



1957

Teacher-Pupil Relationship and the Problem Development of the Early Adolescent

Mary Ignatius Loyola Walsh
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Walsh, Mary Ignatius Loyola, "Teacher-Pupil Relationship and the Problem Development of the Early Adolescent" (1957). *Master's Theses*. Paper 1721.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/1721

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © 1957 Mary Ignatius Loyola Walsh

TEACHER-PUPIL RELATIONSHIP AND THE PROBLEM DEVELOPMENT
OF THE EARLY ADOLESCENT

by

Sister Mary Ignatius Loyola Walsh, B.V.M.

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

June

1957

VITA AUCTORIS

Sister Mary Ignatius Loyola Walsh, B.V.M. was born in Chicago, Illinois, September 24, 1901.

She was graduated from Holy Family Grade School, Chicago, and on June 12, 1919, from Saint Mary's High School. The following September she entered the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In June 1945, she received her degree of Bachelor of Arts from the University of Seattle, Seattle, Washington.

For more than twenty-five years her teaching has been confined to the early adolescent in the parochial schools of Chicago, San Francisco, and Seattle.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose---Needs---Role of school and Teacher	
II. RELATED LITERATURE	13
Teacher Personality---Teacher Behavior--- Teacher Characteristics---Teacher Efficiency---Teacher-Pupil Relationship	
III. PROCEDURES	44
Selection of Sites---Selection of Instruments---Collection of Data--- Treatment of Data	
IV. REPORTS OF RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA .	56
Mooney Problem Check List---Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory---Diagnostic Teacher Rating Scale	
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	67
BIBLIOGRAPHY	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. MEDIAN IQ OF SELECTED GROUPS	45
II. COMPARISON OF SITES	47
III. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SITE	54
IV. RANK ORDER OF SITES IN TERMS OF PER CENT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO ADMINISTRATIONS OF THE MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST	57
V. RANK ORDER POSITIONS OF THE PROBLEM AREAS IN EACH SITE FOR THE TWO ADMINISTRATIONS OF THE MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST	58
VI. RANK ORDER OF SITES BASED ON THE RESULTS OF THE THREE INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE SITES	64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since from clinical and psychiatric reports, teacher-pupil relationships seem to play a role in the appearance of maladjustment in many children, it is the purpose of this thesis to try to determine the validity of such an implication. This must necessarily be within a confined scope, and because of many intangibles be subject to limitations. The primary purpose presupposes other secondary purposes in order to obtain any reliable conclusive evidence. Consequently, before the major objective can be achieved, it will be necessary: 1) To ascertain the problems of the selected students; 2) To appraise the teacher personality of the Eighth Grade teachers of this selected sampling by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory; 3) To study by means of Sister Mary Amatora's Diagnostic Teacher-Rating Scale and the Mooney Problem Check List the correlation between teacher-pupil relation and the problem development of the early adolescent.

For at least two decades there has been a continuous increase of maladjusted and immature adults whose prevalence cannot be minimized. As early as 1938, Symonds estimated that "one out of twenty-one persons becomes a patient in a hospital for mental

diseases in a generation or a lifetime, and the chances of a white person contracting a psychosis or severe incapacitating neurosis during a lifetime, whether sent to a hospital or not, is somewhere near one to ten."¹ In agreement with this, alarming facts on the high-frequency of maladjustment were revealed during World War II. "According to statistics released from the national headquarters of Selective Service for the period of January 1944 to August 1945, out of a total of five and three-fourths millions registered, there were over two and one-half million young men rejected for general military service. In an analysis of the causes it was found that the leading cause for all rejections during the year 1944 was mental disease, which alone accounted for 26.8 per cent of all rejections."² Nor have conditions improved, since according to Hershel Alt³ ten per cent of the school children throughout the country are sufficiently disturbed to be in need of specialized help. The central registry maintained by the New York City Youth Board receives reports from all official and voluntary agencies of children and

¹ Peter F. Oliva, "Causes of Behavior Problems," Ed.D., XXI (April 1956), 8.

² Sister Mary Amatora, O.S.F., "Early Guidance-Personality Adjustment of the School Child," Ed., LXXIII(April 1953), 510.

³ Hershel Alt, "Community Action and Mental Health Problems of Children", M H., XXXVIII(October 1954), 613-626.

youths between the ages of five and twenty known to be delinquent or emotionally disturbed. Approximately 30,000 reports of such children and young people are received each year. On the one hand the director claims that this estimate is too large because it includes those with minor difficulties, while on the other it is too small since it excludes many not referred because of lack of proper facilities. In New York City alone facts seem to indicate that 12,000 between the above stated ages are in need of psychiatric care while actually only one out of every four receive the needed care. The White House Conference on Child Health and Protection claiming a higher per cent for those needing care stated that one out of every three school children is maladjusted. Hence, they maintain, that he is in need of special service if he is to develop into an emotionally mature adult. Alt laments that "Though the profound and compelling needs of mankind have brought an increase in the knowledge and tools at our command, we are far from having achieved a balance between the forces that make for tension and conflicts, and those that make for peace and stability."⁴

This, many attribute to the school or the situations and relationships resulting therefrom. Doctor Dombrose contends that the school is of minimal importance as a causative agent, and that

⁴Ibid., 614

it is "erroneous to assume that school attendance causes neurosis (which manifests itself in maladjustment and immaturity) whereas the truth of the matter is that it only exposed a concealed immaturity."⁵ He further contends that the origin of the neurosis is to be found within the family, in the mother-father-child triangle. Nor would he have one duly alarmed over momentary conflicts such as those that have to do with homework or watching T.V. These, he explains, are not to be confused with those conflicts which produce relatively permanent changes in personality or disturbance of bodily functions, which are the result of pre-school conflicts that were handled by the use of repression and not, therefore, adequately resolved.

Psychologists have experimental evidence from various sources and studies that all of the important learning situations, problems, and relationships that determine or influence the formation of an individual's personality can be experienced in approximately the first six years. Anderson⁶ shows quite conclusively that the child's pattern of adjustment is already set at about nine years of age. His study of children from nine to eighteen years revealed them continuing in the direction in which

⁵Lawrence A. Dombrose, M.D., "Do Teachers Cause Neurotic Conflicts of Children?," M H, XXXIX (January 1953), 109.

⁶John E. Anderson, "The Relation of Attitude to Adjustment," ED, LXXIII (December 1952), 210-218.

they were headed at this age. Hence, "the child, who learns to use neurotic methods for solving emotional problems, will unfortunately be handicapped for the rest of his life for he will not know himself in all of his thoughts and feelings and will be unable adequately to express or gratify himself. Happiness and joy in living will seem to be beyond his reach. As an adult... none of the things outside of him seem to satisfy the things inside of him.⁷ Because of the limitless consequences of neurosis, early signs of emotional disorder or maladjustment should be sought in the pre-school and early school child just as carefully as physical disorders are looked for in routine check-ups. Teachers and those entrusted with the training of children must be given an understanding of the principles of mental health and a familiarity with the early signs of emotional illness so that they may be better prepared to deal with the problems that confront them.⁸ Consequently, search for root causes is one of the professional responsibilities of the school. No other social agency, Oliva⁹ maintains, is as well equipped as the school to perform this task. In many instances, the home can neither meet,

⁷Dombrose, 104.

⁸Norman J. Brill, M.D., "Solving the Problems of Emotional Illness," MH, XXXVIII (October 1954), 233.

⁹Oliva, 8-10.

nor cope with these problems of maladjustment, and the school must, therefore, take the initiative. Here action can be taken to deal with the social and many emotional factors of young people, and thus help them attain sound mental health by adjusting to their handicaps. Moreover, Oliva cautions that "it is far easier to exert one's authority to maintain surface order than it is to ferret out obscure causes of neurotic behavior....

Remedial measures seek to learn the specific causes of misbehavior and to treat these causes through all means available."¹⁰ Another competent authority¹¹ has summarized much of the foregoing when he states

The schools stand in an especially strategic position to buffer some of the adverse influences that bear upon the child. They are in a position to provide a good atmosphere within the school that can counterbalance the reverse at home and in the neighborhood. The least that one can expect of a school is that it should not hurt the child further, and to this end that it should take into account that children differ and need different kinds of help from the school...It calls for an understanding...that the child may live in an atmosphere in which the teacher is encouraging rather than discouraging to his development towards maturity.

To achieve this end, teachers must seek to develop a happy, healthy, secure group climate with relationships of mutual respect between teacher and pupils.

Because education must be based on the sharing and giving of

¹⁰Ibid., 8.

¹¹George S. Stevenson, M.D., "Education for Mental Health," MH, XXXVIII (October 1954), 593.

only academic information, the teacher can only affect and produce learning if he first produces the relevant dynamics of personality change. Quite consistently, therefore, Mones states that "teaching is essentially an active relationship between teachers and learners in the course of which there are engendered in the learner the processes of growth and maturity without any personality loss on the part of the teacher."¹² This is another way of emphasizing the importance of teacher personality, which is the tool with which he works, rather than the content in which he gives instruction. "The teacher may furnish the kindling spark, the illumination, the insight, but it is the pupil who must educate himself. It is the failure of so many pupils to educate themselves that is imposing the question as to why so many teachers fail. The 'WHY' seems to lie in the personality structure of the teacher."¹³ It is this that makes for teacher success or failure.

In view of the foregoing, it is insisted that the relationship between the teacher and the pupil must be founded and geared by one who is himself well integrated and emotionally mature. Otherwise, he would fail in his prime duty as a teacher, namely, to help the child adjust himself to others, to stand emotionally firm,

¹² Leon Mones, "Psychiatric Insight and Educational Effort", ED, LXXVI (November 1955), 1.

¹³Alt, 614.

to be able to help others to do so, and thus be reasonably happy. It is not surprising, therefore, that Douglass¹⁴ demands that a successful teacher today in the Junior High School must be one with a sturdy personality and with at least average mental hygiene. At the same time, Billig, championing the cause of the emotionally handicapped, reminds us that "the education of a child is a continuous process in which the school augments and builds upon the endowment with which the child comes to it. The need for primary and elementary teachers with emotional mature personalities and with some skill in detecting and properly handling the emotionally handicapped is a most conspicuous one."¹⁵

With this need, Mones¹⁶ would heartily agree since he implies that failure to learn arithmetic and reading is as much a matter of emotional, as well as mental retardation. His explanation is that intelligence is tied up with emotional maturity and cannot adequately and finally be measured by such over-simplified tests as those used to obtain an IQ. The findings of eight other researchers, whose conclusions are reported in an article by Mones¹⁷ seems to substantiate this assumption. They claim that from 50 to 100 per cent of reading difficulties are due to

¹⁴Harl R. Douglass, "In-Service Growth of Junior High School Teachers," CH, XXX (September 1955), 10.

¹⁵Alfred L. Billig, "Serving the Emotionally Handicapped," PDK, XXXVI (May 1955), 303.

¹⁶Mones, 142.

¹⁷Ibid., 144.

emotional disturbances while Fischer and others maintain that when reading goes hand in hand with emotional therapy, not only improved reading ability results but a positive betterment of personality structure. "Thus it is the personality factors and structure of the pupil that are becoming the focal point of the teaching process rather than the learning levels or even social adjustment."¹⁸ Father Curran also points out the increasing general awareness of the personal problems affecting learning. "For some years," he says, "we have known that the child's or adult's emotions influence both his learning capacity and his retention....There is an old axiom that says, 'whatever is received is received according to the state of the one receiving.' The emotional state of each child, then, and his personal life adjustment are necessarily important considerations in any learning process."¹⁹

Consequently, if all administrators and teachers would be aware and convinced of the magnitude of this problem and their important role in breakdown preventions, they would be cognizant of their key positions to spot those who need help and apply preventive or remedial measures. Had this been done a decade ago, many of the 600,000 patients in mental institutions might

¹⁸Ibid., 143

¹⁹Charles A. Curran, "Guidance and Counseling in Education," Ed., LXXVII (December 1952), 223.

have learned better adjustment in their formative years.

To prevent such hazards, mere theoretical knowledge does not suffice. More important are the environmental influences of the child, of which school experiences are by no means the least. Since for the most part, at least to the child, the school is the teacher, "He must provide those experiences, which with the aid of divine grace are the best calculated to develop in the young the ideas, the attitudes, and the habits that are demanded for a Christlike living in our American democratic society."²⁰ It is through these experiences that personality development takes place. A teacher worthy of his profession, therefore, "should encourage children to aim at success through honest efforts, to concentrate on the task in hand, to make the best of conditions that they cannot change, to face reality squarely, to take success without being spoiled by it, and to meet defeat without undue discouragement."²¹ However, for the teacher to be effective in his strategic position, as shown in numerous studies and investigations of the "Best Liked and the Least Liked Teacher", he must possess the human qualities of understanding children, be kind and sympathetic, make things interesting and clear, and help pupils "to learn a lot".

²⁰ Commission on American Citizenship, Better Men for Better Times, Washington, D. C., 1943, p. 65.

