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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The problem.-- The writer of this thesis teaches a sixth grade class in a town where the elementary pupils in grades two through six are arranged in homogeneous groups. Median scores on annually administered achievement tests are the criteria for determining homogeneous placement of the pupils.

Homogeneous grouping is supposed to lessen academic strain by making successful achievement possible for larger numbers of pupils. Successful pupils should be happier and more secure. This should be reflected in their social adjustments.

A level of aspiration is one's self-perceived relationship to the world about him. Everyone, whether student, worker, or man of leisure, has levels of aspiration. It would be expected that homogeneous grouping might be an influencing factor on level of aspiration. This particular study is an attempt to determine the relationship, or effect, of homogeneous grouping on the aspiration level of some sixth grade children.

Theory of homogeneous grouping.-- The term "homogeneous" implies likeness or similarity of character. In the field of

education likeness or similarity is attained by grouping pupils according to some common characteristic. The search for homogeneity has assumed many guises. In early schools, classes were composed of pupils having a wide age range but membership was restricted to boys. The limitation to one sex provided a type of homogeneity. Parochial schools, vocational schools, etc., with similar religious backgrounds or common occupational objectives, are other ways of establishing a kind of homogeneity for classroom learning. Throughout the U.S. one kind of homogeneity is established by law. Most states specify the exact age at which a child shall enter school. This provides a homogeneity of chronological age. Some progressive schools have eliminated grade levels and permit pupils to work at their own rate; others make it possible for youngsters to leave classrooms to seek remedial work with other pupils requiring the same kind of help. The objective in each case is to facilitate learning by an arrangement of pupils who are reasonably close in performance potential.

The various ways of obtaining homogeneity is one of the moot questions of today's elementary schools. Most educators agree that a learning situation is enhanced by grouping pupils with the same amount of readiness and similar degrees of ability to perform. However, the means of attaining homogeneity, using any single standard of selection, tends to create a fictitious homogeneous grouping, i.e., to group for similar achievement in spelling probably places a widely
divergent range of mathematical abilities together.

Even in schools where a random or heterogeneous grouping of pupils is used, the teacher attempts to cultivate a homogeneous learning situation by arranging small working units within the room. These are not rigid groups or fixed units of pupils but are flexible enough so that the pupil is learning material in each subject area with other pupils who approximate his skills.

Certain aspects of the philosophy for creating homogeneous groups identified by a single factor, such as median achievement, are interesting. An examination of some of these ideas makes the relationship between homogeneous grouping and aspiration levels more meaningful.

**Homogeneous grouping by single factor selection.**—It is claimed that homogeneous grouping segregates the youngsters into groups where the skills may be taught at a tempo commensurate with the particular groups' ability to learn them. One might hope that in all learning situations pupils were attempting to learn ideas, and techniques within their personal ability range, and at a reasonable rate. Undoubtedly in small classes, it is possible to realize this objective without placing the kind of strain on the teacher which makes the practice prohibitive. Some educators feel that in the average over-populated classroom there is such a large scattering of abilities that only by reducing the range of ability within the entire group can the learning and teaching
process be made economical and efficient. Thus, these edu-
cators advocate homogeneous grouping by a single selection
factor, such as achievement, in the hope that such similarity
of medians may at least make a group less heterogeneous in
character.

Success with the technique of homogeneous grouping has
not been limited to classroom learning experiences. On
snow-covered slopes, the ski instructor attempts to handle
groups of comparable skills and abilities. On a gentle slope
the beginners learn to snow plow. Gaining skill and confi-
dence, they gradually leave fewer sitz marks in their wake.
On steeper slopes those who have acquired sufficient experi-
ence practice jump turns. If the novice joins the more
proficient, and attempts to execute jump turns, his awkward-
ness may provoke him to quit; or, his lack of finesse could
cause a broken leg. In the classroom, if the pupil attempts
numerous tasks which are too difficult, the resulting
frustrations may be much more disturbing, and more permanent-
ly disabling, than a broken leg.

There is no single technique of teaching. A few of the
basic methods are adaptable to the ski slope, the classroom,
or any other learning experience. Those who justify homo-
genous grouping within the grade level claim that the
reduction of ability range within a classroom enables
youngsters of comparable ability to progress at comparable
rates. This should provide equivalent success experiences
for a larger percentage of pupils and the low ability pupils should be less prone to failure. Previous research would indicate that successful children should reflect a more realistic level of aspiration. Pauline Sears (Chapter II) discovered that there is a small discrepancy between anticipation and performance in successful children and a larger, fluctuating discrepancy in unsuccessful children.

Protagonists for homogeneous grouping claim that pupils grouped into "ability" groups are able to work at their own speed and are stimulated by the competition of youngsters of similar achievements. The teaching is geared to the pupils' level and because of this, individual differences of capacity are not arbitrarily sources of failure or success. A degree of success in achievement is realized by a greater number of pupils.

Roger G. Barker, talking about success and failure in the classroom, makes this comment:

"Social acceptability in an intimate group such as a school class requires a high degree of conformity to group standards in all sorts of public behavior. The first step in achieving such acceptability is to set goals in accordance with the group standards. In schools where evaluation is largely on the basis of academic achievements this means that poor students are forced, by the social pressure of the classroom, to set goals they cannot achieve or else to admit that they are mavericks; both are undesirable alternatives from a mental hygiene viewpoint. There is pressure upon bright students, also, to set their goals in conformity with the achievements of their room mates, rather than with their own."1/

Mr. Barker makes four points to summarize his article:

"1. Broaden the basis for evaluating pupils

2. Reduce to a minimum the prominence of the relative standing of the pupils

3. Allow maximum freedom to pupils to set their own goals and to alter them as their success and failure experiences require, i.e., make success possible at all levels of achievement

4. Reduce the dominance of the teacher."

The first three points might be used as supporting arguments for homogeneous grouping. "Broaden the basis for evaluating pupils," becomes essential in a homogeneous group where the curtailed range of ability makes the application of customary ranking difficult. If a slow learner, in a group of slow learners, expends enough effort to succeed at a task, even though the task has been deliberately tailored to his abilities, his mark or evaluation should be high.

By homogeneous grouping it should be possible to "reduce to a minimum the prominence of the relative standing of the pupils." In a group of wide range abilities the unusually bright and the very slow are conspicuous. In a uniform ability group equal struggle towards a goal within reach would tend to produce a uniformity of results.

"Allow maximum freedom to pupils to set their own goals and to alter them as their success and failure experiences require, i.e., make success possible at all levels of achievement."

2/Loc. cit.
require." would be best realized by homogeneous grouping. If the pupil enjoys freedom from overwhelming competition, he is apt to spontaneously mark his own next goal. With youngsters of similar abilities, perhaps slight rises in goals would seem gratifyingly important. In a heterogeneous group the competition might be so unevenly keen and ability discrepancies so outstanding that individual success and failure experiences would be dwarfed by standards and attitudes brashly imposed by the majority of the group.

Thus, the concepts Roger Barker presents, concerning success and failure in the classroom, would be desirably realized by true conditions of homogeneity. A functioning homogeneous classroom would be educationally ideal. However, "homogeneous grouping" is an ambiguous term. Here lies the crux of the problem; a classroom is made up of many complex individuals. One of the few consistent generalizations to be made about any aggregation of individuals concerns the complete lack of uniformity or conformity of any kind. Thus, with diverse ranges of abilities and personality factors, a group classified as homogeneous because of any single feature, may be falsely labeled. In modern education, within any classroom, individual differences tend to be provided for by grouping and regrouping, as many times as necessary, for the various subjects of the curriculum until children are working in a homogeneous situation for the particular task at hand.

1/Roger Barker, loc. cit.
Educators who favor heterogeneous grouping of pupils are not unaware of the values inherent in homogeneity; they simply are not deceived by a grouping which produces, perhaps by a name tag, surface evidence of a homogeneity which can not exist.

**Theory of heterogeneous grouping.**—Those who favor heterogeneous grouping of pupils have several valid reasons for doing so. These educators feel that there is greater motivation within the classroom of a wide range ability group. The teacher is not the dominant center (see point 4 of Barker's summary); there tends to be some pupil leadership to stimulate the class. From limited observation it would seem to this writer that slow-progress groups sometimes develop a "group" personality—lethargic and defensive. However, does a heterogeneous group, with several very slow learners at the bottom and several bright at the top penalize both of these subgroups? A precise answer to this question is dependent upon the individual teacher and his or her ability to create an enthusiastic learning atmosphere. In a well-functioning heterogeneous classroom, the above average child may benefit in many ways from the slower learner. Because the grouping is more democratic, it presumably tends to discourage development of smug and conceited attitudes as are sometimes displayed by the segregated, choice few, of an "A" section. The gifted child may make his own basic skills more permanent by helping a slower classmate; and, in the sharing
experience, become a bit more altruistic. The rapid learners, by nature somewhat creative and curious, usually have the initiative to work independently and, with a capable teacher, will not be restricted to the learning rate of the less gifted. Those who favor heterogeneous grouping repeat the question, is it possible to arrange a really homogeneous group? Or, allowing for individual differences, is the character of such a group merely less heterogeneous? Is there any single standard of selectivity for a homogeneous group which really predicts homogeneity? There appears to be none. Another question of concern might be whether homogeneous grouping has a leveling effect. Over a period of time, does homogeneous division of large groups contribute to greater homogeneity? Does each group develop an attitude which might be described as characteristic of a particular group at a particular level? Does the slow learner adopt a more retarded pace as he imitates other slow learners?

The advantages and disadvantages of certain grouping are not a major issue in this study. Suffice it to say that there is a difference of opinion and practice. The concern here is to discover whether or not youngsters who have been placed in a homogeneous group have been so profoundly affected that they have a more, or less, realistic view of themselves. What is their level of aspiration?

Homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping as involved in this study.-- The youngsters observed for this study were
residents of adjoining towns. These towns are similar in many respects (See Community Backgrounds). One town arranges all youngsters of grades 2-6 in homogeneous groups; the other town uses heterogeneous grouping. In both towns all of the sixth grade students of one school participated. The two schools selected contained all of the sixth grade pupils attending public school in that particular district of town. Each of the schools had an enrollment of sufficient size to warrant four sixth grade classes. All sixth graders in each school took the tests upon which this study is based. Permanent records of all pupils were studied and only pupils who had been members of either school system at the time of entering fifth grade were considered to have been "conditioned" by their particular group for a long enough period of time to make their test valid for the purposes of this study. Each school had acquired a few new pupils in the interval between beginning of grade five and January of the sixth grade year when these tests were administered. After discarding the tests of a few newcomers (in spite of realizing prior to testing that a few tests would be useless, everyone was tested in order to establish better group rapport), there were a total of 103 heterogeneously grouped children to compare with 132 homogeneously grouped children.

In the school containing the homogeneous groups, the pupils were actually members of A, B, C, and D groups as depicted in this study. In the heterogeneous school all
sixth grade youngsters were also divided into four groups but by a random distribution. Therefore, in order to tabulate differences between the outstanding pupils in each group and the slow learners of each group, etc., it was necessary to re-arrange the test results of the heterogeneous pupils to conform to the distribution of the homogeneous pupils.

The 103 heterogeneous tests were assembled and then arranged into four groups by median achievement. The top youngsters comprised the A group, the next highest the B, and so on through the D division. This is the process of selection for the classroom assignment of the homogeneous children. Any special exceptions and doubtful cases among the heterogeneous children were assigned on the same basis as would be their counterparts in the homogeneous group. The totals were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heterogeneous</th>
<th>Homogeneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The divisions decrease in size, according to their letter grade, from high to low. This is a real situation in the homogeneous school. In the heterogeneous school, with the arbitrary "paper" arrangement of classes used for this study, the same policy was followed. Thus, in homogeneous classes a fast moving "top" group has a larger number of pupils than
does the slower moving "low" group where much time must be spent on remedial work. The exact degree of gradation in group size is determined by the range of scores. By looking at a total listing of scores, while keeping in mind the above policy, certain cleavage points usually become apparent. It is better to use this natural division, if one occurs, of grouping than to establish, without reason, a certain pupil count for each division. As previously mentioned, heterogeneous grouping in one of the towns where this study was conducted, follows no set procedure in assigning pupils to their divisions. A few exceptions to this random distribution might be made in the case of some discipline problems. It is usually not wise to let discipline problems congregate in a single class. (This frequently happens in homogeneous grouping.) Therefore, a few individuals, for their own good, for the benefit of fellow classmates, and for the mental health of the teacher, are apportioned to the several classes with careful forethought.

