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PREFACE

This report is presented to the Ohio Department of Education, Division of Guidance and Testing, for the purposes of reviewing the Resident Counselor Project which was in operation in the South-Western City School District, Grove City, Ohio, during the 1966-67 school year.

The individuals who contributed most to the success of the program were Miss Darla E. Coakley and Mr. Thomas J. Hummel, the resident counselors. The continued interest and assistance of Mr. Reece Chaney, a doctoral student at Ohio University and a former resident counselor, has been most helpful.

The classroom teachers who participated in the "World of Work" units should receive special commendation for their enthusiasm and the competency with which they incorporated the units into their curriculum. The teachers were: Mrs. Charlotte Bapst, Miss Anna Barry, Mrs. Dian Bowsher, Mrs. Marie Campbell, Mrs. Edna Harvey, Mrs. Nancy Johnston, Miss Kay Mullenix, Mrs. Linda Rife, Mrs. Carroll Sexton, and Mrs. Peggy Vicars.

Mr. James Rudder, Director of Pupil Personnel, has been a constant source of support and encouragement as well as an efficient administrator of the program. Special recognition must be given to Dr. Paul C. Hayes, Superintendent, and Mr. John W. Bott, Assistant Superintendent, for their dynamic leadership which has enabled the South-Western City School District to become one of the most progressive in the nation.

James A. Frost
Project Supervisor
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ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE APPLICATION AND PROPOSAL
(1966-67)

School District ___ South-Western City Schools ___ County ___ Franklin
3708 South Broadway
Address _______ Grove City, Ohio 43123 City ___ Ex. Vil. ___ Local ___

Telephone Area Code ___ 614 ___ Number ___ 875-2318 ___

Person to be contacted regarding application ___ James Rudder, Director

Title of Proposal: ___ Enhancing and Enriching a Program of Elementary
School Guidance Through the Use of Resident Counselors ___

Summary of Proposal

This proposal outlines a plan for the second year of a program which utilizes advanced graduate students in elementary school guidance, from Ohio University, for the purpose of increasing the scope and depth of the program of elementary school guidance in the South-Western City School District, Grove City, Ohio.

Purpose of Project

1) To continue to develop and evaluate a program of supervised residentships as a means of enriching an on-going program of elementary school guidance. 2) To explore new approaches for improving the preparation of elementary counselors through actual on the job experiences as residents. 3) To carry out an intensive evaluation of certain aspects of a program of Elementary School Guidance.

Proposal Submission and Assurance of Compliance

1. I hereby apply for approval of this elementary school guidance project as described in the attached project proposal.

2: The Assurance of Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, dated June 15, 1966 applies to the application submitted herewith.

PROPOSED BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs</td>
<td>$33,033.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Costs</td>
<td>$3,672.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Costs</td>
<td>$2,802.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Costs</td>
<td>$666.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Project Budget</td>
<td>$40,175.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Signature)_________
Superintendent or Executive
Head submitting Application
I A

The South-Western City School District is located in the south-western quadrant of Franklin County and is made up of almost all of Franklin, Jackson, Pleasant, and Prairie Townships. Located within the boundaries of the South-Western City School District are the villages of Harrisburg, Darbydale, Urbancrest, New Rome, Lincoln Village, Galloway, Georgesville, Briggsdale, and the city of Grove City. The area to be served is suburban, semi-rural, and rural.

The total school population is approximately 14,500 extending from kindergarten through grade 12. There are about 8,500 children in grades kindergarten through grade 6. The district has eighteen elementary schools with a population ranging from 65 to 1,000 pupils per school.

I B

THE NEED FOR THIS PROJECT

1. The guidance program in the elementary schools of the South-Western City School District has developed to the point that additional staff members are needed. Funds for this purpose from the City School budget are limited.

2. With a background of productive experience in elementary school guidance, the South-Western City School District
staff is prepared to develop and evaluate the use of graduate residents as a means of enriching the guidance program.

3. There is a need to continue residentships in elementary school guidance, to provide cooperative supervision of the work of the residents between the District and Ohio University, and to continue assessing the results of this cooperative effort. The University is prepared to assign two guidance certified, advance graduate students specializing in elementary school guidance to this project. The South-Western District staff is prepared to provide these residents full time experience in an established program, to use the residents to enrich this program, to supervise the expanded service provided, and to assist with a critical evaluation of their work.

4. The potential of such a proposal as a pilot project in school-university cooperation for counselor education, program enrichment, and research is very promising. The residents will bring to the program fresh ideas and insights which the experienced counselors, the teachers, director of pupil personnel services, and the other pupil personnel workers in the South-Western program can help to test through field try-out and research.
II A

PROJECT PURPOSES OR OBJECTIVES

1. To demonstrate the enrichment of an existing elementary guidance program through the use of advanced graduate residents who will be assigned by Ohio University. (The District's staff and the counselor education staff of Ohio University will cooperate to effect this program.)

2. To have the residents function in the elementary guidance program described in the South-Western City Schools' revised Handbook of Elementary Guidance.

3. To facilitate a systematic program of local studies of elementary guidance services including evaluation of part of the school district's elementary school testing program through the use of research facilities available through Ohio University and/or the South-Western City School District.

4. To critically evaluate the potential for school-university cooperation to implement program enrichment by incorporating the residentship concept in an on-going elementary guidance program.

II B

1. Can the South-Western City Schools and Ohio University continue to effectively cooperate in a school-university
enrichment program for an on-going elementary guidance program?

2. Can this proposed plan of enrichment continue to provide a means to implement fresh ideas and approaches into elementary guidance under controlled conditions of research and field try-out?

3. Can advanced graduate students serving a year's resident-ship as staff members build productive relations with pupils, parents, and staff? Will the residents in the second year's program be able to build this productive relationship?

4. Can these advanced graduate students serving a year's residentship as staff members also function effectively as members of an on-going pupil personnel service team which includes psychologists, speech and hearing therapists, nurses, and visiting teachers?

III A

THE PROJECT

1. Two full time residents will be assigned to the South-Western City Schools staff as counselors in elementary schools. Their selection and assignment will be cooperatively effected by the staff of the District and the
counselor education staff of Ohio University.

2. These resident counselors will function in a program described in the revised Handbook of Elementary Guidance. While the basic concept of the resident's assignment is envisioned as functioning in the program described in the handbook, certain areas will be selected for enrichment of this basic program.

a. Planning and communication between members of the guidance team will be emphasized.

b. Counselors in residency will keep a daily log of activities.

c. An instrument developed in 1965 for use with the staff in a building to identify areas where the program in progress needs strengthening will be revised and used to continue evaluating the program. Services identified from the first year as desirable will be enhanced, those indicated unimportant will be scrutinized and an effort made to evaluate their role in the program.

d. Specific areas identified in (c) above will be selected and a plan for enrichment developed. An example of the type of enrichment planned is to develop a sequential presentation of the "World of Work" through the primary
grades. This would be based upon planning included in the first year of the project.

e. Recommendations resulting from studies carried out during the first year's program will form a nucleus for research studies that will be designed cooperatively with the consultant staff from Ohio University. It is anticipated that greater emphasis may be placed on the analysis of stereo tapes. Each resident may be expected to prepare a detailed case study of the development of three separate counseling situations; these would include any taped interviews that were conducted.

f. Mr. James Forst, elementary counselor, will be responsible for the implementation and direction of the project and the immediate supervision of the residents. He will be directly responsible to the Director of Pupil Personnel Services of the South-Western City Schools. Specialists in elementary school guidance and other consultants from the staff of Ohio University, will cooperate with Mr. Frost. The consultant staff from Ohio University will develop the evaluation report of the project.

3. Services to pupils, services to staff, and services to parents and community will be provided by the residents, as
by the other elementary school counselors in the District.

4. Implementation and direction of the project and supervision of the work of the residents will be primarily the responsibility of Mr. James Frost, who is to be assigned one-half time for this purpose and one-half time as a counselor in the project. Certain staff members of the Ohio University Department of Guidance and Counseling (Consultant names will be submitted in the fall.) will periodically visit the District, consult with the Pupil Personnel Director and Mr. Frost, observe the residents, hold conferences with the residents, and assist in their growth on the job. The consultants from the University will make recommendations, as they see fit, to the Director of Pupil Personnel of the District.

5. A systematic program of local studies deemed desirable and possible, with the added staff, will be planned and conducted. This research may entail studies of the pupils and their needs or studies of environmental circumstances which have an impact upon pupil adjustment or studies of the developmental effects of the elementary school guidance program. University consultants will assist in the planning and conduct of such studies. University resources for assisting with these
studies (computers, the time of additional graduate students and the like) will be put at the disposal of the District at minimum expense.

Timing: The project will start approximately four weeks prior to the opening of the school year in September, 1966. However, preliminary planning will be begun well in advance of this date. In fact, such planning began late in March, 1966. The project will run for at least one year. It is planned that, should NDEA monies not be available for more than one year, the District and the University will extend every effort to continue the residentships, at least to the extent of one resident.

Resources: The facilities of the South-Western City Schools and the Guidance Training Laboratory of Ohio University.

III B

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

1. Mr. James Frost, elementary school counselor of the District, will spend one-half time in direction of the project and the immediate supervision of the residents and one-half time as a counselor in the project. Mr. Frost's qualifications are as follows:
Mr. Frost's guidance certificate is number 4K3999. He has 42 semester hours of graduate training. He has seven years experience in guidance, four of these as an elementary counselor. His salary is $10,480.50 per year.

From the staff of Ohio University, specialists in elementary school guidance will assume responsibility for supervision in cooperation with Mr. Frost. Dr. Dean L. Hummel, and other Ohio University staff members will serve as consultants to the projects. Their names will be submitted in the fall.

It is important to note that the program in this District is a team project involving a number of persons, who are, in a real sense, resource persons of great importance for the success of this proposed project. Additional professional staff would, of course, include two resident elementary counselors assigned by Ohio University.

2. The consultative or resource staff will consist of members of the Pupil Personnel Department, including:

   a. Director
   b. School Psychologists
   c. Visiting Teacher
   d. School Nurses
e. Speech Therapists

f. Elementary Counselors

Other members of the resource staff are:

g. Building Principals and Curriculum Consultants

h. Staff, Guidance Training Laboratory, Ohio University

i. Teachers in buildings being served by the residents.

Elementary guidance in this school district is developmental and implemented by the team approach. Because of this philosophy any staff member in the District who could provide a necessary service would be expected to participate, even though they are not included in the above list.

3. Clerical and other

One secretary - full time or two half time secretaries.

III C

Materials

A stereo tape recorder and stereo tapes would be utilized so that interviews and conferences of residents could be transcribed. A typewriter and office supplies would be needed for the secretary and the resident counselors. Various tests, inventories, books and professional materials (see budget outline) would also be needed to implement the program.
III D

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Office space—facility designed for privacy and having at least 60 square feet of floor space would be available in each school serviced by the resident counselors. Where the counselor moves from building to building the facility may be shared with another special teacher or teachers. Additional facilities would involve utilizing classroom or large group instruction space as necessary to the program.
IV A.

1. Professional Staff

\[
\begin{align*}
&\$ 10,480.50 \quad \text{Project Director and Counselor (12 months)} \\
&\$ 6,267.50 \quad \text{Resident Counselor 1 (school year plus 20 days)} \\
&\$ 7,500.00 \quad \text{Resident Counselor 2 (school year plus 20 days)} \\
&\$ 24,248.00 \quad \text{TOTAL}
\end{align*}
\]

2. Clerical Staff

\[
\begin{align*}
&\$ 300.00 \quad \text{Accounting 2 $25.00 a month} \\
&\$ 3,837.00 \quad \text{Secretary (full time 12 months)} \\
&\$ 4,137.00 \quad \text{TOTAL}
\end{align*}
\]

3. Retirement

\[
\begin{align*}
&\$ 2,909.76 \quad 12\% \text{ of item 1 total} \\
&\$ 402.89 \quad 10.5\% \text{ of item 2} \\
&\$ 71.24 \quad 26\% \text{ per $100 of items 1 and 2 for Workmens compensation and Disabled Workmens Relief} \\
&\$ 3,383.89 \quad \text{TOTAL}
\end{align*}
\]

4. Consultative Staff

\[
\begin{align*}
&\$ 1,125.00 \quad \text{Consultant staff from Ohio University} \\
&\$ 140.00 \quad \text{30 consultant days @ $75.00 per day} \\
&\$ 1,265.00 \quad \text{Keypunch operator @$4.00 per hour} \\
&\$ 1,265.00 \quad \text{TOTAL}
\end{align*}
\]

5. Total personnel costs

\[
\begin{align*}
&\$ 33,033.89
\end{align*}
\]
## IV B

**TESTING COST** (Includes testing to be done in buildings served by personnel participating in this project. *will* indicate tests to be included in a district wide study.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Ohio Survey Tests, grades 4 and 6</td>
<td>$2,149.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,240 children at $1.00 per child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Research Associates &quot;What I Like to Do&quot; Inventory, grades 4, 5, and 6</td>
<td>$183.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at $.30 per child for 2,030 children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Test of Basic Skills, grades 3 and 5</td>
<td>$588.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at $.50 per child for 1,378 children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuals for Iowa Test of Basic Skills</td>
<td>$16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison-Stroud Reading Readiness Test, grade 1</td>
<td>$108.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$.25 per child for 700 children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durrell Diagnostic Reading Test (For limited diagnostic use).</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henmon Nelson Test of Mental Ability (for limited diagnostic use).</td>
<td>$21.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Test of Mental Maturity, grade 6</td>
<td>$193.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 650 children at $.38 per child.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorge Thorndike Intelligence Tests, Multi-Level A-H Form 1</td>
<td>$396.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $3,672.19
IV C

MATERIALS - Office Supplies

Copy or second sheets, typing paper, ditto paper, mimeograph paper, stencils, dittos, typewriter ribbons, copy holder, legal pads, pencils, (black, colored) Dri-Markers, writing pens, staplers, staples, carbon paper, paper clips, manilla folders, manilla pocket files, alphabetized dividers (file cards), alphabetized divider file, pencils (machine scoring), erasers, steno notebooks, stamp pad, dater:

$ 175.00 TOTAL

PROFESSIONAL SUPPLIES (materials)

$ 104.00 SRA Guidance Service (3 subscriptions).

299.00 Tape Recorder.

41.70 Recording Tape.

31.35 Professional Books.

2,151.92 SRA materials for "Our Working World" grades 1, 2, and 3 for a pilot study. This includes estimated cost for grade 3. The price is not yet available.

$ 2,802.97 TOTAL

MISCELLANEOUS COSTS

$ 216.00 Consultant travel 15 days at 9¢ a mile (160 mi.)

100.00 Project Director travel.

200.00 Resident Counselor travel.
$125.00 Telephones.

$25.00 Telephone extensions.

$666.00 TOTAL

EVALUATION

1. Report prepared by the guidance laboratory at Ohio University.

The evaluation report will be developed under the direction of the consultant staff of Ohio University.

2. Evaluative instruments (to be developed for teachers, principals, and parents). For this part of the evaluation, instruments developed for last year's project will be revised and extended in the following manner:

   a) The teacher survey of counselor functions will be revised to permit an analysis of responses from beginning and experienced teachers as well as teachers who have had guidance courses and those who have had none. An attempt will be made to continue cooperating with Warren Local Schools.

   b) Form I used to evaluate pupil understanding of standardized tests will be revised for use with groups of parents who will be given an interpretation of test results.

   c) An evaluation of individual parent contacts will be made. The counseling contact card will furnish this information.

   d) Each research study will be evaluated. For example,
the "World of Work" units will involve building evaluative material, this is now in progress.

e) An end of year evaluation of the guidance program will be done by teachers and principals, this will be used to evaluate the year's program and help establish targets for future counselors.

f) The monthly counseling experience summary sheet and daily log will be analyzed to see if there are indications of role differences as result of change in counselor or both principal and counselor in a school. The previous year’s log would be used as a basis for comparison.

3. Director’s report of meetings dealing with the problems and planning as it occurred during the year.

4. Residents will maintain a counselee referral record card.

5. A daily log of activities will be kept by the residents.
DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM OPERATION

In many respects, this report will become an addendum to the project report that was made in 1965. The effectiveness of the original project was sufficient that a decision was made in March, 1966, to request extension of the project for another year. Application for the extension was approved and the new resident counselors were employed in May, 1966.

Many studies that were initiated in 1965, provided a rich potential for further research. However, if the resident experience was to enable the new residents to feed new ideas into our program, care had to be exercised not to limit the project by preventing them from trying their ideas.

Because of the University's summer schedule, incoming residents were unable to report until five days prior to the opening of school. In order to facilitate planning, the project supervisor from the school staff visited the residents on the campus. Mr. Hummel attended an Ohio Survey Test meeting sponsored by the Division of Guidance and Testing during the summer at The Ohio State University.

ORIENTATION ACTIVITIES

Orientation activities were for descriptive purposes quite like those carried out the first year. The sequence was altered
somewhat because of the summer graduation date at the University.

Initial Orientation - Talks with the residents were begun before they reported into the district. These centered about their personal problems of establishing a residence in the community.

The over-all pupil personnel program was discussed and the organization of the department was outlined. The relationship of the department was outlined. The relationship of the various specialists were considered together with problems that could ordinarily be anticipated. One specific problem, for example, was the communication difficulty that exists among specialists working in a building. Some factors that contributed to this were the size of the district, the assignment of specialists to schools that were several miles apart, and space problems that required these people to share facilities. Thus, they were scheduled for alternate days in a building.

Program Planning - The revised Handbook was used to establish guidelines for the program. The ways in which the guidelines had been utilized in the various schools during the past year were considered. In this way, new counselors were able to visualize the uniqueness of the counselor's role in each school setting.

It was during this period of the orientation that the residents began to come to grips with transforming ideas from
training to the reality of the work situation.

The system-wide test program was reviewed and the counselor role considered. Experience from the previous year indicated role would differ from one school setting to another.

Time was devoted to the relation of various special programs in the schools to the counselor. Record keeping necessary to maintain order in daily work when moving from one building to another was also considered. An overview of the status of the guidance program, and the related role of the counselor in the various buildings, enabled the new personnel to begin clarifying their understanding of program structure. After these areas had been discussed, it was possible for the new residents to organize methods for implementing their ideas into the basic program.

The residents were introduced to the principals of the schools where they had been assigned. Their office facilities and supplies were reviewed. Two schools were to have counselors on the staff for the first time, and new offices had to be established.

There was special consideration given to steps that could be taken to introduce the counselor in the new buildings. The counselor also spent some time with his principal to gain better perspectives concerning the expectations each principal had for
the program.

**Case Conferences** - During orientation, time was spent reviewing the kinds of referrals counselors received during previous years. The ways in which counselors worked with pupils, parents, other members of the pupil personnel team, and teachers were discussed. Specific cases from previous years were also considered. Tapes made by counselors during the previous year were reviewed.

The past years of experience in the elementary school showed the necessity for establishing rapport with pupils and staff. That this must be accomplished by constant formal and informal contacts became a focal point. To put this another way, the counselor cannot isolate himself in an office and operate effectively. The use of group work was considered. The ideas shared involved methods for structuring groups, problematic situations which lend themselves to group work, and also the flow of pupils from individual counseling to groups as compared to movement from groups to individual counseling.

**Referrals** - Two types of referrals were of concern. First, those pupils referred to the counselor, and second, those pupils who needed to be referred for special services within or outside the school. A referral system, satisfactory to the building
principal, had to be established and the procedure decided on communicated to other staff members. If the procedure was to be informal (no papers to fill out) teachers should know it. If it was formal, they must know how to make the referral. The resident counselors had to be informed concerning the role of other specialists such as the school psychologists, social workers, visiting teachers, nurses and other special teachers. In many buildings, the counselor coordinated the utilization of special services. It was often necessary for the counselor to clear obstacles for other specialists who were not regular building staff members. The above statement included communication with the child so that there was understanding concerning what was happening. Children who were informed could be expected to be more cooperative.

Administrative and Staff Relations - Elementary counselors worked with several administrators. Each school was an autonomous unit reflecting the philosophy of the professional staff. The sensitivity and versatility of the counselor to the needs and expectations of the staff determined the effectiveness with which he was able to work. One important guideline was to never compare activities in one building with those of another.
Professional Growth - The counselor's responsibility to attend professional staff meetings, PTA meetings, as well as other community involvements was considered.

The central Ohio location of this district gave an opportunity to meet and talk with many visitors. There were opportunities to speak to professional and lay groups. Studies reported in later sections of this report were completed by those participating in the project together with others from the consultant staff, graduate students, teachers, and other specialists from the local staff.

Special Problems - The location of this District enables the counselor to utilize many community resources. The residents had to become familiar with these resources. In most cases, referrals to outside agencies was a result of parent conferences. The importance of conducting a conference was considered. Many parents who viewed the counselor in a helping non-authoritarian role called the school and requested to see the counselor.

Throughout the school year, weekly meetings were held to plan and discuss the on-going program. Monthly meetings were held with the staff from Ohio University. Several Saturdays were used to complete work on special projects. Tapes were made and shared during after-school meetings. Some tapes were reviewed by the consultant staff.
Communication - Each year, the importance of this becomes more evident. The counselor must be an expert in communicating. The elementary counselor must carry on meaningful communication over a greater spectrum than most people in the school setting. The type of communication is most crucial, and must be conducted in a non-authoritarian atmosphere. Training and academic success in the University setting counts zero if the professional counselor who is produced can not relate to, and be sensitive to, the communicative tolerances of those with whom he works.
DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO EVALUATE THE PROJECT

The description of the project contains an evaluation section. The numbers below refer to a particular part in the evaluation section of the proposal.

1. This report was prepared by the consultant staff from Ohio University. The report is one of the sections of this report. (Refer to the Table of Content.)

2. Sections 2a, b, and d of this evaluation referred to studies reported on by counselors in the project. Conclusions and recommendations were made for each study reported. In addition to suggestions from the consultant staff, Mr. Reece Chaney, a doctoral student at Ohio University, should be credited for his work in designing the evaluation procedure used for "World of Work" materials, as well as time spent carrying out the evaluation and preparing the report. Dr. Charles Harrington of the consultant staff from Ohio University was statistical consultant and prepared computer programs for the various studies. (Refer to the Table of Content.)

2c. A summary of information (including parent contacts) from the counseling contact cards was prepared by each resident counselor. In order to portray the counselor's contacts over
the year, these summaries were prepared for each quarter. A composite of all contacts was placed after the quarter reports.

In this report, the summaries were, for purposes of identification, labeled Counselor I and Counselor II. Area IV, Nature of the Problem, was overlapped so that only educational or personal-social types of problems were totaled. Many times these judgments were debatable.

This does not represent every contact the counselor made during the year. Contacts made as a result of responsibilities in the test program were not included. No attempt was made to balance the total from each area of the report. This, then, represents a minimal report of contacts for each counselor for the periods defined above. (See pages 27 through 31.)

2e. The end of year evaluation was accomplished by asking a sample of teachers and the principals of various schools to respond to three questions. Eight principals and thirty-two teachers responded.

