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ABSTRACT

This study explored the extent of agreement between principals and teachers relative to the teachers’ style, the extent of agreement between principals and teachers relative to the most effective match between teachers and students with various characteristics, and how classroom placement decisions are made. Participants consisted of 25 principals and 61 teachers. Principals and teachers completed the Teaching Style Inventory (Grasha, 1996) as a description of the teacher’s teaching style. Then, participants reviewed three vignettes of students with varying characteristics and completed a Teaching Style Inventory, to identify the style they thought appropriate for each student. An additional 5 principals and 5 teachers were interviewed to explore the class placement process used in the participants’ schools.

Results revealed that principals and teachers were not in agreement in their ratings of teacher style, with principals rating teachers significantly higher on the delegator style, than teachers rated themselves. Principals and teachers also did not agree with each other in their ratings of the teacher styles needed by the students. Significant differences were found in the ratings depending on who completed the measures (principal or teacher).
interviews, class placement decisions were reported to be based on students’ academic and social-emotional/behavioral skills, need for supplemental support services, and parent feedback, but not teaching style, as anticipated. Teaching style, however, was considered as a part of the conceptualization of the term “match”. Implications are discussed relative to the class placement process and educator evaluation systems.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Changes to educational policy over the course of the past several decades have increased the accountability of school districts relative to student achievement (Hursh, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2007). For example, the federal “Race to the Top” (RTT) competitive grant program requires states receiving funds to reform their teacher evaluation systems with specific federal priorities. One such priority has been the consideration of student academic achievement within the teacher evaluation system, essentially tying student performance to educator evaluation outcomes. The RTT program requires states to “use multiple ratings of categories that take student achievement growth into account as a significant factor…and are designed with teacher involvement” (U.S. Department of Education, 2009, p. 9). The impact of this emphasis has made student achievement a critical focus of reform efforts. With this focus on student achievement, it is important to consider the factors associated with students’ success in the classroom.

Historically, scholars have argued that students are more likely to succeed in academic settings where a match, or “good fit,” exists between the students and the environment (Cowles & Aldridge, 1992; Eddowes & Aldridge, 1990). Keogh (1986) indicated that this goodness of fit is reciprocal; that is, while the teacher and the classroom setting affect the child so, too, does the student affect the teacher. At the heart of this “good fit” is the relationship between the student and the teacher. This traditional perspective is important to consider in light of the recent focus on student achievement.
within teacher evaluation systems. It is important to consider the variety of factors associated with what constitutes a “good fit” or “match” in the classroom setting. Understanding these factors could do much to inform and support the effective implementation of recent educational reform efforts.

**Significance of the Study**

Regardless of the evidence suggesting the importance of a “good fit” between teacher and student, relatively little research has explored how this relationship is formed. This process of assigning students to classrooms can be as simple as taking the total number of students and dividing by the number of available classroom or it can be as complex as making an attempt to create groups of students based on specific criteria and then matching teachers to these groups. With the exceptions of relatively small schools with only one class for each grade or classes with multiple grades in the same room (multi-aged classrooms) that are formed due to student enrollment, the process of assigning students to classrooms occurs in almost every primary, elementary, and secondary school across the country (Carlyon & Fisher, 2012; Heitzman, 2012).

In one of the first in-depth analyses of this process Monk, in 1987, wrote “[i]n light of the importance attached to the pupil assignment process and the associated problems, it is surprising to find that little research has been done on the topic” (p. 168). In this seminal work, Monk was the first to begin to understand the components of class placement and the processes employed by principals to complete the task. Since that analysis, some research has been conducted to explore how these decisions are made (Kraemer, Worth, & Meyer, 2011; Kalogrides, Loeb, & Beteille, 2012; Gao, 2012) and
shows that, to some extent, the individual characteristics of teachers are used to make placement decisions. Some researchers have suggested, for example, that principals take the teaching style of the teacher into account when making placement decisions (Monk, 1987; Kraemer, Worth, & Meyer, 2011), while others have found that other variables, such as student needs for supplemental supports or services, play a role (Kalogrides, Loeb, & Beteille, 2012; Gao, 2012). This is of particular importance at the elementary level where classroom placement is based on many other factors than the master school schedule (which tends to dictate class placement at the secondary level). Through a comprehensive examination of these placement procedures, and a quantitative examination of the extent to which principals and teachers agree on a teacher’s teaching style and extent of agreement between principals and teachers relative to the needs of students, it is hoped that the results of this research will better inform decision makers in the creation of classrooms that represent the “best fit” for teachers and students.

**Purpose of the Study**

Regardless of the evidence suggesting the importance of a “good fit” between teacher and student, relatively little research has explored how this relationship is formed. This dissertation sought to (a) investigate the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the teachers’ style, (b) examine the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the most effective match between teachers and students with anxiety, and (c) investigate how students’ classroom placement decisions are made.
Research Questions

The following three research questions were developed to meet the purpose of the study:

1. To what extent do principals and teachers agree on central characteristics of the teaching style of teachers?
2. To what extent do principals and teachers agree on the most effective teacher-matches for three hypothetical students (two demonstrating anxiety and one typically developing student)?
3. How are students classroom placement decisions made and does the perceived “match” between students’ needs and a teachers’ teaching style play a role in these decisions?
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Literature relative to class placement and how classrooms are formed in schools, how students and teachers are matched, and the social and emotional outcomes of students, as a result this match, provides a context for understanding this study. Theories of teaching and research relative to the examination of agreement in teacher and principal perceptions provide meaningful direction for this study.

Class Placement

This process of assigning students to classrooms (class placement) can be complex and may involve several factors (Carlyon & Fisher, 2012; Heitzman, 2012). In an attempt to understand how placement decisions are made, Monk (1987) conducted interviews with 16 principals to gather data on assignment practices across a sample of schools. He found that there was “considerable variation” (p. 170) in the ways in which principals assigned students to classrooms and, subsequently, to teachers. The level of principal involvement in the process, Monk indicated, was the largest area of variation. “Nine principals reported being centrally involved, four principals reported delegating the responsibility to their teachers, and three principals combined elements of both approaches” (p. 170). Random assignment, teacher rankings of students on a variety of criteria, academic achievement, and reading levels were all used as criteria for student-classroom/teacher assignment in this study (Monk, 1987).

Interestingly, one principal in the Monk study reported using personal perception
of students and teachers for both the composition of the students into classrooms, as well as the assignment of teachers to those classrooms. Monk (1987) hypothesized that the longer the tenure of a principal, the more involved the principal would become in the process. He also suggested that the length of the principals’ tenure in a particular building the more time the principal had to get to know both teachers and student, enabling them to make more informed class placement decisions.

Kraemer, Worth, and Meyer (2012) examined how students were assigned to classrooms across three urban school districts. Principals, or district-level administrators who had been principals during their careers, participated in focus groups designed to elicit information relative to student assignment to classrooms. Kraemer, Worth, and Meyer found that, in most cases, students in classrooms were heterogeneous and that teaching style was considered when matching teachers to classrooms of students. Classroom management, personality, and the extent to which the teacher was nurturing were all aspects of teaching style that principals in the study relied on when assigning teachers to classrooms. Overall, Kraemer, Worth, and Meyer’s findings were consistent with Monk’s (1987) in that both studies found that assignment of students to classrooms involved a number of school personnel in the decision making process.

Gao (2012) investigated teacher assignment to classes relative to the culture of accountability in the education system of the United States. Gao found that the academic performance of students in a teacher’s classroom one year was related to the students assigned to that teacher the following year. This would suggest that, to some extent, class placement is based on the ability of a teacher to foster successful academic performance
from their students. Gao also found that, consistent with Monk’s (1987) hypothesis, a principal’s involvement in the assignment of teachers to students increased when principal had been in the building for a greater length of time.

Kalogrides, Loeb, and Beteille (2012) examined the relationship between teacher characteristics (e.g., years of experience, race, gender) and the class assignment process. They found that teacher experience played a role in the assignment of students to classrooms; teachers with more experience are assigned classes with higher academically achieving students than their less experienced colleagues. Further, Neild and Farley-Ripple (2008) found that ninth grade students (students new to a high school environment) were more likely to be assigned uncertified and/or teachers with less teaching experience when compared to their colleagues. Results mirror the findings of Clotfelter, Ladd, and Vigdor (2006) who also found that more qualified and experienced teachers were more often paired with classrooms of higher achieving students.

Matching students to teachers based on a variety of factors is a common theme throughout these research findings. While some researchers investigated the class placement process in a broad way, some specifically investigated which criteria are used to make the match. The most widely researched criterion is ability grouping.

Early research focused on classroom-level issues regarding tracking and student academic placement, issues that were best investigated at the teacher and classroom level (Brophy & Good, 1986; Eder, 1981; Finley, 1984; Rist, 1970; Ritts, Patterson, & Tubbs, 1992, Good & Brophy, 1974; Good, 1987). Early work also explored how academic ability differs according to socioeconomic status and race (Donnelly, 1987; Slavin, 1987)
and cautioned against decisions regarding class placement being based solely on student ability. This research led to in-depth analyses of the sociological and academic causes and effects of schooling and of grouping students based on ability (Bowles & Gintis, 2002; Cahan & Linchevski, 1996; Gamoran & Mare, 1989; Hallinan, 1994).

Mason & Doepner (1998) examined principal perceptions of the efficacy of combination classes (multi-grade classes) and the processes used to match teachers to combination classes. They found, much like Monk (1987), variation among principals in how they assign teachers to classes. While some relied heavily on teacher input, others reported that they assigned teachers based on their individual characteristics. Factors such as teacher flexibility, pedagogical and curricular knowledge, and ability to manage and “cope” with varied student presentations were cited as some of the characteristics examined when assigning teachers to classes (Mason & Doepner, 1998, p. 166). Overall, Mason & Doepner (1998) noted that principals generally assign “better” teachers and students to combination classes (p. 167).

Gamoran (1993) examined ability grouping of students, specifically the effects of high performing teachers with low-achieving students. Gamoran (1993) found that teacher expectations and level of class discussion, both aspects of teaching style (Grasha, 1996), were positively correlated with high quality instruction for low-achieving students. Moreover, Finley (1984) examined tracking in a comprehensive high school and found that teachers develop preferences for students and often favor students on a traditional college preparatory track in their class over their lower achieving peers.

To more fully understand how ability groupings are determined, researchers have
investigated other variables and specific characteristics that are used in the decision making process. Archbald, Glutting & Qian (2009) studied the extent to which grades, standardized test scores, and race impacted student placement in various academic tracks at the high school level. Results suggested that grades and standardized test scores were more likely than race to predict track placement.

**Matching Students and Teachers**

Research has suggested that students are more likely to succeed in academic settings when a match, or “good fit,” exists between the environment and the student (Cowles & Aldridge, 1992; Eddowes & Aldridge, 1990). Further, goodness of fit appears to be reciprocal (Keogh, 1986). That is, while the teacher and the classroom setting affect the child so, too, does the student affect the teacher and the classroom setting. Keogh (1986) suggested that teachers might spend more time with easy children because they are pleasant and positive, but they may also spend more time with children that are more challenging due to the potential for inappropriate behavior.

Research utilizing the idea of “goodness of fit” as a framework for understanding child-teacher relationships has focused on the relationship between children’s characteristics and their interaction with particular environments (Churchill, 2003; Lerner, Lerner, & Zabski, 1985). For example, Lerner and colleagues (1985) examined the goodness of fit between child characteristics and teacher expectations. One hundred and ninety-four students in grade four were given surveys assessing five distinct temperament attributes. Data relative to teacher demands and expectations for students, as well as teacher-reported ratings of each child’s academic ability, were collected.
Results illustrated that when there was a better fit between the child and the teacher, teachers reported more positive judgments of the child’s academic attributes and competencies. To expand on this, Churchill (2003) examined the relationship between teacher-child goodness of fit and child social and cognitive outcomes. She found that both cognitive and social outcomes were positively correlated with teacher-child fit, and the fit between the teacher and parent was positively correlated with student social and emotional outcomes.

Students will acquire more knowledge, remember more content, and learn skills more effectively when a teacher’s teaching style matches their behavioral attributes and learning style (Hunt, 1972; Lage, Platt, & Treglia, 2000). When a good fit between teacher and student is not present, there tends to be a decrease in students’ performance, an increase in their dissatisfaction and stress (Pervin, 1980). When students are mismatched with a teacher’s style it becomes difficult for students to resolve the inconsistencies between the ways they interact with the classroom and the structure of the classroom (Joyce, 1983; Kagan & Moss, 1963). Researchers further concluded that for growth and learning to occur, students needed to be closely matched to teachers and classrooms. With a good fit, students are able to learn within a comfortable environment that facilitates a meaningful learning experience (Joyce, 1983).

**Student Social and Emotional Outcomes**

The way children behave in the classroom significantly contributes to their fit and success. Some behavioral styles tend to facilitate a better fit within the school environment than others. For example, individuals whose behavior is observed to be
adaptive, approachable and persistent are better able to deal with the complex and ever-changing demands of the school environment (Keogh, 1986). Similarly, children whose behavior can be characterized by focused attention and ability to regulate activity have been shown to experience success in the classroom (Keogh, 1986). Martin (1994) proposed that children whose behavior is characterized by teachers and peers as “socially attractive” are more likely to receive both emotional and academic support. Birch and Ladd (1998) also found that teachers prefer children who are cooperative, cautious, and responsible to children who are disruptive, assertive, and independent.

Emotional development is an integral aspect of children’s overall development. Children who have greater emotional competency, for example, have increased socialization opportunities with peers, develop more friends, have better relationships with their parents and teachers, and enjoy more academic and social successes (McCabe & Altamura, 2011). Emotions can also negatively impact children’s development. Pechtel and Pizzagalli (2011) found that emotional difficulties in childhood have been associated with deficits in a range of cognitive (cognitive performance, memory, and executive functioning) and affective (reward processing, processing of social and affective stimuli, and emotion regulation) functions throughout the lifespan. Emotional difficulties manifest in children in a wide variety of ways. However, the most commonly experienced emotional problems among children and adolescents are internalizing problems, specifically anxiety (Anderson, Williams & McGee, 1987; Merikangas et al., 2010, Rynn, Puliafico, Heleniak, Rikhi, Ghalib & Vidair, 2011). Internalizing challenges are characterized by symptoms turned inward (Santrock, 2005), which may be indicative
of a disturbance in emotion and mood (Zahn-Waxler, Klimes-Dougan & Slattery, 2000). Internalizing challenges may include anxiety, fears, depression, and social withdrawal (Rubin & Coplan, 2007). Internalizing challenges are often difficult to identify because they tend to not be easily observable.

