1990 and 2004 Arkansas Middle Level Survey Comparison: A Statistical Analysis of the

Data

Terry H. Stepka and Gregory B. Meeks

Arkansas State University

Abstract

This paper examines the progress of one state in implementing the middle school concept. Results of a survey distributed in 1990 were compared to results of a similar survey distributed in the spring of 2004. Responses from principals to survey items dealing with the concept that adolescents are unique in reference to other age groups emotionally, intellectually,

physically, and socially to the needs of implementing and sustaining middle school concepts were compared from 1990 and 2004. While some survey items showed no significant differences in the responses from the two groups, it may be possible to posit that the two groups of principals

still feel that adolescents are unique compared to other age groups. Other survey items did display statistically significant differences between the two groups, which may suggest the stage of the middle level concept. Progress or the lack thereof has been noted with each survey item.

Implications from this survey can serve to heighten awareness and continue to improve the

quality of middle level education.

In January of 1990, the *Arkansas Middle Grade Policy and Practice Task Force* commissioned a survey to assess the status of middle level education in the State of Arkansas. The survey was distributed to superintendents and principals to all schools with grades five to nine. Six hundred surveys were distributed and three hundred and forty-three surveys were returned for a return rate of 57.17 percent.

In the spring of 2004, the Arkansas Association of Middle Level Educators and the Arkansas Association of Middle Level Administrators surveyed all of the principals of Arkansas public schools housing fifth through ninth graders. This survey was modeled after the 1990 survey. The 2004 mailing was distributed to 301 principals. Seventy-one surveys were returned for a return rate of 23.6%. Although, the 2004 survey generated a smaller return rate than the 1990, Alreck and Settle (1985) indicates that mail surveys with response rates over thirty percent are rare.

The purpose of this 2004 mailing was to again assess the status of middle level education in Arkansas and to compare the results with the baseline established by the first survey. Where comparisons were possible, independent t tests were conducted on the data from both the 1990 and the 2004 surveys. From the independent t test results the researchers were able to determine if a statistical significant difference was present. Presented here is the statistical analysis on those questions which were able to be compared between the 1990 and the 2004 surveys.

TABLE 1A. Do you agree with the concept that early adolescents (10-15 years old)
are unique in reference to other age groups emotionally, intellectually, physically,
and socially?

Survey	Yes	No	Maybe
1990	94.15%	1.60%	4.26%
2004	98.59%	1.41%	not an option on this survey

An independent *t* test was conducted to determine if a statistically significant difference was present from the first survey in 1990 to the second administered in the spring of 2004 as shown in Table 1B.

TABLE 1B. Ir	TABLE 1B. Independent t Test for Concept of Early Adolescents			
Survey	М	SD	<u>t</u>	
1990	1.10	.4206	.503	
2004	1.03	.1198		

The results of the independent *t* test reveal there is no significant difference between principals' perception from 1990 to 2004 regarding the unique characteristics of early adolescents. The observed *t* value is .503 which is not greater than t critical $_{(.05, 257)}$ of 1.96.

TABLE 2A. Would you support the development of a middle level program in yourcurrent structure?			
Survey	Yes	No	Not Applicable
1990	55.78%	17.08%	27.85%
2004	42.03%	2.90%	52.17%

An independent *t* test was conducted to determine if a statistically significant difference was present from the first survey in 1990 to the second administered in the spring of 2004 as shown in Table 2B. There was no significant difference when only the "yes" responses were considered. However, an adjusted comparison was made taking into consideration the "yes" response and the "not applicable" responses. The "not applicable" responses were those principals who had checked this category because they already had a middle level program in place. Therefore, the adjusted comparison was between those who already had a program in place and those who were supportive of putting a program into their current structure.

TABLE 2B. Independent t Test for Support of Development of Middle LevelProgram and Those Who Already had a Program in Place			
Survey	М	SD	<u>t</u>
1990	1.73	.8717	2.62
2004	2.08	.9815	

The results of the independent *t* test show that there is a statistically significant difference in the support of a middle level program. The computed *t* of 2.62was greater than *t* critical $_{(.05, ..., 05, ..., 05)}$ ₂₂₁₎ which indicates that the difference between the 1990 and 2004 surveys can be attributed to more support of a middle level program.

TABLE 3A. Would or does your district office support making changes deemedappropriate for early adolescents?			
Survey	Yes	No	Maybe
1990	48.68%	3.29%	48.03%
2004	94.03%	5.97%	not an option on this survey

To determine if a significant difference exists for district office support for making changes deemed appropriate for early adolescents, an independent *t* test was conducted to determine if a statistically significant difference was present from the first survey in 1990 to the second administered in the spring of 2004 as shown in Table 3B.

