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As in the domain of science, man attempted to set his "footsteps on the moon", so in the domain of education, man is constantly striving to imprint new educational philosophies.

It would appear that the educational technique known as individualizing instruction, an integral part of the nongraded curriculum, is inspired by theories of the existentialists who "reject traditional conceptions of the relationship between teacher and pupil. The teacher is not in his classroom primarily to impart knowledge (realism), or as a consultant in problem situations (pragmatism), or as a personality to be emulated (idealism). His function is to assist each student personally in his journey toward self realization. Of all persons, the teacher is best placed to promote the growth of free, creative manhood in those who come before him, inspiring them with a passionate concern for the meaning of life and the quality of their own lives". (19:122)

He believes that "the end of group education is the education of the individual, and the individual uses the group for his own personal fulfillment." (19:121) "Subject matter must be used for
the cultivation of the self. However, the student cannot escape the consequences of his actions: he must accept them as the issue of his own free choice." (19:122)

The nongraded elementary curriculum incorporates this thinking and, also, departs strongly from any of the traditional thinking in education. It leans toward the "Aristotelian progressive which would teach children to know how to know." (22:63)

Parker states, "At a time when we need thinking about how best to move ahead, action seems to be frozen on dead center." (22:62)

The result has been more and more retardation of education for children, as the battle waxes hotter and teachers become pitifully confused as to just what is wanted of them. The storm centers mainly around how to meet individual differences in the mass educative process.

How the Two Sides Are Different

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADITIONAL</th>
<th>PROGRESSIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject-centered</td>
<td>child-centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic education</td>
<td>life adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perennialism: certain</td>
<td>instrumentalism-experimentalism:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immutable truths; man's</td>
<td>truth is in the consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unchanging nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato: being (basic truths)</td>
<td>Aristotle: becoming (science,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>always new truths)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the cultural heritage</td>
<td>the learner's interests and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the current problems of a changing society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental discipline</td>
<td>self-discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intellect</td>
<td>whole child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
European two-level: college, noncollege extrinsic motivation teacher a subject specialist content schooling: acquisition of skills and knowledge; emphasis on education for life orderly

American many levels: a continuum of ability, as in society intrinsic motivation teacher a learning consultant process schooling: discovery of need for and acquisition of skills and knowledge; emphasis on education as life dynamic

"True nongradedness implies individualization of instruction. This is the ideal situation," wrote Dr. Joseph Crescimbeni, co-author of the textbook, INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, in a letter to the author.

This writer, like many elementary teachers, has long embraced the idea of nongradedness as the finest tool a teacher could utilize to meet the overwhelming variety of individual needs and differences in the classroom.

Moreover, she is interested in learning how teachers feel about performing in the individualizing of instruction within the nongraded organizational structure.

In correspondence exchanged with John I. Goodlad, one of the nation's foremost proponents of nongrading, Mr. Goodlad stated his thinking in regard to a study of teacher performance.

At no point in my work have I maintained that the nongraded elementary school automatically results in
improved performance of various kinds on the part of children. Rather, nongradedness affords teachers an opportunity to provide more individualized instruction... to study the performance of teachers would be a most significant contribution. (4)

This thesis, therefore, reflects such a study as suggested, and is entitled TEACHER PERFORMANCE IN THE NONGRADED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF CENTRAL WASHINGTON.

I. THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which a nongraded structure in the elementary schools "permits teachers to operate more freely with respect to instructional decisions."

Significance of the Study

Given the avenues open to a teacher to attempt to achieve excellence in instruction, the question arises: what one avenue would provide the best foundation for meeting individual needs and differences which surround one immediately when entering a classroom?

In planning for the learning of 30 or so children in one classroom, we must face these facts of life with regard to the differences that will exist in their learning abilities: for every child in the population who is below average in learning ability there is an above-average student. For every slow learner there is a fast learner. For every moron there is a superior or gifted pupil. And spaced in between these, all along the line—slow, average and gifted included—are found students whose school achievements are somewhat below, or far below, their capacity to achieve. (22:77)
Leo J. Brueckner has stated that "the fact that individuals in a given group differ so greatly has led to the acceptance of the position that "classroom" instruction "should be so organized" that it will "provide fully for individual differences." (29:4)

Concern for teaching the individual has been operating since the early 1900's. Attempts were made to individualize instruction with a grade group. The Wuinetka plan, instituted in the 1920's, was an arrangement whereby each grade level was assigned a certain number of projects or units in each subject. A student was allowed to work his way through at his own rate so long as he mastered the subject plan.

The XYZ plan was another approach towards dealing with problems of individualizing instruction. It was an attempt to divide students by intelligence tests into different grade groups of "similar aptitude and ability." The bright were not to be held back, and the slow pupils were to be encouraged. The curriculum was to be adjusted according to children's needs. Elementary educators made attempts in many different ways to individualize instruction "within the traditional framework of the graded school and the class method of instruction. This concern with the individual is, ... still very much with us." (26:17)

After careful consideration of these quotations and similar literature the writer has often reflected as to whether a school should remain graded and adopt the concept of individualizing
instruction, or change the graded format and adopt individualized instruction within a nongraded framework. Intrinsic to this consideration would be the probable extent or degree that teacher performance might be influenced by the newer structure, nongradedness.

Howard Bardwell and Gross clarify the manner of handling the problem of individual differences in a gradedness and a nongradedness situation.

In a conventionally organized elementary school almost all eight-year old children can be found in the third grade classrooms, taught by third grade teachers. Provisions for individual differences are sometimes made through such devices as sectioning . . . through the giving of multiple assignments, and through sub-grouping. Such practices, . . . are not to be confused with non-gradedness, which is an effort by the faculty to group students appropriately, according to the task to be accomplished. (17:4–6)

Dr. Crescembini further states in a letter to the author that "true nongradedness as an organizational pattern for grouping children is really a reflection of individualizing instruction." (3)

If this is fundamentally so, the study will unquestionably reveal the relationships in the results.

The overall significance of the study will most certainly lie in its relevance in assisting educators to decide the effectiveness of the nongraded elementary organizational structure in the individualizing of instruction.

Hypothesis

There is no significant difference in the degree or extent that a teacher feels free to perform methods of individualizing
instruction in a nongraded situation as opposed to that of a graded one.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Individualizing Instruction

The differentiation of instruction according to individual differences in pupils. (13:290)

Individual Differences

Throughout the report, individual differences will be referred to as meaning the variations or deviations among individuals in regard to a single characteristic or a number of characteristics. It also refers to those differences which in their totality distinguish one individual from another. (13:172)

Nongradedness Defined

Those who are committed to nongradedness seem to be guided by propositions such as the following:

1. Skill and content learnings are made available to pupils on the basis of more than just one year in school.

2. The acceptability of achievement or performance levels of pupils is measured against more than just year in school.

3. It is expected and accepted that an uneven and changing rate of progress will be reflected in the learning curves of pupils, and school arrangements are to be flexible and responsive to variability.

4. Pupils are brought together into instructional groups on the basis of the likelihood that each will find it an advantageous setting in which to learn.