Birch and Ladd (1998) investigated the extent to which the behavior of students affected the relationships they formed with teachers. Students presenting with internalizing challenges were found to evidence more problematic adjustment in the classroom and more problematic relationships with their teachers. In particular, students with internalizing challenges were found to require more guidance and support from teachers to manage their emotional state, which in turn proved problematic for classroom management and instruction. Further, students with internalizing challenges were found to be less able to meet the demands of the school environment (Birch & Ladd, 1998).

Teaching Style

Conceptualizing the many factors that collectively explain the individual characteristics of a teacher’s style is challenging. Grasha (1996) defined teaching style as representing “those enduring personal qualities and behaviors that appear in how we conduct our classes…it is something that defines us, guides us and directs our instructional processes, and that has effects on students and their ability to learn” (p. 1). Teachers have individual and unique teaching characteristics that can be quantified in different ways. A review of literature reveals several popular frameworks that attempt to classify and explain teaching style. In the following paragraphs the frameworks of Fischer and Fischer (1979), Pratt (2002), and Grasha (1996) will be reviewed.
Fischer and Fischer (1979) identified six categories of teaching styles: *task-oriented, cooperative planner, child-centered, learning-centered, subject-centered* and the *emotionally exciting and its counterpart*. The *task-oriented* teacher specifically identifies what students should learn, how it is to be learned, and how the student is to demonstrate their understanding to the teacher. The *cooperative planner* is more “hands-off” than the *task-oriented* teacher, while still in charge of the learning environment, the cooperative planner functions as a guide to student learning and allows high levels of student participation. The *child centered* teacher provides a clear and consistent environment through which the student actualizes their own curiosity through self-directed learning. The student’s curiosity takes precedent over any planning that had been done by the teacher. In contrast is the *subject centered* teacher who focuses exclusively on the content they are delivering and sees the student as a vessel that needs to be filled with content and knowledge. The *learning centered* teacher is, conceptually, a middle ground between the *child centered* and the *subject centered* teacher. The *learning centered* teacher respects both the content and the learner and strives to balance each side as they provide rigorous and meaningful instruction. Finally, the *emotionally exciting* teacher is characterized as highly energetic and highly involved in the classroom — their *counterparts* present as monotone and detached and lack meaningful investment in the teaching and learning process.

Pratt (2002) defined a theoretical framework characterized by five styles: *transmission, developmental, apprenticeship, nurturing, and social reform*. Teachers who rely heavily on content and specifically determine the “what and how” of student
learning, according to Pratt (2002), exhibit characteristics of the transmission style. These teachers tend to provide feedback to students that focus heavily on their mistakes and errors. Teachers see their role as an educator to “transmit” information to the student and to, in a matter of fact way, point out clear errors in performance. Teachers who provide instruction that specifically builds upon a student’s prior knowledge is said to use the developmental style. Developmental teachers focus is on increasing task complexity by building on prior knowledge while maintaining a deep understanding of where students have been, where they are, and where they need to be. Teachers who provide authentic tasks for students to perform in real-life setting or through utilizing real-life problems are said to be exhibiting characteristics of the apprenticeship style. A teacher presenting with a nurturing style focuses on the interpersonal elements of student learning and listening. The nurturing teacher tends to place the focus of their interactions on developing a connection with the student and their response style is focused on the emotional and intellectual needs of the student. The focus of the teacher is placed on getting to know students and then responding to students' emotional and intellectual needs. The social reform style is predicated on the teacher’s ability to continuously relate ideas and concepts explicitly to the lives of the students. Pratt suggested that teachers develop and utilize only one or two styles at a time. As they grow professionally, teachers may drop one style and pick up another. Pratt (2002) argued that most teachers would only utilize one or two teaching styles; however they may exhibit individual actions or beliefs that are found in several teaching styles. The author suggests that effective teachers will cycle through all styles over the course of their career and may,
over time, come to rely on one or two as preferences.

Both Pratt (2002) and Fischer and Fischer (1979) attempted to classify teaching into one (or two) specific styles. This restriction limits the applicability of the framework, because it does not allow researchers to examine the complex interaction and interplay of multiple teaching styles. In contrast, the framework proposed by Grasha (1996) offers a multi-faceted view of teaching style.

Grasha (1996) argued that it is difficult to group teachers into specific categories due to the complexity of teaching. He suggested that an effective teacher does not present with one or two styles, but displays indicators of differing styles in varying degrees at any given time. Through his examination of the literature and direct observation of teachers engaged in teaching, Grasha (1996) conceptualized teaching as occurring within five distinctive domains: expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. Grasha’s model linked each teaching style with specific student outcomes. The expert teacher assumes that he or she has the information, knowledge, and skills needed to provide the information directly to the students. However, Grasha warns, if this style is overused in the classroom it may lead to students becoming intimidated by the teacher’s knowledge base. The formal authority teacher focuses on a clear and methodical way of conducting class paired with firm expectations. Teachers who exhibit a preference for this style tend to be classified as less flexible, more rigid, and to offer a singular and standardized approach to working with students. A teacher who teaches by personal example and who encourages students to observe and emulate the teacher’s approach is said to utilize a personal model. Grasha hypothesized
that this might lead to some students feeling “inadequate if they cannot live up to such expectations and standards” (p. 154). The facilitator style is characterized by a focus on the personal nature of the student/teacher interaction. Teachers who exhibit this style offer a great deal of flexibility in their teaching and are more prone to a “student-centered” approach, paired with a willingness to explore alternate ways of doing things. However, Grasha warns, this approach, if not executed in a positive and affirming manner, may lead to students feeling uncomfortable in the classroom due to general uncomfortable feelings in response to the open and expressive atmosphere. Finally, Grasha (1996) suggested that the delegator style does much to emphasize the student as an independent learner, but the style can be time consuming and may result in misreading of students’ readiness to take on independent work. The author cautioned that the delegator style might contribute to student anxiety as students may be given too much autonomy before they are ready to take it on. Grasha (1996) did not present any particular style as better or more effective than another: “…everyone who teaches possesses each of the five teaching styles to varying degrees. In effect, each individual style is like a different color on an artist’s palette” (Grasha, 1996, p. 153), with no one style better or worse than the other.

Different teaching styles might be more or less effective in different situations. For example, Emer, McLarney, Goodwin, and Keller (2002) examined the effectiveness of group-interactive versus lecture-based formats during counseling sessions for the retention of taught skills and client satisfaction in a group of individuals with psychiatric disabilities. Results revealed that formats that allowed for interaction among group
members promoted better learning and retention than did lecture formats. Further, results showed an increase in functioning levels such that high functioning subjects (subjects with mild levels of psychopathology) learned the most information within structured yet interactive settings. Likewise, Parker (1984) suggested that a cooperative learning environment that emphasized the development of thinking and problem-solving skills minimized student anxiety. Additionally, Parker argued that cooperative learning benefits the student in the acquisition of broad based social and academic goals and that teachers must use their powerful “instructor” role to empower students to learn independently and take responsibility for their own learning. This appears to support the need for the creation of educational environments in which students feel safe to make errors and learn from mistakes.

Hancock, Nichols and Jones (2000) found that highly anxious students (internalizing challenges) performed best with instruction that does not require significant student interaction, while less anxious students performed best with student-centered instruction (instruction that promotes and fosters participatory learning). Additionally, older research suggested that students who learned in a classroom under the direction of a democratic, student-centered (indirect) teacher evidenced better adjustment, more positive attitudes toward learning, better work habits, more self-initiated activities, and higher levels of achievement than students who learned in a classroom under the direction of an autocratic, teacher-centered (direct) teacher (Amidon & Flanders, 1967; Anderson & Brewer, 1946; Flanders, 1959, 1967, 1968; Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1967). Further, teaching styles that are similar to the authoritative (warm and supportive)
parenting style have been found to be positively related to student motivation and their feelings of academic competence for all students (Moos, 1978; Ryan, Stiller, & Lynch, 1994; Wentzel, 1997).

Brock and Joglekar (2011) investigated teaching styles and the use and effectiveness of PowerPoint slides in post-secondary information management classrooms. Participating instructors were asked to self-report their use of PowerPoint slides, the effectiveness of the slides, and their teaching style. Students in the classes were interviewed relative to instructor effectiveness. Brock and Joglekar found that perceptions of teaching effectiveness was not influenced by the number of PowerPoint slides used; rather, positive student feedback was associated with lower text density on slides. Further, instructors characterized as exhibiting the expert or facilitator style were more likely to use “non-textual elements” (e.g., pictures, charts, animation, sounds, etc.) than other teaching styles (Brock & Joglekar, 2011, p. 89). The study was limited by its small sample size and questions about its generalizability outside of postsecondary information management classrooms, but findings nevertheless suggest that variability among teaching styles and in the use of audiovisual aids are associated with subsequent student–reported teacher effectiveness.

Kulinna and Cothran (2003) examined teachers’ perceptions and use of teaching styles. Participants, physical education teachers from across the United States, completed a questionnaire used to examine their use and perceptions of 11 different teaching styles. Kulinna and Cothran (2003) found that teachers reported using a variety of teaching styles and that their professional experience was related to their comfort level with using
specific styles. In other words, the more experience a teacher has, the more comfortable they are with using a variety of teaching styles.

LaBillois and Lagace-Seguin (2007) examined the extent to which a child’s ability to regulate their emotion moderated the relationships between anxiety and a teacher’s teaching style. Students in grades two and four completed a measure to assess their emotion regulation, with their parents completing a measure examining their child’s anxiety levels. Results showed different patterns of associations between teaching styles and parent-reported anxiety for students who were able to regulate their emotions better than those who were less able to regulate their emotions. They found that children who were better able to regulate their emotions evidence lower levels of anxiety relative to the expert teaching style, as compared against their less-regulated peers. Further, results showed that the facilitator and formal authority teaching styles were predictive of higher levels of anxiety in students who were less regulated, with lower levels of anxiety in students who were better able to regulate their emotions.

**Agreement between Teachers and Principals**

The ability to classify teachers, based on the teacher’s self-reported behavioral characteristics, into specific teaching styles is well established. However, what is less clear is the extent to which principals and teachers agree on their perceptions of the teachers’ style. Some research has examined the extent of agreement between teachers and principals relative to principal’s role in the school building (Jorgenson & Peal, 2008), perceptions of principal efficacy (Ware & Kitsantas, 2011), opinions relative to the cause of learning disabilities in students (Kataoka, van Kraayenoord, & Elkins, 2004), essential
teaching characteristics essential to finding employment (Abernathy, Forsyth & Mitchell, 2001), and important leadership qualities necessary for effective teacher leaders (Watt, Mills & Huerta, 2010). However, no prior studies have directly examined agreement on perceptions of teaching style.

Jorgenson and Peal (2008) discussed the dissonance between teacher and principal perceptions of the principal’s role in the school building. Specifically, challenges arise when teachers perceive that the principal has lost touch with the realities of day-to-day life in the classroom. Likewise, Ware and Kitsantas (2011) examined, among other things, the predictive relationship between principal efficacy and teacher commitment to teaching. External factors affecting principal’s effectiveness (e.g., resource allocation) were found to negatively predict teacher commitment suggesting that a principal’s performance, albeit often related to factors outside of their control, impacts a teacher’s commitment to teaching.

Kataoka, van Kraayenoord, and Elkins (2004) examined the extent of agreement between teacher and principal perceptions of the causes of learning disabilities in students. Kataoka and colleagues (2004) argued that teachers play a key role in the identification of students with learning disabilities in the classroom and the extent to which principals and teachers agree on the causes could shed light on the challenges associated with resource allocation and support services. Both teachers and principals were asked to complete a questionnaire that presented possible causes of learning disabilities. Kataoka and colleagues (2004) operationalized “causes” as individual factors that were grouped within one of six topics: curriculum and academic issues,
abilities and educational support, family and lifestyle issues, government control of the education system, social issues, and students’ concerns and their life styles (p. 165). Using a 4-point Likert scale participants identified the extent to which they agreed with a presented statement (from “Strongly Agree” to “Disagree”). Kataoka and colleagues (2004) found variation in the extent of agreement between teachers’ and principals’ perceptions relative to each of the factors. While there was agreement on some factors, principals were noted to more heavily focus on “broader issues” (e.g., the impact of social issues, teachers’ abilities, and professional development) with teachers focusing more on “practical issues” (e.g., how to support students and how best to teach them).

There are also instances in which principal and teacher perceptions match. For example, Abernathy, Forsyth & Mitchell (2001) examined factors considered important when hiring a teacher that were reported by teacher preparation professionals, school-based professionals, and job seekers. Results suggested that, for the most part, all involved agreed on what factors are important when hiring a teacher. Further, Watt, Mills and Huerta (2010) investigated agreement among principal and vice principal perceptions of important characteristics in teacher leaders. While the study was focused on the implementation of a high school programs geared toward increasing college attendance for first-time attendees, results suggested that principals and assistant principals agree on the important characteristics of teacher leaders.

Summary

While some research has examined agreement between principals and teachers, prior studies have not directly examined agreement on perceptions of teaching style. Each
year students are placed into classrooms with teachers. This challenging responsibility contains significant implications for not only student academic, social, and emotional outcomes but implications relative to teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. While some research has suggested, for example, that the teaching style of the teacher impacts the decision making process of principals (Monk, 1987; Kraemer, Worth, & Meyer, 2011). What is less clear is (a) the extent of agreement between how the principal perceives the teaching style of the teacher and how the teacher perceives his or her own teaching style, and (b) the extent to which principals and teachers agree on the most effective match between teachers and students. These issues have important implications relative not only to student academic, social, and emotional outcomes but implications relative to teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to (a) investigate the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the teachers’ style, (b) examine the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the most effective match between teachers and students with anxiety, and (c) investigate how students’ classroom placement decisions are made. To meet the described purposes, the follow research questions were asked:

1. To what extent do principals and teachers agree on central characteristics of the teaching style of teachers?

2. To what extent do principals and teachers agree on the most effective teacher-matches for three hypothetical students (two demonstrating anxiety and one typically developing student)?

3. How are students classroom placement decisions made and does the perceived “match” between students needs and a teachers’ teaching style plays a role in these decisions?