In the school and town with which this study is concerned, where homogeneous grouping is practiced, the supposed homogeneity is accomplished by the median achievement score. When a decision was first reached to arrange all elementary pupils in homogeneous groups (except grade one), the means of establishing homogeneity posed a problem. Was ability or achievement the best means of portending homogeneity? In ability grouping an I.Q. score would probably be the prime
selector. However, I.Q. indicates potential only. One is reminded of the legendary tortoise and hare. A strong, but inert, potential ability may be wholly unproductive.

After due deliberation, it was felt that achievement was the best determiner for locating a pupil's placement and of indicating his immediate future needs. Pupils of similar achievements seem ready to progress together at similar speeds. For the average child there is usually no large discrepancy between achievement and I.Q. An emotionally disturbed child may have an I.Q. which belies his achievement, but in the majority of cases pupils work within a reasonable radius of their abilities.

The decision to form homogeneous groups on the basis of achievement led to the problem of how to evaluate achievement. Objective appraisals of pupils' achievements are not easy. Teachers' marks (one evaluation of achievement) may reflect personality, effort, or relationships to fellow classmates. A teacher may use a mark as evidence of a pupil's discrepancy between performance and ability. Teachers tend to be quite individualistic in their marking. It was necessary to have a reasonably objective evaluation of a pupil's achievement in order to rate a youngster's accomplishments in respect to the entire group. The median achievement score of the annually administered test was selected as the most significant clue showing a child's academic relationship to his group.

In most cases, the use of the achievement score median provided the basis for fairly uniform homogeneous grouping. However, much as this score is valued because it is somewhat objective, its very objectivity and impersonal nature may contribute to individual penalties. If all of the human elements entering into testing are ignored and pupils are automatically assigned to divisions because of a single score, a few pupils will certainly be misplaced. Such errors in placement would include the child who, taking the test in a state of panic, or feeling ill, would obtain a very unrealistic score. Then there is also the clustering of similar scores which makes division cleavages difficult. To fulfill the objective of arranging homogeneous groups, and yet to maintain an awareness of human values, teachers meet with their principals in June of each year. Lists are prepared, locating pupils according to median achievement scores. These scores are the major determinant of next year's division assignments. However, this meeting provides the opportunity for teachers to interpret the scores of the few children who might have been nervous or ill.

For pupils attaining equal achievement scores, the lines between divisions are drawn by using I.Q. scores. If two youngsters have similar achievement scores and there is a question of placement in perhaps a C or a D division, the youngster with the lower I.Q. would probably be assigned to D.
Some consequences of homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping.-- In heterogeneous grouping the lack of any single factor for selecting a class provides enough flexibility so that each year a youngster is a member of a new group. He is not exposed, year after year, to the same 34 (more or less) classmates.

In homogeneous grouping, by the time pupils reach grade six, they have usually had the same classmates for four or five years. Throughout these years a few students will transfer either out or in. Except for those changes, the groups remain rather constant. Some shifting between groups is done by the pupils in the fringe area of each division. At sixth grade level the bottom of the A group comprises a few youngsters who have been members of B at some time. The top youngsters in B have frequently been in A for a year, etc. In most cases, class membership was established in grade two.

As the school population expands there will be a finer degree of homogeneity within the groups of each grade level. For instance, if there are two homogeneous classes of a certain grade level within a building, each one contains a rather scattered range of abilities. On the other hand, in a school where there are five or six groups within one grade level, each classroom reflects a narrower range of ability. The sixth grade homogeneous group observed for this study was in a school with an enrollment large enough to be divided
four ways.

**Community backgrounds.--** The two sixth grade groups tested for this study are in adjoining towns within a twenty mile radius of Boston, Massachusetts. Both towns have grown rapidly in recent years. The town in which classes were grouped heterogeneously will be referred to as Het. and the town using homogeneous grouping will be referred to as Hom. Het. had a population of 9,982 in 1950. In the same year, Hom. had a population of 11,146. In 1955, according to estimates of town officials, Het. had a population of 13,539 and Hom. had a population of 13,754. As of October 1, 1956, the elementary school population for Het. was 2131 and for Hom., 1797. The two sixth grade classes tested contained all of the sixth graders in that particular school district. Each school had a sixth grade enrollment of between 105 and 135. In Het. all elementary pupils were in heterogeneous groups. In Hom. all pupils (except grade one) were in homogeneous groups.

Both towns are mainly industrial and in previous years wages of many residents were earned within the town itself. The characteristics of both towns have changed somewhat in recent years. Mushroom growths of housing developments and individual houses have provided homes for people who were formerly city dwellers. Many of those newcomers earn their living in Boston or in the fringe areas around the city. The

two towns showed a remarkably similar growth pattern. The school systems in both communities were faced with the problems which beset any rapidly expanding community.

**Level of aspiration defined.**—This study is concerned with the relationship, if any, of homogeneous grouping on levels of aspiration. The characteristics and philosophy of homogeneous grouping peculiar to the situation involved in this study have been discussed. It would seem appropriate to scrutinize, for a moment, the wider implications of the term "levels of aspiration."

Kurt Lewin, one of the three original researchers in this field, has defined the level of aspiration as referring "to the momentary goals of the learner, hence to what the learner is trying to do."¹ This brief definition is a very meager expression of Lewin's concept of level of aspiration. He did not apparently believe that a level of aspiration was a trial and error, haphazard setting of a goal by an isolated individual. He seemed to feel that the individual was part of a group and, because of the interdependence resulting from group membership, a social pressure was exerted on goal-setting.

Much of Kurt Lewin's work on level of aspiration evolved from his philosophy concerning group interdependence.

"To Kurt Lewin the American culture ideal of the 'self-made man,' of everyone 'standing on his own feet' seemed as tragic a picture as the initiative-destroying dependence on a benevolent despot. He felt and perceived clearly that we all need continuous help from each other, and that this type of interdependence is the greatest challenge to maturity of individual and group functioning."

Lippitt's citation of Lewin's feeling that "we all need continuous help from each other" becomes understandable in the goal setting area with the realization that the goal set of an individual is tempered by the expectations (help) of his group.

Seymour L. Zelen suggests that: "Level of aspiration may be operationally defined as that observable behavior in which individual differences in goal structure are discernible." The word "structure" used with goal, in Zelen's definition, implies a complexity of behavior response exceeding the simplicity of a simple goal set. A knowledge of previous discrepancies between anticipation and performance is one of the many phases of "structuring" a goal.

Thus, levels of aspiration involve one's own abilities and knowledge of such, plus the awareness of one's society.

J. D. Frank has worded his definition: "...as the level

1/As cited by Ronald Lippitt, The Research Center for Group Dynamics, Beacon House, Inc.; Sociometry Monographs, Number 17, New York, 1947, p. 27.

of future performance in a familiar task which an individual, knowing his level of past performance in that task, explicitly undertakes to reach."

Frank's definition is brief but accurate. For practical application of this definition one need only be cautious about accepting as valid a goal which merely appears to be real. The experimenter must differentiate, if necessary, between the overtly expressed goal and the true goal.

All of the definitions and the ensuing implications indicate that a level of aspiration is a goal setting— not a remote pinnacle towards which one doggedly plods— but, rather, the expectations of the learner in attacking and attempting to conquer the tasks at hand.

These basic definitions are clear and concise but contain no allusion to the complexity of the problem. An individual's level of aspiration seems to be the amalgamation of all past experiences, his self-perceived relationship to the world in which he lives, and the pressure of his social group. Although the outward behavior revealing the level of aspiration is an individual effort, the group influence has been a conditioner for the moment of action. This understanding seems necessary in order to fully appreciate the meaning and use of the term "level of aspiration."

Both an understanding of the term "level of aspiration" and an awareness of the characteristics of homogeneous grouping are necessary in order to evaluate the reaction of a homogeneous group on levels of aspiration.

**Purpose of the study.** The purpose of this study was to measure levels of aspiration in some heterogeneous and some homogeneous sixth grade groups and to make comparisons of the results obtained.

It was hoped that these comparisons would reveal the extent to which homogeneous grouping affects levels of aspiration.

The procedure for obtaining measurements of levels of aspiration is described in Chapter III. For a description of the participating homogeneous and heterogeneous groups see "Homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping as involved in this study" on page 9.

Both sixth grade groups observed in this study represent like cultures and are members of school systems practicing similar educational procedures.

"Nothing succeeds like success" may be an old saw but it is the kind of accepted truism that has added impetus to homogeneous grouping. Previous research suggests that successful children can appraise their abilities and predict performances rather realistically. Unsuccessful children tend to be unable to do this. If one accepts the premise that homogeneous grouping is conducive to academic and
personal success—and that is its "raison d'être"—then homogeneously grouped youngsters, having more opportunities to be successful, should reveal a more realistic pattern of goal setting (level of aspiration) than youngsters of corresponding abilities in heterogeneous groups.

This study, then, is an attempt to discover whether or not homogeneous grouping does affect the aspiration level of some sixth grade children and the extent of that influence, if any.

Summary of aims. Through administration of a perceptual-motor test, it was hoped to reveal levels of aspiration of pupils in two sixth grades. One of the sixth grade groups was comprised of four homogeneous classes; the other of four heterogeneous classes.

The first section of the test presented children with a series of trials on two tasks. They would first estimate and then compare their estimate to the actual performance. The performance and the goal set, or estimate (based on previous trials), should have measured levels of aspiration.

Did the level of aspiration remain constant under the following pressures?

1. Personal failure
2. Social norms (success and failure references).

A second section of the test encouraged the pupil to personally reveal attitudes and feelings which might help to interpret outcomes expressed in section one.
From the comparisons made between sixth grade children of comparable ability in heterogeneous and homogeneous groupings, was it possible to determine any observable differences in level of aspiration which could be attributed to the particular method of grouping?

Summary of Chapter 1

A level of aspiration is a goal setting. This goal set is a revelation of one's perception of the world in which he lives. The level of aspiration is measurable when a goal becomes visible, i.e., an individual declares his objective. The distance between the individual (present behavior and performance) and the intended goal (anticipated performance) is the dimension indicating a level of aspiration.

The problem to be considered is whether or not the level of aspiration of some sixth graders is affected by homogeneous grouping. Sixth grade youngsters, from nearly identical milieus in adjoining towns, were the subjects for observation. To measure the levels of aspiration, a simple perceptual-motor skill test was utilized. The pupil, knowing his performance on a previous task, was encouraged to set his goal for the next attempt. Small discrepancies between performance and goal show realistic appraisals of ability to set a goal within reach whereas large discrepancies show inability to predict behavior performance. Thus, the pupil reveals the degree to which he inhabits a world of reality or irreality.
Comparisons of the results between the youngsters in the town where heterogeneous grouping is a policy of the school department and the youngsters in the nearby town where homogeneous grouping is practiced should show the extent or amount of influence of the type of grouping on aspiration levels. Additional means of evaluating the effect of either homogeneous or heterogeneous grouping on levels of aspiration were provided by applying pressures of social references and personal failure to certain areas of the test.

Grouping of youngsters by any single factor, such as median achievement scores, is one bone of contention among educators. Although educators tend to be unanimous in recognizing the values of learning in a group of comparable performance potential, there seems to be divergent opinions as to whether or not homogeneity is any more than an unapproachable mirage. The philosophies underlying these differences of opinion are interesting but do not crucially affect the outcome of this study.

If, as some educators contend, homogeneous grouping encourages greater achievement and success in school, then this should be reflected in realistic levels of aspiration. Presumably more persons in homogeneous groups should show small discrepancies between performance and aspiration.
Original investigations in 1920's and early 1930's.--Current concepts of levels of aspiration are developments and outgrowths of experiments originating in Germany in the late 1920's. The English term "level of aspiration" is a translation of the composite word "Anspruchsniveau." The German word Anspruchsn denotes: "to make great demands upon (one)" or "to demand." Niveau is a French word meaning "level." Hence, Anspruchsniveau, the "demand" (or goal) "level" has been translated into English as "level of aspiration."

Much of the research has been published in the German language. The first published material in this field was authored by Ferdinand Hoppe in 1930 and had a German publication. Hoppe was a pupil of Professor Kurt Lewin, an instructor at the University of Berlin. The third pioneer in the field was Dembo, also a pupil of Lewin's. Opinion seems

1/John W. Gardner, "The Use of the Term 'Level of Aspiration,'" Psychological Review (1940), 47:59.
2/Thieme-Preusser, Dictionary of the English and German Languages, Hamburg, 1898.
to be undivided on Kurt Lewin's original and continued valuable contributions to the knowledge of aspiration levels. However, printed evidence is a little vague as to whether Dembo or Hoppe accomplished the initial experiments. According to John Gardner, Dembo was first in this field. Dembo was experimenting with anger and frustration when she discovered that, if individuals are faced with a task too difficult to perform, they will substitute intermediate goals. (A level of aspiration.)

