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The process of evaluation for secondary schools in the Commonwealth of Virginia is closely associated with state and regional accreditation. At the state level, commitment to the evaluation process is reflected by the following statement from \textit{Standards For Accrediting Schools in Virginia}:

The evaluation of a secondary school by a visiting committee of the Department of Education shall be considered an essential aspect of accreditation. \textit{(1979:2)}

Standard 10 of \textit{Standards of Quality For Public Schools in Virginia: 1980–82}, states the following:

... the Chairman and members of any visiting committee conducting an evaluation as part of the accreditation process shall be independent of the school division and shall be selected by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. \textit{(1980:7–8)}

The \textit{Policies and Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation} of the Commission on Secondary Schools, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, includes the following statements:

2. A secondary school seeking admission to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools shall conduct a self-study using the appropriate \textit{Evaluative Criteria} published by the National Study of School Evaluation and shall have a
visit from a committee appointed by the State Committee. After admission to membership, each member school is expected to carry on a continuous program of school improvement which is to be reported to the State Committee periodically.

6. A school undergoing its original or reevaluation study shall be required to cover not less than two complete semesters in such self-study, including the time scheduled for the visiting committee.

8. Every ten years the school shall conduct a study based on the appropriate edition of the Evaluative Criteria. A committee representing the State Committee will visit the school to make a reevaluation. A State Committee may at any time it deems advisable require a reevaluation by the school and a visit by an appropriate committee.

16. A school that has been reorganized, consolidated, or otherwise reconstructed so that it retains a portion of the staff and students of a previously accredited school may continue to be accredited with the following stipulation: Such a school must be scheduled for a self-evaluation and an evaluation by a visiting committee within three years of the time it opened as a new institution. (1980:10-11)

In practice, the Virginia Secondary Committee, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, accepts the State Department of Education evaluation program in lieu of requiring a duplicate program for secondary schools. Secondary schools which are members or potential members of the regional accrediting agency may request, through the division superintendent, that the school be placed on the state schedule for secondary school evaluations. The school is then scheduled, on a
first request basis, by the Supervisor of Secondary School Evaluations of the Department of Education. Following this scheduling, and contingent upon the state evaluation program's funding, the schools receive consultation services during the evaluation period by professional staff members of the Department of Education and have the expenses of the evaluation visiting committee members paid by state funds.

The three phases of the Virginia evaluation program are self-evaluation, evaluation by a visiting committee, and follow-up activities. Self-evaluation is considered the most important phase because it provides an opportunity for directed self-analysis. The visiting committee's major value lies in the fact that it can lend objectivity to the evaluation, an attribute difficult to maintain fully during self-evaluation. The insight and encouragement engendered through evaluation, while important, do not serve as total justification for self-evaluation. Follow-up activities, which ultimately enhance the teaching-learning process, must result if the evaluative process is to be worthwhile.

The Virginia program for the evaluation of secondary schools provides the vehicle through which each school's purpose, facilities, curriculum, pupil services, staff and administration, materials and
equipment, and student activities are evaluated in terms of the identified needs, characteristics and resources of the community, the school's stated philosophy and objectives, and the experience and education of the members of the school's faculty and corresponding visiting committee. The **Handbook for Coordinators of School Evaluations** outlines the objectives of the Virginia secondary school evaluation program as follows:

1. To provide a stimulus for evaluation based on recognized and accepted criteria.

2. To increase participation in the school's total educational program by the community, staff and students.

3. To improve the decision-making process by involving students, teachers, administrators, and the community.

4. To identify areas in the school program which may be considered as strengths.

5. To identify the areas in the school program that should be improved.

6. To provide better understanding of and commitment to purposes.

7. To provide for better utilization of educational facilities.

8. To encourage the faculty to participate in activities leading to professional growth.

9. To improve the effectiveness and coordination of all elements contributing to the total school program.

10. To evaluate the implementation of Standards of Quality and accreditation requirements.

11. To meet the requirements of state and regional accrediting agencies. (Williams,
School evaluation as practiced by the Virginia Department of Education is a gathering and assessment of information for the purpose of providing assistance in formulating an organized, continuous program of school improvement. It does not include the assessment of individual teachers or students. The task of the evaluator is to determine how each segment of the program complements or inhibits the total curriculum.

The visiting committee phase of the Virginia Department of Education/Southern Association of Colleges and Schools evaluation program for secondary schools provides a professional, inservice experience to members of evaluation committees for approximately 500 secondary school educators during each school year. This experience requires four days of on-site evaluation activities in a high school located outside of the evaluator's home school division. Activities of the visiting committee member during the evaluation week include visitation in at least two areas of the school's curriculum, membership on at least one administrative area sub-committee, related discussions with the school's faculty members, students and other visiting committee members, and preparation of at least one narrative report which suggests strengths and weaknesses
identified with that particular part of the school's educational program.

The members of secondary school evaluation committees are selected and invited from recommended lists obtained from the professional staff of the Virginia Department of Education and supplemented by lists from administrators who are currently active at various levels of secondary education and related fields. The composition of a secondary school evaluation committee includes educators representing each area of the educational program of the school being evaluated. The typical high school visiting committee during the 1980-81 school year numbered 22 members, including the chairperson and Department of Education coordinator (Williams, 1981:52).

Many of the educators who have had the opportunity to participate on a secondary school evaluation committee have expressed gratitude for the professional experience. These expressions often include personal testimony as to the benefits derived from the week's activities that have carried over into their school, classroom and professional lives. Statements received from former visiting committee members include the following excerpts:

"...provided new ideas for teaching programs"
"...enabled me to have interesting dialogue and interchange of ideas relative to education"

"...provided a unique opportunity to associate with one's colleagues"

"...this experience added to my own professional growth"

"...provided an opportunity to develop a valuable awareness of the role of other departments in a school program - an opportunity not possible in the subjective atmosphere of my own school"

"...provided more knowledge of the educational process than any education course I have ever taken"

"...this week has done more to make me a concerned educator than any experience since I started teaching"

"...gave me an opportunity to form and renew friendships and professional contacts"

"...there is no way I can go into my classroom next week with the same lack of concern that existed when I left for the visiting committee"

The multidimensional approach to defining morale emphasizes the importance of what the individual believes and feels. The level of morale can then be determined by the extent to which an individual feels his needs are satisfied and the extent to which
satisfaction is perceived as a result of the total job situation (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:1-2). Educators who have served as members of visiting committees have indicated, through their unsolicited expressions, that the experiences of the evaluation week related to their own professional environments and were perceived as beneficial. For this reason, and in the absence of documented research that relates morale to the evaluation experience, this study will examine the observed effect of visiting committee membership on morale and attempt to provide statistical evidence that the previously stated testimonials are, in fact, legitimate.

According to Kimbell (1980:4912A), research indicates that high teacher morale contributes to the quality of school programs. At a time when the education environment is attempting to cope with the demands brought on by non-attentive governing boards, rejected bond referenda, increased militancy within the organized teacher associations and reduced educational budgets, it seems appropriate to devote research attention to the morale of the instructional personnel who staff the secondary schools.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of visiting committee membership on teacher morale, as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. Does visiting committee membership improve morale? Does prior visiting committee experience influence morale score changes?

2. What is the impact of visiting committee membership on the morale scores of secondary teachers immediately following the experience? Do changes in morale score dissipate over time?

3. Does visiting committee membership influence scores on the ten factors of morale that are described in the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire?

4. Do demographic variables make a difference in morale score changes related to visiting committee membership?

5. What suggestions do secondary teachers make for improving the visiting committee process?

Research Hypotheses

The seven null hypotheses which were derived from the stated purpose of the study and related research questions were as follows:
1. There is no significant difference in the pre-test morale scores of state recommended teachers who have had previous visiting committee membership and state recommended teachers who have not had previous visiting committee membership.

2. There is no significant difference in the pre-test morale scores of state recommended teachers who are selected for visiting committee membership and state recommended teachers who are not selected for visiting committee membership.

3. There is no significant difference in the short-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who serve on a current visiting committee and have had previous visiting committee membership and state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have not had previous visiting committee membership.

4. There is no significant difference in the retention of gain scores of teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have had previous visiting committee membership and teachers who serve on a visiting committee and have not had previous visiting committee membership.

5. There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who
served on a current visiting committee and state recommended teachers who did not serve on a current visiting committee.

6. There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores on the following ten morale factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and state recommended teachers who did not serve on a current visiting committee:

   a. Teacher rapport with principal
   b. Satisfaction with teaching
   c. Rapport among teachers
   d. Teacher salary
   e. Teacher load
   f. Curriculum issues
   g. Teacher status
   h. Community support of education
   i. School facilities and services
   j. Community pressures

7. There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee based on the following demographic variables:

   a. Sex
   b. Age
c. Educational level  
d. Marital status  
e. Instructional assignment  
f. Years of teaching experience

Significance of the Study

Although much research has been conducted on the relationship of teacher morale to various components of the educational environment, research directed toward the purpose of assessing relationships between teacher morale and teacher participation as members of visiting committees has not been recorded.

The findings of this study should be important to several audiences:

1. They should be important to administrators responsible for conducting inservice programs for secondary school teachers. Knowing the effect of this type of professional activity on the morale of the participants may help to determine how much support should be accorded such activities.

2. Findings may provide additional support for justification of continued state funding for the visiting committee phase of the secondary school evaluation program and expansion of state funding to include the visiting committee phase for junior
high/intermediate/middle schools.

3. Findings may provide information to local school boards and division superintendents relative to possible benefits received by the local school division which allows a teacher to participate on an evaluation team and provides funds for substitute salary while the teacher is away from the home school assignment.

4. Findings should add to the body of knowledge in school evaluations in a way that has not been emphasized in other research.

5. Findings may provide information beneficial to the Virginia Department of Education, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and the National Study of School Evaluation in their continuing efforts to make the school evaluation process beneficial to all participants.

6. Findings will provide suggestions for improvement of procedures for the visiting committee phase of the Virginia Secondary School Evaluation Program.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and definitions have special meaning for this study:

1. Evaluation/Evaluation Process - An
organized, systematic procedure of self-study, visiting committee review, and follow-up activities directed toward school improvement.

2. Secondary Schools - Schools classified as high schools by the Virginia Department of Education.

3. Self-Study/Self-Evaluation - An assessment of the various components of the school's educational program by the total staff of the school, with input from student and community sources, which results in identification of strengths and weaknesses.

4. Visiting Committee/Evaluation Committee - A group of professional educators who are invited into a school to react to that faculty's self-study and produce a document that identifies strengths and weaknesses of the school's educational program.

5. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools - One of the six regional accrediting agencies which accredit schools in the United States. The regional accreditation agency which accredits schools in Virginia and ten other southern states (North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Tennessee, Kentucky, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi).

6. Teacher-Morale - A psychological state of well-being that is based upon the teacher's total score on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire.
7. Teachers - Those who hold professional positions in secondary schools and whose professional assignments require direct daily contact with children for instructional purposes.

8. Sex - Male or female.


10. Education - The highest degree attained by the teacher. Categorized into four groups: Bachelor's Degree, Master's Degree, Specialist Degree or Certificate of Advanced Study, Doctoral Degree.

11. Marital Status - Married or single.

12. Area of Instructional Assignment - Categorized into four groups: Academic, Fine Arts, Vocational, other.

13. Years of Total Teaching Experience - Categorized into four groups: 0-3, 4-9, 10-19, 20-29. 30 or more.

14. Teacher Rapport with Principal - The subscore of the PTO which describes teacher feelings about the principal's professional competence, interest in teachers and their work, ability to communicate, and skill in human relations (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:4).

15. Satisfaction with Teaching - The subscore of the PTO which describes teacher feelings about
relationships with students and satisfaction with teaching (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:4).

16. Rapport Among Teachers - The subscore of the PTO which describes teacher relationships with other teachers (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:4).

17. Teacher Salary - The subscore of the PTO which describes teacher feelings about salaries and salary policies (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:4).

18. Teacher Load - The subscore of the PTO which describes teacher feelings about such matters as record-keeping, clerical work, community demands on teacher time, extra curricular load and keeping up to date professionally (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:4).

19. Curriculum Issues - The subscore of the PTO which describes teacher feelings about the adequacy of the school program in meeting student needs, in providing for individual differences, and in preparing students for effective citizenship (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:4).

20. Teacher Status - The subscore of the PTO which describes teacher feelings about the prestige, security, and benefits afforded by teaching (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:4).

21. Community Support of Education - The subscore of the PTO which describes teacher feelings
about the extent to which the community understands and is willing to support a sound educational program (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:4).

22. School Facilities and Services - The subscore of the PTO which describes teacher feelings about the adequacy of facilities, supplies and equipment, and the efficiency of the procedures for obtaining materials and services (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:4).

23. Community Pressures - The subscore of the PTO which describes community expectations with respect to the teacher's personal standards, participation in outside-school activities and freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:4).