5. The control of pupils' progress through the school rests on efforts to sustain motivation and insure success in learning.
The nongraded curriculum is in direct contrast to the graded curriculum. (26:107-108)

Gradedness Defined

The graded structure divides subject matter and skills of various instructional areas, such as reading and arithmetic, into blocks of subject material to be assigned to each grade level of the school. The content to be covered in one year is outlined in curriculum guides and textbooks and test materials are developed on the basis of the graded series. (26:107)

Summary

The following terms were defined in order to make their conceptualization as words more concise. These terms will be used frequently throughout the paper. They are individualizing instruction, individual differences, nongradedness, and gradedness. The two synonyms for nongradedness are continuous progress and ungradedness.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Number of Surveys

The study consisted of two surveys. (See Appendix B; C)

Type of Surveys

Conducted by the subjective method through correspondence. (See Appendix B; C)

Type of Schools

First class elementary schools.
Participants

First survey. Forty-seven principals were contacted and asked to check conditions of nongradedness in their own elementary school. Forty-four responded; 3 did not. (See Appendix B)

Second survey. One hundred percent of the 42 teachers participating responded to the second survey regarding teacher performance in the individualizing of instruction. Twenty-one schools were represented by 2 teachers per school, who were chosen by their principals. Each of these schools had fulfilled over 1/2 of the conditions of nongradedness as tallied from the first survey, scoring from 3-5 on a scale of 5 conditions. (See Appendix C)

Geographic Location

Central Washington.

Dates Conducted

Survey 1 1-10-70 to 1-22-70
Survey 2 4-18-70 to 4-30-70

Summary

This study was limited by its number of surveys, type of surveys, type of schools surveyed, subjective replies of principals and teachers, the geographic location of Central Washington, and by the dating of the surveys. Forty-seven principals were
contacted; 43 responded, while 42 teachers were contacted in 21 schools. The surveys were dated from January, 1970 through April, 1970.

IV. SUMMARY

In determining the extent to which a nongraded structure in the elementary schools "permits teachers to operate more freely with respect to instructional decisions", one must consider the significance of the problem. This significance will be evident after deciding the value of the results of the study in assisting educators to decide the effectiveness of the nongraded elementary organizational structure in the individualizing of instruction.

It is the belief of the authors that this individualizing is a most important technique in meeting the individual differences which will always exist in a school population. There were many attempts to meet this problem recorded in the histories of education in America. The author refers you to the results of this study. These results reveal how Central Washington teachers are meeting this need. (See Appendix F)
The rationale for a graded system is the assumption that a child at any given chronological age is very much like any other child and is ready to cope with curriculum material assigned to the grade in which he is a pupil. Gradedness assumes that "there is a developmental evenness within each child making it possible for him to do the same quality of work in each area." The possibility of retention in the same grade is considered "a constant source of motivation to spur children to apply themselves to their school work." (26:98)

This so-called "spur" to children has proved detrimental and disheartening to slow learning children as evidenced in many studies.

Children do not learn more by repeating a grade; they often regress. It has been found that promoted low achievers do better in school than nonpromoted children. (9:235-50)

Caswell and Foshay found that failing students become discouraged. They expect to fail again and want to withdraw from school. (8:387-94)
Kurt Lewin found that failing does not inspire future success. It limits one's sense of potential and creates a tendency for aggression. (20:20)

Moreover, low achievers do not seem to keep their peers from achieving in the next grade. In school districts with high nonpromotion rates, achievement in the next grades is lower. (25:2)

Evidence has shown that retention is unsuccessful and Goodlad and Sandin found, in separate studies, that nonpromoted children tended toward social maladjustment after being rejected by their peers. (25:102)

Since the evidence against the validity of gradedness assumptions is abundantly clear in regard to nonpromotion, it follows that one should investigate further to clarify the issues involved in gradedness.

Goodlad and Anderson investigated and found that "first grade children differ in mental age by about four full years" and that by the fourth grade their range in achievement is as great as "the number designating the grade level."(14:6-7) Children are not alike, and their "developing personalities should not be humiliated and deformed." (11:17)

This being self-evident, it might be well for educators with a gradedness organization to consider a structural change. Saylor and Anderson say that many people feel this would provide more effective methods of grouping, more efficient teacher utilization
for instruction, and "more effective regulation of children's yearly progress through the elementary school." (25:96)

Relevant to making an organizational change of this magnitude, one might consider Mr. Lee Smith's experience in his nongraded programs for Brunswick Elementary School in Brunswick, Maryland. He found that after a curriculum guide was developed which listed a developmental pattern by levels, the staff could then proceed toward making the necessary changes in curriculum content. The teachers could consequently adjust their programs in quantity and scope. (24:164)

When considering an ungraded school, one should, also, consider that the ultimate aim is to tailor programs to each pupil. Children should be measured in terms of their own abilities, and teachers' efforts should be geared toward bringing each child up to his potential.

Instead of the child adjusting to the programs, in an ungraded organizational structure, the programs must adjust to the child. (12:240)

This can be accomplished in many ways, some of which we could list as follows: subgrouping, homogeneous ability grouping, specialized teaching, buzz sessions, team teaching, team learning, the mixed set approach, the multi-media approach, and by differentiating assignments. (3:394-95)

Subgrouping involves the breaking up of a group of students into smaller groups. Homogeneous ability grouping is the ability
ranking of students, so that pupils within the group are more nearly alike intellectually and achievement-wise. Specialized teaching is accomplished when each of several teachers that a child meets for instruction are teaching subjects for which they are individually best versed. Buzz sessions include small groups of four to six students who devote time to discuss common problems. Team teaching involves the grouping of two or more teachers for instruction of the same class of students. The teachers share the responsibility of instruction for the students assigned to them. Team learning occurs when children work together in small work teams to solve common problems. The mixed set approach is the provision of textbook and resource materials geared to their own reading ability levels. The multi-media approach is emphasizing the use of multi-media materials such as tape recordings, films, records, programmed units of study, slides and filmstrips, television, newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, and other reference materials. Differentiating assignments occur when fast learners are assigned a task that needs to be worked on in depth while slow learners are assigned a task that is much more simple in complexity. These students might all be working on the same type of subject matter; an example, the study of birds. One might study the color, approximate size and shape of the bird, while another might draw its anatomy in entirety and label the picture with its scientific nomenclature.

Careful planning should accompany any changes in the organizational structure of an elementary school. One might well
be governed by the following conditions which Goodlad says are those conditions which should accompany the nongraded idea.

Conditions Accompanying the Nongraded Idea

1. The nongraded school is one in which graded expectations and graded nomenclature have been removed.

2. The nongraded school is one in which the ceilings and floors of expectancy have been widened in order to account for the range of individuality in an instructional group.

3. The nongraded school is one in which the curricular activities are organized around longitudinal organizing elements rather than according to a uniform set of expectancies for the year.

4. The nongraded school is one in which every possible effort is made to diagnose the needs of individual learners and to intervene in their education according to individual progress and need.

5. The nongraded school is one in which standards of performance are based upon criteria of performance rather than on group norms. (4)

SUMMARY

The author has examined the rationale for gradedness and presented evidence that this rationale is not fundamentally sound as proved by many studies, and by new understandings regarding the developmental patterns of children.

Since this rationale is questionable, a structural change in curriculum organization is needed. Mr. Lee Smith of Brunswick, Maryland, found that this change could be made rather smoothly after a curriculum guide listing a developmental pattern by levels had been planned, while Glogau cautions that one must adjust programs to the
child. Thomas and Cerembin point to ways of doing some of this adjusting which included subgrouping, ability grouping, specialized teaching, buzz sessions, team teaching and learning, the mixed set approach, the multi-media approach, and the differentiation of assignments. This sort of planning and individualizing of instruction would lead one to setting up a school organizational structure that would best meet Goodlad's conditions which should accompany the nongraded idea. (See Appendix A)
CHAPTER III

SIGNIFICANT STEPS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION IN THE NONGRADED ELEMENTARY CURRICULUM

I. EARLY INDIVIDUALIZING

Innovators as early as 1868 began to take steps toward the individualizing of instruction.

