Mrs Betworth has noticed that the small group containing John Andrews and John Perry is being rather noisy and so she decides to check on progress. It leads to her making an important public comparison between the two Johns and Brian.

MRS BETWORTH: I am interested to know what page your group has got up to. There's a couple of groups around 31, 30. John?

JOHN ANDREWS: Page 28.
MRS BETWORTH: I thought somebody in your group had already said 31 actually. See, you're being a bit silly again. I'm so glad Brian's with you because I know Brian's been reading all the time. I am a little uncertain as to what you other two have been doing all this time, but I'm determined I'm not spending all my time with you.

(VOICE TO CRESCENDO)

There are other people in the room who deserve my time as well as you, and you don't always deserve a great deal of anything except people to get, er, what shall we say, a little bit annoyed with you at times!

Day 6 Periods 3 & 4. Mathematics

Mr Rogers has found it necessary to separate John Perry and John Andrews because they have been spending most of their time talking instead of working. A short while later, he returns to John Andrews who is now sitting alone.

MR ROGERS: Well I'm going to let you carry on and get some work done at 12 o'clock 'cos you're a time waster aren't you? You're one of those clever gentlemen who likes to play around while my back's turned.

(LOOKS AT THE COVER OF HIS BOOK)

John Andrews, yes! (PAUSE) You'd better get a lot of work done between now and 12 o'clock.
Day 6  Period 8. Humanities

John Andrews is separated from Norman Woods because they are spending too much time talking.

Day 7 Periods 3 & 4. English

The class is arranged into small groups preparing to read their stories on the theme of 'determination'. The story had been set for homework, but John Andrews did not do it. However, instead of owning up he pretends that he cannot find it in his book.

MRS BETWORTH: .... and this group will read this way round starting with this fabulous story John is still searching for at the moment. To me, John, your lovely little book looks like a complete set of blank pages from beginning to end. Are you going to do your story or are you going to be able to tell it? (PAUSE) John, do you think you can tell it, 'cos you're not going to be able to read it are you!

(SHE IS REALLY BEING KIND TO HIM, SHE KNOWS: ONLY TOO WELL THAT HE HASN'T DONE IT AND IS HOPING THAT HE WILL FINALLY CONFESS)

John, do you think you could tell it?

(JOHN SHRUGS HIS SHOULDERS)

You don't know! (HARDER TONE OF VOICE)

Do you think anybody, John, has ever taught you that it's much more acceptable when you've in a slight amount of trouble to speak clearly, to look pleasant, instead of sitting there going ...
(SHE PULLS FACES, SHRUGS HER SHOULDERS AND ROCKS HER BODY FROM SIDE TO SIDE)

It doesn't impress me John, I'm sorry it just leaves me rather annoyed.

Later in the lesson Mrs Betworth returns to the point and suggests that the three boys who did not write a story should prepare one each in time for the next lesson. However, she clearly differentiates between John Andrews and Norman on the one hand and Anthony on the other.

MRS BETWORTH: (TO THE CLASS) I think that they ought to learn it so that they can tell it to us. Actually John and Norman are very good at gassing and talking, aren't they. They're past masters. I know you're much quieter Anthony, but I think we'll ask these two to do a gassbag on us and tell us the story without actually reading it. 'Cos they're very skilled at talking. Never met anybody better, specially out of the side of their mouths!

(SHE MAKES MUCH OF THIS POINT WITH THE APPROPRIATE GESTURES)

Day 7 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

Following a brief discussion of the contents of a typical Sunday lunch with the whole class Mrs James reminds the class that they were supposed to have collected some magazine cuttings to illustrate their work. She approaches the two Johns.

MRS JAMES: Have you brought any magazines to cut things out from?

JOHN ANDREWS: I couldn't find any.

MRS JAMES: Did you actually look?
JOHN: Yes, I looked in the T.V. Times.

MRS JAMES: Well now that you know what you're doing, maybe to finish it off for Thursday you could bring something once you've got the basic idea started. That's if John and John can sort themselves out and do something with a bit of enthusiasm.

Day 9 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

Further continuation of work on nutrition means that the children are still working in small groups either writing or drawing. John Andrews has finally produced a piece of work but Mrs James does a little more than just praise him.

MRS JAMES: I must say it makes a change John, to say, for you to be able to say mine's finished, because when I looked at your folder I was positively (PAUSE) well I don't know, words fail me. I was really disappointed. The lack of inspiration and thought that's gone into it. For an intelligent boy sometimes I just wonder what you use all day. Or whether you even think about it. Do you? Do you ever think about it and think - well I care?

(JOHN JUST SHRUGS HIS SHOULDERS AND SMILES)

Day 10 Periods 1 & 2. Science

John Andrews is moved from his usual position at the back of the lab and is put on a front bench. The three girls, Deborah, Susan and Dawn are moved from the front to the back. Mrs Jones took this measure so that she could keep a closer watch on John and his work.
Day 11 Periods 1 & 2. English

John Andrews, Norman Woods and John Perry are all separated
"... in places that won't inconvenience
any of us."

Day 11 Periods 5 & 6. Humanities

John Andrews is separated from Norman Woods for chattering when they
were supposed to be working. Mr Johnson sits him outside in the Humanities
resource area where he could be observed through the glass partition
separating the resource area from the classroom.

Day 14 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

The class are continuing to work on their material about diet while
Mrs James moves around looking at their work. She has already had to send
John Andrews outside once to wash his face since, while playing around he
has managed to get large blobs of red ink on it. After he returns Mrs
James takes a chair and sits by his side:

MRS JAMES: You're a devious young man aren't you? If I look
round I don't see you doing anything. But as soon
as I turn around or go out of the room or do what-
ever, you find something to do to annoy somebody.
Now what's got into you?