The questions and a summary of the reaction to each question was prepared and follows below.
SOUTH-WESTERN CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
COUNSELING CONTACTS 1966-67

Counselor I  
First Nine Week Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Contact w/Pupils</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Grade Level (Preface groups w/G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kdg. 1</td>
<td>4. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1. 3</td>
<td>5. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called In</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2. 11</td>
<td>6. 13 and G4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 2</td>
<td>Spec. 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV Nature of Problem
A. Education 22  
B. Personal-Social 24

V Referrals
A. Reading Consultant  
B. Speech Therapist 1  
C. Nurse 7  
D. Psychologist 7  
E. Social Worker 5  
F. Outside Agency

VI Parent Conferences
A. School 2  
B. Telephone 2  
C. Home 0

SECOND NINE WEEK SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Contact w/Pupils</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Grade Level (Preface groups w/G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kdg. 2</td>
<td>4. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1. 4</td>
<td>5. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called In</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2. 12</td>
<td>6. 16 and G12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 3</td>
<td>Spec. 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV Nature of Problem
A. Education 8  
B. Personal-Social 37 plus 12 in groups

V Referrals
A. Reading Consultant  
B. Speech Therapist  
C. Nurse 4  
D. Psychologist 3  
E. Social Worker 2  
F. Outside Agency

VI Parent Conferences
A. School 12  
B. Telephone 4  
C. Home 0

VII Teacher Interview
36

VII Teacher Interviews
49
## Counselor I
### THIRD NINE WEEK SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Contact w/Pupils</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Grade Level (Preface groups w/G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral 35</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kdg. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary 7</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Called In 13</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Work 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV Nature of Problem

A. Education 22
B. Personal-Social 33 plus 25 in groups

### V Referrals

A. Reading Consultant
B. Speech Therapist
C. Nurse
D. Psychologist 2
E. Social Worker 1
F. Outside Agency

### VI Parent Conferences

A. School 8
B. Telephone 3
C. Home 0

### VII Teacher Interviews
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---

### Fourth Nine Week Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Contact w/Pupils</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Grade Level (Preface groups w/G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral 13</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kdg. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary 17</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Called In 9</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Work 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>6 and G4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV Nature of Problem

A. Education 20
B. Personal-Social 19 plus 33 in groups

### V Referrals

A. Reading Consultant
B. Speech Therapist
C. Nurse 5
D. Psychologist 1
E. Social Worker 2
F. Outside Agency

### VI Parent Conferences

A. School 3
B. Telephone 2
C. Home

### VII Teacher Interviews

49
## Counselor II
### First Nine Week Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Contact w/Pupils</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Grade Level (Preface groups w/G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral 52</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Kdg.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary 16</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Called In 3</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Work 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV Nature of Problem

A. Education 16
B. Personal-Social 58

### VI Parent Conference

A. School 6
B. Telephone 3
C. Home

### VII Teacher Interview

80

---

## Second Nine Week Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Contact w/Pupils *</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Grade Level (Preface groups w/G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral 45</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kdg.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary 10</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Called In 0</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Work 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>or more</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV Nature of Problem

A. Education 37
B. Personal-Social 38

### VI Parent Conferences

A. School 19
B. Telephone 13
C. Home 0

### VII Teacher Interview

72

* Contact less due to time for group interpretation of tests.
Counselor II
Third Nine Week Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Contact w/Pupils</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral 50</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Kdg.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary 16</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Called In 10</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Work 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spec.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV Nature of Problem
A. Education 37
B. Personal-Social 10

VI Parent Conferences
A. School 12
B. Telephone 10
C. Home 0

V Referrals
A. Reading Consultant
B. Speech Therapist
C. Nurse 1
D. Psychologist 9
E. Social Worker 11
F. Outside Agency

VII Teacher Interview
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Fourth Nine Week Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Contact w/Pupils</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral 60</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>KDG.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary 15</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Called In 50</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Work 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spec.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV Nature of Problem
A. Education 41
B. Personal-Social 38

V Referrals
A. Reading Consultant
B. Speech Therapist
C. Nurse
D. Psychologist 10
E. Social Worker 10
F. Outside Agency 8

VI Parent Conference
A. School 8
B. Telephone 17
C. Home 0

VII Teacher Interviews
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### COMPOSITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I Contact w/Pupils</th>
<th>II Number of Interviews</th>
<th>III Grade Level (Preface groups w/G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referral 319</td>
<td>1. 211</td>
<td>Kdg. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary 99</td>
<td>2. 50</td>
<td>1. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called In 103</td>
<td>3. 122</td>
<td>2. 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Work 86</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spec. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plus all pupils in 3, 4, 5, 6 and Spec. for test interpretation 71 different groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV Nature of Problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Education 223</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Personal-Social 332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V Referrals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Reading Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Speech Therapist 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Nurse 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Psychologist 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Social Worker 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Outside Agency 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI Parent Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. School 70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Telephone 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Home 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VII Teacher Interviews
QUESTION 1. What are some of the desirable features of this year's program (things you feel should be continued)? Starred (*) items were mentioned by four or more respondents.

**Principals**

- Counseling with individuals.
- Counseling with groups.
- Conferences with teachers.
- Conferences with parents.
- Good communication between counselor and staff.
- Assistance with the test program.

**Teachers**

- Counselor really cares about students referred.
- Counselors improve student-teacher interaction by helping the teacher get more insight into the character of the pupil.
- Counseling with individuals.
- Interpreting tests to pupils and parents.
- Communication with teachers.
- Assist teachers with the test program.
- Counseling with groups.
- Counselor visits classroom and explains his role to the children.
Counselor increases the individual attention given a child. Teachers and pupils looked upon the counselor as a friendly capable person available to assist with problems. Counselor available to consult with teachers.

QUESTION 2. What are some the programs that you feel should be modified or eliminated?

**Principals**

Spend more time working with pupils and teachers. Help teachers administer and record tests. Test directives are confusing, the counselor should take over-all responsibility for the test program. Too many things to do--leaving too little time in the building. Meetings should be alternated or schedules should be alternated to provide that the counselor does not consistently miss one building.

**Teachers**

More time for classroom observation, especially when students resent going to the counselor. Too much paper work.
Counselors schedule such that because of meetings and days not in session actual time spent working in certain buildings was curtailed.

* Curtail time spent testing and thus gain time for counseling.
* Counselors should be involved with testing only by request of the teacher.

The counselor should have at least one conference with each pupil.

The more aggressive child is more likely to be referred to the counselor. However, withdrawn children may be more in need of help. Could efforts be made to help this latter group?

QUESTION 3. What specific recommendation would you make for improving next year's program?

Principal

A more detailed plan for screening pupil problems. Are all problems unique to the individual? Are there problems common to the group?

More time in the building, better scheduling.

Activities involving the counselor with all students, maybe not labeled guidance.
suggestions to increase teachers and other school personnel's
sensitivity to the pupil's need for counseling.
Set up a schedule for individual conferences with pupils,
this would help avoid interrupting classrooms.
Provide orientation time for new personnel to practices in
a particular building.
Reduce the outside commitments of the counselors, to enable
him to concentrate efforts on working with pupils and
staff.

Teachers
The guidance program should include a student council, to
help pupils develop leadership, express their ideas and
listen.
The success of this project rests with the counselor, his
personality, professional competency, and desire to
work in the elementary setting. The program will
vacillate to a degree as long as there are constant
changes of personnel.
There should be scheduling for pupils the counselor sees on
a continuing basis.
Extend efforts to acquaint parents and pupils to this program,
establish a better understanding of its purposes.
Get teachers more information about the different facets of the program, we can't use it if we don't know about it.

* Free the counselor to assist the teacher in working with more pupils. Let teachers administer tests.

* Counselors should be full-time in a building to adequately communicate with teachers and parents and do follow-up work with pupils.

* The counselor needs enough time to work with pupils on a continuing basis. A pamphlet to read isn't too effective, it may only increase frustration.

Parents should be involved so that permission is given for counseling. The counselor should meet the parents or visit the home.

Counselors should visit each classroom in September to help pupils understand the guidance services available to them.

Counselors should be able to return test scores to teachers more promptly.

Specific time set aside for teacher conferences.

Summary The desirable features of the program that were most often mentioned included: 1) Counseling both group and individual,
2) Communication with staff and parents; and 3) Interpretation of tests.

Suggestions concerning needed modifications in the present program included: 1) Services in a building such as increasing classroom observation of children, adjusting downward time spent on testing to increase time spent working with children; 2) Restrict the involvement of the counselor--let him counsel; 3) Increase the scope of the program so the counselor would talk with each child during the year.

Suggestions for improving the program included; 1) More time in a building; 2) Limit the counselors' duties so that he has more time to spend with pupils; 3) The counselor needs time sufficient for follow-up; 4) Pupils being seen by the counselor over a period of time should be placed on a regular schedule to facilitate planning.

2f. An inspection of the logs, counseling experience summary sheets, and comments from the end of the year evaluation from teachers and principals was done. The guidelines for the program as outlined in the Handbook seemed satisfactory. Comparison of last year's resident counselor's logs to this year's logs indicated that the differences were due to counselor personality rather than to any feature of the resident counselor program.
Perhaps the teacher who wrote on her evaluation that as long as there were changes in personnel there would be differences in the specific things done in the program summed it up nicely.

The staff in each building was better informed concerning the resident program and the accompanying yearly change in personnel than they were the first year. This appeared to help the counselor integrate himself into the school more quickly than when the program was not understood as well. The personal qualities of the counselor emerge as the greatest deterrent to successful implementation of the program. The factor most important in building working relations with staff, pupils, and parents is communication.

Regardless of the extent of training and level of academic success, it can not be used until successful communication is established.

3. This section of the report deals with activities designed to contribute to the professional growth of the elementary counselors in the District. After completing pre-school orientation, staff meetings were held after school at least once a week. In addition to this, the staff supervisor met with the residents individually, as necessary, to discuss their individual problems
as they occurred. Many times, an entire meeting was devoted to considering the implementation of new ideas. The staff supervisor was always available by telephone to discuss an immediate problem. As the year progressed, contacts routinely increased and decreased concurrently with the on-going program. Tapes of counseling interviews were also played and discussed, some of these were submitted to the consultant staff for comment.

Once each month, the junior, senior, and elementary counselors met with the Director of Pupil Personnel. This permitted a sharing of problems that occurred at each level of the school sequence. Each month, the consultant staff from Ohio University met with the project personnel either in the District or on the campus at Ohio University.

The elementary counselors also attended sessions conducted by other District programs who invited specialists to the District as consultants.

There have been opportunities for the residents to become familiar with various community agencies such as Child Welfare Board services, Children's Mental Health Center, and Buckeye Boys' Ranch.
4. This section of the evaluation was to contain a summary of counselor contacts. A report of this information was placed in Section 2c with the report on parent contacts.
5. This section contains the activity logs for the two resident counselors.

TOM HUMMEL

ORIENTATION

The program at South-Western City Schools schedules the resident counselors to start their work ten days before school opens and end their work ten days after the end of the regular school year. Since I did not graduate until the 29th of August, I was present for only five days. This cut down on the amount of formal orientation I received.

During this rather brief period, the other resident and myself became acquainted with the elementary guidance program of South-Western City Schools and gained some insight into the part we would play in it. These few days were spent mainly with Mr. James Frost. He gave us information on the structure of all pupil personnel services and the nature of our role in these services. We discussed research projects for the year and our responsibilities in these projects.

It should be mentioned that while we learned about what our responsibilities would be, we were also told that we would have considerable latitude in the planning and executing of activities which were important to us.
I was introduced to many people during these first few days. I met the director and some of the members of the pupil personnel staff, and I was introduced to the principals and many of the teachers at the schools I would be servicing. The principals answered questions and usually showed me about their buildings.

The above activities, combined with the regular meetings which all personnel attended, filled the few days before school started.

THE SCHOOL YEAR

Obviously, the main function of a counselor is not to meticulously record everything that he says and does. For this reason, that which follows is not a complete history of my activities from September 1966 to June 1967. I am quite sure that poor memory and in some cases omissions have caused this record to be something less than complete. The reader should be aware of this fact and not believe that if a particular situation is not listed in this account that such a situation was never encountered by the counselor.

September

September 7 - 9, 1966 - School started on September 7, 1966. My first job was to become better acquainted with staff and
students. I spent a great deal of time talking with teachers and visiting with children at recess and lunch. I began to organize and read interview records left by the previous counselor. I tallied referrals made by each teacher to see who seemed to be active in making referrals. At Finland, I saw a first grade repeater who would not stop crying. I observed a child in the classroom.

September 12 - 16, 1966 - In the schools that I was in for the first time, I continued the activities of the previous week. Also, I started visiting classrooms in order to introduce myself and explain my role to children. Eventually, I visited every classroom in every school. I saw several children who wanted to come and talk. These first conferences seem to have been a result of my visitations. At South Franklin, I saw a child who was being beaten up and his antagonists. I contacted the parents of the abused child.

September 19 - 23, 1966 - Organized Ohio Survey Test materials and began orientation. I talked to teachers about this test and visited each fourth and sixth grade classroom with OST materials. Information blanks were filled out on the answer sheets. I also saw a few children.

September 23, 1966 - I attended the All Ohio Guidance Conference.
September 26 - 30, 1966 - The orientation and administration of OST took seven work days.

October 3 - 7, 1966 - I finished the administration of OST. For classroom grouping purposes, I administered the Nelson Reading Test to nine sixth graders at Finland Elementary and to a third grade class at Darbydale. I had several self referrals in the schools. Teachers referred four children. I talked to teachers about students with whom I was working.

October 10 - 14, 1966 - I organized the materials for ITBS. I conducted the orientation for ITBS, visiting each third and fifth grade classroom. Administration of ITBS followed. I talked to teachers concerning ITBS. I talked with only a few teachers and pupils concerning matters other than testing.

October 17 - 21, 1966 - I wrote group guidance materials for testing. Orientation and administration of ITBS was continued. The ITBS total testing time was eight work days. I did little individual work with students and teachers.

October 24 - 28, 1966 - In some of the sixth grades, I helped with the administration of the California Test of Mental Maturity. I helped some teachers with the administration of the alphabet section of the Harrison-Stroud. Referral of students from teachers and principals picked up in Darbydale, South Franklin, and Finland.
October 28 - I attended the Central Ohio Teachers Association.

October 31, 1966 - November 4, 1966 - I helped teachers with administration of the alphabet section of Harrison-Stroud. I saw each teacher who had a child with whom I was involved.

NOTE: The amount of time devoted to testing sharply decreased after the end of October. Accordingly, it was possible to see more children, parents, and teachers. With the exception of Urbancrest, I was probably averaging seven interviews a day with children.

November 7 - 11, 1966 - Individual conferences were held with approximately twenty children. Also, I had teacher conferences. One of the girls I was working with at Finland seemed as though she might profit from a group experience (Social Skills Group). I received an OK for the group idea from the principal.

November 9 - I attended a meeting with Dr. Foster.

November 11 - I attended the Elementary Guidance Conference.

November 14 - 18, 1966 - I had a discussion with the social worker. Also, I discussed the group idea with teachers. Interviews were conducted with prospective members for the group. The first group session was at Finland. I conducted individual conferences and teacher and principal conferences.
November 16 - I attended a meeting with Ohio University staff.

November 18 - Parent Conference Day.

November 21 - 23, 1966 - I conducted individual conferences and teacher conferences. Also, I had a group session at Finland.

November 28 to December 2, 1966 - I conducted approximately seven individual conferences per day. I saw teachers concerning children and had a group session at Finland. I discussed the group idea with the principal and teachers at Darbydale. Also, I met with prospective members of a Darbydale group.

December 5 - 9, 1966 - I prepared materials for the OST interpretation. I conducted a group session at Finland and Darbydale. Also, I conducted individual conferences and teacher conferences.

December 12 - 23, 1966 - In this time prior to the Christmas vacation, I spent most of my time seeing individual children, groups of children, and teachers. The number of individual interviews ranged from about three to twelve per day. I contacted several parents by phone concerning their children. I spent time calling parents for our parent sample in the estimate study. I talked with principals concerning the scheduling of test interpretation meetings for parents.

December 15 - Attended Ohio University meeting.

December 19 - Attended meeting with Dr. Hill.
January 3 - 6, 1967 - I consulted with the staff psychiatrist. I conducted individual conferences with children, group meetings, and teacher conferences. I also talked with principals about their schools' performance on standardized tests. I passed the results of the test along to the teachers and gave interpretation where appropriate.

January 9 - 13, 1967 - Test results were given to teachers. I conducted an interpretation meeting with Darbydale teachers. Interpretation of test results to students was conducted. Group and individual counseling was continued. I visited third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grade classrooms in all schools to interpret test scores. Total time involved was 16 - 20 hours.

January 16 - 20, 1967 - I interpreted tests to students and conducted a parent meeting at night. Also, I made a presentation at the Darbydale PTA meeting. I had only a few individual interviews and only casual contact with teachers occurred.

January 23, 1967 - Test interpretations to students and parents were conducted. A group session was held. I had individual conferences with children.

January 24, 25, and 26, 1967 - I attended GATB.

January 27, 1967 - Teachers' Workday
January 30 to February 2, 1967 - I discussed cases with social worker and conducted test interpretations with students. I also conducted parent interpretations. I conducted one group session and approximately four individual interviews per day. Also, I conducted a teacher conference and two parent conferences.

February 3, 1967 - I attended GATB workshop.

February 6 - 10, 1967 - I was giving thought to starting more groups. I met with the principals at Urbancrest and Finland. World of Work materials were secured for fifth-sixth grade combinations at Darbydale. I held approximately five individual conferences per day. Two parent conferences and a teacher conference were conducted. Group sessions were conducted.

February 9 - Ohio University meeting.

February 13 - 17, 1967 - I ended a Social Skills group at Finland and interviewed prospective members for three new groups at Finland. I "called in" some sixth graders at Urbancrest for individual conferences and met with a group at Darbydale. I conducted one parent conference and approximately six individual conferences per day. Consulted with staff psychiatrist.

February 20 - 24, 1967 - I started three groups at Finland and interviewed prospective members for a group at Urbancrest. The Darbydale group continued. I met with fifth-sixth grade
combination at Darbydale to discuss World of Work unit. I conducted approximately five individual conferences per day. I administered Youngstown self-concept scale to fifth-sixth grade combination at Darbydale.

March 6 - 10, 1967 - I started interpretation of self-concept scale to class. I met with five groups and conducted individual interviews. Group guidance: testing at Urbancrest sixth grade.

March 10 - South-Western Education Association.

March 13 - 17, 1967 - Group guidance: testing at South Franklin and Darbydale. I met with five groups. I started some after school work at Franklin Village. This lasted for five weeks. I had individual interviews of approximately five students per day. I finished the interpretation of self-concept scale. I talked with the social worker and staff psychiatrist. I had three parent conferences, one by phone.

March 20 - 24, 1967 - I administered California Test of Mental Maturity Long Form to three South Franklin third grade classes. I also met with five groups and had several individual conferences. I had casual teacher conferences.

March 27 - 31, 1967 - I administered the self-concept scale to the sixth grade at Darbydale. I obtained World of Work materials
for a sixth grade class at South Franklin. I conducted about four individual conferences a day. I started working with data which was returned from Ohio University.

**April 3 - 7, 1967** - I met with groups and had individual interviews. I worked on research data. (NOTE: From this point in the year on, I found myself spending much time on research data. Eventually, I spent about 40% to 50% of some weeks on research.) I started working with groups of two children. The Darbydale group started showing progress. I interviewed members of a group of underachievers. Idea came from a fourth grade student at Darbydale.

**April 4** - Warren Local for lunch.

**April 5** - Day of personal business.

**April 7** - Parent Conference Day.

**April 10 - 14, 1967** - I talked with teachers about group idea and met with six groups and several groups of two. Conducted individual conferences, approximately four per day. I saw a group of four third grade boys at Finland. I also had casual teacher contact and worked on research data.

**April 17 - 21, 1967** - Seven groups met with me and several groups of two. I conducted individual contacts, about four a day. I worked on data. (NOTE: Counseling tapered off near the end of the year, plus I have grouped some of the children.)
These two factors have caused interview numbers to drop.)

April 24 - 28, 1967 - Discussion was held with social worker.
I met with six groups and conducted individual conferences.
I had a parent conference by phone. I helped with field day
at South Franklin and worked with data.

May 1 - 5, 1967 - I spent two days writing reports. Met with
all groups, had several individual conferences.

May 8 - 12, 1967 - I worked on reports, met with groups, and
saw individual children. Only casual contacts with teachers.
Had two parent conferences. Started seeing a boy at South
Franklin. I attended a meeting at Children's Mental Health
concerning this child's behavior.

May 15 - 19, 1967 - I worked on written reports. Saw groups
and individual children. I had one parent conference.

May 22 - 26, 1967 - Most of my time was spent in writing and
group and individual counseling.

May 29 to June 2, 1967 - Writing and counseling. I had few
contacts per day with children. Began to organize materials and
records for the close of school.

June 5 - 8, 1967 - Saw a few students, wrote reports, closed
records, and said good-by.
SUMMARY

As one can readily see from the log, the majority of my time was spent in three areas: counseling, group and individual; testing, orientation, administration and interpretation; research activities, including writing. Of these, I feel my experience in counseling to be invaluable.

At South-Western, I was given freedom to try new counseling techniques and to use my own ideas. I feel this is a definite strong point of the resident program. This year was both profitable and enjoyable.

NOTE: I have not tried to list the numerous contacts. I had with Jim Frost, but this does not mean they were insignificant. I feel that my work with Jim was an extremely important part of my experience. As for me, I cannot think of anyone better suited to guiding resident counselors than this man. His honesty, personal warmth, and sensitivity to feelings, allow him to make many significant contributions to the growth of inexperienced counselors. And most important, he gave me the right to make a mistake, freedom to err. It is understandable why Jim will always have a warm place in my memories of this year.
DARLA COAKLEY

Monday, August 29, 1966
A.M. Orientation with Mr. Frost
P.M. Visited Alton-Hall and Stiles and met principals.

Tuesday, August 30, 1966
A.M. Meeting with Mr. Frost
P.M. Visited East Franklin and met principal.

Wednesday, August 31, 1966
A.M. Visited West Franklin and met principal.
P.M. Meeting with Mr. Frost.

Thursday, September 1, 1966
A.M. Orientation of new staff at Norton Junior
P.M. Meeting with Mr. Frost.

Friday, September 2, 1966
A.M. Meeting with Mr. Frost, then visited East Franklin and met new teachers. Had lunch with new teachers and Mr. Garrison.
P.M. Visited Alton-Hall and met new teachers.

Tuesday, September 6, 1966
A.M. Full staff meeting at Pleasant View. After orientation went to West Franklin for lunch with staff.
P.M. Met with staff at Stiles. Talked with different teachers informally after staff meeting.

Wednesday, September 7, 1966
Organized home office at West Franklin, put up bulletin board, familiarized myself with various tests we were expected to give, got oriented to the school, and talked individually with some of the teachers.

Thursday, September 8, 1966
A.M. Discussed placement of child with Mr. Bast; met with seven teachers to arrange a time to meet their children; talked with Mrs. Speice concerning reading test she wants given.
P.M. Meeting with Mr. Frost.
Friday, September 9, 1966
Met with all the teachers individually and arranged a time to meet with their children; studied tests we were to give; talked with speech therapist—in general, became familiar with the school.