All phases of this study were conducted with the full approval of the Boston University Institutional Review Board.
Sample

The participants for Study 1 and 2 consisted of twenty-five individuals who were principals or district administrators ($N=25$) and 61 teachers ($N=61$). Participants in data collection activities relative to Study 3 consisted of five principals ($n=5$) and five teachers ($n=5$) who also participated in data collection for Study 1 and 2.

Recruitment Methods

Two groups of participants were recruited for participation. The first was recruited to participate in Study 1 and 2 designed to determine the extent of agreement between principals and teachers regarding teaching style of the teacher and the match between teaching style and student need. The second group of participants, a subset of the first, was then recruited to participate in Study 3 focused developing an understanding the basis of class assignment. The procedures used to recruit participants for each group are described below.

Study 1 and 2: Teaching style and match between style and student need. The goal of recruitment was to identify elementary school principal-teacher pairs to participate in the study. Elementary principals were identified for inclusion in the study because of the nature of the class placement process at the elementary level. At the middle and high school level class placement may be more of a function of schedules or department heads, and not the building staff. Elementary school principals are also more likely than their secondary peers to play key roles in the assignment of students to

---

1 The term “principal” will be used going forward to describe both groups of individuals.
teachers. Based on a power analysis, the initial aim was to enroll 87 such pairs.

Approximately all 8,265 school district superintendents from the 25 selected US states were contacted via email (see Appendix A) for permission to contact elementary school principals in their districts for participation in the study. Contact information for superintendents was collected from individual state departments of education websites. A total of 1,172 superintendents (14.2%) responded to the initial email and 215 agreed to allow their school principals and teachers to be contacted to participate in the study (18.3% of those responding, 2.6% of total contacted). Reasons given for not providing permission were that the district had a policy of non-participation in research projects, the district had agreed to participate in a number of other studies being conducted at the same time, and that the district was in the midst of significant work relative to implementation of reform and felt that “another thing” was too much for its principals. Twelve school district superintendents requested copies of approval documentation from the Boston University Institutional Review Board, and another six requested the completion of district-specific approval forms in compliance with district policies and procedures. All documentation, as requested, was submitted in compliance with these requests.

All possible (N=672) elementary school principals from the 215 school districts agreeable to participation were contacted via email (see Appendix B). The elementary school principal contact information was collected from individual school websites of participating school districts. The recruiting email introduced the project, sought principal participation, and asked if they were willing to participate and if their teachers could be contacted to request participation as well. Of the total principals contacted, 76 (11.3%)
agreed to participate and allowed their teachers to be contacted.

Approximately 837 elementary teachers were contacted via email (see Appendix C) from addresses collected from the websites of schools in which principals agreed to participate ($n = 76$). One principal provided teacher email addresses to the primary investigator because the teacher email addresses were not readily available on the website. The recruiting email introduced the project and sought teacher participation. Of the total teachers contacted, 87 (10.4%) responded and agreed to participate. It should be noted that the number of teachers contacted was greater than the number of principals participating because several principals agreed to complete the questionnaires for more than one teacher.

**Study 3: Basis of class assignment.** The third study focused on learning about the process and procedures used in schools that form the basis of class placement. Ten school district superintendents from 2 US states were contacted via email (see Appendix D) for permission to contact elementary school principals in their districts to solicit participation. Three principals were contacted from one state and seven principals from another using contact information from the first phase of recruitment activities. All school district superintendents contacted agreed to allow their school principals and teachers to be contacted for recruitment purposes. Ten elementary school principals from 9 school districts were contacted to participate in the study (two principals from the same school district). Principals were contacted via email (see Appendix E) using email addresses collected during the first phase of recruitment activities. The recruiting email introduced the project, sought their participation and, if they were willing to participate,
requested permission to contact individual teachers. Of the 10 principals contacted, 8 (80.0%) responded and agreed to participate and allowed their teachers to be contacted. A total of 14 elementary teachers were contacted from the schools in which principals had agreed to participate in the study. More teachers were contacted than participating principals because several teachers declined participation and, in these cases, another teacher from the same building was contacted with an invitation to participate. An additional nine were contacted who declined participation. Teachers were contacted via email (see Appendix F) using email addresses collected during the first phase of the study. The recruiting email introduced the project and sought their participation. Of the total teachers contacted, five (60.0%) responded and agreed to participate. Additional teachers were recruited from the building but all either declined participation or did not respond to the recruiting email.

**Study 1: Procedures for Agreement on Teacher Style**

Once selected participants were sent, via email, a link to an online survey. This survey was used to solicit the participant’s informed consent and to gather general demographic information. Additionally, the survey was used to collect information relative the extent of agreement on a teacher’s teaching style between the teacher and their principal.

**Participants.** Two criteria were used in recruiting participants for the first and second studies. First, only pairs of principals and teachers who had been in an evaluative relationship were sought. While school principals were the primary targeted administrator to be contacted for participation, in two instances other building and district
leaders participated. Their responses were included in the results as they, in their respective buildings, were involved in the class placement process.

Included in analyses were data from cases in which principal \((N=25)\) and teacher \((N=61)\) participants completed all parts of the survey. Excluded were fourteen \((N=14)\) participants because either one member of the pair did not complete the survey \((n=12)\), or a member of the pair completed only part of the survey \((n=2)\).

The responses of 25 principals and 61 teachers were used in the study (see Table 1). The majority of those who participated were building principals \((n=23)\) and general education teachers \((n=60)\). Other administrative participants whose title varied included one participant who is both a principal and a superintendent and one participant who was an Assistant/Vice principal. In addition to general education teachers, one special education teacher participated. Of the total population of participating principals, six \((n=6)\) provided data on more than one teacher. Two principals completed the data collection procedures on two teachers and three principals provided data on 10, 12, and 15 teachers, respectively.

Table 1

| Agreement on Teaching Style - Participants by Role |
|---|---|---|
| Principals | | |
| Role | \(N\) | % |
| Building Principal | 23 | 92 |
| Superintendent/Principal | 1 | 4 |
| Assistant/Vice Principal | 1 | 4 |
| Total | 25 | 100 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teacher</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of principals (82%) reported working with the teacher with whom they were paired for 4+ years and participants worked in buildings with a range of grade configurations (see Table 2). All principals reported having prior experience working as a teacher. Mean student enrollment at their buildings was 438 (range = 210–904) and mean total teaching staff was reported to be 29.

Table 2

Agreement on Teaching Style - Principal Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years working with Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–5 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Configuration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK–4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK–5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK–8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K–3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K–4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K–5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K–6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K–8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data collection instruments.** Participants completed the *Teaching Style Inventory* (Grasha, 1996) with appropriate permissions. The TSI is a 40-item measure that examines teaching style using a Likert scale. The instrument is used to assess a teacher’s teaching style and yields scores on five constructs (expert, formal authority,
personal model, facilitator, and delegator). The TSI was developed as an extension of the theoretical framework of teaching style developed by Grasha (1996). Grasha initially developed the measure in an attempt to support college and university professors in their development of a reflective and thoughtful teaching practice. Researchers expanded its use to the K–12 setting and, in its most recent form, the TSI is used in conjunction with a learning style inventory (collectively referred to as the Grasha-Reichmann Teaching and Learning Styles Inventory). The TSI was selected due to its prominence in the literature relative to teaching style (e.g., Faruji, 2012; Andrews, 2004; Minkler, 2008; Grasha & Yangarber-Hicks, 2000).

Grasha (1996) reported acceptable reliability (α=.68–.75 on individual scales, and α=.72 for the entire test). However, prior research has not examined the validity of the Teaching Styles Inventory (Minkler, 2008). Even with this limitation, the tool remains widely used and the most often cited tool in literature regarding teaching style (Vaughn & Baker, 2008; Kazemi & Soleimani, 2013; Stanford, 2014; Damrongpanit, 2014; Damrongpanit & Reungtragul, 2013; Audette & Roush, 2013). However, given the lack of established validity, the reported results have to be viewed cautiously.

In addition to completing the TSI, participants were asked a series of questions to collect demographic information relative to the participant’s age, gender, highest degree earned, cumulative years teaching, years in their current role, years working with the current principal, total number of students taught/number of students in class, and subject taught (see Appendix G). Similar demographic information was collected from principals including age, gender, highest degree earned, total years in the education
profession, years as principal, years as principal in current school. Results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Agreement on Teaching Style - Participants by Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th># Principals</th>
<th>%</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 and under</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 and older</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th># Principals</th>
<th>%</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th># Principals</th>
<th>%</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors plus*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters plus*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAGS**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAGS plus*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate plus*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refers to the specified level of education plus some graduate work
** Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Current Role</th>
<th># Principals</th>
<th>%</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants represented a varied sample with 60% of principals and 52% of teachers between the ages of 31 and 50. Ninety-percent (90%) of participating teachers were female, and 46% of principals were female. The majority of the sample had earned a Master’s degree and had completed some graduate course work beyond the Master’s degree (52% of principals, and 66% of teachers). The majority of principals and teachers had worked in their role for more than one year (92% for principals; 97% teachers) and had been in their current role in their current school for more than a year (92% for principals; 98% teachers). Representatives from all developed environments (rural, suburban, and urban) participated in the study.

**Data collection procedures.** Participants were emailed and provided a unique alphanumeric code, as well as a link to the survey (Appendix H and Appendix I). The researcher checked for responses weekly and sent monthly reminders (for a period of 3 months) to those who had not completed the questionnaires. Survey access was closed 3 months after the initial request.
**Data transformation.** Once downloaded, data were organized and only data from pairs who completed the survey were analyzed. Participant responses to questions 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31, and 36 were summed and then divided by the number of questions to generate an index score (per instrument use directions) for the *expert* style. The *expert* teaching style is characterized by an assumption on the part of the teacher that they have the information, knowledge, and skills student’s need (Grasha, 1996). They are considered to be the “expert” in the classroom and questions included statements such as “facts, concepts, and principles are the most important things students should acquire” and “Sharing my knowledge and expertise with students is very important to me” (Grasha, 1996).

Responses to questions 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27, 32, and 37 were summed and then divided by the number of questions to generate an index score for the *formal authority* style. Grasha (1996) explained that the *formal authority* teacher focuses on clear and methodical approaches to their instruction and pairs this with firm and clear expectations. Questions included statements such as “I set high standards for the students in this class” and “I provide very clear guidelines for how I want tasks completed in this class” (Grasha, 1996).

Responses to questions 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28, 33, and 38 were summed and then divided by the number of questions to generate an index score for the *personal model* style. Grasha (1996) explained that the *personal model* teacher strives to lead by personal example and encourages students to observe and emulate. Questions included statements such as “I often show students how they can use various principles and
concepts” and “Students might describe me as a ‘coach’ who works closely with someone to correct problems in how they think and behave” (Grasha, 1996).  

Summing and then dividing questions 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, and 39 by the number of questions to generate an index score calculated the facilitator style score. The *facilitator* nurtures and develops the interpersonal relationship between the teacher and students (Grasha, 1996). Questions included statements such as “I give students a lot of personal support and encouragement to do well in this class” and “Students can make choices among activities in order to complete class requirements” (Grasha, 1996).  

Lastly, responses to questions 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, and 40 were calculated to generate an index score for the *delegator* style. Grasha (1996) explained that the *delegator* tends to emphasize, and works to develop, the student as an independent learner. Questions included statements such as “I assume the role of a resource person who is available to students whenever they need help” and “developing the ability of students to think and work independently is an important goal” (Grasha, 1996).  

**Data anonymity.** To maintain confidentiality, participants were coded as A1-T1, A2-T2, A3-T-3, A-2-T1, etc. where the letter refers to the participant’s role (Administrator or Teacher) and the number refers to the participant number. This system facilitated the linking of scores between administrator and teachers. At no time did the data contain any identifying information, apart from the code.  

**Data analysis.** The extent of agreement between principals’ ratings of teachers and teachers’ ratings of themselves relative to each of the five teaching styles (expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, delegator) was first explored through a
series of Pearson's product-moment correlations. The Shapiro-Wilk test was conducted to assess the normality of the distribution. Then, in order to examine the relationship between principals’ ratings of teachers and teachers’ ratings of themselves relative to each of the five teaching styles (expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, delegator) independent samples t-tests were conducted. All analyses were conducted with index scores, and not the item level.

Six of the principals rated more than one teacher, thereby creating unintended groupings within the subjects. Before conducting the main analyses, a mixed model analysis was conducted in order to explore the extent to which this hierarchical grouping impacted the results. Mixed model designs, according to Seltman (2014), “provide a general, flexible approach…because it allows a wide variety of correlation patterns (or covariance structures) to be explicitly modeled” (p. 357). The mixed model consisted of three analyses. The first analysis was a null model, which examined the amount of variance in principals’ responses accounted for by differences between principals themselves. This analysis provided information about whether there was significant variability across the principals in their ratings of teachers. A finding that there was significant between-subject variability in principal ratings of teachers would indicate that the differences in the scores were influenced by principal characteristics. The second analysis added teaching style as a fixed effect. This provided an opportunity to examine whether each of the five teacher styles (as rated by principals) significantly contributed to variability in principal ratings of teachers. A finding of significance would indicate the differences in the ratings were due to differences among the way the principals rated each
of the teaching styles. The final analysis added teacher ratings to determine whether teacher ratings significantly contributed to principal ratings of teaching style. A finding of significance would indicate that differences between teachers accounted for variance in the principals’ ratings of teaching styles. This final analysis was designed to answer the core research question about teacher-principal agreement, as the contribution of teacher ratings would indicate that the variance in principal ratings was due to differences between the teachers who principals were asked to rate.

Based on the results of the mixed model analysis (described in more detail below), a series of Pearson's product-moment correlations were conducted, with all multiple teacher ratings (i.e., those rated by principals who rated more than one teacher) removed from the analysis, to examine the extent of agreement between principals’ ratings of teachers and teachers’ ratings of themselves relative to each of the five teaching styles (expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, delegator).

