# DETERMINING EDUCATIONAL GOAL PRIORITIES IN A SECONDARY SCHOOL

Thomas C. McGuire and Joseph M. Petrosko

CSE Report No. 92 July 1974

Evaluation Technologies Program Center for the Study of Evaluation UCLA Graduate School of Education Los Angeles, California

### **SUMMARY**

- 1. One hundred and eighty five students, teachers, and parents from a suburban secondary school rated a number of educational goals on a five-point scale of importance. The goals were developed by the Evaluation Technologies Program of the Center for the Study of Evaluation. Four groups of subjects each rated sets of about 60 goals and one group a set of 64 more general "supergoals." (Students, teachers, and parents were represented in all groups.) Finally, one group of students rated the complete set of 234 secondary goals.
- 2. Students, teachers, and parents tended to attach similar importance to the same goals. Goals in such non-academic areas as Personality Characteristics and Health and Safety were uniformly rated high while several academic areas (e.g., Science, Mathematics) fared relatively poorly in in the ratings.
- 3. Item sampling of goals resulted in comparable ratings to a procedure where item sampling was not used. Those students who rated small decks of goals rated them about the same as those who rated an entire 234 goal set.
- 4. Ratings given to supergoals were in many cases significantly different from mean ratings of the subgoals subsumed under them. One could not confidently infer from a supergoal rating what a goal rating would be.
- 5. Students, teachers, and parents all agreed that many types of individuals should participate in the goal-rating process. A very high percentage of students who rated a set of 234 goals said that the task was boring and that there were too many goals to rate. In contrast, most of those who rated small sets of goals felt that the task was interesting.

The approach taken by the Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE) in needs-assessment evaluation stresses the gathering of information from a variety of sources. Needs assessment involves stating potential educational goals or objectives, deciding which of these are of highest priority, and determing how well the existing educational program is meeting these objectives. The latter information is used to identify the major needs of the school.

The <u>CSE Elementary School Evaluation KIT: Needs Assessment</u> (Hoepfner, Bradley, Klein, & Alkin, 1972) guides the elementary school principal in selecting, collecting and analyzing information for needs-assessment decision making. Choosing valid and reliable standardized tests to measure current student achievement is emphasized. Another feature is the collective viewpoints procedure of goal selection in which significant individuals in the school (parents, faculty, and the principal) rate educational goals for their importance on a five-interval scale.

The 106 goals in the Needs Assessment KIT refer to student outcomes in the academic, affective and psychomotor domains. Each goal consists of a title followed by a short descriptive paragraph that summarizes the attributes of a pupil who is reaching that goal. The level of generality is a compromise between the extreme specificity of a behavioral objective and the broadness of an all-encompassing statement (e.g., Goal 3B. Self-Esteem. Has a healthy self-concept, self-confidence, self-security and self-esteem).

The Evaluation Technologies Program of CSE has recently constructed a set of 234 goals of secondary education. These goals serve a parallel function to the 106 elementary goals. First, they provide a taxonomy into which tests can be categorized and evaluated (<u>CSE Secondary School Test Evaluations</u>, Hoepfner, et al., 1974). Second, they will provide a basis for the collective

viewpoints procedure in a projected secondary school Needs Assessment KIT.

Relevant individuals in a secondary school can rate the goals for importance and thus give a decision maker valuable insight into school priorities.

This report describes the first field test of the secondary goals in a school environment. The purpose of the study was to answer several questions —some pragmatic and some of a research nature. It was important to discover if raters could simply perform the task—could they readily do what was expected of them? Did they make reasonable sense out of the goals? Besides these practical issues, several research questions were investigated, all related to the fact that there is a large number of secondary goals. The 106 elementary goals can be rated in about 30 minutes. However, there are more than twice as many secondary goals, leading to the inevitable conclusion that problems may arise in motivating individuals to rate that many items. This led to the question: is it feasible to use item sampling and give each rater a reduced set of goals?

A related question concerns the relationship of the goals to the more general supergoals under which they are classed. The 234 secondary goals are each subsumed under one of 64 more general supergoals (e.g., Supergoal 8. Grammar has two goals: 8A Parts of Speech and 8B Grammar of Sentences). When individuals rate supergoals instead of goals, are the ratings about the same as those that would result from individual goal ratings?

The major research questions of the study were concentrated in four areas:

- 1. A comparison of the ratings obtained from the three populations: students, teachers, and faculty.
- 2. A comparison of the ratings obtained from a group of subjects that rated an entire 234 goal deck with groups that rated smaller decks.
- 3. A comparison of supergoal ratings with those of the individual goals

under them.

4. A survey to answer three questions: According to the raters, should the results of goal rating be incorporated into the school program? How did raters feel about the rating process (interested, bored, etc.)? What group of people (parents, community members, etc.) did the raters believe should perform the goal rating?

#### METHOD

### Subjects

The subjects were 185 individuals from a suburban area high school in Orange County, California: 68 students, 67 teachers and 50 parents. The students were members of two coeducational Physical Education classes that contained approximately equal numbers of sophomores, juniors, and seniors, males and females as well as students of various ability levels. The teachers constituted a 85% sample of an 80-person faculty. The parents consisted of volunteers attending an "open house" at the school.

### Rating Procedure

The general task of every subject was identical—to rate a number of educational goals on a five-interval scale and then complete a short questionnaire about the rating process.

The purpose of the research was explained to the subjects and they were given background information on the development of the goals and the rating system. They were then handed a manila envelope containing a set of goals or supergoals printed on IBM cards, an instruction sheet, 5 small envelopes, and 5 rating "mats" (single sheets of paper numbered 1 through 5), and a question-naire form.

The instructions directed each subject to place the rating mats on a table

from left to right. The rating mats were labeled:

- 1. Unimportant
- 2. Little importance
- 3. Average importance
- 4. Above average importance
- 5. Most important

The written instructions to the subject were as follows:

Sort the goal cards into these five categories, based on how important YOU think they are for the education of a high school student. You may place as many or as few cards as you wish in each category. If you have difficulty in rating a card, put it in the back of the deck and sort it last. There are no right and wrong answers. If you are not sure into which category a goal should be placed, put it into the one in which you feel it comes closest.