Monday, September 12, 1966
A.M. Met with seven teachers individually to arrange a time to meet their children, did some office work
P.M. Counselors' meeting with Mr. Rudder.

Tuesday, September 13, 1966
A.M. Met with twelve rooms of children to introduce myself and explain my function.
P.M. Meeting with Mr. Frost.

Wednesday, September 14, 1966
A.M. Met with fourteen rooms of children to introduce myself and explain my function.
P.M. Scheduled Ohio Survey Tests. Met with Mrs. Deiringer to discuss some pupils she had tested.

Thursday, September 15, 1966
A.M. Met with seven rooms of children to introduce myself and explain my function. Gave the Gilmore Oral Reading Test to five children.
P.M. Met with Mr. Frost to discuss project on working world.

Friday, September 16, 1966
A.M. Met with eleven rooms of children to introduce myself and explain my function.
P.M. Talked with one little girl who was referred by her teacher.

Monday, September 19, 1966
Prepared fourth and sixth grade students at West Franklin for Ohio Survey Tests.

Tuesday, September 20, 1966
A.M. Tested students at West Franklin
P.M. Prepared students at Stiles for Ohio Survey Test
Evening - Attended PTA
Wednesday, September 21, 1966
A.M. Tested students at West Franklin
P.M. Tested students at Stiles

Thursday, September 22, 1966
Tested students at Stiles entire day.

Friday, September 23, 1966
All Ohio Guidance Conference

Saturday, September 24, 1966
All Ohio Guidance Conference

Monday, September 26, 1966
A.M. Prepared students at Alton Hall for Ohio Survey Test.
P.M. Tested at Alton Hall. Met with Mr. Kahler, Miss Gill, Mrs. Mentier, and Mr. Bast to discuss available social services. Met with Mr. Frost and West Franklin teachers to discuss "work" project.

Tuesday, September 27, 1966
Tested at Alton Hall entire day. Met with Mr. Frost and Mr. Green about Iowa Basic Tests.

Wednesday, September 28, 1966
A.M. Tested children who were absent for sections of Ohio Survey Test.
P.M. Gave and scored ten Henmon-Nelson IQ tests for sixth grade teachers.

Thursday, September 29, 1966
A.M. Gave and scored four Gilmore Oral Reading Tests.
P.M. Counseled two children referred by teachers and one child referred by principal. Scheduled Iowa Basic Tests.

Friday, September 30, 1966
A.M. Counseled nine voluntary referrals—mainly scholastic problems.
P.M. Met with a parent concerning child previously counseled.
Monday, October 3, 1966
A.M. Counseled two referrals. Gave five students intelligence tests.
P.M. Cleaned out files and did some back clerical work.

Tuesday, October 4, 1966
A.M. Met with four rooms of students to introduce myself.
P.M. Counseled three students. Oriented third grade for Iowa Basic tests. Met with Carol Dieringer to discuss two students.

Wednesday, October 5, 1966
A.M. Met with five rooms of pupils to introduce myself. Gave five IQ tests. Talked with three referred students.
P.M. Observed a special class so I could work with two counselees. Met with staff; met with Mr. Frost.

Thursday, October 6, 1966
A.M. Gave and scored six Gilmore Reading tests. Met with parent who asked for a conference concerning her child.
P.M. Met with teacher concerning room problem. Talked with one referred student.

Friday, October 7, 1966
A.M. Talked with four children. Filled out two psychological referrals and straightened out files.
P.M. Conference with principal. Straightened out mix-up and placed student in special class. Talked with teachers about Iowa test.

Monday, October 10, 1966
Oriented and administered first section of Iowa Basic Test to all third and fifth grade groups at West Franklin.

Tuesday, October 11, 1966
A.M. Administered sections to children who missed parts of the Iowa Basic Test.
P.M. Talked with one referral. Met with Mr. Frost.
Evening - Attended PTA
Wednesday, October 12, 1966
A.M. Finished up Iowa tests at West Franklin. Delivered tests to East Franklin and conferred briefly with each teacher involved.
P.M. Talked with four students.

Thursday, October 13, 1966
A.M. Talked with four referrals. Observed one first grader. Will talk with him next week.
P.M. Held four interviews with teachers concerning their referrals.

Friday, October 14, 1966
A.M. Talked with five students, two parent interviews, met with principal.
P.M. Finished up Iowa tests, delivered tests to Alton Hall.

Monday, October 17, 1966
A.M. Talked with one referral. Conferences with three teachers. Picked up needed answer sheets from Richards Avenue, took to Alton Hall.
P.M. Staff meeting.

Tuesday, October 18, 1966
A.M. Talked with three students. Two teacher conferences.
P.M. Conference with principal. Read professional literature on school problems.

Wednesday, October 19, 1966
A.M. Talked with two students, one teacher conference.
P.M. Administered CTMM to all sixth grade students.

Thursday, October 20, 1966
A.M. Talked with five students. Coordinated tests to send in.
P.M. Two teacher conferences. Pupil personnel meeting.

Friday, October 21, 1966
A.M. Talked with seven students. One parent conference.

Monday, October 24, 1966
A.M. Talked with one student. Observed one referral. Gave and scored eight Hemmon-Nelson IQ tests.
P.M. One parent conference and one teacher conference. Staff meeting.
Tuesday, October 25, 1966
A.M. Gave and scored an IQ test. Had five individual conferences with students.
P.M. Talked with principal. Had four teacher conferences.

Wednesday, October 26, 1966
A.M. Had four individual conferences with students and two teacher conferences.
P.M. Conference with principal. Meeting with Mr. Frost and Mr. Rudder.

Thursday, October 27, 1966
A.M. Had two individual conferences with students. Conference with three teachers.
P.M. Gave and scored six IQ tests. Meeting with Mr. Frost.

Friday, October 28, 1966
Attended Central Ohio Teachers' Association Meeting.

Monday, October 31, 1966
A.M. Had four individual conferences with students. Talked with a parent. Had two teacher conferences.
P.M. Helped in office during Halloween Party. Staff meeting.

Tuesday, November 1, 1966
A.M. Had two individual conferences with students. Observed two students. Conference with principal.
P.M. Had three teacher conferences. Gave and scored three IQ tests. Prepared OST interpretation list.

Wednesday, November 2, 1966

Thursday, November 3, 1966
Had three individual conferences with students. Had three teacher conferences. Prepared OST interpretation list. Talked with principal. Counselor's meeting.
Friday, November 4, 1966
A.M. Had four individual conferences with students. Talked with principal. Conference with psychologist.
P.M. Had conference with a teacher. Prepared list for OST interpretation.

Monday, November 7, 1966
A.M. Had one individual student conferences. Had four teacher conferences. Interpreted test to teacher.
P.M. Fixed bulletin board. Met with Mrs. Bowsher.

Tuesday, November 8, 1966
A.M. Had five individual student conferences. Had four teacher conferences. Interpreted test to teacher.
P.M. Talked with principal about students.
Evening, Served on panel for discussion at PTA at Alton Hall.

Wednesday, November 9, 1966
Screened five students for World of Work Project. Had conference with principal. Had two teacher conferences. Observed neurologically impaired class.

Thursday, November 10, 1966
Had three individual student conferences. Talked with principal. Had three teacher conferences. Gave and scored six Henmon-Nelson IQ tests.

Friday, November 11, 1966
A.M. Had two teacher conferences. Did background work on three referrals.
P.M. Elementary Guidance Conference at Tipp City.

Monday, November 14, 1966
P.M. Reviewed tests to select one for experimental study. Did background work on students.

Tuesday, November 15, 1966
Had seven individual student interviews. Had seven individual teacher conferences. Talked with one parent.
Wednesday, November 16, 1966
Entire day at Ohio University

Thursday, November 17, 1966
Had three individual student conferences. Had three teacher conferences. Had two hour conference with social worker about students we both are seeing. Conference with principal. Background work for parent conference.

Friday, November 18, 1966
A.M. Had thirteen individual conferences with parents.
P.M. Had two teacher conferences. Had one principal conference. Talked with speech teacher.

Monday, November 21, 1966
A.M. Had three individual student conferences; also group session. Had three teacher conferences.

Tuesday, November 22, 1966
A.M. Had seven individual student conferences. Had four teacher conferences.
P.M. Had conference with Mr. Rife. Meeting with Mr. Frost.

Wednesday, November 23, 1966
A.M. Had four individual student conferences. Had four teacher conferences. Talked with principal and social worker.
P.M. Observed neurological class. Prepared OST labels for dissemination.

Monday, November 28, 1966
A.M. Had one individual student conference. Observed one student for counseling later. Observed a first grade in World of Work. Had four teacher conferences.
P.M. Did back paper work. Had staff meeting.

Tuesday, November 29, 1966
A.M. Had five individual student conferences.
P.M. Had two teacher conferences. Talked with Mr. Rife.
Wednesday, November 30, 1966
A.M. Had one student conference. Had four teacher conferences. Observed third grade in World of Work units.
P.M. Worked on OST scores, went to Stiles to pick up gummed labels.

Thursday, December 1, 1966
P.M. Conference with principal. Counselors' meeting.

Friday, December 2, 1966
A.M. Had conference with principal. Had two student conferences. Observed one student in room.
P.M. Had four teacher conferences. Filled out three social work referrals and other social worker services.

Monday, December 5, 1966
A.M. Had three individual student conferences. Had four teacher conferences. Conference with principal, conference with remedial reading teacher, conference with social worker.
P.M. Disseminated Iowa interpretation. Staff meeting. Talked with two parents.

Tuesday, December 6, 1966
A.M. Had eight individual student conferences. Had seven teacher conferences.
P.M. Information gathered for OST. Meeting with Mr. Frost.

Wednesday, December 7, 1966
A.M. Had three individual student conferences. Administered "What I like to Do" inventory. Book work.
P.M. Had two teacher conferences. Called parents for OST project.

Thursday, December 8, 1966
Met with Title I and Dr. Foster entire day.

Friday, December 9, 1966
A.M. Had five individual student conferences. Called parents for OST. Conference with Mrs. Dioringer.
P.M. Conference (phone) with Mr. Sullivan. Conference with Mr. Garrison. Had three teacher conferences.
Monday, December 12, 1966
A.M. Background for casework. Observed class. Had three teacher conferences.
P.M. Had one student interview. Gave "What I like" inventory. Conference with Mrs. Dieringer.

Tuesday, December 13, 1966
A.M. Had four student interviews.
P.M. Had four teacher conferences. Called parents for OST

Wednesday, December 14, 1966
A.M. Had one student conference and two teacher conferences. Had long conference with Mr. Sullivan.
P.M. Conference with Mr. Mills. Worked on referrals; gave part of "What I Like" inventory; called parents for OST. Went to Alton Hall.

Thursday, December 15, 1966
Spent entire day at J. C. Sommer for conference with University people.

Friday, December 16, 1966
A.M. Had seven individual student conferences. Had two teacher conferences. Observed class.
P.M. Called parents for OST. Had interview with principal.

Monday, December 19, 1966
A.M. Had five teacher conferences, had one student interview. Worked on World of Work Project.
P.M. Meeting with Dr. Hill and others.

Tuesday, December 20, 1966
A.M. Met with Monterey staff and Dr. Hill.
P.M. Tests to Franklin Heights. Conference with principal at Stiles over Iowa, panel for PTA, possible group project.

Wednesday, December 21, 1966
A.M. Had five individual student conferences and two teacher conferences. Observed and talked with Special Education class.
P.M. Called parents for OST interpretation. Talked with social worker. Talked with Mr. Sullivan. Meeting with Mr. Frost.
Thursday, December 22, 1966
A.M. Had five individual student conferences. Conference with two teachers. Conference with principal.
P.M. Phoned parents, worked on ITBS results, Christmas program.

Tuesday, January 3, 1967
A.M. Had six individual student conferences. Had four teacher conferences.
P.M. Conference with principal. Worked on interpretation sheet of OST for teachers.

Wednesday, January 4, 1967
A.M. Had four individual student conferences. Had conference with Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Mills.
P.M. Had two teacher conferences. Worked on OST interpretation sheets for teachers.

Friday, January 6, 1967
A.M. Had six individual student interviews. Had six teacher conferences. Interview with principal.
P.M. Worked on OST interpretation sheets for teachers, picked up OST material from J. C. Sommer.

Monday, January 9, 1967
A.M. At Richard Avenue observing test interpretation.
P.M. Gave three Hemmon-Nelson IQ tests and scored. Had two teacher conferences. Worked on test interpretation and schedules.

Tuesday, January 10, 1967
A.M. Had seven individual student conferences. Had four teacher conferences. Conference with principal.
P.M. Arranged test interpretation. Went to pupil personnel about tests. Attended Stiles PTA as group leader for program.

Wednesday, January 11, 1967
A.M. Had three individual student conferences. Had four teacher conferences. Conference with social worker.
P.M. Parent conference. Picked up test material, organized schedule, and saw all staff.
Thursday, January 12, 1967
A.M. Had three individual student conferences and four teacher conferences. Conferred with principal.
P.M. Filled out psychological referral. Worked on interpretation schedule, saw all teachers, phoned, etc.
Evening - Parent meeting, J.C. Sommer

Friday, January 13, 1967
A.M. Had four individual student conferences. Had five teacher conferences.
P.M. Conference with principal. Conference with psychologist. Scheduled interpretation of tests, arranged all details.

Tuesday, January 17, 1967
Interpreted Iowa and OST tests to West Franklin pupils.
Evening - Parent meeting at Richards Avenue

Wednesday, January 18, 1967
Interpreted Iowa and OST tests to West Franklin pupils.
Conference with social worker.
Evening - Parent meeting at Finland

Thursday, January 19, 1967
Interpreted OST and ITBS to West Franklin pupils. Conference with principal, conferences with two teachers. Parent interpretation meeting 1:30 P.M. at West Franklin.

Friday, January 20, 1967
A.M. Conference with principal. Conference with new social worker – Mrs. Butler
P.M. Interpreted OST and ITBS to East Franklin children.

Monday, January 23, 1967
A.M. Interpreted scores of ITBS and OST to east Franklin.
P.M. Had conference with principal. Had two student conferences. Had one teacher conference.

Tuesday, January 24, 1967
P.M. GATB training workshop.
Wednesday, January 25, 1967
GATB training workshop
Evening - Parent meeting at Darbydale.

Thursday, January 26, 1967
GATB training workshop
Evening - Parent meeting at East Franklin

Friday, January 27, 1967
A.M. Filed materials, talked with all teachers involved in World of Work.
P.M. Had conference with remedial reading teacher, conference with three teachers, conference with psychologist.

Monday, January 30, 1967
Interpreted OST and ITBS test scores to pupils at Stiles.
Had conference with principal.
Evening - Parent meeting at South Franklin.

Tuesday, January 31, 1967
A.M. Interpreted OST and ITBS test scores to pupils at Stiles.
P.M. Had one individual student conference, two teacher interviews, principal conference.
Evening - Parent meeting at Stiles.

Wednesday, February 1, 1967
Interpreted OST and ITBS tests to pupils at Alton Hall
Had one teacher conference.

Thursday, February 2, 1967
A.M. Interpreted OST and ITBS tests to pupils at Alton Hall.
P.M. Had one student conference, two parent conferences, principal conference. Parent meeting at Alton Hall.

Friday, February 3, 1967
GATB Training Workshop

Monday, February 6, 1967
Interpreted OST and ITBS test scores to pupils at Prairie Lincoln School.
Tuesday, February 7, 1967
A.M. Organized, explained experimental IQ testing program to participating teachers. Had eight student conferences.
P.M. Had six teacher conferences and conference with principal. Disseminated OST school reports to teachers and explained them.

Wednesday, February 8, 1967
A.M. Organized, explained experimental IQ testing program to participating teachers. Had five individual student conferences.
P.M. Gave and scored Otis IQ test. Had four teacher conferences. Had conference with principal.

Thursday, February 9, 1967
Met all day with Ohio University consultants.

Friday, February 10, 1967
A.M. Had six individual student conferences and one group conference concerning tests.
P.M. Had five teacher conferences and a principal conference. Worked on social work referrals.

Monday, February 13, 1967
A.M. Had five individual student conferences and six teacher conferences.
P.M. Had a parent conference. Coordinated experimental tests for third grade.

Tuesday, February 14, 1967
A.M. Had nine individual student conferences.
P.M. Had four teacher conferences. Worked on test information for IQ tests.

Wednesday, February 15, 1967
A.M. Had five individual student conferences, conference with Mr. Sullivan, and conference with principal.
P.M. Had two teacher conferences. Worked on test data.
Thursday, February 16, 1967
A.M. Had five individual student conferences and two parent conferences.
P.M. Had two teacher conferences. Met with Mr. Wills of Franklin Village.

Friday, February 17, 1967
A.M. Had nine student conferences and conference with principal
P.M. Had conference with social worker on all mutually served pupils. Had four teacher conferences. Set up group session for next week.

Monday, February 20, 1967
A.M. Had four student conferences and five teacher conferences
Talked with psychologist and principal.
P.M. Cleaned files, worked on IQ tests. Talked with four parents by phone. Gave and scored an IQ test.

Tuesday, February 21, 1967
A.M. Had ten student conference and conference with social worker.
P.M. Had eight teacher conferences. Filled out psychological referrals. Met with Mr. Frost after school.

Wednesday, February 22, 1967
A.M. Had eight student conferences and two teacher conferences.
P.M. Had conference with principal, and conference with Mr. Sullivan. Caught up on paper work.

Thursday, February 23, 1967
A.M. Had eleven student conferences.
P.M. Had three teacher conferences and principal conference.
Had conference with Dr. Driscoll. Explained test comparative sheet to fourth and sixth grade teachers.

Friday, February 24, 1967
A.M. Had six student conferences. Had one group session (five girls)
P.M. Had conference with principal, social worker, Miss Alban, Had two teacher conferences. Filled out psychological.

Monday, February 27, 1967
A.M. Had seven student conferences and principal conference.
P.M. Had four teacher conferences. Did necessary copywork for IQ tests.
Tuesday, February 28, 1967
A.M. Had fourteen individual student conferences.
P.M. Had two teacher conferences. Had conference with principal and parent conference.

Wednesday, March 1, 1967
Attended project conference at Hospitality Inn—was part of group speakers in the PM

Thursday, March 2, 1967
A.M. Had ten individual student conferences, one group session, conference with principal.
P.M. Had three teacher conferences and Counselors' meeting.

Friday, March 3, 1967
A.M. Had seven individual student conference and one group session.
P.M. Had seven teacher conferences and principal conference.

Saturday, March 4, 1967
Mr. Frost and I graded third grade IQ tests.

Monday, March 6, 1967
A.M. Had eight individual student conferences. Had seven teacher conferences.
P.M. Completed paper work. Had conference with the principal

Tuesday, March 7, 1967
A.M. Had seven individual student conferences.
P.M. Had eight teacher conferences and phone conference with social worker.

Wednesday, March 8, 1967
A.M. Had six individual student conferences, six teacher conferences.
P.M. Had conference with social worker. Helped in office when Mr. Mills had to leave.

Thursday, March 9, 1967
A.M. Had seven individual student conference, and one group session. Had conference with principal.
P.M. Had four teacher conferences and conference with L. Gill.

Friday, March 10, 1967
SWEA Meeting
Saturday, March 11, 1967
Mr. Frost and I graded third grade IQ tests.

Monday, March 13, 1967
A.M. Had nine individual student conferences and six teacher conferences.
P.M. Sat in on orientation of Teen Tutorial program. Talked with Reece Chaney about World of Work Unit. Staff meeting.

Tuesday, March 14, 1967
A.M. Had six individual student conferences.
P.M. Had five teacher conferences. Sat in on orientation of sixth graders for junior high. Had conference with principal.

Wednesday, March 15, 1967
A.M. Had twelve individual student conferences.
P.M. Had six teacher conferences. Had conference with principal.

Thursday, March 16, 1967
A.M. Had eleven individual student conferences.
P.M. Had five teacher conferences and principal conference. Sat in on orientation of sixth graders for junior high.

Friday, March 17, 1967 (Conference Day)
A.M. West Franklin - conference with two teachers, conference with principal, worked on case study.
P.M. Stiles - conferences with five teachers; conference with principal, organized tests in filing system.

Monday, March 20, 1967
A.M. Had seven individual student conferences. Administered four sections of Metropolitan Achievement test to six third graders.
P.M. Had eight teacher conferences.

Tuesday, March 21, 1967
A.M. Had nine individual student conferences.
P.M. Had four teacher conferences and conference with principal. Rescored two PMA IQ tests.
Wednesday, March 22, 1967
  A.M. Had ten individual student conferences, one group session, and conference with principal.
  P.M. Had conference with clinical psychologist, six teacher conferences and met with Mr. Frost.

Thursday, March 23, 1967
  A.M. Had twelve individual student conferences and phone conferences with social worker and psychologist.
  P.M. Had two teacher conferences and lengthy conference with principal. Had parent conference.

Tuesday, March 28, 1967
  A.M. Had ten individual student conferences.
  P.M. Had six teacher conferences and parent conference.

Wednesday, March 29, 1967
  A.M. Had two individual student conferences and gave Metropolitan to third graders. Had conference with social worker, Mr. Sullivan, cadet principal.
  P.M. Had six teacher conferences.

Thursday, March 30, 1967
  A.M. Had thirteen individual student conferences.
  P.M. Had four teacher conferences and principal conference.

Friday, March 31, 1967
  A.M. Had eight individual student conferences.
  P.M. Had five teacher conferences and principal conference.

Monday, April 3, 1967
  A.M. Had seven individual student conferences, four teacher conferences. Had phone conference with social worker.
  P.M. Wrote note to send with record for transfer. Worked on bulletin board and on tapes at J. C. Sommer.

Tuesday, April 4, 1967
  A.M. Had seven individual student conferences and six teacher conferences.
  P.M. Gave and scored Henmon-Nelson IQ test. Had conference with principal and worked on tapes for Ohio University.
Wednesday, April 5, 1967
A.M. Had ten individual student conferences and three teacher conferences.
P.M. Had principal conference and parent conference. Did paper work on sociogram.

Thursday, April 6, 1967
A.M. Had ten individual student conferences and three teacher conference.
P.M. Had parent conference and principal conference. Counselors' meeting.

Friday, April 7, 1967
A.M. Had ten individual student conferences.
P.M. Had four teacher conferences, parent conference, and principal conference.

Monday, April 10, 1967
A.M. Had eight individual student conferences and seven teacher conferences and one parent conference.
P.M. Paper work--tests for Mrs. Swor, Sociogram for Mrs. Vicars.

Tuesday, April 11, 1967
A.M. Had ten individual student conferences.
P.M. Had six teacher conferences, phone conferences with social worker and clinical psychologist. Paper work.
Evening - Served on panel at Alton Hall PTA

Wednesday, April 12, 1967
A.M. Had seven individual student conferences and seven teacher conferences.
P.M. Finished achievement test and scored. Had phone conference with psychologist and parent conference.

Friday, April 14, 1967
A.M. Had eleven individual student conferences.
P.M. Had two group sessions. Had four teacher conferences.

Monday, April 17, 1967
A.M. Conference with Mr. Frost, with four students, and with three teachers.
P.M. Conference with parent and with principal.
Tuesday, April 18, 1967
A.M. Had eight individual student conferences and five teacher conferences.
P.M. Conference with principal and phone conference with psychologist, child study, Mr. Frost. Worked on report.