Superintendent W. T. Harris of St. Louis introduced a plan for frequent promotion and reclassification. He kept a graded structure, but regrouped children every six weeks who varied from the rest of the group.

In the 1870's Francis Parker was attacking graded textbooks. President Charles Eliot of Harvard and President William Harper of University of Chicago expressed their notion that gradedness demanded a "stereotyped individual".

John Dewey at University of Chicago desired to liberate individuals. He supported the variety of children in a group, and eliminated classifications of grades, textbooks and subject matter. (12:49-50)

Preston W. Search, Superintendent of Schools in Pueblo, Colorado from 1888-1894, was one of the first American educators to
protest against a lockstep method of teaching as the graded situations provide. He pressed for complete individual progress for every pupil. This, he put into practice in Pueblo and later in Los Angeles in 1895 where he was superintendent. It was a "multiple-track" system. Every program in each high school subject was outlined in order that the student could progress at his own rate in each subject. (5:11)

Other innovations were in progress about the same time. The Batavia plan, introduced by John P. Kennedy in New York, employed additional teachers to help slow learners, while in North Denver, Colorado, the brighter children received additional help and attention.

In the 1900's, Frederic Burk at San Francisco extended the Pueblo Plan, although retaining grades, he divided the work into units. (26:16)

Carleton Washburne utilizing the Winnetka Plan abolished grade promotion and failure. Studies were divided into individual and group activities. The individual activities were divided into tasks. This idea was pioneered in Chicago, Illinois, by James E. McDade and in Bronxville, New York by Willard W. Beatty. (5:10)

Helen Parkhurst developed the famous Dalton plan devised in 1919, which replaced recitations with the conference. Each child had his own "contract" and sought help from several teachers. The rooms were referred to as laboratories. Nonacademic subjects were dealt with by the entire class. (14:49-50) (5:11)

These designs all tended to modify gradedness and directed the
II. NONGRADEDNESS EMERGES

People began experimenting with nongrading. In 1936 and 1947, Richmond, Virginia and Western Springs, Illinois experimented with nongraded. After World War II, the explosion of knowledge seemed to point to the possibility that gradedness was lacking in ability to cope with some of the educational demands. (16:1)

Milwaukee implemented nongradedness in 1942. It is still in effect there. (14:53)

A variety of programs have been developed. Jefferson School in Hawthorne, California, organized an ungraded primary school, which they have continued. In their plan the child is first placed with his age group, but moves with his growth pattern. He remains in an ungraded program four years. Teacher's judgment, tests, and conferences are used in appraising child progress. (6:7)

The Brevard County Schools in Florida call their program SPACE meaning (Selective Phasing, A Continuous Education). SPACE has six levels covering work of approximately one grade. Each level is divided into phases: basic, regular, and advanced. (23:19)

These are other interpretations of nongradedness groupings for more individual attention.

Nathanson School at Niles, Illinois, was designed for nongraded instruction through team teaching. It opened in 1966. The school was planned for 600 students, its population is over 800.
A staff of teachers was split into six teams. Teaming provided for differentiation of instruction ranging from large to small groups to individual children. When working independently, children "read, write, reflect, listen to records and tapes, view filmstrips, record, memorize, create, examine, build, experiment, practice, discover, and investigate." Assistant Superintendent Dagne says about the program:

I feel that our nongraded team-teaching program enables the teachers . . . to take tremendous strides in teaching the individual child. (10:63-70)

Donald W. Barnickle is principal at Elmwood School, Naperville, Illinois, a K-6 school. Nongrading was completed there in 1967. In 1969, he stressed achievements of the program. The elimination of the retention-promotion dilemma, continuous progress resulting in slow learner solid mastery, and rapid advancement of fast learners through advanced levels were noted by him. He, also, recognized the obvious improvement in the mental health of the children, and the improved quality of the teaching in meeting individual needs due to the narrowing of ability gradations. Teacher morale, he says, has improved as teachers are not discouraged by trying "to bring children to grade level". (10:63-70)

Dr. John I. Goodlad served as a consultant in a St. Louis suburban elementary school. A nongraded, team teaching program with emphasis on independent study was developed there. After learning the basic skills, children begin a variety of independent studies. A centrally located learning materials center operates.
Instructional areas with a variety of movable partitions replaced classrooms. (7:80-85)

Osborn School in Rye, New York, has been sighted by GRADE TEACHER as an outstanding example of a nongraded school utilizing individualized instruction techniques. There has been much changing of "school machinery" at Osborn. "Curriculum concepts, instructional techniques and administrative procedures." One to one individualization of instruction is working in spite of the scarcity of teacher aides and large classes. ... "An Osborn teacher is as much a guidance counselor as instructor." (15:84) She evaluates, diagnoses and prescribes. One of her big challenges is to keep track of individual pupil progress. One of the teachers uses bar graphs to keep a record of progress. Another stacks workbooks, thereby, keeping a daily record. Reporting to parents is done by individual written records; curriculum development is participated in by teachers. A wide range of materials and textbooks are kept on hand available for use. Children are free to use the library when they so desire. There must be a continuity of instruction for smooth movement from one level to the next. Curriculum guides offer these teachers broad goals and basic concepts, but in the end, the teacher interprets specific pupil needs. Reading and math at Osborn are considered separately, but all other subjects fall under the "inquiry processes" label.

Children are judged on the basis of their ability to think and find useful information as well as on their ability to collect
facts. Pupils assisting pupils is common and a variety of activities are going on at the same time in one classroom.

William E. Turner, the principal, says that his teachers work hard, but "they do what good teachers everywhere will do if you remove barriers." (15:82-6)

III. SUMMARY

The author has attempted to show some of the history of individualizing instruction and to represent a view of some of the early nongradedness programs and theories. She has included a variety of recently developed programs as an example of what the different programs entail. Early individualization attempts reveal grouping and regrouping, revamping of textbooks, John Dewey's theory on "liberating individuals", and those views of Eliot and Harper regarding the "stereotyped" individual as a result of gradedness instruction. The "multiple-track" system was discussed together with the Winnetka plan of eliminating promotion and failure and planning studies which included both individual and group activities. There were the beginnings of the contract plan and conferences introduced by Parkhurst, and a variety of nongradedness schemes beginning just prior to 1940. These schemes included the ungraded primary, the SPACE program, team teaching instruction, and many plans to individualize. Dr. Goodlad's experience serving as a consultant in a St. Louis plan to use movable partitions with a central learning materials center revealed new ideas in flexibility of construction.
The final example was that of a nongraded program being individualized as in the Osborn School in Rye, New York. It is hoped that these examples will acquaint the reader with the type of development that has taken place in individualizing instruction in a nongraded school. It is interesting to note that the ideas developed throughout the history of individualizing are very well known techniques commonly used in many schools today.
In order to conduct a study which could aid teachers in making decisions as to the efficacy of the nongraded approach to individualized instruction, it is necessary to secure information from teachers themselves. (See Appendix C)

Teachers identified as working in a nongraded situation were asked the following question:

To what extent or degree does teaching under conditions of nongradedness permit teachers to operate more freely with respect to the following instructional decisions? (See Appendix C)

The first survey was necessary to identify schools with programs underway which fit the conditions of nongradedness situation by achieving a score of 3-5 fulfilling conditions of nongradedness as identified by Dr. Goodlad. (See Appendix B)

The second survey was necessary to inquire of teachers the question quoted above. The instructional decision included 16 possible tasks of individualizing instruction, which are itemized herein. (See Appendix C)

Before conducting Survey #1, the State Department of Public Instruction was contacted regarding their knowledge of elementary
Schools in Central Washington, which might have the nongraded curriculum structure. (See Appendix B) Their replies indicated that they were aware of work being accomplished on an experimental basis, but were not very aware of that being accomplished by schools which were fulfilling nongradedness standards in their daily operation of the entire school. This illustrates the new nature of its development in this area.