His reply is quiet and indistinct, but it seems to imply that the others
are bothering him.

MRS JAMES: Take no notice, the day that you switch off and take
no notice then they will stop bothering you, if
that's what you think they're doing, and you might
find that you're getting on with your work a bit
better.
Day 17 Periods 3 & 4. English

Mrs Betworth is preparing the class for some choral speaking, and arranges a number of small groups of children to recite different parts of the poem. The poem is about a dog, and when she comes to the line "I'm a mad dog ..." she gives it to John Andrews and Norman Woods - adding

MRS BETWORTH: Most appropriate. What a coincidence!

Day 17 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

Mrs James begins the lesson by trying to conduct a discussion to draw together some of the information learnt over the past few lessons on the topic of food and nutrition. Both John Perry and John Andrews are being particularly provocative and it is clear that Mrs James is becoming more and more irritated by their behaviour. Eventually she moves John Perry to another desk away from his friends. One minute later John Perry begins playing around again and John Andrews joins in. This disturbs Anthony and attracts Mrs James' attention again.

MRS JAMES: John Andrews (PAUSE). You really are a silly boy aren't you!
(HER VOICE IS FIRM AND SERIOUS)

A few minutes later she returns to the same theme.

MRS JAMES: It's a pity you waste your time because that's the most accurately drawn clock I've seen. When you can do some things so well why do you make such a mess of them in other regions?

(JOHN SHRUGS HIS SHOULDERS AND GRINS. HE IS SLOUCHED IN HIS CHAIR)

Sit up! If you tidied yourself up you might have a different attitude altogether.
Day 20  Periods 3 & 4. P.E. (Basketball in the hall)

The lesson begins with the usual warm-up games and then Miss Shiels demonstrates some new moves and techniques in basketball. She stops them all and suggests that she wants to show them one more thing before she plays a proper game of basketball with them.

MISS SHIELS: Come on, I want to show you one more thing and then I'll play a game with you. All sit down here.

(TEY SIT AROUND IN A GROUP)

I'll have the two rogues demonstrating this.

John Andrews and Norman Woods get up and walk out in front of the group.

MISS SHIELS: Come on, look you know who you are without having to ask! (MUCH LAUGHTER)

Day 24 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

In a previous lesson Mrs James had suggested that the children might look up some information about the role of minerals in our food. John Andrews brings some information to her and she praises him for it, but adds an extra comment.

MRS JAMES: I see you've been busy - I hope it's going to continue!

Teachers' remarks about John Andrews

Science: Mrs Jones

"Doesn't work quietly, something of a day-dreamer, so much so that even when pushed he ends up with less work than other people in his group."

"John has ability, there's no doubt about that, he just doesn't use it."
He just has absolutely no motivation whatsoever to do well and he's got not motivation to ask anything because he's not interested in what he's doing."

"John doesn't really co-operate on any level with a group. It's probably true that he gets more out of being told off than he does from being praised, because he does in fact smile a lot when you talk to him about what he's done wrong."

**Music: Mr Davies**

"An extrovert, likes to hide his inadequacies with a front that's getting him into trouble. But in fact under that there's an awful lot more coming out."

"I'm sure a lot of John's attention seeking is due to a built-in thought that he isn't up to the standard."

"Wants things two or three times before he's happy to go away. Perhaps to use somebody else's initiative rather than his own. Likes the things laid out to make the task so that he knows what he's doing."

**French: Mrs Lindsay**

"A fairly outgoing personality - an attention seeker by doing silly things that he usually knows are pretty silly, but likes to be noticed."

"John is far less mature (than James or Dean) and less able academically. John is timid and he blushes."

"John likes company, he must do because he's always seeking company."

"John is shy although he seeks a lot of attention, but when he gets it he's not always sure how to cope with the attention once it's been foisted onto him. He blushes up, he looks away, he smiles with great delight and"
pleasure because he's got it but his outward reaction just embarrasses him a lot."

Mathematics: Mr Peters

"John wants to be accepted from a sort of naughty point of view, he actually gets something positive by being naughty and getting told off for it. He certainly seems to take more cudos from being told off than from what he does from being praised."

Mathematics: Mr Rogers

"John's behaviour leaves something to be desired. His concentration flits around, but I'm beginning to suspect he's a very able boy who can see his way through fairly quickly and sees some of the exercises as a little bit tedious."

Health Education: Mrs James

"John is a devious character in lots of respects."

"John needs to project his image but he is very withdrawn and needs encouragement to in fact say anything that will commit himself. I think that he has something to offer at times but he needs to be, although he's trying to project himself he's really quite shy of being noticed. He's almost over-concerned about being brought to the fore and yet, for some reason, he needs to project himself. It's some sort of inferiority thing."

"John is a fly-by-night who can switch off and on at the flick of a switch and will apply just when he wants to apply."

Drama: Mr Lomas

"John has got very great difficulty with his own identity really, who he's supposed to be. In the early days of my dealing with him he was
obviously coming up to be told off, it was where he got his kicks. We've changed that situation a bit now but he's a long way behind.'

"John has many anti-social tendencies."

P.E.: Miss Shiels

"John is silly, follows his friends, tries to make a fool of himself. I think he likes everybody to look at him to see what he's doing."

"John doesn't behave and listen in class. He's a silly boy who makes more noise and needs telling off more than once."

"John very much wants to be the centre of attraction and that's why he behaves like he does."