**Study 2: Procedures for Agreement on Student Need**

The extent of agreement between principals and teachers relative to student needs was examined through the presentation of three student vignettes and a request for recommendation regarding appropriate teaching styles to match student need. The vignettes were of one typically developing student and two students demonstrating internalizing challenges. A survey was used to collect data that examined teachers’ and principals’ perceptions of student needs and an analysis was completed to determine the extent to which principal and teacher pairs agreed.
Data collection procedures. Each principal-teacher pair was presented with three vignettes of students: two presenting with internalizing challenges one typically developing student (see Appendix J). The three vignettes were presented in a counterbalanced order for each participant. Participants were asked to read each vignette and then complete a Teaching Style Inventory (TSI) regarding the extent to which they thought each of the 40 teaching practices (e.g., “small group discussions are employed to help students develop their ability to think critically”) was necessary for the student in the vignette to be successful in school (Grasha, 1997). The vignettes identified for use in this study were specifically selected to provide the respondent with illustrative examples of students with varying levels of internalizing presentations. Internalizing challenges, as previously discussed, are often difficult to identify because they tend to not be easily observable. This population of students is of particular interest not only because of their prevalence, but also due to the fact that the challenges these students face are more likely to be missed by their teacher, when compared to students with externalizing difficulties that are more easily observable. The vignettes required the respondents to carefully read summarizing statements regarding the student’s behavioral presentation. The vignettes have been used in previous literature and determined to have face validity (Pearcy, Clopton & Pope, 1993; Green & Clopton, 1996).

Each of the individual student characteristics presented in the vignettes were derived from the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach, 1991). The CBCL is a rating scale used to screen for a variety of potential problem behavior areas, including examining how a child generally behaves in a wide range of circumstances. The CBCL
has well-developed test-retest reliability (e.g., $r=.95–.99$ for subscales), has good content validity, construct validity, and criterion-related validity, and is one of the most widely used tools to characterize student functioning (Nakamura, Ebensutani, Bernstein & Chorpita, 2009). Two vignettes represented students who would receive a clinically significant rating (suggesting the student see a mental health professional as the student may be presenting with one or more internalizing disorders), as identified through the CBCL, and one represents a student presenting with typical functioning. The text of the vignettes is as follows:

**Student vignette A (Internalizing: Clinically significant rating on CBCL).**

David is a shy student who worries about tests and grades. He bites his nails and approaches the teacher's desk with several questions just before a test is to begin. He often becomes upset if he receives a poor grade or if he is criticized. He very much wants to please his teacher and parents, and thus fears making mistakes and feels guilty when he does poorly (Pearcy, Clopton, & Pope, 1993, p. 166).

**Student vignette B (Typically functioning; Non-Clinically significant rating on the CBCL).**

Mary is a shy student who tends to withdraw from her classmates during unstructured time and she prefers to be alone. Sometimes, she seems nervous when her peers attempt to engage her in-group activities. If she is left to her own initiative to join in a group activity, she will not do so. When she is alone, she is creative and active (Pearcy, Clopton, & Pope, 1993, p. 166).
**Student vignette C (Internalizing: Clinically significant rating on CBCL).**

Mark works slowly in the classroom and as a result often has to take his work home to complete. He seems to procrastinate often. This is partly due to his fear of making mistakes and oversensitivity to criticism, as he feels a need to do "perfect" work. He generally finishes his work and gets good grades, but it takes him much longer than his peers. In general, he is a child who withdraws from others, especially peers, and tends to keep things to himself (Greene, Clopton, & Pope, 1996, p. 184).

In order to control for effects related to the order in which vignettes were presented, a counterbalancing technique (McBurney & White, 2009) was employed and systematically applied to the presentation of vignettes across all participants (see Table 4).

Table 4

**Study 2: Agreement on Student Need - Participants by Vignette Sequence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. A = David, B = Mary, C = Mark*

**Data transformation.** The data were scored following the procedures established by the TSI. Responses for every vignette were calculated separately.

**Data analysis.** The data were analyzed to examine the extent of agreement between the principals’ and the teachers’ ratings for each of the three vignettes. A series
of Pearson's product-moment correlations were conducted. Then, in order to examine the potential differences in scores between the principals’ and the teachers’ ratings for each of the three vignettes, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted. For both analyses, examination was conducted for index scores.

Concern about the potential effects of principals who were paired with multiple teachers led to the decision to first examine the structure of responses in a mixed model framework. This mixed model framework allowed for adjustment for the fact that one principal was being compared to multiple teachers in analysis of vignette ratings. Analyses described earlier for use to examine teacher ratings (and principals’ ratings of their teachers) were used here as well, to compare principal and teacher ratings of each of the 3 vignettes.

Following the mixed model analysis, the Pearson's product-moment correlations were conducted again, with all multiple teacher ratings removed from the analysis, to examine the extent of agreement between the principals’ and the teachers’ ratings of each vignette.

**Study 3: Procedures for Basis of Class Assignment**

One-to-one semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted to collect information about how class placements are made and the processes used to make them. The questions asked were exploratory in nature and sought to examine the existence of processes, procedures, and/or policies used in practice relative to class placement. Participants were asked if they consider “match” between student and teacher in their classroom assignment process, and if they do, questions were asked to gain understanding
of what they conceptualize the term “match” to mean (Appendix K). These data were used to establish a conceptual understanding of “match.” No documents or associated materials were collected from participants.

**Participants.** Of the 10 principals contacted, 8 (80.0%) responded and agreed to participate and allowed their teachers to be contacted. Of the 8 teachers contacted, 5 (60.0%) responded and agreed to participate. The responses of five principals ($N=5$) and five (general education) teachers ($N=5$) were collected (see Table 5).

All participants were female and 80% of were between the ages of 30 and 60. Eighty percent of the principal participants had a Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study (CAGS) or a CAGS plus additional graduate work and all of the teacher participants had earned a Master’s degree or higher. All principals and teachers had worked in their role for more than one year and all had been in their current school for more than a year. Eighty percent of principals and teachers reported working in suburban settings and twenty percent in an urban setting (see Table 5).
Table 5

*Study 3: Basis of Class Assignment - Participants by Demographic Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Principals</th>
<th>%</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Span</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and under</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 and older</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters plus*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAGS**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAGS plus*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Current Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Role at Current School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Geographic Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refers to the specified level of education plus some graduate work
** Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study

All principals reported working with their paired teacher for more than one year and were principals of buildings with one of three different grade configurations: pre-K–4; preK–5; and pre-K–8. All principals reported having experience in the role of teacher. Mean student enrollment at their buildings was 431 and average number of teaching staff in the buildings was reported to be 25 (see Table 6).
### Table 6

**Study 3: Basis of Class Assignment - Principal Demographic Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Working with Teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Configuration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK–4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK–5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK–8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience as Teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>431</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Staff</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data collection procedure.** Data were collected during one-to-one audio-recorded semi-structured telephone interviews (Appendix K). All information regarding personal identity and responses were kept confidential. Participants were assigned a unique alphanumeric code and all data were kept in a locked filing cabinet.

**Data Analysis.** Following the interviews, all data were transcribed and an inductive coding procedure was used to examine emergent themes (Bourque, 2004). The analysis was designed to determine current practices in student placement from the perspective of both teachers and principals and followed a phenomenological reduction process. Phenomenological reduction allows the researcher to examine in-depth meaning ascribed to experiences (Creswell, 1998; Rossman & Rallis, 1998; & Holstein & Gubrium, 1994). As described by Creswell (1998), the goal of data analysis in a phenomenological study is “to reduce the textural (what) and structural (how) meanings of experiences to a brief description that typifies the experience of all of the participants.
in a study” (p. 238). Data were analyzed using the following process, as outlined Creswell (1998):

1. Creation and organization of data files;
2. Revision of the text and notations from the transcripts;
3. Description of the experience;
4. Classification of the subject’s statements and classification by meaning grouped into units;
5. Interpretative textural description, structural description, and description of the experience; and
6. Representation of the essence of the experience using tables, figures, statements and other meaningful units.

Summary

Data were collected to (a) investigate the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the teachers’ style, (b) examine the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the most effective match between teachers and students with internalizing challenges, and (c) investigate how students’ classroom placement decisions are made. Results of the study are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to (a) investigate the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the teachers’ style, (b) examine the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the most effective match between teachers and students with anxiety, and (c) investigate how students’ classroom placement decisions are made. Results for each of the three studies (agreement on teacher style, agreement on student need, and basis of class assignment) are presented separately.

Study 1: Agreement on Teacher Style

A series of Pearson's product-moment correlations were run to assess the relationship between principals’ ratings of teachers and teachers’ ratings of themselves relative to each of the five teaching styles variables (expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, delegator). Correlations between principal and teacher ratings of the five styles ranged in magnitude from $r(59)=.004–.172$ and none were statistically significant. These results indicate that principals and teachers were not in agreement with each other in their ratings of teacher’s style.

A series of independent-samples t-tests were run to determine if there were differences in mean principal and teacher ratings on each of the five teaching styles. There were no outliers in the data, as assessed by an inspection of boxplots. Table 7 displays the means and standard deviations for each teaching style for both principals and teachers. There were no statistically significant differences between principals and
teachers relative to ratings on the expert teaching style (Principals: $M = 4.69$, $SD = 0.86$; Teachers: $M = 4.82$, $SD = 0.69$), the formal authority teaching style (Principals: $M = 5.44$, $SD = 0.83$; Teachers: $M = 5.26$, $SD = 0.57$), the personal model teaching style (Principals: $M = 5.64$, $SD = 0.73$; Teachers: $M = 5.26$, $SD = 0.69$), or the facilitator teaching style (Principals: $M = 5.81$, $SD = 0.89$; Teachers: $M = 5.70$, $SD = 0.64$). Principals rated teachers higher on the delegator teaching style than teachers rated themselves (Principals: $M = 5.26$, $SD = 0.99$; Teachers: $M = 4.62$, $SD = 0.67$) at a statistically significant level ($M = 0.64$, 95% CI [0.34, 0.95], $t(105.309) = 4.172$, $p = .0005$). Follow-up analyses suggested a moderate effect size ($d = .75$) between principal and teacher ratings of the teacher relative to the delegator teaching style.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Auth.</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Model</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegator</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A p < .05, indicating a significant difference between principal and teacher ratings*

A mixed model analysis was conducted to test the association of principal and teacher ratings of teacher style, accounting for the potential hierarchical relationship of principals and teachers because of cases in which principals rated multiple teachers. The first model (null model) was calculated to determine the amount of variance in principals’ responses accounted for by the nesting of teachers within principals. The second model added in the principal’s scores on each of the five teaching styles as a fixed effect, with
the final model then adding in teacher ratings. Principal identity (ID) accounted for approximately 36% of the variance (Wald Z = 2.761, p = .006) in their ratings (F (1, 27.8) = 2221.53, p < .001), suggesting that there was significant variation in how individual principals were likely to rate teachers. In Model 2, which added scores on each of the five teaching styles, principal ratings additionally accounted for a significant proportion of the variance (F (4, 278.4) = 32.92, p < .001; Wald Z = 2.926, p = 003). However, teacher ratings, once added into the model along with principal ID and teaching style, did not account for a significant proportion of the variance, 0.0% (F (4, 279.3) = 31.216, p < .001; Wald Z = 1.204, p = .22). Results of the model indicated that the nested data (one principal completing the measure on multiple teachers) significantly impacted results and accounted for more variance in principal ratings than teacher ratings. As a result, principals who rated multiple teachers were removed from analysis for any additional teacher they rated beyond the first.

Based on the results above, the series of Pearson's product-moment correlations were run to assess the relationship between principals’ ratings of teachers and teachers’ ratings of themselves relative to each of the five teaching styles variables (expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, delegator). Correlations between principal and teacher ratings of the five styles ranged in magnitude from r(23)=.022–.608 and none were statistically significant. These results indicate that principals and teachers were inconsistent with each other in their ratings of teacher’s style.
Study 2: Agreement on Student Need

To examine the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the most effective match between teachers and a typically developing student and two students with anxiety. Results for each vignette are presented separately.

Multivariate analysis of variance: David, Mary, and Mark. A one-way multivariate analysis of variance was run to determine the effect of respondent (principal or teacher) and vignette (David, Mary, or Mark) on ratings relative to the five teaching styles (expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator). Table 8 displays the means and standard deviations for each style as rated by principals, teachers, and principals and teachers combined (total) for each vignette and Table 9 displays the results of the one-way multivariate analysis of variance.
Table 8

*Descriptive Statistics – Principal, Teacher, and Total Ratings by Vignette*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>David</th>
<th>Mary</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Auth.</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Model</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegator</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Study 2: MANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert Vignette (David, Mary, or Mark)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent (Principal or Teacher)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Term (Vignette x Respondent)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Authority Vignette (David, Mary, or Mark)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.976</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent (Principal or Teacher)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.603</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Term (Vignette x Respondent)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.823</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Model Vignette (David, Mary, or Mark)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.572</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent (Principal or Teacher)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.709</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Term (Vignette x Respondent)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Vignette (David, Mary, or Mark)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.220</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent (Principal or Teacher)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.824</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Term (Vignette x Respondent)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegator Vignette (David, Mary, or Mark)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.725</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent (Principal or Teacher)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Term (Vignette x Respondent)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, indicating a significant main effect

There was a significant main effect for respondent (principal or teacher) in a model that included all 5 teaching styles, $F(5, 356) = 5.87, p < .0005$; Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.866$, partial $\eta^2 = .076$. Principals and teacher ratings were significantly different for the formal authority ($F(1, 360) = 7.603, p = .006$; partial $\eta^2 = .021$) and the facilitator ($F(1, 360) = 8.824, p = .003$; partial $\eta^2 = .024$) teaching styles. Principals rated the formal authority style as significantly more helpful for students than did teachers, while teachers rated the facilitator style as significantly more helpful for students than did principals.

There was also a significant main effect for vignette (David vs. Mary vs. Mark) ($F$
(10, 712) = 5.33, p < .0005; Wilk's Λ = 0.924, partial $\eta^2 = .070$). Scores for Mary were significantly higher than David ($p = .015$) on the expert teaching style. Scores for Mark were significantly lower than Mary ($p = .002$) and David ($p = .049$) on the formal authority teaching style. Scores for David were significantly higher than scores for Mark ($p = .021$) on the facilitator teaching style. And scores for Mary were significantly higher than Mark ($p = .009$) and David ($p = .003$) on the delegator teaching style.

The interaction term (Respondent by Vignette) was not significant for any teaching style, indicating that ratings of the best teaching styles for students did not vary as a function of raters differentially responding to the three vignettes.

**Preliminary correlations: David.** In the vignette, David was described as a student who manifested anxiety that would be scored as clinically significant on the CBCL. A series of Pearson's product-moment correlations were run to assess the relationship between principal and teachers ratings of the vignette of David on each of the five teaching styles (expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, delegator). Correlations between principal and teacher ratings of David ranged in magnitude from $r(59)=.055–.672$ and none were statistically significant. These results indicated that principal and teacher perceptions of the teaching style that best fits David’s needs are dissimilar.