TABLE 3B. Independent t Test for District Office Support for Making Changes Appropriate for Adolescents			
Survey	М	SD	<u>t</u>
1990	1.99	.9866	7.61
2004	1.06	.2307	

There is a statistically significance difference between the perception of district office support for making changes appropriate for adolescents. The computed *t* of 7.61 is greater than *t* critical $_{(.05, 217)}$ which indicates the difference between the responses is not due to chance or other variables but to a definite change in perception by the those surveyed.

TABLE 4A. Membership in National Middle School Association			
Survey	Yes	No	
1990	26.03%	73.97%	
2004	59.14%	40.85%	

To determine if a statistically significant difference in professional membership in the National Middle School Association was present between 1990 and 2004, an independent t test was done. The data is presented in Table 4B.

TABLE 4B. Independent t Test for Membership in the National Middle School Assoication			
Survey	М	SD	<u>t</u>
1990	1.74	.4288	4.26
2004	1.41	.4915	

The results of the independent *t* test indicate a statistically significant difference in membership between the two surveys given that *t* observed of 4.26 is greater than *t* critical $_{(.05,142)}$ of 1.96. One can conclude that membership in this organization has increased significantly in the past fourteen years.

TABLE 5A. Does your middle grades program use interdisciplinary teamorganization?		
Survey	Yes	No
1990	33.78%	66.22%
2004	71.83%	28.17%

The following table (Table 5B) represents the results of an independent t test to determine

if a statistically significant difference was present between the 1990 and 2004 data..

TABLE 5B. Independent t Test for the Use of Interdisciplinary Team Organization				
Survey	М	SD	<u>t</u>	
1990	1.66	.4762	4.92	
2004 1.28 .4530				

A computed t of 4.92 is greater than t critical (.05, 143) of 1.96 which indicates a

statistically significance difference between the use of interdisciplinary team organization from 1990 to 2004.

FABLE 6A. Does your middle level program(s) have an advisor/advisee program?		
Survey	Yes	No
1990	31.51%	68.49%
2004	36.62%	63.38%

To determine a statistically significant difference in the use of advisor/advisee programs from 1990 to 2004, an independent t test was conducted. The results are shown in Table 6B.

TABLE 6B. Independent t Test for the Use of Advisor/Advisee Program			
Survey	М	SD	<u>t</u>
1990	1.68	.4678	0.8809
2004	1.61	.4858	

The subsequent results of this independent *t* test do not indicate a significant difference in the use of advisor/advisee programs from 1990 to 2004. The computed *t* of .8809 is less than *t* critical $_{(.05, 142)}$ of 1.96. The difference in the two surveys can be attributed to chance.

TABLE 7A. Does your middle level program have flexible scheduling"?		
Yes	No	
27.14%	72.86%	
50.70%	49.30%	
	Yes 27.14%	Yes No 27.14% 72.86%

An independent *t* test was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in flexible scheduling from 1990 to 2004. The results are shown in Table 7B.

TABLE 7B. Independent t Test for the Use of Flexible Scheduling				
Survey	М	SD	<u>t</u>	
1990	1.73	.4479	2.74	
2004	1.49	.5035		

As indicated by the results of the independent *t* test, there was a significant difference in the use of flexible scheduling from 1990 to 2004. The computed *t* of 2.74 was greater than *t* critical $_{(.05, 139)}$ of 1.96, which indicates that the differences in the two surveys did not occur by chance.

Does your staff need training/in-service in middle level programs?

A little less than seventy percent of principals in 1990 indicated that their faculty needed training or in-service in middle level programs and almost seventy-nine percent of principals felt like their faculty would be willing to be trained.

An independent *t* test revealed the following) when comparing the answers to the above questions from 1990 to 2004.

TABLE 8. Independent t Test for the Need of Training/In-service				
Survey	М	SD	<u>t</u>	
1990	1.30	.4506	1.57	
2004	1.20	.4007		

While principals felt their faculty would benefit from training in 1990 and 2004, there was no significant difference between the two groups in the fourteen-year time span. The computed *t* of 1.57 was less than *t* critical $_{(.05, 217)}$ which does not indicate a significant difference in the responses.

Would your staff be willing to receive training in middle level programming?

By 2004, the percent of principals indicating that their faculty needed training was slightly over eighty percent and almost ninety-three percent felt that their faculties would be receptive to such training.

TABLE 9. Independent t Test for the Willingness of Faculty for Training				
Survey	М	SD	<u>t</u>	
1990	1.21	.4089	2.63	
2004	1.07	.2577		

principals of the willingness of their respective faculties to receive training in the middle level philosophy. The computed *t* of 2.63 is greater than *t* critical $_{(.05, 207)}$ of 1.96, which does indicate a statistically significant difference in the responses between the two groups.