"John is a silly boy, just stupid."

Second Year Form Tutor: Mr Danby

"John is a reasonably intelligent and able boy, he's very much a little boy. Mischievous."

"John is a bit like John Perry, he'll tag along half-heartedly, and do anything anybody else is doing."

"John knows exactly what he wants and he'll put on this veneer of going along with other people, he'll do just enough work usually to keep out of trouble, in fact, he really wants to be outside or he wants to be causing trouble or he wants to be looking out of the window."

"John is somewhat sly and underhand at times. Whatever he says to you you've got to balance that with the thought that there are ulterior motives. He is also very underhand. I've caught him lying to me on more than one occasion."

"John can be a silly little boy, but you can have a fairly adult conversation with him at times."
"John doesn't talk to girls. If he does he pokes fun at them or makes snide remarks."

**English: Mrs Betworth**

"John would be quite happy left to himself, he'd do nothing. Since he's been on report he's improved a lot. In reality people think he's normal, that he achieves fairly reasonably well. He's nowhere near average, I don't think he's very bright. He's very much nearer the bottom than a lot of people would think."

"John is well turned out. He's well nourished, and well looked after. His only lacking is in concentration and effort. But I don't think he's as bright as some people think he is."

"John just isn't industrious. Physically he is a fit little boy. I don't know much about his home, except that he looks well cared for."

**Humanities: Mr Johnson**

"John is rather mischievous, he's got quite a lot of ability compared to John Perry, and yet they tend to move towards each other. They are both downright devious."

"John probably knows the answers to questions but he can never be bothered to put his hand up. If you question him directly you've got to repeat the question and then he'll answer it."

"John rarely conforms. He isn't particularly well behaved although he's much improved."
Susan West, Deborah Anderson and Linda Waters each have a pen which is dressed in the form of a doll. They keep bouncing them up and down along the desk like dancers.

**MRS BETWORTH:** You could write a little play one day like a puppet play and get them doing things. You could hide behind the table if we turned it sideways and have a little puppet play. Don't you think we could?

(The three girls all nod and giggle)

Norman Wood, John Andrews and John Perry are sitting together directly behind the three girls, Mrs Betworth makes her next comment loudly enough for the whole class to hear.

**MRS BETWORTH:** We could do a play about that daft lot sitting behind. (GIGGLES)

They're always wasting their time, don't you think!

Following this incident Mrs Betworth tells the whole class that they have just five minutes left, she then approaches the same three boys.

**MRS BETWORTH:** Are you actually doing any work in this now?

(EACH REPLIES: I am!)

After five minutes Mrs Betworth stops them all and clears away their work. She proceeds to read to them from a book called 'My Side of the Mountain'. In this story a small boy learns how to fish, which leads to a discussion on the use of pieces of fish as bait to catch larger fish. She is searching
for the word 'lure'. Several children get the opportunity to volunteer information, but Peter Lipscomb gets particular praise at the expense of Norman Woods.

MRS BETWORTH: What does it mean if you're going to use something for bait?

(HANDS GO UP)

Norman?

NORMAN: Like a maggot on the end of a lure.

(SHE MISUNDERSTANDS HIS USE OF THE WORD LURE AND SUBSTITUTES THE WORD HOOK)

MRS BETWORTH: Yes, you're using it on the end of the hook. What are you hoping to do with a maggot or whatever you're going to use? Yes Miss Davies?

ROSEMARY: You're hoping that when the fish comes along and bites it you're going to get it caught on the hook, that's what you want it to do.

MRS BETWORTH: That's what you want it to do -

PETER LIPSCOMB: (SHOUTS OUT). You want to attract it. 

MRS BETWORTH: Attract it - excellent.

(SHE REALLY EMPHASISES THIS PRAISE)

By the way, people that go fishing, you can buy artificial attractions. They've got a special name? Does anyone know?

PUPIL: Spinners.

MRS BETWORTH: Spinners... Can you think of another thing? No? Another word that means to attract a fish, anybody know it?
Have you ever heard of a lure? Trying to lure a fish?

While some of the class reply in unison 'Yes' Norman makes a great show of looking hurt and mouths to his friends, "I said that!"

Day 2 Periods 5 & 6. Health Education

Mrs James has constructed a simple apparatus to demonstrate the collection of wood tar from cigarette smoke. It consists of a collapsible plastic bottle filled with cotton wool with a lighted cigarette placed into a small hole in the cap. As the bottle is squeezed, cigarette smoke passes through the cotton wool leaving a brown stain. She has the class all sitting watching as the first cigarette is lit and the bottle is passed round so that everyone can have a try at working it. While this is going on Mrs James, a non-smoker herself, makes several references to the fact that she knows who smokes.

Mrs James: You've got to remember that one cigarette or two cigarettes is not going to make much difference, it's just when somebody starts smoking and they smoke some number of cigarettes repeatedly every day, and that number perhaps increases as they get a bit older or as they leave school and can afford a few more. Isn't that right Norman?

After lighting the second cigarette, Mrs James stands at the front of the class holding the apparatus. Several children are moving around and there is a moderate level of chatter. While she is explaining about the cotton wool Norman gets out of his seat and approaches her to get a better view.
MRS JAMES: Now down towards the end of the tube, there, (POINTS) the cotton wool has already become discoloured, and that was a small size cigarette.

Now you stay where you are and I'll bring this ...

(NORMAN APPROACHES)

go away! Do you know, sometimes I wonder really if you're still young first years, the way you react!

The apparatus is being passed round as before and Mrs James is following it. She comments upon various children's work as she does so. When she reaches Norman she makes special reference to him.