24. Short-term Morale Score Gain - The difference between the pre-test morale score (T1) and the score obtained on the last day of a teacher's membership on a visiting committee (T2).

25. Long-term Morale Score Gain - The difference between the pre-test morale score (T1) and the score obtained during May, 1982 (T3).

26. Retention of Morale Score Gain - The difference between the score obtained on the last day of a teacher's membership on a visiting committee (T2) and
the score obtained during May, 1982 (T3).

27. Recommended Teacher - A secondary school teacher who has been recommended for visiting committee membership by Virginia Department of Education staff members or by administrators from educational institutions in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to secondary school teachers who were holding professional instructional positions in the Commonwealth of Virginia and who were recommended for participation on one of the thirteen secondary school visiting committees scheduled for the fall semester of the 1981-82 school year. Recommendations for visiting committee participation were made by professional staff members of the Virginia Department of Education and supplemented by voluntary contributions of names received from administrators who are currently active at various levels of secondary education and related fields. Secondary teachers who served on visiting committees during the 1980-81 school year were not considered for the recommended lists due to the Department of Education policy of not inviting a teacher to serve on a visiting committee during two consecutive school years.
Organization of the Study

Within the remainder of this five chapter study, Chapter Two presents a review of related literature and research associated with evaluation and morale. Chapter Three contains a description of research methodology employed in the study. Chapter Four provides an analysis of the data, and Chapter Five contains the summary, findings, conclusions and recommendations based on the analysis of the data.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

This review of research and related literature was limited to the general areas of evaluation, accreditation and morale, the focus of the study. The vast amount of research in the areas of morale and related factors necessitated a restriction in the scope of the literature review to include the selected areas of morale definition, concept and relationship to educational factors. The review of evaluation and accreditation topics has been designed to provide an overview of the relationship between state and regional evaluation and accreditation, and to describe the secondary school evaluation process and its component parts as practiced in Virginia high schools at the time of the study.

Evaluation and Accreditation

Accreditation is the term that has been applied to the process whereby an organization or agency recognizes a school or a program of study as having met certain qualifications or standards that have been
established as criteria (Selden, 1960:6). This type of recognition may be held by various levels of educational institutions if they have met or exceeded the accepted standards by the designated competent agency or official association (DeYoung, 1960:420). Accreditation is primarily a means to an end, with the stimulation of growth and improvement in schools as its chief value (Commonwealth of Virginia, 1976:1). While there are many definitions of the process and no commonality exists in the usage of the terms accredit, approve, accept, certify, classify, license, recognize, and register, it is a general assumption that the attainment of accreditation indicates a commendable and meritorious status that is not self-assumed (Orlans, 1975:1-4).

State universities in the midwestern part of the United States approached this problem of recognition with their accreditation method, a procedure which allowed university professors to visit high schools within their states which were seeking accreditation. Following the visit and related discussions, the group of visitors from the university determined if the difficulty of the high school curriculum and the preparation of its staff would insure that graduates who were recommended by the school officials or had a certain academic standing could receive automatic
admission into the university program. (Church, 1976:292).

The University of Michigan, in 1871, was the first institution of higher learning to form a commission for the purpose of inspecting the high schools of that state. This group evaluated the quality of teachers, organization and offerings of the curriculum, and standards achieved by the students of the particular school. Following the evaluation, and if the school's program were approved by the commission, graduates would be admitted to the University of Michigan without further examination. This method became so popular that, by the end of the nineteenth century, over two hundred colleges and universities were using some variation of this accrediting procedure (Butts, 1947:513).

It soon became apparent to the universities involved in the review of high school programs that it was going to be impossible to achieve the desired level of curriculum standardization since many out-of-state students were seeking admission. Behind the leadership of the state universities, the process of voluntary accreditation through regional standardizing agencies developed as an effort of groups of colleges and secondary schools to mutually agree on standards of
achievement. These standards would insure the participating high schools that their graduates would be able to meet the colleges' entrance requirements (Campbell et al., 1965:457).

The initiative for the development of the regional accreditation concept in the Southern states came from college representatives who recognized the need to elevate educational standards and establish closer relationships with the secondary schools within their regions (Selden, 1960:31). This identified need led to the formation of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in 1895 (Campbell, 1965:457).

The chief purpose of accreditation, as expressed by the Commission on Secondary Schools of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, is the stimulation of improvement in member secondary schools. The accreditation procedure which has been established by the Commission on Secondary Schools insures that each school accredited by the Commission and approved for membership by the Association has been closely screened at five stages in the process. The school is required to conduct a self-study and be evaluated by a visiting committee, have the evaluation studied by members of the State Committee, have the recommendations of the State Committee reviewed and evaluated by the appropriate
Reviewing Committee, and have the actions of the Reviewing Committee considered by the Commission and then by the School Delegate Assembly at the Annual Meeting of the Association (SACS, 1981:4-7).

Most educational institutions have periodically been the subjects of an accreditation study. Such studies of institutions are in the realm of true evaluation efforts, since institutions and personnel are studied to prove whether they serve designated functions in society. Basically, the source of questions for accreditation studies address the following: Are institutions, programs, and personnel meeting minimum standards, and how can their performance be improved? These questions are typically answered through self-study and self-reporting by the individual or institution. Panels of experts are then assigned to visit the institution, verify a self-report, and gather additional information. The basis for the self-studies and the visits by expert panels are usually guidelines that have been specified by the accrediting agency (Stufflebean and Webster, 1980:11).

Tyler, in reflecting upon evaluation as a program of improvement, stated the following:

Considered broadly, evaluation is the discovery of the nature and worth of something. In relation to education, we may evaluate students, teachers, curriculums, administrators, systems, programs, and nations. The purpose for an
evaluation may be many, but always, evaluation attempts to describe something and to indicate its perceived merits and shortcomings. (1969:370)

Manlove and McGlasson (1965:64-76) concluded from a survey that evaluation and accreditation, while not synonymous, are usually inseparable. Indications are that accreditation generally depends upon a previous systematic evaluation, and that evaluation often leads to accreditation.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools has been accrediting secondary schools in Virginia and ten other southern states since 1896. The relationship of regional accreditation to the process of school evaluation is described in the following paragraph from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Policies and Procedures For Evaluation and Accreditation:

Assessment of the level of quality and excellence of any organization, process, or service is the central purpose of evaluation and accreditation. In the case of school evaluation or accreditation, sound determination of quality can be achieved only in terms of criteria that indicate whether or not the school's operations and accomplishments are in conformity with acceptable purposes. As has been pointed out, the Southern Association believes that evaluation and accreditation stimulate improvement in member institutions. (SACS, 1981:8)

As expressed by Hunt (1978:260), the decision by school authorities is not whether to evaluate or not evaluate,
because evaluation is constantly taking place formally or informally. It is rather to determine why to evaluate, then evaluate regularly.

In Virginia the evaluation process is conducted in schools for two basic reasons: self-improvement and to meet accreditation requirements. Standards for Accrediting Secondary Schools in Virginia makes the following reference to evaluation:

The evaluation of a secondary school by a visiting committee of the Department of Education shall be considered an essential aspect of accreditation. (1979:2)

The Policies and Procedures For Evaluation and Accreditation of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools requires that all schools seeking membership be evaluated prior to being admitted and that the evaluation process be conducted every ten years thereafter (SACS, 1981:10).

The Commonwealth of Virginia Board of Education has shown a commitment to the value of the evaluation of public schools by providing a consultant or coordinator from the professional staff to schools conducting evaluation and by appropriating money to pay expenses for visiting committee members while evaluating secondary schools. This state aid has been in effect since 1947, and, among the eleven southern states which make up the Southern Association of Colleges and
Schools, is unique to Virginia (Magill, 1980:28).

Jewell (1981:7) explains that the objective aspect of accreditation in Virginia is promoted through the administration of the accreditation process, and the subjective aspect is encouraged by requiring schools to show evidence of a definite program for the improvement of instruction, identifying needs and problems of the school and working toward solving the identified problems. The evaluation program and the services of a supervisory staff with expertise in all phases of the educational process is provided by the Virginia Department of Education to assist in these endeavors.

In an Oregon study of the follow-up to high school evaluations, Hahn (1955:120-132) found that teachers and principals felt the evaluation process provided support for known needs, opportunity to determine program strengths and weaknesses through self-analysis and inter-departmental understanding and appreciation. He suggested that school faculties should develop improvement programs based on their evaluations, since only through systematic, purposeful follow-up can effective implementation result for visiting committee recommendations.

Ricart (1956:321-341), in a study of twelve public secondary schools in Pittsburgh, concluded that
the evaluations within the studied schools had been an effective force in stimulating a continuous program of improvement.

Sheely's study (1967:145) of the reevaluation of twenty-eight Indiana high schools found that the evaluation process was responsible for a large number of both quantitative and qualitative changes in each of the participating schools.

Magill (1980:163), in a follow-up study of the evaluation process in Virginia Junior High, Middle, and Intermediate schools, concluded that the process of school evaluation had been responsible for a large number of planned changes directed at improvement.

Although the previously cited authors emphasized the positive aspects of the evaluation process, there are opposing viewpoints. Stufflebean and Webster (1980:11) concluded that the main advantage of the values-oriented accreditation study is that it aids lay persons in making informed judgments about the quality of educational institutions and the qualifications of educational personnel. The main difficulties are that the guidelines of accrediting bodies typically emphasize the intrinsic and not the outcome criteria of education and that the self-study and visitation phases offer many opportunities for corruption and inept performance.
In summary, it has been observed that of all societies, the free one depends most heavily on quality education for the fulfillment of its destiny. The teacher and the quality of the teacher's performance are of paramount importance. The likelihood that the teacher will improve is enhanced when evaluation is carried out systematically in accordance with good planning, conscientious follow-through and careful assessment of results (Commonwealth of Virginia, 1974:1).

The Virginia Secondary School Evaluation Program

School evaluation as practiced by the Virginia Department of Education is a gathering and assessment of information for the purpose of providing assistance in formulating an organized, continuous program of school improvement. This program is most effective when accomplished with the consent and interest of those being evaluated and should be carried out primarily by peer groups. Ratings should be a minor objective; rather, emphasis should be placed on realistic perception of strengths and areas of concern (Williams, 1980:19).

The phases of the evaluation process for the secondary school which is being evaluated are self-
evaluation, evaluation by a visiting committee and follow-up activities.

The Self-Study Phase

The self-study phase of the evaluation process is conducted over a period of twelve to eighteen months. During this time the total school staff and student and community representatives participate in activities that lead to the identification of strengths and weaknesses characteristic of the school (NSSE, 1978:6).

Dr. E. E. Brickell, Division Superintendent of the Virginia Beach City Public Schools, in an October 8, 1980, open letter to the faculty and staff of Plaza Junior High School, summarizes the worth of the self-study phase of the evaluation program in these words:

No doubt the self-study is the most illuminating and significant part of the accreditation process, and it can yield many beneficial results.

It is an instrument for opening a channel of communication between the school and its community; it is the springboard for encouraging an assessment of community needs and community understanding of the school program, pinpointing strengths and weaknesses; it provides for an analysis of existing school conditions and practices; it requires individual and staff deliberation, discussion, research, and informational changes; it affords an opportunity for participation in school management through recommendations for improvement.
Finally, it is the catalyst for a systematic plan for school improvement.

The Visiting Committee Phase

Shortly after the initiation of self-evaluation, the coordinator invites a well-qualified educator to serve as chairperson of the visiting committee which will evaluate the school upon completion of the self-study. Once the visiting committee chairperson has accepted the invitation to serve, the coordinator meets with him to discuss the progress of the self-evaluation, provide background information, and work with him in planning for the detailed work ahead, devoting special attention to plans for the subsequent evaluation by the visiting committee (Young, 1974:2).

The visiting committee includes members who have educational backgrounds and experiences in all areas being evaluated. They may represent the state department of education and collegiate institutions, or be superintendents, principals or teachers. Members are not selected from the school division in which the school being evaluated is located (SACS, 1981:7).

The purpose of the visiting committee is to validate the evaluation carried out by the school staff and to suggest changes to improve the educational program. This visitation is required if the evaluation
is to be used for regional accreditation purposes and can be valuable to the school's administrators when the evaluation is used to interpret the work of the school to the community, parents, alumni and appropriate boards (NSSE, 1978:7).

The work of the visiting committee can be categorized into six phases. The first phase is a perusal of the school's self-study, with particular attention given to the general area reports. The visiting committee members also give special attention to those areas to which they are assigned as subcommittee members. The second phase includes a review of the completed Evaluative Criteria sections which correspond to the visiting committee members' assignments. These sections are usually mailed to the subcommittee chairperson with the self-study report and will be available to all subcommittee members upon their arrival at the school. Discussions with the corresponding faculty subcommittees are a part of this phase and take place on the first day of the visiting committee evaluation.