After rating the goals, the subject placed each of the 5 rated decks into the small envelopes, filled out the 3-item questionnaire, and returned all materials to the experimenter.

### Design

Parents and teachers were randomly assigned to one of five treatment groups; students to six treatment groups. Treatment groups differed in the number and type of goals they contained:

Treatment	Contents of Deck
1	58 goals
2	58 goals
3	59 goals
4	59 goals
5	<b>64</b> supergoals
6 (students only)	234 goals

The goal decks in treatments 1 through 4 were selected from the total set

of 234 goals from subject fields in the same proportions as were present in the total set. For example, about the same proportions of mathematics goals were present in treatments 1, 2, 3 and 4 as were present in the 234 goal deck. No small deck was overbalanced with goals from a particular subject area. Treatment 5 involved giving subjects the deck of supergoals and treatment 6 giving subjects (students only) the entire 234 goal deck.

Table 1 gives a complete array of the treatment conditions and subject groups, including the number of persons in each cell.

Number of Subjects in each Treatment by Subject-Group Condition

			Subject Groups				
]	[reatments		Students	Teachers	<u>Parents</u>		
1.	58 goals		n = 9	n = 12	n = 10		
2.	58 goals		n = 9	n = 12	n = 8		
3.	59 goals		n = 9	n = 12	n = 8		
4.	59 goals		n = 8	n = 13	n = 12		
5.	64 supergoals		n = 21	n = 8	n = 12		
6.	234 goals		n = 12	n = 0	n = 0		
		TOTALS	68	67	50		

#### RESULTS

### Comparison of Students, Teachers, and Faculty

The average ratings of goals and supergoals for each group is contained in Table 10 (Appendix). A conception of these ratings can be gained from examining them in a more manageable form. Table 2 displays mean ratings for the combined

sample of sixteen major goal areas, with each mean representing an average over approximately 14 goals. Table 3 shows the ten highest rated goals for the three populations. Goals in the areas of Personality Characteristics, Health and Safety, Driver and Traffic Safety were consistently rated quite high while Music, Science, Industrial Arts, and Mathematics ranked rather low. Other specific subject-matter areas such as English and Social Studies fell somewhere in the middle of the range.

TABLE 2
Secondary School Goal Areas and the Rated Importance

Goal Area	Mean Rating
Personality Characteristics (Temperament, Attitudinal Factors of Achievement, Social Behavior)	4.35
Health and Safety (Physical and Mental Health; Habit forming Substances; Marriage, Family and Sex Education; Public Health; Safety Education)	3.94
Oriver and Traffic Safety (Safe Driving, Vehicle Purchase, and Maintenance)	3.82
Intellectual Skills (Understanding, Memory, Systematic Reason- ing, Creativity, Evaluation)	3.66
Inglish Language Arts (Deve <b>lo</b> pmental Reading; Speech, Drama, Oral Presentation; Grammar; Writing Skills; Forms of Literature; Analysis and Evaluation of Literature)	3.41
Social Studies (Anthropology, Economics, Geography, Government, History, Psychology, Sociology, Social Studies Skills)	3.40
Physical Education (Physical Development and Well Being; Sports and Games; Personal Impact of Physical Education)	3.29
Philosophy and Religion	3.22
/ocational Education (Knowledge and Skills for Success, General Aptitudes, General Attitudes, Interests, Perceptual and Motor Abilities)	3.15
dome Economics (Home and Family Management, Food and Meal Preparation, Clothing and Textiles)	3.13
Foreign Language (Knowledge of Elements, Mastery of Technique, Insight into a Culture, Assimilation of Language and Culture)	3.00
rts and Crafts (Knowledge, Production, Response)	2.91
Music (Knowledge, Production, Response)	2.82
Science (Biology, Chemistry, General Science, Physics)	2.82
ndustrial Arts (Arts and Practices)	2.75
Mathematics (General, Applied, Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Probability and Statistics, Advanced Math)	2.68

TABLE 3

Ten Highest Rated Goals of Students,
Teachers and Parents

		<u>Students</u>	
Rank	Goa 1		Rating
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	40a 4b 4a 16c 19c 40f 42b 16a	Interpersonal Relationships Emotional Security Motor Vehicle Laws & Rules of the Road Driver Responsibilities Personality Development Consumer Health Sensitivity & Concern Social Behavior Skills Personal Health Home Management	4.50 4.44 4.33 4.33 4.25 4.22 4.13 4.11
		<u>Teachers</u>	
Rank  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	40b 52a 43b 16c 16b 41a 41b 25b	Emotional Security Realistic Responsibility Interpersonal Relationships Personal Philosophy & Values Personality Development Nutrition Self-Concept Achievement Motivation Integration of Information Social Behavior Skills  Parents	Rating 4.83 4.83 4.77 4.75 4.67 4.67 4.58 4.54
Rank	Goal	rarents	Rating
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	41c 16c 40b 40a 4a 4b 6a 16a	School Orientation Personality Development Realistic Responsibility Emotional Security Driver Responsibilities Motor Vehicle Laws & Rules of the Road Reading Comprehension Skills Personal Health Nutrition Deductive Reasoning	4.83 4.80 4.80 4.70 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.60

Several inferential statistical tests were performed with the data. Table 4 shows the results of three t-tests based upon mean ratings from the population groups. Two t-statistics were significant beyond the .05 level, indicating significant differences among students and other groups of raters. Students tended to rate the goals lower than did teachers and parents; teachers did not rate goals lower than parents.

Table 5 displays the correlations of the mean ratings and rankings for 234 goals for the three groups of raters. Correlations based upon the rankings were significant beyond the .01 level for all combinations of rater groups, indicating some similarity in the goal ranks among the groups.