The first class schools to be chosen in the study were selected from the Washington Education Directory. (30)

I. FIRST SURVEY

The first survey disclosed the number of schools meeting John I. Goodlad's conditions of nongradedness. These conditions were:

1. Graded expectations and graded nomenclature have been removed.

2. The ceilings and floors of expectancy have been widened in order to account for the range of individuality in an instructional group.

3. Curricular activities are organized around longitudinal organizing elements rather than according to a uniform set of expectancies for the year.

4. Every possible effort is made to diagnose the needs of individual learners and to intervene in their education according to individual progress and need.

5. Standards of performance are based upon criteria of performance rather than group norms.

The graph in Figure 1 highlights the degree of nongradedness found in 21 schools, while Table 1 charts and identifies the towns, schools, and the areas within the schools which were analyzed in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>Scores of Nongradedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WAPATO - INTERMEDIATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>YAKIMA - HOOVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ELLensburg - LINCOLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>WAPATO - PRIMARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EAST WENATCHEE - GRANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WALLA WALLA - PAINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MOSES LAKE - PENINSULA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>WALLA WALLA - WASHINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>RICHLAND - MARCUS WHITMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KENNEWICK - FRUITLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>WENATCHEE - LINCOLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WENATCHEE - WASHINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SELAH - SUNSET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ELLensburg - MT. STUART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>EAST WENATCHEE - CASCADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WALLA WALLA - JEFFERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RICHLAND - SPALDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>KENNEWICK - WASHINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>KENNEWICK - VISTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>WENATCHEE - LEWIS &amp; CLARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>WENATCHEE - COLUMBIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Nongradedness Found in 21 Schools
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWNS</th>
<th>SCHOOLS</th>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wapato</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Migrant, Underachiever</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yakima</td>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>Grades 4-6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ellensburg</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>$4\frac{1}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wapato</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>$4\frac{1}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. East Wenatchee</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Nongraded Primary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Walla Walla</td>
<td>Paine</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Moses Lake</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>$3\frac{1}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Walla Walla</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Primary 1-2</td>
<td>$3\frac{1}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Richland</td>
<td>Marcus Whitman</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>$3\frac{1}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kennewick</td>
<td>Fruitland</td>
<td>2 Cont. Growth</td>
<td>$3\frac{1}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Wenatchee</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Inter. Reading</td>
<td>$3\frac{1}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Wenatchee</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>$3\frac{1}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Selah</td>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ellensburg</td>
<td>Mt. Stuart</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. East Wenatchee</td>
<td>Cascade</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Walla Walla</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Richland</td>
<td>Spalding</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Kennewick</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>All (Cont. Growth)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A score of 3 or more through 5 for those schools fulfilling the conditions of the nongraded idea, in all or part of their program, was the criteria for selection of schools for the second survey. Principals used their own subjective judgment as to whether their schools were fulfilling each of five conditions either fully, partially, or not at all. If fully was checked, the school received a score of 1 for that condition. If partially was checked, the school received a score of \( \frac{1}{2} \) for that condition. A sample survey is in the Appendix.

In the first survey, 47 schools were contacted by mail. Forty-four schools responded and 3 did not respond.
scoring. It, also, lists the amount of the total scoring by schools. Both charts share the same numbering of school systems.

A look at Table 1 tells one that a nongraded situation is being attempted in a variety of special areas as well as in entire schools.

They range from all of the school participating to special groups such as primary, intermediate, intermediate reading, migrant, underachiever, and special education classes. Two classes in two different schools were viewed as continuous growth experiments. These embryonic gestures toward nongrading must be considered when analyzing results of the second survey of teachers.

The first part of the first survey has not been mentioned before. (See Appendix B) It concerned school organization. It was included as a warm-up exercise for the survey concerning conditions of organization. It was expected that persons completing it would be using a variety of criteria to decide whether or not they had a nongraded situation in their particular school. Goodlad speaks of this when he talks about statistics.

Consequently, it is almost impossible to report accurate statistics, especially when there is still considerable disagreement and misunderstanding with respect to the precise nature of nongraded school. (14:207)

The principals identified their schools and experimental classrooms in many ways, as the following figure reveals. Only two classified their schools as nongraded as shown in Table 2. In contrast, the writer identified 21 schools or areas within
Table 2

Warm-Up Survey of Principals of 44 Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Classification</th>
<th>Survey Tally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded Primary with Remaining Classes Graded</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded Intermediate with Remaining Classes Graded</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Elementary Nongraded</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Nongraded Classes</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other *</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 7 principals did not check rectangles.

Criteria Established by Principals Themselves
these schools as exhibiting positive characteristics of nongradedness. Table 1 has illustrated this identification.

Upon averaging all the degrees of nongradedness, as shown in Figure 1, the writer found that 3.57 was the average score of a possible score of 5. (Figure 2)

This would indicate that, on the average, Central Washington schools are not fully meeting the criteria of nongradedness as set forth by John I. Goodlad, but are, on the average, meeting it to a degree of approximately 71+%.

On the basis of this finding, the writer has reasoned that the results of the second survey regarding 16 tasks of individualizing instruction will be influenced by teachers who have been in schools, which on the average, are not fully nongraded.

A further analysis of the first survey reports is shown in the Comparative Table of Responses, Table 3. Here the percentiles of markings for each condition are shown in order of their values when fully and partially scores were added together. This table gives one an idea as to the priority each condition is receiving in each school as the condition is conceived by the principal of the school.

Condition 4 was marked the most frequently. It was:

Every possible effort is made to diagnose the needs of individual learners and to intervene in their education according to individual progress and need.

Condition 5 was marked the next most frequently. It was:
21 CENTRAL WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS'
AVERAGE SCORES MEETING CONDITIONS
OF NONGRADEDNESS

Average Scoring of 21 Schools Shown in Degrees of
Nongradedness

Survey I Criteria Established by John I. Goodlad

Conditions were met either in selected classrooms or
in the entire school.

Fig. 2
CONDITIONS

1. Every possible effort is made to diagnose the needs of individual learners and to intervene in their education according to individual progress and need.

2. Standards of performance are based upon criteria of performance rather than group norms.

3. Curricular activities are organized around longitudinal organizing elements rather than according to a uniform set of expectancies for the year.

4. The ceilings and floors of expectancy have been widened in order to account for the range of individuality in an instructional group.