Phase three begins with the visitation of classes for the purpose of determining the effectiveness of instruction and appropriate use of teaching aids and materials. Appropriate subcommittee members also meet
with personnel in the areas of student support services. An attempt is made to have each teacher visited at least twice. The fourth phase requires the writing of subcommittee reports for presentation to the entire visiting committee.

The fifth phase includes a discussion of preliminary findings with faculty subcommittee members. This provides an opportunity to correlate visiting committee information with the school subcommittee members and to correct discrepancies. The final phase of the visiting committee's work is the presentation of the report to the faculty. The general area reports are discussed with faculty subcommittee members, and a faculty meeting is held for the visiting committee chairperson to deliver summary and concluding remarks (Williams, 1981:76-77).

The Follow-up Phase
When the visiting committee leaves the school, the faculty and administration have two documents from which to develop an organized plan for improvement: the self-study report and the visiting committee report. This plan should lead to improvements in the following areas:

1. better staff understanding and commitment to purpose
2. an improved school program
3. improvement of staff personnel
4. better utilization of facilities
5. better school-community interaction
6. better coordination among all concerned with the school
7. broader understanding of the total school program by staff members (Young, 1974:4-6).

The implementation of these and other improvements is the follow-up phase of the evaluation program. For secondary schools in Virginia, this phase has two aspects: the Virginia Department of Education eighteen-month follow-up, and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools five-year interim evaluation procedure.

The Virginia Department of Education eighteen month follow-up report asks for a breakdown of recommendations implemented and recommendations deemed not valid for the school. This information is reviewed by the Supervisor of Secondary School Evaluations and the school's progress made a matter of record. A corresponding progress report based on the school's response is also made to the Virginia Secondary Committee, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools five-year interim evaluation process exists to insure an
organized program of school improvement and continuous progress toward the implementation of recommendations made during the evaluation process. To this end, the Virginia Secondary Committee provides information and assistance to member schools to insure that the evaluation process develops into a continuous, coordinated program for each school. This committee, through the office of the Executive Secretary, supplies schools with suggestions for follow-up organization, follow-up timetable development and reporting format. (Virginia Secondary Committee, 1981:15-19).

At the beginning of the sixth year following visiting committee evaluation, a member of the Virginia Secondary Committee and the educator who served as chairperson for the previous visiting committee evaluation make arrangements with the school's principal to visit the school. During this visit to the school, the interim evaluation committee discusses with administrators and faculty members the progress that has been reflected in the five-year interim report and serves as consultant on special school concerns or problems. This committee then delivers a report to the principal and central office representative concerning observations made and recommendations for continued improvement (Williams, 1981:101-105).
Morale

Morale is an imprecise although highly important term that is related to the emotional and mental reaction of a person to his job. It may best be conceived as a continuous variable. The level of morale is then determined by the extent to which an individual's needs are satisfied, and the extent to which the individual perceives satisfaction as stemming from the total job situation. High morale is evident when there is interest in and enthusiasm for the job. What is important in morale is what the person believes and feels, rather than the conditions that may exist as perceived by others (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:1).

The Definition and Concept

Research interests and efforts in the area of employee attitudes began to mount in the late 1920's and 1930's. One of the first systematic research efforts devoted to human factors in work situations was accomplished by Elton Mayo at the Hawthorne Plant of the Western Electric Company during the years 1927-1932. The interest that developed from this study motivated a greater research emphasis in human relations, job satisfaction, and morale. These early studies by Mayo
indicated that productivity was more than a function of employee aptitude, training, and the skills possessed (Spivey, 1978:11-12).

Many investigators of teacher morale have treated total scores as though morale was unidimensional, and yet one of the few points of agreement among recent researchers of morale has been that morale is multidimensional. The practice of measuring morale in terms of a preconceived definition assigned by the investigator has been inadequate as a means of identifying and measuring the various dimensions of morale. Within this context, Bentley and Rempel have defined morale as "the professional interest and enthusiasm that a person displays toward the achievement of individual and group goals in a given job situation" (1980:2). This definition recognized the satisfaction of both individual and group needs and their effective harmonization as a basis for morale.

Child, in a report of a conference on psychological factors in morale held in 1940 at Cambridge, recognized three realms of discussion and offered the following definitions of morale:

1. (The individual-organic emphasis) The term morale refers to a condition of physical and emotional well-being in the individual that makes it possible for him to work and live hopefully and effectively, feeling that he shares the basic purposes of the groups of which he is a member; and that makes it possible for
him to perform his tasks with energy, enthusiasm, and self-discipline, sustained by a conviction that, in spite of obstacles and conflict, his personal and social ideals are worth pursuing.

2. (The group emphasis) Morale refers to the condition of a group where there are clear and fixed group goals (purposes) that are felt to be important and integrated with individual goals; where there is confidence in the attainment, in the leaders, associates, and finally in oneself; where group actions are integrated and cooperative; and where aggression and hostility are expressed against the forces frustrating the group rather than toward other individuals within the group.

3. (Emphasis on "individual within the group" on any specific occasion) Given a certain task to be accomplished by the group, morale pertains to all factors in the individual's life that bring about a hopeful and energetic participation on his part so that his efforts enhance the effectiveness of the group in accomplishing the task at hand. (1941:393-400)

Watson (1942:30) observed that good morale was shown by the stamina with which people stand up under punishment and by the energy with which they strive to realize their ideals. As the corollary, he explained that poor morale was evidenced by those who could not take it and who became easily discouraged and disillusioned.

Watson, along with Likert, Batesoh, Lazarsfeld, and Lewin, participated in a round-table discussion on morale that was sponsored by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. During the period of their deliberations the discussants decided that
morale had five components:

1. A clearly defined, positive goal: people need hope and something to look forward to in order to sustain high morale.

2. Togetherness and mutual support: people need to feel a sense of common purpose in order to sustain high morale.

3. Knowledge of common danger: high morale requires shared danger which can arouse the individual and the group into a higher state of energy mobilization.

4. Something each can do: there must be a conviction that it is possible to overcome the danger and achieve the goal and that each member shares important tasks.

5. Approaching the goal: there must be a sense of progress toward the goal. (Motowidlo et al., 1976:50)

Hahn and Morse (1951:8) defined morale as the sum of satisfactions which the individual experiences because of his membership and involvement in an organization. Gordon (1955:1) stated that morale is a feeling of well-being experienced by an individual when his needs are being filled to his satisfaction. Stagner (1958:64), in a report of the motivational aspects of industrial morale, observed that morale is an index of the extent to which the individual perceives a probability of satisfying his own motives through cooperation with the group. At the same symposium, Guion (1958:62) reported on the problems of terminology.
He pointed out that the group of psychologists had revealed various definitions of morale and listed them as follows:

1. the absence of conflict
2. a feeling of happiness
3. good personal adjustment
4. ego-involvement in one's job
5. cohesiveness of the group
6. collection of job related attitudes
7. acceptance of the group's goals

He then proceeded to offer his own definition of morale as "the extent to which the individual's needs are satisfied and the extent to which the individual perceives that satisfaction as stemming from his total job situation." Katzell (1958:73) stressed that "morale is a condition of congruent motivation among members of a group, resulting in relatively high levels of energy expenditure toward common goals having positive valence."

Getzels and Guba (1957:438-439) developed a model which suggested a definition of morale as the interaction among the variables of belongingness, rationality and identification. They defined the variable "belongingness" as how well an individual perceives that meeting institutional expectations will
permit him to serve personal needs, "rationality" as the perception of the relationship between individual and group goals and "identification" as the degree to which an individual is able to integrate the goals of the institution with his own needs.

Gregory expressed the opinion that when people are happy morale is high. He suggested two definitions for morale:

In general terms, it has been described as a feeling of belongingness or a feeling of happiness resulting from good personal adjustment through the satisfaction of individual needs and the absence of conflict.

On the industrial level, morale has been variously defined as a collection of job-related attitudes, an individual's ego involvement in his job, his personal acceptance of the goals of the group, and his satisfaction with the job in general. (1959:33)

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, in a 1959 study of the industrial employee motivations of 203 accountants and engineers, found that positive events are dominated by references to intrinsic aspects of the job, such as achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and advancement. Negative events are dominated by extrinsic factors such as interpersonal relations with superiors and peers, technical supervision, company policy and administration, working conditions and personal life. Based on these factors, the researchers concluded that the presence of certain
factors called satisfiers act to increase the individual's job satisfaction, but the absence of these factors does not necessarily cause job dissatisfaction. There are other factors called dissatisfiers which, when absent, do not necessarily result in satisfaction and positive motivation. In brief, this two-factor theory of motivation postulates that one set of factors (motivators) produces satisfaction, but another set (hygienes) produces dissatisfaction. Work satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not opposites; rather, they are separate and distinct dimensions of work orientation that increase or decrease from a neutral point of job satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction (Hoy and Miskel, 1978:102-104).

Spivey reports that Herzberg, in a 1966 study, described job satisfaction as a dichotomous variable, as opposed to the previous concept of job satisfaction as a continuous variable, and reflected further on the 1959 research:

First, the factors involved in producing job satisfaction were separate and distinct from the factors that led to job dissatisfaction . . . . These two factors were not obverse of each other. Thus, the opposite of job satisfaction would not be job dissatisfaction, but rather no satisfaction; similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction, not satisfaction with one's job. (1977:15-16)

Summers, who also conducted research on morale
in industry, reports the following:

...the general feeling seems to be that morale consists of a composite of factors. Morale can be viewed as a description of esprit de corps, enthusiasm, or zeal. Most definitions hint and relate to various satisfactions obtained from the job or work environment. Some of the factors comprising morale are: personality of the individual, job performance, ability, motivation, working conditions, organizational structure, supervisor's leadership style, individual needs, etc. (1965:40)

Later research and literature stressed the importance of group influences on morale. Davis (1967:58), in his book on the subject of human relations and organizational behavior, defined morale as "the attitudes of individuals and groups toward their environment and toward voluntary cooperation to the full extent of their ability in the best interests of the group." Blum and Naylor (1968:391) argued that morale is related to job satisfaction but is not the same thing. They attempted to define morale and its group and motivational aspects in four main determinants: a feeling of togetherness; the need for a goal; observable progress toward the goal; and specific, meaningful tasks necessary for goal achievement distributed among the group members.

Motowidlo (1976:48-60), in a review of motivation, satisfaction and morale in army careers, explained that the combined writings of psychologists
and military authors on morale suggest that a high-morale group is cohesive with high levels of esprit de corps and unit pride. He summarized the thinking of military authors about morale as a state of mind characterized by the following:

- a. a sense of advancing toward a worthwhile goal
- b. an exaltation of ideals
- c. a determination to reach the goal
- d. positive and adaptive attitudes toward adverse conditions
- e. feelings of contentment and satisfaction
- f. courage
- g. discipline
- h. self-confidence
- i. feelings of group cohesiveness

Kline, in a 1977 paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, defined morale as a condition of readiness for the next challenge. He explained readiness as characterized by accumulated energy, having a future-time orientation, arising from satisfaction and expectation of forthcoming challenges and successes, and tending toward the subsequent work activity.

Cooper (1977:9) observed that high morale does not ensure high productivity and that certain situ-
ational and environmental factors, as well as motiva-
tional determinants that result in greater worker
effectiveness and productivity, may generate high morale
and job satisfaction.

Hogan, in a 1979 address to English teachers in
two-year colleges, summarized his thoughts on the
changes that have taken place in the concept of morale
with these words:

We should recognize the difference between
morale and esprit de corps (we use them as if
they're interchangeable, and they're not).
Esprit de corps is what you feel when everything
is going great. Morale is what you feel when
it's not quite going so well. There's a
difference between the '60s and the '70s in our
profession. In the '60s there was money all
around; there were growing enrollments and jobs
for everybody. Then we had esprit de corps.
Now we need morale.

The Relationship to Educational/Demographic Factors

Luther F. Shealy, in a study of the relationship
between selected variables and teacher morale, found
that readily accessible data about teachers are useful
in the prediction of morale level. His conclusions
included the following:

1. The single best set of prediction variables
   was the academic variables: National Teacher
   Exam score, type of degree, and number of
   education courses.

2. Correlations indicated that older, more
   experienced teachers with more professional
   education courses and advanced degrees tended to
   have higher morale.
3. Morale level of male teachers was lower than the morale level of female teachers.

4. There was a higher morale level for teachers whose salary was not the primary source of income, nor needed for family expenses.

5. Elementary teachers had higher morale than secondary teachers. (1974:6997A)

Tharpe (1976:3280A), in a study of morale of public elementary, junior high, and high school teachers in Louisiana, found that conditions affecting teacher status, image and salary have especially strong impact on the morale of male teachers, who exhibited lower morale scores than female teachers. She also found that the teaching profession is more gratifying to female teachers with respect to salary, status and working conditions, and that levels of teacher morale usually increase as teaching experience increases. She concluded that since more experienced teachers have higher morale levels, it is likely that teachers are more susceptible to low morale levels during their early years of teaching.