MRS JAMES: Now you're a dab hand at this, you just know all about it anyway don't you. (HE GRINS)

Are you still smoking? (HE GRINS)

come on be honest about it.

NORMAN: When I can afford it.

When it is time to replace the cigarette, John Andrews provides one from his pocket, which leads to further discussion about being caught in school with cigarettes.

MRS JAMES: Er, I'm just going to leave this and see - it's not smoking normally.'cos you wouldn't have that amount of red end would you!

NORMAN: Yes you could.

MRS JAMES: Could you?

NORMAN: Yes.

MRS JAMES: Oh, you really do know an awful lot about it don't you. I hope that when you see all the muck that is
going into here you'll think about what you're
doing to yourselves at your tender ages!

A little later in the lesson Mrs James changes the subject in order to
discuss some of their past work on food and nutrition.

**MRS JAMES:** I'd like some of these charts to make a new second
year display.

*(JOHN PERRY IS STANDING AT HER SIDE)*

John, go away. Sit down. I'm tired of you walking
around.

*(HER VOICE IS FIRM AND SHE LOOKS RUFFLED)*

If you haven't got your own things then you're going
to have to do without. Because if anybody's walked
around this afternoon, you people

*(SHE POINTS TO NORMAN AND THE TWO JOHNS)*

have done more of it than anybody else! It's just
proving to me that you can't do something a little
bit different without your losing attention and losing
track of what you're supposed to be doing altogether.

---

**Day 6 Periods 1 & 2. English**

Mrs Betworth is reading to the class from a book called 'My Side of
the Mountain'. While she does so everyone except Norman and John Perry is
listening with interest. When she finishes, Mrs Betworth makes a clear
distinction between these two boys and Brian.

**MRS BETWORTH:** By the way, while I was reading to you there
were two people talking.

*(TURNING TO NORMAN AND JOHN)*
Don't think you fool me Norman and John, you're really rather rude. I didn't stop. Do you know why I didn't stop? Because you were the only two not listening. Why should I ruin the story for the rest of the class when you're the only two.

So I didn't ruin the story because I rather think some of them were quite enjoying it. Now listen very carefully. You will not sit together next time you come to this room. You will sit at one side of the room, one of you, and the other side of the room, the other of you. You will not sit near Brian, who works, and you will not sit near John Andrews (who doesn't) either. So tomorrow when you come, you will come to me and you'll say -"Where are we going to sit Mrs Betworth?"

(SHE RAISES HER VOICE)

I have given you a very long time and a great deal of help and persuasion to prove to me that you can sit next to your friends and you can't manage it. So now (BANGS THE DESK VERY HARD WITH A BOOK)
you won't sit next to them again! Either of you. You're wasting your time, and I'm fed up with it. I'm very displeased with you!

Day 6 Period 8. Humanities

Norman and John Andrews are separated by Mr. Johnson for talking instead of working.
Mrs Betworth begins the lesson by handing back the stories which the children had written for homework, based upon the idea of 'determination'.

MRS BETWORTH: Anybody not got their story ready?

(A FEW HANDS GO UP)

Oh dear, why not?

NORMAN: I was away when you gave it out.

MRS BETWORTH: Were you? Away nearly all last week?

(HER VOICE CONVEYS GREAT SURPRISE)

But I thought you were here on Thursday. (PAUSE)

When did I give you your work?

CHORUS: Friday!

MRS BETWORTH: Well weren't you here on Friday?

NORMAN: No.

MRS BETWORTH: Weren't you Norman. Oh, I'm sorry.

(BUT DETERMINED TO PIN HIM DOWN)

So you were here yesterday, and so you took absolutely no notice that everybody else was doing a story. You thought you'd got out of it. Did you think you'd got out of doing it?

NORMAN: No.

MRS BETWORTH: No, well then, why didn't you do it?

(HER VOICE BECOMES DEEPER AND FIRMER, SHE IS NOT AMUSED)

Norman, I do not admire people who shrug their shoulders, shake their heads and haven't got the guts to say yes or no. I'm extremely kind and
understanding to people who will be honest and straightforward and say so  (PAUSE)
You make me feel very disappointed! You've spoilt what we're going to do you see.

Day 7 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

Following a discussion of the content of a typical Sunday lunch, the class work in groups on their displays on nutrition. Some are writing about food and others are doing drawings and illustrations to go with the writing. Today, Norman is working with some boys who exert a positive influence on him. (James, Dean and Stephen.)

Towards the end of the lesson Mrs James approaches Norman and his companions. He has now produced two drawings, one of a hamburger and the other of a toffee apple, each with some writing included in the drawing to explain about the food.

MRS JAMES: Oh, (TO THE OTHERS IN THE GROUP)
do you know it's a great deal for him to achieve
two completed things isn't it.

(NORMAN MAKES A GREAT SHOW OF BEING WORN OUT)
Is he tired now, old man?

NORMAN: I had three days off last week!

MRS JAMES: It's quite an achievement isn't it. But don't you think it's quite nice to finish two things? And if you started a third and you finished that on Thursday it would be even more satisfying. Think about something you could write 'cos your writing has so much improved hasn't it?
Day 10  Periods 3 & 4. P.E. (Basketball in the hall)

Miss Shiels has been teaching them various moves in basketball and has now got them all ready to play an actual game. Most of the team are bunched up in one place waiting for the ball, but Norman positions himself to one side, allowing himself more space to move. Miss Shiels notices this and quickly praises him, but adds a comment.

MISS SHIELS: There's one sensible person in this team, amazingly it's Norman!