5. Graded expectations and graded nomenclature have been removed.

Comparative Table of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition 1</th>
<th>Condition 2</th>
<th>Condition 3</th>
<th>Condition 4</th>
<th>Condition 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standards of performance are based upon criteria of performance rather than group norms.

Condition 1 received the lowest marking of **fully and partially**.

It was:

Graded expectations and graded nomenclature have been removed.

Figure 3a-e shows a more complete analysis of the first survey results. It compares each condition's markings of **fully and partially** with **fully** and no markings at all. The conditions are placed in the order of priority John I. Goodlad used (See Appendix) when he listed the criteria. It is interesting to observe on Table 3, that Goodlad's number one condition is marked by principals as the least important. The condition Goodlad placed in number two position is second from the last as rated by principals. Goodlad's number three condition is, also, number three with the principals. Goodlad's number five condition is ranked by the principals as next highest in priority in their schools, while Goodlad's number four condition is ranked by the principals as that one condition enjoying the highest priority in their schools.

This judgment as to priority marking of the conditions is based on the average number of total responses for each item. The comparing of Goodlad's order of listing criteria and the principals' average order of rating criteria is a matter for speculation and thought. The writer would venture to state that principals have not met condition one to a great extent because they have found it difficult to do away with grade labels and graded nomenclature.
1. Graded expectations and graded nomenclature have been removed.

2. The ceilings and floors of expectancy have been widened in order to account for the range of individuality in an instructional group.

3. Curricular activities are organized around longitudinal organizing elements rather than according to a uniform set of expectancies for the year.
1. Every possible effort is made to diagnose the needs of individual learners and to intervene in their education according to individual progress and need.

5. Standards of performance are based upon criteria of performance rather than group norms.

* John I. Goodlad's current thinking regarding the nature of a nongraded school. (The conditions of the nongraded idea were spelled out in a letter to this author, October 6, 1969.)
One of the principals hinted at this when he wrote this comment on the survey form: (See Appendix E)

We use the grade names (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) because the parents understand it. We teach the kids because we understand them.

Condition two would be difficult for respondents to score highly on the survey form as the presence of grade labels and grade expectations blocks the full "widening of ceilings and floors of expectancy to account for the range of individuality in an instructional group." To have an ideal nongradedness situation, the writer believes, these "ceilings and floors of expectancy" should not be arbitrarily constricted by any form of gradedness, but should allow the child to continually progress as his unique development dictates.

II. SECOND SURVEY

The second survey (See Appendix C) was mailed to teachers in 21 first class schools which met the necessary degrees of nongradedness compiled during the first survey. The schools in which these teachers perform scored a rating of from 3-5 on the principals' survey. (Table 1) Two teachers in each of these schools were requested by their principals to score Substantial, Moderate, or Minimal according to the "extent or degree ... teaching under conditions of nongradedness permits teachers to operate more freely with respect to ... instructional decisions."

In illustrating teachers ranking of instructional decisions, the author arranged a chart which is shown on Table 4. It combines
Table 4
Teachers' Ranking of Decisions in Terms of the Problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Decision #</th>
<th>Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td># 2</td>
<td>Checking what a child already knows before determining the degree of complexity and the degree of difficulty in which he will work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td># 5</td>
<td>Evaluating on the basis of change or improvement in individual rates of growth and development rather than by a fixed standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td># 3</td>
<td>Communicating with pupils singly or in small groups as opposed to sending oral messages to &quot;whom it may concern.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td># 16</td>
<td>Finding more freedom to individualize the task, what the learner does to achieve it, and what the teacher does to assist him in a self-contained classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td># 13</td>
<td>Providing many ways of learning, thereby, helping the student learn how to learn. (Ex., reading and reporting, reading and performing, audio-visual techniques, creative writing, discussion with individuals or groups; constructing models or dioramas.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td># 9</td>
<td>Varying learning activities so that all pupils are participating in some learning activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td># 7</td>
<td>Utilization of a variety of resources for in and out of class use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Decision #</th>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>Substantially and Moderately Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td># 14</td>
<td>Providing for extra help and enrichment through planning or allowing use of extra class time while other pupils are completing a given task or mastering a given concept or skill. (Timing needed to complete a task.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td># 8</td>
<td>Making a variety of assignments for both in-class and out-of-class work. (Selected at least partly by pupils themselves.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td># 1</td>
<td>Thoughtfully making decisions on the basis of a child's learning needs as to whether the task should be accomplished alone or in a group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td># 12</td>
<td>Adopting resource person and helper role--pupils contribute to direction or content of the lesson with the opportunity to lead and initiate change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td># 15</td>
<td>Utilizing a team teaching situation with more alternatives in teaching style and competence, more dimensions in grouping, and more professional knowledge in diagnosis and prescription.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td># 4</td>
<td>Varying communication messages in type and difficulty for different pupils in order to make sure understanding exists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td># 6</td>
<td>Planning a program after surveying your group to discover what interest each child would like to follow, and considering interests in the light of access of materials, space, and the need for adult guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Decision #</th>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>Substantially and Moderately Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 #</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Identifying with your class situations that cause problems. Problem solving ways to deal with these that acceptable behavior patterns may be chosen as a response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 #</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Determining already learned psychomotor skills in an effort to decide the appropriate tasks to help a child perceive what he is to do to achieve further.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substantially and Moderately according to frequency of answers and places each in the order of their ranking of individualized instructional tasks which the teachers feel the most free to use within a nongradedness situation as opposed to other organizational structures. In Central Washington this would naturally be compared with the long-utilized gradedness structure in which most teachers have operated.

Decision #2 ranked first in priority with the teachers. It was:

Checking what a child already knows before determining the degree of complexity and the degree of difficulty in which he will work.

Decision #10 was ranked as #16 in instructional decisions which allowed more freedom to perform teaching tasks under a nongradedness structure. Decision #10 was:

Determining already learned psychomotor skills in an effort to decide the appropriate tasks to help a child perceive what he is to do to achieve further.

These rankings were compiled on the strength of 100% returns and were averaged on this basis. (See Appendix F)

Table 5 illustrates the percentiles of findings in each category, and is compiled to record a complete analysis of the second survey. The individualized task decisions are shown together with the percentages applying to each task.

The degree that nongradedness permits Central Washington teachers to perform more freely in instructional decisions, in the opinion of the teachers, was found by averaging all 16 tasks and their
1. Thoughtfully making decisions on the basis of a child's learning needs as to whether the task should be accomplished alone or in a group.

2. Checking what a child already knows before determining the degree of complexity and the degree of difficulty in which he will work.

3. Communicating with pupils singly or in small groups as opposed to sending oral messages to "whom it may concern".

4. Varying communication messages in type and difficulty for different pupils in order to make sure understanding exists.

5. Evaluating on the basis of change or improvement in individual rates of growth and development rather than by a fixed standard.

6. Planning a program after surveying your group to discover what interest each child would like to follow, and considering interests in the light of access of materials, space, and the need for adult guidance.

7. Utilization of a variety of resources for in and out of class use.

8. Making a variety of assignments for both in-class and out-of-class work, (Selected at least partly by pupils themselves.)
9. Varying learning activities so that all pupils are participating in some learning activity.

10. Determining already learned psychomotor skills in an effort to decide the appropriate tasks to help a child perceive what he is to do to achieve further.

11. Identifying with your class situations that cause problems. Problem solving ways to deal with these that acceptable behavior patterns may be chosen as a response.

12. Adopting resource person and helper role—pupils contribute to direction or content of the lesson with the opportunity to lead and initiate change.