²¹ Raphael C. McCarthy, S.J., Ph.D., Safeguarding Mental Health, Milwaukee, 1937, p. 93.

Since teacher personality is of such prime importance, teacher rating by pupils, even on the elementary level is becoming more common and has improved human relations in the classroom. With this Bolin certainly agrees, claiming that, "One of the best sources of criticism lies in student evaluation. Who knows more intimately than the students how well the subject is taught, how well the class is behaved, how well student problems are handled, how well the class and the teacher work together? The principal or the superintendent may have more penetrating insights from observing a class, but the contacts of either of these administrators with the classroom are intermittent and infrequent. Students observe the class every day."²²

Nonetheless, many teachers at all levels have opposed these ratings (unless they are flattering) even though assessment or evaluation is a sine qua non in an effective personnel program. Since all professional people are judged, and recognize that they must attain the standards that have been set for their respective profession, it seems unreasonable and inconsistent that teachers should object. This can be one of the best assets to help them achieve one of the most important of human goals. "Teachers as a group hold what is possibly the greatest vital key to the growth and development of wholesome, healthy, and well-balanced

²² Donald W. Bolin, "Student Evaluates Teacher," CH, XXX (October 1955), 120.

personalities. Youth is the golden age for the establishment of socially integrated behavior; of behavior that is cooperative, flexible, adaptive, and objective; of behavior that is at the same time morally sound, righteous, and just. The task is great, but not beyond the capacity of the sincere, earnest, and conscientious teacher."²³ This is especially true if he be a member of that educational system whose "position today is unique because it makes religion the co-ordinating principle of man's studies as well as of his life....This (the teacher has been taught) can be accomplished by educating the soul and heart as well as the head. ...(Thus he will form) loyal and patriotic citizens, an honor to themselves, and a tower of strength for their country against religious and moral decay."²⁴ That teachers do achieve and do strive to achieve such goals is evidenced in the many studies of "Related Literature", which are briefly reviewed in the following chapter.

²³Sister Mary Amatora, O.S.F., "Guiding the Child's Personality Potential to Fruitful Fulfillment," ED, XXXIV (November 1953), 8.

²⁴Ignatius Walsh, Catholic Education, (Chicago, 1917), 2,4,8.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

To date literature on teacher-pupil relationships, as such, is scant as compared with literature on some other phases of teaching. In the quest for what has been achieved in this field, it has been necessary to try to determine what is conducive to a good or bad relationship from the consideration of the teacher as well as of that of the pupil. For the former, data can be gathered rather easily from studies dealing with teacher efficiency, while for the latter, findings are fewer and less unified.

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, hundreds of writings have appeared in educational literature dealing with measurement predicting teacher efficiency. Notable among these were the Barr's¹ initial studies in which he summarized work done by numerous researchers. Although Barr included the application of teaching techniques in the six following steps:

1) definition of task to be performed in terms of the goals to be

¹Arvil Sylvester Barr. "The Wisconsin Study of Teaching Ability," JER, XXXIII (May 1940), 671-684.

attained; 2) determination of pupil-change by appropriate instruments before and after instruction; 3) determination of where instruction is satisfactory or unsatisfactory; 4) thorough diagnostic tests to determine the cause of satisfactory or unsatisfactory growth and achievement; 5) improved formulation to remove cause of unsatisfactory growth and achievement; 6) evaluation of program to ascertain if performance has improved or not; only studies relative to the fourth step, the measure of pupil growth and achievement, will be reported here as they suggest teaching efficiency. Seven of these investigations will be briefly presented.

This particular group of studies for which data was collected from 1936-1938 was concerned mainly with seventh and eighth grade teachers in non-departmentalized one and two-room rural schools in Wisconsin. The main body of the data for investigation, however, consisted of measures of three groups of teachers and pupils: 1) twenty-four teachers teaching a state-graded school with 342 pupils; 2) forty-seven teachers teaching in one-room rural schools with 338 pupils; 3) thirty-one teachers in one-room and two-room schools with 181 pupils.

In the first investigation of this specific Barr study,

Rostker² aimed to determine the relationship between the results attained by teachers on certain evaluative instruments and measurable teaching ability as pupil changes. He concluded that the intelligence observed through the teacher is the highest single factor conditioning teaching ability. Significantly related and closely associated with teaching ability were, he claimed, knowledge of the subject matter and the faculty to diagnose and correct pupil maladjustment as well as the attitude of the teacher towards teaching. He also found that the social attitudes of Citizenship teachers were important factors of teaching ability. Two negative conclusions that were stated were the statistical insignificance between supervisory ratings and teaching ability and that personality objectively defined and measured showed no substantial relation to teaching ability. Further, he found that age, size of school, and experience could influence teaching ability.

Rolfe³ in a similar investigation proposed to determine the validity of certain measures of teaching ability as correlated with pupil change as a criterion. Contrary to Rostker, he concluded that personality and rating scales showed a positive relation to teaching ability, and that social attitudes,

²L.E. Rostker. "The Measurement of Teaching Ability-Study One." JEE, XIV (September 1945), 6-51.

³J.F. Rolfe, "The Measurement of Teaching Ability, Study Two," JEE, XIV (September 1945), 52-74.

intelligence, as well as the attitude towards teaching were not necessarily related to pupil change.

The purpose of the third investigation was to determine the validity of certain teacher tests and rating scales as measures of teaching efficiency when pupil change is employed as a criterion. From the data collected therein, La Duke⁴ concluded:

- 1) Intelligence of the teacher was significantly related to the teacher efficiency;
- 2) Professional knowledge of theory and practice of Mental Hygiene positively but not significantly related;
- 3) There was a tendency for the effective teacher to be conservative in methods although liberalism or conservatism seemed to have little effect on efficiency;
- 4) Teacher's attitude towards profession showed little relationship to efficiency;
- 5) Teachers who were more considerate of others tended to be more inefficient;
- 6) Ratings of teachers by supervisors and supervising teachers did not agree with pupil gain;
- 7) Use of different rating scales by the same rater on the same teachers resulted in considerable differences in teacher ranking.

To seek relationships between observable teacher activities of the more specific type and the changes produced in pupils as measured by tests was the objective of the fourth investigation by

⁴C. V. LaDuke, "The Measurement of Teaching Ability -Study Three, "JEE, XIV (September 1945), 75-100.

Jayne.⁵ He reported that the evaluation of teaching as it is frequently done on the basis of the relative amount of teacher and pupil talk, the average length of pupil participation, the number of specified type of questions, and teachers' comments were without validity.

To ascertain the further nature of teaching ability, Von Eschen⁶ sought to determine the efficiency of particular supervisory programs producing measurable changes in pupils in view of specific objectives; the relationship between pupil changes in certain basic study skills and in silent reading as well as in the Social Studies on the Seventh and Eighth Grade levels; and the changes in teachers most closely associated to teaching success measured in pupil change. The findings revealed that: 1) Supervisory programs were most effective in areas upon which the concentration was made. This focal point was necessary to obtain maximum results from supervision. 2) In a supervisory program in Silent Reading as well as the ability to perform basic skills - such as: map reading, interpretation of graphs, use of necessary references- the pupils progressed one hundred per cent more than was normal. However, this was not significantly related to changes in other areas of pupil growth. 3) What are

⁵D.D. Jayne, "A Study between the Relationship of Teaching and Educational Outcomes," JEE, XIV (December 1945), 101-34.

⁶D.R. Von Eschen, "The Improbability of Teachers in Service," JEE, XIV (December 1945), 135-156.

the teachers' changes?

The sixth investigation attempted: 1) To learn what measurable relationship existed between teacher personality as measured by personality tests and his ability to produce measurable changes in pupils; 2) What inter-relationships are there among different measures of personality? 3) To what extent can measurable pupil changes be predicted from the composites of personality measures? From the findings, Gotham⁷ concluded that: 1) There was no significant relationship between tests of personality qualities and personality rating; 2) A significant finding shows lack of agreement among several criteria of teacher efficiency; 3) Criterion of pupil change apparently measured something different from that measured by the teacher-ratings and tests on qualities commonly associated with teaching efficiency.

What are the common factors in teaching ability, which are measured by various tasks, which are related to pupil growth in the Social Studies, and which of these are related to the supervisory ratings of teachers were the questions Hellfritsch⁸ sought to answer in his study. His conclusions were that teacher rating scales often used to evaluate the efficiency of a teacher

⁷R.E. Gotham, "Personality and Teaching Efficiency," JEE, XIV (December 1945), 157-165.

⁸A.C. Hellfritsch, "A Factor Analysis of Teacher Abilities," JEE, XIV (December 1945) 166-199.

were slightly related to observed pupil growth in the Social Studies, and that there was no teacher measure that could be validly substituted for actual measurements of pupil growth in evaluating ability to teach.

In addition to these initial summarizations by Barr, he later published summaries of 138 investigations dealing with the measurement of predicting teacher efficiency. Nineteen of these had to do with the measure of pupil change as a criterion. At the end of these investigations, Barr⁹ insisted that the criterion for teacher efficiency seemed even more important than it did at the inception of the study. Purposely emphasis was placed on pupil change with the realization that this involved not only the guidance of learning activities, but also many teacher-pupil relationships, teacher-teacher relationships, teacher-administrator relationships, teacher-community relationships, and the more important responsibilities growing out of these.

While pupil change theoretically seemed sound, it actually presented many difficulties. How is one to know the goals of teaching and learning? How may one measure the outcome of teaching and learning adequately? How may one treat data to secure reliable results? These difficulties were practically

⁹ Arvil Sylvester Barr, "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency - A Summary of Investigations", JEE, XVI (1948), 203-283.

controlled by supervisory ratings and tests of qualities commonly associated with teaching success.

Since teaching is a very human activity, the author reminded the teacher that he should set a better example of good human relationships, social values, and laudable citizenship. This, Pope Pius XI¹⁰ also maintains

Perfect schools are the result, not so much of good methods as good teachers that are thoroughly prepared and well-grounded in the matter that they have to teach; who possess the intellectual and moral qualifications required by their most important office; who cherish a pure and holy love for the youths confided to their care because they love Jesus Christ and His Church, of which these are the children of predilection; and who have, therefore, sincerely at heart the good of the family and the country.

Barr expressed this idea another way when he reminded the teacher that his success depends in no small part on how he measures up to the expectancy of those he serves - government and school officials, parents, and pupils.

Barr concluded this particular study with the acknowledgement that some factors in teaching efficiency need further exploration and study - such as: drive, expressiveness, academic aptitude, cultural background, knowledge of the subject, attitude towards teachers and teaching, social sensitivity and proficiency in human relations, teacher-pupil relations, professional judgment,

¹⁰ Pope Pius XI, "The Christian Education of Youth," CM XXVIII (February 22, 1930).

and emotional adjustment. "Sometimes these by-products," he alleges, "are more important than their primary outcomes."¹¹

Four years after publishing summaries of 138 investigations, Barr¹² stressed a shift in emphasis on what he styled the "Dynamic evaluation of performance" approach. At the same time, he called for marked concentration of research efforts upon the study of teacher-pupil relationship and teacher personality.

Among other research programs that had been undertaken in past years relative to determining the characteristics of an effective teacher, the most extensive of these major enterprises was a study of teacher characteristics reported by Ryans.¹³ It had two principal objectives: 1) the identification and analysis of patterns of teacher behavior and 2) the development of materials used for the prediction of this same behavior. Hence, all that is included in the former is styled the descriptive category, while anything relative to the latter is placed in the methodological category.

Various techniques had been used in the research to understand the significant patterns of behavior. Among these were extensive and intensive classroom observation of teachers in public schools

¹¹Arvil S. Barr, "Impressions, Trends, and Further Research," JEE, XIV (December 1945), 206.

¹²Arvil S. Barr, et al., "Report of Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," RER XXII (1952), 238-253.

¹³David G. Ryans, "The Investigation of Teacher Characteristics," TER, LIV (October 1953), 371-396.

throughout the United States; surveys of teacher activities, preferences, attitudes, and educational viewpoints, and development of paper and pencil psychometric instruments. These last mentioned aimed to identify individuals characterized by particular personal and social behavior patterns.

Before using these techniques, it was decided, however, that a "Critical Incident" procedure was a necessary preliminary research to the program. Accordingly, someone - supervisor, administrator, teacher, student-teacher -- well acquainted and closely associated with the unnamed teacher was to describe some behavior that made for success or failure, and, consequently, effective or ineffective teaching. In the early stages, competent adults were interviewed personally to tell of the very best teacher that they had had in school. Later Critical Incident Blanks, which had undergone many revisions, but in their final form seemed to be satisfactory for the purposes intended, were adopted. On these the participants were asked to write the descriptions of specific happenings, observing the following directions: 1) must be the actual behavior of a teacher in a specific situation; 2) must be objective; 3) must refer to some special educational event; 4) must show clearly either effective or ineffective teaching. From these, generalized Descriptive statements of Critical Behavior of Teachers were compiled under two headings: Effective Behavior and Ineffective Behavior.