**Preliminary correlations: Mark.** Mark was presented in the vignette as a student who would be scored as having anxiety, which is clinically significant, based on the CBCL. A series of Pearson's product-moment correlations were run to assess the relationship between principal and teachers ratings of Mark on each of the five teaching
styles (expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, delegator). Correlations between principal and teacher ratings of Mark relative to the expert, formal authority, facilitator, and delegator teaching styles ranged in magnitude from $r(59)=-.075–.155$ and were not statistically significant. The correlation between principal and teacher ratings of Mark relative to the personal model teaching style was significant ($r(59) = .319, p = .012$).

**Preliminary correlations: Mary.** Mary was presented as a typically developing student with no clinically significant ratings on the CBCL. A series of Pearson's product-moment correlations were conducted to assess the relationship between principal and teachers ratings of Mary on each of the five teaching styles (expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, delegator). Correlations between principal and teacher ratings of Mary ranged in magnitude from $r(59)=-.282–.216$ and none were statistically significant. These results indicated that principal and teacher perceptions of the teaching style that best fits Mary’s needs are inconsistent.

**Mixed model analyses.** Mixed model analyses were run to account for the fact that several principals were paired with multiple teachers in the dataset, creating a hierarchical structure, by which principal ratings were sometimes compared to the ratings of more than one teacher. A series of three analyses were conducted for each vignette. In Model 1, only principal ID was as a predictor of principal ratings. In Model 2, a fixed effect for teaching style was added. Finally, in Model 3, teacher ratings were added.

**David.** For the first vignette (David) Principal ID accounted for approximately 35% of the variance ($Wald Z = 2.723, p = .006$) in principal ratings ($F (1, 24.4) =$
Adding in principal reports of teaching style additionally accounted for a significant proportion of the variance ($F(4, 276.2) = 103.74, p < .001$; Wald $Z = 3.144, p = .002$). However, teacher ratings, once added into the model along with principal ID and principal reports of teaching style, did not account for a significant proportion of the variance, 0.0% ($F(4, 234.4) = 95.328, p < .001$; Wald $Z = .717, p = .47$).

**Mark.** In the third vignette (Mark), Principal ID accounted for approximately 23% of the variance (Wald $Z = 2.389, p = .017$) in principal ratings ($F(1, 25.0) = 2384.547, p < .001$). Adding in principal reports of teaching style additionally accounted for a significant proportion of the variance ($F(4, 276.7) = 43.430, p < .001$; Wald $Z = 2.722, p = .006$). The final model did not converge in SPSS. However, the observed pattern was similar to the other conditions where the variability accounted for by teacher's ratings was quite small and of a similar magnitude as observed in the other models. Results of the models indicated that the nested data (one principal completing the measure on multiple teachers) significantly impacted analysis results. Therefore a decision was made to remove principals who rated multiple teachers from the analysis.

**Mary.** In the second vignette (Mary), Principal ID accounted for approximately 36% of the variance (Wald $Z = 2.753, p = .006$) in principal ratings ($F(1, 26.3) = 2486.60, p < .001$). Adding in principal reports of teaching style additionally accounted for a significant proportion of the variance ($F(4, 278.1) = 15.786, p < .001$; Wald $Z = 2.850, p = .004$). However, teacher ratings, once added into the model along with principal ID and principal reports of teaching style, did not account for a significant
proportion of the variance, 0.0% (F (4, 270.4) = 15.674, p < .001; Wald Z = .758, p = .45).

**Revised correlations.** Based on the analysis above, a series of Pearson's product-moment correlations were then repeated to assess the relationship between principal and teacher ratings on each of the vignettes relative to each of the five teaching styles, with principals who were paired with multiple teachers removed from analysis for any additional teacher they were paired with beyond the first.

**David.** Correlations between principal and teacher ratings of David ranged in magnitude from r(23)= -.313–.187. As before, there were no significant associations between principal and teacher ratings of David on each of the five teaching styles, suggesting that principals and teachers were inconsistent with each other in their ratings of David’s needs.

**Mark.** Correlations between principal and teacher ratings of Mark ranged in magnitude from r(23)= .113–.379. There were no significant associations between principal and teacher ratings of Mark on each of the five teaching styles, suggesting that principals and teachers were inconsistent with each other in their ratings of Mark’s needs.

**Mary.** For Mary, correlations between principal and teacher ratings on the expert, personal model, facilitator, and delegator teaching styles ranged in magnitude from r(23)= -.185–.330. There was a statistically significant negative correlation between principal and teacher ratings of Mary relative to the formal authority teaching style, r(23) = -.450, p = .024.
Study 3: Basis of Class Assignment

The final phase of the study was to understand the approach used by principals and teachers when making class placement decisions and to determine whether a perceived “match” between teachers and students played a role in the decision-making. Data were collected through semi-structured telephone interviews with 5 pairs of principals and teachers, each interviewed separately. All participants were female, with the majority of participants working in suburban environments (Principals and Teachers 1, 2, 4, and 5), with Principal and Teacher 3 working an urban setting. Mean student enrollment across the five schools was 431 with a maximum student enrollment of 580 (Principal and Teacher 5) and a minimum student enrollment of 210 (Principal and Teacher 4).

The interview questions were adapted from those used by Monk (1987) in his examination of the steps used to assign students to classrooms (Appendix K) and were edited to focus specifically on the assignment procedure and the variables used to make decisions during placement. All interviews followed a similar question pattern where participants were first asked to describe the practice used in their building to assign students to classrooms. Thoughts and experiences around disagreements in opinion about the best placement for individual children and rationale for disagreements were then explored, followed by an examination of the concept of “match” as each participant understands it. Participants were then asked to provide advice/suggestions to improve the system.

The data collected are presented under the two major themes that revealed
themselves across participant’s responses. Responses from both principal and teacher participants were coded and analyzed, with quotations pulled from the data to best illustrate the identified themes. The first theme, layered complexity of the placement process, revealed that the placement of students into classrooms is not an event, but rather a time-consuming process involving layers of complexity with the ultimate goal being the development of heterogeneously grouped students. The second theme, conceptualization of the term match, suggested variability in the way the word is conceptualized with teaching style being only one variable in participants’ understanding of the term.

**Layered complexity of the placement process.** All principal and teacher participants described the task of assigning students to classrooms as a complex process that involves the input of constituents both inside (teachers, specialists, guidance counselors) and outside of the school (parents). Rather than an event, all participants described the placement of students into classrooms as a process involving several steps, with each step adding progressive feedback to the overall task. Generally speaking, the steps involved teacher feedback, specialist teacher feedback, parent input, and some level of administrative review with the ultimate goal of producing heterogeneous groupings. Toward this end, nine out of ten participants reported considering the academic and social/behavioral skills of the students, seven out of the ten participants reported examining the students’ need for support services, and eight of the ten participants reported listening to the feedback parents have relative to their perceptions of their students’ needs.

Both principals and teachers described the first step as a meeting with all of the
teachers for a particular grade of students in the building sitting down together, discussing student academic skill and social-emotional/behavioral skill level, and grouping the students so as to create classrooms at the next grade level with mix abilities and needs. A principal described this step as follows:

So what classroom teachers do is they take the current students they have and they make categories of low, medium, high students in academics, behavior, and the needs of families. And then they build for outgoing classes, so there is a collection of all those kids and all those kids, so you don’t have a classroom of all high academics and all low academics, so your groupings should be all mixed.

What was clear was that principals provided teachers a significant amount of responsibility to create the class lists. This finding runs contrary to the original premise of the current study: that the building principal makes placement decisions. Results suggest that principals do not play as large of a role in the process as originally theorized. Another principal highlighted this finding:

Well initially class lists are actually determined by the teachers, so for example, at the end of grade two the two second grade teachers will sit down and divide up the class, taking into consideration things like personalities and academic levels to kind of spread it out so there are children of all abilities in each class, we don’t group by abilities. Also, if I did have any questions about whether or not I agree if a particular child should be in a specific class or not, that would change things too. I must admit - I mainly go by the teacher recommendations.
While general academic skill was considered to be a key variable by eight of the ten participants, another equally as important variable considered in the process was the specific needs of the students relative to supplemental services and supports. Participants noted examining student’s needs relative to special education and/or related services, English language learner supports and/or services, guidance and counseling involvement, and Title I supports and/or services. Additionally, many participants reported that the service providers of these supplemental supports and services were consulted in the placement process. A principal highlighted this aspect:

The special education department will meet about those students [on a 504 or IEP] and just talk about any common needs or groupings. Occasionally we will have some special education students that can’t be grouped together, for a lot of different reasons, and there are students that can be grouped together that require similar services that would help us with our limited resources—whether it be for OT or speech and language, academic reading or whatever.

The complexity of the placement process is magnified when examining a student’s need for supplemental services and supports. A principal explained, “we also group for special education services and try to maximize our special education support staff, the aides.” This carries implications for service delivery, and the ease of scheduling for service providers. Several participants described this phase as a significant challenge. Participants reported examining student needs and making adjustments to best suit service delivery. An example provided by one of the principals was the following: if there are four sections of a particular grade and within that grade there are 6 students
who, as a part of a service delivery plan, require 30 minutes of small-group instruction in mathematics five times a week with a special educator. Given the scheduling demands of the school, class lists may be adjusted to allow the leveraging existing resources as strategically as possible. Rather than having those six students who required math support spread across four classrooms, the special educator may place those six students in the same class. Consideration of this information necessitates teachers having to review the lists and make adjustments

While academic and social-emotional skills of the students and the need for supplemental supports and services were important variables reported to be used in class placement, the concerns and opinions of the students’ parents were also taken into account, albeit with varying levels of consideration. Most participants discussed parents having the option to complete some kind of a form that provided some formal input into class placement decisions. One principal described the use of the parent form in this way:

Once we have our class lists pre-finalized then I have gathered parent input forms from families that want to have a say and I use that information if it is appropriate to look at the placement of their child and make sure it fits. So some families might have cousins in the same school and they don’t want to be with their relatives, or neighbors, or whatever.

Another principal expanded on this practice by explaining that parent interpretation of the student’s past interpersonal experiences with peers and medical information also plays a role. They said:
So I send out a parent feedback form, every parent gets one of those forms; I get a form back from almost every parent in the building. They give me information on oil and water mixes that I may not have that historical information but they want me to know in those years past that a child has had a problem with Billy Bob and they don’t want the child with Billy Bob anymore. Or that they don’t want to be in a peanut free classroom, those are two of the issues that come up most often, or if there are health issues that we need to consider, parents will put that information on the parent feedback form. That information is held confidentially with me and I go through the lists multiple times to make sure that we have addressed the concerns that the parents have shared and then I assign teacher names to those lists.

There were variations in responses among participants relative to the weight or importance of the parents’ input into the process. There was agreement among nine of the participants that students’ academic and social-emotional/behavioral skills were essential to the process; however, when discussing parents’ feedback there was a clear division relative to the amount of weight each participant gave to the parents’ input.

Participants seemed to either support their input above all other factors (four participants), while others considered it just another variable – no more or less important than the others (four participants). One principal explained that she, above all else, considers the parent feedback when looking at class lists:

I would take the list and, number one, take into consideration any parent request that may have been made that the teachers may not be aware of and that may
include teacher personalities or teacher styles as well and that would shift the
grouping around a little bit.

In contrast a teacher presented the variable of parent feedback as just another
consideration, but cautioned its use beyond its intent. She explained the way in which
parent feedback was collected and used as follows:

Parents are allowed to fill out forms in the office. They cannot write specific
teacher names, but they can express certain types of things that they feel are best
for their children or that they would work well with other children. Those things
are taken into consideration. And that’s given to us after we have already
[grouped the students into sections] so then we go back and look at it again. We
are given some information that is given on those blue forms, as they are called,
but not all the information. There is certain private information that teachers are
not knowledgeable about.

Further, one principal explained that parents are “welcome” to complete a form if they
have any specific information they would like to share. However, the parent feedback is,
again, considered just another part of the system. While all participants cited parent
feedback as a variable in class placement, differences in the weight assigned to this
variable were noted.

The procedure begins anew as various constituent groups review and provide
feedback to the class lists. All participants reported that this takes months to complete
and requires a significant amount of management. The building principal, at a point
when they feel they have met the needs of the students, will then finalize the list and assign the teacher or teachers to a class list.

**Conceptualization of the term match.** Participants reported that the culminating step of the class placement process is that of assigning a teacher to a group of students. It was hypothesized that the teaching style of the teacher would be a part of the participants’ conceptualization of the term “match.” All principal participants, during the first phase of the study, were asked “when assigning students to classrooms and teachers, does the “match” between the student and the teacher ever play a role in your decision-making?” and all responded yes. Interestingly, however, only one participant, a principal, directly and specifically mentioned the word “match” related to a teacher’s teaching style.

When I assign a teacher’s name to the list I am thinking about, typically, the students who require the most support and how they might be best matched with the teacher knowing what I know of their teaching style.

During the semi-structured interviews, both principal and teacher participants were asked to define what the word “match” meant to them. All responses included a discussion of some connection between teachers and students but often the connection was nebulous.

All participants described the challenges that exist when there is not a good fit between a student and his or her teacher. A teacher highlighted a challenge that may emerge under these circumstances.

You could have a child who, one teacher my say, “oh that kid is such a behavior problem” and then gets a reputation, then goes to the right fit class, where he can
move about, use some creativity, maybe he isn’t the best paper and pencil task master. But when you give him the assignment of being creative and putting something in place that he is real good at and you look at differentiating his instruction. I think that’s when you have to look at the fit for the child, you know, the child probably wasn’t a behavior issue, it was just the teacher wasn’t matched up well with him or the teacher wasn’t matched up well with how the child learns best.

While explaining their conceptualization of match, several participants articulated the challenge that may develop when attempting to assign groups of students with a predetermined number of teachers in a predetermined number of sections. A principal stated:

“Match” would be that right fit with the teacher and student. It’s difficult because you often have 22–25 kids who you are trying to find that right match for. So you will have some kids that might not have the very best year because their teacher was not the very best match for them. But you will also have students that will have the very best year because their teacher was the very best match for them. So, you know, you just can’t get it right for everybody because everybody has to be placed.

Give that the word “match” was used by only one respondent, was this concept considered and how was it described? Responses generally gravitated toward teaching style.