John Gardner describes Dembo's experiments in the following manner:

"The concept of 'level of aspiration' was first formulated by Dembo, one of Lewin's students, in the course of an experimental investigation of anger. Her experimental situations employed frustration as a means of evoking anger, the subject being required to perform some task which was either extremely difficult or completely impossible. A by-product of her investigation was the discovery that when a required goal is too difficult the subject will set up an intermediate goal which is easier than, but a step toward, the required goal. This intermediate goal she termed the subject's momentary level of aspiration."1/

Another research worker in this field, Roger G. Barker, in summarizing briefly the development of levels of aspiration concepts, ignores T. Dembo and credits Hoppe (working with Kurt Lewin) with having originated these concepts. (According to Gardner, Ferdinand Hoppe published the first major study on levels of aspiration.) Hoppe was doing research on the

meaning of failure and success to an individual when he discovered that amount, or degree, of achievement is not a measure of success. Achievement is a relative condition, dependent on an individual's expectations (levels of aspiration).

Barker's description of Hoppe's experiment is worth quoting.

"Hoppe first considered the fundamental problem of when a person experiences success and when failure. He presented his adult subjects with simple motor and intellectual tasks such as hanging sixteen rings upon as many hooks as they passed upon a rapidly moving belt, and solving puzzles. During each trial with the tasks, Hoppe observed the subjects secretly and after the completion of each trial he interviewed them thoroughly in an effort to find out the circumstances under which they experienced success and failure. One result was clearly apparent: the experiences of success and failure were unrelated to the actual achievements of the individual. One subject might experience success when he placed four rings on the hooks; another experienced failure when he placed fifteen correctly. In addition, for a particular person, the achievement experienced as success (or failure) continually changed; at one time a single ring correctly placed might give rise to an experience of success, while on a latter occasion the placing of six rings would result in an experience of failure. These findings led Hoppe to a conclusion which seems very obvious once it is stated, but one that is so fundamental that it has very wide implications: the occurrence of success and failure experiences is independent of actual achievement; it is determined, rather, by the goals, expectations and aspirations of the person at the time of the action. These expected achievements Hoppe called the level of aspiration."¹

Out of his research Hoppe evolved this definition of

level of aspiration:

"The subject... always undertakes the task with certain demands (Anspruchen) which can change in the course of the activity. The totality of these constantly shifting, now indefinite, now precise, expectations, goal-settings or demands in connection with one's own future performance, we shall term the level of aspiration of the subject."\(^1\)

If the words, "constantly shifting, now indefinite, now precise," were deleted, the definition would be harmonious with current thinking on the subject. Later research has suggested that for specific tasks, over a period of time, there will be a steadiness of goal levels instead of "constantly shifting" levels.\(^2\)

Researchers have also added enrichment to Hoppe's idea that demands (goals) "can change in the course of the activity." Any changes taking place would probably not be haphazard, unpredictable patterns of behavior but revelations of the subject's ego involvement, and his awareness of social pressure. Ego involvement stimulates self competition. Social pressure, or frames of reference, which indicate to the subject a relationship or comparison with others, are also contributing factors to personal realization (ego involvement) of success or failure. Success or failure as a psychological determinant of level of aspiration has been one of the focal points for study in the years succeeding the

\(^1\) As cited by John W. Gardner, "The Use of the Term 'Level of Aspiration,'" *Psychological Review* (1940), 47:61.

original investigations of Hoppe, Dembo and Lewin.

Thus, in Germany in the late 1920's Kurt Lewin and two pupils, Dembo and Hoppe, opened new vistas promising greater understanding of man's mind. From the experimental research done by Lewin, Dembo and Hoppe, the rudimentary philosophy which added "level of aspiration" to the vocabulary of psychology was formulated.

**Experiments since 1930's expanding level of aspiration concepts.**-- A perusal of research since Hoppe's original publication in 1930 reveals many individuals ascertaining and reaffirming the theories advanced by Hoppe. A list of research people who have made outstanding contributions, and who have expanded the concepts of level of aspiration, would include: Barker, Frank, Gardner, Jucknat, and Pauline Sears.

Barker conducted experiments with Dembo and Lewin somewhat as follows:

1. Children permitted free play with attractive toys
2. Wire screen partition lowered between children and toys
3. Children given only a few play materials (they could still see the more desirable toys through wire screen but could not obtain them)
4. Observation indicated that the frustration caused by denial of the toys resulted in less constructive play. Children attacked the barrier and also tried to leave scene of experiment. (After observation period the
children were permitted to play again with toys to prevent undesirable after effects.\(^1\)

This example of frustrating behavior is compatible with the view expressed by John Dollard and co-authors when, in a study of "Frustration and Agression," they assumed that "aggression is always a consequence of frustration."\(^2\)

If, "the entire process by which persons attain goals is commonly named motivation,"\(^3\) then failure and frustration might be the common name for the process of not reaching goals. Olson adds that, "Under the concepts of level of aspiration, success and failure are relative to the goals that a learner sets for himself."\(^4\) Later research has attempted to increase understanding about the relationships between goal-setting and success and failure. Studies of aggression, frustration, success and failure have all contributed to the present knowledge of level of aspiration. The information is far from definitive but data gathered to date would suggest that overt behavior, such as expressing ridicule, may be a form of aggression; aggression results from frustration; frustration may be a by-product of failure;

\(^1\)As cited by Willard C. Olson, Child Development, D. C. Heath & Company, Boston, 1949, pp. 208-209.


\(^3\)Willard C. Olson, ibid., p. 338.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 339.

\(^5\)John Dollard, op. cit., p. 46.
failure (and success) are factors affecting levels of aspiration. Future research may discover new ways to measure level of aspiration and thereby untie, at the source, the riddle of some of these behaviorisms which cause classroom misfits.

Frank was one of the first researchers to emphasize ego-involvement as a causitive factor in goal setting. In 1935, he stated:

"It is suggested that the size of the difference between the average level of aspiration and the median level of past performance is due to the involvement of the ego-level of the individual in the task, as shown by self-competition or social pressure."

Ego-involvement, as one of the components of levels of aspiration, is a major determinant of the entire goal setting response. Because of ego-involvement, the individual has a concern to perform in a manner pleasing and satisfying to himself. A desire to perform in a manner for group approval is also necessary to nourish this ego. Frank calls these two extensions of ego-involvement self-competition and need for social approval. The satisfying fulfillment of these two needs cannot be gauged by any specific performances or amounts of accomplishment. An activity may produce satisfaction or dissatisfaction depending upon the person's own expectations. One's expectations may be such that an experience is quite gratifying. This same experience might prove

---

markedly ungratifying to someone with a different level of expectation (aspiration).

In a study of level of aspiration, one must contend with the many facets visible because of ego-involvement. One result of this involvement is the behaviorism of setting a goal to please an observer or peer. This is done to protect the ego. Gardner says: "Individuals commonly 'edit' those aspects of their behavior, verbal or non-verbal, which are open to public inspection." The "editing" in this instance implies setting a goal in response to an outside pressure. Perhaps a teacher, or another adult, is representative of standards incongruous to the student's own objectives and perceptions. The subject may select a compromise goal in order to "save face" or protect his ego. This compromise goal is not a true goal. Karl C. Garrison and J. Stanley Gray feel that a pupil will set a high goal, for approval of peers, and then not struggle to reach it. This is defense mechanism for frustration.

Another facet of ego-involvement concerns one's level of ability. For the numerous tasks of living, individuals vary in their abilities to perform. An individual of limited ability may be pressured to act at his maximum potential. Research suggests the pressure is probably applied by the

1/John W. Gardner, "The Use of the Term 'Level of Aspiration,'" Psychological Review (1940), 47:62.

group with which the individual identifies himself. Robert A. Davis feels this social pressure is an important factor in goal-setting. He presents the idea that a level of aspiration is a compromise between protecting the ego by setting a goal well within the capacity to achieve and a desire to perform beyond ability as a result of group pressure. Thus, "Conflict between fear of psychological failure and failure to win approval in maintaining goals that are socially acceptable may result in a level of aspiration near the top range of one's ability." 

Regardless of all social pressure, an individual has minimum and maximum limits of performance and endurance which are delineated by his own native abilities. It is the adjustment of levels of aspiration and selection of tasks within these limitations, and within the converging lines of his group, that enables the individual to find mental poise. Davis is aware of the importance of native ability when he says: "Psychologically, he (a person) does not experience a real feeling either of success or of failure unless the difficulty of the task is close to his level of ability."

Experiments measuring the height of the level of aspiration were conducted by Jucknat. She determined level of


2/Ibid., p. 332.

3/Ibid., p. 333.
aspiration by a series of ten paper and pencil mazes. These mazes were arranged in the order of difficulty. A small maze was very easy and a large one very difficult. They were arranged on a table so that the subject could see the order of difficulty at a glance. The subject was asked to select a maze and to work on it. Thus, if he selected maze number nine (next to the most difficult) his aspiration level score for trial one was nine. Jucknat tested 500 subjects in this manner. She then grouped the results according to whether the aspiration level was high, medium, or low. School grades of the subjects were then examined. She discovered that good students tended to have a high level of aspiration; average students a medium level; and poor students either at the upper or lower end of the scale of levels of aspiration.

Jucknat's experiments were followed by those of Pauline Sears. There was no conflict between the theories of these two experimenters. However, Professor Sears was much more concerned about ego-involvement. Jucknat's subjects apparently had no previous experience with mazes. The experience (from which they could formulate a goal area) was gained within the experience itself. Were the maze attempts of sufficient duration to establish knowledge of performance and thus enable a valid goal-setting? If so, some self-competition may have been functioning. Apparently Jucknat used no other frames of reference. If no comparisons to a group were made (and in this instance, for this task, they
would be individually aware of none), the lack of social pressure would probably lessen the ego-involvement and hence the fixing of a goal would seem less vital to the individual. In spite of the lack of any ego-involvement of the subjects tested, Jucknat's conclusions were in harmony with the work done later by Professor Sears. Good students selected a high level of aspiration and were able to attain it. Those on the other end of the scale, the poor students, selected goals either high or low. These high or low goal sets caused wide margins between performance and goal. Recent research has indicated that these large discrepancies are unrealistic goals.

One of the most significant single pieces of research has been done by Pauline S. Sears. She was concerned with the aspiration levels of some academically successful and unsuccessful children. Professor Sears, appreciating Frank's interpretation of the importance of ego-involvement to level of aspiration, only used children who had shown ego-involvement in their school work. By interviews with children, scanning records, and listening to teachers' reports, Professor Sears selected children with enough ego-involvement to have realized experiences of success or failure. Professor Sears' experiment was based on the hypothesis that:

"One factor in the level of aspiration pattern for a given task is the characteristic past experience of success or failure which the individual associates with that task. In other words, one might expect different levels of aspiration for a given task in ego-involved subjects who have in the past characteristically ex-
experienced different amounts of success or failure with that task, and who, therefore, probably anticipate the individually characteristic amounts in new performances in the same task or similar ones."

Professor Sears worked as follows:

1. Three small groups of children were selected.
   a. Success group; those having high records in reading and arithmetic
   b. Failure group; those having poor records in reading and arithmetic
   c. Differential group; those having good records in reading but poor in arithmetic.

   All were screened to insure comparable C. A.'s, I. Q.'s and socioeconomic backgrounds.

2. Each pupil given series of tasks in reading and arithmetic. The performance level was indicated to pupil before proceeding to next task. Pupils were asked to estimate next score upon being informed of present score.

3. An analysis was made on the basis of discrepancies between scores anticipated and those obtained.
   a. Success group adjusted levels of aspiration within narrow range.
   b. Failure group showed much fluctuation. They seemed

to set goals low as safeguard against failure or
set goals impossibly high.

c. Differential group set realistic goals in reading
(which was success area) and unrealistic goals in
arithmetic. Arithmetic was for them a failure
area.

As a part of the experiment Professor Sears introduced
references of success and of failure. These social frames of
reference produced the expected results of small discrepancies
between expectation and performance for the success group and
large, varied discrepancies for the failure group.