TABLE 4

Means, Variances and t-statistics for 234 Goals for 3 Groups of Raters

	Mean <u>Rating</u>	Variance	<u>t</u> 1
Students	3.05	.33	3.37* (students vs. teachers)
Teachers	3.26	.56	1.37 (teachers vs. parents)
Parents	3.35	.41	5.29* (parents vs. students)

TABLE 5

Correlations of the Mean Ratings and Rankings\*
for 234 Goals for 3 Groups of Raters

		<del></del>		
	<u>Students</u>	Teachers	Parents	
Students		.61	.52	
Teachers	.60		.79	
Parents	.51	.78		

<sup>\*</sup>Correlations based on the ratings are above the diagonal; those based on the rankings are below the diagonal (statistical tests revealed the latter 3 to be significant beyond the .01 level).

### Comparison of Goal Ratings from 234 Goal Deck with Smaller Decks

Individual t-tests were computed comparing the mean rating of each goal as part of a small deck and the mean rating of the same goal as part of the complete deck. The analyses yielded significant differences for 9 of the 234 goals (4% of the total). This approximated the chance level of frequency. Thus, item sampling of goals did not affect the ratings they received.

A correlation coefficient was computed based on the vector of means yielded from the whole-deck and small-deck procedures. Table 6 shows the results of the analysis.

TABLE 6

Results of Correlation between Mean Ratings: Goals Rated in Total Deck vs. Goals Rated in Subdecks (Student Groups Only)

Total Deck Mean = 2.94

Subdeck Mean = 3.05

n = 234

r = .58

A moderate correlation of .58 indicated a fair degree of relationship between the two goal-rating approaches. The coefficient reveals that the general pattern of goal ratings (as opposed to a comparison of the ratings goal-by-goal) was roughly the same whether derived from the whole-deck or subdeck procedure.

# Comparison of Supergoal Ratings with those of the Individual Goals Under them

Correlations were computed between the mean ratings of the supergoals and the mean ratings derived from their corresponding goals (e.g., the mean of supergoal 1 was paired with the mean of five mean ratings of the goals subsumed under supergoal 1, etc.). The standard error of estimate was also computed, where supergoal means were taken as predictors of goal means.

Table 7 shows correlations and standard errors of estimate for the three separate groups and the combined sample.

TABLE 7

Correlations of Supergoal Means with Subgoal Means and Standard Errors of Estimate, Supergoals predicting Goals

	<u>Means</u>		Standard Dev			
	Supergoals	<u>Goals</u>	<u>Supergoals</u>	Goals	<u>r</u>	<u>Se</u>
Students	2.99	3.05	.45	.58	.39	.53
Teachers	3.18	3.26	.71	.75	.74	.50
Parents	3.57	3.35	.62	.63	.61	. 50
Combined	3.20	3.24	.52	.58	.69	. 42
Sample						

A further analysis involved t tests that were computed between each supergoal mean ratings and the mean rating of their corresponding goals. Results showed that a significant difference between supergoal means and goal means existed with 23 of the 64 supergoals (about one-third of the total).

Table 8 lists those supergoals where significant differences occurred.

Many of the differences involved areas in which individual goals received high ratings, such as the areas of Personality Characteristics, Health and Safety, and English Language.

TABLE 8

Significant t-statistics (p < .05) Obtained in Comparing Supergoal Means with Corresponding Goal Means (Combined Sample)

	Supergoal	Supergoal Mean	Goal <u>Mean</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>
8.	Grammar	3.76	3.07	3,30	107
9.	Writing Skills	3.98	3.47	3.20	252
10.	Forms of Literature	3.06	3.55	2.54	115
11.	Analysis and Evaluation of Literature	2.71	3.06	2.02	117
14.	Insight into a Foreign Culture	2.65	3.13	2.13	111
16.	Physical and Mental Health	3.86	4.38	-2.91	142
19.	Public Health	3.33	3.93	-3.20	144
32.	Algebra	3.14	2.60	3.23	194
35.	Probability and Statistics	2.31	2.78	-2.71	181
37.	Knowledge of Music	2.45	2.80	-1.99	<b>19</b> 8
38.	Production of Music	2.16	2.67	-2.51	140
39.	Response to Music	2.61	3.09	-2.32	115
40.	Temperament	3.84	4.24	-2.30	227
41.	Attitudinal Factors of Achievement	<b>3.7</b> 8	4.22	-2.21	140
42.	Social Behavior	3.78	4.41	-3.33	115
43.	Philos ophy	3.22	3.69	-2.27	111
44.	Religion	2.35	2.98	-2.87	169
47.	Personal Impact of Physical Education	3.02	3.45	-2.12	144
49.	Chemistry	2.86	2.49	2.23	223
58.	Sociology	3.39	3.85	-2.72	181
60.	Knowledge and Skills for Vocational Success	3.33	2.85	2.97	266
62.	General Vocational Attitudes	3.57	3.98	-2.36	136
64.	Vocational Perceptual and Motor Abilities	3.35	2.81	2.85	214

### Survey of Rater Opinion

The survey of rater opinion elicited reactions to three questions related to the goal-rating process. Results are contained in Table 9. It was found that a high percentage of raters felt the results of the card sort should be incorporated into the school program, even if it were difficult to do so. There was agreement between most parents and teachers that the process of card sorting was "interesting." In contrast, students felt, in approximately equal percentages, that the goal rating was (a) interesting; (b) boring; (c) involved, confusing, or difficult vocabulary; and (d) required the sorting of too many cards. Ninety-two percent of the students who rated a 234 goal deck felt both that the task was boring and that it required sorting too many cards. Relatively high percentages of all respondents were of the opinion that parents, teachers, and students should participate in rating goals. A smaller percentage of students than teachers or parents thought that school administrators, school board members, or community members should rate the goals.