Wednesday, April 19, 1967
A.M. Had nine individual student conferences and four teacher conferences.
P.M. Conference with principal and phone conferences with Hummel and Kehler. Reports and back paper work.

Thursday, April 20, 1967
A.M. Had eleven individual student conferences.
P.M. Had four teacher conferences, principal conference, conference with Dr. Dane and one with Elizabeth Butler.

Friday, April 21, 1967
A.M. Had seven individual student conferences and five teacher conferences.
P.M. Had long conference with principal. Observed special class and worked on records.

Monday, April 24, 1967
A.M. Had ten individual student conferences.
P.M. Had seven teacher conferences. Staff meeting.

Tuesday, April 25, 1967
A.M. Had ten individual student conference.
P.M. Had eight teacher conferences, principal conference, and phone conference with social worker.

Wednesday, April 26, 1967
A.M. Had eight individual student conferences and five teacher conferences.
P.M. Had conferences with principal, psychologist, clinical psychologist, and parent. Observed neuro impaired class.

Thursday, April 27, 1967
A.M. Had eight individual student conferences and seven teacher conferences.
Friday, April 28, 1967
A.M. Had eleven individual student conferences.
P.M. Had six teacher conferences and principal conference. Observed Arbor Day assembly.

Monday, May 1, 1967
A.M. Had nine individual student conferences and four teacher conferences.
P.M. Conference with principal. Met with Mrs. Bowsher about the World of Work.

Tuesday, May 2, 1967
A.M. Had eleven individual student conferences.
P.M. Had six teacher conferences and principal conference. Filled out psychologist referrals. Met with Mrs. Johnston about World of Work.

Wednesday, May 3, 1967
A.M. Had seven individual student conferences and eight teacher conferences.
P.M. Gave part of Metropolitan Achievement test. Had conference with principal and parent conference. Watched sixth grade play with school.

Thursday, May 4, 1967
A.M. Had nine individual student conferences and three teacher conferences.
P.M. Had conference with principal. Wrote referral to CSC. Counselors' meeting.

Friday, May 5, 1967
A.M. Had ten individual student conferences and three teacher conferences.
P.M. Had conference with principal and phone conference with psychologist. Took tour of East Franklin area with principal.

Monday, May 8, 1967
A.M. Had seven individual student conferences.
P.M. Had seven teacher conferences. Gave and scored Metropolitan Achievement Test.
Tuesday, May 9, 1967
A.M. Had nine individual student conferences.
P.M. Had six teacher conferences and principal conference.

Wednesday, May 10, 1967
A.M. Had nine individual student conferences.
P.M. Had four teacher conferences and principal conference.

Thursday, May 11, 1967
A.M. Had twelve individual student conferences.
P.M. Had four teacher conferences and principal conference.
Had parent conference at school and parent conference with social worker and parent at Curriculum Center. Also, met with Dr. Dane.

Friday, May 12, 1967
A.M. Had eleven individual student conferences.
P.M. Had four teacher conferences and principal conference.

Saturday, May 13, 1967
Mr. Frost, Tom Hummel, and I worked on Ohio University projects.

Monday, May 15, 1967
A.M. Had eight individual student conferences.
P.M. Had seven teacher conferences, principal conference, and psychologist conference—explained Frostig visual perception materials.

Tuesday, May 16, 1967
A.M. Had ten individual student conferences.
P.M. Had nine teacher conferences and a parent conference.

Wednesday, May 17, 1967
A.M. Had nine individual student conferences.
P.M. Had four teacher conferences and principal conference.

Thursday, May 18, 1967
A.M. Had ten individual student conferences, four teacher conferences.
P.M. Had conference with principal and psychologist.
Attended personnel meeting.
Friday, May 19, 1967  
A.M. Observed in one classroom. Had ten individual student conferences.  
P.M. Had six teacher conferences and conference with principal.

Monday, May 22, 1967  
A.M. Had nine individual student conferences and five teacher conferences.  
P.M. Had conference with principal. Met with Mr. Frost at 2:00 to assimilate materials for World of Work report.

Tuesday, May 23, 1967  
A.M. Had thirteen student conferences.  
P.M. Had eight teacher conferences and one conference with principal.

Wednesday, May 24, 1967  
A.M. Had nine individual student conferences.  
P.M. Gave and scored CTMM Short Form IQ Test and had five teacher conferences.

Thursday, May 25, 1967  
A.M. Had ten individual student conferences and four teacher conferences.  
P.M. Had conference with principal and with psychologist. Wrote notes to include with children's folders.

Friday, May 26, 1967  
A.M. Had nine individual student conferences.  
P.M. Had conference with principal and seven teacher conferences.

Monday, May 29, 1967  
A.M. Had eight individual student conferences.  
P.M. Had five teacher conferences and conference with principal.

Wednesday, May 31, 1967  
A.M. Had two individual student conferences, three teacher conferences and conference with principal.  
P.M. Gave and scored seven metropolitan achievement tests to Special Education class. Also went to Pleasant View high School to pick up tests. Had conference with Mr. Sullivan and met with Mr. Frost after school.
Thursday, June 1, 1967
A.M. Had five individual student conferences and two teacher conferences. Observed emotionally disturbed classes at Georgesville.
P.M. Counselors' Meeting.

Friday, June 2, 1967
A.M. Had ten individual student conference.
P.M. Had five teacher conferences and principal conference.
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A STUDY OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE ELEMENTARY COUNSELOR: TEACHER PERCEPTION COMPARED TO COUNSELOR PERCEPTION

PURPOSE - This study was carried out in order to determine if teachers who had counseling services were in agreement with counselors concerning some selected areas that relate to the counselors' function in the guidance program.

LIMITATIONS - The study was limited to a sample of elementary teachers from the South-Western City Schools where elementary counselors were members of the staff. The elementary counselors were those from the South-Western City Schools and the Title I program of the Columbus City Schools.

SIGNIFICANCE - A study was completed during the 1965-66 school year. This study was designed to compare the point of view regarding counselor role among teachers working in schools where a counselor was on the staff to those of teachers working in schools where no counselor was on the staff. In view of the continued concern of many educators regarding an elementary counselor's role, it seemed appropriate to study the functions of counselors working in elementary schools.

PROCEDURE - An instrument was devised by revising items from the previous year's study and the addition of items as a result of comments received from teachers, counselors, and principals. Items used in the "Elementary Guidance Program Function" sheet were placed in Figure 1.
1. Flexibility in the counselor's program so as to meet varying conditions.
2. Amount of time counselor is scheduled for each building.
3. Counselor's understanding of the school community.
4. Amount of time spent for individual counseling.
5. Cooperation with other specialists (e.g. school psychologists, nurses, etc.)
6. Counselor's communication with the teacher and others after a child has been referred.
7. Counselor's ability to communicate with parents.
8. Flexibility of counselor's time schedule.
9. Time spent coordinating and assisting teachers with the standardized test program.
10. Counselor's knowledge of child growth and development.
11. Orientation of sixth graders to the junior high school program.
12. Counseling with groups of pupils to help them better understand problematic situations.
13. Communicating information to teachers concerning pupils' needs.
14. Helping teachers identify and make proper referrals of children who need special help beyond what the building staff can provide.
15. Conferring with parents at the request of the teacher or principal.
16. Assisting teachers to interpret cumulative record information to parents.
17. Utilization of counseling service for children.
18. Assisting teachers to prepare and present to classroom groups information concerning:
   a. Sex Education
   b. Mental Health
   c. Social Relations (Use role playing, sociometric devices, etc.)
   d. Study habits, manners, honesty, etc.
   e. Concepts dealing with Our Working World.
   f. Tests
19. Prepare and participate in case studies.
20. Counselor availability to teachers and pupils (i.e. assigned to the school staff rather than Central Office.)

FIGURE 1

ITEMS THAT WERE PLACED ON THE ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE PROGRAM FUNCTION INSTRUMENT
A five point scale was devised and arranged as a continuum from, More Important (A) to Less Important (E). On the scale, C was to be considered Average. Figure 2 shows a summary for the cover sheet of the "Elementary Guidance Program Function." This furnished information about the respondent concerning (1) teaching experience, (2) guidance courses completed, and (3) years of experience where a counselor was on the staff.

In September, the survey was distributed to a sample of one hundred and eight teachers in eight schools. Eighty-one teachers responded (75%). Of the eighteen counselors included in the study, all responded. The survey has been reproduced beginning on page 93.

ANALYSIS OF DATA - The responses from all teachers were compared to counselor responses using the chi-square ($\chi^2$) technique. In order to further analyze teacher responses, they were subdivided according to teaching experience. Three levels of experience were identified: (1) those with over five years experience, (2) those with two to five years experience, and (3) those who were in their first year of teaching.
THE ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE PROGRAM FUNCTION

School Summary

Teacher 81  Counselor 18

Experience 1 year 20  2-5 years 32  Over 5 yr. 29

Grade taught presently K 7  1 9  2 15  3 19
4 7  5 14  6 7  Sp. Ed. 3

College Guidance Courses you have taken:

Teachers only  (51% had two or more)

1. Tests and Measurements 59
2. Individual counseling 1
3. Group counseling 2
4. Child psychology 78
5. Child growth and development 56
6. Occupational Information 1
7. Guidance Principles 21
8. Social Work 8
9. Child Study 16
10. Other 19

Indicate the approximate number of years a counselor has been on the staff where you have taught 2.5 years (average)

FIGURE 2

A summary of information from the cover sheet of the Elementary Guidance Program Function
The distribution of observed responses in the \((X^2)\) table was in many cases clustered in two rows of three cells producing a 2 X 3 table while for other items the distribution spread over the scale to produce a 2 X 5 table.

Cells with small expected frequencies made it necessary to perform an exact test for these items. Items significant at the .05 level are identified with asterisks. However, an item significant at the .05 level, on which the exact test showed no difference, will not be discussed. The results of the chi-square analysis for all items are reported in Table I.

**ANALYSIS OF ITEMS** *- Item 1, Flexibility in the counselors' program so as to meet varying conditions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - All</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 yrs. exp</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 yrs.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The \(X^2\) tables for this item showed the responses were limited to cells A, B, and C. Thus, teachers and counselors were essentially in agreement. Teachers were more conservative in their judgment of this item than were counselors. It could be conjectured that teachers wanted the schedule to flex when

* The items that show teacher-counselor combinations of significance will have a table of responses for significant combinations beneath a statement of the item.
## TABLE I

A TABLE OF CHI-SQUARES ($X^2$) AND EXACT PROBABILITIES FOR THE VARIOUS TREATMENT COMBINATIONS OF THE ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE PROGRAM FUNCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>Exact</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>Exact</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>Exact</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>Exact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.020*</td>
<td>.032*</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.030*</td>
<td>.041*</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.021*</td>
<td>.042*</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.009**</td>
<td>.019*</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.007**</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.018*</td>
<td>.016*</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.011*</td>
<td>.018*</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.034*</td>
<td>.047*</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.029*</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.042*</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.021*</td>
<td>.025*</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.003**</td>
<td>.006**</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.038*</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.004**</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>1.243</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.011*</td>
<td>.026*</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.017*</td>
<td>.029*</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.008**</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.025*</td>
<td>.041*</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.006**</td>
<td>.005**</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.029*</td>
<td>.036*</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>1.968</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>1.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.016*</td>
<td>.029*</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.038*</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.027*</td>
<td>.041*</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.009**</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18c</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.002**</td>
<td>.003**</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.004**</td>
<td>.003**</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.032*</td>
<td>.029*</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.026*</td>
<td>.041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18d</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.016*</td>
<td>.050*</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.026*</td>
<td>.033*</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18e</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.045*</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.007**</td>
<td>.007**</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18f</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.044*</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.479</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.019*</td>
<td>.024*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sig. at .05  ** Sig. at .01
they needed the counselor's service, but stable so that they could depend upon a schedule being followed.

**Item 2 - Amount of time counselor is scheduled for each building.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - 2-5 yrs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 2 was not significantly different for all teachers. Responses of counselors compared to teachers with over five years of experience and new teachers differed significantly for this item. This difference occurred because of the more conservative responses of teachers in the A, and B, and C cells. Considering the treatment combinations, teachers in the 2 to 5 year category made more responses in the A cell than did the other two groups. Thus, the differences noted in the other two combinations were offset when all teachers were considered.

**Item 5 - Cooperation with other specialists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - All</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 yrs.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 yrs.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to Item 5 were primarily limited to cells A, B, and C with one new teacher response in cell D. Teachers felt this item was of greater than average importance but teachers were more conservative than counselors in their evaluation of its importance. First year teachers appeared to see less need for cooperation among specialists, as observed by the more equal distribution of responses among cells.

Item 6 - Counselors' communication with the teacher and others after a child has been referred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - Over 5 yrs.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference found was one of degree of importance. This significant combination led to the alternatives that (1) experienced teachers were not as concerned about communication as counselors or (2) counselors communicated in a manner that kept this from becoming a concern to teachers.

Item 8 - Flexibility of counselor's time schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - All</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This item was significant when all teachers were compared to counselors, even at the .01 level. An examination of the various treatment combinations indicated that new teachers contributed mainly to this difference. An inspection of the other groups indicated there were no significant differences. It might be inferred that new teachers were unfamiliar with the role of the counselor as it was understood by other staff members. Once again, teachers were more conservative in estimating the importance of this item than were counselors.

Item 11 - Orientation of sixth graders to the junior high school program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - all</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 yrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this item, 2-5 year teachers and new teachers contributed mainly to the difference. Differences indicated by new teachers were more evident and were significant at the .01 level. The continued conservative response from teachers can be noted. This is the first item where teachers have felt there was a least important area of function for the elementary counselor.
Item 12 - Counseling with groups of pupils to help them better understand problematic situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - All</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 yrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers in the 2-5 year experience level contributed primarily to this difference. An examination of chi-square values in Table I for various treatment combinations indicates the other groups were not significantly different. Differences were significant at the .01 level between counselors and teachers with 2 to 5 years of experience.

Item 18a - Assisting teachers to prepare and present to classroom groups information concerning sex education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - Over 5 yrs.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences among the various treatment combinations except for teachers with over five years experience. Since teachers in general agree with counselors, we might assume that an experienced teacher was more aware of the need for sex education than any other group including counselors. They also felt a need for assistance.
Item 18b - Assisting teachers to prepare and present to classroom groups information concerning mental health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - All</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 yrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This item elicited the most divergent opinions between counselors and teachers thus far observed. Although experienced teachers were not placed in the above table, an examination of Table I revealed the opinions of this group conformed more closely to the other groups of teachers than to counselors. This led to the speculation that: (1) teachers felt they were now provided adequate assistance; or (2) teachers see no need for this type of information; or (3) teachers felt counselors could not provide adequate assistance; or (4) counselors should not become involved in classroom presentations or preparations.

Item 18c - Assisting teachers to prepare and present to classroom groups information concerning social relations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - All</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 yrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 yrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chi-square obtained for the comparison of responses for counselors and all teachers was significant beyond the 1 percent level for this item. However, when the various treatment combinations were considered, new teachers responded more nearly like counselors than did the other two combinations. Teachers with over five years experience differed most. The conclusions that recently trained teachers were more aware of the value of using sociometric techniques in the classroom than were teachers who received their training a few years ago should be considered.

Item 18d - Assisting teachers to prepare and present to classroom groups information concerning study habits, manners, honesty, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - all</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this item, an inspection of the various treatment combinations indicated the major difference was contributed by 2-5 year teachers. It might be inferred that teachers recognize the importance of providing this type of information for pupils. Perhaps teachers in the 2-5 year experience
group felt competent to prepare and present this information themselves.

Item 18e - Assisting teachers to prepare and present to classroom groups information concerning concepts dealing with our working world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - 2-5 yrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences were highly significant among teachers with 2 to 5 years experience and counselors. However, this difference while pronounced followed the same pattern as responses from new teachers. Experienced teachers (over 5 years) were more like counselors.

Item 20 - Counselor availability to teachers and pupils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers - New</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although teachers in general were in agreement with counselors on this item, there was a difference for the new teacher-counselor combination.

Opinions were not polar but rather new teachers were more conservative in their feelings.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS - This study has shown a large measure of agreement among the elementary teachers and counselors. For many items, where differences were found, opinions differed in the levels of choice between average and most important. Counselor functions that were most in question centered about Item 18.

Items 1, 2, and 8 referred to program flexibility, time in a building, and flexibility of the counselor's time schedule while in a building. It was concluded that there was no wide divergence of opinion, rather teacher opinions were more conservative than those of counselors.

Opinions elicited for items in 18a through 18f produced greater differences than in other areas. However, there was not enough information available to produce an adequate interpretation of the meaning underlying this area of divergent opinion.

RECOMMENDATIONS - It appears that most of the functions included in this study are acceptable to teachers. However, a questionable area of function has been identified. It concerns the area of "assisting the teacher to prepare and present in the classroom."
This must be studied more thoroughly so that some meaningful interpretation can be given the information gained thus far.

A more in depth study of the role teachers see for the counselor in orientation activities is recommended. This study should also include determining teacher understanding of problems faced by pupils and parents when the move to junior high school occurs, or when a need for other orientation programs arises.

Teacher responses to an item concerning group counseling indicates a careful, continued evaluation of the effectiveness of this technique must be continued by counselors. More effective communication with teachers may be a key to enhancing this tool for helping children solve problems.

There are many guidance programs in operation where a counselor is part of the staff. Further studies should focus more clearly upon the activities of counselors presently working in elementary schools. Moreover, further research is needed to determine the extent to which counselors with different levels of experience share views with teachers of similar experience. It is no longer a problem of searching for a role, rather it is a time for evaluating the effectiveness
of activities in which elementary counselors presently engage themselves. In this manner, an approach to effective delineation of the role can get under way. It may never be completed.
Please complete the following:

Check (x)

Teacher____  Administrator____  Counselor____

Experience  1 year ____  2 to 5 years ____  over 5 years ____

Grade taught presently  K  1  2  3  4  5  6

College guidance courses you have taken:

1. Tests and measurements  6. Occupational Information
2. Individual counseling  7. Guidance Principles
5. Child growth and development  10. Other

Indicate the approximate number of years a counselor has been on the staff where you have taught ____________

This is a list designed to assess the relative importance of various factors in the elementary guidance program. These factors are based on teacher comments from last year's survey as well as principals evaluation and the counselor's log.

These results will assist the staff and administration in adjusting the elementary guidance program activities. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Teachers familiar with the present program should make responses based upon their experience.

Teachers not familiar with the program should respond in terms of their concept of what the program should encompass.
Please use the five point continuum from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Important</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circle a letter to indicate the relative importance of various factors of the program.

1. Flexibility in the counselor's program so as to meet varying conditions. A B C D E
2. Amount of time counselor is scheduled for each building. A B C D E
3. Counselor's understanding of the school community. A B C D E
4. Amount of time spent for individual counseling. A B C D E
5. Cooperation with other specialists (e.g. school psychologists, nurses, etc.) A B C D E
6. Counselor's communication with the teacher and others after a child has been referred. A B C D E
7. Counselor's ability to communicate with parents. A B C D E
8. Flexibility of counselor's time schedule. A B C D E
9. Time spent coordinating and assisting teachers with the standardized test program. A B C D E
10. Counselor's knowledge of child growth and development. A B C D E
11. Orientation of sixth graders to the junior high school program. A B C D E
12. Counseling with groups of pupils to help them better understand problematic situations. A B C D E
13. Communicating information to teachers concerning pupils' needs.

14. Helping teachers identify and make proper referrals of children who need special help beyond what the building staff can provide.

15. Conferring with parents at the request of the teacher or principal.

16. Assisting teachers to interpret cumulative record information to parents.

17. Utilization of counseling service for children.

18. Assisting teachers to prepare and present to classroom groups information concerning:
   a. sex education
   b. mental health
   c. social relations (use role playing, sociometric devices, etc.)
   d. study habits, manners, honesty, etc.
   e. concepts dealing with our working world
   f. tests

19. Prepare and participate in case studies.

20. Counselor availability to teachers and pupils (i.e., assigned to the school staff rather than Central Office).
THIRD GRADE MENTAL MATURITY TEST EVALUATION
THIRD GRADE MENTAL MATURITY TEST EVALUATION

PURPOSE - This study was instituted in order to evaluate several mental maturity tests and present the results to the Pupil Personnel Council. The results were used to aid in the selection of a mental maturity test for third graders in the district.

LIMITATIONS - This study was limited to administering a test to a classroom group. Therefore, it can not be inferred that a group taking any test was randomly selected other than the randomness of the class.

PROCEDURE - There were two main areas of concern: (1) the test selected should be acceptable to teachers with respect to administration, scoring, profiling, and interpretation, as well as the confidence a teacher placed in the scores reflecting her perception of a class, (2) standardization procedures reported by the test maker.

This report is concerned with the areas mentioned under (1) above.

Four tests were selected, long and short forms were used when available. Teachers were asked to rank their pupils
according to the performance they would expect on a mental ability test. The teacher was asked to administer one of the tests selected for study. She was asked to give her impressions of the events related to preparing for and administering the test. Each teacher was asked to score and profile one of each of the tests selected. Each teacher was asked to give her impressions regarding ease of scoring and profiling.

The Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests were administered to the third grades at Monterey Elementary School. The Level A, Form 1, verbal and non-verbal battery was used.

The actual testing time was sixty-two minutes. The verbal battery was given before recess (thirty-five minutes actual test time) and the non-verbal (twenty-seven minutes) after recess. The test administration took the morning. The teacher and counselor administered the test in the classroom. Children were able to follow directions with very little difficulty. They had more difficulty with the non-verbal section.

The scoring time was approximately two hours for a class of thirty-one pupils. The tests provided verbal and non-verbal
raw scores, age equivalents, grade equivalents, grade percentiles, a verbal and non-verbal IQ and a total IQ.

Several features of this test deserved mention. A reusable multiple test booklet which can be used in grades three through thirteen was used. (Consumable test booklets were available for grades K - 2.) The tests were concurrently normed with the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. Special Percentile Norms for IQ levels provided a percentile score in each of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, skill test according to ability. When used together, the tests could be appropriate for use in special education classes as well as in a regular classroom.

Some limitations of this test are: the manual was bulky and difficult to use as the norms for grades 3 through 13 were included. It was easy to lose your place and discover you were using the wrong norm table. While machine scoring was available, the tests were hand scored. The company made no provisions for any type of profile that could be used for recording purposes when hand scoring tests. One could be designed provided sufficient clerical help was available to
prepare the profile.

The California Long Form, Test of Mental Maturity was given to a class of third graders in West Franklin Elementary School. Level I, 1963, revision was used. The actual testing time was thirty-seven minutes for the non-language section and thirty minutes for the language section. A total of sixty-seven minutes were necessary. The administration of this test should be spread over two mornings. The test was administered by the teacher in the classroom. Scoring and profiling time was about fifteen to twenty minutes for each child. Booklets for this test are consumable.

Both forms of the California Test produced a verbal and a non-verbal score as well as a total. Teachers pointed out difficulty experienced in profiling this test because of the small size of the marks on the profile sheet. Booklets for this test are consumable.