Professor Sears sums up the induced success and failure
frames of reference as follows:

"Hence it seems warranted to conclude at least
tentatively that present experience of induced success or
failure has in general the same effect as a similar, long-
continued past experience: viz., increase of discrepancy
and its variability under failure, and decrease of both
under success."1/

Professor Sears' results verified and expanded the find-
ings of previous researchers. Anderson and Brandt, in
particular, in 1939 had completed a study of goal-setting by
fifth graders. In this study the pupil was informed of his
standing relative to the class. These norms stimulated the
ego-involvement which is so integral a part of levels of

1/Pauline S. Sears, "Levels of Aspiration in Academically
Successful and Unsuccessful Children, "Educational Psy-
chology, A Book of Readings, Edited by Arthur P. Colardarci,
aspiration. Professor Sears reaffirmed their results; namely, that poor achievers set levels of aspiration with much larger discrepancies than those with average or above achievement.

A major concern for experimentation has been the relationship of personality variables to levels of aspiration. John Gardner worked on this problem in 1940. He presented 51 adolescents with 20 trials in a digit-symbol substitution. Gardner (following Frank's method) announced the results of each test to the subject who was then asked to define his goal for the next test. The scores reported to the subject were not actual scores but were the scores from a prearranged sequence. The examiner was fixing an aspiration level by the amount of discrepancy. The subjects were rated (by four qualified judges) on eight traits which included fear of failure, tendency to face failure frankly, etc. It was hoped to ascertain any relationship between level of aspiration behavior and certain personality traits. These are Gardner's conclusions:

"...A particular sort of aspiration-level behavior may not be taken as diagnostic of the presence or strength of any particular one of the variables dealt with. This does not mean that level of aspiration bears no significant relationship to the individual's personality; it simply means that whatever this relationship

may be, it is not sufficiently uncomplicated to permit the use of aspiration-level behavior as unequivocal evidence of a specific trait.\footnote{1/John W. Gardner, "The relation of Certain Personality Variables to Level of Aspiration," \textit{Journal of Psychology} (1940), 9:205.}

Seymour L. Zelen credits Lewin and his followers as describing the purpose of the level of aspiration in the following words:

\begin{quote}
\textit{...to make explicit the possibility of observing goal levels in the course of a relatively specific activity...and linking the experimentally observed manifestation of goal striving to the individual's behavior in other situations.}\footnote{2/Seymour L. Zelen, "Behavioral Criteria and Rorschach Measures of Level of Aspiration and Rigidity," \textit{Journal of Personality} (December, 1954), Number 2, 23:207.}
\end{quote}

The inter-relationship of level of aspiration and other behavior makes this a complex psychological problem. It is a problem not yet fully understood. How is "the experimentally observed manifestation of goal striving" linked "to the individual's behavior in other situations?"

Hoppe in his early experiments felt that a high level of aspiration might be compensation for inferior ability.

Lewin has felt that "...feelings of superiority or inferiority may be developed from the frequency with which the level of aspiration is achieved."\footnote{3/As cited by Pauline S. Sears, \textit{Educational Psychology, a Book of Readings}, Dryden Press, New York, 1955, p. 394.}

Hull found (in a study with college students) that "...the more aspirations diverge from realistic predictions, the
more defensive the behavior of the subject becomes.\footnote{As cited by Karl C. Garrison and J. Stanley Gray, Educational Psychology, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1955, p. 259.}

Leon Festinger has noted rationalization as an aspiration level by-product:

"This tendency to avoid failure and achieve success is present throughout and may lead, for example, to rationalization after the action (blaming the tool). This tendency has been reported frequently by other experimenters and is one of the basic facts in a level of aspiration situation."\footnote{Leon Festinger, "A Theoretical Interpretation of Shifts in Level of Aspiration," Psychological Review (1942), 49:244.}

A level of aspiration then is one behavior expression of personality. Measurement and observation must precede understanding of aspiration level. A level of aspiration may be measured only to the extent that a subject wishes to expose himself. In spite of the difficulties of measurement, enough tests have been undertaken to reveal certain tendencies and concomitant behaviors of aspiration levels. The behaviorisms briefly mentioned above are sufficient to indicate some of the directions to be taken by future research.

**Summary of Research**

Research in the psychological field of aspiration levels originated in Germany in the 1920's. Hoppe, Dembo, and Lewin developed the term "level of aspiration." A level of aspiration is an immediate goal. Individuals have various goal...
setting habits. Previous experience is a conditioning factor in goal setting. The level (height) of one's aspiration (goal) does not indicate success or failure. Success or failure are relative to the amount of discrepancy between expectation and performance. Psychological implications of level of aspiration are concerned with the self (performance) as opposed to the ideal (expectation) self.

Level of aspiration is the degree to which one inhabits a world of reality or irreality, i.e., small or large discrepancies between what one anticipates and what one accomplishes. Ego-involvement is important to a level of aspiration. Without ego-involvement there is no incentive to set a true goal. Ego-involvement means self-competition and the desire for social approval.

Levels of aspiration are realistic and stable in successful situations. They tend to fluctuate and be unstable with experiences of failure. Test sampling of goal levels tends to reveal the larger and total established pattern of behavior. This total pattern of behavior is the product of goal setting within one's ability limits (self-competition and self-realization) and a goal setting at the upper limits of one's ability because of social pressures.

A level of aspiration is probably a result of personality variables; but, experimentation to date has not revealed the exact cause and effect relationship, or degree of involvement, between variables of personality and levels of aspiration.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Design of the study.-- The objective of this study was to prepare and administer a test which would register the levels of aspiration of some sixth grade children. It was hoped that a study of the results would indicate whether or not membership in either a homogeneous or heterogeneous school class had influenced, to any marked degree, the level of aspiration.

The sequence of steps were as follows:
1. Preparation of test
2. Trial administration of test
3. Revised test
4. Administration of revised test
5. Scoring of tests

Preparation of the test.-- Before attempting to create a test to measure something, one must assume that it is measurable. The assumption that levels of aspiration are measurable is based in part upon logical consideration of the theories involved. Secondly, enough research and experimentation has been done by competent and trained educators to suggest that this is a measurable area.

The theoretical aspects of levels of aspiration involve
the adjustment and adaptation of the individual to the reality of the world around him. Dr. Russell N. Cassel, one of the foremost researchers in this field, has made this comment:

"For any given moment of time, Kurt Lewin maintained that all of the entities which effect an individual constitute his life space. This life space may be grouped into two separate areas or fields:
1. The physical field or the world as it really is.
2. The psychological field or the world as the individual perceives it."

One might think of a level of aspiration as being the difference between statements one and two; a level of aspiration is the discrepancy between "...the world as the individual perceives it" and "...the world as it really is." Setting of a goal is the outward expression of an individual's perception of the world around him. Performance by an individual expresses the world of reality. To test level of aspiration then, it is only necessary to determine the amount of discrepancy between a goal and the performance which attempts to reach (or which may over-reach) that goal. Performance is an observable fact. The major difficulty lies in discovering a true goal. In order to insure a frank revelation of goal setting, it is necessary to have a type of task which requires no previously developed skill. It is also necessary to employ a task which is free from any involvement with previous frustrating experiences. For instance, a failing reader, presented with a reading task, may become so emotionally disturbed

that he cannot define his own goal. To prevent tension and to make the test a pleasant task for the youngsters cooperating on this study, a simple recording of numbers on symbols was the device used to measure levels of aspiration. The slow learner was not apprehensive nor was the bright child overly confident. The task seemed neither important enough nor difficult enough to cause an attitude of fear or uncertainty. It was hoped that the simplicity of the task would afford comfortable challenge without becoming monotonous.

The possibility of measuring levels of aspiration in the classroom is enhanced by the singular quality of immediacy which must be a characteristic of aspirational goal setting. Loosely defined goals and remote objectives do not reveal levels of aspiration. A level of aspiration refers to the immediate goal and subsequent performance of a learner. This immediacy of response makes classroom measurement of aspiration levels feasible. The pupils are provided with an opportunity to set a goal for the simple task of recording numbers. This goal setting is followed by an immediate thirty second performance attempt.

Some recent research has indicated that it is possible to measure levels of aspiration. The only published test (as far as this writer could determine) evaluating levels of aspiration is "The Cassel Group Level of Aspiration Test" by Russell N. Cassel. In the test manual Dr. Cassel paid tribute to the work of T. Dembo, F. Hoppe and K. Lewin and explained his own
test preparation in these words:

"This level of aspiration concept... involves the assignment to an individual of a standardized task to be done a number of times. Evaluations based upon a number of past performances and future goals on the same task are then made. The main score for evaluating this level of aspiration dimension of the personality has been the mean discrepancy between performances and succeeding goals on the same task."1/

Dr. Cassel's standardized task is the placement of small circles, by the test subject, above and below each X in a row of X's. Dr. Cassel places emphasis on reaching goals by explaining a scoring system in the test directions. According to these directions one does not receive credit for over-reaching a goal. On the other hand one is penalized some points for not reaching a goal. This is done, presumably, to encourage an honest goal setting. At sixth grade level, a system of points does not seem necessary. Sixth grade pupils are apt to perform sincerely without the cajollement of a point system. Therefore, certain modifications were introduced in establishing the task used in this study. Without the promise of point awards, "I expect to do" was the phrase used to encourage goal setting and "I did" enabled the pupil to be aware of his own performance. Trial testing supported by experience with the attitudes of youngsters at sixth grade level indicated that this request for accuracy should be sufficient.

The Cassel test may be used for any students or adults

1/Russell N. Cassel, op. cit., p. 3.
with "a fifth grade or higher level of reading ability." Some sixth grade youngsters do not have a fifth grade reading level. Others attain fifth grade at a marginal level. The test also appears to be too long for some sixth grade students. The repetition of X's, a total of 1440, could be monotonous for the slow learner with a short attention span. The numerous X's, all close together, may be confusing to the child with a reading handicap. The Cassel test then seems to be suited for higher grades than sixth.

For this study an attempt was made to plan a test specifically for a sixth grade level. Certain requirements for performance and administration had to be fulfilled in organizing the test. These included (not listed in order of importance):

1. Administrative
   a. Suitable for administration to groups
   b. Test brief, directions simple and clear
      (1) To insure best application by pupil
      (2) Interrupt, as little as possible, regular schedule
   c. To test level of aspiration comprehensively test
      must include:
      (1) Goal sets based on structured goals
      (2) Goal set following personal failure
      (3) Goal sets following social references of success and failures

1/Russell N. Cassel, op. cit., p. 5.
d. Materials easily available and not hard to manipulate

e. Easy to score

f. Enable administration by regular classroom teacher

II. Performance

a. Within ability range of sixthgraders

(1) C. A. from 10 to 14 years

(2) I. Q.'s from 70's to 130's

b. Duration of task must be too long to allow completion; measurement not valid, if one continuously over-reaches goal

c. Test not so long as to induce restlessness

d. Test tasks must not be disagreeable to pupil.

Trial testing indicated that a digit substitution on simple geometric patterns would be feasible as a test task for measuring levels of aspiration. Trial testing also suggested the number of tests to include in a series. For the final revised test, and test directions, see Appendix.

Trial administration of test.-- Sample tests were presented to eight sixthgraders:

Two youngsters had low I. Q.'s (70-90)

Two youngsters had average I. Q.'s (90-110)

Two youngsters had above average I. Q.'s (110-125)

Two youngsters had high I. Q.'s (125-135)

One pupil, in each set of two, had a reading difficulty.

The other pupil was reading at probably the top of his
ability range. Neither I. Q. score nor reading ability seemed to determine the type of performance. None of the pupils appeared bored nor were they uncooperative on the test task. Completed sample tests were then administered to a 33 pupil sixth grade classroom containing pupils who had a wide range of abilities. Directions, format of the test, etc., seemed practical, clear and purportedly measured level of aspiration.

Revised test.-- After slight revisions a final test was prepared. There were two sections to the test. The first section of the test (pages 2-4) encouraged the pupil to reveal, by direct action, his ability to approach a goal of his own setting. A simple perceptual-motor skill task involving number substitutions on simple geometric designs was employed. There was a thirty second time limit on each single test of a series except for test number seven (reason for this exception noted in explanation). By mere counting it was possible to determine the amount of discrepancy between the pupil's actual performance and his estimate, or goal, for the next performance. The discrepancies between performance and goal setting for the test tasks provided a tangible way of revealing the youngster's concept of reality - his level of aspiration.

Test 1 on page two and the first tests in each series on pages three and four were sample tests which provided orientation and the practice for setting a structured goal. A haphazard goal setting, without prior experience, cannot
measure level of aspiration. One cannot have a perceptual relationship to something of whose characteristics one is unaware. Thus, when the examinee stated he would "expect to do" a certain amount, this expectation was not a haphazard guess but was a structured goal based on experience.

The second section of the test was an un-numbered page immediately following page four. This page provided the pupil with an opportunity to reveal some personal feelings and fears.