The means used to obtain the criterion data was controlled

direct observation of teacher behavior in the classroom. This was to be done by efficient judges or observers rather than pupil judgments of teachers, which were definitely ruled out because they were thought to be incompetent and less capable of making analytic judgments. A more valid procedure as regards the pupil was thought to be to observe their responses to teachers. It was believed that these should be indicative of pupil behavior under which the first four items on the Classroom Observation Record were listed. These served as assessments for teacher behavior, which was tabulated second on the Classroom Observation Record, and for which every effort was made to keep it factual. Although in this phase of the study, elementary and secondary teachers did not duplicate each other, they were very similar, and three correlated factors might be used to describe teacher behavior at each level. These were: 1) understanding, friendliness, and responsiveness on the part of the teacher; 2) systematic, responsible, organized teacher behavior; 3) teacher's stimulating and original behavior.

Other researches were directed to understanding teachers' attitudes. Scales for measuring these attitudes were constructed. Elementary school teachers were found to be significantly more positive or favorable in their responses to attitude inventory than secondary school teachers. This was particularly true in measuring several attitudes especially those towards pupils. Attitudes seemed to have been unrelated to the amount of teaching

experience.

Important as attitudes were, viewpoints, notably educational ones, resultant from one's philosophy, were of equal significance. Hence, elementary and secondary forms of Inquiry were administered in Summer School classes in ten-teacher-education institutions in nine states. Although there was a divergence of viewpoints, the most important information could be gained from the items having to do with the acceptance or rejection of subject-matter-centered-teaching and emphasis upon academic standards.

The second objective of this vast program was to construct psychometric devices that would measure and predict teacher behavior. After much experimentation by administering personality schedules and inventories, a large number of new instruments were developed by the staff. These especially constructed instruments were analyzed in relation to their discriminating power, while a number of them were item-analyzed against the upper and lower twenty-seven per cent of each of several groups of teachers. It was these items that made up the preliminary form of a Teacher Characteristic Schedule, which has gone through a number of revisions, and was in a constant process of refinement as it continued to be administered to additional samples of teachers.

Although the resumé of this study was quite lengthy, the author claims that it was impossible to describe in detail the numerous data that had been accumulated in this program. A few of the trends in some of the descriptive studies were reviewed,

but mention and discussion of the technical problems had, for the most part, been omitted.

While there had been a great output of time, energy, and money in this study, as well as an extensive accumulation of data; the question: "What is an effective teacher like?" or "What are the distinguishing characteristics of a competent teacher?" remained unanswered according to Ryans at this time, 1953. This research program had been informative, if only fragmentarily, in the studies thus far pursued as regards the nature of teacher behavior, ways of measuring teacher behavior and characteristics, and techniques for the analysis of teacher characteristic data. The author claimed that there were also periodic findings that substantiated the relationship between the teacher and pupil behavior even though the evidence had not been sufficiently conclusive to allow any dogmatic pronouncements in this regard.

With this Bush,¹⁴ who reported the findings of the Stanford Investigations concerning teacher-pupil relationships, would agree. In this study, the relationships of twenty-seven teachers and their pupils in five schools in three communities, selected at random, were investigated. The classes ranged from Grade Seven through Fourteen and included every academic and nonacademic

¹⁴Robert Nelson Bush, The Teacher Pupil Relationships, New York, 1954.

subject offered in the curricula of these respective schools. In all, 650 relationships were studied.

The study, reported in book form is currently referred to as "action research." It concerned itself with a case study of a public school teacher, Miss Brown and her pupils, who were selected at random. In it were described the procedures and techniques used in the investigation. An analysis from both the statistical and case study point of view of the factors that significantly affected the relationships under consideration was presented.

Apart from the experience and the compiled data, the investigation has resulted in a number of working hypotheses and tentative conclusions concerning the nature of teaching, supervision, and the operation of human relationships, particularly the teacher-pupil relationship in the schools. The most notable findings were: 1) There is an uniqueness and complexity in this relationship; 2) The pupil's liking for the teacher is one of the most powerful factors in bringing about effective learning relationship between the teacher and the pupil; 3) To be an effective teacher, one must be adjusted in the area of human relationships and know how to handle himself objectively; 4) The amount, type, and way that information had been acquired about pupils was of major importance; 5) There is a tendency for teachers and pupils, whose purposes are similar, to have common interests and social beliefs; 6) No significant relation was found between

the teacher's knowledge score and competence; 7) Teachers seldom feel neutral about administrators, and frequently when this relationship is disturbed, the quality of teaching deteriorates. It was likewise indicated that administrator-teacher relationship affects the tone or morale of the school.

While the above are guideposts to adopt or avoid for effective teaching, the author cautions against generalizing concerning the competence of teachers. He claims that the case of Miss Brown "is no more representative than any other case which might have been reported. Each teacher and each teacher-pupil relationship is unique. Each highlights some aspect of the total problem of teacher competence."¹⁵ This is verified in this study since no teacher studied was found to be either effective or ineffective with all his pupils. Bush enlarges upon this statement: "The most meaningful and accurate appraisal is probably one that is specific and limited to the effectiveness between a given teacher and a given pupil at a specific time in the current needs of that pupil."¹⁶

The investigation as set forth in this book was valuable because it was a "field approach". Consequently it concentrated on the teachers and pupils not as separate entities, but on their

¹⁵ Bush, 64.

¹⁶ Ibid., 199.

interaction with each other. It was revealed in this study that if the pupil liked the teacher, he raised him high on all characteristics. The same tendency was noted with a person who had a high I.Q., had received high grades, and had high tested achievement. He in turn rated the teacher and class activities high, and in turn received high ratings from the teacher. This may be understandable in the light of many factors affecting teacher-pupil relationship.

Since teacher-pupil relations along with the objectives of the course, the teaching methods employed, and the learner's ability make for effective or ineffective learning, Nelson¹⁷ maintained that there should be a keen awareness of the significance of interpersonal relations on all educational levels whether it be primary or up into the college or university. In his article, he raised the following questions: 1) What kinds of teacher-student relationships are desirable? 2) What are some of the ways whereby such relationships may be established and maintained?

The answer to the first question was dealt with in the first part of his paper under what, the author calls, clues. Of these there are four: namely, Mental Hygiene, Student Opinion, Good Morale in Industry, and Determining Purpose of Education. These,

¹⁷A. Gordon Nelson, "Better Teacher-Student Relations," PDK, XXXVI, (May 1955), 295-301.

he pointed out in detail, were safe indices in the quest for a correct response.

From the mental-hygiene point of view, desirable teacher-student relations are those which help the members of a class to become secure, self-respecting, independent, responsible persons, who have respect for the rights of others. This makes for maturity and good adjustment. However, this goal is not possible for achievement if the human relations aspect of teaching is ignored, if the teacher has not reasonably good mental health, and if relations with students are not consonant with the principles of mental hygiene. Symonds, one of the noted mental-hygienists, who has done considerable research states that "An individual who is to succeed as a teacher should be: 1) emotionally stable; 2) able to identify himself with students; 3) free from anxiety; 4) should have self-respect, dignity, and courage; 5) should not be too self-centered; 6) should feel adequate to the task of teaching."¹⁸ From this listing, the import of the teacher's mental health cannot be overlooked because it not only affects the academic achievement of the student but even more so his mental health.

That this is true is evident in an examination of students' opinions relative to desirable traits for success in teaching.

¹⁸Percival M. Symonds, "Personality of the Teacher," JER, XL (May 1947), 652-661.

Many investigations have been carried on in this regard. The most exhaustive of these to date, Nelson claims, is Witty's "Evaluation of the Effective Teacher." He obtained 33,000 letters from pupils in Grades I-XII in which these pupils described "The Teacher Who Helped Me Most." The positive traits most frequently mentioned are cooperative democratic attitude; kindness and consideration for the individual; patience, wide interests, personal appearance and pleasing manner, fairness and impartiality; sense of humor; good disposition and consistent behavior; interest in pupils' problems; flexibility, use of recognition and praise; and unusual proficiency in teaching. All of these are considered indicative of the good mental health of the teacher. From these same letters were ascertained undesirable characteristics listed according to frequency and not conducive to a healthy teacher-pupil relationship. These were bad temper and intolerance; unfairness and inclination to have favorites; disinclination to show interest in the pupil; unreasonableness in demands; gloominess and unfriendliness; sarcasm and disposition to use ridicule; tendency to talk excessively; overbearingness and conceitedness;

¹⁹Paul A. Witty, "Evaluation of the Effective Teacher," in *Improving Educational Research*, Washington, D.C., 1948, pp. 198-214.

²⁰Paul A. Witty, "The Teacher Who Helped Me Most," EE, XXIV (October 1947), 345-354.

and lack of a sense of humor. These latter listings do not signify good mental health on the part of the teacher.

To further appreciate the importance of this relationship, Nelson²¹ suggests that an investigation of employer-employee relationships in industry might be an invaluable asset to the teacher. This in a proportionate degree, he claims, can be applied to the student because basically all human beings' psychological needs are the same.

Likewise a teacher who learns from any and every source what makes for harmonious relations is fully aware of the all-embracing formal purpose of education in the United States. Therefore, teacher-student relations should be of the type that will help students to live democratically that they may be better prepared to deal with others on the same basis. "It is by such experience and such learning that the democratic way of life is enhanced."²² The author enumerated some ways by which this may be accomplished. They were: 1) Note effect of behavior upon students; and be able to see their point of view; 2) Know pupils and be sensitive to individual needs; 3) Have interest in students; do not treat them as robots - for example, employ constructive comments, informal conversations, praise, etc; 4) Establish clear

²¹ Nelson, 298.

²² Donald J. Shanks, "The Teacher as Counselor," Series VI, NO. 10, XII (1948), p. 14.

communication with student by explaining purpose of the course, the "what" and "how" of assignments, discussing achievement and result of work, reprove when needed, allowing a "give" and "take" in expressing opinion, accepting pupil evaluation; 5) Be fair and train for democratic leadership. A teacher thus actuated should provide a high level of cooperation on the part of all members of the group, and, in consequence thereof, should establish a wholesome teacher-student relationship.

Nelson²³ further contends that desirable learning does not take place where there is friction, frustration, or misunderstanding. Hence, no teacher can ignore the necessity of establishing friendly and harmonious student-relationships especially in a country where democracy is considered a way of life as well as a form of government. This places emphasis on student responsibility as well. However, the teacher because of his maturity should assume the major responsibility and remember that everything that he does in contact with his students affects their relationship for good or ill.

While the foregoing studies and investigations have been discussed in some detail because of their contributions and

²³Nelson, 301.

import, there are some others that might be cited and briefly explained. An additional study of teacher-pupil relationship was the Cleveland Survey, subsidized by the New York Commonwealth Fund, and reported by E. K. Wickman.²⁴ This study was concerned with the attitude of the teacher towards the students' behavior and actions rather than with the various factors of the classroom and the pedagogical procedures of the teacher. It is noteworthy in this study that while the teachers considered delinquencies, sex, and annoying classroom behavior the most serious problems; the mental hygienists claimed that withdrawal was the most serious personal problem.

Another study, "The Measurement of Teacher Merit," was made by McCall²⁵ It investigated teacher behavior and certain conditions of teaching in the light of an over-all criterion contributed by a number of different kinds of pupil growth.

The study of the General Research Fund of the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, reported by Grim and Hoyt,²⁶ was limited to certain interpersonal relations. The authors regarded the psychological state of the learner as a cluster of intervening variables (such as feelings, attitudes, emotions, etc.) between

²⁴E.K. Wickman, Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes, New York, 1932.

²⁵W. A. McCall, Measurement of Teacher Merit, Raleigh, N. C., 1952.

²⁶Paul S. Grim, and Carl R. Hoyt, "Appraisal of Teaching Competency," ER Bu. XXXI (April 16, 1952), 85-91.

the instructional material as stimulus and teacher-approved behavior as responses. They were interested in the educational development of the child within himself rather than in the relations to others about him, an antithesis to accepting face-value appearance.

In a desire to find out the characteristics liked best in a teacher, Anderson²⁷ stated that 6,404 children ranging from 3B to 8A inclusive of the Cleveland Public Schools were asked to write a composition on "The Teacher I Like Best of All" and to tell why. The reasons stated were grouped under four headings: Personal Appearance; Discipline; Teaching Ability; and Traits of Character. Previous to gathering data from the children's compositions, administrators and teachers were asked to vote on which of the four headings they thought would be mentioned most often by the children. Quite contrary to the administrators' and faculties' expectations, the heading, personal appearance, that they rated first, was mentioned by only 4 per cent of the children while teaching ability was chosen by 56 per cent, and discipline by 29 per cent. The outstanding single characteristic emphasized was kindness, which was discussed by 30 per cent, in some cases at great length. Only three of this large number mentioned pretty clothes.

²⁷H.H. Anderson, J. E. Brewer, and M.F. Reed, "Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalities," APM No. 11 (December 1946), 3-156.