The Primary Mental Abilities Test was given to a class
of third grade pupils at Stiles Elementary School. The edition revised in 1962 was used. Time required for this test was over one hour. It should be given on two successive days. Scoring and profiling required about twenty minutes. Booklets for this test were consumable.

The Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests, Alpha Form, were given to a class of third grade pupils at West Franklin Elementary School. There were two scores; one verbal, the other non-verbal. The last copyright was 1939. About forty minutes actual work time was required. Scoring and profiling required about five minutes per pupil. Booklets for this test were consumable.

The Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests: New Edition, Alpha Short Form, copyright 1954, were given to a third grade class at West Franklin Elementary School. This test yields a verbal and a non-verbal score. The verbal test requires ten minutes and the non-verbal test requires twelve minutes. Test booklets were scored and profiled in about five minutes per pupil. Booklets for this test were consumable.
ANALYSIS OF DATA - A teacher interview checklist for tabulating opinions regarding third grade tests of mental abilities was prepared and placed in Figure 1. A summary of opinions from the teacher interview checklist gave the following information. The opinion of the language and/or reading level ranked the Lorge-Thorndike and California Test of Mental Maturity (both forms), as good. The Otis (both forms) was considered adequate. Teachers preferred a test that gave both verbal and non-verbal measures. Administration time and directions were considered suitable for all tests. Teachers questioned the value of long forms of a test. Scoring of the California Short Form, the Lorge-Thorndike, and the Otis Short Form were preferred. Teachers, in general, saw no great value in preparing profiles. Everything considered, the Otis Short Form, California Short form, or the Lorge-Thorndike were preferred. The above sequence of naming does not indicate order of preference. Some teachers indicated they might be biased toward the California Short Form because of familiarity with the instrument.

Each class member was ranked by the teacher prior to giving the test. The teacher was asked to estimate the rank for a pupil according to where she would expect him to place on the test. The mental ability test raw scores and the composite
TEACHER INTERVIEW CHECKLIST FOR TABULATING OPINIONS REGARDING 3rd GRADE TESTS OF MANUAL ABILITIES

Name of Test Administered ____________________________

I. General Opinions:
A. Was the language used appropriate and did it correspond to the reading level of the students tested?
1. CTMM Good Adequate Poor
2. Lorge-Thorndike Good Adequate Poor
3. Otis Good Adequate Poor
4. PMA Good Adequate Poor
B. Opinions regarding tests measuring only verbal and reading ability as opposed to tests measuring verbal and non-verbal ability:
1. Like verbal only test ______
2. Like verbal, non-verbal tests _____
3. Points in favor of both but prefer verbal only test ______
4. Points in favor of both but prefer verbal, non-verbal X
5. No opinion ______
Also attempt to get reaction on the Otis which gives verbal and non-verbal results from two sets of directions applied to a single set of pictures. Like X Dislike____ No Opinion____

II. Was administration time suitable? Yes X No_____ Comment____

III. Was manual of directions clear cut and easily understood? Yes X No____

IV. Were directions to students clear and easily understood? Yes X No____

V. Is the long form of a test worth the extra time required beyond the short form of the same test?
A. CTMM Yes______ No______ Uncertain X
B. Otis Yes______ No X Uncertain____

VI. Scoring (Rank from easiest to most difficult)
A. CTMM-CF 1 2 3 4 5 6
B. CTMM-Long 1 2 3 4 5 6
C. Lorge-Thorndike 1 2 3 4 5 6
D. Otis-SF 1 2 3 4 5 6
E. Otis-Long 1 2 3 4 5 6
F. PMA 1 2 3 4 5 6

VII. Determine the pupil profile felt to be most helpful by having teacher rank from the least to the most helpful. Indicate if teacher feels profiles in general are a waste of time by checking here____
A. CTMM-SF 1 2 3 4 5 6
B. CTMM-Long 1 2 3 4 5 6
C. Otis-SF 1 2 3 4 5 6
D. Otis-Long 1 2 3 4 5 6
E. PMA 1 2 3 4 5 6

VIII. Taking everything into consideration, the test I would most like to see given to 3rd grade students next year would be___________

FIGURE 1
This figure summarizes teachers' opinion of mental maturity tests administered to 3rd grade classes.
This checklist was prepared by Richard Green, Test Coordinator.
score from the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) were ranked for each class in the sample. A rank-order correlation was computed for (1) total mental maturity raw score rank to teacher rank, (2) total mental maturity raw score rank to ITBS composite score, and (3) ITBS to total mental maturity raw score rank. These correlations were placed in Table I below.

When rankings from the ITBS and mental maturity total raw score were correlated, coefficients significant at the 1 percent level were obtained for classes using the California Short Form, Otis Long Form, and the Lorge-Thorndike. The Otis Short Form was significant at the 5 percent level. Correlations below 5 percent were obtained for classes using the California Test of Mental Maturity Long Form and the Primary Mental Abilities test.

Total raw score ranks from the mental abilities tests were compared to the teacher rankings. Correlations significant at the 1 percent level were obtained for classes that took the California Test of Mental Maturity Short Form, the Lorge-Thorndike and the long and short forms of the Otis. The Primary Mental Abilities correlation was not significant at the 5 percent level while the California Test of Mental Maturity Long Form was significant at this level.
TABLE I

This is a table of rank-order correlations computed for ranks obtained in selected third grade classes that were given a mental maturity test, and had a composite score from the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills as well as a rank assigned by the teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CTMM</th>
<th>CTMM Short</th>
<th>Otis Short</th>
<th>Otis Long</th>
<th>PMA</th>
<th>Lorge-Thorndike</th>
<th>Lorge-Thron.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=25</td>
<td>N=29</td>
<td>N=10</td>
<td>N=21</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>N=25</td>
<td>N=29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test to ITBS</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test to Teacher Rank</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.94**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITBS to Teacher Rank</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 5 percent level
** Significant at the 1 percent level

Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)
California Test of Mental Maturity (CTMM)
Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests:
    New Edition (Otis-Short)
Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests:
    Alpha Form (Otis-Long)
Lorge-Thorndike Multi-Level Form 1, Level A
Primary Mental Abilities (PMA)
When the composite score from the ITBS was compared to teacher rankings, all correlations were significant at the 1 percent level. In fact, all correlations were between .74 and .88.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS** - Tests that were considered adequate for use in grade three include: (1) the Lorge-Thorndike Multi Level; (2) the California Test of Mental Maturity Short Form 1963; and the (3) Otis Short or Long Form.

A per pupil cost table is given below. It must be kept in mind that booklets for the Lorge-Thorndike Multi-Level are reusable. Past experience indicates six years' use is a minimum expectancy for this type of test booklet.

**COST CHART PER PUPIL**
(Transportation not included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Per year per pupil</th>
<th>Per year for six years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Test of Mental Maturity</td>
<td>$.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Test of Mental Maturity - SF</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability - SF</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Mental Abilities</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorge-Thorndike Multi-Level, Booklet</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>$.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Manual Administration</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer Sheet MRC (500's)</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Service - Press Label</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Manual</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>$.472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Manual cost 60¢ per classroom of 30 pupils.
On the basis of the above report, it was recommended that the Lorge-Thorndike Multi-Level test be adopted for use by all third grades in the District next year.
PARENT EVALUATION OF A MEETING TO INTERPRET STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES
PARENT EVALUATION OF A MEETING TO INTERPRET STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES

PURPOSE - This study was done in order to gain some indication of parent reaction to and understanding of standardized test scores, after they attended a program designed to communicate this information.

LIMITATIONS - The sample of parents who completed the evaluation was selected from those who attended the interpretation meeting and agreed to complete the instrument. Parents from eleven different elementary schools were represented in the sample.

SIGNIFICANCE - For the past five years, elementary counselors in this school district had scheduled evening test interpretation meetings for parents. These meetings were held in each school and were designed to give parents information about standardized tests. The child's test scores were returned to parents at the meeting. During this period, it appeared certain objectives emerged that were important for counselors to communicate to parents. This evaluation was an attempt to determine parent reaction to some of these areas.

PROCEDURE - An evaluation sheet was prepared. The objectives for the meeting were used as a guide for preparing items. Past experiences in these meetings, as they related to the questions asked by parents, helped in the structure of the evaluation sheet.
After children were given their test results and had constructed their own profile in their classroom during a school day, the profiles were returned to the counselor. A meeting for parents was scheduled to be held on an evening one or two days after the children received their scores. Parents were given their child's profile during the meeting.

The counselors planned a program, (1) to familiarize parents with standardized test norms, (2) to point out the limits of standardized tests, and (3) to prepare some groundwork to help the parent visualize problems encountered when comparisons were made for their child in a class and in a more general population.

The number of parents asked to complete the evaluation was determined by the enrollment for the school. Only parents who planned to attend the meeting were included. Parents were contacted to see if they expected to attend the meeting. If they were not coming, another parent was asked to complete the evaluation until the desired number was obtained. About one thousand attended these meetings in eleven elementary schools. The sample consisted of one member selected from sixty-five different families.

**ANALYSIS OF DATA** - The responses for each item were tabulated and placed below the item to which they referred. Since
Garrett has suggested that confidence bands not be formed for present values based on fewer than 50 cases, they were not reported for items 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12.¹

When the responses numbered more than fifty, the standard error of a percentage (σ%) was computed for that item. The formula used was:²

\[ \sigma \% = \sqrt{\frac{PQ}{N}} \]

\[ P = \text{percentage of occurrence of the behavior} \]

\[ Q = (1-P) \]

\[ N = \text{Number of cases} \]

Comments made by parents were reproduced and placed below the item to which they referred.

Parents were asked -- Please check the response that seems best to you. Space has been provided for you to comment whenever necessary.

Item 1. Was there a difference between your estimates and the actual performance of your child on the tests?

Yes 35 (62.5%)  No 21 (37.5%) \[ \sigma \% = 6.4\% \]

The .99 Confidence Interval for the Population percent

Yes  from 46% to 79%

No  from 21% to 54%

For this experiment 62.5% of the parents estimated their child's scores to be the same as the score produced by the test. If this experiment were to be repeated we would expect


²Ibid.
that 99% of the time parents estimates of their child's performance would coincide with actual test scores between 34% and 76% of the children. This relationship was established by using the standard error of a percentage to form a 99% confidence interval for each response category.

Similarly, if the experiment were to be repeated we would expect, with 99% confidence, that parents estimates of their child's performance would differ for actual scores from 21% to 54% of the children.

COMMENTS: (Each line unless indented is a separate comment.)
Thought she would be nervous and not have enough time.
He has far more ability than performed.
I thought she would do better in language.
I expected a higher math score.
I thought my son's best subject was Arithmetic.
I believe Carolyn is capable of a far higher showing in Academic Ability by her grade cards and the way she is at home.
No material difference. Estimates were within the actual performance range.
Not too much difference.
Carol had given me the grades.
Barry's was considerably lower. Judy's was as I had expected.
Pretty hard to guess completely accurately.
I over estimated Charles' reading score.
I thought that it should have been higher.
I feel as though the test scores were very accurate.
This child seems to show more ability than tests indicated-possibly because of wide range of interests that it is not possible for test to cover.
I was very surprised in academic achievement.
I knew it would be low, but it was even lower than I thought.
I thought they would do better than they did.
There was a difference in one and not in another.
Her scores were much lower than I expected, especially in Academic Ability - Total and in Reading.
COMMENTS: (Con't)
I am sure that David could do much better.
She averaged lower than her every day work would indicate.

Item 2. Can you account for differences between your estimates and your child's test performance?
Yes 16 (36.4%) No 28 (63.6%)

Only 44 parents answered this item. It appeared that most of these parents felt their children had no limiting factors. However, about one third did not respond to the item except to write a comment.

COMMENT: (Each line is a separate comment unless indented.)
Lack of attention.
I believe at the present time she is emotionally upset to a degree which is reflected in her school work.
I expected it to be low.
I feel that Barry put out very little effort.
I have tendency to under estimate. Then if she achieved higher than my guess, I'm pleasantly surprised, not disappointed.
Christina cannot work under pressure.
Possibly too cautious.
Not checking their homework grades closely enough to make sure that they agree with what they tell me they get.
Some of child's scores were considerably better than in last year's test (Iowa Basic). Child was often not well last year which may have been the case on test day.
Reading, although she reads well.
I believe they can do better but sometimes don't apply themselves. They get distracted pretty easily.
When my child is given time limit, I think he worries more about finishing.
She just doesn't try as hard as she could.

Item 3. What kind of tests were these?
Achievement 33 (82.5%) Interest 2 (5%) Capacity 5 (12.5%)

A fairly large number of parents did not respond to this item. Most correctly identified it as an achievement test, not a capacity test. An attempt was made in the meeting to
convey the meaning of the academic ability score as a capacity measure. This part of the program was either unsuccessful or the respondents did not understand that they could check two descriptive terms.

COMMENTS: (Each line is a separate comment unless indented.)
I believe he is doing his best.
I do not believe, however, that written tests are always completely accurate on showing ability.
I felt her capacities were greater than they are.

Item 4. Does your child have any work habits that might limit his performance on tests like these?
Yes **20** (37%)  No **34** (63%)  \( \sigma \% = 6.6\% \)

The .99 Confidence Interval for the Population Percentage
Yes from 20% to 54%
No from 46% to 80%

About two thirds of the parents felt their children had no work habits that would limit their performance on the test. Those who felt their children had work habits that would influence test performance described them in the comments below.

COMMENTS: (Each line is a separate comment unless indented.)

Doesn't know how seemingly to work--just any way to get it out of the way.
He feels inadequate.
Sometimes doesn't apply himself.
He's a dreamer.
He plays around too much.
I do not think she concentrates sufficiently on what she is doing.
Time limits.
He can't stand too much brain strain, gets a nervous twitching.
Carol has a very good interest in all subjects. She enjoys reading and studying very much. Many times to the exclusion of TV programs.
He doesn't start work on time.
Too slow.
Works hard and likes work.
Charles is careless and lazy. Jimmy can't work as fast nor as comprehensively as he should.
COMMENTS: (Con't)

She likes to hurry thru her work and get on with something else.
Lisa's oral reading is good, but comprehension is poor.
Child does not seem to place any importance on tests.
Does not apply herself.
He is a jittery child and soon loses interest, seldom finishes anything.
One has the bad habit of trying to answer questions without reading first. They all three tend to hurry too much.
He is slow at times.
She works slowly which might hamper her.
None that I am aware of.
Lack of concentration.

Item 5. Was your child in about the same place on these tests as he is in the classroom with respect to average, above average, or below average?

Reading
Yes 41 (78.8%)  No 11 (21.2%)  \( \pm \% = 5.7\% \)

The .99 Confidence Interval for the Population Percentage

Reading
Yes from 4.1% to 93.5%
No from 6.5% to 35.9%

English
Yes 41 (80%)  No 10 (20%)  \( \pm \% = 5.6\% \)

The .99 Confidence Interval for the Population Percentage

English
Yes from 65.6% to 94.4%
No from 5.6% to 34.4%

Math
Yes 36 (75.9%)  No 15 (24.1%)  \( \pm \% = 6\% \)

The .99 Confidence Interval for the Population Percentage

Math
Yes from 60.4% to 91.4%
No from 8.6% to 39.6%

The number of parents who felt this test placed their children about the same in terms of above average, average or below average as their classroom grades, were greater for reading and English than for mathematics.

COMMENTS FOR ALL PARTS: (Each line is a separate comment unless indented.)

According to the grade card, she is mostly average.
According to the report card that she receives every nine weeks, she carries a B+ average. She has definitely come up in reading abilities. Math seems to be slipping lately. He has always been a slow learner. I have tried spelling 30 minutes or 45 minutes and think he knows the words but by morning we were right back where we started.

I believe they're doing better now than in October. They're more settled.

I feel that he is above average in reading in his room, but not on tests.

I am sure in taking this test David was very nervous.

With the exception of reading, she is an A and B student--C in reading.

Item 6. Achievement in Reading, English, and Math were evaluated.

What do you consider your child's greatest strength?

Reading 26  English 19  Math 21

Was this true according to these tests?

Yes 38 (63.3%)  No 22 (36.7%)  χ² = 6.2%

The .99 Confidence Interval for the Population Percentage

Yes from 47.3% to 79.3%
No from 20.7% to 52.7%

What do you consider your child's greatest weakness?

Reading 13  English 17  Math 26

Was this true according to these tests?

Yes 33 (60%)  No 22 (40%)  χ² = 6.6%

The .99 Confidence Interval for the Population Percentage

Yes from 43% to 79%
No from 23% to 57%

The parents indicated that they felt the test identified strengths and weaknesses to about the same degree. Reading was most often identified a strength and mathematics a weakness.

She has always been a rapid comprehensive reader. In the test, her reading and vocabulary scores were her lowest. I always felt her math normally came hard for her.
COMMENTS: \(\text{Con't}\)

I'm confused.
According to test, he is weakest in math.
I might be old fashioned in my belief that greater emphasis should be placed on the three R's and less time with other associated subjects.
Not as familiar with Jay's base of learning as is my wife.
Speech defect.
Math takes more figuring.
She reads books real well, but maybe she does not understand what she is reading. She seems to have no trouble in math.
This is the lowest score but still high average. I thought reading would be higher than English. Math not really a weakness.
It seems he is better in math. But I know reading and understanding what you read is the key to all work.
I think they hurried too much.
She can do well on all these subjects when she tries.

Item 7. Does your child have any educational problems?
Yes 17 (34.7\%) No 32 (65.3\%)

If "yes", is there anything that needs to be done by:
The student Yes 14 No 3
The home Yes 11 No 6
The school Yes 6 No 11

The larger response to this item was "no" indicating satisfaction with school progress for the most part. The parts concerning student, home, and school had more than one area checked "yes". An inspection of responses indicated the "no" space was unnecessary and most did not check a negative response.

COMMENTS: Part 2, the student (Each line is a separate comment unless indented.)

Try a little harder.
I feel maybe he should try harder and bring his homework home but he never does.
She could improve her work habits.
He does as little as possible.
Learning to retain knowledge that she reads.
Charles could apply himself more.
Christina has to learn to concentrate and work faster.
Better study habits—getting at homework rather than putting it off.
More help on reading.
Needs to take more time to do his work—stopyy and careless at times.
Study and get mind on work.
Greater concentration.
He should pay more attention.
Show more attention to his work in classroom.

COMMENTS: Part 3, the home
I think maybe I should limit TV for him to maybe one hour each day and give him one hour of homework with my help.
We must constantly stress the importance of trying.
Lisa is no problem at home.
She is too forward and wants to be at the start of whatever might be going on.
Make sure they get their work done at home.
Always room for improvement, isn't there? A child needs reinforcement from home.
Parents probably need to help child apply himself and stick to things better. Also use free time better.
I am not sure what I can do.

COMMENTS: Part 4, the school
Some children don't work well on their own. He has been in a room of two grades—two years and I feel he hasn't had adequate help from the teachers. Everytime I try to help the teacher said not to do it that way he says.
Child needs more competition and knowledge that work below his ability will not be acceptable.
She is too happy-go-lucky. It is OK if she does or if she doesn't.
More emphasis on learning basic skills and less on sidelines.
Also the teacher might try to help each individual child with one weakness sometime during the school year.
Just keep up the good teaching.
More help on reading.
Yes, let the parents see more homework papers graded.
Need for teachers to insist more homework or test papers be seen by parents so they know what kind of work is being done. Also, the need for children to be able to feel free to approach a teacher for assistance. (This is a general observation.)
Item 8. Will the interpretation of these tests affect the way you view your child's work in school?

Yes 21 (43.7%)  No 27 (56.3%)

The parents who responded to this item were rather evenly divided. However, many did not respond. It was interesting to note that many who did not check yes or no did write a comment. The comments on this item give more insight into parent feelings than the yes or no answer gave.

COMMENTS: (Each line is a separate comment unless indented.)

He did better than expected.
The tests were about the same as the grades that he brings home.
Will see what we can do to help in Math.
I will encourage him to continue to strive for top performance.
Results of tests are in line with school grades.
I have tried to be interested in all the children's school regardless of grades.
Barry, I feel, is of average intelligence when he applies himself. Judy has a reading difficulty which she is trying very hard to overcome.
Child is enjoying school and is learning. Improvement in this year's test score over last (Iowa Basic) bears out that child is in better health and better adjusted this year than last.
I'll try to watch more carefully. I'll also try harder to help. Sometimes, I guess, we just don't take time.
I feel that he can do a little better than he did, but I am very pleased with his test and his school work.
I was very pleased with the results of the tests, and very proud.

With interest.
More study views and a better prospective.
I know he needs help and I am going to help him the way I know to do Math, reading, or whatsoever even though it is not the new Math.
I was not crediting her with her achievement.
We had knowledge of child's ability from prior tests, other teachers, and observations.
I feel as though she should be encouraged to read as much as possible and tell what she has read.
We will try to help bring up her responses in reading and Math. Should it?
I expect her to, and encourage her to, do the best she can.
She usually does.
Test shows child is not working up to his capacity in school.
I already had a rather good picture of his grades.

Item 9. Do you intend to discuss these results with your child?
   Yes 40 (87.6%)   No 6 (12.6%)

Most parents indicated they would discuss the test with their child. However, the comments set the tone for discussion. There was little indication that there would be any punitiveness but rather an atmosphere of interest and understanding.

COMMENTS: (Each line is a separate comment unless indented.)
Probably, if she wants to.
Very little—just to let her know I am interested and proud of her work because she works very hard.
They're very much interested.
With teacher.
I discussed the test with Steven, not in the presence of the other children. They are doing well in school and I didn't want him to feel inadequate.
Test only further illustrates what we discuss all the time and ability score on this test seems a little low.
We will try to help her with her comprehension.
Ask her why she was so low on her test and why she was so high on grade card.
But without criticism.
I don't know, probably to a certain point.

Item 10. Did this meeting give you any new information about your child? Yes 25 (40.3%) No 37 (59.7%)

The .99 Confidence Interval for the Population Percentage
Yes from 24.3% to 56.3%
No from 43.7% to 75.7%

Did this information give you any new information about tests? Yes 46 (85.2%) No 8 (14.8%) \( \sigma \% = 4.7\)
This meeting, structured to furnish parents information concerning standardized tests, did just that. However, since parents received their child's test scores during the meeting, it was interesting to note that most parents attending accurately assessed the stated purpose of the program.

**COMMENTS:** For all parts (Each line is a separate comment unless indented.)

- Reinforced what we already believed true about child (see #8)
- Better understanding of the nature of the tests and how to interpret the results.
- She gets nervous when she has to get anything done in a certain time limit.
- It made me realize how badly he did need help.
- I don't feel that tests should be marked in such a way that it would just be a chance and not really a true picture.
- Had previous knowledge of this test and others and how they are given and scored.
- I thought that she was much higher than this.
- She rated higher than I thought according to this test.
- First test the child has taken that I have seen.
- I have never seen test scores from any previous tests she might have taken, but I do not believe she thoroughly understood the way the score sheets were to be marked.

Item 11. Do you feel the school should continue to provide opportunities such as this to acquaint parents with standardized tests?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consensus for this item was an unqualified yes. Many of the parents commented rather than check an answer.