First section of test.-- There were four parts to the first section of the test as follows (see Appendix for sample test):

Tests 2-7. What was the level of aspiration in a simple perceptual-motor skill task? The pupil revealed his level by setting a goal for the next task with full knowledge of his previous performance. This procedure yielded a total of five discrepancies between "I did" of test 2 and "I expect to do" of test 7. Adding the amount of discrepancy between each "I did" and "I expect," irregardless of whether an estimate was high or low, showed the individual's approach to reality; reality being the zero score by which a pupil could anticipate (with knowledge of past experience) his future performance.

Test 8. This test was designed to show the effect of personal failure on goal setting. By reducing the time from 30 seconds to 26 (with no comment), failure should have been experienced. Presumably the child's failure to attain his goal should have resulted in a larger discrepancy on the
subsequent trial under normal time limits. After scoring "I did" for test 7, how many pupils were realistic enough to shift their level of aspiration downward for test 8, to compensate for defeat in 7?

Tests 9 and 10 were not scored. They enabled the examinee to return to his normal pace before proceeding with the next directions.

Tests 11-13. It was expected that these tests would show the effect of social reference of failure. At completion of test 10, the examiner asked pupils to list scores of tests 8-10 in the upper right hand corner of the page. This provided opportunity for the examiner to be very mobile and apparently observe everyone's work. Then the examiner's remarks about failure appeared credible. The examiner compared results in the group very unfavorably with results in another (imaginary) group. As in the previous test, the amount of discrepancy between each "I did" and "I expect to do" revealed the level of aspiration.

Test 14 and "I expect" of test 15 provided experience for a structured goal in a new type of test task. This task was no more difficult than the other but introducing a new task was necessary in order to provide a reference of success. It would not be plausible to be tremendously successful on a task which had just been referred to as complete failure.

Tests 16-18. Do social references of success affect aspiration levels? At the conclusion of test 15, the examiner
followed the same procedure as for test 11. This time, however, the idea of success was substituted for failure. The comments lauded the pupils' excellent results and showed the examiner's pleasure and amazement that they had performed so well on a very difficult task. A comparison was made between this kind of performance and other (imaginary) performances which were much less successful. Did this social reference of success cause a shift in goal levels?

The second section of the test (the final page) was designed to gain a more complete understanding of the pupil's problems, his reactions to certain school situations, and his relationships to others. For the eleven problems, or statements, in this second section of the test, the pupil was offered an opportunity to indicate a few of his needs, desires, or relationships as he felt them. These are the questions used: (Question number one was not evaluated. It was used as a sample.)

1. I wish I could join a club at school.
2. I am afraid of most tests in school.
3. I often get in trouble in school.
4. I wish I had better marks.
5. My parents wish I had better marks.
6. I wish I didn't have to go to school.
7. School work is too easy for me.
8. I need more friends.
9. I don't like most people.
10. I wish older folks would help me when I need help.

11. My parents don't like my friends.

12. I need to learn how to get along with people.

A type of test response was required which would insure qualified answers. A yes or no answer precluded any partial acceptance, or rejection, of an idea. In order to evaluate the importance of a problem, a four choice scale of answers was used. A check in the large box indicated a big problem; a check in the next largest box indicated a medium sized problem; a check in the small box suggested a small problem; a check on the "no" indicated no problem at all. (☐ ☐ ☐ No) There was no purposeful numerical arrangement or sequence of statements.

In the second section of the test these personal expressions of feeling on the part of the child was an attempt by the examiner to probe a little deeper into the youngster's perception of his own world. The answers to the eleven problems were expected to portray, however briefly, the attitude and behavior portrait of the child as he sees himself. This additional revelation of personal feelings is important to understanding more completely the level of aspiration of the various groups. Only by self revelation is it possible to measure or evaluate a level of aspiration. Sometimes successful people appear to be reaching their goals. This impression

\[\text{This scale for evaluating answers was suggested by the Junior Inventory Form S, First Edition, April, 1955, Science Research Associates, 57 West Grand Avenue, Chicago 10, Illinois}\]
is created by accomplishing deeds of skill or daring beyond the means of the less gifted. However, it is not possible to judge completely the meaning of the level of aspiration by the end results - that is, by the performance, or magnitude of the task. An observer is apt to be misled by a pseudo goal, one which is ostensibly accepted, and seemingly appropriate, but which may really conceal the true goal. The real goal, which is intimate and personal is the only basis for an understanding of the level of aspiration.

Grandma Moses's primitives depicting the American scene are quite bright and forthright. One might assume that this happy old lady sits at her easel, envisions her immediate goal (picture) and proceeds - with no discrepancy between her awareness of previous performances and her new goal. Pretend, for a moment, that each time she sits at her easel she sets an ideal, or goal, with the intention of creating a scene or landscape in the subtle, delicate style of Corot. In spite of numerous repetitious attempts to imitate Corot, hearty, vigorous, American primitives continue to emerge from her easel. To her personally, this would cause malcontentment and frustration. However, the public, ignorant of her true aspirations, might accept her efforts as evidence of a satisfactory realization of personal goals. Grandma Moses's pictures, or the endeavors of any artist, may win public acclaim and yet be personal failures from the viewpoint of the creator. The artist was unable to mate goal setting with
Again and again it must be emphasized that level of aspiration cannot be measured by the size of the task or the value of the accomplishment. Only the individual is aware of his own goals. Edward MacDowell completed a manuscript one day and threw it into the fireplace. He was discontented because his goal had not been realized by his performance. When Mrs. MacDowell cleaned the cabin where he had been working, she found the scrap of paper on the hearth. This bit of manuscript contained "To a Wild Rose" which became universally renowned. How many other discrepancies between goal setting and performance have been forfeited to the world because no tidy housewife rescued them?

Popular acceptance of an artist's "trash" such as "To a Wild Rose," or the "pot boilers" that competent authors release, probably does not assuage the artist's creative conscience. He remains cognizant of his own potential and is able to appraise, sometimes with embarrassment, efforts which produce mediocrity. The mature, sincere artist cannot be happily replete on just the acclaim of an audience. He must satisfy his own needs by a realistic level of aspiration. The artist, like any school child, or any normal adult must set goals realistically for personal happiness.

Yet, is the world richer because of the psychological disturbance of some of its greatest artists? Is the personal dissatisfaction or anguish, caused by a large discrepancy
between vision (goal) and performance, the driving force which has enabled a few individuals to exceed the performance of average man? Perhaps some men, like Vincent Van Gogh, are especially prone to inhabit a world of irreality. Was Vincent Van Gogh really "mad?" Or, could his personal goal setting habits have been the determinants of torment and frustration propelling him towards the famous corn field?

Speculating upon special artistic talent vs. goal setting, provocative as it may be, would not apply specifically to sixth graders. However, awareness of extremes, inducing irreality, may shape a more complete understanding of the more common aspirational levels of normalcy. It was hoped that the final test page would bare some of the perceptions so crucial to evaluating level of aspiration at sixth grade level. The final test page was not numbered. The children were asked not to put their names on this section of the test. They were told that these nameless pages would be detached from the remainder of the test booklets. By these procedures it was hoped that a feeling of anonymity would encourage frankness.

Administration of revised test. -- One full school day was used in each cooperating town to administer the tests.

Tests were administered to one class at a time. Each pupil remained at his own desk in his own classroom for the testing process.

All pupils appeared to participate in the tests enthusiastically. The format and content of the test appeared to be
practical and seemed to measure a level of aspiration.

Youngsters in both schools reflected the buoyancy and cooperation which is the product of a capably staffed school.

Scoring of tests.-- Prior to scoring it was necessary to organize the heterogeneous children into "paper arranged" homogeneous groups as explained in Chapter I. This permitted a comparison of each homogeneous group with its heterogeneous counterpart.

The actual scoring involved two methods. In section one the amount of discrepancy between performance and goal set, under several previously mentioned pressures, established a level of aspiration. The group levels were measured by the mean and standard deviation. In section two the tallies for questions pertaining to personal adjustments were compared according to the per cent of youngsters reacting a certain way in relation to the aggregate division membership.

The significant feature of all comparisons and evaluations was to determine whether results were characteristic of pupils' abilities irrespective of grouping or whether results could be attributed, in spite of abilities, to the influence of a particular group.

Summary of test results.-- There are two parts to the test with four series of tests in the first section. They are arranged as follows:

1. After practicing a task (test 1) does the pupil select a realistic or unrealistic goal for himself? (tests 2-6)
2. When the pupil experiences failure, does he shift his level of aspiration? (test 8)

3. Does the image of the subject, or what he expects to achieve, shift when he is given a frame of reference identifying his efforts with failure? (tests 11-13)

4. Does the image of the subject, or what he expects to achieve, shift when he is given a frame of reference identifying his efforts with success? (tests 16-18)

5. Has placement in either a homogeneous or heterogeneous group, as shown by personal exposure of attitudes and feelings, any relationship to levels of aspiration? (test section on final page)
Table 1. Total Amounts of Discrepancy Between Performance and Subsequent Level of Aspiration Under Varying Conditions of Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Trial 2-7</th>
<th>Trial 8</th>
<th>Trial 11-14</th>
<th>Trial 15-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het...</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hom...</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td><strong>5.54</strong></td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td><strong>14.05</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het...</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hom...</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td><strong>7.70</strong></td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td><strong>17.75</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het...</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td><strong>7.92</strong></td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td><strong>13.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hom...</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td><strong>8.94</strong></td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td><strong>8.76</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het...</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>35.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hom...</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td><strong>9.78</strong></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td><strong>11.04</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/a/Structured goal.
/b/Following personal failure experience.
/c/Following social reference of failure.
/d/Following social reference of success.

*Significant at 5 per cent level of confidence for both groups within division level.
**Significant at 1 per cent level of confidence for both groups within division level.
***Significant at 5 per cent level of confidence between test series of one group within division level.
****Significant at 1 per cent level of confidence between test series of one group within division level.
Table 2. Medians for Total Amounts of Discrepancy in Tests 2-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Heterogeneous</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Heterogeneous</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Heterogeneous</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Heterogeneous</td>
<td>12.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of first section of test. -- By a series of four tests an attempt was made to discover:

1. Level of aspiration with structured goal, i. e., familiar task
2. Level of aspiration following personal failure
3. Level of aspiration after social reference of failure
4. Level of aspiration after social reference of success.

The mean was used as a basis for comparing groups within a series. Medians were also found for tests 2-7. Means and medians were based on the total amount of discrepancy in any series between performance and goal. The amount of discrepancy was considered more important than its direction. The following formula was utilized to determine the significance of the difference between the means: $D = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum (M_1 - \bar{X}_1)^2 + \frac{1}{n-1} \sum (M_2 - \bar{X}_2)^2}$

The standard deviation scores, in general, supported research done by Pauline Sears (See Chapter III). Bright children were not as prone to wildly over or under estimating performance as were the slower children. This was reflected in small standard deviation scores. The exception occurred in the homogeneous D group. The standard deviations in this group were smaller than in heterogeneous D. Thus, the majority of low achieving homogeneous youngsters were more stable than the low achieving heterogeneous pupils.
The first tests in each series were included for practice. The pupils were not informed that these tests counted less than the others. It was hoped that the same effort would be expended on all tests so that by recognizing his own performance level, the pupil could then establish a level for anticipated performance which would disclose habitual response patterns.

1. Level of Aspiration with Structural Goal

Means and medians were used to compare each division level of heterogeneously grouped children with the corresponding level of homogeneously grouped children. Comparisons were also made between a division level and other division levels containing the same type of grouping.

In the five test series (2-7), none of the differences between means reached a five per cent level of significance. However, a slight pattern became apparent. The A youngsters in either type of grouping had the lowest mean discrepancy, or expressed the greatest degree of reality. Both B groups had larger means (less realistic). The C groups had a slightly lower mean than B (but still higher than A). This pattern was very consistent. But, then, in the D groups, the heterogeneous pupils had a mean considerably larger than C; whereas, in the homogeneous D the youngsters had a mean less than their own C group. This particular pattern is reiterated by the medians. According to the medians, each heterogeneous and homogeneous group grew less realistic (higher median) with each drop in division level. There was only one exception and that was in
the low (D) homogeneous division. The median for this group was even lower (more realistic) than that of their own A group.

Thus, these few statistics support previous research (Pauline Sears, Chapter II) by suggesting that successful children have smaller discrepancies between performance and goal set. The bright youngsters in A heterogeneous, when dispersed among youngsters of varying degrees of ability, appear to be somewhat more realistic than those of any other group (including their counterparts in homogeneous A). The unexpected exception, which is not supported by previous research, was the pattern of realism expressed by the poor students when they are all grouped together (D homogeneous).