TABLE 10A. Would your staff be interested in visiting an exemplary middle level program?		
Survey	Yes	No
1990	80.00%	20.00%
2004	85.29%	14.71%

An independent *t* test was utilized to determine if a significant difference was apparent in the responses to this question from 1990 to 2004. The results are shown in Table 10B.

TABLE 10B. Independent t Test for Visiting an Exemplary Middle Level Program			
Survey	М	SD	<u>t</u>
1990	1.20	.4014	2.94
2004	1.03	.3758	

These results indicate a statistically significant difference in the interest in visiting an exemplary middle level program from principals' responses from 1990 to 2004. It seems that more interest is present among today's principals when compared to the respondents answers in the 1990 survey. The computed *t* was 2.94 which is greater than *t* critical $_{(.05, 211)}$ of 1.96, which does indicate a statistically significant difference between the two groups.

References

Alreck, P., and Settle, R. (1985). The survey research handbook. Illinois: Irwin Publishing Company.

Appendix

Item Compared	1990 Survey Item	2004 Survey Item
Do you agree with the	Item 1	Planning Opportunities,
concept that early		Item 2
adolescents (10-15 years		
old) are unique in reference		
to other age groups		
emotionally, intellectually,		
physically, and socially?		
Would you support the	Section B, Item 1	Planning Opportunities,
development of a middle	·····	Item 1
level program in your		
current structure?		
Would or does your district	Section B, Item 16	Planning Opportunities,
office support making		Item 10
changes deemed		
appropriate for early		
adolescents?		
How are the middle grades	Section A, Item 5	District Organization, Item
in your district organized?		2
Membership in National	Section A, Item 9	Middle Grades Program,
Middle School Association		Item 3
Percent of Schools Utilizing	Section A, Items 3, 4, and 6	Middle Grades Program,
Interdisciplinary Teams,		Item 1
Advisor/Advisee Program,		
and Flexible Scheduling		
What do you perceive as the	Section B, Item 11	Planning Opportunities,
most difficult task in either		Item 11
designing, implementing, or		
improving a middle level		
education program?		
Other than money, what	Section B, Item 12	Planning Opportunities,
further assistance would		Item 12
you use to make your		
middle grades program		
more thorough and effective		
in all areas?		
Would your staff be willing	Section B, Item 13	Planning Opportunities,
to receive training in middle		Item 5
level programming?		
Would your staff be	Section B, Item 15	Planning Opportunities,
interested in visiting an		item 9
exemplary middle level		
program?		

1990 and 2004 Middle Grades Survey Comparison Matrix

MIDDLE GRADES SURVEY PRINCIPALS/SUPERINTENDENTS JON E. PEDERSEN SAMUEL TOTTEN THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS FAYETTEVILLE, AR 72701

QUESTIONS FOR SURVEY FOR MIDDLE GRADES

- 1. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE CONCEPT THAT EARLY ADOLESCENTS (10-15 YRS) ARE UNIQUE IN REFERENCE TO OTHER AGE GROUPS EMOTIONALLY, MENTALLY, PHYSICALLY AND SOCIALLY? YES_____NO_____MAYBE_____
- 2. DO YOU HAVE A MIDDLE LEVEL PROGRAM (OR SCHOOL) IN YOUR DISTRICT? YES_____ NO_____ MAYBE_____

If YES complete SECTION A & B If NO complete SECTION B only

SECTION A

- DOES YOUR MIDDLE LEVEL PROGRAM HVE ANY SPECIAL PROGRAMS (e.g. advisor/advisee, exploratory curriculum, etc.) THAT ARE SPECIFICALLY FOR YOUR MIDDLE LEVEL PROGRAM/
 - If so, please provide the name and focus of such programs:
- 2. How many middle level programs do you have in your district?
 - 1____2___3___4___5___ or more___
- 3. Does your middle level program have an advisor/advisee program? Yes_____No_____
- 4. Does your middle grades program use interdisciplinary team organization? Yes____ No____
- 5. What combination of grades constitutes your middle level program? 5-6____5-7____5-8____6-7____6-8____6-9____7-9____Other____
- Does your middle level program have "flexible scheduling?" Yes____ No____
- 7. If yes, please succinctly describe how it works:
- 8. If you currently have a middle level program, what new programs are you currently working on implementing over the course of this school year?
- 9. Does your middle level program/school/district belong to the National Middle School Association?