Robbins,²⁸ reporting on a study conducted in the University of Ohio among 200 Sophomores and 150 Juniors, ranging in age from twenty to twenty-six, obtained similar results. They had been asked to check two lists, one entitled; "What I Consider the Most Important Good Personality Traits of My Best Teacher," the other, "What I Consider the Most Important Bad Personality Trait of My Poorest Teacher." Both boys and girls ranked ability to teach first, and knowledge of subject matter second. Girls rated general enthusiasm third while boys favored student participation. Sense of humor was scored twelfth and last by the boys, but seventh by the girls. Pleasing voice, neatness of appearance, and poised business-like attitude were least important. There was no notable preference for or against the sex of the teacher.

In an experiment conducted by Anderson and Brewer but reported by Herrick,²⁹ 128 kindergarten children were the subjects. They were divided into three groups: 1) Nursery school of normal or supervised children of Iowa City; 2) An orphanage nursery school group; 3) A control group of non-orphanage nursery children of pre-school age. Its purpose was to see if social interplay of children could be observed and reliably recorded, as well as to

²⁸R.G. Robbins, "Student Reactions to Teacher Personality Traits," EAS, XXX (1941) 241-246.

²⁹V.E. Herrick, "Teachers' Classroom Personalities," ESJ, XLVI (1945), 126-129.

analyze the behavior data of the three groups of children of pre-school age. Two children were brought to the experimental play room and allowed to play with sandbox and toys for five minutes; their behavior being observed through a one-way vision screen. Then each child was paired at random with five others in an experimental play situation. Each orphanage child whether in nursery school or in the control group was paired with five of his own group and with five of the other group. Observations were recorded as tallies on the observation blank; from these, scores were obtained. Eight categories of dominative behavior and four of integrative behavior were defined. These included practically all of social behavior which observers could see or hear. Results showed that among contacts initiated by teachers, two out of three were dominative, while among teacher contacts initiated by children six out of seven were integrative. Hence, teachers had higher mean tendencies of dominative than integrative contacts. This revealed that teachers were meeting aggression with aggression, systematically inciting resistance, not systematically cutting the vicious circle. The results also showed the teachers' tendency to dominate boys.

On the assumption that teaching personality, as well as the pupils' attitudes towards the teachers as a result of the teachers'

attitudes towards them could be measured, Cook and Leeds³⁰ constructed a Teacher-Pupil Inventory. This resembled the items of Strong's Interest Inventory except that a five point scale was used instead of a three. The scale used in rating teachers was a modification of Baxter's Rating Scale of Teacher's Personal Effectiveness. Seventy schools participated in the study. The findings indicated that the attitude of individual teachers towards the pupils is significantly related to the pupils' attitudes towards the teacher. Both can be measured with reliability approaching ninety. Pupils ratings at intermediate grade levels are reliable and valid. Further significant relation was shown between their ratings and those of the principal and of an expert. As a final conclusion, the authors maintained that teaching personality can be measured with as high a validity as can academic aptitude.

Despite the long and painstaking endeavors in this field of research, most of the studies verify the findings of Dosmas and Tiedman's³¹ annotated bibliography on teacher competence. Of the listed 1000 titles, only a few of the studies reported made any

³⁰W.W. Cook, and C.H. Leeds, "Measuring the Teaching Personality," EPM, VII (1947), 399-410.

³¹S.J. Dosmas and D.V. Tiedman, "Teacher Competence - An Annotated Bibliography," ED, XIX (1950), 101-218.

pretense of getting to the essential problem, relationship with teacher behavior and its effects as revealed in pupil behavior. Due to the many intangibles involved, as well as the unavailability of measuring devices for most teacher behavior and for all but a few pupil behavior, educators have been greatly handicapped.

In an effort to turn the tide in this regard, Sister Mary Amatora Tschechteln, O.S.F. has constructed personality and diagnostic tests along with teacher-rating scales. She has also conducted numerous studies in child and adolescent psychology, as well as family life studies. One of her articles concerns itself with the similarity in teacher and pupil personality.³² In it the Child Personality Scale and its component teacher form was used. Having taken a special precaution to avoid the halo effect by staggering the ends, it was believed these scales would further objectivity since a number of independent judgments could be secured for each individual teacher and pupil.

The personalities of 100 teachers and their pupils from Grades IV through VIII of public and private schools in both urban and rural areas were studied. In the first part of this study, the teacher was rated on each of the twenty-two traits of personality by three or four fellow teachers in the same school, but not necessarily those teaching the same grade. The pupils were rated

³²Sister Mary Amatora, O.S.F., "Similarity in Teacher and Pupil Personality," TJP, XXXVII (1954), 45-50.

by eight classmates on each of the twenty-two items. In the second part of the investigation, ratings were secured for each pupil from three or four of his teachers.

When completed, two separate analyses were made; the first, based on the personality of the teachers and pupils as judged by teachers; the second, compared personalities of teachers as rated by pupils. The ratings each teacher received on each scale were averaged separately for each teacher on each scale, thus giving the teacher's raw score ratings on a specified scale. For the pupils there were two sets of data, each being handled separately. After each pupil's raw score in each part was computed separately as for teachers, a mean was obtained for each class for each scale.

The data corroborated each other and revealed positive relationships among all of the twenty-two elements of personality measured. The results of more than half the scales indicated similarity between teacher and pupil personality, which were statistically significant at one per cent level of confidence. In addition, on one fourth more of the items there was verification within the five per cent level.

Since statistical data report only facts, they do not disclose anything relative to casual relationships, which would have no major part in this study since the author had used it to prove the import of teacher personality. The most important findings appear to be that there were no negative correlations,

but rather that every element of personality measured showed positive relationship. Sister Mary Amatora cautioned that if such findings were true generally, it is of paramount concern that administrators and teachers in teacher-training schools be on the alert to detect any unfavorable characteristics of this significant factor in teaching success.

In another study by Sister Mary Amatora³³ the purpose was to show how some 1000 children in Grade IV through VIII in both public and private schools have discriminated in rating their teachers. The number of pupils in the rooms of these seven teachers varied from twenty-five to fifty-six. The scale used was the author's Diagnostic Teacher Rating Scale. Ratings were made from each area of the diagnostic check list corresponding thereto, but because the median rating of the scaled items was not the exact theoretical mean, they were transposed into percentile scores, which have been plotted on a profile. These show how discriminating the pupils were.

Quite contrary to adult opinion, children of elementary school age are often surprisingly discerning in their casual observations of teachers. At this age, too, they are quicker in making teacher-acquaintance. Another argument in favor of their decisions is the length of their contact with their respective teachers because

³³Sister Mary Amatora, O.S.F., "Can Elementary School Children Discriminate Certain Traits in Their Teachers?" XXIII, GD, (March 1952) 75-80.

in most cases elementary schools are not departmentalized. Consequently, at this level the entire school day, including even the recreation, is spent under the same teacher, thus making possible more detailed and continuous observations. While in anything human, there is a diversity of opinion, there is no criterion for denying the possibility of reaching a consensus of agreement.

To remove further objections that this is just another new educational fad, the article has emphasized that this was no recent device to aid teacher improvement. For nearly half a century this procedure has been used by college students, later by high school students, and for the last few decades at the elementary school level. Of the last mentioned, Sister Mary Amatora cited two of the more comprehensive large-scale studies. One was that of Kratz,³⁴ who surveyed ratings of teachers by 2000 pupils of Grades II through VIII; the other was that of Hanthorn³⁵ who used the ratings of over 6,000 elementary pupils.

Although these studies cannot be conclusive or generalized as regards all elementary school children, they were enlightening and revealing and could be vitally significant. They also show that pupils even at this scholastic level do have judgments, which

³⁴H.E. Kratz, "Character of the Best Teacher As Recognized by Children," XXXX PS, III (June 1896), 413-18.

³⁵A. Hanthorn, "My Best Teacher," AC, XV (January 1930), 5-6, 60-61.

are not of a carbon-copied nature, and that they do have some definite ideas of what should characterize a true teacher, of whom no better model can be found than the Master Teacher of all times. "He had no stereotyped formula; He did not treat all alike. He did not always approve of their ideas or their deeds, but He made them all feel that they were taken seriously and completely understood as worthwhile, individual persons."³⁶ To have acted thus was just another manifestation of Christ's perfectly integrated personality, which was "free from all eccentricity and motivated by the most sincere and lofty altruism that ever dictated how man should deal with man."³⁷

Since the studies pertinent to teacher-pupil relationship emphasize the importance of personality, all teachers should be interested in making their own the tenets of the core book of effective personality published in a series of four monographs by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. They give a life-size portrait of Him of Whom Nicodemus said, "Rabbi, we know that you have come a teacher from God,"³⁸ and who extended that universal invitation, "Learn of Me."³⁹ In so doing, teachers will be better able to

³⁶Hugh P. O'Neill, S.J., Personality and Mental Health, St Louis, 1955, pp. 8-9.

³⁷Ibid., p. 9.

³⁸New Testament, Jn. Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, New York, 1952

³⁹Ibid., St. Matthew, XII. p. 28.

carry on those procedures which make for desirable teacher-pupil relationship. As a means to the attainment of this ultimate objective, the next chapter was undertaken.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

To accomplish the purpose of this thesis, care had to be taken in the selection of schools and tests as well as the collection and treatment of the data. The procedures used in collecting and interpreting the data are presented in this chapter.

The schools selected satisfied the following criteria: 1) Location in similar community areas of Chicago only having approximately the same socio-economic level; 2) staffed by the same community of religious teachers; 3) no significant difference in class size; 4) pupils whose median I.Q. range from slightly above to slightly below 100; 5) early adolescents of the Eighth Grade in a one-grade room; 6) all white pupils. Lest this last stipulation might be interpreted as indicative of racial discrimination, a word of explanation might be fitting. In the original plan an allowance was made for an approximate twenty-five per cent of colored children in a group, but because schools with an intermixture of races could not be located that satisfied the other criteria, number six was an uncontrollable factor. The above criteria were chosen to remove as many variables as possible.

That adherence to the criterion concerning I.Q. was closely observed can be noted from the following table.

TABLE I

MEDIAN I.Q. OF SELECTED GROUPS

GROUP	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	CHECK
MEDIAN I.Q.	107	99	98	102	101	96	101	103

Although some of the external surroundings of the schools might seem to contradict their being in the comparatively same socio-economic level, substantiation from authoritative sources ¹ and ² justified their choice. Since both of these statistical studies had been based on the 1950 census and the conditions of the early fifties, further verification was sought by directly contacting The Chicago Plan Commission in the City Hall. They, however, had no more recently compiled data and agreed that the evidence gathered justified the conclusions, especially because of the redevelopment and rehabilitation carried on within the last three years in the blighted areas, as they are so-called. Data was

¹Edited by Philip M. Hauser and Evelyn M. Kitawaga, Chicago Community Inventory, (Chicago, 1953).

²Office of the Housing and Redevelopment Coordinator, Chicago, March, 1955.

collected about the community area and, where possible, about the greatly varied census tracts in which the schools were located. The table on the next page lists the determinants for the above conclusions. In it, as well as throughout the thesis, all identity has been concealed. Schools and teachers have been assigned only letters while the pupils have been assigned numbers.

At first planning, nine sites seemed feasible. The principals of these schools were contacted and acquainted with the purpose and plan of the study, thereby soliciting their interest and cooperation, which was spontaneous and very wholehearted. Thereupon, a list of pupils indicating I.Qs, race, and any other pertinent information was requested. From the lists received it was necessary to reject two schools: one, because of 1) a combined seventh and eighth grade group; 2) a twenty per cent Puerto Rican and a thirteen per cent Mexican enrollment; the other school because of a forty per cent colored enrollment. While one school was retained for the study although it had thirteen colored in its Eighth Grade, its remaining enrollment of forty-four, over and above the excluded group, along with the other criteria that it satisfied, seemed to justify its retention as a significant site. However, the scores of these thirteen colored pupils while valuable for any remedial individual help were not included in the findings of the study. This left seven schools qualified for the study. One of these, School H, was used as the check or control group while another school had two eligible classes.

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF SITES

Criteria	Com. Area Group	#7 B	#24 A	#27 E-G	#28 C-H	#31 D-F
NATIVITY (%)						
White		80.7	75.4	69.4	47.1	78.4
Foreign Born		17.5	29.9	13.5	11.4	21.3
Negroes		.2	1.4	16.7	40.9	.3
Other Races						
HOUSING (%)						
1 unit detached		4.0	5.6	4.1	4.1	8.9
1 unit attached		.8	.4	1.5	1.9	.1
1&2 semi-detached		.8	.8	2.7	1.6	.5
2 units		15.1	19.9	16.8	13.7	20.5
3 & 4 units		25.3	34.0	25.3	26.0	38.3
5-9 units		20.2	30.4	21.3	32.1	29.7
10 or more units		33.8	8.9	27.7	20.6	18.3
SCHOOLING (yrs.) Median						
		9.7	8.5	9.0	8.3	8.5
ANNUAL INCOME (Median)						
		\$3,678	\$3,577	\$3,442	\$2,695	\$3,568
RENT (Median)						
		\$ 38.24	\$ 24.13	\$44.12	\$17.14	\$3165
OCCUPATION (%)						
Professional		10.1	4.2	5.9	5.6	3.5
Office, etc.		47.8	40.9	44.0	29.5	40.6
Skilled		25.1	38.8	30.2	30.5	39.3
Unskilled		15.8	15.8	18.3	30.8	18.3
OTHER CHARACTERISTICS (%)						
Mech. Refrig.		86.8	81.6	89.7	65.8	79.0
Ice Refrig.		6.0	8.6	6.3	21.2	8.9
No. Refrig.		7.0	9.4	3.8	11.2	11.8
Television		25.2	29.7	27.7	18.7	30.6

While it had been recommended to have teacher selection include a range of teaching experience, other limitations of choice relative to the pupils and sites interfered with this selection receiving an "a priori" consideration. Nevertheless, the desired distribution was provided for since the years of teaching experience ranged from thirteen to forty.