Day 10  Period 7. French

The children are all completing a crossword puzzle in French. One answer in the puzzle is "DES", but Norman has written it in as "DAY".

MRS CARTWRIGHT: What's this DAY?. Mayday in your case I should think, a distress signal. (WITH EMPHASIS)

DES! Have you seen it before Norman? DES!

Day 11  Periods 1 & 2. English

The children have been engaged in a comprehension exercise and drawing a picture to go with it. Towards the end of the lesson Mrs Betworth checks on who has completed the work, making additional reference to the quality of Norman's work, especially his drawing.

MRS BETWORTH: How many people have finished everything?

(SOME HANDS GO UP, INCLUDING NORMAN'S. SHE POINTS TO HIM)

That's because you're a speedy Gonzalez. (GIGGLES)

A CHILD: What do you mean by everything?
MRS BETWORTH: Well everything is the answers and the drawing,

(POINTING TO NORMAN'S WORK)

and the scribble as far as you're concerned.

Day 15 Periods 7 & 8. French

During an oral session Mrs Cartwright is going around the class asking children to say which sports they like and do not like. She has a set of cards with pictures on which depict a whole variety of things they have been learning about. Eventually she changes the subject and shows them a picture of a school and asks Norman if he dislikes school. Unfortunately for him he does not recognise the picture.

MRS CARTWRIGHT: Right, Dawn, Le football?

DAWN: Il aime le football.

MRS CARTWRIGHT: Il aime le football. Le tennis? Oui Peter?

PETER: Il deteste le tennis.

MRS CARTWRIGHT: Et le golf? Le golf Martin?

MARTIN: Il deteste le golf.

MRS CARTWRIGHT: L'école, where's l'école.

(HOLDS UP THE PICTURE)

What is it?

NORMAN: Ice hockey!

MRS CARTWRIGHT: (SURPRISED) Ice hockey?

(LAUGHTER FROM THE CLASS)

L'école, put an 'S' instead of the e-acute. It's not the lager! (LONG PAUSE)

I think you'll have seen one in your time.
I may be wrong.  

Put an 's' where that first 'e' is in école.

FINALLY SHE GIVES IN AND TELLS HIM

School, have you seen a school in your life?

NORMAN GRINS

Unfortunately, yes!

FINALLY, TO THE CLASS

And so - Il deteste l'école.

After a few minutes when she revises the responses to all of the previous questions she return to l'école.

MRS CARTWRIGHT: L'école. I'd better ask Norman now he's found out what it is.  

Tu aime l'école?  Tu deteste l'école?

NORMAN:  Je deteste l'école.  

MRS CARTWRIGHT: Tu deteste l'école, I had a feeling.

Day 17  Periods 3 & 4. English

Mrs Betworth is preparing the class for some choral speaking. She asks different groups of children to recite different parts of the poem which is about a dog. When she comes to the line. "I'm a mad dag ..." she gives it to Norman and John Andrews, adding,

Most appropriate, what a coincidence.

Day 20  Periods 3 & 4. P.E. (Basketball in the hall)

The lesson begins with the usual warm-up games and then Miss Shiels demonstrates some new moves and techniques in basketball. She stops then
all and suggests that she wants to show them one more thing before she plays a proper game of basketball with them.

MISS SHIELS: Come on, I want to show you one more thing and then I'll play a game with you. All sit down here.

(THEY SIT AROUND IN A GROUP)

I'll have the two rogues demonstrating this.

Norman and John Andrews get up and walk out in front of the group.

MISS SHIELS: Come on, look you know who you are without having to ask! (MUCH LAUGHTER)

Day 24 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

Mrs James is distributing leaflets about nutrition, she points out to Norman that one of the leaflets is "Intended for the older school child".

MRS JAMES: I hope that you will note what that says.

(NORMAN READS THAT IT IS INTENDED FOR THE OLDER SCHOOL CHILD)

Well if I'm going to give this to you I consider you to be an older school child. It would be nice to think that you responded as such, wouldn't it.

Teachers' remarks about Norman Woods

Music: Mr Davies

"Norman is probably less outwardly unsure of the work that he does and will make a great noise about it. He seems, by and large, quite happy to be part of an homogeneous mass."
"Norman will only ask for help when he feels he needs it, being content to press on when he knows what he is doing. Content to present a completed piece of work rather than have it checked every five minutes."

Health Education: Mrs James

"Norman is not very serious minded, he has always been one to pass things off and have a laugh about it."

"Norman is a fly-by-night who can switch off and on at the flick of a switch, and will apply just when he wants to apply."

"Norman is fairly easy-going in his way."

Drama: Mr Lomas

"Norman is fairly outgoing but he finds it difficult to take a role in drama, and leave being Norman for a while."

"Norman is not terribly socially aware and is not likely to get involved when there is a discussion of the implications of social relationships. He is just good natured, a lot of these things don't seem to touch him at all."

"Norman is never very likely to give public expression to ideas. He's very friendly towards you, I feel he's very limited in his ability to develop ideas or express them."

French: Mrs Cartwright

"Norman, I've been very pleased with, actually, this year because from being totally out in the wilds, not knowing what was going off at all, at least we've picked the oral side of him up this year. He will take part, he can remember, will try and take part. On the written side Norman's books are absolutely atrocious to look at and he doesn't seem capable of
tidying them up or being able to put anything worthwhile accurately down. Poor old Norman, either doesn't get it done or can't read it when it has been done."

P.E.: Miss Shiel's

"Norman is very quiet and shy, and the only reason he's noisy and gets into trouble is that he's with his friends and he's trying to be different."