13. Providing many ways of learning, thereby, helping the student learn how to learn. (Ex: reading and reporting, reading and performing, audio visual techniques, creative writing, discussion with individuals or groups; constructing models or dioramas.)

14. Providing for extra help and enrichment through planning or allowing use of extra class time while other pupils are completing a given task or mastering a given concept or skill. (Timing needed to complete a task.)

15. Utilizing a team teaching situation with more alternatives in teaching style and competence, more dimensions in grouping, and more professional knowledge in diagnosis and prescription.

16. Finding more freedom to individualize the task, what the learner does to achieve it, and what the teacher does to assist him in a self-contained classroom.
markings. Total percentages demonstrating these averages are to be found on Table 6.

All 16 tasks were supported substantially and moderately by 85.04% of the markings. Fifty-four and nine-tenths of the number of markings supported these tasks substantially, 30.14% of the time, moderately, and 10.3-% of the time, minimally. No markings appeared 4.6+% of the time.

The writer would remind readers that the 85.04% average of markings was made by teachers working in schools which are fulfilling, on the average, about 71+% of the criteria for nongradedness as suggested by John I. Goodlad, therefore, it is likely that the true effectiveness of all of these tasks cannot be fully known by the average teacher marking the survey.

III. SUMMARY

Findings of the study indicate that 85+% of the teachers surveyed in 21 schools felt that both substantially and moderately they could support their freedom to perform 16 individualized tasks of teaching in a nongraded situation as opposed to any other school organizational structure. (See Appendix F)

The first survey indicated that teachers taking part in the survey were from schools, which on the average, met Goodlad's conditions of nongradedness by a scoring of 3.57 out of a possible scoring of 5. (Table 1) This revealed that teachers performing these tasks were not, on the average, performing them as freely as
### DEGREES OF A 4.2 TEACHER SURVEY--TOTAL PERCENTAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent or Degree</th>
<th>Substantially and Moderately</th>
<th>Substantially</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Minimally</th>
<th>No Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of 16 Tasks of Individualizing</td>
<td>85.04%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>30.14%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extent or Degree Nongradedness Permits Central Washington Teachers to Perform More Freely in Instructional Decision Making.

Table 6
they would be under a fully nongraded situation. Therefore, many of them had not really experienced the freedom to perform under these conditions, making it more difficult to make judgments regarding this freedom.
The null hypothesis has been rejected on the basis of the results of the study regarding TEACHER PERFORMANCE IN THE NONGRADED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF CENTRAL WASHINGTON.

Eighty-five plus percent of the teachers surveyed felt that substantially and moderately they could support their freedom to perform sixteen tasks of individualizing instruction in a nongraded situation. Of the 85+%, 54+% supported it, on the average, substantially, 30+% moderately, and 10% minimally, while 4+%, did not mark anything.

The first study identified schools and classrooms which fulfilled over half of the conditions set forth by Dr. Goodlad as being those conditions which accompany the nongraded idea. Three and fifty-seven hundredths was the total average scoring of the 21 schools which qualified for meeting over half of those conditions. A score of 3 for each school was the minimum acceptable. Five would have been a perfect average score.

It must be remembered that nongradedness in Central Washington is embryonic in nature. Some of the schools have just begun to use
the nongraded structure, while others are in the planning and the experimental stages as evidenced by the first study. Central Washington teachers are well on the path toward leaving their fresh imprints on nongradedness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The writer's recommendations on the basis of this study are:

1. that more schools in Central Washington take note of the opinions of teachers in the supporting of the performance of tasks of individualizing instruction in a nongraded curriculum structure as opposed to a graded one.

2. that schools recognizing these results adopt a thoroughly comprehensive nongraded program of their own, building the structure on the sound basis of the criteria John I. Goodlad has purported here.

3. that school systems now operating within a partially nongraded structure eliminate graded nomenclature and graded expectations, so that the "ceilings and floors of expectancy" can be further strengthened and widened for "the range of individuality in an instructional group."

4. that in order to accomplish recommendations 1, 2, and 3, it is important that:

   a. teachers are made aware of the nature of nongradedness and of its efficiency in helping them perform tasks of individualizing instruction. (This may be accomplished
through inservice training.)

b. the school board, parents, and students be prepared to appreciate the individual attention nongradedness affords. (This may be accomplished through a sound public relations program.)

c. administrators be thoroughly prepared to guide and direct a truly successful nongradedness program. (This may be accomplished by making a thorough study of basic principles of organization and through observation of successful programs.)
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APPENDIX A

JOHN I. GOODLAD CORRESPONDENCE
September 27, 1969

John I. Goodlad, Dean
Office of the Dean
Graduate School of Education
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dear Dr. Goodlad:

As you are aware, I am beginning a thesis study on "the extent to which a nongraded" elementary "structure permits teachers to operate more freely with respect to instructional decisions" as per your suggestions.

I was very pleased to secure the cooperation of three outstanding members of Central's Education Department as a thesis committee: Drs. James Monasmith, Chairman, Byron DeShaw and Robert Carlton. Dr. Carlton clearly remembers your last visit to Ellensburg, and all of the committee members were extremely pleased that you responded to my inquiry as you did in your letter of July 14th.

Dr. Monasmith is a dynamic individual, vitally interested in curriculum. He has a "go-getter" type personality and reputation on campus. His education lectures sing with vitality and interest. He immediately recognized as I did, the challenge in your suggestion, and I feel that we are going to make a credible effort "to study the performance of teachers" in the nongraded elementary schools of Central Washington.

At this point, I am curious as to what your favorite definition of nongradedness is. We are doing a study within the study to determine what schools are "nongraded" vs. those which are "graded". Neither the Superintendent of Public Instruction or WEA have an adequate list of those schools in Central Washington, which are nongraded.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Helen K. Dickson

Please Note:
Personal data has been redacted due to privacy concerns.
July 2, 1969

John I. Goodlad, Dean
Office of the Dean
Graduate School of Education
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dear Dr. Goodlad:

While rereading yours and Mr. Anderson's text, THE NONGRADED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, I was struck by your comment on research on page PVii stating, "Research into this problem remains quite unimaginative and dependent upon outmoded designs or instruments."

I am preparing a proposal for a thesis for an M Ed degree in Curriculum Supervision and had planned to entitle it, THE EMERGENCE OF THE NONGRADED ELEMENTARY CURRICULUM IN CENTRAL WASHINGTON.

I am writing you because I understand you were teaching at Ellensburg about ten summers ago.

It was my thought that I would like to examine information regarding schools in this area which have adopted a so-called "nongraded" approach to see just how adequate, imaginative, and practicable they are from the viewpoint of the "Ernie's" and for the other children ranging upwards in the continuum of individual differences found in every school.

I know you are a busy person, yet I am risking a little infringement on your time in order that I might come up with a meaningful study at Central that would be a worthwhile, though small, contribution to those being made in the field of nongradedness. Is there a slant to this you would like to see investigated in your area?

I have seen your lectures in movies and have participated in in-service training at Redfield, South Dakota, a six hundred student school, held to acquaint teachers with the idea of nongradedness. I am "sold".

So, also, is my young elementary principal at Entiat, a 235 student graded elementary school in Chelan County, Washington.

Please Note:
Personal data has been redacted due to privacy concerns.
The more we learn, the fewer pitfalls we will encounter when we move to a nongraded program.