**COMMENTS:** (Each line is a separate comment unless indented.)

- Any effort to better schools is appreciated.
- Even though most parents have a fairly accurate picture of their child, the tests will provide more information.
- Keep trying to teach parents.
- I think it does good to know where our children stand in the classroom in comparison to other schools. Also it helps us know where they are weakest.
The parents would be more familiar with the child and his work in school.
I appreciate being informed on such things.
Gives parents an opportunity to become aware of problem areas that may be indicated by great variance between performance in school and scores on tests.
This is very good.
Although I do not believe a child's ability should be judged entirely on test scores, I do think it is an important part of their education to be able to take tests and meet competition.

Item 12, Do you feel this meeting provided you with adequate information?

Yes 43 (89.6%)  
No 5 (10.4%)

If "no" would you like a conference with the counselor?

Yes 5 (100%)  
No 0

In conjunction with this item, parents were given an opportunity to schedule a conference with the counselor before they left the meeting.

COMMENTS: (Each line is a separate comment unless indented.)
I would like a conference with the counselor as I feel LuAnne may not be ready for junior high and would like some information.
I would like to know what he thinks I might try to improve. Not just test grades but his over-all work in school and any other ideas he can give me to help Steven.
I would have appreciated a comparison of local school district performance with state and national scores.
CONCLUSIONS - When the responses were compared for items one and five, it seems that while parent estimates differed from test performance, test results were in line with classroom performance. An examination of comments shows that parents' estimates tend to be higher than test scores. If this was combined with item 5, then one might conclude that many parents were of the opinion their children could improve their school performance.

Parents were unable to account for differences between the test scores and their estimates (Item 2), and in general felt their children had no work habits that would limit their test performance (Item 4).

Most parents felt their children had no serious educational problems (Item 7). But those who did usually felt they were multiple in terms of home, school, and student. This item related to Item 4 positively in that parents responded in the same manner to both.

RECOMMENDATIONS - There seems one all important indicator for action. There should be a concentrated effort directed toward furnishing parents as much information as possible to help them form a more real frame of reference from which to view their child. This would encompass not only the immediate school
community but the child projected into the general population.

Group meetings for parents should be continued. As pupil counselor ratio decreases, attention should be given the possibility of working with smaller groups. Perhaps this would become a vehicle to accomplish the goals outlined above. When meetings are provided for smaller groups of parents, more emphasis can be placed on information about the child. Thus, the parents' unrealistic attitudes can be brought into focus.

Consequently, when information from Items 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 were considered, it appeared parents were somewhat unrealistic in their expectations.

More strength was noted in reading, and weakness in mathematics. The parent's comments were verified by the test results.

This meeting accomplished its goal in that it provided information about tests. Parents indicated they felt this was valuable. They did not feel this type meeting provided new information about their child.
GROUP GUIDANCE WITH THIRD GRADERS
GROUP GUIDANCE WITH THIRD GRADERS

Early planning for this group guidance began during the summer. Original planning centered about a core of activities to help children learn that there were alternative solutions to problematic situations, also to help children see that varying solutions present unique outcomes that must be evaluated along a continuum from good to bad. Also, patterns of behavior which produced acceptable solutions to problems were not identical for all persons.

The planned activities were not to begin until after Thanksgiving vacation, pupils had some time to become acquainted and the teacher was able to learn something of the dynamics of the class. The teacher's observations indicated that the class was not closely knit. They seemed not to participate in organized play activities. They were not participating in classroom group-learning activities; rather they acted as individuals, always waiting for specific directions from the teacher.

Before Thanksgiving, the teacher wanted to organize small group activities. She decided to use a sociometric device to help her organize the small groups. The social acceptance scale was given.¹

A revised version of this instrument was used for this study. The items which composed this inventory are reported in Figure 1.

1. Write 1 in front of your own name.

2. Write 2 in front of the name of everyone who is a close friend, someone you would take home to stay all night.

3. Write 3 in front of the name of everyone who is a good friend. Someone you like to play with at school.

4. Write 4 in front of the name of everyone who is not a friend, but who you feel is all right.

5. Write 5 in front of the name of every pupil whom you do not know.

6. Write 6 in front of all the names which are left.

FIGURE 1

The social acceptance scale adapted from Ohlson, *Guidance: An Introduction*
The results were placed on a grid. This enabled the teacher to see both the way each class member viewed others in the class and the way class members were viewed by their peers. These results were placed in Table I.

The results from this device indicated a low level of sensitivity among members of the class. It was decided to structure some activities for the purpose of increasing interaction among members of the class. First, an attempt was made to obtain a movie that would depict a problematic situation which would be used to structure class interaction. It was not possible to obtain a suitable movie so a picture was substituted as a structuring device.

The picture chosen showed a group of children around a child on the playground. They seemed to be making fun of him. The picture was shown to the class, and the counselor asked them how they thought the various people in the picture felt. The boy being picked on in the picture elicited comments such as bad, sorry, sad, afraid, etc. A series of four half hour discussion periods were carried out with this class. These resulted in a group decision that this was a new student and the class had the responsibility to make the new member feel welcome and help him become a part of the new class. The result of these discussion
### TABLE I

A Distribution of Choices for the Social Acceptance Scale Given in November

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Z.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickie W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Cox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbie J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELECTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SELECTOR |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
groups was the formation of a greeting committee where class members would assume responsibility for helping a new pupil get acquainted. However, the teacher was able to observe an increased awareness of all the class members to the feelings of others and their concern about how a new pupil might get along when he entered the room. This was in contrast to their feelings at the outset, when all pupils indicated this responsibility was the teachers.

Pupils were asked if they would like to continue this type of activity. The response was positive. The teacher and counselor then explored with the class the idea of forming small groups that would meet in the counselor's office. The pupils indicated they would like to do this. The teacher structured groups of five or six pupils. An attempt was made to balance these groups so that a member would be outgoing, another quiet, one would be bright academically, and another slow academically. The groups met for one half hour. Attendance was voluntary. Each group decided what they wished to talk about. The groups came in sequence and all groups had at least two sessions with the counselor. The range of topics was great. Examples of things that were discussed included; liking school, doing work without being told more than once, saying something in front of the
class, getting work done on time, listening carefully, and copying from friends.

After the second group meeting in the counselor's office, the teacher began assigning projects to the various groups to see if cooperative work groups would be established. Earlier attempts to do this had been unsuccessful.

The teacher summarized her observations of classroom behavior during this period of time as follows:

1. Displayed a "new" willingness to help students who have been absent.
2. Students are now asking teacher if they can take papers, books, etc. to students who are ill at home.
3. Welcoming committee has developed successfully not only with new pupils but with substitute teachers.
4. New friendships among the pupils have developed—mostly among the boys.
5. Children have increased in their ability to share their thoughts and ideas with the class.

In April, a second set of responses on the social acceptance scale was obtained. These results were recorded on a grid in the same manner as the responses for the first administration. These responses are reported in Table II.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAYNE S.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIM M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMILY W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNIE Z.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICKIE W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRIS R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATT M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTH M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERY K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEILA K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRENDA J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOROTHY H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBBIE G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIE G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMIE C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAY B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAD B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBIE B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLA A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TABLE II

A Distribution of Choices for the Social Acceptance Scale Given in April.
ANALYSIS OF DATA - Responses reported in Tables I and II give two types of information. When the tables are read by columns, it is possible to determine how a child views his classmates. When they are read horizontally, a pupil's status in the group as determined by peers can be observed.

The numbers 2, 3, and 4 were considered relatively desirable in terms of peer relations, while 5 and 6 were considered undesirable.

The teacher selected some children for whom she wished to determine if a change in the number of 5 and 6 selections (horizontally) between Table I and II were great enough to say that peer relations had improved during the year.

It was decided to test the following hypothesis. The proportion of 5 and 6 numbers found only in Table I equals the number of 5 and 6 numbers found only in Table II. The procedure outlined in Walker and Lev was used. The equation for the proportion was:

\[
\frac{(b - c)^2}{b + c} = X^2
\]

Where

\(b\) = Number of 5 and 6 in the first table but not in the second.
\(c\) = Number of 5 and 6 in the second but not in the first table.

The obtained Chi-squares are reported in Table III.

TABLE III

A Table of Chi-squares for Pupils Selected by the Teacher to Determine if the Decrease in 5 and 6 Choices from Table I to Table II was Significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Name</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>11.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>11.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbie</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>11.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>8.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>7.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .01 level of significance with 1 degree of freedom

An inspection of the Table III reveals that of the eight pupils who were selected by the teacher, five made changes that were significant. These pupils were the members of the class the teacher felt were unlikely to show change or the pupils who had expressed a feeling of loneliness early in the year.

SUMMARY - The teacher prepared a short paragraph for each pupil listed in Table III.

Carla: When I examined the chart for November, Carla had one each of 2 and 3 among her choices. Thus she felt close to
very few in the class. My observations of Carla on the playground and in the classroom indicated that she was becoming more sociable, joined more in games than at first and no longer remained near me as in the early part of the year.

Emily: Emily was liked by her classmates but seemed to keep much distance in terms of having "close" friends. She did not reject classmates but, rather, tended to participate in a clique of two or three. She cooperated on projects with various classmates, but this has not appeared to increase her circle of associates on the playground.

Abbie: During the early part of the school year, Abbie depended on one classmate (Debbie) for a playmate. Abbie frequently compared herself with Debbie and was often heard to say that Debbie was the smartest, prettiest, etc. As the year progressed, Abbie's attitude changed. Abbie developed a larger circle of friends. She no longer needed Debbie's approval and constant company.

Brad: Brad encountered academic difficulty this year. While he appeared to be outgoing in his relations with the peer group, closer examination revealed that he operated on the fringes of the classroom social structure. His pattern of behavior could best be described as one who plays the role of a congenial follower.
Marie: Marie, a quiet, slightly immature child, showed little observable change during the year. She joined activities when asked to do so, but never voluntarily entered group actions.

Brenda: Brenda was quiet throughout the year. However, she has always worked and played well in groups. She seemed to prefer following the leadership of others rather than to assume a leadership role.

Larry: Larry had academic difficulties throughout his school life. Early in this school year, his classmates had little to do with him, either during play or in the classroom. He never seemed to impose himself on his peers but was always available to join in when asked. As the year progressed, classmates developed an understanding of Larry's limitations, thus they have become more accepting of him. Larry never gave up on a task assigned him regardless of its difficulty.

Connie: Connie, a quiet, intelligent girl, was friendly with everyone. She seemed never to have a best friend, but rather several good friends. She did not participate in active play to the extent of most girls in the class.

Sam: Sam carried on a continuous campaign for attention, both in the classroom and during recess. He needed both to be noticed and well liked, the result was he often became the class clown.
Don: Don, in his autobiography, stated that he had enjoyed the third grade because he had made so many new friends.

This teacher-counselor team approach was presented to show cooperative effort among members of a school itself. It must be emphasized that the results described in this paper were based only on a small aspect of the total program.

It seemed that the things described contributed to an increased sensitivity by pupils in the class to the needs of others. During the parent conferences, the teacher received favorable comments about changes they observed in their children. They related the changes to activities being carried out in the classroom.

Credit should be given to Miss Teresa Sickles, a third grade teacher at J. C. Sommer Elementary School, for the important part she had in this project.

The last week of school, Miss Sickles asked the children to write on the important things they had learned in the third grade. The teacher starred (*) sentences that indicated growth in an area related to the group guidance activities. Space here does not permit reproducing an entire paper in most instances. However, a few lines including the (*) sentence from several papers have been included below.
Mark:
I learned a lot of English. *I met a great deal of friends too and important ones too. Like Frankie and Scott W., I learned how to use a telephone correctly too.

Larry G:
I learned a lot of things. *One of the things I learned to make friends. And I learned how to make things.

Larry S:
I learned to read, I learned to like you. *I learned to play. I learned to tell time.

Emily:
I have learned to write better, *I have learned to get along with my friends. I think I have learned to do my work pretty well.

Kim:
I have learned Arithmetic, Spelling, English, Reading, and others. *I have met people.

Frank:
I liked all the subjects, especially Math. *I have learned to get along with other people. You have been nice this year, Thank you.

Debbie:
I've learned that it isn't easy to take the wonderful step to fourth grade while I am being tried out. *I've also learned that I can make friends if I don't be a snob, be polite. I've made five more friends than last year.
Jamie:
*I made many more friends. I learned and liked studying most about sound and hearing.

Don:
*I learned how to connect a light to a switch to a dry cell.
*I made a lot of friends, like Mark C., Ted N., Larry S. and I am glad I got Miss Sickles.

Scottie:
*I learned alot about you and other people. I've met different people that I like.

Marie:
*I have made many friends this year. I like Spelling and Social Studies.
CASE STUDY OF KEITH
CASE STUDY OF KEITH

Elementary schools in America have always attempted to help each individual student get the most that he possibly can from his school experience and to make the best possible use of his abilities. The extension of guidance services has been largely an attempt to aid in this process. Frost and Frost state:

"In an effective elementary guidance program, every effort is made to provide those services to the individual that will enable him to make the maximum use of his capacities and opportunities. As such, guidance is an integral part of every good educational program and its success is dependent upon the understanding and involvement of all personnel within a school."¹

In recent years, the number of specialized school personnel who provide various services to students has greatly increased. Many schools now provide the services of psychologists, nurses, speech therapists, social workers, librarians, attendance officers, and clinical psychologists to aid the students in various ways. These specialists, working with teachers, parents, and administrators, can provide additional services to enable the students to reach their optimum level of achievement.

The following case study will illustrate how an entire personnel team attempted to identify problem areas and to aid one student in adjusting to his school and society.

Identifying Data

Subject:  Keith Stern  9-14-57
Parents:  Mr. and Mrs. John Stern
Siblings:  David Stern  12-25-55
          Michael Stern  7-14-61

Keith is a very quiet, almost non-verbal, child who does not seem to relate to anyone to any great degree. He generally answers direct questions by nodding his head, seldom plays with other youngsters, and rarely volunteers information of any nature. This non-verbal characteristic makes it rather difficult for Keith in the ordinary classroom, or even in his social relations in general. This is primarily the reason he was selected for a case study.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CASE: Keith is doing very poor school work at the present time. His grades are failing in all subject areas. He is currently receiving remedial reading, as he is reading more than one year below his expected level. An evaluation prepared by a school psychologist last year indicated that Keith functions in the upper borderline of the dull normal range of
intelligence. (Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test administered in April, 1966, gave an IQ of 89.) The report gave indication, also, of Keith's difficulties in reading and arithmetic. At that time, Keith was reading one year below level, and he could do only simple operations of addition and subtraction—no borrowing or regrouping. He also had poor visual perception. It was very difficult for Keith to discern similarities in items. These observations are still accurate descriptions of Keith's limitations at the present time.

Keith's entire school history seems to be one of inadequate interpersonal relations. The biggest problems seem to center about his inability to get along with other people. He does not play with the other children and can not relate to adults. This is not a recent development, as it was apparent when he entered our school last year. His aloofness from others seems to be a continuing pattern, for it was noted on the school record we received that he was unable to communicate with peers or adults.

Keith appears to be under rather severe emotional tension. He is a thin, pale boy who rarely smiles and seems to be withdrawn much of the time. His nails are bitten and he walks very slowly, as if it is a real effort to move his feet. He rarely looks at the person talking and almost never speaks voluntarily.
The projective tests given by the school psychologist last year suggested that Keith had hostile and negative feelings toward things in general. They also suggested some real difficulties with interpersonal relationships and a depressed and defeatist attitude. The tests indicated that he disliked any form of fantasy and became upset when any attempt to fantasize was evident.

Keith's physiological needs seem to be adequately met. He is small, but not undernourished. His clothing is not the best, but is clean and adequate. Keith attends school regularly with few absences.

The family lives in a two story wood frame duplex house. Keith occupies a room by himself. The children have adequate room to play, as the house has both a front and back yard.

Keith mentions possessions frequently—apparently the boys have quite a few toys with which to play. His favorite possession is a bicycle.

Keith's psychological needs are not provided for as adequately as his physiological needs. There is little security in the family. The mother started divorce proceedings last May, but Mr. Stern continued to live at home until fall. Mrs. Stern did his laundry, etc., although Mr. Stern did not stay in the home all the time. Mrs. Stern was working to supplement the family's income, as Mr. Stern frequently changed positions.
The children said in November that their father was no longer at home. Since then, Mrs. Stern has been granted a divorce and Mr. Stern has remarried. The children live with their mother but visit their father frequently on weekends.

When Mr. Stern was home, he was the dominant parent. He was quite large and loud, his wife small and soft-spoken. Mr Stern did most of the disciplining in the family. Keith was spanked sometimes, but the parents said that the most effective punishment was to make him remain still for awhile.

Mrs. Stern told the social worker that Keith received less attention than the other two boys. Dave, the oldest child, had been ill several times and received much attention due to this. Michael, the youngest child, was "so cute" that he also received much attention. The mother seemed to realize she showed favoritism, but Mr. Stern just said he was never able to understand Keith.

Keith does have learning difficulties, primary of which is an inability to read. He is receiving remedial reading twice weekly in an effort to improve his reading.

Instruction at home is on a minimum level. Rarely, according to Keith, does anyone read to him, or help him with any type of school work. Since mother works, the boys stay with a babysitter until evening. During this time, the boys play outside or watch
television. The parental attitude toward school is one of little concern. They do not attend parent-teacher conferences or PTA—in fact, they have very little contact with the school.

According to the boys, the family does very little together. They do not talk much at meals, seldom go shopping, to movies, etc. Keith says that they watch television a lot—this appears to be the main form of recreation.

Keith seems to have few interests or hobbies other than television; however, he recently joined a Cub Scout troop and seems to be quite interested in those activities. He talks eagerly of camping out this summer with the troop.

In an effort to help Keith adjust to society, the entire school pupil personnel team has become involved with him in some way. Keith has received counseling both last year and this year, psychological services, remedial reading instruction, social work service, and was seen throughout the summer by a clinical psychologist.

Following are examples of contributions of various members of the school personnel team who participated in the study of Keith.

CLASSROOM TEACHER:
October 15, 1966 - Keith "clams up" when asked anything
he absolutely refuses to talk. He doesn't finish his work either.

November 2, 1966 - Keith can function a little better if someone stands beside him constantly.

December 13, 1966 - Keith told his teacher about filling out an interest inventory in the counselor's office--said it was fun. This was the first he had mentioned the counselor to his teacher.

January 9, 1967 - Keith mentions his father fairly often since the divorce—he never did before the divorce.

February 17, 1967 - Keith seems to be slipping backwards in ability to do school work. His teacher found he could do a little arithmetic if she read the problems to him. He seldom pays attention to anything going on in the room.

March 15, 1967 - Keith has been talking to his teacher when she sits beside him during lunch; however, he still will not communicate at other times.

March 16, 1967 - Keith refused to talk in class when asked a question. The teacher sent him to the principal, for she felt it had gone far enough. Although the principal tried to talk with him for approximately forty-five minutes, Keith absolutely refused to talk.

March 23, 1967 - The teacher feels that Keith will show little progress in a normal class, that he should be placed in a special class with fewer pupils.
Student Teacher:
December 1, 1966 - Keith does some better in class, but only when someone in beside him—he doesn't try anything on his own.

December 13, 1966 - Keith volunteered to imitate an animal during an extra project report. This was his first voluntary act so far.

Remedial Reading Teacher:
November 10, 1966 - Keith would not talk at all—just sat silently when asked anything.

December 11, 1966 - The first voluntary comment made to the reading teacher concerned a bulletin board. Keith declared it was all right, but his mother could have made a better one because she is an artist.

January 14, 1967 - Keith is sometimes talkative when with two others in reading; however, he refuses to answer direction questions unless the answer can be one or two words.

March 17, 1967 - Keith frequently talks with the reading teacher about general things. He particularly enjoys telling about others getting into trouble in the room. He still answers questions pertaining to reading comprehension with the briefest answer possible.
Social Worker:
May 23, 1966 - The school social worker contacted the home concerning Keith. She reported that it was very difficult to get them to talk about Keith, as they were more concerned about Dave.

Mrs. Stern freely stated that Keith had lacked attention from both parents. She rationalized this by saying Dave had been ill and required a lot of attention, and so had the "baby." The youngest is now in kindergarten.

Mr. Stern said little about Keith, except to say that he had never understood him and had never been able to communicate with him. He described Keith as timid and small, while his brothers were regarded as outgoing and well-built. Mr. Stern seemed to compare Keith unfavorably with his brothers. The social worker reported little communication in the home other than that required for the tasks of daily living.

June 15, 1966 - The school social worker contacted the home again to see why Keith did not keep an appointment with the clinical psychologist. Mrs. Stern said that she had not received the letter and explained this by saying that the children frequently got the mail on days she worked, and she did not always get to see all of it. Keith and Dave were both present during the visit—neither spoke at all.
July 20, 1966 - The social worker called at the home and Keith answered the door. He was quite talkative then.

April 27, 1967 - The social worker attempted to contact the mother to discuss the possibility of placing Keith in a special class, since he is not functioning at all in a regular class. Mrs. Stern did not keep the appointment.

May 11, 1967 - Another appointment was made with Mrs. Stern to discuss placing Keith in a special class.

Keith's mother was a slight, rather quiet woman who seemed very concerned about her children's academic ability. She stated that she was aware that the boys had severe problems in school; however, their behavior at home was quite different from their behavior at school. At home, the boys play with the neighborhood children and seem to get along with others fairly well. At school, the boys—Keith in particular—do not associate with the other children to any great degree.

Mrs. Stern was very receptive to the idea of placing Keith in a special class for emotionally disturbed children next year. She stated that she knew he needed help and she was willing to try anything that might help him get along better in school.

The social worker told Mrs. Stern that she would contact her again next fall concerning the boys.
CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGIST:

The clinical psychologist started working with Keith sometime in March, 1966. For quite sometime, he received no verbal response at all.

May 26, 1966 - Keith finally responded with a full sentence! Mr. Sullivan told Keith that he would like to see him throughout the summer. Keith replied, "Then I can't go to my grandmother's house."

Although Mr. Sullivan worked with Keith off and on during the summer, good communication was never established. He considered dropping the case the following fall, but decided to try again because of the father being out of the house.

December 14, 1966 - Mr. Sullivan said that Keith would not respond at all.

December 21, 1966 - Keith responded very well--talked freely to Mr. Sullivan.

February 15, 1967 - Keith refused to talk at all.

February 22, 1967 - Mr. Sullivan said that Keith was reticent, but responded better than he had the last four weeks.

March 22, 1967 - Mr. Sullivan stated in a communique that Keith's response to him showed some improvement, but continued to be very erratic. He suggested that Keith be considered for the class for emotionally disturbed children.
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST:

April 6 and May 11, 1966 - Keith was seen by the psychologist on two different occasions. He reported that Keith was quite frightened when he came in the room and would only answer direct questions after much praise.

Keith stated that he did not have any friends because he did not try to make any. Any questions relating to his family brought absolute silence.

Test results showed that Keith had perceptual difficulties, and rather severe learning problems in reading and arithmetic. The tests also indicated a hostile and negative attitude toward life in general. Projective tests given to Keith indicated some real difficulties with interpersonal relationships, and a depressed and defeatist attitude.

The psychologist recommended that Keith receive therapy from a clinical psychologist, and also receive supplementary tutoring.

Due to the large number of students to test, Keith was not seen this year by a school psychologist.