Yes____ No____

SECTION B

- As a superintendent/principal would you support the development of a middle level program within your present junior high structure? Yes_____No____
- As a superintendent/principal would you prefer a 6-8 organization pattern verses the traditional 7-9 concept? Yes_____No____
- 3. If you do not have a middle program in your district, are there plans to develop one in the near future?

Yes____No____

- Would you be interested in receiving assistance in developing a middle level program? Yes____ No____
- 5. Have you read the Carnegie Report: <u>Turning Points</u>? Yes____No____
- 6. If not, would you be interested in receiving a brochure of the report? Yes____ No____
- 7. To what extent do you have heterogeneous grouping in your school? Please be specific in your answer.
- 8. Is your district currently part of a restructuring effort? Yes____ No____
- 9. How many high schools do you have in your district? Junior High _____Middle School ____Elementary School_____
- 10. What is/are the size(s) (enrollment) in your middle school(s)?
- 11. What do you perceive as the most difficult task in either designing/implementing/improving a middle level education program?
- 12. If there is any area in which you need assistance in either developing/implementing or improving your middle level education program, what is it?
- 13. Does your faculty need training/inservice in middle level programs?
- 14. Will your staff be willing to be trained/inserviced in middle level programming?
- 15. Would you or your staff be interested in visiting an exemplary middle level program?
- 16. Would your district office support making changes deemed appropriate for early adolescents?

Public Schools of Arkansas: Survey of Middle Grades

The following questions are specific to the "middle school concept" and may need some clarification of terms. Any questions may be directed to Danny Barnett, Effective Strategies, Inc. at (501)281-0392 or <u>dbarnet1@ipa.net</u>.

District Organization

Question 1:	How many students are in your district?
Question 2:	How are the middle grades in your district organized?(i.e. 5-6, 5-8, 6-7, etc.)Number of students?
Question 3:	Does your district have a "middle school building"? YESNO If YES, how many?
Question 4:	Has your district reorganized in the last ten years to an identified middle level grade organization?YESNO Did you build a new building to house it?YESNO If more than one, how many buildings?
Question 5:	district?YESNO If YES, please describe:
	If NO, please go to section on Planning Opportunities.
Question 6:	Is there a middle grades principal assigned to your middle grades organization(s)? YESNO If YES, do they have an assistant(s)?YESNO How many?

Middle Grades Program

Question 1: Which of the following middle level concepts are contained in your middle grades program?

- ____ Interdisciplinary teaming
- ____ Team Common Planning Time
- ____ Homogeneous Grouping
- ____ Athletics(interscholastic)
- ____ Flexible Scheduling
- ____ Integrated Curriculum
- ____ Student Portfolios

- ____ Adviser/Advisee program
- ____ Individual Planning Time
- ____ Heterogeneous Grouping
- ____ Athletics(Intramural)
- ____ Exploratory Curriculum
- ____ Peer Tutoring
- ____ Peer Counseling

Question 3:	Is your school building represented by membership in any of the following
	organizations?

- ____ National Middle School Association (NMSA)
- ____ Arkansas Association of Middle Level Education (AAMLE)
- ____ Arkansas Association of Middle Level Administrators (AAMLA)
- ____ Arkansas Association of Elementary School Principals (AAESP)
- ____ Arkansas Association of Secondary School Principals (AASSP)

Planning Opportunities

Question 1:	Would you support the development of a middle level program in your current structure?YESNONot applicable(have one already)
Question 2:	Do you agree with the concept that early adolescents (10-15 years old) are unique in reference to other age groups emotionally, intellectually, physically, and socially?YESNO
Question 3:	Academically, do you think any variation of a 5-6-7-8 organization pattern would best support and promote the current accountability standards?YESNOUNDECIDED
Question 4:	Does your staff need training/in-service in middle level programs? YESNO
Question 5:	Would your staff be willing to receive training in middle level programming? YESNO
Question 6: from?	What areas of middle level training would your staff benefit the most
	List 5 in order of preference(1 is highest) Refer to question 1-MGs
Program	
	1
	2
	3
	4 5
	J.

- Question 7: What percentage of your staff has received training in and/or has studied middle level philosophy? _____
- Question 8: How many teachers on your staff have received recent licensure specifically for middle level math/science or middle level language/social studies?_____
- Question 9: Would you or your staff be interested in visiting an exemplary middle level program? _____YES ____NO
- Question 10: Would or does your district office support making changes deemed appropriate for early adolescents? ____YES ____NO
- Question 11: What do you perceive as the most difficult task in either designing, implementing, or improving a middle level education program?
- Question 12: Other than money, what further assistance would you use to make your middle grades program more thorough and effective in all areas?

Please mail this completed survey to:

Dr. Greg Meeks Arkansas State University P.O. Box 2350 State University, Arkansas 72467