In spite of the fact that these figures are not significant at even a five per cent level, the observable trends were interesting. It may be that with larger samples the figures would prove to be statistically meaningful.

2. Level of Aspiration Following Personal Failure

Test 8 was designed to measure level of aspiration after an experience of personal failure. In test 7 the time was cut four seconds, with no comment. This should have prevented pupils from reaching their goals (except for those who were underestimating their goal setting). Thus, failures should have been experienced. Two thirds of the children did experience failure. Then, to acknowledge the level of their failure performance, the discrepancy between "I did" of 7 and "I expect to do" of 8 should have been either a zero or a very
small number.

All scores were multiplied by five in order to simplify the comparisons with the five tests of the first series. Only the scores of the youngsters who did not reach their goals in test 7 were used in computing the mean. Goal shifts could not be reactions to failure unless failure had been experienced. Probably the youngsters who did not experience failure in test 7 were the unrealistic pupils. If these unrealistic scores were disregarded, the remaining scores represented those, who by their failure in 7, offered one proof of their proximity to reality. Therefore, one may be observing level of aspiration following failure for a realistic group. It was interesting to note that the children who did not experience failure in 7 had scattered membership from all of the groups.

Of the youngsters who realized failure, only nine pupils set a goal higher than their performance on the (unknown to them) deliberately induced failure of test 7. Twenty-eight people set a goal at exactly the level of performance (no discrepancy); 116 people set a lower goal than performance level after having realized failure.

It was interesting to compare the means after failure with those preceding failure. Before and after failure, the means in the A and B heterogeneous groups remained rather constant. In the C and D heterogeneous groups the means become larger following failure. Thus, the greater discrepancies in the lower groups showed less stability under pressure of
failure for the poor students in heterogeneous groups. This condition was reversed in the homogeneous groups. In the homogeneous A and B groups the means were larger after failure and the lower C and D groups tended to remain constant following defeat. Presumably equal and keen competition in homogeneous top groups, where youngsters have ability to be successful, makes failure a more frustrating experience. On the other hand, homogeneous grouping, according to this one test, tends to make failure less emotionally disturbing for the lower groups. Consequently the slower homogeneous pupils were able to maintain a greater stability of goal set than would be expected, according to research, of "unsuccessful children."

3. Level of Aspiration After Social Reference of Failure

This series included "I did" of test 11 to "I expect" of test 14. There were three tests in this series so the means and standard deviations were multiplied by 1.66 in order to make equivalent comparisons with the other series.

To determine levels of aspiration after a reference of social failure, the examiner commented very unfavorably about the test performances and compared their poor results to another (imaginary) much more successful group. (See test directions.)

In computing these means all scores were used. Then comparing this social reference of failure with the personal failure test, it must be remembered that the efforts of the unrealistic children, whose scores were ignored in test 8,
were included in compiling the statistics for this series.

Except in two cases (out of the 8 total groups) means were higher when the pressure of social failure was applied than they were after personal failure. A higher mean indicates greater irreality. The two exceptions were the homogeneous A and heterogeneous D. The D heterogeneous pupils tended to register greater unrealism in all of the series. Except for the homogeneous A pupils, under the pressure of personal failure, the means of both A groups showed little shifting.

The means between heterogeneous and homogeneous pupils in any division were so slight as to be insignificant except for B. Between the B groups the figures were significant at the five per cent level of confidence and showed greater discrepancies for the homogeneous pupils.

As previously mentioned, comparisons between the social and personal failure series may be somewhat limited because of the smaller number of cases involved under personal failure.

4. Level of Aspiration After Social Reference of Success

This series included "I did" of test 15 to "I expect" of test 18. The means and standard deviations were again multiplied by 1.66 in order to make equivalent comparisons with the other tests.

The examiner preceded this series with comments commending their very successful performances. (See test directions.) This social success reference should have induced smaller discrepancies between performance and goals. This tended to be
true and, as would be expected, the mean for both groups of each division was smaller than the corresponding mean after social failure. Heterogeneous D had the largest mean and standard deviation. Thus, even temporary success could not overcome the unsteadiness caused by prolonged failure.

"Nothing succeeds like success" may be a basic truth in spite of its triteness. In each instance, except one, the success reference caused a downward shift in the group mean. The one exception showed a rise from 11.59 to 11.66 - a negligible increase.

None of these figures reached a total of statistical significance as great as a five per cent level of confidence. However, a feeling of success did seem to encourage a somewhat more realistic approach to a goal. This greater degree of reality after success did not upset the general pattern which seemed to be consistent in all series; namely, bright youngsters in a heterogeneous group approach goals more closely than bright youngsters in a homogeneous group. D homogeneous pupils are closer to reality than D heterogeneous. The middle groups seem to fluctuate.

Analysis of responses to final page of test.-- Statements 2-12 on the final test page revealed some feelings and attitudes toward school and home. The results were tabulated on a percentage basis. In tabulating these responses it was found that occasionally a pupil omitted an answer. In such instances the percentages were based upon the number of responses to the
particular question and not upon total class membership. After computing the percentages, to determine the reliability of the differences between them, the following formula was used:

$$CR = \frac{(P_1 - P_2) - 0}{\sigma_{P_1 - P_2}}$$

When interpreting these self-evaluating responses, it was significant to observe the differential in the graded (size of box checked) answers. There is an exactness to saying, "This is a big problem," or, "This is no problem at all." Specific gradations between these points were more difficult to define. In a few instances it was interesting to balance the figures for "no" problem against the three other percentages. These three percentages indicated that the item was a problem. The degree of intensity then became the focal point of interpretation.

Individual responses - isolated cases - were not pertinent to the development of this problem. The question was whether or not certain problems manifested themselves as being characteristic of any one of the eight groups. Has homogeneous or heterogeneous grouping affected the pupils' social or academic relationships to such an extent as to have influenced the levels of aspiration? Table 3 lists the totals, in per cents, of the group replies to these rather personal questions. The homogeneous groups were comprised of 132 children and there was a total of 103 in the heterogeneous groups. For analysis the responses were roughly divided into three categories: (1) social
adjustments (getting along with others), questions 8, 9, 12; (2) school achievement, questions 2, 7, 4, 5; (3) personal adjustments, questions 3, 4, 10, 11.

Table 3. Comparative Adjustments of Heterogeneously and Homogeneously Grouped Pupils (all opinions expressed in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division Level Group</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) het</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) hom</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) het</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) hom</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) het</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) hom</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) het</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) hom</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) het</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) hom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) het</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) hom</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) het</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) hom</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) het</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) hom</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
### Table 3. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division Level Group</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>het</td>
<td>hom</td>
<td>het</td>
<td>hom</td>
<td>het</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish didn't have to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School work too</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't like most</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish older folks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help when needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(concluded on next page)
Table 3. (Concluded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division Level Group</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Parents don't like friends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Need to learn how to get along with people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 No</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 No</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a/Significant at one per cent level of confidence.
b/Significant at one per cent level of confidence.
c/Significant at one per cent level of confidence.
*Significant at five per cent level of confidence.
**Significant at one per cent level of confidence.

Social adjustments, statement 8: "I need more friends."--For slightly more than half of the children in both homogeneous and heterogeneous groups this was no problem at all. For the others it seems to be slightly more of a "big" problem in the homogeneous groups. Of the homogeneous pupils, 13.6 per cent found "needing more friends" a big problem whereas only 5.1 per cent of the heterogeneous children felt this way. In either type of grouping the smallest percentage of children
feeling this need as a "big problem" were in the A divisions. The differences between any divisions, irregardless of grouping, seems to be insignificant. This sample of opinion indicates that a "need for more friends" is not peculiar to any one group tested.

Statement number 9, "I don't like most people." -- The totals for each gradation of this problem were almost identical for both the heterogeneous and homogeneous groups. There were only slight exceptions to this uniformity of response. In heterogeneous A not liking people was not a large problem for anyone. In homogeneous A not liking people was a "big" problem for 10 per cent of the class. In the B groups a 5-17 disparity in per cents existed in the same direction. The C and D groups reversed this trend so that, as a result, there was only a discrepancy of 2.3 per cent in totals between the homogeneous and heterogeneous labeling of "not liking most people" as a major problem. None of these totals were statistically significant at even the five per cent level of confidence.

Thus, although "not liking people" was a larger problem for the bright youngsters in a homogeneous group and for slower learners in heterogeneous groups, neither trend was strong enough to offer decisive evidence. The trend may suggest that it is difficult for a bright student to like fellow classmates who offer keen academic rivalry. Did this same problem appear in the heterogeneous C and D because they resented all the brighter youngsters of their group? Or, perhaps these two
trends, which deviated from the total group pattern, were merely accidental.

Statement number 12, "I need to learn how to get along with people."— Sixty-one per cent of the heterogeneous A and 40 per cent of the homogeneous A children found this to be somewhat of a problem. In the B groups the ratio was similar (54 per cent of heterogeneous and 35 per cent of homogeneous found this to be a problem). The C groups tended to reverse the opinions expressed by A and B. Thus, the following comparisons of totals indicated that any trends were so slight as to be inconsequential:

- Heterogeneous (large and medium problem) 17 per cent
- Homogeneous (large and medium problem) 18.1 per cent
- Heterogeneous (small or no problem) 82.2 per cent
- Homogeneous (small or no problem) 81.8 per cent.

Summary of statements 8, 9, 12.— In social relationships there proved to be no outstanding differences between the homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. However, forming of friendships seemed to be a somewhat more pressing problem in the homogeneous groups. Is it possible that in homogeneous grouping one's classmates are more competitive and less friendly? There seemed to be no particular group characteristic for not liking people except in the A and B groups. In these groups a larger number of pupils in the homogeneous groups considered not liking people a big problem. Is it possible to be happy with people, to get along with them, and yet not
like them? Less than one half of the percent of children who claimed they "don't like most people" in the homogeneous A and B groups did not feel that they had a big problem in learning "how to get along with other people." Has membership in homogeneous A and B groups encouraged an attitude of snobbery? For apparently, not liking people was a problem, and yet, the youngsters who recognized this problem would not admit that they needed to learn how to get along with others.

These few statistics, for the three questions involved, suggested that, although heterogeneously grouped youngsters may be socially a bit happier, the total differences exposed were so slight as to be doubtful factors for influencing levels of aspiration.

School achievement, statement 2, "I am afraid of most tests in school."-- These results were surprising. Youngsters in a homogeneous group work with a selected group of other children who have similar capacities and potentialities. The elimination of unequal competition should induce a climate of confidence and security. Successful experiences should have lessened the fear of tests. These figures belie that supposition.

In heterogeneous D where failure might be presumed to be most prevalent, and five or six years of repetitious failure should have developed an inherent fear of tests, the figures showed less tension concerning tests than in homogeneous D. Ten per cent of heterogeneous D and 38 per cent of homogeneous
D had a big fear of tests. All of the totals, except one, showed consistently that homogeneous youngsters were more fearful of tests than the heterogeneous children. The exception was in the homogeneous B group where 51 percent of the children had no fear of tests as compared with 32 percent of B heterogeneous. The homogeneous B was the writer's class. In teaching, the writer has deliberately attempted to cultivate an attitude of casualness and relaxation towards testing. Whether or not any classroom procedures influenced this figure would be difficult to determine.

Fear of tests was a big problem for 11.8 percent of all of the heterogeneous pupils. It was a big problem for 22.7 percent of all of the homogeneous youngsters. Statistically these percents indicated a reliable difference at slightly better than the five percent level of confidence.

Statement 7, "School work is too easy."-- All divisions of both groups reacted to this statement with similar responses. The widest interval between any of the totals, for each gradation of the problem, was 3.3 percent. This difference was so slight as to be insignificant. In both D groups 17 percent of the youngsters indicated this to be a "big" problem. Possibly these youngsters did not take time to think this problem through. For the slow readers this question had ambiguous phrasing. The problem concerned school work; they may have overlooked "too easy" and placed a check mark in the large box. At least both D groups either interpreted it
incorrectly; or, with full understanding, deliberately scored it in like fashion.

Statement 4, "I wish I had better marks."— Before looking at the per cent totals representing the various group viewpoints, it might be well to qualify the term "better marks." "Better marks" was not interpreted for the pupils taking the test but certain assumptions may be made on the basis of a knowledge of pupil ability and achievement. A wish for better marks does not necessarily mean that youngsters yearn for A's instead of failures. A wish for better marks for the bright youngster might be a desire for A's in place of B's. The pinnacle of success for the slow learner could mean all marks at a barely passing level. In interpreting this question any letter grades were irrelevant, both for the youngster being tested, and for the writer when attempting to analyze results. The point of concern was whether or not placement of the children in homogeneous or heterogeneous groups affected their acceptance of and satisfaction with their marks, regardless of the caliber of the marks earned.