TABLE 9

Percentage of Each Rating Group
Responding to Each Question of Survey

Question	Students (small decks)	Students (234 goal decks)	Teacher	Parents
Do you think the results of the card sorting should be incorporated into the school program?	N=56	N=12	N=67	N=50
Yes, even if it would be difficult to incorporate the results.	18%	58%	64%	38%
Yes, if they could be incorpor- ated without difficulty	<b>7</b> 0	42	32	50
No	12	0	4	12
Check the ways that you feel about the card sorting.				
Interesting	22%	8%	72%	78%
Boring	23	92	6	0
Vocabulary confusing or difficult	23	0	7	6
Sorting procedures confusing	5	0	0	6
Too many cards to sort	21	92	0	4
Too few cards to sort	3	0	3	0
*Other	3	0	12	6
Check the groups of people you feel should do the card sort.				
Parents	64%	67%	97%	100%
Students	93	75	90	88
Teachers	90	92	100	72
School Administrators	25	25	77	82
School Board Members	48	8	72	40
Community Members	23	8	70	58

<sup>\*</sup>Of the 21 comments made within the "other" category, eight dealt with the general idea that it is very difficult to rate goals objectively. Two comments were from teachers who believed more information was needed for the students for whom the goals were intended before they could be rated effectively. The remainder dealt generally with the concern that often the descripter of a goal (or supergoal) contained some statements that the rater would rate very high and some that he/she would rate very low.

### DISCUSSION

Before discussing the results, it should be noted that there are a number of limitations to this study. First, it involved only one suburban high school in a middle class neighborhood. Strictly speaking, results should not be generalized to other types of schools. Further, many independent variables which may affect the ratings (geography, ethnicity of respondents, socio-economic status of student body) could not be explored in one small study and should be investigated in a field test involving numerous schools. Despite these caveats, the study provides valuable information on the rating process, and points up a number of interesting comparisons with the field test results of the Elementary School Evaluation KIT (Hoepfner, Bradley and Doherty, 1973).

There was a fair amount of congruence among the three groups of raters on the goal ratings and rankings, as revealed by correlations ranging from about .51 to .79. Moreover, an examination of the top 10 goals of students, teachers, and parents show many similarities. As with the elementary goal ratings, affective goals such as Personality Development and Emotional Security were consistently rated very high. Other relatively non-academic goals in the areas of Health and Driver Safety also rated prominently. While the exact implications of these results are unclear, it would appear that the presumed dominance of the "3 R's" may be illusory. Traditional subjects did not fare well in the ratings, indeed, mathematics was rated lowest of all the major goal areas. A comment made by Hoepfner, et al., (1973) in discussing the elementary goal ratings can be justifiably reiterated, "Such findings may indicate that our post-Sputnik priorities have changed (p. 40)."

Item sampling of goals appeared to be a workable procedure, at least with the student subjects that were tested in this study. Breaking up the 234 goal deck into 58 or 59 goal decks that proportionally represented the complete list

yielded comparable ratings to the whole-deck procedure.

Comparison of ratings attached to goals and those given to supergoals showed a rather large number of discrepancies. One cannot confidently predict, based on a supergoal rating, what the mean rating of its subsumed goals will be. Examination of those supergoals where discrepancies occurred indicate that many of the high-ranking goals (e.g., in Personality Characteristics) seemed to attract such high ratings that they stood considerably apart from their "fellow goals" under a supergoal. Thus, when the mean was calculated of a group of goals, it was quite different from the supergoal of the group.

The survey of raters showed consistent support for involving many individuals in the goal-rating process. Student reluctance to involve school administrators in goal rating may reflect traditional tensions between the managers and the managed (or, more cynically, the keepers and the inmates). Lack of enthusiasm from those subjects who had to rate a 234 goal deck is understandable. Rating the complete deck took as long as 75 minutes, while no person rating a smaller deck took longer than 25 minutes to complete the task.

### REFERENCES

- Hoepfner, R., Bradley, P. A., & Doherty, W. J. <u>National priorities for elementary education</u>. CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation. No. 2. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, 1973.
- Hoepfner, R., Bradley, P. A., Klein, S. P., & Alkin, M. C. <u>CSE elementary school</u> evaluation KIT: <u>Needs assessment</u>. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973.
- Hoepfner, R., Conniff. Jr., W. A., et al. <u>CSE secondary school test evaluations</u>. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, 1974. 3 vols.

APPENDI X

TABLE 10 Mean Ratings for Supergoals and Goals

Sup	ergoa	als and Goals	Students	Teachers	<u>Parents</u>	Combined Sample
1.	Know	ledge of Arts and Crafts	2.62	3.00	2.42	2.71
1	1A.	Nature and Scope of Art	3.00	3.67	3.40	3.39
2	1B.	Art Materials and Techniques	2.67	2.67	2.60	2.65
3	1C.	Art Composition and Style	2.67	2.83	2.63	2.72
4	1D.	Works of Art	2.89	3.33	2.75	3.03
5	1E.	Analysis of Art and Craft Products	3.00	2.58	2.50	2.69
2.	Prod	luction of Art and Craft Works	2.67	3,06	2.42	2.75
6	2A.	Mechanical and Hand Skills in Art	3.33	2.75	3.00	3.00
7	2B.	Compositional and Style Skills in Art	3.11	2.58	2.50	2.72
8	2C.	Subject Matter Skills in Art	2.25	3.31	2.83	2.88
3.	Resp	onse to Arts and Crafts	2.48	2.89	2.42	2.61
9	3A.	Personal Response to Arts and Crafts	2.38	3.62	3.08	3.12
10	3B.	Judgmental Response to Art	2.13	3.23	2.92	2.85
4.	Fund	lamentals of Safe Driving	4.14	3.89	4.67	4.18
11	4A.	Driver Responsibilities	4.33	4.42	4.60	4.45
12	4B.	Motor Vehicle Laws and Rules of the Road	4.33	4.25	4.60	4.39
13	4C.	Basic Driving Skills	3.44	3.83	4.00	3.76
14	4D.	Auto Accident Prevention	2.78	4.33	4.25	3.83
15	4E.	Procedure in the Event of Auto Accident	2.89	4.08	3.88	3.66