"Norman is very easily influenced by his friends, quite shy but when he's with a lot of the boys tends to be silly. On his own he behaves quite well and works quite hard."

Second Year Form Tutor: Mr Danby

"Norman has few ideas of his own, he's very much led by others."

"Norman doesn't have a particularly serious attitude to his work. I'm not saying he doesn't work, but it's not that important to him. His parents don't come into the school. He doesn't mix in necessarily with all the boys, I think he finds it difficult to be accepted by others."

"Norman gives the impression that he isn't very able, but I think he is."

English: Mrs Betworth

"I like Norman, he's easy-going, he does his work but he does it as briefly and as quickly as he possibly can. He's also got the charming way of honestly letting you know he's awfully glad he's done it and can he sit there and do nothing for a minute or two? I think he's honest, thoroughly honest. He's honestly being a bit lazy at times, but he doesn't upset me. He's not particularly clever, he's not particularly bright, but he does join in quite well. Norman has a great deal of common sense."
"I know Norman rushes his work, but he does do some work, and it's O.K. He comes from a fairly rough home I think but a happy one."

**Humanities: Mr Johnson**

"Norman is mischievous!"
JOHN PERRY

Rank order No.24

Day 2 Periods 3 & 4. English

Susan West, Deborah Anderson and Linda Waters each have a pen which is dressed in the form of a doll. They keep bouncing them up and down along the desk like dancers.

MRS BETWORTH: You could write a little play one day like a puppet play and get them doing things. You could hide behind the table if we turned it sideways and have a little puppet play. Don't you think we could?

( THE THREE GIRLS ALL NOD AND GIGGLE)

John Perry, Norman Woods and John Andrews are sitting together directly behind the three girls. Mrs Betworth makes her next comment loudly enough for the whole class to hear.

MRS BETWORTH: We could do a play about that daft lot sitting behind. (GIGGLES)

They're always wasting their time don't you think!

Following this incident Mrs Betworth tells the whole class that they have just five minutes left, she then approaches the same three boys.

MRS BETWORTH: Are you actually doing any work in this row?

(EACH REPLIES: I am!)

Day 2 Periods 5 & 6. Health education

Mrs James has constructed a simple apparatus to demonstrate the collection of wood tar from cigarette smoke. It consists of a collapsible plastic bottle filled with cotton wool with a lighted cigarette placed into
a small hole in the cap. As the bottle is squeezed, cigarette smoke passes through the cotton wool leaving a brown stain. She has the class all sitting watching as the first cigarette is lit and the bottle is passed round so that everyone can have a try at working it. This whole exercise creates a great deal of excitement which Mrs James has difficulty keeping under control. John Perry, John Andrews and Norman Woods are particularly affected by this and spend a great deal of time talking, fidgeting about and turning around in their seat or getting up and walking around the room. Eventually Mrs James makes a comment.

MRS JAMES: I'd like some of these charts to make a new second year display.

(JOHN PERRY IS STANDING AT HER SIDE)

John, go away! Sit down, I am tired of you walking around.

(HER VOICE IS FIRM AND SHE LOOKS RUFFLED)

If you haven't got your own things then you're going to have to do without. Because if anybody's walked around this afternoon, you people

(POINTS TO JOHN PERRY, JOHN ANDREWS AND NORMAN WOODS)

have done more of it than anybody else! It's not just proving to me that you can't do something a little bit different without you losing attention and losing track of what you're supposed to be doing altogether.

Despite this warning John Perry persists, he keeps turning around in his seat, calling to other children in the class, and constantly checking what I (the observer) am doing. As time goes on Mrs James gets visibly angrier.
with him. She approaches him, and with a firm and resolved tone of voice she warns him again while lightly tapping him on the shoulder.

MRS JAMES: If I have to sort you out young man I shall be very angry indeed. Now stop fooling around and get on with your work. Don't turn around once more whilst this lesson is going on!

As the lesson draws to a close she takes up the question of the bad behaviour of the whole class, and the two Johns in particular.

MRS JAMES: I've just had enough! In fact I'm quite appalled with some of the behaviour this afternoon. It's been silly in the extreme for some people.

(SHE TAKES A LONG HARD LOOK AT THE TWO JOHNS)

And you, young man, can see me for a few minutes before you actually go, John Perry!

(HE IGNORES HER. SHE SHOUTS VERY LOUDLY)

John! Get out here.

(SHE DIRECTS HIM TO THE FRONT OF THE ROOM AND MAKES HIM FACE THE WALL)

Stand there until I've got patience to speak to you. And get your hands out of your pockets and face the other way.

John faces the wall but takes sly peeps and grins at his friends when he thinks Mrs James is not looking. He clearly isn't ashamed of being treated like this, he seems to be enjoying it.

Day 5 Periods 3 & 4. P.E. (Minor games)

Miss Shiels gets ready to demonstrate dribbling a basketball and chooses John Perry as her helper. He has to stand in front of her with
his hand in the air counting, with his fingers, the number of times she bounces the ball. He has great difficulty doing this which provides Miss Shiels with the opportunity to make a direct comparison between him and Dean.

MISS SHIELS: ... Now there's no fingers there (BOUNCE) there's no fingers there (BOUNCE) there's five fingers there (BOUNCE) (GIGGLES FROM THE CLASS WHO ARE ALL SITTING ROUND WATCHING) There's still five fingers there (BOUNCE) still five (BOUNCE). There's four (BOUNCE) still four (BOUNCE) three, yes good (BOUNCE) two, yes, good (BOUNCE) one. (SHE LAUGHS) Is he always like this?