Allred, in a study of teacher morale as it relates to the principal's administrative leadership style, found the following:

1. There is a significant positive relationship between teacher morale and the age of the teacher.

2. There is not a significant relationship between teacher morale and the sex of the
teacher.

3. There is not a significant relationship between teacher morale and the educational level of the teacher.

4. There is a significant relationship between teacher morale and the teacher's length of service. (1980:4218A)

Reese, in a study of the morale of North Carolina teachers in fifty randomly selected schools during the 1978-79 school year, concluded the following:

1. Teacher morale can be better determined by focusing on the components that make up morale as well as on a total morale score.

2. Age made little difference in regard to teacher morale, although a gradual progression in the level of morale was noted with increasing age, except for the 41-45 age group category, whose members had the lowest morale.

3. In general, female teachers had higher morale than male teachers.

4. Non-white teachers had higher morale than white teachers.

5. Marital status, teaching experience, years taught in present teaching situation, grade level presently taught, and educational level of the teacher made no difference in terms of the morale of teachers.

6. Size of school was related to teacher morale. Schools with 501-1000 students enrolled ranked higher with regard to morale factors "community support of education" and "school facilities and services". (1980:72-73)

Lewis (1968:3382A), in a survey of public school teachers in the Shikellamy, Pennsylvania, school district, investigated factors which tend to lower,
strengthen or improve teacher morale. The conclusions formulated from data received from the 214 study participants revealed that teachers 50 years of age and older had very high morale and that teachers in the younger 20-34 age group had low or very low morale. He also found that teachers with a master's degree or higher generally had average or higher morale, that married teachers had the highest morale rating, and that approximately one-half of the teachers having at least twenty-six years of teaching experience had high or very high morale, while only one-third of the teachers with one to ten years of teaching experience had corresponding high or very high morale levels.

Johnson, Clary, and Brown studied the morale of 114 vocational education teachers in Guilford and Johnston counties in North Carolina in 1969 by relating the ten factors on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire of teacher morale to each of eight selected demographic factors. Their findings are summarized below:

1. A significant relationship was found between sex of the teacher and the dimensions "satisfaction with teaching" and "teacher status". Female teachers scored higher than male teachers on these morale dimensions.

2. Highest mean morale scores on all ten morale dimensions were attained by teachers who were grouped in the category "fifty years of age and older".

3. There were no statistically significant relationships between teacher morale and
educational level. (1969:35-37)

Rempel and Bentley (1963:236-238), in a study of 263 vocational agriculture teachers in Indiana, found that teachers having from fifteen to thirty years of teaching experience had significantly higher morale than those with less than fifteen or more than thirty years of teaching experience. They also found that teachers with only the bachelor's degree and little or no additional training had significantly lower morale than teachers with more preparation.

Spivey (1977:753A) used the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and Russell's Change Orientation Instrument to study the relationships between morale and change orientation of 936 randomly selected vocational education teachers in Alabama. His conclusions were that teachers with high morale tend to have more positive attitudes toward change and that teacher morale is influenced by variables that include daily student load, adequacy of facilities and equipment, age of the teacher and education of the teacher.

Davis (1979:3648A), in a study conducted in the European region Department of Defense Dependents School on teacher perceptions of factors contributing to staff morale and the principal's management style found that teacher morale was unrelated to any demographic factor
analyzed in the study except age. However, Bergeth (1970:6293A), in a study in selected school divisions in North Dakota, found that teachers with the least education had higher morale than teachers with advanced degrees and that more experienced teachers had higher morale than less experienced teachers.

Forrest (1970:1701A) utilized the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire to study the relationships between selected independent demographic variables and the morale of 683 teacher respondents representing seven vocational and one non-vocational educational fields. An analysis of the data revealed the existence of a significant relationship between one or more of the morale factors and the independent variables: teaching field, age, race, teaching experience, years in present teaching position, size of school and daily student load.

Summary

Research supports the thesis that teacher morale has a direct influence on the operation of a school and that good staff morale is important to the operation of an effective educational program. The professional staff members' perception of their role in the school and in the community, the ways in which achievement and participation are recognized, administrative
expectations of the teacher and the opportunities that exist for professional growth are factors that contribute to the level of teacher morale within a school.

The school evaluation process provides the opportunity for teachers to participate in the decision-making procedure during the self-evaluation phase of the program and permits a number of teachers to be recognized as professionally competent through participation on visiting committees which react to the self-evaluation completed by staff members of another school. This identification and participation in an extended four-day professional endeavor gives the teacher an opportunity to be involved in professionally related discussions that explore ideal educational situations for all areas of a comprehensive instructional program.

Much of the most recent research relating to teacher morale has utilized the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire as the data collection instrument and has explored the morale factors which make up the total morale score of the instrument. These studies have examined various levels of demographic independent variables and support the thesis that age and experience, sex, level of education attained, marital
status and teaching assignment have an influence on teacher morale.

The existing research concentrates on teacher morale and relationships with demographic categories. There was found no evidence of research relating teacher morale with professional in-service experiences for teachers.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Chapter Three includes a description of the research design utilized in the study, a listing of research hypotheses which guided the study, an explanation of sample selection and instrumentation, a review of reliability and validity established for the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire and discussions of data collection and data analysis procedures.

Research Design

The study utilized a pre-test/post-test control group design to determine the effect of visiting committee participation on teacher morale, as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. The research groups were determined as follows:

Group I: (Experimental Group E1) Recommended teachers who had no previous visiting committee experience and who served on a visiting committee during the fall semester of the 1981-82 school year.

Group II: (Experimental Group E2) Recommended teachers who had previous visiting committee experience
and served on a visiting committee during the fall semester of the 1981-82 school year.

Group III: (Control Group C1) Recommended teachers who had no previous visiting committee experience and did not serve on a visiting committee during the 1981-82 school year.

Group IV: (Control Group C2) Recommended teachers who had previous visiting committee experience and did not serve on a visiting committee during the 1981-82 school year.

Group V: (Experimental Group N1) Teachers with no previous visiting committee experience, who served on a visiting committee during the fall semester of the 1981-82 school year, but were recommended by sources other than the Virginia Department of Education.

Group VI: (Experimental Group N2) Teachers who had previous visiting committee experience, served on a visiting committee during the fall semester of the 1981-82 school year, but were recommended by sources other than the Virginia Department of Education.

Stratified random sampling was used to select 250 teachers from the recommended list of visiting committee members for 1981-82. These teachers received the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire during October, 1981 (T1), before the initiation of visiting committee
activities for the 1981-82 school year. Visiting committee participants received an additional administration of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (T2) on the last day of their respective visiting committee assignments. These scores provided an indication of short-term gain (T2-T1) in teacher morale and offered a comparison with the long-term gain (T3-T1) as indicated by the scores from the administration of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire to all groups during May, 1982 (T3), approximately six months after the visiting committee experience.

The paradigm for this research design was as follows:

E1 - - R - - T1 --> X --> T2 --> T3
E2 - - R - - T1 --> X --> T2 --> T3
C1 - - R - - T1 --> --> --> --> --> T3
C2 - - R - - T1 --> --> --> --> --> T3
N1 - - - - - --> --> X --> T2 --> T3
N2 - - - - - --> --> X --> T2 --> T3
R: the stratified random sampling method that is common to groups E1, E2, C1 and C2

T1: administration of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire at the beginning of the 1981-82 school year

T2: administration of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire immediately following the treatment,
visiting committee participation

T3: administration of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire in May, 1982

X: the treatment, visiting committee participation

-->: progressive sequence of the 1981-82 school year

Dependent variables:

1. Total score on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

2. Scores on the ten factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

Independent variables:

1. Visiting committee membership

2. Previous visiting committee experience

3. Demographic categories: sex, age, education, marital status, area of instructional assignment, years of teaching experience

A direct comparison of group means and differences in gain scores between the research groups was made to determine the singular effect of the independent variable, visiting committee experience, on teacher morale and the ten factors of morale. Differences in mean scores were tested for significance using t-test statistical procedures. Analysis of variance
statistical procedures were used to test the demographic independent variables for significance.

Research Hypotheses

The seven null hypotheses which were derived from the stated purpose of the study and related questions were as follows:

1. There is no significant difference in the pre-test morale scores of state recommended teachers who have had previous visiting committee membership and state recommended teachers who have not had previous visiting committee membership.

2. There is no significant difference in the pre-test morale scores of state recommended teachers who are selected for visiting committee membership and state recommended teachers who are not selected for visiting committee membership.

3. There is no significant difference in the short-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have had previous visiting committee membership and state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have not had previous visiting committee membership.

4. There is no significant difference in the
retention of gain scores of teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have had previous visiting committee membership and teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have not had previous visiting committee membership.

5. There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and state recommended teachers who did not serve on a current visiting committee.

6. There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and state recommended teachers who did not serve on a current visiting committee on the following ten morale factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire:
   a. Teacher rapport with principal
   b. Satisfaction with teaching
   c. Rapport among teachers
   d. Teacher salary
   e. Teacher load
   f. Curriculum issues
   g. Teacher status
   h. Community support of education
   i. School facilities and services
j. Community pressures

7. There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee when based on the following demographic variables:

a. Sex
b. Age
c. Educational level
d. Marital status
e. Instructional Assignment
f. Years of teaching experience

Sample Selection

Members of the experimental and control groups were selected by random sampling procedures from predescribed groups. Groups I, II, III, and IV were derived from lists of suggested visiting committee members that are obtained annually from the professional staff members of the Virginia Department of Education. The lists of recommended visiting committee members for the 1981-82 school year contained the names of 333 secondary teachers recommended for membership on the thirteen evaluations scheduled for the fall semester. A 75% sample (N=250) was obtained by eliminating every fourth name as contained on the subject area lists. The
sample was divided into two units: the experimental groups I (prior experience) and II (no prior experience) from the unit which consisted of recommended teachers who were selected to be members of visiting committees and the control groups III (prior experience) and IV (no prior experience) from the unit which consisted of recommended teachers who were not selected to be members of visiting committees. Experimental groups V and VI consisted of those secondary teachers who were selected for visiting committee membership but were not included on the recommended lists from which the sample was drawn.

The 1981-82 recommended lists for visiting committees were obtained for the following instructional areas as listed in the Evaluative Criteria, 5th Edition, published by the National Study of School Evaluation: Agriculture; Art; Business Education; Distributive Education; Driver Education; English; Foreign Language; Health and Physical Education; Home Economics; Industrial Arts; Mathematics; Music; Science; Social Studies; Special Education; and Trade and Industrial Education.

Table I reflects the pre-test population sample in the different areas of instructional assignments and the return percentage for each instructional area.
### Table 1
Pre-test Survey Data Collection Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Area</th>
<th>Number In Sample</th>
<th>Percentage Of Sample</th>
<th>Number Surveys Returned</th>
<th>Percentage Instructional Area Return</th>
<th>Percentage Of Total Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Ed.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Physical Ed.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Ed.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Industrial Ed.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>215</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instrumentation

The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (revised form) was used in this study to provide a measure of teacher morale. This previously validated and standardized instrument, which yields a total score of teacher morale as well as sub-scores which distribute morale across ten identified dimensions, was designed by Bentley and Rempel (1980) at Purdue University. They utilized the approach to measuring morale that consists of asking the individual to make qualitative judgments and express his feelings about the people and things in his environment that may be related to his morale. These responses were then weighted and quantified so that a total score or index could be assigned.

The instrument consisted of 100 items designed to provide the teachers an opportunity to express their opinions about their work and various school problems. The scale for recording responses to the items on the Opinionaire allowed for the following reactions by the teachers:

A - Agree with the statement
PA - Probably Agree with the statement
PD - Probably Disagree with the statement
D - Disagree with the statement

Values for items were assigned as follows:
When A was the keyed response the values were

A  PA  PD  D
4   3   2   1

When D was the keyed response the values were

A  PA  PD  D
1   2   3   4

A total score for teacher morale was obtained from the summation of the scores on the 100 items.

The ten factors included in the revised Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire are listed and described as follows:

Factor 1 - Teacher Rapport With Principal: deals with the teacher's feelings about the principal . . . his professional competency, his interest in teachers and their work, his ability to communicate, and his skills in human relations.

Factor 2 - Satisfaction With Teaching: pertains to teacher relationships with students and feelings of satisfaction with teaching. According to this factor, the high morale teacher loves to teach, feels competent in his job, enjoys his students, and believes in the future of teaching as an occupation.

Factor 3 - Rapport Among Teachers: focuses on a teacher's relationships with other teachers. The items here solicit the teacher's opinion regarding the cooperation, preparation, ethics, influence, interests, and competency of his peers.