Sup	ergoa	ls and Goals	Students	Teachers	<u>Parents</u>	Combined Sample
5.		lamentals of Motor Vehicle chase and Maintenance	3.43	3.17	3.58	3.37
16	5A.	Motor Vehicle Maintenance and Repair	2.75	3.46	3.08	3.15
17	5B.	Economics of Motor Vehicle Purchase	3,38	3.62	3.42	3.48
6.	Deve	lopmental Reading	3.38	4.44	4.83	4.10
18	6A.	Reading Comprehension Skills	3.78	4.42	4.60	4.29
19	6B.	Research and Study Skills	3.33	3.92	4.40	3.90
20	6C.	Vocabulary Development and Spelling	3.33	3.58	4.00	3.65
7.	Spee	ech, Drama, and Oral Presentation	2.81	3.67	3.83	3.35
21	7A.	Organization of Ideas for Oral Presentation	2.78	3.17	3.60	3.19
22	7B.	Types of Speeches and Drama	2.89	2.83	3.20	2.97
23	7C.	Mechanics of Oral Presentation	3.22	3.08	3.50	3.26
24	7D.	Listening Habits	3.11	4.25	4.25	3.90
8.	Gram	mar	3.57	3.50	4.50	3.76
25	8A.	Parts of Speech	3.89	2.75	3.13	2.90
26	8B.	Grammar of Sentences	3.44	2.83	3.63	3.24
9.	Writ	ing Skills	3.43	4.06	4.83	3.98
27	9A.	Organization of Ideas for Writing	2.89	3.67	4.25	3.59
28	9B.	Sentence and Paragraph Development	2.89	3.83	3.75	3.52
29	9C.	Style	2.56	3.83	3.38	3.31
30	9D.	Mechanics of Writing	2.44	4.08	4.38	3.66
31	9E.	Formal Writing	3.22	3.17	3.88	3.38
32	9F.	Personal Writing	3.11	4.42	3.88	3.86
33	9G.	Creative Writing	3.11	2.67	3.38	3.00

Sup	ergoal	s and Goals	Students	<u>Teachers</u>	Parents	Combined <u>Sample</u>
10.	Forms	of Literature	2.48	3.33	3.67	3.06
34	10A.	Knowledge and Understanding of Literature	3.88	3.38	3.58	3.58
35	10B.	Sources of Literature	3.25	3,62	3.58	3.52
11.	Analy	sis and Evaluation of Literature	2.14	2.89	3.42	2.71
36	11A.	Analysis of Plot and Theme	2.63	3.15	3.33	3.09
37	11B.	Analysis of the Structure of Literary Works	3.38	2.77	2.83	2.94
38	110.	Evaluation of Literature	3.00	3.08	3.08	3.06
39	11D.	Appreciation of Literature	. 2.89	3.33	3.25	3.17
12.	Knowl Langu	edge of the Elements of a Foreign age	2.62	2.56	2.75	2.63
40	12A.	Foreign Language Writing Systems	2.56	2,92	2.60	2.71
41	12B.	Foreign Language Phonetics	2.89	2.83	2.80	2.84
42	12C.	Foreign Language Vocabulary	2.89	3.25	2.90	3.03
43	12D.	Foreign Language Grammar	2.78	3.00	2.63	2.83
13.	Maste	ry of Foreign Language Technique	2.71	2.78	2.75	2.75
44	13A.	Foreign Language Reading Ability	2.56	3,33	3.00	3.00
45	13B.	Foreign Language Listening Comprehension	2.22	3.25	3.13	2.90
46	130.	Foreign Language Writing Ability	2.78	2.33	2.75	2.59
47	13D.	Foreign Language Speaking Ability	3.56	3.17	3.38	3.34
14.	Insig	ht into a Foreign Culture	2.52	2.89	2.50	2.65
48	14A.	Literature of a Foreign Culture	2.89	2.50	2.38	2.59
49	14B.	Social-Historical Features of a Foreign Culture	2.88	4.08	3,58	3.61

Sur	pergoa	s and Goals	Students	Teachers	<u>Parents</u>	Combined Sample
15.	Assir Cultu	nilation of Foreign Language and ure	2.86	3.17	3.08	3.02
50	15A.	Interest in Learning and Using a Foreign Language	2.75	3.54	3.33	3.27
51	15B.	Interest in Learning About and Involvement in a Foreign Culture	2.75	3.62	3,33	3.30
16.	Physi	cal and Mental Health	3.38	4.06	4.42	3.86
52	16A.	Personal Health	4.11	4.33	4,60	4.35
53	16B.	Nutrition	4.00	3.92	4.60	4.16
53	160.	Personality Development	4.33	4.67	4.80	4.61
17.	Habit	Forming Substances and Their Use	3.67	3.72	4.33	3.84
55	17A.	Smoking and Tobacco	3.11	4.25	3.50	3.69
56	17B.	Alcohol and Alcoholism	3,33	4.33	3.38	3.76
57	17C.	Drug Use and Abuse	3.56	4.67	3.88	4.10
18.	Marri	age, Family, and Sex Education	3.24	4.33	4.58	3.94
58	18A.	Sex Education	3.44	4.33	4.25	4.03
59	18B.	Dating	2.78	3.50	3.75	3.34
60	180.	Marriage and Family Life	3,22	4.00	4.00	3.76
19.	Pub1i	c Health	3.14	3,39	3.58	3.33
61	19A.	Community Health	3.11	4.42	3.75	3.83
62	19B.	Diseases	3.75	3.92	3.92	3.88
63	190.	Consumer Health	4.25	4,08	3.92	4.06
20.	Safet	y Education	3.67	3,67	3,42	3.61
64	20A.	Safety and Accidents	3.88	4.08	3.58	3.85
65	20B.	First Aid	4.00	3.54	3.58	3.67