THE CLASS IN CHORUS: Yes. (LAUGHTER)

MISS SHIELS: Remind me to pick Dean Berwick next time, he usually manages to do what I ask!

O.K. that is to stop you looking at the ball.

Day 5 Periods 5 & 6. English

The children are organised into small groups and are taking it in turns to read aloud from a story called 'My Side of the Mountain'. John Perry is in a group with John Andrews and Brian Buxton. The two Johns are not doing much reading. Every few minutes they turn around to see what I (the observer) am doing, they then make comments to each other and laugh. Mrs Betworth is aware of this going on and, for the most part, chooses to ignore it. However, she finally feels that it is time to do something about it.
MRS BETWORTH: I am going to say before I stop you, but I am interested to know -

(SHE IS INTERRUPTED BY JOHN PERRY WHO IS PLAYING AROUND)

- John Perry - you - really - are - being - very silly, aren't you?

(SPOKEN SLOWLY AND DELIBERATELY)

Now just stop your giggling.

I am interested to know what page your group has got up to. There's a couple of groups around 31, 30. John?

JOHN ANDREWS: Page 28.

MRS BETWORTH: I thought somebody in your group had already said 31 actually. See you're being a bit silly again. I'm so glad Brian's with you because I know Brian's been reading all the time. I am a little uncertain as to what you other two have been doing all this time, but I'm determined I'm not spending all my time with you.

(VOICE TO CRESCENDO)

There are other people in the room who deserve my time as well as you, and you don't always deserve a great deal of anything except people to get, er, what shall I say, a little bit annoyed with you at times!

Day 6 Periods 1 & 2. English

Mrs Betworth is reading to the class from the book called 'My Side of the Mountain'. While she does so everyone except John Perry and Norman is listening with interest. When she finishes, Mrs Betworth makes a clear
distinction between these two boys and Brian.

MRS BETWORTH: By the way, while I was reading to you there were two people talking.

(TURNING TO JOHN AND NORMAN)

Don't think you fool me Norman and John, you're really rather rude. I didn't stop. Do you know why I didn't stop? Because you were the only two not listening. Why should I ruin the story for the rest of the class when you're the only two. So I didn't ruin the story because I rather think some of them were quite enjoying it. Now listen very carefully. You will not sit together next time you come to this room, you will sit at one side of the room, one of you, and the other side of the room, the other of you. You will not sit near Brian, who works, and you will not sit near John Andrews (who doesn't) either. So tomorrow when you come, you will come to me and you'll say "Where are we going to sit Mrs Betworth?"

(SHE RAISES HER VOICE)

I have given you a very long time and a great deal of help and persuasion to prove to me that you can sit next to your friends and you can't manage it. So now

(BANGS THE DESK VERY HARD WITH A BOOK)

you won't sit next to them again! Either of you. You're wasting your time, and I'm fed up with it. I'm very displeased with you!
Day 6 Periods 3 & 4. Mathematics

During most of this lesson the class are working individually from their SMP books. Mr Rogers walks around the room helping individuals. He approaches the two Johns who are sitting together and chatting.

MR ROGERS: (PUTTING HIS HAND ON JOHN PERRY'S HEAD)
Hey! I want to see you getting on with some work this morning, I wasn't very impressed last week.

(AS HE SAYS THIS HE MOVES JOHN'S HEAD GENTLY FROM SIDE TO SIDE. JOHN LOOKS EMBARRASSED BUT SAYS NOTHING)

About five minutes later, having noticed that John has done no more work, but has continued to chatter and wriggle about looking round the room, Mr Rogers moves him.

MR ROGERS: Take your book and sit on the back desk and get on with your work. You don't seem to be able to work together. Now get on with it!

(Note that in two consecutive lessons John Perry has been separated from his friends.)

Day 10 Periods 5 & 6. English

Mrs Betworth is moving round the class talking to individuals about the writing they are doing. John Perry appears to have a cough.

MRS BETWORTH: Oh dear, are you suffering from a cough, and a bit of the sniffles?

JOHN: Yes.

MRS BETWORTH: Well your writing's quite nice and tidy. I was very pleased with that homework, it was a good one.
(REFERS TO HIS STORY ON THE THEME OF 'DETERMINATION')

Did it take you a long time to do it?

JOHN: Yes, it did. (SMILES)

MRS BETWORTH: Well, it was very good indeed. Did Dad help you with some of your spellings?

JOHN: Yes.

MRS BETWORTH: Yes well, that's fine. I'm very glad he does. It's kind of him to be interested in you John. Not everybody's dad will bother you know. Now you take your time and you'll come on if you concentrate.

Mrs Betworth is able to add more encouragement a little later when she helps him find a picture of a bicycle.

MRS BETWORTH: Well what is it you're really wanting to draw?

JOHN: A bike.

MRS BETWORTH: A bike, well then I'd better have a look and see whether I can't find a picture of a bike somewhere for you.

She goes across to the bookshelf and looks through some books.

MRS BETWORTH: Look at that old fashioned one, eh?

JOHN: That's not what I want really.

MRS BETWORTH: Well at least it gives you an idea of the arrangement of the wheels and the handlebars doesn't it? Now keep going, you never know what you might manage.
Day 11  Periods 1 & 2. English

When the children arrive Mrs Betworth sits the two Johns and Norman in separate corners of the room as promised in a previous lesson. Despite this John Perry's behaviour attracts her attention, and comment, on several occasions. At one point, towards the end of the lesson she notices that he has got out of his seat and crossed the room to approach Norman.

MRS BETWORTH: Have you finished?