Almost all (8 out of 10) of participants defined match as being a good fit between
the student and specific characteristics of the teacher’s teaching style. A principal responded:

So when I think of kids and a teacher, I think of what styles the teacher has emulated and has been successful at and what styles they have emulated and have not been successful at despite support. So that if a child needs something in particular, like maybe the child needs a more flexible teacher and I know a teacher is very inflexible, despite how much they have tried to be flexible, I can’t put that child in that room. So that match wouldn’t work, so it’s really looking at [whether] the teacher is the right match for that child.

For some, teaching style was described in terms of specific teacher characteristics; for example, “flexibility” was used as an illustrative example when attempting to expand on their perception. Another principal also connected teaching style and patience with approaches to dealing with behavior. She stated:

The teaching style…approaches to a certain child’s way of learning or even the way that they address behavior issues. And if they have the patience for certain types of children, that is what I would look at.

Another principal articulated that a combination of teaching style with other variables, classroom management, as an example, is what match meant to her and said “I think that teaching style, management style of the class, the teacher’s style of developing relationships with the kids; those would be the things I would look at.” She went on to explain that it is about the extent to which the teacher is able to build relationships with the students:
Some students thrive on that teacher relationship and you will get the most out of them, while to some kids that isn’t as important to them, but a well managed, well-structured and high expectations classroom is. You would hope that every class has all of those things but I think that most classes have that and some have real strengths in those areas. So knowing the student and knowing the classroom, when I say, “match” that is what I am thinking.

Other specific characteristics articulated by participants included flexibility, strictness, structure/rules, patience, and individual teacher personality. What was clear, however, was that there was no clear consensus of what teaching style meant as each participant described a differing cluster of individual teacher characteristics. One teacher, when initially asked to explain what she thinks of when she hears the word match, described it this way:

   I guess maybe I would think of it in terms of personality, well not so much personality but my teaching style. It happens to be pretty old school, it happens to be pretty structured. So I watch, for example, or listen to my daughter who is also an elementary school teacher, at the same level. She is much more; I don’t want to say “free” with the students, because she definitely has control of her classroom. But she is able to accommodate many more things then I feel that maybe I would be able to do. So I guess for a match it would be perhaps the teaching style.

While teaching style was identified as a key component of participants’ understanding of “match” so, too, was teacher experience/skill levels and classroom management skills.
Some participants explained that a teacher’s experience and skill level were important components to the conceptual understanding of match and they expressed an opinion that teacher need to be able to work with all students placed in their class. A principal articulated it this way:

I want to take the lowest group and think about what teacher has the skill set that is going to best be able to meet the needs of those kids that are struggling most academically, socially, emotionally, and behaviorally…but on the other hand though, as I said, I want to give all my teachers the opportunity to work with all kinds of students so they get that kind of practice.

Participants explained that in order for there to be a good match, there needed to be some ability of the teacher to work with and address the needs of individual students within a particular class. A principal illustrated this when she said “I want to give all my teachers the opportunity to work with all kinds of students so they get that kind of practice.” In this statement, the principal expressed the idea that it was part of their role to see that teachers had an opportunity to work with a diverse range of students, for the purpose of expanding their skill sets.

Summary

In order to better understand the class placement process, data were collected relative to three research questions.

1. What is the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the teaching style of teacher?
2. What is the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the most effective teacher-matches for three hypothetical students demonstrating differing behavioral characteristics: typically developing and demonstrating anxiety?

3. Basis of Class Assignment - How are student’s classroom placement decisions made and does the perceived “match” between a student and a teacher’s teaching style plays a role in these decisions?

A summary of findings is included in Table 10 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the teaching style of teacher?</td>
<td>Principals and teachers would exhibit significant agreement in their perceptions of teacher style.</td>
<td>Principals and teachers were inconsistent in their ratings of teacher style. Principals rated teachers significantly higher on the delegator teaching style, than teachers rated themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the extent to which there is agreement between principals and teachers relative to the most effective teacher-matches for three hypothetical students demonstrating differing behavioral characteristics: typically developing and demonstrating anxiety?</td>
<td>Principals and teachers would exhibit significant agreement in their perceptions of the needs of students with anxiety.</td>
<td>Principals and teachers were inconsistent in their ratings of the teacher styles needed by students with anxiety. For a typically developing student, principal and teacher ratings of need for formal authority teaching style were negatively correlated. Significant differences were found in the ratings depending on who completed the measures with principals rating the formal authority style as significantly more helpful for students than did teachers, while teachers rated the facilitator style as significantly more helpful for students than did principals. Scores for the typically developing student were significantly higher than for the students with anxiety on the expert and delegator teaching style. Scores for one of the students with anxiety were significantly higher than the other student with anxiety on the facilitator teaching style, and scores for the other student with anxiety were significantly lower than the typically developing student and the other student with anxiety on the formal authority teaching style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are student’s classroom placement decisions made and does the perceived “match” between a student and a teacher’s teaching style plays a role in these decisions?</td>
<td>Class placement decisions would involve consideration of “match” between teachers and students. Teaching style would play a role in the concept of “match”</td>
<td>Class placement decisions are based on information relative to students’ academic and social-emotional/behavioral skills, need for supplemental support services, and parent feedback. Teaching style, generally, was not considered in placement decisions but was a part of the conceptualization of the term “match”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the first study, principals and teachers were not in agreement in their ratings of teacher style. Principals rated teachers significantly higher on the delegator teaching style, than teachers rated themselves. In the second study, principals and teachers were also not in agreement in their ratings of the teacher styles needed by students with anxiety. For a typically developing student, principal and teacher ratings of need for formal authority teaching style were negatively correlated. Significant differences were found in the ratings depending on who completed the measures with principals rating the formal authority style as significantly more helpful for students than did teachers, while teachers rated the facilitator style as significantly more helpful for students than did principals. Scores for the typically developing student were significantly higher than the students with anxiety on the expert teaching and delegator teaching styles. Scores for one of the students with anxiety were significantly higher than for the other on the facilitator teaching style, and scores for the other student with anxiety were significantly lower than the typically developing student and the other student with anxiety on the formal authority teaching style. In the third study, results revealed that class placement decisions are based on information about students’ academic and social-emotional/behavioral skills, need for supplemental support services, and parent feedback. Teaching style was not described as an explicit consideration in the placement decision, but was a part of the conceptualization of the term “match” between teachers and students.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The overarching goal of this research was to investigate the process by which students are matched with teachers in classroom placement, and how this process works for students with anxiety. The research explored (a) the extent of agreement between principal perceptions of the teaching style of teachers and teachers perception of their own teaching style, the (b) the extent to which principals and teachers agree on the most effective match between teachers and students with anxiety, and (c) how classroom placement decisions are made and whether the perceived “match” between a student and a teacher’s teaching style plays a role in these decisions. Results revealed that principals and teachers differ in their perceptions of both teacher teaching styles and the needs of students with anxiety. Further, teaching style was not reported to be a main factor in class placement decisions.

Main Findings

Agreement on teacher style. It was hypothesized that there would be agreement in principals’ perceptions of teachers’ teaching styles and teachers’ perceptions of their own teaching style. However, results indicate that principals and teachers were consistently discrepant in their ratings of teacher style with all correlations, across all rating categories, low and non-significant. In addition, principals rated teachers as significantly higher on the delegator teaching style, than teachers rated themselves.

These results are consistent with findings from other researchers who have reported that principals and teachers often express significant disagreement in their
perceptions of school staff roles and behaviors. Jorgenson and Peal (2008) found that principals and teachers disagree on their perceptions of what the principal’s role is in the school building. Kataoka, van Kraayenoord, and Elkins (2004) found that principals and teachers disagreed about the cause of learning disabilities in students. In the current study, results of the mixed model analysis indicate a strong response patterns for principals, regardless of the teacher they were rating. This suggests that principals might be more influenced by their own prior perceptions of a teacher’s teaching styles than the actual teaching style of the teachers they were rating. When the principals who completed the multiple ratings were removed from the analyses, correlations between teachers and principals were still non-significant. This additionally suggests that discrepant ratings of teacher style were not merely a function of respondent fatigue (i.e., principals conducting multiple ratings did not differentiate their ratings for different teaching styles), but rather it seems that teachers and principals are consistently discrepant in their perceptions of teacher teaching styles.

**Agreement on student need.** It was hypothesized that principals and teachers would agree in their perceptions of the needs of students. However, results indicate significant differences in the ratings, with principals more often identifying the *formal authority* style as being more helpful than did teachers who more often identified the *facilitator* style as more helpful. It is interesting, yet not surprising, that principals found the *formal authority* style to be more appropriate than did teachers. The *formal authority* style, may be considered more desirable by principals as it may suggest a higher level of control of the classroom, possibly resulting in less principal involvement in day-to-day
issues of the classroom. The facilitator style, on the other hand, was described by Grasha (1996) as being characterized by a focus on the personal nature of the student/teacher interaction with teachers who exhibit this style offering a great deal of flexibility in their teaching and are more prone to a “student-centered” approach, paired with a willingness to explore alternate ways of doing things. Given this explanation, it is not surprising that the teachers, who may be more focused on the centrality of the student-teacher dynamic in the classroom, found this style to be more impactful than any of the other styles, as it the one that most clearly focuses on the interaction between them and their students. Generally, these results suggest that principals tended to favor a style that provides a clear and methodical approach, where teachers tend to favor a more student-centered approach. Further, and consistent with this finding, ratings were inconsistent across vignettes, with principal and teacher ratings of typically developing student’s need for the formal authority teaching style being negatively correlated. The existence of this inverse relationship between these groups is interesting and further illustrates the discrepancy between principals’ and teachers’ perceptions relative to the needs of students. In this instance, when examining the needs of a typically developing student, principals and teachers disagreed relative to the need of the formal authority style.

Teachers and principals rated the expert and delegator rating style as significantly more helpful for the typically developing student than for the students with anxiety. As described by Grasha (1996) the expert teacher assumes that he or she has the information, knowledge, and skills needed to provide the information directly to the students, while the delegator style emphasizes the student as an independent learner. What is interesting
is that each style, *expert* and *delegator*, could be seen as representing two ends of a spectrum – with the expert style focusing on the teacher as being core to classroom learning and the delegator style focusing on the student as core to learning. The finding that scores for both of these styles are higher for the typically developing student than the students with anxiety are consistent with the cautions outlined by Grasha in his original work. Grasha (1996) warned that the *expert* teaching style might lead to students becoming intimidated by the teacher’s knowledge base. He also expressed that the *delegator* style may result in the misreading of students’ readiness to take on independent work and might contribute to their anxiety, as students may be given too much autonomy before they are ready to take it on (Grasha, 1996).

Principals and teachers rated the *facilitator* teaching style as benefiting one of the students with anxiety (David) significantly more than the other (Mark). In the vignettes, Mark is characterized as a student who is a slow worker, overly sensitive, and has a propensity for perfectionism, while David was described as biting his nails, approaching the teacher with several questions before beginning work, and becoming upset when he is provided with a poor grade. The more overt characteristics of anxiety in David’s presentation may have accounted for the fact that participants rated him as benefiting significantly more than Mark from a style focused on flexibility and willingness to explore alternative ways of teaching. Hancock, Nichols and Jones (2000) found that highly anxious students performed best with instruction that did not require significant student interaction, while less anxious students performed best with student-centered instruction (instruction that promotes and fosters participatory learning). The
participants’ recommendations are sound, given Hancock, et al.’s findings.

Additionally, scores on the *formal authority* teaching style for the vignette depicting one student with anxiety (Mark) were significantly lower than for the vignette of typically developing student and the other student with anxiety (David). The *formal authority* teacher focuses on a clear and methodical way of conducting class paired with firm expectations with teachers who exhibit a preference for this style tending to be classified as less flexible, more rigid, and to offer a singular and standardized approach to working with students. In the vignette, Mark presented with less overt characteristics than David, yet was described as working slowly, procrastinating, having a fear of making mistakes and being oversensitive to criticism. Mark’s presentation may have been interpreted as being less likely to respond positively to the *formal authority* style. Mark works slowly and is overly sensitive to criticism, while the *formal authority* teacher is less flexible, more rigid, and offers a singular and standardized approach to working with students. This finding suggests that teachers and principals might be attuned to the needs of students with this presentation of anxiety.

**Basis of class assignment.** Results revealed that class placement decisions are made following a complex procedure that involves the input of constituents both inside (teachers, specialists, guidance counselors) and outside of the school (parents). Rather than an event, all participants described the placement of students into classrooms as a process involving several steps, with each step adding progressive feedback to this overall task which echoes the findings of other researchers on the topic (Monk, 1987; Carlyon & Fisher, 2012; Heitzman, 2012). Most interestingly, however, was the role of
the teachers in this process. While the principal oversaw and was a part of the process it was typically the general education teachers who were the ones who constructed the initial lists while other teachers (e.g., special education, ELL, etc.) adjusted, revised, and edited the lists. No principal in the sample reported turning the task over to teachers to complete independently, as Monk (1987) had found previously.

Findings suggested that the class placement process involved teacher feedback, specialist teacher feedback, parent input, and some level of administrative review with the ultimate goal to produce heterogeneous groupings. Additionally, all principal participants (in both phases of the research) reported using the “match” between teachers and students in their class placement decisions. However, when asked to define the term “match”, principals and teachers reported characteristics that could be considered a part of teaching style, but most did not all explicitly connect teaching style to the concept of “match”.

**Summary**

Taken collectively, results revealed that principals and teachers do not agree on the teaching style of teachers, nor is there agreement when asked to determine the best fit between teachers and students with anxiety. Participants did recognize that students with anxious presentations have greater difficulty with teachers who are less flexible and more rigid, yet pairs of teachers and principals who work in the same building often did not agree on the extent to which students will benefit from a particular style. And, more importantly, teachers and principals did not agree on their perceptions of whether teachers demonstrate a formal authority style in practice. This means that even if both
teachers and principals think that a student might struggle in a class with a teacher exhibiting a formal authority style, they still disagreed on whether any one teacher is using that style. Teachers were found to be centrally involved in the complex class placement process with principals ultimately making the assignments of students to teachers. When asked specifically how they would define “match,” principals talked about teaching style. However, when describing placement decisions, teaching style was not described as an important piece of information.

Implications

The implications of these findings are most critical to the class placement process. It was hypothesized that principals and teachers would exhibit agreement relative to the teacher’s teaching style and the needs of students. However, results suggest that no such agreement exist and, further, they make an argument for incorporating match into placement decisions. When asked to define the term “match”, principals and teachers reported characteristics that could be considered a part of teaching style, but did not all explicitly connect teaching style to the concept of “match”. There was an underlying assumption in the hypothesis that there was agreement between principals and teachers.