Since it is the major purpose of this thesis to try to determine the validity of the implications that teacher-pupil relationship seems to play a role in the maladjustment of many children, many tests were considered as the measuring instrument for achieving the purpose proposed both as regards the teacher and the pupil. Among these were the California Test of Personality, Boynton P.B.C. Personality Inventory, California Mental Analysis, Minnesota Multiple Personality Inventory, Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Test, and the Mooney Problem Check List along with Sister Mary Amatora's Personality and Diagnostic Rating Scales. Because of the instability and emotional fluctuations of the early adolescent, any test attempting to measure attitudes or anything with an emotional basis was rejected as impractical. It was likewise decided that personality tests, which are designed to predict certain patterns of behavior, simply show the correlation between these and actual behavior as judged by other criteria, and, therefore, would not further the purposes of this study.

Finally, the Mooney Problem Check List (MPCL), Form J, Junior

High School, was selected because it states problems that are common to the early adolescent, who merely has to indicate by checking his own specific difficulties. A further recommendation for it was that it was neither a test, nor does it yield a score. The items checked give only a "census count" of each of the student's problems, which have been limited by his awareness and his willingness to reveal them. This check list appraises the major concern of a group as well as discovers clusters of associated problems. In the interest of teacher pupil relationship, they suggest a more personalized relationship with each student, as well as to further the analysis of the inhibitory pupil who is hard "to reach" or understand. By a retesting procedure, this Problem Check List measures change brought either in recognition of problems or frankness in disclosing them. Apart from the above, the reusable booklets with separate answer sheets was an economic recommendation, while the time element, simplicity of administration, ease of summarizing problems due to format and arrangement gave weight to this choice. Although these lists are self-administrative, it was thought to be more advisable for high school and junior high school students to mark them during a class period. Consequently, in the administration of this list, the directions are read aloud and there is supervision to prevent interference from other students. Because there is no time limit, even the slower students are encouraged to take ample time to express their problems, which are listed in seven areas

of thirty items each. These areas are: Health and Physical Development (HPD); School (S); Home and Family (HF); Money, Work, Future (MWF); People in General (PG); Self-centered Concerns (SC); Boy and Girl Relations (BG). While some items could be placed in more than one area, they are placed under the one in which they seem most relevant. This list, as well as those on the College and High School levels were originally prepared by Ross L. Mooney and Leonard V. Gordon of the Ohio University, by which institution they were printed and distributed. In 1950, however, they were revised by changing some of the items of the various forms. This revision along with the present printing and distribution is done by the Psychological Corporation of New York City. A copy of the Mooney Problem Check List used in this study will be found in Appendix I of this thesis.

A second test designated for this study as a means of obtaining a child's impartial and anonymous opinion of his teacher was the Diagnostic Teacher-Rating Scale by Sister Mary Amatora, O.S.F. This was developed from an experimental study in which pupils listed all the qualities that they liked and disliked in teachers. From this resulted several thousand items, which after being sorted, fell into seven broad general areas that determined the seven questions of the Area Scales. These separate items resulting in several hundred were further combined and edited, and again distributed to pupils for evaluation by sorting them into eleven piles from best to worst according to their estimate of the items

of specific importance. Any item not showing substantial agreement by statistical methods among the evaluators was discarded, while the resultant ninety-eight items of the highest agreement were arranged into two forms, A and B, of practically equal scale values. Both forms may be given at the same sitting, or the second may be given after a lapse of months, and thus serve as a comparative study. The forty-nine items of each form are divided among the seven areas: Liking for Teacher; Ability to Explain; Kindness, Friendliness, and Understanding; Fairness in Grading; Discipline; Amount of Work Required; Liking for Lessons. A copy of each form has been placed in Appendix II.

Since it is true that Junior High School students may be too immature to give valid judgments, and that the "halo effect" may jeopardize the validity of pupils rating teachers, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) was selected to be administered to the teachers as a counter check of the ratings by the pupils. Because this test has been designed to measure the attitudes of a teacher, which predict how well he will get along with pupils in interpersonal relationships, it might serve to show quite a differentiation between the attitudes that he thinks he has and the attitudes that he puts into daily practice as observed and interpreted by his pupils. The Inventory prepared by Walter W. Cook, University of Minnesota; Carroll H. Leeds, Farnam University; and Robert Callis, University of Missouri and copyrighted by the Psychological Corporation of New York City in 1951,

consists of 151 statements designed to sample opinions about teacher-pupil relations. One favorable feature about this inventory is that there are no right or wrong answers since there is considerable disagreement as to what these relations should be.

To further reduce variability consequent upon different administrators giving the tests, an experienced psychometrist did all the testing. The first testing session occurred towards the end of October when the Mooney Problem Check List was given in the seven designated sites. The pupils were encouraged to answer the three questions on the reverse side of the answer sheet as these responses are often the key to the items checked. Since these lists were to be used for research purposes, anonymity was thought to be the wiser procedure. Accordingly each pupil was given a number, and the teacher was asked to keep a seating plan of this first session that comparisons between this checking and the rechecking would not be invalidated. At this same time the teachers took the MTAI.

About ten days after this first administration, the MPCL was again presented to the Eighth Graders of Class H, which had been set aside as the check group. Although some claim greater reliability for the findings if a cross section of the total group had been selected for this purpose, several difficulties prevented this, and, hence, one site was substituted.

In early February the pupils of the selected schools were given Sister Mary Amatora's Diagnostic Teacher-Rating Scale

(DTRS). This had no time limitations, and, if any items were not clear, the administrator was free to explain the context.

The rechecking of the MPCL, which was the third part of this study, was carried on in mid-February with the same directions and under the same conditions as in the first session. Every precaution was taken to assure number identity since the purpose of this rechecking was to note if there had been an increase or decrease of problems. Either fact in itself is not all revealing, but must be weighted against other factors when an analysis of the data is made.

The listings of any pupil who was not present to check the MPCL on both occasions was invalidated, and, therefore, were not included in the total summaries. Because of this, the number of pupils whose results were eligible for consideration in this study was about thirty less than the anticipated number. Absence was the only reason for invalidating a check list.

The completion of these three preparatory steps of the study gave the following data relative to the number of pupils participating in both checkings of the MPCL and also the DTRS.

TABLE III
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SITE

SITE	MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST			DIAGNOSTIC TEACHER RATING SCALE		
	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
A	18	24	42	16	25	41
B	22	24	46	18	25	43
C	19	25	44	18	23	41
D	25	21	46	26	21	47
E	22	20	42	24	24	48
F	16	19	35	15	21	36
G	24	20	44	25	21	46
	<u>146</u>	<u>153</u>	<u>299</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>302</u>

To eliminate another possible variable, the lists and scales were all checked and scored by the one who had proposed the study, and, in consequence, was most interested in the findings as well as the analysis.

The results of the administrations of the MPCL were summarized in the following ways: boys' responses, girls' responses, and combined responses. The results of the second administration were compared to those of the first to determine whether there had been an increase or a decrease of problems during the interim. The

differences in the number of problems reported by the pupils of the seven classes participating in this study were ranked from most decrease to least decrease in per cent of problems. In addition, an analysis of the responses of all the subjects to the MPCL was made to determine if there were any similarities or differences in the number of problems checked by the pupils of each group of the seven areas of the check list.

The scores received by the teachers on the MTAI were ranked according to the percentile rank assigned to each as determined from Table II in the "MTAI Manual." The rank difference coefficient of correlation was computed for these ranks and the rank-order positions of the percentage of decrease in the number of problems between the successive administration of the MPCL.

For each school, the mean of the ratings of the pupils of their teachers on the "Area Scale" of the DTRS was found. These averages were ranked and "rho" was determined between them and the percent of decrease in the number of problems expressed by the students at each school respectively. The rank difference between the teachers' ratings on the MTAI and the "Area Scale" of the DTRS was also determined.

The ratings of the pupils of their teachers on the "Area Scale" of the DTRS were compared to the pupils' treatment of the individual items of the scale proper which dealt with these areas.

The results of this treatment of data are reported in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF RESULTS AND INTERPRETATIONS OF THE DATA

Since the Mooney Problem Check List (MPCL) is not a test, it does not measure the scope or the intensity of student problems in such a way as to yield a test score. The items checked by pupils are to be regarded only as a "census count" of each student's problems, limited by his awareness of them and his willingness to reveal them. With this recommendation of the author in mind, data were gathered and classified as to boys' responses, girls' responses and total responses for each administration of the check list. The differences between the total number of problems expressed by the pupils in each of the seven classes in the two administrations of the Mooney Problem Check List were used as the basis for ranking the sites from greatest per cent of decrease of problems to least per cent of decrease. The findings are reported in Table IV.

Site E with a 27 per cent decrease was the one in which there was the greatest decrease in per cent of problems between the first administration of the MPCL in October and the second administration in February. The other sites and their per cents

TABLE IV

RANK ORDER OF SITES IN TERMS OF PER CENT DIFFERENCES
 BETWEEN THE TWO ADMINISTRATIONS OF THE MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST

SITE	First Admin.			Second Admin.			Difference	Percent	Rank
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total			
A	801	1204	2005	526	920	1446	539	26.9	2
B	940	1096	2036	730	838	1568	468	23.0	3
C	777	1078	1855	550	969	1519	336	18.1	5
D	1065	904	1969	919	735	1654	315	15.9	6
E	1056	766	1822	756	574	1330	492	27.0	1
F	673	637	1310	597	441	1018	292	22.3	4
G	<u>1302</u>	<u>878</u>	<u>2180</u>	<u>1091</u>	<u>810</u>	<u>1901</u>	<u>279</u>	<u>12.8</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	6614	6563	13177	5169	5287	10456	2721		

were ranked in the following order: A (26.9%); B (23%); C(18.1%); D(15.9%); G (12.8%). It is interesting to note the rank order of the positions of sites E and G, which are classes in the same school. This might suggest the possibility of the influence of a given teacher upon the problems of her students. In the total picture there is a greater percent of decrease by seven per cent in the problems expressed by the boys than by the girls. However, the authors caution against misjudgment in this regard. "The fact that the student has a problem is not in itself 'bad'. Whether a problem is to be taken as 'bad' or 'good' or 'Neutral' in an individual case depends on whether it signifies a point in progression toward growth or signifies a point of imbalance toward

excessive frustration. The same item in one case may be 'bad' and in another case 'good'. Students who cannot recognize their problems or who fear to express them may well be in a worse situation than those who are free in their recognition and expression."¹

In Table V are the results of the responses of all the subjects to determine the pattern of the seven problem areas of the MPCL. These were obtained by comparing the total problems in each area and ranking them accordingly.

TABLE V

RANK ORDER POSITION OF THE PROBLEM AREAS IN EACH SITE FOR THE TWO ADMINISTRATIONS OF THE MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST

SITE RANK	A		B		C		D		E		F		G	
	I*	II**	I	II	I	II	I	II	I	II	I	II	I	II
1	MWF	MWF	S	S	MWF	S	MWF	SC	SC	MWF	S	S	SC	BG
2	SC	SC	SC	MWF	S	MWF	SC	MWF	MWF	SC	SC	MWF	MWF	SC
3	S	S	MWF	SC	SC	SC	S	S	S	S	MWF	HF	S	MWF
4	PG	HF	HF	HPD	BG	HPD	PG	PG	BG	BG	BG	SC	BG	S
5	HF	BG	HPD	HF	PG	BG	BG	BG	PG	PG	PG	BG	PG	HF
6	BG	PG	PG	PG	HF	HF	HF	HF	HF	HPD	HF	PG	HF	PG
7	HPD	HPD	BG	BG	HPD	PG	HPD	HPD	HPD	HF	HPD	HPD	HPD	HPD

*First Administration

**Second Administration

¹Ross L. Mooney and Leonard V. Gordon, The Mooney Problem Check List-Manual, New York, 1950, 6.

From the above table it can be noted that on the whole the summaries of the individual sites present a similar pattern with an occasional interchange in rank as evidenced above.

In the first mentioned area, Money, Work and Future (MWF), the greatest number of problems centered about "Wanting to earn some of my own money," and "Needing a job during vacation." The solution of these would in turn eliminate the other big matters of concern in this regard: namely, "Wanting to buy more of my own things, Having no regular allowance, and Having to ask parents for money." Another matter of big import was "Deciding what to take in High School while many of the boys were "Wanting to know more about trades." In the first administration one out of every three found "Wondering if I'll ever get married" to be a problem, but in the interim of the five months, it was a problem for only one out of four.