Factor 4 - Teacher Salary: pertains primarily to the teacher's feelings about salaries and salary policies. Are salaries based on teacher competency? Do they compare favorably with salaries in other school systems? Are salary policies administered fairly and justly, and do teachers participate in the development of these policies?
Factor 5 - Teacher Load: deals with such matters as record-keeping, clerical work, "red tape", community demands on teacher time, extra-curricular load, and keeping up to date professionally.

Factor 6 - Curriculum Issues: solicits teacher reactions to the adequacy of the school program in meeting student needs, in providing for individual differences, and in preparing students for effective citizenship.

Factor 7 - Teacher Status: samples feelings about the prestige, security, and benefits afforded by teaching. Several of the items refer to the extent to which the teacher feels he is an accepted member of the community.

Factor 8 - Community Support of Education: deals with the extent to which the community understands and is willing to support a sound educational program.

Factor 9 - School Facilities and Services: has to do with the adequacy of facilities, supplies and equipment, and the efficiency of the procedures for obtaining materials and services.

Factor 10 - Community Pressures: gives special attention to community expectations with respect to the teacher's personal standards, his participation in outside-school activities, and his freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom.

Reliability

The revised form of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was administered to the high school faculties of schools in Indiana and Oregon which had twenty or more teachers. The sixty Indiana schools were a stratified random sample and the sixteen Oregon schools were selected primarily from the eastern part of
that state. The instrument was then readministered to all schools four weeks later. In total, test-retest data were obtained for 3023 secondary teachers.

Bentley and Rempel (1980:5) reported test-retest correlations ranging from .62 to .88 for the subfactor scores and .87 for the total score. The mean and standard deviation for the total score for the test and retest administration of the Opinionaire were, respectively, 312.49 and 38.31 for the first administration, and 311.28 and 40.77 for the retest administration. The designers of the test instrument also reported that interfactor correlations which were computed from the sample of 3023 secondary teachers ranged from .18 to .61 with a median correlation of .38. It was their opinion that these correlations, in most instances, appeared to be sufficiently low to make factor scores meaningful in assessing the status of morale for an individual or for a group. They observed that the magnitude of the correlations between items and the factor to which they belong indicated that, in most instances, they contributed significantly to that factor.

Validity

The original form of the Purdue Teacher
Opinionaire, which was developed in 1961 and included 145 items grouped into eight categories, was validated against peer judgments made by fellow teachers. The peer judgments were obtained at the time the teacher responded to the Opinionaire. By means of an attached rating form, teachers were asked to identify, by name, the teachers whom they considered to have the highest morale. They were also asked to identify an equal number of teachers with low morale.

On the basis of these judgments, high, middle, and low teacher morale groups were identified. To determine the validity of the instrument against the peer judgment ratings, mean scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire were calculated for each of the groups. Differences were in the expected direction for each of the three groups. The differences were also significant beyond the .05 level of significance.

Bentley and Rempel (1980:7) have observed, however, that there is no relevant criterion on which to judge the validity of an instrument of the nature of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire except, perhaps, the relative performance of teachers. Peer ratings and evaluations by administrators have had very limited relevance as a criterion of validity of teacher morale. To the extent that teachers agree with one another, are self
consistent in their ratings, and content validity is exhibited, at least adequate validity may be assumed.

Bentley and Rempel (1963), Brinkman (1966), and the National Education Association Department of Classroom Teachers (1966) have reported that in studies in which the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire has been used, it has been found to discriminate sharply among different schools, and also among the individual teachers in a school. Conditions known to exist in a particular school situation often have been reflected in the teacher responses to the Opinionaire. The authors have also observed that when morale scores on the Opinionaire were low in a school, teacher turnover was frequently high the following year (Bentley and Rempel, 1980:7).

Data Collection Procedure

The following sequence of events was implemented to collect the data for this study:

A packet of introductory and measurement material was mailed to each of the 250 members of the sample on October 1, 1981, before the selection of visiting committee members was made. This packet included an introductory letter explaining the study, (Appendix A), a coded copy of the Purdue Teacher
Opinionaire, (Appendix E), and a coded supplemental information sheet, (Appendix F). The supplemental information sheet requested information pertaining to the following selected demographic factors:

1. Sex
2. Age
3. Education
4. Previous visiting committee membership
5. Marital status
6. Area of instructional assignment
7. Years of teaching experience

The designation of the various instructional areas to categories is shown by Table 2. Instructions included a request to return the completed Purdue Teacher Opinionaire and demographic questionnaire no later than October 15, 1981. A follow-up request was mailed to non-respondents on October 16, 1981.

Similar packets were prepared for members of Experimental Groups I, II, V, and VI, who would be asked to take the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire on the last day of their visiting committee evaluation. This packet included a letter of explanation (Appendix C), the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (Appendix E), and a visiting committee supplemental information sheet (Appendix G).
Table 2
Assignment of Instructional Areas to Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Area</th>
<th>Categories of Instructional Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Physical Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Industrial Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Numbers</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = number of teachers in instructional area sample
Sum of N = 250
Visiting committee participants were also requested to respond to questions regarding strengths and weaknesses of the visiting committee process and to indicate ways their evaluation experience could have been improved (Appendix G). These packets were delivered to the appropriate Virginia Department of Education evaluation coordinator for delivery to the visiting committee members on the last day of the visiting committee evaluation. The coordinator was also asked (Appendix B) to collect the packets before the members of the visiting committee concluded the evaluation activities on that day.

A third series of packets, which included a cover letter (Appendix D) and the coded Purdue Teacher Opinionaire, was prepared for a May 1, 1982, mailing to study participants who had returned the first mailing in October, 1981, or had served on a fall, 1981, evaluation committee. The cover letter requested completion and return of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire by May 15, 1982. A follow-up letter was mailed on May 17, 1982, to those who had not returned the requested information by that date. Data collection was terminated on May 28.

A thank-you letter and a summary of the findings of the study were mailed to study participants on September 1, 1982.
Data Analysis Procedure

Demographic information and data collected to measure teacher morale were keypunched and analyzed through the computer center facilities at Virginia Commonwealth University using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). A direct comparison of group means and differences in gain scores between the research groups was made to determine the singular effect of the independent variable, visiting committee experience, on the total score for teacher morale and the ten factors of morale which are included in the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. Differences in mean scores were tested using t-test statistical procedures. Analysis of variance statistical procedures (Subprogram General Linear Models - GLM) were used to test the demographic variables which had more than two values. Significance was reported at the actual probability level and indicated at the .2, .1 and .05 levels.

Further analysis utilizing Duncan's Multiple Range Test was made of significant demographic variables which had more than two values. Significance between possible combinations of individual or group dimensions of the variables were reported at the .05 level.

Data were reported through the presentation and explanation of statistics and tables which reflect the
selected statistical procedure. Suggestions for improvement in the visiting committee phase of the evaluation process were categorized and reported through the presentation of frequency tables.
Chapter 4

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

The detailed findings of this study are based on an analysis of data collected during the 1981-82 school year. The research design utilized the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and personal data forms to supply the raw data from the secondary school teachers who were included in the population sample.

The purpose of the study was to investigate the effect of visiting committee membership on teacher morale. Seven null hypotheses were derived from the purpose statement and served to direct the focus of the study. Data are presented in tabular form according to the order of the null hypotheses, as stated in Chapter Three. Significance is reported in the various tables, with one asterisk indicating significance at the twenty percent level, two asterisks indicating significance at the ten percent level, and three asterisks indicating significance at the five percent level.

Information derived from a questionnaire distributed to all visiting committee members (Appendix G) is presented by frequency distribution analysis in
Analysis of Data by Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the pre-test morale scores of state recommended teachers who have had previous visiting committee membership and state recommended teachers who have not had previous visiting committee membership.

The mean pre-test scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire for the two groups which represented the dimensions of visiting committee experience were analyzed using t-test statistical procedures. A comparison of the group mean scores on the pre-test Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire is presented in Table 3. Although the mean score of the group with previous visiting committee experience was higher (mean=301.2) than the mean score of the group with no previous visiting committee experience (mean=296.6), the difference was not significant (p = .42) and the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the pre-test morale scores of state recommended teachers who are selected for visiting committee membership and state recommended teachers who are not selected for visiting committee membership.
Table 3

Pre-test Mean Scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire By Previous Visiting Committee Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visiting Committee Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Prob &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Membership</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>301.2</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Previous Membership</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>296.6</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
N = Number of Teachers  
SD = Standard Deviation  
Prob = Probability  
Degrees of Freedom = 213.0
The mean pre-test scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire of the two groups which represented the dimensions of the selection process for visiting committee membership were analyzed using t-test statistical procedures. A comparison of the group means on the pre-test Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire is presented in Table 4. Although the mean morale score of the group not selected for visiting committee membership was slightly higher (mean=299.9) than the group selected for visiting committee membership (mean=294.4), the difference was not significant (p = .39) and the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the short-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have had previous visiting committee membership and state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have not had previous visiting committee membership.

The difference between pre-test (T1) and visiting committee week (T2) mean scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire for the two groups which represent the dimensions of visiting committee experience was analyzed using t-test statistical procedures. A comparison of the mean short-term (T2-T1) gain scores is
### Table 4

Pre-test Mean Scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire By Selection For Visiting Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selected for Membership</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>294.4</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Selected For Membership</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>299.9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
N = Number of Teachers  
SD = Standard Deviation  
Prob = Probability  
Degrees of Freedom = 213.0
presented in Table 5. A significant difference in the scores of the two groups was found (p < .2). In comparing the two groups, the mean gain score of the group with previous visiting committee experience was greater (+21.4) than the mean gain score of the group with no previous visiting committee experience (+11.9). Since the comparison of mean short-term gain scores for the two groups reflected a significant difference (p = .17), Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in the retention of gain scores of teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have had previous visiting committee membership and teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have not had previous visiting committee membership.

The difference between visiting committee week (T2) and May, 1982, post-test (T3) mean scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire for teachers who served on a fall, 1981, visiting committee was analyzed by the categories of visiting committee experience using t-test statistical procedures. A comparison of the mean retention (T3-T2) scores is presented in Table 6. The results of the analysis show that the group which had previous visiting committee experience had a higher morale score (mean=312.0) immediately following current
Table 5

Short-term Gain Scores (T2-T1) on Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire By Previous Visiting Committee Experience For Paired Groups of Teachers Selected For Current Visiting Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visiting Committee Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Gain (T2-T1)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Prob &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Membership</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+21.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Previous Membership</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>+11.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
N = Number of teachers  
SD = Standard Deviation  
Prob = Probability  
Degrees of Freedom = 54.0  
* p < .2
Table 6

Visiting Committee Week (T2), Post-test (T3), and Retention Scores (T3-T2) on Purdue Teacher Opinionaire By Previous Visiting Committee Experience For Paired Groups of Teachers Selected For Current Visiting Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visiting Committee Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (T2)</th>
<th>Mean (T3)</th>
<th>Retention (T3-T2)</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Prob &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Membership</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>312.0</td>
<td>294.1</td>
<td>-17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Previous Membership</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>305.5</td>
<td>292.4</td>
<td>-13.1</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
N = Number of teachers  
Prob = Probability  
Degrees of Freedom = 77
visiting committee experience than the group with no previous visiting committee membership (mean=305.5), but regressed more over the period of time between the visiting committee week and the concluding month of the school year. Since a comparison of the morale loss scores for the two groups was not significant (p = .37), the hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and state recommended teachers who did not serve on a current visiting committee.

The difference between pre-test (T1) and May, 1982, post-test (T3) mean scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire for the two groups which represent the dimensions of the selection process for visiting committee membership was analyzed using t-test statistical procedures. A comparison of the long-term (T3-T1) mean gain scores is presented in Table 7. The group which was state recommended but was not selected for visiting committee membership maintained a higher morale score throughout the course of the 1981-82 school year and had less long-term score regression than did the group which was selected for current visiting committee membership. The differences, however, were not significant (p = .59)
Table 7
Pre-test (T1), Post-test (T3), and Long-term Gain Scores (T3-T1) on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire for Paired Groups of Teachers by Current Visiting Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visiting Committee</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (T1)</th>
<th>Mean (T3)</th>
<th>Gain (T3-T1)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t  Value</th>
<th>Prob &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Served</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>295.6</td>
<td>288.5</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Serve</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>302.8</td>
<td>298.1</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
N = Number of Teachers  
Degrees of Freedom = 151  
Prob = Probability  
SD = Standard Deviation
and the hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and state recommended teachers who did not serve on a current visiting committee on the following morale factors: (a) teacher rapport with principal, (b) satisfaction with teaching, (c) rapport among teachers, (d) teacher salary, (e) teacher load, (f) curriculum issues, (g) teacher status, (h) community support of education, (i) school facilities and services, and (j) community pressures.