COUNSELOR:

October 17, 1966 - Not one sound was uttered during the first contact with Keith. He answered a few questions by nodding
his head. He seemed nervous, and would not look at the counselor.

October 26, 1966, November 5, 1966, and November 23, 1966 - Very little communication occurred during these sessions. Occasionally, Keith would nod his head in reply to something.

December 12, 1966 - Keith filled out an interest inventory with the counselor. He talked voluntarily about some of the items mentioned on the inventory. He also smiled and said "Hi" to the counselor when he passed her in the hall later--a first on both counts!

December 14, 1966 - Keith really talked to the counselor--seemed quite eager to talk about interests.

The counselor became involved in interpreting test results to children in four different schools. The regular routine was interrupted and she did not see Keith again until February.

February 14, 1967 - After not seeing Keith for so long, some of the ground gained was lost--he did not respond verbally at all for several occasions.

February 22, 1967 - Keith refused to talk. The counselor told him that he could leave if he wished to, that he did not have to stay. He did not want to leave.

Keith seems to try to wait out any questions--he seems to think that if he does not answer, someone else will be asked
or the matter will be forgotten entirely. When the counselor waits—sometimes five minutes or more—he will finally answer.

February 29, 1967 — Keith sees the counselor on a weekly basis. Frequently the silences last longer than the conversation; however, he seems to want to stay.

March 6, 1967 — Keith volunteered more information than ever before. He talked about Cub Scouts, summer plans and hobbies. He grinned and acted silly—something he has never done previously. He was reluctant to leave the counselor's office. He seemed to want to communicate very badly, yet was sometimes unable to verbalize his thoughts.

April 25, 1967 — At the present time, Keith is able to communicate to a very small degree with the counselor. He seems to want to talk, but is unable to express many things. He now voluntarily talks some, but to no great extent. He will answer direct questions; however, it frequently is after a very lengthy pause.

Keith was given an interest inventory by the school counselor. The inventory indicated that his interests were mainly in the realm of science and home arts. Keith said that he liked to help his mother with the housework—one of the few interests he voluntarily mentioned.
In another instrument, *A Book About Me*, Keith identified himself as the boy telling others what to do (a complete reversal of his real role in a group) and the boy who played most often with girls.

Keith also filled out a self-concept scale with the counselor. His concept of himself differs significantly from his actual self. He saw himself as unafraid in school, not giving up easily, doing well in school, getting along well with classmates, talking easily with others, and not feeling left out of class activities. In actuality, Keith is the reverse of all these concepts.

A sociogram of the class revealed Keith to be almost isolated from his peers; however, there were three other children who were chosen less often than he. On the sociometric device, Keith chose the two most popular boys in his class as his friends. There was also a mutual choice between Keith and another near isolate.

**SUMMARY OF INVOLVEMENT**

The entire pupil personnel team has worked with Keith for quite some time. He has received all the services available in our school system since last year. He has also received help during the summer from the clinical psychologist.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Although Keith has received all the extra services available, he still is unable to communicate with others to any great degree. He does not function in a normal class situation at all. The personnel team recommends that Keith be considered for the special class for emotionally disturbed children. It is hoped that a class of this nature will enable Keith to experience some success in school.

The personnel involved also feel that Keith should continue to receive the extra services he now receives, even though the benefits are not very evident at the present time. Perhaps a continual saturation of attention will eventually break the emotional block that at present handicaps Keith in our society.
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WORLD OF WORK
WORLD OF WORK

This is a report on a pilot project concerning the World of Work that was initiated in grades one, two, and three of certain selected schools in the South-Western City School System.

Planning for the project was begun prior to the opening of the schools. The proposal outline follows.

PLANNING FOR SOCIAL STUDIES "WORLD OF WORK: UNIT

This report is to outline planning for the pilot unit to be introduced this year.

The Social materials planned for the core of the program are not yet available for grade 3; however, grades 1 and 2 are on order. Mr. Reece Chaney, a doctoral student from Ohio University, is assisting in the preparation of evaluative material. Planning with teachers will begin about four weeks after school opens. In the event the materials for grade 3 are still available, an alternate plan developed by Mrs. Marie Campbell, a third-grade teacher at West Franklin, has been considered for use.

The unit will be used to develop concepts. It is of little importance to be concerned about whether a child wants to become a fireman, painter, or race driver. Occupational choice is contingent upon many variables coupled with the fact that a
first grade child today will have completely new fields of jobs to explore when he enters the job market. This emphasizes the necessity for a multiple factor approach. The human resources aspect of economic education is now, and can continue to be, involved as the child builds a frame-of-reference from which the world-of-work is viewed.

A conversation with Dr. Carse, from the University of Texas, produced his point-of-view that the way people get into a vocation ultimately resolves itself to chance. People develop a frame-of-reference. It is the purpose of this demonstration to show that within the structure of the working world there are certain basic concepts that can be used to give a child (later an adult worker) a way to look at himself, a producer, in the World of Work. The purpose of this approach is to identify factors related to these concepts and introduce them to children then reinforce and expand them at sequential grade levels.

The objectives in the primary grades must be established in such a manner that they become a foundation as the scope of study progresses during sequential years.

Baer and Roeber in Occupational Information outline the basic concepts that affect career development. They are: biological, sociological, psychological, economic, political, chance.
The scope of the unit will be limited by the (1) time that can be devoted to the project, (2) innovations resulting from pupil involvement, (3) skill of counselors and teachers, and (4) pupil interest.

The Senesh materials have been chosen as a core about which lessons will be built. The aim of the lessons will be to motivate pupils to understand the importance of human resources in the economic structure of our society.

Thus, it appears that the path we shall explore is one of presenting concepts in lessons which will stimulate attitude formation or alteration. The possibility that value formation or perhaps value changes will be integrated into the self concept as a result of this approach will need evaluation. Present thinking indicates that we will attempt to build an instrument to be analyzed to assess value change, insightfulness, and self concept.

The evaluation will be accomplished by tape recorded individual interview. Therefore, a random sample of pupils from each grade will be selected. The sheet following this memorandum outlines the evaluative procedure. Sets of pictures are being prepared for use in the evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Job Description</th>
<th>Before</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Janitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assembler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bookkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Laborer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sales Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Truck Driver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Warehouseman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mechanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Telephone Lineman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The next two questions will be removed when inappropriate.)

Which picture shows a job most like that of your father? ________
Which picture shows a job most like that of your mother? ________
Which picture represents the kind of job you would like to do? ________
  1. ________ Why?
  2. ________ Why?
  3. ________ Why?
Which picture represents the kind of job you would not like to do:
1. ________ Why
2. ________ Why
3. ________ Why

Which job would be the most interesting ________ Why
Which job would pay the most money ________ Why
Which job would be the hardest work: ________ Why
Which job would be the one that most people would look up to: ________ Why
Which job would be the easiest: ________ Why
Which job would be like the one that you most likely will have: ________ Why
Which job could a person keep as long as he wanted to: ________ Why

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Rank of Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janitor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembler</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Clerk</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouseman</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Lineman</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which three workers could we most easily get along without:
1. ________ Why
2. ________ Why
3. ________ Why
Which three workers would it be most difficult to get along without:

1. ______ Why'
2. ______ Why'
3. ______ Why'
Evaluations of the children involved in the pilot study were made by Mr. Reese-Chaney prior to the presentation of materials. A report of the evaluation procedures is included on the following pages.
Chapter I

INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

The processes of vocational development are lifelong, with special significance being seen in the childhood years of continued development and planning.¹

Super maintains that vocational development is an ongoing, continuous, generally irreversible, orderly, patterned and dynamic process, which involves interaction between the individuals behavior repertoire and the demands made by society, that is, by the developmental tasks... (it) is essentially a process of compromise and synthesis.²

Vocational development is seen as being as much a part of the child's growing up as mental, physical, social and emotional development. Galloway emphasized this aspect

of the total development when he wrote:

indeed, youth matures vocationally as well as physically, emotionally and socially, and becomes involved in a series of longitudinal decisions that transpire from late childhood to adulthood.\(^3\)

Borrow,\(^4\) Beilin,\(^5\) Carter,\(^6\) Crites,\(^7\) and Thompson\(^8\) have stressed the significance of vocational development in relation to an individual's total development in early life.

Viewing vocational development as a process beginning in early childhood representing an important aspect of maturation of the individual, implies that considerable attention is needed in understanding and aiding children in this growing-up process.

Children's knowledge and attitudes concerning occupations are thought to be of considerable importance in vocational development. Vocational decisions and choices are made on the bases of knowledge, attitudes, and values.

According to Rosenberg, occupational choices are influenced by certain overarching attitudes which condition the individuals perception of diverse aspects of the world. The same author further suggests that an occupational choice is not a value, but it is made on the basis of values.

Hill suggests that attitudes and values held toward vocations are of significance in future decision making.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem. The purpose of this study was to seek the answers to the following questions: (1) to what extent do elementary children possess vocational knowledge and understandings relating to 16 selected occupations? (2) What attitudes and values have elementary children developed concerning these occupations? (3) What effect does sex, academic ability, grade level and socio-economic status have on knowledge, attitude and values of these elementary children?

More specifically, this study is an attempt to assess the vocational knowledge, attitudes and values of elementary children

in grades one, three, and five.

**Null Hypotheses.** Descriptive as well as statistical comparisons were made from the data on the basis of sex, grade level, socio-economic, and academic ability comparisons. To provide greater clarity, the following null hypotheses were formulated.

**Hypothesis 1.** There were no significant differences in occupational knowledge when comparisons were made between the boys and girls in the study.

**Hypothesis 2.** There were no significant differences in occupational knowledge when comparisons were made among the three socio-economic groups represented.

**Hypothesis 3.** There were no significant differences in occupational knowledge when comparisons were made among the three academic ability levels represented.

**Hypothesis 4.** There were no significant differences in occupational knowledge when comparisons were made among the grade levels represented.

**Importance of the Study.** This study will hopefully add to our present knowledge of the vocational development of children. Such studies as this have been encouraged on the basis of the lack of information available and the need for greater understanding of this developmental process.
Much of the literature has pointed to the early years of growth and development as being the foundation for the beginnings of vocational decision making. Shartle attempted to outline much of the process of development of the young child when he wrote:

the child develops early concepts and attitudes about life and work that form a background for further information and later decisions. He sees people at work, he is exposed to the attitudes of his parents, relatives, friends, and playmates. Later, he reads newspapers, magazines, and books; he has hobbies and recreation. Some hobbies become taboo, others are known as very desirable. Values develop by which he appraises various kinds of work in terms of his own satisfactions. Many of his school subjects and experiences involve occupational information directly or indirectly.

Borrow concluded that occupational research workers have largely ignored developmental experiences before puberty. The same author contends that the control of impulses, the growth of cognitive processes, and the rudiments of moral development all have roots in early childhood and all have implications for a psychology of vocational development.


It was felt that the exploration of elementary children's knowledge, attitudes and values concerning occupations would provide some insight into development of these children.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Occupational attitudes and values. Throughout the report of this investigation, the term occupational attitudes and values was interpreted as meaning the readiness to react in a particular way toward or against occupations; the deep lying beliefs that tend to direct responses that one makes toward occupations.

Occupational knowledge. Occupational knowledge was determined by scores obtained by "titling" and "description" of occupations.

Socio-economic level. The socio-economic level of students was determined by the use of Roe's occupational classification. The term socio-economic was used to designate occupational classifications only.

Academic ability. The term academic ability was used to designate pupil achievement in school based on standardized achievement tests and the teachers' ratings of pupils.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Several limitations are apparent in this study. The

population included in this study was from a single geographical area. These children were from a predominately middle and lower-middle class socio-economic level. The number of occupations that were used to elicit responses from the children were limited in number and scope. Sixteen occupations representing all occupational categories, according to the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, were included.

This study was further limited by the number of students included in the sample.

Any generalizations drawn as a result of this study are valid only for the population with which this study was conducted.

IV. ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF THE PAPER

A review of the related literature pertinent to this study will follow in Chapter II. The literature was divided into five sections for presentation and discussion. The first section related to vocational development, the second to vocational choice, the third to vocational interests, the fourth to attitudes and values and the fifth to occupational information.

Chapter III was organized to describe the procedures in the study. Chapter IV was the presentation of the results of the study. Chapter V included a summarization of the study, a presentation of conclusions and an offer of recommendations.
Understanding the world of work, developing appreciations for all worthwhile work, and eventually fitting oneself successfully into the world of work should be the objective of every pupil in the elementary school.\(^1\)

Arbuckle claims that occupational information has a claim to a place in the elementary school curriculum just as any other information, however, it is important only to the extent that a teacher or counselor is able to use it to help a child become involved in the learning process.\(^2\)

A major concern has been expressed involving the various roles, understandings, attitudes, tasks, etc. that a child must learn in our society. Havighurst was much aware of the significance of this when he wrote:


\(^2\)Dougal S. Arbuckle, "Occupational Information in the Elementary School", *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*. Winter 63-64, 12:77-84
The tasks the individual must learn—the developmental tasks of life—are those things that constitute healthy and satisfactory growth in our society. There are things a person must learn if he is to be judged and to judge himself to be a reasonably happy and successful person. A developmental task is a task which arises at or about a certain period in life of the individual, successful completion of which leads to his happiness and to success with later tasks while failure leads to unhappiness in the individual, disapproval by the society, and difficulty with later tasks.³

**Vocational Development.** Havighurst presents vocational development as a lifelong process with six stages, from childhood to old age. Of particular importance was the middle childhood state which he outlined:

The principal developmental tasks of middle childhood, from about 5 to 10 years of age, are (1) developing fundamental skills in reading, writing, and calculating; (2) learning physical skills necessary for ordinary games; (3) learning to get along with age-mates; (4) learning an appropriate masculine or feminine social role; (5) developing concepts necessary for everyday living; (6) developing conscience, morality, and a scale of values; and (7) achieving personal independence.⁴

Stratemeyer presented an outline of vocational developmental tasks covering four broad stages of development from early childhood to adulthood. He stresses the ability of the


child to grow in an awareness of his environment; extending the range of his understanding with the work of individuals and community agencies; understanding the range of occupations, the nature of specialization, and proposals for assuring that the needed work of the world will be carried out; and participating in decisions that assure that the needed work of the world will be carried out.5

While Stratemeyer's scheme is broad and generalized, it nevertheless gives a rather clear indication of the factors involved in the early development of this process.

Super wrote that development is a continuous process, with the ability to perform new behavioral acts largely dependent on capacities for behaviors which have already developed.6 In keeping with the continuity of this process, Super has adopted "vocational life stages" to illustrate this process; the Growth Stage extends from conception to age fourteen; Exploratory Stage from 15 to 20; Establishment Stage from 25 to 40; Maintenance Stage up to 65; and Decline after 65.7

Tiedeman and O'Hara wrote that career development refers to those aspects of the continuous unbroken flow of a person's experience that are relevant to his fashioning of an identity "at work."  

Baer and Roeber wrote that the consequence of changing occupational structures and increasing occupational mobility is that today career development must be viewed as a lifelong process. This process of career development is best described as selective perception by which individuals select and give attention to certain daily experiences by:

- (a) experiencing, or participating in daily events,
- (b) perceiving, or attaching certain meanings to his experiences,
- (c) differentiating, or sorting out and grouping his perceptions; and
- (d) generalizing or drawing conclusions from these sorts or groups about himself and his environment.

The individual then is aware of the various events in his life. The manner in which he accepts or rejects, internalizes or ignores, assembles or disregards these will determine the reactions an individual will make to an occupational experience.

---

10 Baer, and Roeber, op. cit., p. 2.
Wrenn was in agreement with this when he suggested that the start is from the student's perception of himself and of the kinds of needs these perceptions reflect, rather than from the vocational demands as such. The basis for choice rests upon whatever factors have most significance for the person making the choice.11

Ginzberg has postulated that occupational choice is a developmental process that takes place over a period of approximately 10 years:

First, occupational choice is a process which takes place over a minimum of six or seven years, and more typically, over ten years or more. Secondly, since each decision during adolescence is related to one's experience up to that point, and in turn has an influence on the future, the process of decision making is basically irreversible. Finally, since occupational subjective elements with the opportunities and limitations of reality, the crystallization of occupational choice inevitably has the quality of a compromise.12

Roe proposed a theory of vocational development in which early childhood experiences are determinative of later job selection. Using Maslows' theory that a hierarchy of needs exists within each of us, she has noted that occupation can be

---

channel for meeting not only "low order" needs such as safety and security, but also higher needs such as self-esteem, independence, and self-actualization. Roe considers parental attitudes and home atmospheres in early childhood as crucial forces in determining adult choices.13

Most writers seem to agree concerning the developmental nature of occupation. A large number agree that the bases of this process are begun in early childhood; that many factors are involved and play significant roles.

Occupational Choice. The choice of an occupation is usually one of the most important decisions a person makes in his lifetime.14

According to Wrenn, vocational choice and preparation is an important objective for a sizable proportion of the elementary school population and for an even larger proportion of the high school students.15

The fact that an occupational choice is determined by many factors was advocated by Holland when he wrote:

... students select vocations both to engage in attractive activities and roles, and to avoid activities and roles which they see as distasteful, and

13Anne Roe, "Early Determinants of Vocational Choice" Journal of Counseling Psychology, 4:212-217, 1957
which they believe they are incompetent to perform. Further, it seems clear that the students make choices in terms of the kind of person they believe themselves to be.  

According to Hoppock, an occupational choice is determined by the person's knowledge of occupations and his ability to think clearly. He further emphasizes that information about occupations helps him to recognize what occupations will best meet his needs.17.

Lyon wrote that vocational choice is bound by the occupations available to the individual in his preferred orientation, by his ability to perform adequately, by his self-evaluation, and by a host of other factors such as his knowledge of occupational classes, social pressures from family and peers, and limitations imposed by the environment.18

Galler indicated that a child seldom confines himself to one occupational choice; a choice of occupation at a particular time is an important index of his interests, the trends of his thought and values.19


Edmiston and Starr concluded that from the seventh to the twelfth grades pupils show little development in the ability to recognize important factors of occupational choice. These investigators asked students which of 27 factors had strong or weak influences on their choices of a vocation. They found that the occupational opportunity to serve man-kind was ranked in first place by both boys and girls.  

Vocational Interests. The fact that children develop an interest in occupations is evident in the literature and very obvious in everyday life. Several studies have shown that interests in occupations are expressed by the very young child. Nelson found that children as low as third grade had well formulated status attitudes regarding occupations and level of education. The same writer also found that children start as early as age eight or nine to reject some occupations as of no interest to them and that prior to grade three have begun the process of narrowing the range of occupations considered favorably.

Chown concluded from a study of 96 boys and 96 girls from English grammar schools that it seems children do consider

---

interests, intelligence, and personality factors when making an occupational choice and apparently they also consider their own temperaments, almost without realizing it.\textsuperscript{22}

Tyler has shown that sex difference in interests, and in relationships between interests and primary mental abilities can be seen as early as first grade.\textsuperscript{23}

LaDue concluded from a study of children whose fathers were from distinct occupational levels that:

\textparagraph{... social studies interests of children in grades two, four, and six, regardless of grade level of occupational group of the parents, encompass geographical areas from the child's home and community to various parts of the nation, world, and universe. Furthermore, there seems to be no emerging pattern which indicated that children's interests at any grade level were restricted to only one or two geographical areas. Children in the second grade indicated as much interest in their community, nation and the world as did fourth and sixth grade children.}\textsuperscript{24}

Mehenti found that vocationally mature boys were higher than vocationally immature boys on interest-maturity but not on intelligence or peer acceptance, commonly considered as


criteria of general maturity. Mehenti's findings suggested also that interest maturity may more appropriately be considered an index of vocational maturity.  

Crites conducted a study concerned with the relationship of parental identification to vocational interest development. He found that sons who perceive themselves as quite similar to their fathers have interests in different areas than those who see themselves as unlike their fathers. Evidently mothers have less impact on the likes and dislikes acquired by their sons than theory suggests, was concluded by Crites.

Attitudes and Values. Attitude formation, a process that starts early in life and continues through life, is determinative of educational and occupational planning and deciding.

Heisler emphasized the early development of attitudes when she wrote:

... Children in school do have an opportunity to develop many attitudes and abilities that may be invaluable later in a vocational situation. The development of wholesome attitudes toward self and others, an understanding of the

---

occupational world helps students form a less biased attitude toward work areas and gives freedom to select.28

Tennyson, Soldahl, and Mueller support the idea of early influences when they asserted that all classroom teachers, irrespective of the particular subject they teach, have some influence on the developing vocational attitudes and choices of their students.29

Attitudes not only develop during the early years of school but are changed and shaped as a result of experience and copying of models of significant persons in the child's life. Tennyson exemplified this when he wrote:

This is a period of reality testing for the young person, for it is here that he is subject to the judgment of his adult teachers and through them he catches glimpses of life in the outer world. His teachers are new models for the child, and under their guidance he receives a gradual introduction to the society and culture of these adults. Pattern ing his behavior after these new models, attune to the nuances of attitudes they portray, the child's personality may be molded by the values and attitudinal forces represented in the school environment—an environment which may or may not reflect accurately the social scheme in which he lives or the one in which he will eventually assume a work role.30


30 Tennyson, Soldahl, and Mueller, op. cit., p. 15.
Many factors contribute to the development of attitudes by the young child. Perhaps few, if any, are more important to the learning of the child than his teacher. Studies have indicated that teachers are lacking in certain areas of knowledge and understandings that are of great importance to attitude development.

Lifton, in a study of teacher knowledge of occupations, found that teachers were generally lacking in knowledge and that teachers at the elementary level know most about professional fields of work. 31

Tennyson wrote that it is obvious that the view of the work world presented during the first six years of elementary school through reading media is limited in scope. 32 Lifton found that studies taping teacher occupational knowledge, and jobs mentioned in elementary texts and fiction books, provide youngsters with the most information about the jobs they are least likely to get. 33

The early development of attitudes and values are influenced to no small degree by the factors cited above. As the basis for

---

attitudes and values are formed early, Wrenn suggests that earlier concern and attention be given:

In a rapidly changing and more complex world, there should be more attention given to the development of a sense of values. It may be true that values cannot be "taught", but it is certainly true that a sense of values is developed during childhood and the years of adolescence, with or without curricular direction.34

Miller agrees, and points out that there can be little doubt that many general attitudes and values are learned before adolescence which have important bearings on later occupational preferences. Some of these attitudes and values have their roots well back in early childhood.35

A study by Gribbons and Lohnes reveals that the value categories favored by adolescents in the discussion of vocational issues reveal aspects of their self-concept systems which are crucial in determining occupational preferences. Enough early maturity and constancy in the typal hierarchies of vocational values over five years of adolescence has been shown to warrant challenging Ginzberg's theoretical position that values do not play an important part in early vocational development.36

---

34 C. Gilbert Wrenn, op. cit., p. 94.
Grubb, in a study of the influence of programmed materials on vocational values, found that the use of programmed materials may well have an influence on certain vocational values held by adolescents.37

Many factors influence attitudes and values. Apparently, the school curriculum can be an effective means towards developing and shaping attitudes and values.