In the third area, Self-centered Concerns (SC), which closely followed the first, the chief concerns from the data supplied were: "Being afraid of making mistakes, Trying to stop a bad habit, Sometimes not being as honest as I could be, Lacking self-control, Sometimes wishing that I had never been born, Forgetting things, Finding it hard to talk about my troubles."

In the third area, School (S), many problems were checked consistently by the pupils. However, in the rechecking they showed a great decrease. Nevertheless, because of their being difficulties, which can be greatly helped if not eradicated by a

wholesome teacher-pupil relationship, they are listed in the order of frequency: "Don't like to study, Trouble with Arithmetic, So often restless in classes, Not interested in certain subjects, Afraid to speak up in class, Not spending enough time in study, Afraid of failing in school work, Afraid of tests, Trouble with spelling and grammar, and Too much school work to do at home."

In the remaining four areas, the items most often checked by the pupils were as follows: People in General - "Losing my temper; Getting into arguments, Wishing people liked me better, Wanting a more pleasing personality, Never chosen as a leader, Feelings too easily hurt." Home and Family (HF) "Parents working too hard, Talking back to my parents, Not getting along with a brother or sister"; Boy-Girl (BG) "Learning to dance, So often not allowed out at night, No place to entertain friends, Too little chance to do what I want to do, Not allowed to have dates, and Nothing interesting to do in my spare time;" Health-Physical Development (HPD), For boys if short and underweight, for girls if tall and overweight, also any bearing on their appearance, "Often not hungry for meals" was the admission of eighty-six.

Of the 210 items, the total number checked for "Being behind in school, Wanting to live in a different neighborhood, Girl friend, and Clash of opinions between me and my parents" was the same in each listing. The first two were even identical as to the number of boys and girls. Eighteen of them showed an increase in the rechecking and are listed in the order of frequency: Smoking(14),

Unable to discuss certain problems at home (10), Deciding whether to go steady (8), Too little spending money (6), Need a job during vacation (6), Not enough discussion in class (5), Boys don't seem to like me (5), Teachers not practicing what they preach (5), Too few nice clothes (4), Parents separated or divorced (2), Getting into trouble (2), Giving into temptations (2), Parents making too many decisions for me (2), Deciding whether I'm in love (1), Feeling ashamed of something I've done (1), Being careless (1), Missing too much school because of illness (1), Not allowed to use the family car (1), The increase of the above problems seemed a normal development and indicative of their growing-up.

While for the most part there was a great decrease at least in the indication of problems, this is not necessarily of itself to be accepted as a good omen. This consequence may be attributable to one of three causes. The need of definite help had been recognized, sought, and accepted, thus clearing up difficulties. Or, the experience of the past months had caused the pupil to become reticent since he had not found that understanding and kindness that he had hoped for. Hence, problems are no longer disclosed. Recognition of the key problem would also tend to decrease the number of problems. On the other hand, an increase of problems or rather the statement of them does not imply a poor or faulty teacher-pupil relationship; in fact the converse may be true. The rapport built up by the teacher over these months may have

inspired a courage and confidence that impel pupils to manifest those problems which previously had been jealously guarded.

In the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) there are no right or wrong answers although these terms have been used to avoid a change in the accepted terminology. They do not imply correctness or incorrectness of an answer, but rather agreement or disagreement with specific attitude statements. Hence, the number wrong was subtracted from the number right, thus obtaining the attitude score. This was then compared with the appropriate group norm to get its equivalent percentile rank, which had been determined by an experimental study of a stratified random sample of Minnesota teachers of whose returns 1,714 were usable. In establishing the group norms, it was decided that length of teaching experience and presumably also age were not significantly related to teachers' attitudes in the elementary and high schools, but that they were significantly related in one room rural schools. In graded elementary schools the same was true relative to the size of the school system. The authors² also caution that the Inventory to some extent at least reflects their educational philosophy; consequently if the user's philosophy is at variance with theirs, he will score low. They claim, however, that the

²W.A. Cook, C.H. Leeds, and R. Callis, Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Manual, New York, 1951.

original validation study in 1946 was carried out in schools that represented the average educational philosophy and practice, neither extremely progressive or ultraconservative. It is felt that these preliminary remarks were a necessity for the correct understanding of the percentile ranks obtained by the teachers of the participating groups. The teachers (designated here by the letter of the site in which they were teaching) ranked as follows: F, A, C, G, D, E, B.

The mean of the ratings of the teachers on the "Area Scale" of the Diagnostic Teacher-Rating Scale (DTRS) was used as the basis for ranking the teachers. They ranked as follows: F, C, E, G, D, B, A. The good qualities listed according to their frequency were: "Knows how to teach (268), Neatness (260); Always explains lessons clearly (255); Humorous (248); Gives extra help to those in need (246); Gives grades earned (236); Speaks in clear, pleasant voice (226); Explains meaning (220); Gives fair grades (215); Can be talked to as a friend (208); Gives all a chance to answer (207); Keeps good order (204); Right amount of work (204); Lessons interesting (196); Never too much or too little work (184); Quite fair in grading (183)." The faults most frequently checked were: "Has a quick temper (138); Runs overtime with lessons (79); Always finds fault with everything one does (54); Does not praise (51); Unkind correction (50); Grades some too low (38); Is too grouchy (38)." The eight least marked items were: Explains in a way that no one can understand (17); Is not polite (16); Does not

explain the lessons clearly (15); Always wears a frown (15); Does not know very well the lessons she teaches (9); Gives the boys better grades (8); Never is fair in grading (7); Is not interested in school work (4). No item was left unchecked by everyone.

Table VI lists the information which was used in compiling the three rank difference correlations for: 1) the per cent of decrease of problems between the two administrations of the MPCL and the rank order of teachers according to the MTAI; 2) the former variable and the ranking of the rating of the teacher by the pupils on the "Area Scale" of the DTRS; 3) the latter variable and the rank order of the teacher's score on the MTAI.

TABLE VI

RANK ORDER OF THE SITES BASED ON THE RESULTS
OF THE THREE INSTRUMENTS USED IN THIS STUDY

RANK	MPCL*	MTAI**	DTRS***
1	E	F	F
2	A	A	C
3	B	C	E
4	F	G	G
5	C	D	D
6	D	E	B
7	G	B	A

*Mooney Problem Check List **Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory ***Diagnostic Teacher Rating Scale

The values for "rho" for the three pairs of variables mentioned were: $-.14$; $-.11$; and $+.36$ respectively. Although none of the above values are statistically significant at either one per cent or the five per cent level of confidence, the utilization of these instruments should not be completely dismissed for future investigations in the area of teacher-pupil relationships. The magnitude of "rho" for the first two variables, although low was negative and this suggested a desirable relationship in that generally the groups of students who reported the greatest per cent of decrease in problems were in the classrooms of teachers who ranked highest on the MTAI and DTRS.

The low value of "rho" for the third pair of variables might be explained on the basis of the educational philosophy of the teachers who participated in this study. In that, scores on the MTAI and supervisory reports on the teachers were quite different in some instances. This suggested, as the authors of the instrument state in their manual³, that perhaps the educational philosophy of the teachers deviated appreciably from that of the authors and that probably another instrument would be more valuable.

The findings of this study contributed additional information about the all important area of teacher-pupil relationships and

³Ibid., 4.

suggested that many more studies in this field need to be conducted. The conclusions of this work along with some recommendations for further research are included in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At the very outset of the study, it was realized that its purpose would very probably not be conclusively achieved. Nevertheless, its findings have provided another proof of the generally accepted assumptions that some adolescents are besieged with many problems while others are not, and also that where there is a desirable teacher-pupil relationship, problems are eliminated or at least greatly lessened. However, because of the countless intagibles in such a study there are many questions left unanswered, much that calls for more diligent and extensive research.

The responses of the Mooney Problem Check List have merely substantiated objectively the existence of many problems for many adolescents, which are neither unique nor too different from each other. They further showed that the pupils' problems are clustered in related areas and are provoked or aggravated by their environment or their heritage.

In the two weeks' lapse between the testing and retesting of the Control Group, there was a considerable decrease, ranging from thirty-one to eighty-one, in the total number of problems in each of the seven areas of the MPCL. This might have been due to an observed reticence, or that the feelings of the moment played a

great part in their markings. Given the first test without any preliminary warning or time for premeditation, these pupils complied very sincerely and wholeheartedly with the administrator. However, when they related this experience to their elders they may have been cautioned to be non-committal, or their less guileless peers may have taunted them for their gullibility. However, while it is true that no relationship, no matter how ideal, could effect such a change in so short a time, Gordon¹ proves that problems can change over a few days or from one administration to another. Within a nine day interval, he administered the check list to seventy college men and forty-six college women. He found eighty three per cent of changes, but at the same time the frequency with which items were marked on the first administration was correlated with the frequency with which each of the same items were marked on the second administration and a correlation coefficient of .93 was found. If an expert would not consider such an occurrence a limitation of the instrument, it should not cause any concern as regards the control group.

Since the decrease in the per cent of problems may be due to teacher rapport, undesirable impact from the teacher, or that one has learned to spot key problems, it might be recommended that

¹Leonard V. Gordon and Ross L. Mooney, The Mooney Problem Check List (Manual) New York, 1950, p. 8.

there be a longer time-spacing between the two administrations of the checking. This might assure greater validity because additional time is needed before a more definite relationship can be established.

Due to the limited time available, only one form of the DTRS was given to the pupils who participated in this study. The results obtained might have been more conclusive had Form A been given in the earlier part of the year followed by Form B as near to the end of the year as possible. Thus comparative data would be provided that might facilitate the determining of the effectiveness of the teacher's role relative to the pupil's problems.

The results obtained by the teachers on the MTAI disclosed that not always those having the highest percentile rank on the MTAI were considered to be the most effective teachers by their supervisors and pupils. This would suggest that greater caution and care be taken in the selection of an instrument to be used for measuring teacher attitudes. To do so would assure closer agreement between the educational philosophy of the authors and the potential users.

Like all human instruments, the tests used had their limitations even though every precaution was taken to remove any possible variables. Their results are merely directive because with such a small localized sampling, no conclusive deductions could be made. They are of value in so far as they are accepted as just another evidence of pupils' needs and problems; teacher-

pupil attitudes, which are indicators of classroom behavior; and the interaction of the teacher upon the pupil and vice versa, which in turn affect their relationships. Pupils' ratings of teachers are quite indicative that the claim to certain attitudes or the mere expression of them neither control teacher conduct nor produce any change in pupil behavior.

According to Saint Thomas, "Whoever teaches, leads another to truth,"² since "Truth is an intelligible light and a simple form,"³ this should be a reliable directive in determining proper attitudes. These can only result in a wholesome teacher-pupil relationship. Through this medium the teacher can help the pupils to change ideas, attitudes, and actions not merely by guiding their learning, but also by opening up new avenues of experience. This he will do if he satisfied the following criteria stated by Youngs.⁴ In his classroom the teacher maintains a good emotional climate. He organizes his class and its activities so that all have the feeling of belonging. Undemonstrative affection is given to all his students. Above all, such a teacher is alert to recognize individual needs and difficulties, and does something about them.

²Walter Farrell, O.P. and Martin J. Healy, My Way of Life. Brooklyn, 1952, p. 148.

³Ibid., 149.

⁴George R. Youngs - Lecture given at Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois, 1953.

If these are a teacher's tenets, like another Michelangelo, he will gaze down at each child and say, "There's an angel in that marble, and I'm going to make him visible."⁵ This he will do if he has earnestly and seriously endeavored to master his Christian philosophy and psychology. By his fidelity to their principles, he will be harmoniously attuned to "the touch of the Master's hand"! What greater guarantee is there for desirable and wholesome teacher-pupil relationships!

⁵Christopher News Notes, No. 75, May 1956, p. 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Amatora, Sister Mary, O.S.F. Diagnostic Teacher Rating Scale Manual. Cincinnati, Ohio, 1952.
- Bush, Robert Nelson. The Teacher-Pupil Relationship. New York, 1954.
- Commission on American Citizenship. Better Men for Better Times. Washington, D.C., 1943.
- Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. The New Testament. New York, 1952.
- Cook, W.A. Leeds, C.H. Callis, R. Minnesota Attitude Teacher Inventory Manual. New York, 1951.
- Farrell, Walter, O.P., and Martin J. Healy. My Way of Life. Brooklyn, New York, 1952.
- Hauser, Philip M. and Kitawaga, Evelyn M. Chicago Community Inventory, Chicago, 1955.
- McCarthy, Raphael C. Safeguarding Mental Health, Milwaukee, 1937.
Training of the Adolescent, Milwaukee, 1934.
- Mooney, Ross L. and Gordon, Leonard V. Mooney Problem Check List Manual. New York, 1950.
- Office of the Housing and Redevelopment Coordinator of Chicago. Census Blocks, Chicago, March 1955.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics. New York, 1956.
- Sisters of Charity, B.V.M. Elementary Handbook. Dubuque, Iowa, 1949.
- Wickman, E.K. Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes. New York, 1932.
- Witty, Paul A. "Evaluation of Studies of the Characteristics of the Effective Teacher". Improving Educational Research, Washington, D.C., American Education Research Association, pp. 198-204.