JOHN: I've come to borrow his pencil sharpener.

MRS BETWORTH: But I said you could borrow my pencil sharpener.

Go on, off you go.

(SHE RETURNS WITH HIM TO HIS PLACE AND SITS BY HIS SIDE)

Now, got your pen? (HE NODS)

Can you use it then? And can you use it to put something at the end of that sentence, what do you reckon it should be?

(HE WRITES IN HIS BOOK WHILE SHE WATCHES)

You'd do a lot better (TONE OF VOICE HARDENS) if you concentrated on what you were doing, wouldn't you? Because you've just put that full stop in the middle of the next sentence. Put it at the end of the right sentence. You're too bothered about other people in this room and not yourself, aren't you?

Day 17  Periods 5 & 6. Health education

Mrs James attempts to conduct a discussion on nutrition and the role of vitamins in a balanced diet. However, John Perry and John Andrews
continually chatter and wriggle about in their seats. First of all she separates them, and then later she allows them to sit together again in the hope that, having been separated once, they might behave. Despite this they both continue to provoke her until she becomes very angry.

MRS JAMES: Get on! (PAUSE) Hurry up, and fill that chart in, and when you've thought exactly what we talked about then you can tell me.

JOHN PERRY: What have I got to fill it in with?

(HE HAS A CHEEKY TONE OF VOICE AND A SILLY GRIN ON HIS FACE)

Mrs James begins to rise to his constant provocation and starts to say things that she would probably regret in a more rational moment.

MRS JAMES: Do you have to prove that you're even more stupid than you were before? Em? I don't think it's necessary at all! Now when I come back I want to know exactly what we talked about and what you're going to put on that chart!

Following this incident Mrs James moves John Perry and Anthony Pearson, and tells them that next lesson they will all sit separately. John Perry is sent to a table occupied by a group of girls.

MRS JAMES: (TO LINDA WATERS) Linda, do your best to ignore that silly boy, because really this is beyond a joke.

She then walks round the table to where John is sitting, leans towards him and raises her voice.

MRS JAMES: You are quite stupid aren't you! Get that finished and I want to see both of you tomorrow break time ...
Teachers' remarks about John Perry

Mathematics: Mr Peters

"John struggles both mathematically and from a reading point of view."

"John appears to want to be recognised from the point of view of a naughty aspect rather than acceptance that he's doing good work. The negative side is, in his eyes, more appealing than the positive side."

"John hasn't much to offer in the mathematical line really."

Mathematics: Mr Rogers

"I think John is an odd one out on just about any criterion I care to select. I don't see him as being a very happy lad in the school classroom situation."

"Maybe John needs a lot of work of fairly easy calibre to boost his confidence. If he were in one of the lower sets and he was getting lots of ticks he might be a very different kettle of fish. He's very reluctant to move without reassurance from somebody else that he might possibly be right."

Health Education: Mrs James

"John needs to be noticed and yet he has a certain hesitancy."

"John is fairly limited academically but will actually settle down and try to work when the spirit moves him. He is easily led."

"John needs encouragement and help before he can achieve something."

Drama: Mr Lomas

"John is not very highly motivated in drama although he's made a lot of strides since the start of the year in his attitude towards the subject."
He is very insecure about taking a role, constantly glancing across at me to see if he's not going to be told off 'cos he's doing something in role that he'd not normally be allowed to do."

"John is turned in on himself. He is almost masochistic in his need to be torn off a strip now and again. Better than being ignored I suppose."

P.E.: Miss Shiels

"John is a very silly boy, just stupid."

Second Year Form Tutor: Mr Danby

"John is fairly quiet and is usually quite difficult to have a conversation with. John isn't that able, he needs remedial English. He certainly tries hard."

"John just goes along with the crowd. He'll only do most things half heartedly."

"John has few ideas of his own, he's very much led by others."

"John is quiet and very difficult to talk to. Very nervous although he's improving somewhat. It is very difficult to find something to talk to him about apart from school. He's dead keen on football and sport. He doesn't seem to have any ideas of his own at all."

"John is quiet, he sits with nothing to think about. If we're doing anything written he finds it very difficult, he's got a rather low reading age."

English: Mrs Betworth

"John always sticks out like a sore thumb in most situations because he's so physically awkward. He wriggles and fiddles, because I think he must be self conscious about something or other. His ability is quite
remedial in some areas. He also finds it difficult to communicate with some people. He's what I would call bashful. John's vocabulary is almost bereft of anything interesting."

"John is an immature little boy in some ways. He does try so desperately hard with his homework. It's obvious that he's had a great deal of help at home, but I wrote on his report thanking his parents for helping him, but I'm pleased because I put any support that he can get can only be positive. He must get very positive parental support. They must be trying desperately hard to help him. He always looks clean and tidy and smart. Well turned out."

"John is unhappy because he's not very able, he's unhappy because he's unable to achieve things and I think he tries to cover it up with pretend shyness. Some of this is an act I think. I think he's nervous and he worries about all sorts of things. He is so well turned out he must come from a very caring home."

**Humanities: Mr Johnson**

"John is rather mischievous, he is downright devious."
APPENDIX II

Tables of rank-order correlation coefficients employed in elementary linkage analysis for all 12 teachers.
Table 13. Mr Danby. Second year form tutor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Miss Shiels. Physical Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Mr Davies. Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Mrs Cartwright, French

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Mrs Lindsay, French

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Mrs Betworth, English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19. Mr Lomas. Drama

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Mr Rogers. Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Mr Johnson. Humanities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22. Mrs Jones. Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Mr Peters. Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. Mrs James. Health Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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