However, my immediate concern is my question to you regarding the investigation to be made. Is there a worthwhile slant to this investigation which I may have missed?

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Helen K. Dickson
Dear Mrs. Dickson:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding The Nongraded Elementary School. At no point in my work have I maintained that the nongraded elementary school automatically results in improved performance of various kinds on the part of children. Rather, nongradedness affords teachers an opportunity to provide more individualized instruction.

My suggestion regarding your thesis is that you study the extent to which a nongraded structure permits teachers to operate more freely with respect to instructional decisions. To study the performance of children as an end product in the nongraded school is a mistake. To study the performance of teachers would be a most significant contribution.

Yes, I have participated in teaching at Central State College in Ellensburg. I was there during the summer of 1960, participating in a workshop on nongrading.

Since I grew up in the Northwest, I have an unusually involved interest in educational activities in that part of the country. I will be very interested in what you attempt to do.

Sincerely yours,

John L. Goodlad
Dean

Please note:
This signature has been redacted due to security reasons.

Please Note:
Personal data has been redacted due to privacy concerns.
Mrs. Helen K. Dickson

Dear Mrs. Dickson:

Responding to your letter of September 27, I have no favorite definition of nongradedness. Rather, it is necessary to spell out the conditions which accompany the nongraded idea. Recognizing its inadequacies, let me try the following:

1. The nongraded school is one in which graded expectations and graded nomenclature have been removed.

2. The nongraded school is one in which the ceilings and floors of expectancy have been widened in order to account for the range of individuality in an instructional group.

3. The nongraded school is one in which curricular activities are organized around longitudinal organizing elements rather than according to a uniform set of expectancies for the year.

4. The nongraded school is one in which every possible effort is made to diagnose the needs of individual learners and to intervene in their education according to individual progress and need.

5. The nongraded school is one in which standards of performance are based upon criteria of performance rather than group norms.

At least this provides you with some of my current thinking regarding the nature of a nongraded school. Most of these ideas have been embraced by Dr. Daniel Purdom in his doctoral dissertation which soon will be published through the [I|D|E|A] organization.

Cordially yours,

John I. Goodlad, Dean
APPENDIX B

SURVEY LETTER FORMS

FIRST SURVEY
Please indicate by check mark the type of organization being utilized in your school.

1. Nongraded primary with remaining classes graded. □
2. Nongraded intermediate with remaining classes graded. □
3. Entire elementary nongraded □
4. No nongraded classes □
5. Other (Please explain below.) □

THIS CONCLUDES THE FIRST PART OF OUR SURVEY CONCERNING SCHOOL ORGANIZATION.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE SECOND PART OF OUR SURVEY CONCERNING CONDITIONS OF ORGANIZATION, WHICH MAY BE FOUND ON THE NEXT PAGE.

(PLEASE TURN PAGE)
NONGRADEDNESS IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF CENTRAL WASHINGTON

Please check one column after each statement. (You have three choices.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITIONS DEFINED *</th>
<th>FULLY</th>
<th>PARTIALLY</th>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graded expectations and graded nomenclature have been removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The ceilings and floors of expectancy have been widened in order to account for the range of individuality in an instructional group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Curricular activities are organized around longitudinal organizing elements rather than according to a uniform set of expectancies for the year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Every possible effort is made to diagnose the needs of individual learners and to intervene in their education according to individual progress and need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Standards of performance are based upon criteria of performance rather than group norms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* John I. Goodlad's curriculums thinking regarding the nature of a nongraded school. (The conditions of the nongraded idea were spelled out in a letter to this author, October 7, 1969.)
APPENDIX C

SURVEY LETTER FORMS

SECOND SURVEY
To what extent or degree does teaching under conditions of nongradedness permit teachers to operate more freely with respect to the following instructional decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantial Degree</th>
<th>Moderate Degree</th>
<th>Minimal Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thoughtfully making decisions on the basis of a child's learning needs as to whether the task should be accomplished alone or in a group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Checking what a child already knows before determining the degree of complexity and the degree of difficulty in which he will work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicating with pupils singly or in small groups as opposed to sending oral messages to &quot;whom it may concern&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Varying communication messages in type and difficulty for different pupils in order to make sure understanding exists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluating on the basis of change or improvement in individual rates of growth and development rather than by a fixed standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Planning a program after surveying your group to discover what interest each child would like to follow, and considering interests in the light of access of materials, space, and the need for adult guidance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Utilization of a variety of resources for in and out of class use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Making a variety of assignments for both in-class and out-of-class work. (Selected at least partly by pupils themselves.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Varying learning activities so that all pupils are participating in some learning activity.

10. Determining already learned psycho-motor skills in an effort to decide the appropriate tasks to help a child perceive what he is to do to achieve further.

11. Identifying with your class situations that cause problems. Problem solving ways to deal with those that acceptable behavior patterns may be chosen as a response.

12. Adopting resource person and helper role—pupils contribute to direction or content of the lesson with the opportunity to lead and initiate change.

13. Providing many ways of learning, thereby, helping the student learn how to learn. (Ex. reading and reporting, reading and performing, audio visual techniques, creative writing, discussion with individuals or groups; constructing models or dioramas.)

14. Providing for extra help and enrichment through planning or allowing use of extra class time while other pupils are completing a given task or mastering a given concept or skill. (Timing needed to complete a task.)

15. Utilizing a team teaching situation with more alternatives in teaching style and competence, more dimensions in grouping, and more professional knowledge in diagnosis and prescription.

16. Finding more freedom to individualize the task, what the learner does to achieve it, and what the teacher does to assist him in a self-contained classroom.

References: Indicators of Quality, Key Concepts of Individualization
Assn. of Public School Services, Columbia University

Dr. Madeline Hunter, Univ.Ed. School at UCLA, directed by John I. Goodlad Instructor, March, 1970
"Tailor Your Teaching to Individualized Instruction"
APPENDIX D

DR. CRESCIMBENI CORRESPONDENCE
3-2-70

Mr. Joseph Crescimbeni,
Jacksonville University,
% Random House Publishers,
New York, New York

Dear Sir:

Your book regarding INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL is highly interesting to me. You and Mr. Thomas have accomplished an extremely worthwhile book, easily understood and most instructive.

By way of introduction, I am an experienced, middle age, but hopefully creatively flexible teacher. At present, I am completing work toward a Specialty in Curriculum Director work and happen to be working on a thesis regarding Teacher Performance in the Nongraded Elementary Schools of Central Washington. Naturally, this will include the featuring of techniques in individualizing instruction.

I note that you have not mentioned the nongraded structure as being necessary or needed as an organizational pattern to achieve success in individualizing.

I sense that you have not mentioned this for several concrete reasons. Would you feel free to share your thoughts with me regarding the advantages or disadvantages of using nongradedness as a setting for individualizing? If you would care to write an answer to this question, I would very much appreciate hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Helen K. Dickson

Please note:
This signature has been redacted due to security reasons.
Office of the Dean

21 March 1970

Mrs. Helen K. Dickson

Dear Mrs. Dickson:

Thank you for your kind letter of March 2nd regarding our textbook, INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. We are most happy that you found the book useful and practical to fit your educational philosophy.