The difference between pre-test (T1) and May, 1982, post-test (T3) scores on the ten morale factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire for the two groups which represent the dimensions of the selection process for visiting committee membership was analyzed using t-test statistical procedures. A comparison of the long-term (T3-T1) mean gain scores for each morale factor is presented in Table 8. A significant difference at the .05 level was found for only one factor, "curriculum issues". For this factor, the group which served on a current visiting committee experienced a long-term mean score regression of -1.65, while the group which was not selected for current visiting committee membership had a
Table 8

Pre-test (T1), Post-test (T3), and Long-term Gain Scores (T3-T1) on Selected Morale Factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire By Current Visiting Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morale Factors</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Prob &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59.32</td>
<td>57.45</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
<td>59.65</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64.91</td>
<td>63.28</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>67.39</td>
<td>65.61</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44.58</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>45.18</td>
<td>44.09</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.78</td>
<td>32.96</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>32.76</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morale Factors</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Current Membership N=46</th>
<th>No Current Membership N=107</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Prob &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Gain</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>14.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Morale Factor 1 = Teacher rapport with principal
Morale Factor 2 = Satisfaction with teaching
Morale Factor 3 = Rapport among teachers
Morale Factor 4 = Teacher salary
Morale Factor 5 = Teacher load
Morale Factor 6 = Curriculum issues
Morale Factor 7 = Teacher status
Morale Factor 8 = Community support of education
Morale Factor 9 = School facilities and services
Morale Factor 10 = Community pressures
Prob = Probability
Degrees of Freedom = 151
*** p < .05
mean regression of only -0.58. Hypothesis Six (f), "curriculum issues", was rejected. Other parts of the hypothesis were not rejected.

Hypothesis 7a: There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee when compared by sex categories.

The difference between pre-test (T1) and May, 1982, post-test (T3) morale scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire was analyzed using t-test statistical procedures for the two groups which represent the dimensions of sex for those state recommended teachers who served as members of a current visiting committee. A comparison of the long-term (T3-T1) gain scores is presented in Table 9. Although the male members of the experimental group maintained a higher mean score throughout the 1981-82 school year, this group reflected almost twice the long-term mean regression rate as did the female group. The difference in mean long-term gain scores was not significant (p = .54) and the hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 7b: There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee when compared by age categories.
Table 9
Pre-test (T1), Post-test (T3), and Long-term (T3-T1) Gain Scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Compared by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Prob &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>288.26</td>
<td>282.68</td>
<td>- 5.58</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>312.30</td>
<td>301.90</td>
<td>-10.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>295.58</td>
<td>288.53</td>
<td>- 7.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  N = Number of Teachers
Prob = Probability
Degrees of Freedom = 44.0
The difference between pre-test (T1), and May, 1982, post-test (T3) morale scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was analyzed using Analysis of Variance statistical procedures. A comparison of the long-term (T3-T1) gain scores is presented in Table 10. Examination of Table 10 shows that the age group category 50-59 had the highest pre-test (T1) morale score and gained 5.24 points over the course of the school year. Age group categories 30-39 and 40-49 experienced the greatest long-term regression, -12.73 and -11.20, respectively. Age group 60+ had only one respondent and was not considered in this analysis. Since the comparison of long-term gain scores by age was not significant (p = .37), the hypothesis was retained. Hypothesis 7c: There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee when compared by attained educational level. The difference between pre-test (T1), and May, 1982, post-test (T3) morale scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was analyzed using Analysis of Variance statistical procedures. A comparison of the long-term (T3-T1) gain scores is presented in Table 11. Examination of Table 11 shows that in comparing the levels of educational attainment, category "bachelor's
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>$F$ Ratio</th>
<th>Prob &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>283.45</td>
<td>285.82</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>289.99</td>
<td>277.26</td>
<td>-12.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>312.44</td>
<td>301.24</td>
<td>-11.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>314.78</td>
<td>320.02</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>226.00</td>
<td>231.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>295.58</td>
<td>288.53</td>
<td>-7.03</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
N = Number of Teachers  
Prob = Probability  
Degrees of Freedom = 41.0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>304.72</td>
<td>291.39</td>
<td>-13.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>289.95</td>
<td>287.98</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>278.94</td>
<td>272.94</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>293.94</td>
<td>266.94</td>
<td>-27.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>295.58</td>
<td>288.54</td>
<td>-7.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
N = Number of Teachers  
Prob = Probability  
Degree of Freedom = 42.0
degree" had a higher post-test (T1) score (304.72) than the "master's degree" group (289.95). However, by the end of the school year (T3) the morale scores for the two groups were essentially the same, with the "bachelor's degree" group having regressed -13.34 points and the "master's degree" group only -1.97 points. Since the comparison of long-term gain scores was not significant (p = .41), the hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 7d: There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee when compared by marital status.

The difference between pre-test (T1) and May, 1982, post-test (T3) mean scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire for the two groups which represent the dimensions of marital status was analyzed using t-test statistical procedures. A comparison of the long-term (T3-T1) gain scores is presented in Table 12. The category "married" had a higher pre-test (T1) morale score (300.45) than the category "single" (278.95) and maintained a higher score over the course of the 1981-82 school year. A comparison of the long-term gain scores was not significant (p = .71) and the hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 7e: There is no significant
Table 12

Pre-test (T1), Post-test (T3), and Long-term (T3-T1) Gain Scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Compared By Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>T1 Mean</th>
<th>T3 Mean</th>
<th>Gain Score</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Prob&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>300.45</td>
<td>292.69</td>
<td>-7.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>278.05</td>
<td>273.57</td>
<td>-4.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>295.58</td>
<td>288.53</td>
<td>-7.03</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  N=Number of Teachers
        Prob = Probability
        Degrees of Freedom = 44.0
difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee when compared by instructional assignment.

The difference between pre-test (T1) and post-test (T3) mean scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was analyzed using Analysis of Variance statistical procedures. A comparison of the long-term (T3-T1) gain scores is presented in Table 13. A comparison of the categories of the variable "instructional assignment" shows that the group "fine arts" had the lowest mean morale score at both testing periods (T1=278.28, T3=273.82), but experienced less long-term regression (-4.46) than the other groups. The categories "vocational" (T1=305.35, T3=298.66) and "other" (T1=307.56, T3=297.38), which includes health, physical education, and special education teachers, had the highest pre-test and post-test morale scores. A comparison of long-term gain scores was not significant (p = .98) and the hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 7f: There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee when compared by years of teaching experience.

The difference between pre-test (T1) and post-test (T3) mean scores on the Purdue Teacher
Table 13

Pre-test (T1), Post-test (T3), and Long-term (T3-T1) Gain Scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Compared by Instructional Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Assignment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>T1 Mean</th>
<th>T3 Mean</th>
<th>Gain Score</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>291.49</td>
<td>284.72</td>
<td>-6.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>278.28</td>
<td>273.82</td>
<td>-4.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>305.35</td>
<td>298.66</td>
<td>-6.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>307.56</td>
<td>297.38</td>
<td>-10.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>295.58</td>
<td>288.53</td>
<td>-7.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N=Number of teachers
Prob = Probability
Degrees of Freedom = 42.0
Opinionaire was analyzed using Analysis of Variance statistical procedures. A comparison of the long-term gain scores is presented in Table 14. A significant difference at the .1 level was found and the hypothesis was rejected. Further analysis utilizing Duncan's Multiple Range Test revealed a significance at the .05 level between the mean long-term gain scores of combined categories "10-19" and "20-29" and combined categories "0-3" and "4-9". The Duncan Test also revealed a significant difference at the .05 level between category "20-29" and the other three combined categories. This, however, was influenced by the fact that category "20-29" contained only one respondent.

Analysis of Visiting Committee Member Questionnaire

Each secondary school teacher who served as a member on one of the thirteen high school visiting committees conducted during the fall semester, 1981, was asked to complete a questionnaire (Appendix G) on the last day of the evaluation week. This questionnaire presented seven incomplete statements that were to be completed with a selection from a Likert-type scale. The eighth question asked for an open-ended response. All questions related to the evaluation week experiences of the visiting committee members and were as follows:
Table 14

Pre-test (T1), Post-test (T3), and Long-term (T3-T1) Gain Scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Compared by Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>291.47</td>
<td>283.82</td>
<td>-7.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>293.99</td>
<td>281.15</td>
<td>-12.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>321.66</td>
<td>324.47</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>220.97</td>
<td>266.94</td>
<td>45.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>295.58</td>
<td>288.53</td>
<td>-7.03</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = Number of Teachers
Prob = Probability
Degrees of Freedom = 42.0
** p < .1
Question 1: Motel accommodations for the visiting committee were (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) excellent.

Question 2: Preparations made by the school for the visiting committee were (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) excellent.

Question 3: Organization provided by the chairperson and coordinator was (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) excellent.

Question 4: Hospitality provided by the school faculty and administration was (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) excellent.

Question 5: This school's total educational program is (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) excellent.

Question 6: Compared with the total educational program evaluated this week, my home school's total educational program is (1) not as good, (2) about the same, (3) better.

Question 7: Compared with other visiting committees on which I have served, this visiting committee experience was (1) not as good, (2) about the same, (3) better.

Question 8: How can visiting committee evaluation be improved?

Table 15 presents the frequency distribution and
Table 15
Frequency and Percentage of Response on the Visiting Committee Member Questionnaire, Questions 1-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Poor N</th>
<th>Poor %</th>
<th>Fair N</th>
<th>Fair %</th>
<th>Good N</th>
<th>Good %</th>
<th>Excellent N</th>
<th>Excellent %</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = Frequency of Response
% = Percentage of Response
percentage of response for questions 1-5. On Question one, 98% of the respondents felt that their motel accommodations during the visiting committee week were either "good" or "excellent". The same percentage of respondents (98%) judged the preparations made by the school (Question two) to be either "good" or "excellent". For Question three, 87% of the responses classified the preparations made by the chairperson and coordinator of the visiting committee to be "excellent". When combined with the "good" category, the total was 98%. When asked about their impressions of the hospitality provided by the faculty and administration of the school being evaluated (Question four), 90% of the respondents felt that this provision was "excellent". Question five asked for a response related to the total educational program of the school being evaluated. Of the respondents, 77% felt that the educational program was either "good" or "excellent" and another 17% chose "fair". Only 2% judged the total educational program to be "poor".

Table 16 presents the frequency distribution and percentage of response for Questions six and seven. On Question six, which requested a comparison of the total educational program of the school being evaluated with the total educational program of the visiting committee
Table 16
Frequency and Percentage of Response on the Visiting Committee Member Questionnaire, Questions 6-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not As Good</th>
<th>About The Same</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = Frequency of Response
% = Percentage of Response
member's home school, 67% of the respondents stated that their home school had a "better" educational program than the school being visited. For Question six, 24% judged the educational programs to be "about the same", and 9% said that their home school's program was "not as good". Question seven asked for a comparison of the current visiting committee experience with other visiting committee experiences the committee member may have had. Of the twenty-seven current committee members with previous visiting committee membership who responded to Question seven, 59% judged the current committee to be a "better" experience, 37% stated it was "about the same", and 4% said the current experience was "not as good" as past visiting committee experiences.

Question eight was designed to be open-ended and asked for suggestions for improvement in the organization for visiting committee evaluation. Table 17 presents a summary of these suggestions. The suggestion which appeared most frequently (N=17) was that more time be spent at the school, particularly in additional classroom visitation and discussions with students and teachers. Other suggestions related to an earlier scheduled mailing of general information and self-study material to the members of the visiting committee (N=8), a later due date for reports and reporting during the
### Table 17

**Frequency Summary of Improvement Suggestions For Visiting Committee Evaluation, Question 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Spend more time at the school in classroom visitation and discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Send general information and self-studies to visiting committee members at an earlier date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provide a visiting committee checklist for subcommittees (to include regulations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provide more time to observe classes and write reports before having to report to the total committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Avoid late night meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Require less classroom visitation and allow more time for interview/discussion with faculty members and subcommittees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provide better orientation for the joint committee when they move to the second assigned school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Limit subcommittee assignments for major area subcommittee chairpersons and/or members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eliminate the use of joint committees to serve more than one high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide additional orientation for visiting committee members with no previous visiting committee experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide a better explanation of schedule, reporting format, and deadlines during orientation sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Include joint committee in final meetings at both schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evaluation week (N=7), and the need for a subcommittee checklist that includes regulations of the state and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (N=7). In addition, suggestions were made to limit the length of meetings, number of subcommittee assignments for visiting committee members, and the amount of time spent in classroom visitation.

Summary of Findings

The data were obtained from 274 secondary school teachers. Of this number, 232 were recommended for visiting committee membership by Virginia Department of Education personnel and 42 were recommended from sources other than the Department of Education.

A significant difference (p < .2) was found between the short-term (T2-T1) gain scores of state recommended teachers who had previous visiting committee experience and state recommended teachers who had not had previous visiting committee experience. It was found that the mean gain score of the group with previous visiting committee experience was significantly higher than the group without previous experience.