Sup	ergoal	s and Goals	Students	Teachers	Parents	Combined Sample
21.	Home	and Family Management	3.24	3.67	3.50	3.45
66	21A.	Family Relations	3.89	4.33	4.30	4.19
67	21B.	Home Nursing and Child Care	3.89	3.25	3.40	3.48
68	210.	Home Management	4.11	3.58	3.70	3.77
69	21D.	Consumer Economics	2.67	4,00	3.50	3.45
70	21E.	Housing	2.56	3.50	3.00	3.07
71	2 <b>1</b> F.	Furnishing	2.67	3.00	2.75	2.83
22.	Food	and Meal Preparation	2.67	2.78	3.08	2.80
72	22A.	Food Preparation	3.22	3.33	3.13	3.24
73	22B.	Meal Serving	2.67	2.67	2.88	2.72
23.	C1oth	ning and Textiles	2.29	2.33	2.67	2.39
74	23A.	Clothing and Textile Selection	2.38	2.77	2,58	2.61
75	23B.	Sewing and Clothing Construction	2.50	2.23	2.75	2.48
76	23C.	Care of Clothing	2.38	2.77	2.50	2.58
24.	Indus	trial Arts and Practices	2.90	2.78	3.00	2.88
77	24A.	Industrial Shop Safety	3,22	2.83	3,50	3.16
78	24B.	Drafting (non-vocational)	2.22	2.17	2.90	2.42
79	24C.	Woodworking (non-vocational)	2.67	2.83	2.25	2.62
80	24D.	Metals and Machines (non-vocational)	2.67	2.75	2.50	2.66
81	24E.	Electricity and Electronics (non-vocational)	3.22	2.42	3.13	2.86
82	24F.	Graphics (non-vocational)	2.78	2.50	2.50	2,59
83	24G.	Auto Mechanics (non-vocational)	3.13	3.00	2.83	2.97

# <u>Average Ratings</u>

Sup	ergoal	s and Goals	Students	Teachers	Parents	Combined Sample
25.	Under	estanding	3.33	4.39	4.25	3.92
84	25A.	Comprehension and Production of Information	3,38	4.46	4.08	4.06
85	25B.	Integration of Information	3.25	4.54	4,42	4.18
26.	Memor	ту	3.33	2.72	3.67	3.20
86	26A.	Rote Memory	2.33	1.67	2.00	1.97
87	26B.	Meaningful Memory	3.11	3.67	3.90	3.58
27.	Syste	ematic Reasoning	3.29	4.44	4.50	3.98
88	27A.	Deductive Reasoning	3.33	4.25	4.60	4.10
89	27B.	Inductive Reasoning	2.78	3.83	3.88	3.52
28.	Creat	tivity	3.33	4.44	4.17	2.92
90	28A.	Ingenuity	3.11	4.08	3.88	3.72
91	28B.	Flexibility	3.11	4.08	4.50	3.90
92	28C.	Elaboration	2.78	3.75	2.63	3.14
29.	Evalu	uation	3.57	4.22	4.58	4.04
93	29A.	Logical Judgment	4.11	4.25	3.50	4.00
94	29B.	Social Judgment	4.33	4.25	3.75	4.14
30.	Gener	ral Mathematics	3.43	3.56	4.67	3.76
95	30A.	Arithmetic	3.78	4.00	4.30	4 . 03
96	30B.	Number Concepts, Systems, and Sets	2.89	3.08	3.40	3.13
97	30C.	Measurement	2.89	3.50	3.50	3.32

Sup	ergoa1	s and Goals	<u>Students</u>	Teachers	Parents	Combined Sample
31.	Appli	ed Mathematics	2.86	2.50	3.58	2.90
98	31A.	Business and Consumer Mathematics	3.44	3,42	3,90	3.58
99	31B.	Industrial and Vocational Mathematics	2.78	2.58	3.20	2.84
100	31C.	Computer Programming	2.56	2.42	3.20	2.71
101	31D.	Computer Theory and Practice	2.33	2.08	3.00	2.45
32.	Algeb	pra	3.24	2.61	3.75	3.14
102	32A.	Algebraic Skills and Concepts	3.11	2.67	3.00	2.90
103	32B.	Real and Complex Number Systems	2.78	2.67	2.75	2.72
104	32C.	Equations and Inequalities	2.67	2.50	2.75	2.62
105	32D.	Exponents, Radicals, Logarithms, and Functions	2.22	2.25	2.50	2.31
106	32E.	Linear Algebra	2.67	2.00	2.88	2.45
33.	Geome	try	3.10	2.28	3.67	2.94
107	33A.	Informal Geometry	2.67	3.00	3.25	2.97
108	33B.	The Nature of Proof in Mathematics	2.89	2.50	2.75	2.69
109	33C.	Euclidean Plane Geometry	3.33	2.50	2.63	2.79
110	33D.	Coordinate Plane Geometry	3.11	2.33	2.13	2.52
111	33E.	Solid Geometry	3.33	2.08	3.00	2.72
34.	Trigo	nometry	2.33	1.67	3.17	2.29
112	34A.	Trigonometric Rules	2.89	2,50	2.75	2.69
113	34B.	Coordinate Trigonometry	3.00	2.42	2.00	2.48
114	<b>34</b> C.	Trigonometric Formulas and Identities	2.89	2.33	2.63	2.59
115	34D.	Trigonometric Circular Functions	2.78	2.33	2.38	2.48

Supe	rgoals	and Goals	<u>Students</u>	Teachers	Parents	Combined Sample
35.	Proba	bility and Statistics	2.24	2,06	2.83	2.31
116	35A.	Organizing and Presenting Statistical Data	3.50	2.62	3.17	3.03
117	35B.	Descriptive Statistics	2.25	2.31	2.92	2.52
118	35C.	Probability Concepts and Distributions	2.88	2.62	3.08	2.85
119	35D.	Statistical Inference	3.00	2.38	2.92	2.73
36.	Advan	ced Mathematics	2.57	1.67	3.08	2.37
120	36A.	Analysis and Elementary Functions	2.50	2.08	2.83	2.45
121	36B.	Analytic Geometry	2.38	2.31	3.25	2.67
122	36C.	Calculus	2.00	2.15	3.00	2.42
37.	Know1	edge of Music	2.19	2.50	2.83	2,45
123	37A.	Nature and Scope of Music	3.11	3,67	3,60	3.48
124	37B.	Elements and Media of Music	2.67	2.92	2.50	2.71
125	37C.	Structure and Organization of Music	1.89	3.08	3.00	2.69
126	37D.	Knowledge of Musical Works	2.11	3.17	3.13	2.83
127	37E.	Analysis of Musical Works	1.78	2,33	2.63	2.24
38.	Produ	oction of Music	2.14	1.89	2.58	2.16
128	38A.	Vocal Performing Skills in Music	2.67	2,42	3.25	2.72
129	38B.	Instrumental Performing Skills in Music	3.44	2.33	3.38	2.97
130	380.	Compositional Skills in Music	3.00	1,62	2.75	2.36
39.	Respo	nse to Music	2.14	2.89	3,00	2.61
131	39A.	Personal Response to Music	3.38	3.23	3.42	3.33
132	39B.	Judgmental Response to Music	2.88	2.85	2.83	2.85