Editor. Mental Health, Yearbook 1954, Part II, National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago, 1955.

B. PAMPHLETS AND ARTICLES

- Alt, Hershel. "Community Action and Mental Health Problems of Children." Mental Hygiene, XXXVIII (October 1954), 613-626.
- Amatora, Sister Mary, O.S.P. "A Diagnostic Teacher-Rating Scale." Journal of Psychology, XXX (October 1950,) 395-399.
- "A Twenty-Two Trait Personality Scale." Journal of Psychology, XVIII (July 1944), 3-8.
- "A Study in Teacher Personality." Journal of Educational Research, XXXIV (May 1951), 709-714.
- "Can Elementary School Children Discriminate Certain Traits in Their Teachers?" Child Development XXIII (March 1952,) 75-80.
- "Child Adjustment Number," Education LXXIII (December 1952) 201-208.
- "Early Guidance-Personality Adjustment of the School Child." Education LXXIII (April 1953), 510-513.
- "Educate the Whole Child." Education, LXXI (February 1951), 393-396.
- "Factor Analysis of Children's Personality Scale." Journal of Psychology, XVIII (October 1944), 197-201.
- "Norms on Child Personality Scale." Elementary School Journal, LI (December 195), 209-213.
- "Reliability of Personality Scale." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XII (Spring 1952), 132-136.
- "Self-Appraisal of Children." Journal of Educational Research, XXXIX (September 1945), 25-32.
- "Similarity in Teacher and Pupil Personality". Journal of Psychology, XXXVII (January 1954), 45-50.
- "Social Perception of Teaching Personality." Progressive Education XXXII (November 1955).
- Teacher Personality - Its Influence on Pupils." Education LXXI (November 1950) 154-158.

"Teacher-Rating by Younger Children." Journal Teacher Education, V (June 1954), 149-152.

"Grade-level Similarities and Differences in the Teacher Personality." School and Society, LXXIX (June 23, 1954), 25-28.

"Guiding the Child's Personality Potential to Fruitful Fulfillment." Education, XXIV (November 1955), 156-164.

"Teachers' Rating of Pupil Personality." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXI (January 1945), 22-26.

Anderson, H.H., Brewer, J.J., and Reed, M.F. "Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalities," Applied Psychology Monographs, No. 11 (December 1946), 3-156.

Anderson, John E. "The Relation of Attitude to Adjustment." Education, LXXIII (December 1952), 210-218.

Barr, Arvil Sylvester. "Wisconsin Study of Teaching Ability." Journal Educational Research, XXXIII (May 1940), 671-684.

"Impressions, Trends, and Further Research." Journal Experimental Education, XIV (December 1945), 200-206.

"Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency. A Summary of Investigations." Journal of Experimental Education, XVII (1948), 203-283.

"Wisconsin Studies of Teaching Ability." Journal Educational Research, XLI (May 1948), 710-717.

"Measurement of Teaching Ability." Journal Experimental Education, XIV (1945) 1-206.

Barr, et al. "Report of Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness." Review Educational Research, XXII (1952), 238-253.

Billig, Alfred Leroy. "Serving the Emotionally Handicapped." Phi Delta Kappan, XXXVI (May 1955), 303-304.

Bolin, Donald W. "Student Evaluates Teacher." Clearing House, XXX (October 1955),

Brill, Normal J. "Solving the Problem of Emotional Illness." Mental Hygiene, XXXVIII (October 1954), 594-603.

Cook, W.W. and Leeds, C.H., "Measuring the Teaching Personality," Educational and Psychological Measurement, VII (1947), 399-410.

- Curran, Charles A. "Guidance and Counseling in Education." Education, LXXIII (December 1952), 223-228.
- Dombrose, Lawrence A. "Do Teachers Cause Neurotic Conflict in Children." Mental Hygiene, XXXIX (January 1955), 99-110.
- Dosmas, S.J. and Tiedman, D.V. "Teacher Competence - An Annotated Bibliography." Journal Experimental Education, XIX (1950), 101-218.
- Doyle, C.I., S.J. "Personality Development." Catholic Business Education Review, VI (November 1954), 27-32.
- Douglass, Harl Roy. "In-Service Growth of Junior High School Teachers." Clearing House, XXX (September 1955), 11-15.
- Gothman, R.E. "Personality and Teaching Efficiency." Journal Experimental Education, XIV (December 1945), 157-165.
- Grim, Paul S. and Hoyt, Carl R. "Appraisal of Teacher Competency." Education Research Bulletin, XXXI (April 1952), No. 4, 85-91.
- Hanthorn, Alice. "My Best Teacher." American Childhood, XV (January 1930), 5-6; 60-61.
- Hellfritsch, A.C. "A Factor Analysis of Teacher-Abilities." Journal Experimental Education, XIV (December 1945), 166-199.
- Herrick, V.E. "Teachers' Classroom Personalities." Elementary School Journal, XLVI (1946), 126-159.
- Jayne, D.D. "A Study of Relationship Between Teaching and Educational Outcomes." Journal Experimental Education, XIV (December 1945), 101-134.
- Krants, H.E. "Characteristics of the Best Teacher as Recognized by the Children." Pedagogical Seminary, III (June 1896), 413-418.
- La Duke, C.V. "The Measurement of Teaching Ability (Study Three)." Journal Experimental Education, XIV (September 1945), 75-100.
- McCall, W.A. "The Measurement of Teacher Merit." State Department, Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1952.
- Mones, Leon. "Psychiatric Insight and Educational Effort." Education, LXXVI (November 1955) 139-151.
- Nelson, A.G. "Better Teacher-Student Relations." Phi Delta Kappan, XXXVI (May 1955), 295-301.

- O'Neill, Hugh P., S.J. "Personality and Mental Health. St. Louis, 1955.
- Oliva, Peter F. "Causes of Behavior Problems." Education Digest, XXI (April 1956), 8-10.
- Robbins, F.G. "Students' Reactions to Teacher Personality Traits," Education Administration and Supervision, XXX (1944), 241-246.
- Rolfe, J.F. "The Measurement of Teaching Ability-Study Two." Journal Experimental Education, XIV (September 1945), 52-74.
- Rotsker, L.E. "The Measurement of Teaching Ability-Study One." Journal Experimental Education, XIV (September 1945), 6-51.
- Ryans, David G. "The Investigation of Teacher Characteristics." The Education Record, XXXIV (October 1953), 371-396.
- Shank, Donald S. "The Teacher as Counselor." Office of Education, Washington, D.C., Series VI, Pamphlet No. 10, XII (1948).
- Stevenson, George S. "Education for Mental Health." Mental Hygiene, XXXVIII (October 1954), 585-602.
- Symonds, Percival M. "Characteristics of the Effective Teacher." Journal Experimental Education, XXIII (June 1955), 289-310.
- "Evaluation of Teacher Personality." Teacher College Record, XLVIII (1946), 21-34.
- "Personality of the Teacher." Journal Education Research. XL (1947), 625-661.
- Symonds, Percival M. and Murray, Sherman. "A Personality Survey of Junior High School Students." School Review, LX (1947) 449-461.
- Tiedeman, S.C. "A Study of Pupil-Teacher Personality." Journal Education Research, XXXV (1942), 651-664.
- Von Eschen, D.R. "The Impro ability of Teachers in Service." Journal Experimental Education, XIV (December 1945), 135-156.
- Walsh, Ignatius. Catholic Education. Chicago, 1917.
- Williams, Jr. C.C. "When Pupils Rate the Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan, XXXV (April 1954), 283-284.

Witty, Paul A. "The Teacher Who Helped Me Most." Elementary Education, XXIV (October 1947), 345-354.

Zweibel, A.D. "Psychiatric Principles and Their Implications for the Classroom Teacher." Education, XXXVI (November 1955), 181-185.

APPENDIX I

SPECIMEN COPY OF THE MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST

**1950
REVISION**

MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST

**J JUNIOR
HIGH
SCHOOL
FORM**

ROSS L. MOONEY
Bureau of Educational Research
Ohio State University

HPD
S
HF
MWF
BG
PG
SC
TOTAL

Age..... Date of birth..... Boy..... Girl.....

Grade in school..... Name of school.....

Name of the person to whom you are to turn in this paper.....

Your name Date.....

DIRECTIONS

This is a list of some of the problems of boys and girls. You are to pick out the problems which are troubling you.

Read the list slowly, and as you come to a problem which is troubling you, draw a line under it. For example, if you are often bothered by headaches, you would draw a line under the first item, like this, "1. Often have headaches."

When you have finished reading through the whole list and marking the problems which are troubling you, please answer the questions on Page 5.

DIRECTIONS: Read the list slowly, and as you come to a problem which troubles you, draw a line under it.

1. Often have headaches
2. Don't get enough sleep
3. Have trouble with my teeth
4. Not as healthy as I should be
5. Not getting outdoors enough
6. Getting low grades in school
7. Afraid of tests
8. Being a grade behind in school
9. Don't like to study
10. Not interested in books
11. Being an only child
12. Not living with my parents
13. Worried about someone in the family
14. Parents working too hard
15. Never having any fun with mother or dad
16. Spending money foolishly
17. Having to ask parents for money
18. Having no regular allowance
19. Family worried about money
20. Having no car in the family
21. Not allowed to use the family car
22. Not allowed to run around with the kids I like
23. Too little chance to go to parties
24. Not enough time for play and fun
25. Too little chance to do what I want to do
26. Slow in making friends
27. Bashful
28. Being left out of things
29. Never chosen as a leader
30. Wishing people liked me better
31. Being nervous
32. Taking things too seriously
33. Getting too excited
34. Being afraid of making mistakes
35. Failing in so many things I try to do
36. Too short for my age
37. Too tall for my age
38. Having poor posture
39. Poor complexion or skin trouble
40. Not good-looking
41. Afraid of failing in school work
42. Trouble with arithmetic
43. Trouble with spelling or grammar
44. Slow in reading
45. Trouble with writing
46. Sickness at home
47. Death in the family
48. Mother or father not living
49. Parents separated or divorced
50. Parents not understanding me
51. Too few nice clothes
52. Wanting to earn some of my own money
53. Wanting to buy more of my own things
54. Not knowing how to buy things wisely
55. Too little spending money
56. Girls don't seem to like me
57. Boys don't seem to like me
58. Going out with the opposite sex
59. Dating
60. Not knowing how to make a date
61. Being teased
62. Being talked about
63. Feelings too easily hurt
64. Too easily led by other people
65. Picking the wrong kind of friends
66. Getting into trouble
67. Trying to stop a bad habit
68. Sometimes not being as honest as I should be
69. Giving in to temptations
70. Lacking self-control
71. Not eating the right food
72. Often not hungry for my meals
73. Overweight
74. Underweight
75. Missing too much school because of illness
76. Not spending enough time in study
77. Too much school work to do at home
78. Can't keep my mind on my studies
79. Worried about grades
80. Not smart enough
81. Being treated like a small child at home
82. Parents favoring a brother or sister
83. Parents making too many decisions for me
84. Parents expecting too much of me
85. Wanting things my parents won't give me
86. Restless to get out of school and into a job
87. Not knowing how to look for a job
88. Needing to find a part-time job now
89. Having less money than my friends have
90. Having to work too hard for the money I get
91. Nothing interesting to do in my spare time
92. So often not allowed to go out at night
93. Not allowed to have dates
94. Wanting to know more about girls
95. Wanting to know more about boys
96. Wanting a more pleasing personality
97. Being made fun of
98. Being picked on
99. Being treated like an outsider
100. People finding fault with me
101. Not having as much fun as other kids have
102. Worrying
103. Having bad dreams
104. Lacking self-confidence
105. Sometimes wishing I'd never been born
106. Often have a sore throat
107. Catch a good many colds
108. Often get sick
109. Often have pains in my stomach
110. Afraid I may need an operation
111. Don't like school
112. School is too strict
113. So often feel restless in classes
114. Not getting along with a teacher
115. Teachers not practicing what they preach
116. Being criticized by my parents
117. Parents not liking my friends
118. Parents not trusting me
119. Parents old-fashioned in their ideas
120. Unable to discuss certain problems at home
121. Choosing best subjects to take next term
122. Deciding what to take in high school
123. Wanting advice on what to do after high school
124. Wanting to know more about college
125. Wanting to know more about trades
126. No place to entertain friends
127. Ill at ease at social affairs
128. Trouble in keeping a conversation going
129. Not sure of my social etiquette
130. Not sure about proper sex behavior
131. Awkward in meeting people
132. Wanting to be more like other people
133. Feeling nobody understands me
134. Missing someone very much
135. Feeling nobody likes me
136. Being careless
137. Daydreaming
138. Forgetting things
139. Being lazy
140. Not taking some things seriously enough