The response of the slow learners was quite similar. Seventy per cent of the heterogeneous D found this to be a big problem while 63 per cent of the homogeneous D felt likewise. Twenty per cent of the heterogeneous D and 30 per cent of the homogeneous D felt that this was a medium sized problem. Thus, 90 per cent of the heterogeneous D and 93 per cent of the homogeneous D were in agreement on this problem. A remaining
10 per cent heterogeneous D felt this to be either a small problem or none at all and seven per cent of the homogeneous D felt this to be no problem. Regardless of grouping, these were the youngsters with the low I. Q.'s. If the philosophy upon which homogeneous grouping is based were being realized, then these homogeneous D youngsters would be achieving successfully - but at a different level. Either the philosophy is not feasible as an educational tool or its particular application in this situation is deficient in some respect.

In the C groups 88 per cent of the heterogeneous pupils expressed a wish for better marks whereas 97 per cent of the homogeneous pupils were dissatisfied with present marks.

In the B groups there was a reversal of this trend and 88 per cent of the homogeneous pupils wished for better marks while 96 per cent of the heterogeneous had similar desires.

The largest discrepancy was in the A group. Sixty-eight per cent of the heterogeneous children wished for better marks as some degree of a problem. Of the same bright youngsters in the homogeneous A, 86 per cent wished for better marks. (This includes per cents for big, medium, and small problems.) Thus, almost 20 per cent more children in a heterogeneous A were better satisfied with marks than they would be in a corresponding homogeneous group. This discrepancy in the A group is even more conspicuous if one looks at the per cent of youngsters expressing a wish for better marks as "a big problem." In the homogeneous A where the competition is keen, 46 per cent of
the pupils considered the wish for better marks a serious
problem. In heterogeneous A, those same bright youngsters,
scattered among average and slow learners had only 16 per cent
of their total who felt that better marks was a big problem.
Undoubtedly, it is much harder to obtain an A in a homogeneous
group.

Except for these figures in the A group, no other comparis-
sons showed such sharp contrasts. However, one other compari-
son was interesting. It may be noted that A and C homogeneous
show slightly more anxiety over better marks than do B and D.
This pattern may be rather consistent over a period of time.
Placement in a homogeneous group is based mainly on achievement,
with I. Q. and teacher recommendations being secondary con-
siderations. Observation of numerous homogeneous groups has
convinced this writer that "will to accomplish" may not be a
determinant of an I. Q. score but certainly is a vital factor
for establishing an achievement median. Thus, of the bright
youngsters who are in the top 50 per cent of the entire grade
group, those who have sufficient drive reach an achievement
level placing them in the A group. They tend to be the ones
who worry about marks and who are concerned about competition.
Those pupils who are more casual and consequently achieve
less, (the other half of the 50 per cent) sift into a B group.
These B youngsters tend to be more contented with marks re-
ceived than would the not too much brighter youngsters in the
A who are striving for perfection. The same desparities may
hold true between the C and D homogeneous groups.

Statement 5, "My parents wish I had better marks."-- On the whole the answers to this statement varied very little from problem 4 (personal wish for better marks). The children probably reflected parental concern. This question was not addressed to the parents and so the question was rated by the pupil according to what he felt his parents thought. In both the homogeneous C and D groups there were no parents who were completely satisfied with the child's marks. This was compared to the heterogeneous C, where eight per cent of the pupils expressed no problem, and to the heterogeneous D where five per cent of the youngsters checked "No." Apparently, some of the parents of heterogeneous slow learners had made their children feel that they were satisfied with their marks. Is a parent's understanding and evaluation of his own child decreased by the child's membership in a homogeneous group? Why would there not be at least one or two parents in these homogeneous groups who, understanding the child's limitations, would make him feel that he was satisfied with the child's report card?

Summary of statements on school achievement.-- Educators advocating homogeneous grouping have felt that the children were happier, better adjusted, and more successful than were the pupils in heterogeneous groups. In this analysis the terms used to cover these objectives were: social adjustments, school achievement and personal adjustments. It has already been observed that either type of grouping per se had no
profound influence on social adjustments. Thus, social adjustments could not be isolated as a single determining factor in discrepancies between the two groups for levels of aspiration.

In the area of school achievement, the type of group may have nurtured a particular psychological outlook altering levels of aspiration. The homogeneous groups expressed a feeling of greater parental concern for school improvement. Parental dissatisfaction sends a tense child to school. Has close competition produced a feeling of mental impotency where none existed? Dissatisfaction with marks and parental disapproval of marks may have resulted from struggling with opponents of equal strength. In a peck order of social dominance (or intellectual order), where each person has more or less accepted his position in the group, perhaps there is a comfortable feeling of assurance. For the purposes of this paper it was not necessary to know the reasons for fearing tests, etc. However, it was important to note that responses to the statements on school achievement disclosed some differences in attitude between the homogeneous and heterogeneous youngsters. The attitudes of homogeneous pupils towards the academic phase of school life signified more anxiety and attendant tensions. This would be reflected in the youngster's perception of the world he lives in. Thus, a homogeneous group, by hampering a child academically (from a mental health perspective) could affect a level of aspiration.

Personal adjustments, statement 3, "I often get into trouble in school." The popularly accepted synonym for "trouble" seems to be "discipline problem." One goal of homogeneous grouping is to attain better discipline or to eliminate behavior problems. Youngsters who are not frustrated (because they are socially and academically successful) are supposed to show less aggression. Therefore, in the homogeneous groups, there should be fewer discipline problems and the children should not be apprehensive about "getting into trouble."

Again, as in school achievement, the factual figures belie the philosophy. Although none of these per cents are significant at the five per cent level of confidence they do suggest a slight trend. Nine per cent, or almost one tenth of the children in the homogeneous A find discipline a "big" problem. In the heterogeneous A, "getting into trouble" is not a large problem for anyone. In A, B, and C "getting into trouble" at school is a big problem for a greater number of youngsters in the homogeneous groups. These figures show a reverse trend with the slower pupils. In the heterogeneous D group 20 per cent of the children find "getting into trouble" a big problem. Only four per cent of the D homogeneous find this a big problem.

Apparently, some potential "trouble makers" benefit from membership in a group where the pace is not too swift. Achievement scores are similar for these slow learners of either group. Probably the slower pace, while not expanding
total achievement, creates a more comfortable environment. All of the figures seem to indicate less of a behavior problem for the slower youngsters who are in a D homogeneous group. Discipline is no problem for 40 per cent of the D heterogeneous youngsters nor for 59 per cent of the D homogeneous. One comparison was to balance those two figures against these:

D heterogeneous -- some degree of a problem -- 60 per cent
D homogeneous -- same degree of a problem -- 40 per cent.

These totals suggested that by at least 20 per cent the slow youngster, behavior wise, was better off in a homogeneous group. Otherwise, the totals favored the heterogeneous groups for good behavior adjustments.

Statement 6, "I wish I didn't have to go to school."-- Heterogeneously grouped youngsters appeared to be less reluctant pupils than those in homogeneous classes. In homogeneous classes almost one third of the A group and more than one third of all the other groups wished in a "big" way that they did not have to attend school. The A youngsters, the high ability group, should have been happy, successful, and eager to remain in school. Only one tenth of the A heterogeneously grouped youngsters and less than one fifth of all heterogeneously grouped youngsters wished to leave school in a "big" way. One might have expected school attendance to be most abhorrent to the D pupils. The 60 per cent of D heterogeneous, who considered getting into trouble a source of discomfort, would not appear to be happy in school. Strangely enough for 52
per cent of the D heterogeneous pupils school attendance was no problem at all. It was no problem for only 25 per cent of the supposedly happier homogeneous D youngsters.

Statement 10, "I wish older folks would help me when I need help." This was "no problem" for one third of the homogeneous A and for more than one third of the homogeneous B. However, 6 per cent of the heterogeneous A, as compared to 14 per cent of the homogeneous A, found this a "big problem." In the B groups little difference occurred. The relationships expressed in A were reversed in the D groups where 29 per cent of the heterogeneous and 20 per cent of the homogeneous found this a "big problem." As previously mentioned in statement 4, divisions A and C homogeneous may be populated by pupils expending more effort than those in the B and D divisions respectively. This may account for a larger percentage of A and C homogeneous pupils who found needing help a large problem. They may be the youngsters who work under somewhat of a strain and are apprehensive about marks. This could aggravate a slight feeling of insecurity and a desire for more help.

The heterogeneous and homogeneous totals indicated no large aggregate differences between the groups. All gradations of the problem were included in a scatter of per cents ranging from 18.8 per cent to 30.7 per cent for the heterogeneous group and 15.4 per cent to 33.1 per cent in the homogeneous group. The distribution of sub totals of per cents represented a somewhat even allocation of feeling toward each degree of
the problem.

Thus, these slight differences did not seem to suggest any specific directions or conclusions.

Statement 11, "My parents don't like my friends."-- The total reactions of all homogeneous and all heterogeneous pupils to this problem were very similar. This was no problem at all for almost three quarters of each group. However, an analysis of the figures exposed a few interesting trends.

In A no heterogeneous pupils considered parents dislike of friends either a large or middle sized problem. Twenty-seven per cent found this to be a very small problem. In the corresponding homogeneous group, 15 per cent of the pupils felt that parental disapproval of friends was a large or medium sized problem. Only nine per cent thought of this as a very small problem. However, the percentage of either group of A, who found this no problem at all, was very close (heterogeneous, 73 per cent - homogeneous 77 per cent).

A comparison of heterogeneous and homogeneous B and C groups indicated that larger numbers of heterogeneously group ed children were inclined to feel that a parental dislike of friends was no problem at all.

The D groups reflected a different attitude. Of the heterogeneous pupils, 58 per cent (or less than three fifths) considered their parents dislike of friends "no problem." In the homogeneous group, 83 per cent (or more than four fifths) considered parental dislike of friends "no problem."
When comparing totals, the D group tended to counterbalance A, B, and C so that there appeared to be no discrepancies between the types of grouping. However, among the A, B, and C groups heterogeneous parents seemed somewhat happier about their children's friends. In the D groups, it was the homogeneous parents who apparently approved of their children's friends.

Summary of personal adjustment, statements 3, 6, 10, 11.--

After careful scrutiny of the totals, it appeared that statement 10 ("I wish older folks would help me when I need help") might be disregarded completely. An analysis showed that no trends or patterns were present regardless of how the figures were juxtaposed.

The other three statements produced some definite reactions. Because people are apt to be happier and more successful doing things they like to do and vice versa, the discrepancy between the two groups concerning a wish not to attend school was rather alarming. Percentages show greater contentment on the part of heterogeneously grouped youngsters. Sixteen per cent of the heterogeneous pupils wished to leave school very badly; 35 per cent of the homogeneous youngsters felt the same way. There were no reversals in those trends. There was a more consistent uniformity of responses than for many of the problems. Why were the D heterogeneous pupils happier in school? In spite of supposedly not working at their own level, did they crave the excitement and interest of
a more variegated group? Did even the slow youngster become bored with fellow plodders?

Why did almost one tenth of the homogeneous A youngsters (and none of heterogeneous A) tend to think of themselves as behavior problems? Was it a matter of comparison? Would behavior and responses which were conspicuous in an ivory towered, select top group, seem quite innocuous in a more average group? Or, were those same select homogeneous A students, who were fearful of tests and unhappy about marks, slightly more aggressive and belligerent? Did the higher standards of a homogeneous A group accentuate problems - or create special problems?

Less parental approval of friends in the A, B, and C homogeneous groups should have made personal adjustments at home and school more difficult.

Except for the D youngsters in a homogeneous group who thought they behaved better, and whose parents were happier with their friends, the figures all seemed to suggest that heterogeneous grouping is more conducive to satisfactory personal adjustments. Yet, even without the friction of discipline problems to cause unhappiness, and in spite of parental approval of friends, more D homogeneous children wished to leave school than did their heterogeneous counterparts.

Summary of final test page. -- An evaluation of the responses to this section of the test revealed greater happiness
and better school adjustments for the pupils in heterogeneous groups. Attitudes and adjustments are not innate reflex actions. They are learned behaviorisms. They are psychological rather than physical. Consequently, the discrepancies between homogeneous and heterogeneous groups, evidenced by these self-revelations of attitudes, should affect levels of aspiration. According to these trends, the heterogeneous youngsters, being a little more secure in a realistic world, should have performed better on goal setting tasks.