Supe	rgoals	and Goals	Students	Teachers	<u>Parents</u>	Combined Sample
40.	Temper	rament	3.14	4.44	4.17	3.84
133	40A.	Emotional Security	4.44	4.83	4.70	4.68
134	40B.	Realistic Responsibility	4.11	4.83	4.80	4.61
135	40C.	Inquiring Boldness	2,67	4,00	4,38	3.69
136	40D.	Productive Self Assertion	3.00	4,33	4.38	3.93
137	40E.	Friendliness and Trust	3.78	4.50	4.25	4.21
138	40F.	Sensitivity and Concern	4.22	4.17	4.38	4.24
41.	Attitu	udinal Factors of Achievement	2.95	4.39	4.33	3.78
139	41A.	Self-Concept	4.11	4.67	4.25	4.38
140	41B.	Achievement Motivation	3.44	4.58	4.38	4.17
141	41C.	School Orientation	3.25	4.00	4.83	4.12
42.	Social	l Behavior	3.19	4.22	4.17	3.78
142	42A.	Interpersonal Relationships	4.50	4,77	4.17	4.48
143	42B.	Social Behavior Skills	4.13	4.54	4.25	4.33
43.		occial penarior oxyrio				
144	Philos		3.05	3,17	3.58	3.22
						3.22
145	43A.	sophy	3.05	3,17	3.58	
	43A.	Nature and Scope of Philosophy Personal Philosophy and Values	3.05 2.56	3,17 3.17	3.58 3.60	3.13
145	43A. 43B. Relig	Nature and Scope of Philosophy Personal Philosophy and Values	3.05 2.56 3.44	3,17 3,17 4,75	3.58 3.60 4.40	3.13 4.26
145 	43A. 43B. Relig	Nature and Scope of Philosophy Personal Philosophy and Values	3.05 2.56 3.44 2.05	3,17 3.17 4.75	3.58 3.60 4.40 3.17	3.13 4.26 2.35
145 	43A. 43B. Religated	Nature and Scope of Philosophy Personal Philosophy and Values ion World Religions	3.05 2.56 3.44 2.05 2.00	3,17 3.17 4.75 2.17 3.50	3.58 3.60 4.40 3.17 3.75	3.13 4.26 2.35 3.10

# <u>Average Ratings</u>

Supe	rgoals	and Goals	<u>Students</u>	Teachers	<u>Parents</u>	Combined Sample
45.	Physi	cal Development and Well-Being	3.33	3.61	4.17	3.63
150	45A.	Physical Growth and Development	3.67	4.08	4.50	4.10
151	45B.	Motor Skills, Movement, and Mus- cular Coordination	3.11	3.42	4.00	3.52
46.	Sport	s and Games	2,95	2,83	3.33	3.00
152	46A.	Rules and Strategies of Sports and Games	2.44	2.67	3.00	2.69
153	46B.	Skill in Sports and Games	2.44	3.00	2.63	2.72
154	46C.	Physical Education Equipment	3.22	2.42	3.38	2.93
47.	Perso	onal Impact of Physical Education	2.62	3.06	3.67	3.02
155	47A.	Social and Psychological Impact of Physical Education	3.33	3.58	3.88	3.59
156	47B.	Group Activity and Sportsmanship	3.25	3.92	3.75	3.70
157	47C.	Interest and Independent Partici- pation in Sports and Games	2.88	3.23	3,08	3.09
48.	Biolo	эду	3.38	3.67	3.67	3.55
158	48A.	Nature, Origin, and Evolution of Life	3.22	3.25	3.60	3.35
159	48B.	Reproduction	4,00	3.92	3.90	3.94
160	48C.	Plants	2.44	2.67	2.80	2.65
161	48D.	Animals	2.44	2.67	3.00	2.71
162	48E.	The Biology of Man	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.55
163	48F.	Ecology	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.00
164	48G.	Investigative Skills and Knowledge in Biology	2.00	3.17	2.63	2.66

Supe	Supergoals and Goals		Students	Teachers	<u>Parents</u>	Combined Sample
49.	Chemi	stry	3.00	2.39	3,33	2.86
165	49A.	History, Theories, and Principles of Chemistry	2.44	2.50	2.75	2.55
166	49B.	Terminology, Symbols, and Element Families	2.56	2.17	2.75	2.45
167	49C.	Atomic and Molecular Structure	2.33	2.08	2.75	2.34
<b>16</b> 8	49D.	Chemical Reactions	2.22	1.83	2.75	2.21
169	49E.	Carbon Compounds and Bio-Chemistry	2.33	2.50	2.63	2.48
170	49F.	Investigative Skills in Chemistry	2.56	2.58	3.75	2.90
50.	Gener	al Science	3.24	2.39	3.67	3.04
171	50A.	Geology	2.89	2.83	3.63	3.07
172	50B.	Weather Science	2.89	2.50	3.00	2.76
173	50C.	Ocean Science	3.00	2.75	3.38	3.00
174	50D.	Space Science	2.78	3.00	3.25	3.00
51.	Physi	cs	2.81	2.28	3.25	2.73
175	51A.	Mechanics	3.13	2.31	3.25	2.85
176	51B.	Kinetic Theory	1.88	2,08	2,75	2.27
177	51C.	Fields and Electricity	2.25	2.23	2.75	2.42
178	51D.	Waves and the Propagation of Energy	1.88	2.38	2.75	2.39
179	51E.	Atomic and Nuclear Physics	1.75	2.46	3.25	2.58
52.	Anthr	ropology	2.71	2.89	3.00	2.84
180	52A.	Nature and Scope of Anthropology	2.44	2.92	3.30	2.90
181	52B.	Characteristics of Cultures	3.22	3.33	3.50	3,35
<b>1</b> 82	52C.	Human Evolution and Variations	2.78	2.67	3.20	2.87