In examining the ten morale factors which make up the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire total morale score, it was found that "curriculum issues" was the only factor
for which a significant difference (.05 level) was found between long-term (T3-T1) gain scores for the two groups representing the dimensions of the selection process for visiting committee membership. In this analysis, the group which served on a current visiting committee had a significantly greater long-term mean score regression than did the group which did not serve on a current (fall, 1981) visiting committee.

Statistical analysis of the demographic variables included in this study revealed a significant difference (p < .1) in the long-term gain scores for "years of teaching experience". It was found that teachers with 0-9 years of teaching experience a significantly greater long-term mean regression score than the group with more than nine years of teaching experience.

Suggestions for visiting committee improvement were grouped from highest to lowest by the frequency of response. The most frequently listed suggestion (N=17) was for more time at the school, especially to be spent in classroom visitation and in discussions with students and teachers. Other reported suggestions ranged in frequency from eight to three. Thirty additional suggestions received either one or two responses and were not included in the frequency table.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The process of evaluation in Virginia secondary schools includes the self-study, visiting committee, and follow-up phases. During the visiting committee phase, invited educators come into the host school for a period of three and one-half days to visit classes, engage in programmatic discussions with teachers and students and react to the recommendations contained in the faculty's self-study document. Research has been recorded which focuses on the implementation of visiting committee recommendations by the faculty and administration of the school evaluated and on the relationship of teacher morale to various components of the educational environment. However, research directed toward the purpose of assessing relationships between teacher morale and participation on evaluation committees has not been recorded.

The purpose of this dissertation was to investigate the effect of visiting committee membership on teacher morale, as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. Answers were sought to the following questions:
1. Does visiting committee membership improve morale? Does prior visiting committee experience influence morale score changes?

2. What is the impact of visiting committee experience on the morale of secondary teachers immediately following the experience? Do changes in morale scores dissipate over time?

3. Does visiting committee membership influence scores on the ten factors of morale that are described in the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire?

4. Do demographic variables make a difference in morale score changes related to visiting committee membership?

5. What suggestions do secondary teachers who serve as members of visiting committees make for improving the visiting committee process?

The seven null hypotheses which were derived from the stated purpose of the study and related questions were as follows:

1. There is no significant difference in the pre-test morale scores of state recommended teachers who have had previous visiting committee membership and state recommended teachers who have not had previous visiting committee membership.

2. There is no significant difference in the
pre-test morale scores of state recommended teachers who are selected for visiting committee membership and state recommended teachers who are not selected for visiting committee membership.

3. There is no significant difference in the short-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have had previous visiting committee membership and state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have not had previous visiting committee membership.

4. There is no significant difference in the retention of gain scores of teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have had previous visiting committee membership and teachers who served on a current visiting committee and have not had previous visiting committee membership.

5. There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and state recommended teachers who did not serve on a current visiting committee.

6. There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee and state
recommended teachers who did not serve on a current visiting committee on the following ten morale factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire:

a. Teacher rapport with principal
b. Satisfaction with teaching
c. Rapport among teachers
d. Teacher salary
e. Teacher load
f. Curriculum issues
g. Teacher status
h. Community support of education
i. School facilities and services
j. Community pressures

7. There is no significant difference in the long-term gain scores of state recommended teachers who served on a current visiting committee when based on the following demographic variables:

a. Sex
b. Age
c. Educational level
d. Marital status
e. Instructional assignment
f. Years of teaching experience

The population of this study consisted of 333 secondary teachers recommended for membership on the
thirteen visiting committees scheduled for the fall semester of the 1981-82 school year. A seventy-five percent random sample (N = 250) was taken from this population. Following the selection of visiting committee members by evaluation coordinators from the professional staff of the Virginia Department of Education, the sample was divided into two groups. The experimental group consisted of teachers who were selected to be members of a visiting committee and the control group consisted of teachers who were not selected for visiting committee membership.

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was used to measure teacher morale and a coded demographic information sheet was used to collect data pertaining to selected teacher-related factors. A questionnaire asking for responses to questions related to strengths and weaknesses of the visiting committee phase of the evaluation process was prepared and included in the packet for visiting committee week post-test measurement.

A letter of introduction, instructions, the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, and the demographic information sheet were included in a packet for mailing on October 1, 1981, to each of the 250 teachers in the research sample. Usable instruments were returned by
215 teachers or 86% of the teachers sampled.

A similar packet of information, with the addition of the visiting committee member questionnaire, was delivered to evaluation coordinators. These packets were dispersed by the coordinator to secondary teachers on the last day of the evaluation week. Usable instruments were completed by 115 teachers. These included teachers who were part of the sample population and teachers who had been identified for visiting committee membership from sources other than Virginia Department of Education recommendation.

A third series of packets, including a cover letter and the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire, was mailed on May 1, 1982, to 263 study participants who had returned the October, 1981, pre-test forms (N = 215) or had served on a fall, 1981, evaluation committee (N = 48). Usable instruments were completed by 173 teachers, or 66% of the teachers included in the post-test mailing.

Teacher responses to items on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire were processed by the IBM 370 Computer housed in the Computer Center on the campus of Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, Virginia.

Findings

The results of testing the seven null hypotheses
of this study and consideration of frequency tables compiled from responses to questions on the visiting committee member questionnaire led to the following findings:

1. There is no indication, from this research, that previous visiting committee experience causes an impact on the long-term morale scores of teachers.

2. Although teachers selected from the state recommended lists had lower mean scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire than teachers not selected, there was no significant difference in the pre-test morale scores of those groups.

3. The findings in this study indicate that prior visiting committee experience appears to have a significant \( (p = .17) \) but moderate influence on short-term gain scores, with teachers having prior visiting committee experience achieving higher gain scores than those without prior experience.

4. Morale gain scores appear to decline at about the same rate for teachers regardless of previous visiting committee experience.

5. Service on a visiting committee does not have a lasting effect on morale scores of those who participate in that activity. There was no significant difference between the gain scores of participating
teachers and non-participating teachers using Purdue Teacher Opinionaire scores taken during October and May of the same school year.

6. An analysis of the long-term gain scores for the ten factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire indicated no significant difference in nine of the ten factors. A significant difference ($p < .01$) in favor of non-participating teachers was found in the factor labeled "curriculum issues".

7. An analysis of long-term gain scores using a variety of demographic factors for teachers who served on a visiting committee yielded few significant findings. "Years of teaching experience" appeared to be the variable which had the greatest impact on morale scores ($F = 2.55$, $p = .07$), with teachers having less than ten years of teaching experience indicating a greater year-long loss of morale score than teachers with ten or more years of teaching experience.

8. The comparison of scores for any one testing period indicates that, generally, male teachers have a higher morale score than female teachers; married teachers have a higher morale score than single teachers; morale scores increase as teachers become older; teachers with only the bachelor's degree have a higher morale score than teachers with graduate degrees;
and vocational, driver education, health and physical education, and special education teachers have a higher morale score than teachers in academic or fine arts areas.

9. The vast majority of visiting committee members are satisfied with motel accommodations, preparations made by the school for the visit of the committee, the organization provided by the committee chairperson and the Department of Education coordinator, and the hospitality shown to the committee by the school's faculty and administration.

10. The vast majority of visiting committee members think their home school's total educational program is as good or better than the program evaluated during the visiting committee week.

11. The majority of visiting committee members who have had previous visiting committee membership perceive the current evaluation experience to be better than previous visiting committee experiences.

Conclusions

The application of these findings to the problem statement and research questions led to the following conclusions:

1. Morale score increases during the period of
the visiting committee experience but decreases as the school year progresses.

2. Previous visiting committee membership appears to influence the short-term gain in morale score experienced at the time of the current evaluation week but gains dissipate as the school year progresses.

3. Visiting committee membership does not significantly affect the score on any of the ten morale factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire except the factor "curriculum issues", for which teachers who serve on a visiting committee experience a greater loss of morale score as the year progresses. This significance, if in fact a reality, is probably due to an increased awareness of curriculum issues brought about by discussions during the visiting committee's deliberations. However, this factor of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire only considers the responses to five items. Thus, the reported difference in scores represents an average of one higher response to one of the five items.

4. Members of visiting committees consider the experience a beneficial professional opportunity and are, generally, satisfied with the present format for the evaluation week.

5. Morale score, as defined by the ten factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, may be the wrong
descriptor to determine the lasting benefit that is derived by teachers from participation in a professional activity such as visiting committee membership.

Recommendations

Recommendations for further study in the area of teacher morale and the evaluation process are as follows:

1. A similar study be conducted that would examine the effect of visiting committee membership on teachers, looking at factors other than morale that relate to professional growth.

2. Research be conducted to determine if more appropriate characteristics other than morale are affected by the experiences of visiting committee membership.

3. Research be conducted to determine the effect of the evaluation process on the faculty members of the school being evaluated.

4. Research be conducted to determine the effect of the recently instituted five-year interim evaluation study on the effectiveness of the evaluation program in secondary schools.

The responses of teachers to questions regarding their experiences during the week of visiting committee
evaluation led to the following recommendations for visiting committee organizational change:

1. The schedule for the week of visiting committee evaluation should be changed to permit more time for classroom visitation and discussions with faculty and students.

2. The Department of Education coordinators should complete the formation of visiting committees at such time that would insure the receipt of orientation information and the school's self-study by the visiting committee members at least three weeks before the evaluation begins.

3. Additional guidelines should be developed for use by members of visiting committee subcommittees during the evaluation week.

4. Those charged with organizational responsibilities for a visiting committee should revise the evaluation week's schedule to allow more time for observation and discussion before asking for reports.

5. The length of night meetings should be limited to insure that the visiting committee members have time for rest and individual work.

6. The usefulness of joint committees for the evaluation of two or more schools during the same visiting committee week should be reconsidered.
7. Additional orientation activities should be provided for visiting committee members without previous experience.

8. Guidelines that would prevent the assignment of multiple subcommittee chair and/or major area assignments should be established.

Observations

Since this study was limited to secondary school teachers who were selected for visiting committee membership on one of the thirteen evaluations conducted during one semester of one school year, findings of this research should not be widely generalized. No attempt was made to include administrators, supervisors, college or university personnel, guidance counselors, or librarians in this study of the effect of visiting committee membership on morale.

It was observed that only fifty percent of the possible number of visiting committee membership positions were filled by secondary teachers. A larger percentage of administrators, supervisors, and college and university personnel than was expected served on the thirteen visiting committees included in this research, thus limiting the number of teachers included in this study.
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APPENDIX A

PRE-TEST SURVEY LETTER TO STUDY PARTICIPANTS
Dear

I am currently in the process of completing work towards the Ed. D. degree in educational leadership and administration at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The research topic which I have selected is an investigation of the relationship between the morale of public secondary school teachers and various aspects of the secondary school evaluation program. The results of this study will be of interest to both the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and the Virginia Department of Education.

As one of 250 randomly selected public secondary school teachers, your participation in the study is of vital importance. Responses of participating teachers will be kept confidential. Your identity and the name of your school and school division will not be disclosed in the study or the summary of the results of the study which will be sent to you upon request.

Will you please respond to the enclosed Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and the Supplemental Information Sheet within the next few days and return them to me before October 15, 1981? A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your use in returning the requested information. I thank you, in advance, for your consideration to this request and for taking the time to furnish data to be used in this research project.

Sincerely,

L. Irvin Williams, Associate Member
Virginia Secondary Committee

Enclosures
APPENDIX B

MEMORANDUM TO VISITING COMMITTEE COORDINATORS
TO: Evaluation Coordinators for Fall Visiting Committee Evaluations

FROM: L. Irvin Williams, Supervisor Secondary School Evaluations

SUBJECT: Survey of Certain Visiting Committee Members

Thank you for agreeing to assist in the collection of data for this research project. As I mentioned in our previous discussion, the enclosed questionnaire packets are to be completed by visiting committee members who are secondary school teachers. The packets should be given to appropriate visiting committee members on the last day of the evaluation week and collected by you after approximately 30 minutes (no time limit, however). Please place the completed questionnaires in the return envelope provided and seal the envelope. I will then collect the sealed envelope during the week following visiting committee evaluation.

LIW/stg
APPENDIX C

MEMORANDUM TO VISITING COMMITTEE MEMBERS
TO: Certain Members of Fall, 1981 Evaluation Committees

FROM: L. Irvin Williams, Supervisor Secondary School Evaluations

On this concluding day of your visiting committee week, you are being asked to participate in a research project to investigate the effect of visiting committee membership on teacher morale. Although some visiting committee members may have had the opportunity to complete the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire during an October pre-test data gathering period, each of you who teach in a public secondary school is being asked to participate at this time. You will also be asked to complete a post-test instrument in May. Your identity and your responses will be kept confidential and your cooperation valued and appreciated. The survey instruments and instructions are as follows:

I. The Supplemental Information Sheet (2 pages):
   A. Control Number - please do not mark this space.
   B. Name/school/address - this information is needed for post-test mailing in May and will be coded for research purposes.
   C. On page 2, please give your feelings about the topics presented.