The level of aspiration test scores, although not always statistically significant, did corroborate these trends. However, there was one consistent exception. The slow learners, under any conditions, appeared to have a more realistic level of aspiration if they were working together in a homogeneous group.
CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

By testing some sixth grade children, an attempt was made to discover whether or not homogeneous grouping had affected the levels of aspiration.

Previous research has indicated that goal-setting is an expression of habitual behavior and that successful children tend to set goals within reach more consistently than do unsuccessful children. Presumably, homogeneous children, working at levels within distance of attainable goals, should be more successful and consequently have more realistic goal levels.

The measurement of aspiration levels (first section of test) did not indicate that homogeneously grouped youngsters, in general, were any more realistic than heterogeneously grouped pupils. The bright youngsters in either type of grouping showed the smallest discrepancies between performance and goal set. Although the "top" heterogeneous youngsters had even smaller discrepancies than the bright youngsters placed in a homogeneous group, the differentiation was not large enough to be significant except following personal failure. The heterogeneous A were much more realistic in setting goals after having experienced personal defeat.

For all tests, both A groups maintained almost constant
means (steadiness of goal-setting) except for the previously mentioned homogeneous A whose pupils apparently became flustered after personal failure.

The poor students in a heterogeneous situation, working with other youngsters of widely scattered abilities, showed the largest means and greatest amount of fluctuation. The only homogeneous group to verify the contention that segregation by ability should provide greater success and thus more realistic goals was D.

In the final section of the test, neither homogeneous or heterogeneous youngsters seemed to be affected socially by the particular type of grouping. In the area of school achievement, narrowed ranges in the homogeneous groups apparently increased the competition and consequently stimulated greater tension and anxiety.

The outstanding per cent in the second test section, revealing attitudes, concerned the individual adjustments to school. Heterogeneous youngsters seemed more willing to attend school. Larger numbers of the homogeneous youngsters felt that attending school was a large problem. (These figures were significant at the one per cent level.)

Many figures in the test suggested trends but were not sufficiently significant statistically to offer conclusive evidence. Although 235 children were tested, for purposes of comparison they were divided into eight groups. Some of those groups contained less than 30 pupils. Larger samples may have
pointed to more specific conclusions.

Within the limits of these statistics, it would seem that:

1. Homogeneous grouping affected the aspiration level of the slow learner. The poor student seemed to be more realistic in his goal-setting behavior when he worked exclusively with other low achievers.

2. The very bright youngsters were somewhat better able to appraise their performance and goal, if they were not working together in a homogeneous group.

Thus, homogeneous grouping made the low achievers more realistic and the bright students somewhat less realistic. Except for these two trends, homogeneous grouping did not seem to affect the aspiration level. Nor did evidence that homogeneous youngsters were less happy and under greater tension, seem to affect their goal-setting habits.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summarization of Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homogeneous</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both A groups tended to be more realistic than other divisions under all conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Noticeable instability of goal sets following personal failure. Compared to Het A, significant at 1 per cent level of confidence. | 1. A more realistic level of aspiration, under all conditions, than any other group.  
2. No children felt that getting into trouble was a big problem.  
3. No children felt that not liking people was a big problem.  
| 2. About 10 per cent felt that getting into trouble in school was a big problem. |  
| 3. Ten per cent felt not liking people a big problem. |  
| 1. Noticeable instability of goal sets following personal failure. Compared to Het B, significant at 5 per cent level of confidence. | 1. Following personal and social references of failure, discrepancies between groups at any division level largest in B. Het B more realistic than Hom B (5 per cent level of confidence).  
| 3. Eighty-four per cent of parents wished pupil had better marks as a "big" problem. |  
| 3. There were not any parents satisfied with marks |  
| 1. More stable than D Het under all conditions. |  
| 2. Forty-eight per cent of parents wished pupil had better marks as a "big" problem. |  
| 3. Eight per cent of parents were satisfied with marks. |  
| 1. Both social references induced more unrealistic goal sets than for performance on structured goal or personal failure. | 1. Less realistic, all conditions, than any other group.  
2. About 48 per cent had a desire to leave school.  
| 2. More realistic and stable than D Het under all conditions. |  
| 3. About 75 per cent had a desire to leave school. |
TEST ADMINISTRATION

TODAY YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE A SPECIAL SORT OF A TEST. IN
THIS TEST YOU ESTIMATE, OR GUESS, HOW MUCH YOU THINK YOU CAN
DO. IT IS IMPORTANT TO WORK AS FAST AS YOU CAN WITHOUT
MAKING MISTAKES.

WRITE TODAY'S DATE, ________________, AFTER THE WORD
'DATE.' WRITE YOUR NAME AFTER THE WORD 'NAME'. ON THE NEXT
LINE WRITE THE NAME OF THE SCHOOL AND YOUR ROOM NUMBER. IF
YOU ARE A GIRL, DRAW A CIRCLE AROUND THE WORD 'GIRL.' IF YOU
ARE A BOY, DRAW A CIRCLE AROUND THE WORD 'BOY.' NOW WILL YOU
WRITE YOUR NAME AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGES 2, 3, AND 4. YOUR
NAME SHOULD BE ON EVERY PAGE EXCEPT THE LAST ONE.

AT THE TOP OF PAGE 2, LOOK AT THE FIGURES BETWEEN THE
ARROWS. THE ARROWS POINT TO SOME FIGURES WITH NUMBERS IN
THEM. NOW LOOK AT THE SAMPLE. WHAT NUMBER SHOULD BE PLACED
IN THE FIRST FIGURE? YES, 2 GOES INSIDE THE FIRST FIGURE.
TAKE YOUR PENCIL AND WRITE A 2 IN THE FIRST FIGURE WHICH IS A
CIRCLE. WHAT NUMBER SHOULD BE PLACED IN THE SECOND FIGURE?
YES, 4 IS RIGHT. TAKE YOUR PENCILS AND MAKE A 4 IN THE
SECOND FIGURE WHICH IS A TRIANGLE. YOUR NUMBERS DO NOT HAVE
TO FIT EXACTLY INTO THE CENTER OF THE FIGURES. IT IS MATCHING
THE CORRECT NUMBER TO THE RIGHT FIGURE THAT IS IMPORTANT. YOU
MAY NOW FILL IN THE REST OF THE FIGURES IN THE SAMPLE ROW.
DO NOT GO BEYOND THE END OF THE SAMPLE ROW.

Check to see that directions are being followed. Correct
the sample row together to encourage accuracy. The purpose
of the test will be realized if they are following directions
regardless of the perfection of their performance.

PLACE PENCILS ON DESK. LOOK AT TEST 1. YOU WILL FIND THE
NUMBER 1 AT THE LEFT SIDE OF YOUR PAPER. THERE ARE 3 ROWS
IN TEST 1. THEY ARE TO BE DONE EXACTLY AS YOU HAVE JUST DONE
THE SAMPLE. I WILL TELL YOU WHEN TO START. START AT THE BE-
ginning OF EACH ROW AND DO EVERY FIGURE IN THAT ROW BEFORE
GOING TO THE NEXT ROW. DO NOT GO BEYOND THE DOUBLE LINES
THAT MARK THE END OF TEST 1. YOU WILL HAVE 30 SECONDS TO DO AS
MANY AS YOU CAN. AT THE END OF 30 SECONDS, I WILL SAY, STOP.

READY - PENCILS IN YOUR HANDS -  GO  Time exactly 30 sec.
STOP.

COUNT THE NUMBER OF FIGURES YOU WERE ABLE TO PUT A NUMBER
IN. AT THE RIGHT OF TEST 1, JUST ABOVE THE DOUBLE LINE WHERE
IT SAYS, 'I DID' WRITE THE NUMBER YOU DID. Check to see that
they follow instructions.

LOOK AT TEST 2. YOU ARE NOW GOING TO GUESS HOW MANY YOU
THINK YOU CAN DO. AT THE RIGHT OF TEST 2, WHERE IT SAYS,
'I EXPECT TO DO,' WRITE THE NUMBER YOU THINK YOU CAN DO IN 30 SECONDS. Check these instructions. Work as fast as you can but be sure you are accurate. It is important that you guess the number you can do as accurately as you can, and that you do as many each time as you possibly can. Pencils ready. You are going to do Test 2. Do not go beyond the double line at the end of Test 2. Go Time 30 sec. STOP.

Again write the number actually completed. Each test is to be administered in the same way with the following exceptions:

Test 7 cut the time to 26 seconds (Make no comment)

Preceding Test 11.

BEFORE WE DO THE NEXT TEST, COPY THE NUMBER YOU DID IN TEST 8 ON THIS PAGE BESIDE THE FIGURE 8 IN THE UPPER RIGHT HAND CORNER. Hold up booklet and point to upper right hand corner. Put the number you did in Test 9 right here beside the number 9. Now look at Test 10. Put the number you did in Test 10 beside the number 10 here in the corner. (point) Add the number you did in these 3 tests and write the total beside the word TOTAL. Walk around the room to check these directions. Try to be mobile enough so that they feel you may have observed the individual totals.

Now make this comment as near verbatim as possible without actually reading the words. As I've glanced around the room, I'm surprised to find that you have been able to do so few. This test has been given to other sixth grade classes. They were able to do much better than you are doing. Many of the children were able to complete all of the figures in most of the tests. I don't know just why you are doing so poorly. We'll try a few more tests to give you a chance to improve.

Read. READY FOR TEST 11. Work as fast as you can but be sure you are accurate. Go Time 30 seconds STOP

Preceding Test 14, fill in and correct the sample. Do not set a goal for Test 14. Otherwise, Tests 14-18 are administered as were all of the others. The one exception is preceding Test 16 when the following comment is to be made:

(Be sure that the pupils feel that their work on Tests 14 and 15 has been observed.) I am quite surprised at the work you are doing on these particular tests. You are doing an excellent job! This is a very difficult test. Almost everyone of you has done much more than is expected. One sixth grade class had no one who
DID AS WELL AS SOME OF YOU HAVE DONE ON SEVERAL OF THE PAPERS I HAVE JUST SEEN. LET'S DO 3 MORE TESTS TO SEE IF YOU CAN REALLY KEEP UP THIS OUTSTANDING WORK.

NOW TURN TO THE LAST PAGE. THIS IS A VERY SHORT TEST OF STILL ANOTHER KIND. YOU'VE BEEN VERY GOOD WORKERS. THIS TEST IS NOT TO SEE HOW FAST YOU CAN WORK. THERE IS NO SCORE FOR THIS TEST. YOUR NAMES WILL NOT BE USED WITH YOUR ANSWERS.

I'M DOING SOME SPECIAL WORK AT A COLLEGE IN BOSTON. WE'D LIKE TO KNOW A LITTLE MORE ABOUT HOW BOYS AND GIRLS YOUR AGE REALLY FEEL ABOUT SCHOOL.

LET'S LOOK AT THE FIRST QUESTION "I WISH I COULD JOIN A CLUB AT SCHOOL." LOOK AT THE 3 DIFFERENT SIZE BOXES. THEY WILL TELL HOW YOU REALLY FEEL ABOUT IT. IF THIS IS A BIG PROBLEM AND YOU THINK ABOUT IT A LOT PUT A CROSS IN THE LARGE BOX. (Demonstrate on board). IF THIS IS A MIDDLE-SIZED PROBLEM, PUT THE CROSS IN THE MIDDLE-SIZED BOX. IF THIS IS JUST A VERY SMALL PROBLEM, PUT THE CROSS IN THE LITTLE BOX. IF IT IS NOT A PROBLEM FOR YOU AT ALL -- IF YOU ARE NOT AT ALL CONCERNED ABOUT IT, PUT A CROSS OVER THE NO.

ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

WHEN YOU HAVE FINISHED, PUT YOUR PENCILS DOWN. TURN YOUR TEST BOOKLETS SO THAT THE PAGE WITH THE DATE AND YOUR NAME IS ON TOP. PLACE THE BOOKLET ON THE DESK. DO NOT TURN TO ANY OTHER PART OF THE TEST.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Boy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 | 7 |
| 2 | 8 |
| 3 | 9 |
| 4 | 10 |
| 5 | 11 |
| 6 | 12 |
1. I wish I could join a club at school.
2. I am afraid of most tests in school.
3. I often get in trouble in school.
4. I wish I had better marks.
5. My parents wish I had better marks.
6. I wish I didn't have to go to school.
7. School work is too easy for me.
8. I need more friends.
9. I don't like most people.
10. I wish older folks would help me when I need help.
11. My parents don't like my friends.
12. I need to learn how to get along with people.