- | | |
|--|---|
| 141. Can't hear well | 176. Nose or sinus trouble |
| 142. Can't talk plainly | 177. Trouble with my feet |
| 143. Trouble with my eyes | 178. Not being as strong as some other kids |
| 144. Smoking | 179. Too clumsy and awkward |
| 145. Getting tired easily | 180. Bothered by a physical handicap |
| 146. Textbooks hard to understand | 181. Dull classes |
| 147. Trouble with oral reports | 182. Too little freedom in classes |
| 148. Trouble with written reports | 183. Not enough discussion in classes |
| 149. Poor memory | 184. Not interested in certain subjects |
| 150. Afraid to speak up in class | 185. Made to take subjects I don't like |
| 151. Family quarrels | 186. Clash of opinions between me and my parents |
| 152. Not getting along with a brother or sister | 187. Talking back to my parents |
| 153. Not telling parents everything | 188. Mother |
| 154. Wanting more freedom at home | 189. Father |
| 155. Wanting to live in a different neighborhood | 190. Wanting to run away from home |
| 156. Needing a job during vacations | 191. Afraid of the future |
| 157. Needing to know my vocational abilities | 192. Not knowing what I really want |
| 158. Needing to decide on an occupation | 193. Concerned about military service |
| 159. Needing to know more about occupations | 194. Wondering if I'll ever get married |
| 160. Wondering if I've chosen the right vocation | 195. Wondering what becomes of people when they die |
| 161. Not knowing what to do on a date | 196. Learning how to dance |
| 162. Girl friend | 197. Keeping myself neat and looking nice |
| 163. Boy friend | 198. Thinking too much about the opposite sex |
| 164. Deciding whether I'm in love | 199. Wanting more information about sex matters |
| 165. Deciding whether to go steady | 200. Embarrassed by talk about sex |
| 166. Getting into arguments | 201. Being jealous |
| 167. Getting into fights | 202. Disliking someone |
| 168. Losing my temper | 203. Being disliked by someone |
| 169. Being stubborn | 204. Keeping away from kids I don't like |
| 170. Hurting people's feelings | 205. No one to tell my troubles to |
| 171. Feeling ashamed of something I've done | 206. Sometimes lying without meaning to |
| 172. Being punished for something I didn't do | 207. Can't forget some mistakes I've made |
| 173. Swearing, dirty stories | 208. Can't make up my mind about things |
| 174. Thinking about heaven and hell | 209. Afraid to try new things by myself |
| 175. Afraid God is going to punish me | 210. Finding it hard to talk about my troubles |

HPD
S
HF
MWF
BG
PG
SC
TOTAL

DIRECTIONS: When you have finished marking the problems which are troubling you, answer the questions on page 5.

APPENDIX II

SPECIMEN COPY OF THE DIAGNOSTIC TEACHER-RATING SCALE

APPENDIX III

SPECIMEN COPY OF THE MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

Form A

WALTER W. COOK
University of Minnesota

CARROLL H. LEEDS
Furman University

ROBERT CALLIS
University of Missouri

DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of 150 statements designed to sample opinions about teacher-pupil relations. There is considerable disagreement as to what these relations should be; therefore, there are no right or wrong answers. What is wanted is your own individual feeling about the statements. Read each statement and decide how YOU feel about it. Then mark your answer on the space provided on the answer sheet. Do not make any marks on this booklet.

- If you strongly agree, blacken space under "SA"
- If you agree, blacken space under "A"
- If you are undecided or uncertain, blacken space under "U"
- If you disagree, blacken space under "D"
- If you strongly disagree, blacken space under "SD"

SA	A	U	D	SD
█	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
SA	A	U	D	SD
⋮	█	⋮	⋮	⋮
SA	A	U	D	SD
⋮	⋮	█	⋮	⋮
SA	A	U	D	SD
⋮	⋮	⋮	█	⋮
SA	A	U	D	SD
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	█

Think in terms of the general situation rather than specific ones. There is no time limit, but work as rapidly as you can. PLEASE RESPOND TO EVERY ITEM.

Copyright 1951. All rights reserved.
The Psychological Corporation
304 East 45th Street
New York 17, N. Y.

SA—Strongly agree
A—Agree

U—Undecided
or uncertain

D—Disagree
SD—Strongly disagree

1. Most children are obedient.
2. Pupils who "act smart" probably have too high an opinion of themselves.
3. Minor disciplinary situations should sometimes be turned into jokes.
4. Shyness is preferable to boldness.
5. Teaching never gets monotonous.
6. Most pupils don't appreciate what a teacher does for them.
7. If the teacher laughs with the pupils in amusing classroom situations, the class tends to get out of control.
8. A child's companionships can be too carefully supervised.
9. A child should be encouraged to keep his likes and dislikes to himself.
10. It sometimes does a child good to be criticized in the presence of other pupils.
11. Unquestioning obedience in a child is not desirable.
12. Pupils should be required to do more studying at home.
13. The first lesson a child needs to learn is to obey the teacher without hesitation.
14. Young people are difficult to understand these days.
15. There is too great an emphasis upon "keeping order" in the classroom.
16. A pupil's failure is seldom the fault of the teacher.
17. There are times when a teacher cannot be blamed for losing patience with a pupil.
18. A teacher should never discuss sex problems with the pupils.
19. Pupils have it too easy in the modern school.
20. A teacher should not be expected to burden himself with a pupil's problems.
21. Pupils expect too much help from the teacher in getting their lessons.
22. A teacher should not be expected to sacrifice an evening of recreation in order to visit a child's home.
23. Most pupils do not make an adequate effort to prepare their lessons.
24. Too many children nowadays are allowed to have their own way.
25. Children's wants are just as important as those of an adult.
26. The teacher is usually to blame when pupils fail to follow directions.
27. A child should be taught to obey an adult without question.
28. The boastful child is usually over-confident of his ability.
29. Children have a natural tendency to be unruly.
30. A teacher cannot place much faith in the statements of pupils.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

SA—Strongly agree
A—Agree

U—Undecided
or uncertain

D—Disagree
SD—Strongly disagree.

31. Some children ask too many questions.
32. A pupil should not be required to stand when reciting.
33. The teacher should not be expected to manage a child if the latter's parents are unable to do so.
34. A teacher should never acknowledge his ignorance of a topic in the presence of his pupils.
35. Discipline in the modern school is not as strict as it should be.
36. Most pupils lack productive imagination.
37. Standards of work should vary with the pupil.
38. The majority of children take their responsibilities seriously.
39. To maintain good discipline in the classroom a teacher needs to be "hard-boiled."
40. Success is more motivating than failure.
41. Imaginative tales demand the same punishment as lying.
42. Every pupil in the sixth grade should have sixth grade reading ability.
43. A good motivating device is the critical comparison of a pupil's work with that of other pupils.
44. It is better for a child to be bashful than to be "boy or girl crazy."
45. Course grades should never be lowered as punishment.
46. More "old-fashioned whippings" are needed today.
47. The child must learn that "teacher knows best."
48. Increased freedom in the classroom creates confusion.
49. A teacher should not be expected to be sympathetic toward truants.
50. Teachers should exercise more authority over their pupils than they do.
51. Discipline problems are the teacher's greatest worry.
52. The low achiever probably is not working hard enough and applying himself.
53. There is too much emphasis on grading.
54. Most children lack common courtesy toward adults.
55. Aggressive children are the greatest problems.
56. At times it is necessary that the whole class suffer when the teacher is unable to identify the culprit.
57. Many teachers are not severe enough in their dealings with pupils.
58. Children "should be seen and not heard."
59. A teacher should always have at least a few failures.
60. It is easier to correct discipline problems than it is to prevent them.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

SA—Strongly agree
A—Agree

U—Undecided
or uncertain

D—Disagree
SD—Strongly disagree

61. Children are usually too sociable in the classroom.
62. Most pupils are resourceful when left on their own.
63. Too much nonsense goes on in many classrooms these days.
64. The school is often to blame in cases of truancy.
65. Children are too carefree.
66. Pupils who fail to prepare their lessons daily should be kept after school to make this preparation.
67. Pupils who are foreigners usually make the teacher's task more unpleasant.
68. Most children would like to use good English.
69. Assigning additional school work is often an effective means of punishment.
70. Dishonesty as found in cheating is probably one of the most serious of moral offenses.
71. Children should be allowed more freedom in their execution of learning activities.
72. Pupils must learn to respect teachers if for no other reason than that they are teachers.
73. Children need not always understand the reasons for social conduct.
74. Pupils usually are not qualified to select their own topics for themes and reports.
75. No child should rebel against authority.
76. There is too much leniency today in the handling of children.
77. Difficult disciplinary problems are seldom the fault of the teacher.
78. The whims and impulsive desires of children are usually worthy of attention.
79. Children usually have a hard time following instructions.
80. Children nowadays are allowed too much freedom in school.
81. All children should start to read by the age of seven.
82. Universal promotion of pupils lowers achievement standards.
83. Children are unable to reason adequately.
84. A teacher should not tolerate use of slang expressions by his pupils.
85. The child who misbehaves should be made to feel guilty and ashamed of himself.
86. If a child wants to speak or to leave his seat during the class period, he should always get permission from the teacher.
87. Pupils should not respect teachers anymore than any other adults.
88. Throwing of chalk and erasers should always demand severe punishment.
89. Teachers who are liked best probably have a better understanding of their pupils.
90. Most pupils try to make things easier for the teacher.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

SA—Strongly agree
A—Agree

U—Undecided
or uncertain

D—Disagree
SD—Strongly disagree

91. Most teachers do not give sufficient explanation in their teaching.
92. There are too many activities lacking in academic respectability that are being introduced into the curriculum of the modern school.
93. Children should be given more freedom in the classroom than they usually get.
94. Most pupils are unnecessarily thoughtless relative to the teacher's wishes.
95. Children should not expect talking privileges when adults wish to speak.
96. Pupils are usually slow to "catch on" to new material.
97. Teachers are responsible for knowing the home conditions of every one of their pupils.
98. Pupils can be very boring at times.
99. Children have no business asking questions about sex.
100. Children must be told exactly what to do and how to do it.
101. Most pupils are considerate of their teachers.
102. Whispering should not be tolerated.
103. Shy pupils especially should be required to stand when reciting.
104. Teachers should consider problems of conduct more seriously than they do.
105. A teacher should never leave the class to its own management.
106. A teacher should not be expected to do more work than he is paid for.
107. There is nothing that can be more irritating than some pupils.
108. "Lack of application" is probably one of the most frequent causes for failure.
109. Young people nowadays are too frivolous.
110. As a rule teachers are too lenient with their pupils.
111. Slow pupils certainly try one's patience.
112. Grading is of value because of the competition element.
113. Pupils like to annoy the teacher.
114. Children usually will not think for themselves.
115. Classroom rules and regulations must be considered inviolable.
116. Most pupils have too easy a time of it and do not learn to do real work.
117. Children are so likeable that their shortcomings can usually be overlooked.
118. A pupil found writing obscene notes should be severely punished.
119. A teacher seldom finds children really enjoyable.
120. There is usually one best way to do school work which all pupils should follow.

SA—Strongly agree
A—Agree

U—Undecided
or uncertain

D—Disagree
SD—Strongly disagree

121. It isn't practicable to base school work upon children's interests.
122. It is difficult to understand why some children want to come to school so early in the morning before opening time.
123. Children that cannot meet the school standards should be dropped.
124. Children are usually too inquisitive.
125. It is sometimes necessary to break promises made to children.
126. Children today are given too much freedom.
127. One should be able to get along with almost any child.
128. Children are not mature enough to make their own decisions.
129. A child who bites his nails needs to be shamed.
130. Children will think for themselves if permitted.
131. There is no excuse for the extreme sensitivity of some children.
132. Children just cannot be trusted.
133. Children should be given reasons for the restrictions placed upon them.
134. Most pupils are not interested in learning.
135. It is usually the uninteresting and difficult subjects that will do the pupil the most good.
136. A pupil should always be fully aware of what is expected of him.
137. There is too much intermingling of the sexes in extra-curricular activities.
138. The child who stutters should be given the opportunity to recite oftener.
139. The teacher should disregard the complaints of the child who constantly talks about imaginary illnesses.
140. Teachers probably over-emphasize the seriousness of such pupil behavior as the writing of obscene notes.
141. Teachers should not expect pupils to like them.
142. Children act more civilized than do many adults.
143. Aggressive children require the most attention.
144. Teachers can be in the wrong as well as pupils.
145. Young people today are just as good as those of the past generation.
146. Keeping discipline is not the problem that many teachers claim it to be.
147. A pupil has the right to disagree openly with his teachers.
148. Most pupil misbehavior is done to annoy the teacher.
149. One should not expect pupils to enjoy school.
150. In pupil appraisal effort should not be distinguished from scholarship.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Sister Mary Ignatius Loyola Walsh, B.V.M. has been read and approved by three members of the Department of Education.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts.

April 30, 1962
Date

Henry B. Malecki
Signature of Adviser