II. The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire: Please answer each of the 100 questions.

III. Please accept my sincere thanks for your participation in this study. The data will be used in dissertation research (VPI) and for planning future evaluation activities.
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APPENDIX D

POST-TEST SURVEY LETTER TO STUDY PARTICIPANTS
Dear

The research project on the relationship of teacher morale to the various aspects of the secondary school evaluation program has been an on-going endeavor throughout the 1981-82 school year. As the spring semester draws quickly to a close, I ask, once more, for your cooperation and participation in the final phase of this study—the process of obtaining a measurement of teacher morale near the end of this school year. This measurement will be compared with other scores obtained during the year. Your participation at this time is of particular importance since you were a part of the randomly selected sample which responded in October.

As with your previous response, this information will be kept confidential. Your identity and the name of your school and school division will not be disclosed.

Will you please respond to the enclosed Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and return it to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope before May 15, 1982? I thank you for your earlier participation in this study and for the consideration you may give to this final request.

Sincerely,

L. Irvin Williams
Associate Executive Secretary
Virginia Committee, SACS

LIW/stg
Enclosures
1. Details, "red tape," and required reports absorb too much of my time

2. The work of individual faculty members is appreciated and commended by our principal

3. Teachers feel free to criticize administrative policy at faculty meetings called by our principal

4. The faculty feels that their salary suggestions are adequately transmitted by the administration to the school board

5. Our principal shows favoritism in his relations with the teachers in our school

6. Teachers in this school are expected to do an unreasonable amount of record-keeping and clerical work

7. My principal makes a real effort to maintain close contact with the faculty

8. Community demands upon the teacher's time are unreasonable

9. I am satisfied with the policies under which pay raises are granted

10. My teaching load is greater than that of most of the other teachers in our school

11. The extra-curricular load of the teachers in our school is unreasonable

12. Our principal's leadership in faculty meetings challenges and stimulates our professional growth

13. My teaching position gives me the social status in the community that I desire

14. The number of hours a teacher must work is unreasonable

15. Teaching enables me to enjoy many of the material and cultural things I like

16. My school provides me with adequate classroom supplies and equipment

17. Our school has a well-balanced curriculum

18. There is a great deal of gnipping, arguing, taking sides, and feuding among our teachers

19. Teaching gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction

20. The curriculum of our school makes reasonable provision for student individual differences

21. The procedures for obtaining materials and services are well defined and efficient

22. Generally, teachers in our school do not take advantage of one another

23. The teachers in our school cooperate with each other to achieve common, personal, and professional objectives

24. Teaching enables me to make my greatest contribution to society

25. The curriculum of our school is in need of major revisions

26. I love to teach

27. If I could plan my career again, I would choose teaching

28. Experienced faculty members accept new and younger members as colleagues

29. I would recommend teaching as an occupation to students of high scholastic ability

30. If I could earn as much money in another occupation, I would stop teaching

31. The school schedule places my classes at a disadvantage

32. The school tries to follow a generous policy regarding fringe benefits, professional travel, professional study, etc.

33. My principal makes my work easier and more pleasant

34. Keeping up professionally is too much of a burden

35. Our community makes its teachers feel as though they are a real part of the community

36. Salary policies are administered with fairness and justice

37. Teaching affords me the security I want in a position

38. My school principal understands and recognizes good teaching procedures

39. Teachers clearly understand the policies governing salary increases

40. My classes are used as a "dumping ground" for problem students

41. The lines and methods of communication between teachers and the principal in our school are well developed and maintained

42. My teaching load in this school is unreasonable

43. My principal shows a real interest in my department

44. Our principal promotes a sense of belonging among the teachers in our school

45. My heavy teaching load unduly restricts my non-professional activities

46. I find my contacts with students, for the most part, highly satisfying and rewarding

47. I feel that I am an important part of this school system

48. The competency of teachers in our school compares favorably with that of teachers in other schools that I know

49. My school provides the teachers with adequate audio-visual aids and projection equipment

50. I feel successful and competent in my present position
51. I enjoy working with student organizations, clubs, and societies. [A PA PD O]
52. Our teaching staff is congenial to work with. [A PA PD O]
53. My teaching associates are well prepared for their jobs. [A PA PD O]
54. Our school faculty has a tendency to form into cliques. [A PA PD O]
55. The teachers in our school work well together. [A PA PD O]
56. I am at a disadvantage professionally because other teachers are better prepared to teach than I am. [A PA PD O]
57. Our school provides adequate clerical services for the teachers. [A PA PD O]
58. As far as I know, the other teachers think I am a good teacher. [A PA PD O]
59. Library facilities and resources are adequate for the grade or subject area which I teach. [A PA PD O]
60. The "stress and strain" resulting from teaching makes teaching undesirable for me. [A PA PD O]
61. My principal is concerned with the problems of the faculty and handles these problems sympathetically. [A PA PD O]
62. I do not hesitate to discuss any school problem with my principal. [A PA PD O]
63. Teaching gives me the prestige I desire. [A PA PD O]
64. My teaching job enables me to provide a satisfactory standard of living for my family. [A PA PD O]
65. The salary schedule in our school adequately recognizes teacher competency. [A PA PD O]
66. Most of the people in this community understand and appreciate good education. [A PA PD O]
67. In my judgment, this community is a good place to raise a family. [A PA PD O]
68. This community respects its teachers and treats them like professional persons. [A PA PD O]
69. My principal acts as though he is interested in me and my problems. [A PA PD O]
70. My school principal supervises rather than "snipes" the teachers in our school. [A PA PD O]
71. It is difficult for teachers to gain acceptance by the people in this community. [A PA PD O]
72. Teachers, meetings as now conducted by our principal waste the time and energy of the staff. [A PA PD O]
73. My principal has a reasonable understanding of the problems connected with my teaching assignment. [A PA PD O]
74. I feel that my work is judged fairly by my principal. [A PA PD O]
75. Salaries paid in this school system compare favorably with salaries in other systems with which I am familiar. [A PA PD O]
76. Most of the actions of students irritate me. [A PA PD O]
77. The cooperativeness of teachers in our school helps make my work more enjoyable. [A PA PD O]
78. My students regard me with respect and seem to have confidence in my professional ability. [A PA PD O]
79. The purposes and objectives of the school cannot be achieved by the present curriculum. [A PA PD O]
80. The teachers in our school have a desirable influence on the values and attitudes of their students. [A PA PD O]
81. This community expects its teachers to meet unreasonable personal standards. [A PA PD O]
82. My students appreciate the help I give them with their school work. [A PA PD O]
83. To me there is no more challenging work than teaching. [A PA PD O]
84. Other teachers in our school are appreciative of my work. [A PA PD O]
85. As a teacher in this community, my nonprofessional activities outside of school are unduly restricted. [A PA PD O]
86. As a teacher, I think I am as competent as most other teachers. [A PA PD O]
87. The teachers with whom I work have high professional ethics. [A PA PD O]
88. Our school curriculum does a good job of preparing students to become enlightened and competent citizens. [A PA PD O]
89. I really enjoy working with my students. [A PA PD O]
90. The teachers in our school show a great deal of initiative and creativity in their teaching assignments. [A PA PD O]
91. Teachers in our community feel free to discuss controversial issues in their classes. [A PA PD O]
92. My principal tries to make me feel comfortable when he visits my classes. [A PA PD O]
93. My principal makes effective use of the individual teacher’s capacity and talent. [A PA PD O]
94. The people in this community, generally, have a sincere and wholehearted interest in the school system. [A PA PD O]
95. Teachers feel free to go to the principal about problems of personal and group welfare. [A PA PD O]
96. This community supports ethical procedures regarding the appointment and reappointment of the teaching staff. [A PA PD O]
97. This community is willing to support a good program of education. [A PA PD O]
98. Our community expects the teachers to participate in too many social activities. [A PA PD O]
99. Community pressures prevent me from doing my best as a teacher. [A PA PD O]
100. I am well satisfied with my present teaching position. [A PA PD O]
APPENDIX F

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION SHEET
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION SHEET

Control Number

Please return to: L. Irvin Williams
P. O. Box 6-Q
Richmond, VA 23216

In the spaces provided for each item below, please check the appropriate category which indicates your situation. ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL. PLEASE DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEM.

Sex:

Female
Male

Marital Status:

Married
Single

Age (as of 10/1/81)

20 - 29
30 - 39
40 - 49
50 - 59
60 +

Area of Instructional Assignment:

Academic Subject
Fine Arts Subject
Vocational Subject
Elective Subject
Other

Education:

Bachelor's Degree
Master's Degree
Specialist Degree or Certificate of Advanced Study
Doctorate

Years of Total Teaching Experience:

0 - 9
10 - 19
20 - 29
30 or more

Evaluation Participation:

Previous member of a visiting committee
Last visiting committee membership 1 - 2 years ago
Last visiting committee membership 3 - 4 years ago
Last visiting committee membership 5 or more years ago
No previous visiting committee membership

Research Summary (available summer, 1982)

I would like a summary of the results of this study
I would not like a summary of the results of this study
APPENDIX G

VISITING COMMITTEE SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION SHEET
VISITING COMMITTEE
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION SHEET

Control Number __________

School Evaluated ___________________________

Your name ________________________________

Your school ________________________________

School address ________________________________

________________________, Virginia

Zip ______

In the spaces provided for each item below, please check the appropriate category which indicates your situation. ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL. PLEASE DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEM.

Sex: ___ Female ___ Male

Marital Status: ___ Married ___ Single

Age (as of 10/1/81)

20 - 29 ___ 30 - 39 ___ 40 - 49 ___ 50 - 59 ___ 60 +

Area of Instructional Assignment:

Academic Subject: ___________________________

Fine Arts Subject: ___________________________

Vocational Subject: __________________________

Elective Subject: ___________________________

Other: ___________________________

Highest Degree Attained:

Bachelor's Degree ___ Master's Degree ___ Specialist Degree or Certificate of Advanced Study ___ Doctorate

Years of Total Teaching Experience:

0 - 3 ___ 4 - 9 ___ 10 - 19 ___ 20 - 29 ___ 30 or more

Evaluation Participation:

Last visiting committee membership 1 - 2 years ago ___ Last visiting committee membership 3 - 4 years ago ___ Last visiting committee membership 5 or more years ago ___ No previous visiting committee membership before this week
In the place provided for each item, please circle or complete the appropriate category which indicates your feelings about the topic in question.

Scale for questions 1 - 5

1 - Poor
2 - Fair
3 - Good
4 - Excellent
NA - Not Applicable

1) Motel accommodations for the visiting committee were 1 2 3 4 NA
2) Preparations made by the school for the visiting committee were 1 2 3 4
3) Organization provided by the chairperson and coordinator was 1 2 3 4
4) Hospitality provided by the school faculty and administration was 1 2 3 4
5) This school's total educational program is 1 2 3 4

Scale for questions 6 - 7

1 - not as good
2 - about the same
3 - better
NA - not applicable

6) Compared with the total educational program evaluated this week, my home school's total educational program is 1 2 3
7) Compared with other visiting committees on which I have served, this visiting committee experience was 1 2 3 NA

8) How can visiting committee evaluation be improved?

a. __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

b. __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   ____________________________
   ____________________________
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THE EFFECT OF VISITING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP ON TEACHER MORALE

by

L. Irvin Williams

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of the study was to investigate the effect of visiting committee membership on teacher morale, as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire.

Two hundred fifty teachers were selected to receive the PTO during October, 1981, before the initiation of visiting committee activities. Visiting committee participants received an additional administration of the test on the last day of their respective visiting committee evaluations and all study participants received the PTO during May, 1982.

A direct comparison of group means and differences in gain scores between the research groups was made to determine the effect of the independent variables, visiting committee experience and demographic characteristics on teacher morale and the ten factors of morale. Differences in mean scores were tested for significance using t-test and analysis of variance statistical procedures.

The findings of this study appear to justify the
following conclusions:

1. Morale scores of secondary school teachers increase during the period of the visiting committee week but decrease as the school year progresses.

2. Previous visiting committee membership influences the gain in morale score experienced at the time of the evaluation week but gains dissipate as the school year progresses.

3. Visiting committee membership does not significantly affect the score on any of the ten morale factors of the PTO except the factor "curriculum issues".

4. A greater loss in morale score is experienced during the course of the school year by teachers with less than ten years teaching experience.

5. Members of visiting committees consider the experience a beneficial professional opportunity and are, generally, satisfied with the present format for the evaluation week.

6. Morale score, as defined by the ten factors of the PTO, may not be the best choice of a dependent variable to determine the lasting benefit that is derived by teachers from participation in a professional activity such as visiting committee membership.