						Combined
Supe	rgoals	and Goals	Students	<u>Teachers</u>	<u>Parents</u>	<u>Sample</u>
53.	Econo	mics	3.67	3.00	3.75	3.45
183	53A.	Business and Trade	3.67	3.3 <b>3</b>	3.60	3.52
184	53B.	Economic Systems	3.56	3.67	3.90	3.71
54.	Geogr	aphy	2.52	3.00	3.42	2.90
185	54A.	Physical Geography	2.56	2.75	3.50	2.94
186	54B.	Cultural and Social Geography	2.89	3,50	4.13	3.48
187	54C.	Political and Economic Geography	2.89	3.67	3.88	3.48
55.	Gover	nment	3.67	3.72	4.42	3.86
188	55A.	United States Government	3.78	4.50	4.25	4.21
189	55B.	Other Types of Government	3.22	3.75	3.88	3.62
190	55C.	Citizenship	3.56	4.42	4.00	4.03
56.	Histo	ry	2.86	2.94	3.67	3.08
191	56A.	Ancient History	2.33	2,42	3.00	2.55
192	<b>56</b> B.	Medieval History	2.22	2.25	2.75	2.38
193	56C.	Modern World History	3.11	3.25	3.25	3.21
194	56D.	American History	3.33	3.83	3.38	3.55
195	56E.	State and Local History	2.78	3.83	3.38	3.38
57.	Psych	nology	3.33	3.61	3.75	3.53
196	57A.	The Nature and Scope of Psychology	3.67	2.92	2,88	3.14
197	57B.	Human Behavior	3.89	4.00	3.75	3.90
198	57C.	How Psychology Can Help People	3.78	4.08	3.13	3.72
58.	Socio	ology	3.05	3.67	3.58	3.39
199	58A.	Man and His Society	3.63	4.23	4.25	4.09
200	58B.	Distribution and Organization of People	3.88	3.62	3.92	3.79

Supe	rgoals	and Goals	<u>Students</u>	<u>Teachers</u>	<u>Parents</u>	Combined Sample
201	58C.	Social Change	3.63	3.85	3.92	3.82
202	58D.	Minority Groups in America	3.38	4,00	3.58	3.70
59.	Socia	1 Studies Skills	2.57	3.39	3.33	3.04
203	59A.	Research Skills in Social Studies	2.63	3.38	3.42	3.21
204	59B.	Critical Thinking Skills in the Social Studies	2.13	3.85	3.75	3.39
205	59C.	Interest in the Social Studies	2.63	3.77	3.75	3.48
60.	Know1	edge and Skills for Vocational				
	Succe	PSS .	3.33	3.28	3.42	3.33
206	60A.	Agricultural Vocations	2.44	2.08	3.00	2.48
207	60B.	Distributive Vocations	2,33	3.08	3.00	2.84
208	60C.	Health Occupations	3,00	2,92	2.50	2.81
209	60D.	Gainful Home Economics Vocations	3.00	3.33	3.20	3.19
210	60E.	Office Occupations	3.00	3.00	3.10	3.03
211	60F.	Technical Vocations	2.67	2.75	2.80	2.74
212	60G.	Trade and Industrial Occupations	2.89	2.58	3.20	2.87
61.	Gener	al Vocational Aptitudes	3.29	3,39	3.75	3.43
213	61A.	Clerical Aptitude	2.44	3.00	2.50	2.69
214	61B.	Following Directions and Appli- cations	3.22	4.42	3.25	3.72
215	61C.	Spatial Aptitude	2.67	2.75	2.00	2.52
216	61D.	Mathematical Facility	3.22	3.33	3.13	3.24
217	61E.	Vocational Creativity	3.33	3.42	3.25	3.34
218	61F.	Managerial Aptitude	2.67	3.33	3,25	3.10
219	61G.	Interpersonal Skills	3.44	4.08	3.13	3.62

# <u>Average Ratings</u>

Supe	rgoals	and Goals	<u>Students</u>	Teachers	<u>Parents</u>	Combined Sample
62.	Gener	al Vocational Attitudes	3.38	3.56	3.92	3.57
220	62A.	Vocational Responsibility	3.56	4.42	4.00	4.03
221	62B.	Job Adaptability	3.78	4.25	3.75	3.97
222	62C.	Vocational Relationships	2.56	4.00	4.25	3.93
63.	Vocat	cional Interests	3.19	3.39	3.17	3.25
223	63A.	Mechanical-Manual Interests	3.33	3.00	3.25	3.17
224	63B.	Social Interests	3.67	3.92	3.50	3.72
225	63C.	Theoretical Interests	3.56	4.17	2.63	3.55
226	63D.	Outdoor Interests	4.00	3.00	2.75	3.24
227	63E.	Creative Interests	3.75	3.46	3.33	3.48
228	63F.	Office Interests	3.75	2.54	2.67	2.88
229	63G.	Domestic Interests	3.75	2.77	2.92	3.06
64.	Vocat	tional Perceptual and Motor				
	Abili		2.95	3.56	3.75	3.35
230	64A.	Auditory Acuity	2.63	2,62	2.25	2.48
231	64B.	Visual Acuity	3.50	2.85	2.50	2.88
232	64C.	Coordination	3.88	3.00	2.83	3.15
233	64D.	Dexterity	3.88	2.62	2.42	2.85
234	64E.	Physical Stamina and Strength	3.38	2.62	2.25	2.67