Dr. Thomas and I are both firm believers in the nongraded school structure, and true nongradedness as an organizational pattern for grouping children is really a reflection of individualized instruction. Our book was intended as a vehicle of classroom execution for the classroom teacher who is in the graded classroom building. Too often, teachers state that they cannot become flexible or individualistic in their teaching because of the existing classroom-grade level structure. We feel such teachers are wrong, and that every teacher can and, indeed, must individualize her teaching if she is going to be justified for her professional responsibilities.

Nongraded classrooms are very prevalent here in Florida, and it was in this State where John Goodlad devised the idea of a nongraded school. Consequently, we all hold some personal pride for this type of academic structure, which we feel will be most beneficial for the youngsters in our schools.

True nongradedness implies individualization of instruction. This is the ideal situation.

Best wishes to you in your academic work and on your forthcoming thesis. There is a great deal of literature available on nongraded schools and you should have access to a great deal of information for your thesis.

Sincerely

Joseph Crescimbeni, Ph.D.
Dean of the Faculty

Please note:
This signature has been redacted due to security reasons.
Please Note:
Personal data has been redacted due to privacy concerns.
Mrs. Helen K. Dickson

Dear Mrs. Dickson:

Our Elementary Department reports that there are few ungraded elementary schools in the central part of the state. Hebeler Elementary School, the campus school at Central Washington State College, and South Wenatchee Elementary School are ungraded.

If you wish a list of the schools in the Puget Sound region, we can provide them for you.

Sincerely yours,

Louis Bruno
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Please note: This signature has been redacted due to security reasons.

Please Note: Personal data has been redacted due to privacy concerns.
Mrs. H. Dickson

Dear Mrs. Dickson:

Your recent card has been directed to our office for reply.

The State Department has not published materials on individualizing instruction. Some of our staff members have mimeographed some of their ideas that are closely related. A copy of one of these is enclosed. It was written by Lois H. Roth and deals with the field of reading.

You should contact Mrs. Alice McGrath, ISD Superintendent, Intermediate School District 104, Box 605, Ephrata, Washington 98823. A special project in individualizing instruction was conducted in nine counties and include 154 elementary teachers. This was a Title III Project completed last year and represents the largest single state endeavor in individualizing instruction.

Sincerely yours,

DIVISION OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Robert Groeschell
Director of Elementary Education

RG:hh

Enc.

Please note:
This signature has been redacted due to security reasons.

Please Note:
Personal data has been redacted due to privacy concerns.
Dear Teacher,

The work you are performing in your school has been selected as a representative sample for a teacher survey of schools operating under certain conditions of nongradedness. These conditions were the criteria for an earlier survey sent to your principal this year.

This study is to ascertain the "extent or degree that teaching under conditions of nongradedness permits teachers to operate more freely with respect to instructional decisions".

It would be appreciated if you would complete the form by checking appropriate degrees under "substantial, moderate, and minimal".

These surveys are being made to fulfill requirements for a Master's Thesis at Central Washington State College to be written this summer. The information you furnish us is vital to securing the data necessary for the study.

We would very much appreciate your cooperation in returning these forms in the enclosed envelope on or before April 30th.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Helen K. Dickson.

Incl. 2

Please note:
This signature has been redacted due to security reasons.

Please Note:
Personal data has been redacted due to privacy concerns.
Dear Sir:

Your school has been rated as achieving a score of 3 or better on a total scale of 5 for schools in central Washington which fulfill the philosophical conditions of nongradedness as suggested by Goodlad.

The second half of our survey concerns teacher performance and attempts to discover the "extent or degree that teaching under conditions of nongradedness permits teachers to operate more freely with respect to instructional decisions".

We would appreciate it if you would distribute it together with the teacher letter to teachers on your staff. Choice of staff members receiving same is left to your discretion.

It would be most helpful to have the forms returned in the enclosed envelope on or before April 30th.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Helen K. Dickson

Incl.

Please note:
This signature has been redacted due to security reasons.

Please Note:
Personal data has been redacted due to privacy concerns.
Please indicate by check mark the type of organization being utilized in your school.

1. Nongraded primary with remaining classes graded. □
2. Nongraded intermediate with remaining classes graded. □
3. Entire elementary nongraded □
4. No nongraded classes □
5. Other (Please explain below.) x

We still use grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc. . . . Please the grades names because the parents understand them;
Not using the kids because we understand them.

THIS CONCLUDES THE FIRST PART OF OUR SURVEY CONCERNING SCHOOL ORGANIZATION.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE SECOND PART OF OUR SURVEY CONCERNING CONDITIONS OF ORGANIZATION, WHICH MAY BE FOUND ON THE NEXT PAGE.

(Please turn page)
APPENDIX F

TALLIES
Please indicate by check mark the type of organization being utilized in your school.

1. Nongraded primary with remaining classes graded.

2. Nongraded intermediate with remaining classes graded.

3. Entire elementary nongraded

4. No nongraded classes

5. Other (Please explain below.)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

THIS CONCLUDES THE FIRST PART OF OUR SURVEY CONCERNING SCHOOL ORGANIZATION.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE SECOND PART OF OUR SURVEY CONCERNING CONDITIONS OF ORGANIZATION, WHICH MAY BE FOUND ON THE NEXT PAGE.

(PLEASE TURN PAGE)
### Tally Survey #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Partially Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 12% Marked Fully</td>
<td>4½ 23½ 10</td>
<td>28 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 35% Marked Fully</td>
<td>12 22 7</td>
<td>34 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 25% Marked Fully</td>
<td>10 26 4</td>
<td>36 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 48.75% Marked Fully</td>
<td>21 21 1</td>
<td>43 91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 21.9% Marked Fully</td>
<td>9 30 2</td>
<td>39 95.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**: 32½ 122½ 24
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey 2. Tally</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Thoughtfully making decisions on the basis of a child's learning needs as to whether the task should be accomplished alone or in a group.</td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Checking what a child already knows before determining the degree of complexity and the degree of difficulty in which he will work.</td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicating with pupils singly or in small groups as opposed to sending oral messages to &quot;whom it may concern&quot;.</td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Varying communication messages in type and difficulty for different pupils in order to make sure understanding exists.</td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluating on the basis of change or improvement in individual rates of growth and development rather than by a fixed standard.</td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Planning a program after surveying your group to discover what interest each child would like to follow, and considering interests in the light of access of materials, space, and the need for adult guidance.</td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Utilization of a variety of resources for in and out of class use.</td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Making a variety of assignments for both in-class and out-of-class work. (Selected at least partly by pupils themselves.)</td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Varying learning activities so that all pupils are participating in some learning activity.

10. Determining already learned psycho-motor skills in an effort to decide the appropriate tasks to help a child perceive what he is to do to achieve further.

11. Identifying with your class situations that cause problems. Problem solving ways to deal with these that acceptable behavior patterns may be chosen as a response.

12. Adopting resource person and helper role—pupils contribute to direction or content of the lesson with the opportunity to lead and initiate change.

13. Providing many ways of learning, thereby, helping the student learn how to learn. (Ex. reading and reporting, reading and performing, audio visual techniques, creative writing, discussion with individuals or groups; constructing models or dioramas.)

14. Providing for extra help and enrichment through planning or allowing use of extra class time while other pupils are completing a given task or mastering a given concept or skill. (Timing needed to complete a task.)

15. Utilizing a team teaching situation with more alternatives in teaching style and competence, more dimensions in grouping, and more professional knowledge in diagnosis and prescription.

16. Finding more freedom to individualize the task, what the learner does to achieve it, and what the teacher does to assist him in a self-contained classroom.
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