Given these findings which demonstrated a high level of disagreement between principals’ views of a teachers’ teaching style and the way a teacher views his or her own style, there is cause for concern as related to educator evaluation system. The educator evaluation model in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2012), for example, establishes a system that is designed to promote dialogue and discussion of the practice of teaching and ongoing
discussion between educators and evaluators on their effectiveness as teachers. It will be essential that educators and evaluators come to understand each other’s view of what is or should be demonstrated in the classroom. How else could an evaluator be expected to improve an educator’s performance when, from the outset, there is disagreement on that what educator’s style is or should be. Further, how can an evaluator be expected to provide meaningful feedback to an educator if the evaluator’s perceptions are misaligned with the educator’s view of their practice.

The ultimate goal of education evaluation is to improve outcomes for students. It can be argued that in order for students to get the most out of their educational experiences, it is essential that their teacher, and their teacher’s principal, have engaged in discussions relative to each other’s perceptions of the teacher’s practice. Then, in cases where there may be disagreement, the principal and teacher should work collaboratively to understand how differences in perceptions may impact the principal’s ability to provide meaningful feedback designed to maximize the teacher’s performance and make well informed placement decisions.

Limitations

Sample size. The sample size might have been too small to detect significance. A priori power analyses were conducted, as suggested by Bredenkamp (1969), Hager (2006), and Erdfelder and Faul (2008), in order to determine the size of the sample needed to effectively detect significant results. Cohen (1988) discussed that in a priori power analyses the sample size is computed as a function of the required power, significance, and effect size. An a priori power analysis conducted prior to data
collection suggested a sample size of 87 unique principal-teacher pairs, or a total of 174 participants. However, following extensive recruitment, only 25 unique pairs were found. Additional teachers were recruited and paired with already participating principals, thereby creating a hierarchical, or stacked, data set. This hierarchical relationship significantly impacted the proposed statistical analysis and required revision to the data analysis. If additional pairs had been recruited, there may have been a greater number of significant results as several analyses approached statistical significance. Further, greater recruitment would have provided for better distribution of pairs among the six counterbalanced presentations of the student vignettes and a more nationally representative sample. Additionally, there may have been respondent bias with those interested in teaching style more apt to respond to recruitment efforts.

Vignettes. The vignettes identified for use in this study were specifically selected to provide the respondent with illustrative examples of students with varying levels of internalizing presentations. Although the vignettes have been used in previous literature (Pearcy, Clopton & Pope, 1993; Green & Clopton, 1996), the students who presented with clinically significant ratings on the CBCL were both male. Gender may have been a confounding variable in the analyses, with both clinically significant profiles being male. Additionally, during data collection participants were provided with the vignette and then asked to complete a 40-item TSI on each. Although a counterbalancing technique was employed to control for order effects, given the number of questions following each vignette it is possible that respondent fatigue may have impacted the results.
Theoretical Framework. The study was conducted using Grasha’s (1996) theoretical framework to understand teaching style. Grasha (1996) offers one approach to examine teaching style and may be as valid as measure other frameworks (e.g., Fischer and Fischer, 1979 & Pratt, 2002). Further, the Teaching Style Inventory (TSI) was used to collect data relative to teaching style and characterizes teacher characteristics using Grasha’s framework and, as previously discussed, lacks established validity. Even with this limitation, the tool remains widely used and the most often cited tool in literature regarding teaching style. Caution should be exercised when using the tool and while interpreting these results.

Conclusions

The findings of the study align with the findings of Monk’s (1987) seminal work that found that placement is a process that involves the consideration of a number of important variables. Further, results expand on those of other researchers who have explored the individual variables used as a part of the class placement process (Kraemer, Worth, & Meyer, 2011; Kalogrides, Loeb, & Beteille, 2012; Gao, 2012) establishing teaching style as a strong likely variable used for the actual assignment of teachers to groups of students. The research also lends itself to an established body of scholarship that explores factors associated with teaching students with anxiety in the classroom (Everson, Tobias, Hartman, & Gourney, 1993; Hopko, Crittendon, Ialongo & Edelsohn, 1994; Campbell & Evans, 1997; Grant & Wilson, 2005; Owens, Stevenson, Norgate & Hadwin, 2008; Tramonte & Willms, 2010; Geist, 2010; Martin, Burns & Schonlau, 2010; Rockhill et al., 2010) and advances the field in understanding the impact on the
perceptions of principals and teachers in the class placement of students with anxiety. Further, principals and teachers were found to adapt their perceptions of “fit” between teacher and student based on the social-emotional presentation of students.

Results revealed that principals and teachers do not agree on the teaching style of teachers. In addition to the implications for the student placement process, finding might also be important given the current state of educator evaluation that has made a move to connect teachers’ evaluation to student achievement. Finding that principals and teachers generally do not agree on teachers’ teacher style informs the ongoing dialogue between teacher and principal. Further, in order to maximize the impact of teachers on student achievement, principals may want to consider adding teacher-student fit as a more explicit variable in the class placement process.

Future research should examine the perceptions that teachers have of the teaching styles of other teachers in their school. Results suggested that the current teachers of a particular grade begin the class placement process by creating the initial class lists. It could be that the teachers are forming the groupings with knowledge of their teacher-colleagues. It is possible that they are impacting the process by forming initial groups based on some characteristics of known teachers in the next grade. It would be interesting to explore the extent of agreement of teachers across grade-level teams (e.g., examining the extent of agreement of second grade teachers perceptions of themselves coupled with first grade teachers perceptions of the second grade teachers, and so on).

The class placement process consumes a considerable amount of time within a school. All principals interviewed discussed receiving no formal training or support to
facilitate this process. Providing training to school principals regarding the variables associated with class placement, as well as proving some training or support relative to the importance of a good fit between teachers and students may have significant implications for student achievement.
Appendix A

Superintendent Recruiting Email (Study 1 and 2)
Dear Superintendent:

My name is James LaBillois and I am a doctoral candidate in Education at the Boston University School of Education and the Executive Director for Instruction for the Norwell Public Schools in Norwell, Massachusetts. As a part of my dissertation research, I would like to invite elementary principals and elementary general education teachers in district to participate in a research study that is being conducted to better understand how students are assigned to classrooms (the “student placement” process).

I am writing to request permission to contact your elementary principal/s and one teacher in each building to participate in the study. Participants will be asked to complete a series of web-based questionnaires. First, they will be asked to complete a demographic questionnaire designed to collect some background information. Then they will be asked to complete a questionnaire asking them to characterize the teaching style of one teacher in their building or, in the case of the teacher, complete a questionnaire where they characterize their teaching style. Once completed both teachers and principals be asked to read about three hypothetical children, and then complete a questionnaire after each one that will identify the best teacher for that student. Total participation time is estimated to be between 20–25 minutes.

I am inviting schools in districts across the country to participate. There is no risk to any of your staff and participants will be free to withdraw their permission for participation at any time. If there are specific policies and/or procedures, apart from your approval, please let me know and I will take the associated steps to complete them.

If you are agreeable to letting your staff participate, please let me know and I will email your principals to ask their willingness to participate. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 781-206-7444 or Dr. Donna Lehr at 617-353-3240. Questions or concerns about research participants’ rights may be directed to the Boston University Institutional Review Board office at 617-358-6115.

Thank you in advance for your support.

Yours truly,

James M. LaBillois
Appendix B

Principal Recruiting Email (Study 1 and 2)
Dear Principal:

My name is James LaBillois and I am a doctoral candidate in Education at the Boston University School of Education and the Executive Director for Instruction for the Norwell Public Schools. As a part of my dissertation research, I would like to invite you and one of the teachers in your building to participate in a research study that is being conducted to better understand teacher’s teaching styles and the extent to which there is agreement regarding the needs of specific students.

Principal participants will be asked to complete a series of web-based questionnaires. First, you will be asked to complete a demographic questionnaire designed to collect some background information. Then you will be asked to complete a questionnaire asking you to characterize the teaching style of one randomly selected teacher in your building. Once completed you will be asked to read about three hypothetical children, and then complete a questionnaire after each one that will identify the best teacher for that student. Teacher participants will also complete the demographic questionnaire, a questionnaire about their own teaching style, and complete the questionnaires about the best teacher for the three hypothetical children. Total participation time is estimated to be between 20–25 minutes.

I am inviting schools in districts across the country to participate. There is no risk to you or your staff members and participants are free to withdraw their permission for participation at any time. Each participant will be assigned an alphanumeric identification number. Participant names will not be revealed to anyone or appear in any written work. I will also offer to share with results of the research with any participant when the study is completed.

If you are interested in participating, and would be agreeable for me to contact one random teacher in your building for participation, please let me know by responding to this email. I will not contact any teacher in your building until I receive your permission. Once I hear from you, and you agree to participate, I will contact a random teacher in your building. Once I hear from them, and they’re agreeable to participate, I will email you both an informational email containing a link to the survey.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 781-206-7444 or Dr. Donna Lehr at 617-353-3240. Questions or concerns about research participants’ rights may be directed to the Boston University Institutional Review Board office at 617-358-6115.

Thank you in advance for your support.

Yours truly,

James M. LaBillois
Appendix C

Teacher Recruiting Email (Study 1 and 2)
Dear Teacher:

My name is James LaBillois and I am a doctoral candidate in Education at the Boston University School of Education and the Executive Director for Instruction for the Norwell Public Schools. As a part of my dissertation research, I would like to invite you to participate in a research study that is being conducted to better understand teacher’s teaching styles, how students are assigned to classrooms, and the extent to which there is agreement regarding the needs of specific students.

Teacher participants will be asked to complete a series of web-based questionnaires. First, you will be asked to complete a demographic questionnaire designed to collect some background information. Then you will be asked to complete a questionnaire asking you to characterize your teaching style. Once completed you will be asked to read about three hypothetical children, and then complete a questionnaire after each one that will identify the best teacher for that student. Your building principal has also agreed to participate and they will also complete the demographic questionnaire, a questionnaire about your teaching style, and complete the questionnaires about the best teacher for the three hypothetical children. Total participation time is estimated to be between 20–25 minutes.

I am inviting schools in districts across the country to participate. There is no risk to you and participants are free to withdraw their permission for participation at any time. Each participant will be assigned an alphanumeric identification number. Participant names will not be revealed to anyone or appear in any written work. I will also offer to share with results of the research with any participant when the study is completed.

If you are interested in participating, please let me know by responding to this email and I will send you an informational email containing a link to the survey. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 781-206-7444 or Dr. Donna Lehr at 617-353-3240. Questions or concerns about research participants’ rights may be directed to the Boston University Institutional Review Board office at 617-358-6115.

Thank you in advance for your support.

Yours truly,

James M. LaBillois

Boston University - Charles River Campus
Institutional Review Board
Approved: 07/19/13 – 05/22/2014
Appendix D

Superintendent Recruiting Email (Study 3)
Dear Superintendent:

My name is James LaBillois and I am a doctoral candidate in Education at the Boston University School of Education and the Executive Director for Instruction for the Norwell Public Schools in Norwell, Massachusetts. As a part of my dissertation research, I would like to invite elementary principals and elementary general education teachers in district to participate in a research study that is being conducted to better understand how students are assigned to classrooms (the “student placement” process).

I am writing to request permission to contact your elementary principal/s and one teacher in each building to participate in the study. Participants will be asked to participate in a brief 10–15 minutes telephone interview. The questions are designed to get information on how students are placed into classrooms each year (class placement process). I am inviting schools in districts across the country to participate. There is no risk to any of your staff and participants will be free to withdraw their permission for participation at any time. If there are specific policies and/or procedures, apart from your approval, please let me know and I will take the associated steps to complete them.

If you are agreeable to letting your staff participate, please let me know and I will email your principals to ask their willingness to participate. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 781-206-7444 or Dr. Donna Lehr at 617-353-3240. Questions or concerns about research participants’ rights may be directed to the Boston University Institutional Review Board office at 617-358-6115.

Thank you in advance for your support.

Yours truly,

James M. LaBillois

Boston University - Charles River Campus
Institutional Review Board
Approved: 05/23/13 – 05/22/2014
Appendix E

Principal Recruiting Email (Study 3)
Dear Principal:

My name is James LaBillois and I am a doctoral candidate in Education at the Boston University School of Education and the Executive Director for Instruction for the Norwell Public Schools in Norwell, Massachusetts. As a part of my dissertation research, I would like to invite you to participate in a research study that is being conducted to better understand how students are assigned to classrooms in your school (the “student placement” process).

I am writing to see if you would be interested in participating in a brief telephone interview (10–15 minutes). I will be asking you questions about how the student placement process works in your school. I am inviting schools in districts across the country to participate. There is no risk in participating in the interview. If you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw your permission for participation at any time. I will also ask one of your teachers (randomly selected) to also participate to explain the process from their point of view. Each participant will be assigned an alphanumeric identification number. Participant names will not be revealed to anyone or appear in any written work. I will also offer to share with results of the research with any participant when the study is completed.

If you are interested in participating, and would be agreeable for me to contact one random teacher in your building for participation too, please let me know and I will mail each of you a consent form for participation. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 781-206-7444 or Dr. Donna Lehr at 617-353-3240. Questions or concerns about research participants’ rights may be directed to the Boston University Institutional Review Board office at <inset contact information>.

Thank you in advance for your support.

Yours truly,
James M. LaBillois

---

Boston University - Charles River Campus
Institutional Review Board
Approved: 05/23/13 – 05/22/2014
Appendix F

Teacher Recruiting Email (Study 3)
Dear Teacher:

My name is James LaBillois and I am a doctoral candidate in Education at the Boston University School of Education and the Executive Director for Instruction for the Norwell Public Schools in Norwell, Massachusetts. As a part of my dissertation research, I would like to invite you to participate in a research study that is being conducted to better understand how students are assigned to classrooms in your school (the “student placement” process).

I am writing to see if you would be interested in participating in a brief telephone interview (10–15 minutes). I will be asking you questions about how the student placement process works in your school. I am inviting schools in districts across the country to participate. There is no risk in participating in the interview. If you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw your permission for participation at any time. Each participant will be assigned an alphanumeric identification number. Participant names will not be revealed to anyone or appear in any written work. I will also offer to share with results of the research with any participant when the study is completed.

If you are interested in participating please let me know and I will mail you a consent form for participation. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 781-206-7444 or Dr. Donna Lehr at 617-353-3240. Questions or concerns about research participants’ rights may be directed to the Boston University Institutional Review Board office at <inset contact information>.

Thank you in advance for your support.

Yours truly,
James M. LaBillois

---

*Boston University - Charles River Campus*

*Institutional Review Board*

*Approved: 05/23/13 – 05/22/2014*
Appendix G

Demographic Questionnaire
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Please completely fill out all information on this form to the best of your ability.

What is the alphanumeric identification code from your informational e-mail? _____

What is your age?
- 25 and under
- 26–30
- 31–40
- 41–50
- 51–60
- 61 and older

What is your sex?
- Male
- Female

What is the highest level of education you have completed?
- Bachelor’s Degree
- Bachelor's Degree and some graduate courses
- Master's Degree
- Master's Degree and some additional graduate courses
- Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study (C.A.G.S.)
- C.A.G.S and some additional graduate courses
- Doctoral Degree
- Doctoral Degree and some additional graduate courses

How many years, in total, have you been working in the education field?
- First Year
- 2–3 years
- 4–5 years
- 6–10 years
- 11–20 years
- 21–30 years
- More Than 30 years

What would best describe your current role?
- General Education Teacher
- Special Education Teacher
How many years, in total, have you been working in your current role?

- First Year
- 2–3 years
- 3–5 years
- 5–10 years
- 11–20 years
- 21–30 years
- More Than 30 years

How many years, in total, have you been working in your current role in your current school?

- First Year
- 2–3 years
- 3–5 years
- 5–10 years
- 11–20 years
- 21–30 years
- More Than 30 years

What would best describe the geographic location in which you work?

- Rural
- Suburban
- Urban

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE PRESENTED TO PRINCIPALS ONLY

(Principals Only): How many years have you been working with the teacher you completed the questionnaire about?

- First Year
- 2–3 years
- 3–5 years
- 5–10 years
Have you had experience as a teacher?

- YES
- NO

If yes, what grade/grades

- Pre-School/Pre-Kindergarten
- Kindergarten
- One
- Two
- Three
- Four
- Five
- Middle School
  - Subject/s:
- High School
  - Subject/s:

If yes, how many years were you a teacher?

- 1 year
- 2–3 years
- 3–5 years
- 5–10 years
- 11–20 years
- 21–30 years
- More Than 30 years

What is the total student enrollment at this school?

- __________

How many classroom teachers (including special educators) are there in this school?

- __________

What grades do you serve?

- __________

When assigning students to classrooms and teachers, does the “match” between the student and the teacher ever play a role in your decision-making?

- YES
- NO
Appendix H

Principal Participant Email (Study 1 and 2)
Dear Participant:

Thank you for your interest in participating in this research. You have been assigned the following alphanumeric code: A#-T#. Please keep this code confidential and handy when you complete the web-based questionnaires. You will be asked to enter the code when you begin to respond.

When completing the first questionnaire regarding teaching style, you will be completing it based on <TEACHER’S NAME>.

When you are ready to begin, please click <HERE> to complete the questionnaire.

Should there be any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you in advance for your support.

Yours truly,

James M. LaBillois

**Boston University** - Charles River Campus
**Institutional Review Board**
**Approved:** 05/23/13 – 05/22/2014
Appendix I

Teacher Participant Email (Study 1 and 2)
Dear Participant:

Thank you for your interest in participating in this research. You have been assigned the following alphanumeric code: T#-A#. Please keep this code confidential and handy when you complete the web-based questionnaires. You will be asked to enter the code when you begin to respond.

When you are ready to begin, please click <HERE> to complete the questionnaires.

Should there be any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you in advance for your support.

Yours truly,

James M. LaBillois

Boston University - Charles River Campus
Institutional Review Board
Approved: 05/23/13 – 05/22/2014
Appendix J

Student Profiles
STUDENT PROFILES

You will be presented with a series of three student profiles. Please read each student profile carefully. After reading the student profile, think about the most appropriate teacher for this student. How would that teacher answer each of these questions?

What is the alphanumeric identification code from your informational e-mail?

_______

Student Profile: David
David is a shy student who worries about tests and grades. He bites his nails and approaches the teacher's desk with several questions just before a test is to begin. He often becomes upset if he receives a poor grade or if he is criticized. He very much wants to please his teacher and parents, and thus fears making mistakes and feels guilty when he does poorly.

Student Profile: Mary
Mary is a shy student who tends to withdraw from her classmates during unstructured time and she prefers to be alone. Sometimes, she seems nervous when her peers attempt to engage her in-group activities. If she is left to her own initiative to join in a group activity, she will not do so. When she is alone, she is creative and active.

Student Profile: Mark
Mark works slowly in the classroom and as a result often has to take his work home to complete. He seems to procrastinate often. This is partly due to his fear of making mistakes and oversensitivity to criticism, as he feels a need to do "perfect" work. He generally finishes his work and gets good grades, but it takes him much longer than his peers. In general, he is a child who withdraws from others, especially peers, and tends to keep things to himself.
Appendix K

Interview Scripts
PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW SCRIPT
(Questions adapted from Monk (1987))

The following script was used to collect data:

• Do you have any questions about the interview?

Say: As I mentioned in my e-mail/phone call, we're interested in the methods you use to assign students to classes.

• Please tell me how you go about assigning students from one grade to the next?
• Do these methods vary depending on the grade level?
  o (If yes: How and why?)
• How do teachers influence the assignment of students to their classes?
• Could you describe a specific instance where a teacher disagreed with how students were being assigned?
• What was the nature of the teacher’s disagreement?
• What grade level did this occur at?
• What did you do?
  o Why?
• What would be the most legitimate reason a teacher could use to justify an objection to a class assignment?
• Why do you consider this to be legitimate?
• What would you consider to be an illegitimate reason for a teacher to try to influence the assignment of students?
• Why is this illegitimate?
• How do you (or would you) handle illegitimate requests made by teachers?

Say: In your questionnaire, you indicated that the “match” between teachers and students might influence your class assignment decisions.

• Tell me more about this process?

• What do you interpret the word “match” to mean?

Say: We haven't talked very much about teacher characteristics that could influence student assignments.

• What are some teacher characteristics that on occasion can make a difference?

• Are there certain teachers that you assign certain types of students?

  ○ (If yes: What type? Why?)

Say: O.K., some final questions:

• Has your approach to this administrative task changed over the years?

• Was there anything in your training that has helped you deal with this task?

• What was it?

• How does it help?

• Can you summarize what the experience has taught you?

• What advice would you give to a new principal?

• What improvements would you like to see made?

• Is there anything else you think I should know about how class assignments have been made?

• What is it?

Say: Thank you very much.
TEACHER INTERVIEW SCRIPT
(Questions adapted from Monk (1987))

The following script was used to collect data:

• Do you have any questions about the interview?

Say: As I mentioned in my e-mail/phone call, we're interested in the methods used in your building to assign students to classes.

• Please tell me how your school goes about assigning students from one grade to the next?

• Do these methods vary depending on the grade level?
  o (If yes: How and why?)

• How do you, as a teacher, influence the assignment of students to their classes?

• Could you describe a specific instance where you disagreed with how students were being assigned?

• What was the nature of your disagreement?

• What grade level did this occur at?

• What did you do?
  o Why?

• What, in your opinion, would be the most legitimate reason someone could use to justify an objection to a class assignment?

• Why do you consider this to be legitimate?

• What would you consider to be an illegitimate reason for someone to try to influence the assignment of students?
• Why is this illegitimate?
• How does your school handle illegitimate requests made by teachers?

Say: In your questionnaire, you indicated that the “match” between teachers and students might influence your class assignment decisions.

• Tell me more about what you meant.
• What do you interpret the word “match” to mean?

Say: We haven't talked very much about any individual teacher characteristics that could influence student assignments.

• What are some teacher characteristics, in your opinion, that may make a difference?
• If you were in charge of student placement - are there certain teachers that you assign certain types of students?
  o (If yes: What type? Why?)

Say: O.K., some final questions:

• What advice would you give to a new principal about the student placement process?
• What improvements to the student placement process would you like to see made?
• Is there anything else you think I should know about how class assignments are made?
• What is it?

Say: Thank you very much.
Appendix L

Principal Informed Consent Form (Study 3)
You have been invited to participate in a research study being conducted in your school by James M. LaBillois, doctoral student, under the supervision of Dr. Donna Lehr of the Boston University School of Education. The purpose of the research is to (a) examine the class placement process and to (b) examine the extent of agreement between principals and teachers regarding their perceptions of teaching style and students’ needs.

You will be asked to participate in a one-to-one, audio recorded, telephone interview that is designed to gather information on how the student-class placement process is completed in your school. Participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time. Total participation time is estimated to be between 10–15 minutes. You may choose not to participate in this research study. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts in participating in this research. There are no benefits to you from participating in this research. Results from this research may contribute to the literature relative to student class placement.

All your personal information will be kept confidential. Study data will be kept in a locked file cabinet. Only study staff, the BU IRB, and federal and state agencies that oversee or review research will have access to study data.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask me at 781-206-7444 or Dr. Donna Lehr at 617-353-3240. You may obtain further information about your rights as a research subject by calling the BU CRC IRB office at 617-358-6115.

___________________________________________________
Signature of Principal ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Please place the completed consent form, place it in the provided stamped envelope and mail at your earliest convenience.

☐ I would like to receive a copy of the results of the study via email once it is complete.

My email address for this purpose is: ____________________________

___________________________________________________
Signature of PI ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Study Title: Principal and Teacher Perceptions of Student-Teacher Match: Is there Agreement?

IRB Protocol Number: 3175E
Consent Form Valid Date: July 19, 2013
Study Expiration Date: May 22, 2014
Appendix M

Teacher Informed Consent Form (Basis of Class Assignment)
You have been invited to participate in a research being conducted in your school by James M. LaBillois, doctoral student, under the supervision of Dr. Donna Lehr of the Boston University School of Education. The purpose of the research is to examine (a) the class placement process and to (b) examine the extent of agreement between principals and teachers regarding their perceptions of teaching style and students’ needs.

You will be asked to participate in a one-to-one, tape recorded, telephone interview that is designed to gather information on how the student-class placement process is completed in your school.

Participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time. Total participation time is estimated to be between 10–15 minutes. You may choose not to participate in this research study.

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts in participating in this research. There are no benefits to you from participating in this research. Results from this research may contribute to the literature relative to student class placement. All your personal information will be kept confidential. Study data will be kept in a locked file cabinet. Only study staff, the BU IRB, and federal and state agencies that oversee or review research will have access to study data.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask me at 781-206-7444 or Dr. Donna Lehr at 617-353-3240. You may obtain further information about your rights as a research subject by calling the BU CRC IRB office at 617-358-6115.

___________________________________________________________
Signature of Teacher                                         Date

Please place the completed consent form, place it in the provided stamped envelope and mail at your earliest convenience.

☐ I would like to receive a copy of the results of the study via email once it is complete.

My email address for this purpose is: ___________________________

___________________________________________________________
Signature of PI                                              Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Title: Principal and Teacher Perceptions of Student-Teacher Match: Is there Agreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRB Protocol Number: 3175E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Form Valid Date: July 19, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Expiration Date: May 22, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N

Principal Informed Consent Script (Study 1 and 2)
First page of online survey:

You have been invited to participate in a research being conducted in your school by James M. LaBillois, doctoral student, under the supervision of Dr. Donna Lehr of the Boston University School of Education. The purpose of the research is to examine (a) the class placement process and (b) the extent of agreement between principals and teachers regarding their perceptions of teaching style and students’ needs.

You will be asked to complete a series of web-based questionnaires. You will be asked to:

- Complete a demographic questionnaire designed to collect some background information.
- Complete a questionnaire about the teaching style of one teacher in my building (principals) or a questionnaire about my teaching style (teachers).
- Read three descriptions of hypothetical children, and then complete a questionnaire after each one that will identify the best teacher for that student.

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts in participating in this research. There are no benefits to you from participating but results from this research may contribute to the literature relative to student class placement.

All personal information will be kept confidential. Study data will be kept in a locked file cabinet. Only study staff, the BU IRB, and federal and state agencies that oversee or review research will have access to study data.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask me at 781-206-7444 or Dr. Donna Lehr at 617-353-3240. You may obtain further information about your rights as a research subject by calling the BU CRC IRB office at 617-358-6115.

Participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time. Total participation time is estimated to be between 20–25 minutes.

You may choose not to participate in this research study, by not responding to this survey. You may choose to stop participating once you begin the survey. Simply exit the browser to do so.

By clicking NEXT, you are consenting to participation in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Title:</th>
<th>Principal and Teacher Perceptions of Student-Teacher Match: Is there Agreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRB Protocol Number:</td>
<td>3175E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Form Valid Date:</td>
<td>July 19, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Expiration Date:</td>
<td>May 22, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix O

Teacher Informed Consent Script (Study 1 and 2)
First page of online survey:

You have been invited to participate in a research being conducted in your school by James M. LaBillois, doctoral student, under the supervision of Dr. Donna Lehr of the Boston University School of Education. The purpose of the research is to examine (a) the class placement process and (b) the extent of agreement between principals and teachers regarding their perceptions of teaching style and students’ needs.

You will be asked to complete a series of web-based questionnaires. You will be asked to:

- Complete a demographic questionnaire designed to collect some background information.
- Complete a questionnaire about the teaching style of one teacher in my building (principals) or a questionnaire about my teaching style (teachers).
- Read three descriptions of hypothetical children, and then complete a questionnaire after each one that will identify the best teacher for that student.

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts in participating in this research. There are individual benefits from participating but results from this research may contribute to the literature relative to student class placement.

All your personal information will be kept confidential. Study data will be kept in a locked file cabinet. Only study staff, the BU IRB, and federal and state agencies that oversee or review research will have access to study data.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask me at 781-206-7444 or Dr. Donna Lehr at 617-353-3240. You may obtain further information about your rights as a research subject by calling the BU CRC IRB office at 617-358-6115.

Participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time. Total participation time is estimated to be between 20–25 minutes.

You may choose not to participate in this research study, by not responding to this survey. You may choose to stop participating once you begin the survey. Simply exit the browser to do so.

By clicking NEXT, you are consenting to participation in this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Title:</th>
<th>Principal and Teacher Perceptions of Student-Teacher Match: Is there Agreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRB Protocol Number:</td>
<td>3175E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Form Valid Date:</td>
<td>July 19, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Expiration Date:</td>
<td>May 22, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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