**Occupational Information.** Accurate occupational information is essential to effective occupational choice, which has been explored to some extent in the literature relating to vocational development, but occupational knowledge and related areas of exploration have been insufficiently studied.38

Tennyson suggests that today's children have neither the means to comprehend the intricate relationships of occupational life nor the knowledge of procedures through which adequate information can be secured.39

Children in our society are much in need of information about the world in which they live and must someday work. They will be required to know considerable about themselves and others--to adapt to a changing environment.

---

39 Tennyson, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-10
Sinick summarized a study by Parker of 180 children from grades 2, 4, and 6 in seven Illinois elementary schools. Individual interviews tapped the children's conceptual level of understanding regarding 14 occupational areas. Questions involved general job family information, job differentiation, and social implications of jobs. Conceptual level scores for fourth and sixth graders were significantly higher than for second graders in each of the seven occupational areas but the difference between fourth and sixth graders were not significant. Significant relationships were found between conceptual levels in each of the seven areas and the variables of chronological age, mental age and reading ability. On the basis of Parker's study, it was concluded that occupational information should indeed be geared differentially to different grade levels because of the influence of such developmental factors as age, intelligence, reading ability and socio cultural background.  

Hoppock states that if we could give students accurate information about jobs whenever the students show an interest in their own vocational development, whether this be in kindergarten or in graduate school or in every grade between, we could surely increase the probability of wiser decisions when the

---

students finally go to look for a job.\textsuperscript{41}

Information plays an important role in the decision-making process. The information that a student has is thought to be indicative of his general maturity. Lyon indicated that some boys are able to plan for themselves in the world of work at an earlier age because they are more knowledgeable about that world.\textsuperscript{42} Norris, Zeran, and Hatch contend that a student cannot make an adequate adjustment without knowledge of the complex occupational, educational, and social environment in which he lives.\textsuperscript{43} Unrealistic choices, Hoppock asserts, result from not having enough information about oneself or about occupations or from the inability to think clearly.\textsuperscript{44}

The inclusion of information in the curriculum of the elementary school concerning self and others, and the world of work has been suggested by many. The importance of such information is reflected by an ever changing complex world.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{42} Rhee Lyon, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 373.
\textsuperscript{44} Robert Hoppock, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 74-85.
Summary. The literature revealed considerable agreement concerning the significance of vocational development. The importance of early childhood was also noted, as the bases for later decisions and planning are influenced by early experiences and learnings.

The interests of children have been shown to develop early in life; occupational interests are varied even in the young child. The fact that children are faced with countless complex decisions throughout their lives, many of which must be faced before adolescence, has led to the suggestion that young children be given information about education and occupations early.

Concern was also expressed in the literature regarding the development of attitudes and values toward occupations. The development of wholesome attitudes toward work is viewed as an important objective of our educational endeavor.

One finding evident throughout the literature was that more attention and understanding are needed in the vocational development of the young child.
Chapter III
PROCEDURES

I. POPULATION USED

Permission was obtained from the administration of a city school system in Central Ohio to use pupils in the district for this study.

The subjects were selected from three elementary schools in the district. These schools were located in the same geographical community and represented similar socio-economic backgrounds. The community itself is part of a large industrial complex with a total population of nearly a million. These children represent a rural-suburban population whose parents are primarily semi-skilled factory workers.

The final selection of subjects for the study was secured in the following manner: From grades one, three, and five, class lists were arranged alphabetically by grade level, sex, and academic ability. Within each strata, all names were numbered consecutively and the table of random numbers was entered for the selection of subjects. Thirty boys and thirty girls were selected from each grade level in this manner. The loss of students, however, between the time of sampling and administering the instrument limited the final number in grade one to 25 boys
and 25 girls, in grade three to 25 boys and 25 girls, and in
grade five to 24 boys and 27 girls.

Academic ability was provided by achievement test results
and teacher ratings of pupils. Academic ability groups were
determined by achievement test results in grades three and
five and by teacher ratings in grade one. The children were
divided into three academic ability groups, the upper, middle
and lower thirds of their class. Socio-economic levels were
determined on the basis of Roe's Two-Way Classification of
Occupations which classified the level of the father's occupation.¹

The occupation of the father was obtained from the school records.

II. INSTRUMENTS USED

As the major purpose of this study was to provide
descriptive as well as statistical evidence of the vocational
knowledge, attitudes and values of elementary children, a
simplified and yet reliable means of assessing these factors was
required. Since the study required that children in grades one,
three, and five respond to identical material and questions, a
necessary requirement was the inclusion of materials that would
meet the needs of the study and yet be such that first grade, as
well as fifth grade, children could handle them.

¹Anne Roe, The Psychology of Occupations (New York: John
Wiley and Sons, 1956), p. 151

These occupations are representative of the total labor force of the area where these children live and of the country as a whole.

Black and white drawings of houses considered to be representative of different economic circumstances were used with the pictures of occupations to elicit additional information from the children.

A structured questionnaire designed to be used in conjunction with the set of pictures and drawings in individual interviews with elementary children was constructed to obtain information concerning knowledge, attitudes, and values.

The Preliminary Tryout. A preliminary tryout was conducted with 15 primary children to determine the feasibility and practicality

---

Administration of the Instrument. For the purpose of this study, the instrument was administered in the following manner: The child, in an individual interview, was shown each of the 16 pictures and asked to (1) title and (2) describe each occupation represented. Having all 16 pictures in view, the child was asked to respond to the following questions: Which of these workers would you like to work with? Which of these workers would you not like to work with? Which job would be the easiest? Which job would be the most interesting? Which job would pay the most money? Which job would be the hardest work? Which job would be the one that most people would look up to? Which job would a person keep as long as he wanted? Which job would a person not be able to keep very long? Which worker could we most easily get along without? (Are there any workers that we don't need?) Which worker would it be most difficult to get along without? (the one that we need the most) These latter two questions presented difficulties and alternate questions were included when necessary. For each question that was asked the children, a "why" was also included to find reasons for children responding as they did.

The child was then presented the drawings of houses and asked to point out the house that would be most like the one in which
each worker would probably live.

Scoring and Rating the Responses. The "titling" and "description" responses were rated by a panel of three judges on a four point scale (3-2-1-0) on the basis of adequacy and accuracy of responses. The criteria for these responses were determined by the use of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles.\(^3\)

An exact response in "titling" or "description" was scored 3, a possible but less exact response was scored 2. A score 1 was given to the following responses: "don't know," no responses, or a description of the job when a title was requested. Obviously wrong responses received a score of 0.

Each child received a composite score; job titling scores plus job description scores provided the composite score.

The remainder of the information obtained from the study was summarized and was included in Appendix B.

III. SAMPLING PROCEDURE

For the purpose of this study the \(t\) test and the analysis of variance technique were utilized for statistical comparison of the data.

The following comparisons were made using the analysis of variance technique: comparison of the mean scores of first, 

third, and fifth grade children in occupational knowledge, comparison of the mean scores of upper, middle, and lower academic ability groups in occupational knowledge, and comparison of the mean scores of three socio-economic groups in occupational knowledge.

The t test was used to determine if differences existed between the mean scores obtained by boys and girls in occupational knowledge.

When significant differences were found in the comparisons made by the analysis of variance technique; the t test was employed to determine where significant differences might exist between the means.

Statistical procedure required the hypotheses to be stated as null hypotheses. The null hypotheses stated that no differences exist in occupational knowledge when comparisons were made by sex, socio-economic level, academic ability level and grade level.

If the null hypothesis is negated concerning sex comparisons, the sample population will provide a t value great enough to indicate that differences exist between the groups. If the null hypothesis is true, the sample population will provide a t value less than that needed for significance.

If the null hypothesis is negated concerning comparisons made by the analysis of variance technique, the sample population will
provide a $F$ value great enough to indicate that differences exist among the groups. If the null hypothesis is true, the sample population will provide a $t$ value less than that needed for significance.

All sample values will go into two groups: those that negate the null hypothesis and those that assume that the null hypothesis is true.

The $t$ test was computed from the raw scores by the following formula suggested by Blommers and Lindquist:\(^4\)

$$t(df=n_1+n_2-2) = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{n_1 s_1^2 + n_2 s_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \left( \frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}}$$

The analysis of variance technique was computed from the raw scores by the following formula suggested by Walker and Lev:\(^5\)

$$F = \frac{\text{mean square between group means}}{\text{mean square within groups}}$$

Where:

Total: \[ \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{N_j} (X_{ij} - \bar{X})^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{N_j} x_{ij}^2 - \frac{T^2}{N} \]

Between means: \[ \sum_{j=1}^{k} N_j (\bar{X}_j - \bar{X})^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{T_j^2}{N_j} - \frac{T^2}{N} \]

Within groups: \[ \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} x_{ij}^2 - \frac{T_j^2}{N_j} \]

---

Chapter IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study was concerned mainly with the occupational knowledge, attitudes and values of elementary children. The instrument used in the study was administered, scored, and the data summarized according to the procedure given in Chapter III. Each child received a score for "titling" and "description" of the 16 occupations. These scores provided the basis for statistical analysis of data.

The statistical portion of this study dealt with occupational knowledge among first, third, and fifth grade children.

To accomplish the statistical portion of this study, four hypotheses were established to be tested. The level of significance was set at the .05 level.

The first hypothesis was that there were no significant differences in occupational knowledge when comparisons were made between the sexes in grades one, three, and five.

The $F$ test was employed to test for homogeneity of variance. The results of the $F$ test were that the variances were unequal, so the Cochran Cox $t$ was employed. The appropriate manipulations for evaluating the differences between these groups are shown in Table I.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BOYS</th>
<th>GIRLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X$</td>
<td>4822</td>
<td>5067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>322217</td>
<td>333435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>65.16</td>
<td>65.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>8005</td>
<td>5318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$F = \frac{s_1}{s_2} = 1.53$$  $$F @ .05 = 1.47$$

Decision: Reject $H_0: \sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$ Accept $H_1: \sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2$

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{108.20}{74} = 69.06}{77} = 1.53$$

$$t = \frac{65.80 - 65.16}{1.53} = .042$$

$$t_{.05} = 1.992 \frac{108.20}{74} + 1.990 \frac{69.06}{77} = 4.695$$

$$t_{.05} = 1.991$$

Observed $t = .042$

Decision: Accept $H_0: \sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ as tenable.
The t value obtained was .042 and the value needed for significance was 1.99. The hypothesis was accepted. It was concluded that differences in occupational knowledge between boys and girls seem to be negligible.

The second hypothesis stated that there were no significant differences in occupational knowledge when comparisons were made among the various socio-economic groups represented. The data in Table II concern this hypothesis.

**TABLE II**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEAN SCORES OF THREE SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13295</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>13191</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>106.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision: Accept $H_0: M_1 = M_2 = M_3$ as tenable.

Three socio-economic groups were established by the use of Roe's Occupational Classification. An analysis of variance technique was employed to determine if mean differences were evident among these subgroups.
A $F$ ration of .489 was found and the value needed for significance was a $F$ of 3.06. The hypothesis was accepted.

The conclusions drawn from this was that socio-economic background does not appear to be a factor in occupational knowledge.

The third hypothesis stated that there were no significant differences in occupational knowledge when comparisons were made among the academic ability levels represented.

The analysis of variance technique was used to determine if mean differences were evident among the subgroups based on academic ability. The data are included in Table III:

The analysis of variance technique yielded a $F$ ratio of 11.89 and the value needed for significance was 3.06. The hypothesis was rejected.

**TABLE III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$F_{.05}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13339</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>11493</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>77.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision: Reject the $H_0: M_1 = M_2 = M_3$. Accept $H_1: M_1 \neq M_2 = M_3$. 
To provide greater clarity and understanding, the $t$ test was used to test for significance between the means to establish where the differences might exist.

When comparisons were made between upper and middle academic ability groups, a $t$ value of 2.86 was found and the value needed for significance was 1.96. Comparisons between upper and lower academic ability groups yielded a $t$ value of 4.43 and the value needed for significance was 1.96. Comparisons between middle and lower academic ability groups yielded a $t$ value of 2.41 and the value needed for significance was 1.96.

Significant differences were found to exist among and between all of the academic ability groups. From this, it was concluded that the academic ability level of students does seem to influence occupational knowledge.

The fourth hypothesis stated that there were no significant differences in occupational knowledge when comparisons were made among the three grade levels represented.

Mean differences among the subgroups were determined by the analysis of variance technique. The analysis of variance technique yielded a $F$ ratio of 31.59 and the value needed for significance was 1.96. The hypothesis was rejected. Appropriate data are included in Table IV.
The t test was applied to test for mean differences between the groups.

Comparisons between grades one and three yielded a t value of 8.30 and the value needed for significance was 1.96. Comparisons between grades one and five yielded a t value of 7.36 and the value needed for significance was 1.96. Comparisons between grades three and five yielded a t value of 1.43 and the value needed for significance was 1.96.

Significant differences were found between two of the three groups; between grades one and three, and grades one and five. No significant differences were found between grades three and five. It was concluded that differences in occupational knowledge appear to be observed more readily between first grade and third and between first and fifth grade students than differences between third grade and fifth grade children.

**TABLE IV**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES AMONG MEAN SCORES OF FIRST, THIRD, AND FIFTH GRADE STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13639</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between means</td>
<td>4081</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2040.5</td>
<td>31.59</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>9558</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>64.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision: Reject the H0 M1=M2=M3. Accept H1 M1=M2=M3.
The non-statistical aspect of this study dealt with children's responses concerning occupations. The portion of the study which did not lend itself to statistical treatment was summarized and included in Appendix B.

From this data the following conclusions were offered. Sex differences in occupational attitudes and values are evident in all grade levels studied. The range of occupations considered favorable are broader for boys than for girls.

Factors relating to occupations which children seem to value include work which provides a challenge, is seen as stimulating or interesting to do and generally characterized as hard work. Helping other people was mentioned by a large number of students as being a highly desirable characteristic for an occupation. Another characteristic that appeared to be held in high esteem related to the attractiveness feature or something the child felt that he would like or that provides a variety of things to do.

Children seem to look down on occupations that require little of a worker. They respond unfavorably to occupations which they view in this manner.

The reasons that children give for responding to occupations are usually very similar. However, these responses are usually directed toward many occupations.
Children seem to be aware of many of their own limitations and many of their attitudes and values are based on these limitations. Responses as "I can't do that," "don't know how," "too hard," "dangerous," "too dirty," or others such as "I like that," "that's easy," or "fun," seem to indicate some knowledge about the occupations and some awareness of its requirements.

An important aspect revealed in this study was that many children were not able to give reasons for responding to occupations as they did. Providing reasons was certainly more difficult than pointing to a picture of an occupation in response to a question. It seems that attitudes about occupations have developed in many cases without any underlying logic or assumption. A large number of children could give no reason for responding to a particular occupation.

Responses concerning occupations and levels of housing provided few clear-cut patterns. Occupations which showed the greatest amount of concensus were: assembler, accountant, manager, farmer, and doctor. Perhaps the most clear-cut pattern was farmer where the majority of responses placed him in the lowest socio-economic level of housing.

Occupations which pictured women and white collar workers were generally placed in the upper levels of houses while the
blue collar workers were placed most often in the lower and middle levels.

An examination of the data in Appendix B also reveals that there exists among children a great amount of misinformation about occupations. Evident also is that many attitudes and values seem to be based on this information.

In general, few differences in responses reflecting attitudes and values were apparent between boys and girls or among the grade levels.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to seek the answers to the following questions: (1) To what extent do elementary children possess vocational knowledge and understandings relating to 16 selected occupations? (2) What attitudes and values have elementary children developed concerning these occupations? (3) What effect does sex, academic ability, grade level and socio-economic status have on knowledge, attitudes and values of these children?

A structured interview with children in grades one, three, and five utilizing 16 pictures of occupations for the purpose of investigating children's knowledge, attitudes and values about occupations was the means of obtaining information for this study.

The design of the study provided for statistical and non-statistical treatment of the data. The statistical aspect of the study required the testing of four hypotheses. The hypotheses stated that there were no significant differences in occupational knowledge when comparisons were made among and
between the mean scores of the various subgroups of children in grades one, three and five. Subgroups' comparisons were made on the basis of sex, academic ability level, grade level and socio-economic level.

The non-statistical data were organized and reported.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were offered on the basis of the results of the study:

Two of the four hypotheses were rejected on the basis of the data. Significant differences in occupational knowledge were found among the academic ability levels represented. Comparisons between academic ability levels also provided significant differences. Academic ability level seems to be a factor effecting occupational knowledge. Significant differences in occupational knowledge were found among the grade levels. Further analysis revealed significant differences between first and third grade children and first and fifth grade children. No differences were found between third and fifth grade children.

Hypotheses concerning occupational knowledge on the basis of sex and socio-economic level revealed no differences.

Responses of children reflecting attitudes and values
provided the non-statistical data in this study. These findings were:

1. The data revealed sex differences in occupational attitudes and values. The occupations considered favorably are broader for boys than girls.

2. Factors which children seem to value concerning occupations are hard work, a "like" quality, helping people, and the attractiveness features.

3. Children seem to be aware of their limitations and many of their attitudes and values seem to be made on the basis of these limitations. Many attitudes do not seem to have a logical or thought-out basis.

4. White-collar and women's occupations appear to be held in higher regard by children than are the blue-collar occupations.

5. Considerable evidence is available to indicate that misinformation has often influenced the thinking of these children. Incomplete and distorted information apparently forms the basis for these misgivings.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

It was recommended that various approaches be employed to assess the vocational knowledge, attitudes and values of
elementary children. It is also recommended that the use of pictures be continued in this endeavor and that greater emphasis be placed on the development of instruments that will provide a greater representation and a more suitable means of obtaining information.

As attitudes and values develop very early in children, it is recommended that studies be conducted exploring the influence of systematic instruction on the development of attitudes and values.
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**RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION**

"WHICH OF THESE WORKERS WOULD YOU LIKE TO WORK WITH?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asl.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bkr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Car.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mgr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tch.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Egr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lbr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Scl.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tdr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Doc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sec.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mec.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tin.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help people</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like It</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do more things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't do much</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION

"WHICH OF THESE WORKERS WOULD YOU NOT LIKE TO WORK WITH?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jan.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asl.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bkr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Car.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mgr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tch.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fmr.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Egr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lbr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Scm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tdr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Doc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sec.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mec.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tln.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't like that</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Hard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't do it</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too dirty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to wear suit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know how</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION

"WHICH JOB WOULD BE THE EASIEST?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Grade 1 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 1 Girls</th>
<th>Grade 3 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 3 Girls</th>
<th>Grade 5 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 5 Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bkr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tch.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frm.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lbr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scl.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tdr.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mec.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tln.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Grade 1 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 1 Girls</th>
<th>Grade 3 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 3 Girls</th>
<th>Grade 5 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 5 Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't like that</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just sell parts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just drives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just takes motes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to be inside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too hard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just clean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't do much</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION

"WHICH JOB WOULD BE THE MOST INTERESTING?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jan.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asl.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bkr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Car.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mgr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tch.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frm.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Egr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lbr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Scl.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tdr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Doc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wrs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sec.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mec.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tln.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't do much</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Different</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help People</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION

"WHICH JOB WOULD BE THE HARDEST WORK?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asl.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bkr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Car.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mgr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Egr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lbr.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tdr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Doc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sec.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mec.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tln.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No response | 1 | 1 | 2 |

Reasons given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isn't easy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take care of a lot of people</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do a lot of work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Mixed up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to stay up all night</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get dirty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit in seat too long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION

"WHICH JOB WOULD PAY THE MOST MONEY?"

Responses Grade 1 Grade 3 Grade 5 Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Asl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bkr.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mgr.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tch.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bgr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lbr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Slc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tdr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Doc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mec.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tln.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No responses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend more hours driving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help kids</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Like it</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn things</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid the most</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works a lot (hard)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People buy (things)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total responses: 35

Total reasons: 29
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION

"WHICH JOB WOULD BE THE ONE MOST PEOPLE WOULD LOOK UP TO?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Grade 1 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 1 Girls</th>
<th>Grade 3 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 3 Girls</th>
<th>Grade 5 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 5 Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jan.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bkr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Car.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mgr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tch.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Egr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lbr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ScI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tdr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Doc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sec.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mec.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tln.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons given

- Don't know: 2, 5, 5, 1, 4, 3, 20
- Looks hard (work): 3, 2, 4, 3, 7, 4, 23
- Can save your life: 2, 3, 2, 4, 3, 14
- The more you do the more you get: 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 9
- Have to know inside of car: 1, 1, 2
- Have to raise crops to feed animals: 1, 2, 2, 5
- So people can learn: 3, 2, 5, 3, 5, 18
- Helps when sick: 6, 3, 4, 3, 2, 5, 23
- Sells things: 2, 1, 3, 2, 2, 10
- Helps you with work: 3, 4, 3, 2, 12
- Dangerous: 2, 2, 2, 3, 9
- Don't do much: 3, 3
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION

"WHICH WORKER COULD WE MOST EASILY GET ALONG WITHOUT?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bkr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Car.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mgr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frm.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Egr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lbr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sc1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tdr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Doc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sec.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mec.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tln.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to do that</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't do much</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else could</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION

"WHICH WORKER WOULD IT BE MOST DIFFICULT TO GET ALONG WITHOUT?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bkr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Car.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mgr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tch.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frm.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Egr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lbr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sc1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tdr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Doc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sec.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mec.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tln.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps people</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too hard to do</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixes things for us</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need milk, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION

"WHICH JOB COULD A PERSON KEEP AS LONG AS HE WANTED?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Grade 1 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 1 Girls</th>
<th>Grade 3 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 3 Girls</th>
<th>Grade 5 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 5 Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bkr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Car.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mgr.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tch.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frm.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Egr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lbr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Scl.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tdr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Doc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mec.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tln.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons given

- Don't know: 5 6 4 3 3 6 27
- People need him: 5 4 2 3 6 5 25
- He owns it: 6 4 8 7 3 4 32
- My dad did it: 1 3 4
- It's harder work: 3 4 4 3 3 4 21
- Someone else could do that: 2 3 2 3 1 11
- Work for self: 3 2 5 6 5 6 27
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION

"WHICH JOB WOULD A PERSON NOT BE ABLE TO KEEP VERY LONG?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jan.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bkr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Car.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mgr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Egr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lbr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Scl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tdr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Doc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sec.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mec.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tln.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons given

Don't know | 7 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 37
Could be fired | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 21
Dangerous | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 22
Too hard to keep very long | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 12
Might get sick | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3
Might run out of cement | 4 | 2 | 6
Doesn't like to work | 2 | 1
Might lose ability to do work | 3
Could run out of work | 2 | 3
Too easy | 1 | 2 | 4
RESPONSES OF CHILDREN CONCERNING

OCCUPATIONS AND LEVELS OF HOUSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levels of houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bkr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mgr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Frm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Egr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lbr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Scl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tdr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Doc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tln.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report on World of Work continued...

It was felt that each teacher should be permitted to emphasize whatever materials she deemed to be the most effective; therefore, structuring of the use of the materials was very flexible.

The Senesh materials were used as the core of the project for grades one and two. Because material for grade three was as yet unpublished, a unit previously used in one of South-Western's Elementary Schools was used as the major source of information for grade three. The unit used in grade three follows. This unit was prepared by Mrs. Marie Campbell, a third grade teacher at West Franklin.
Introduction:

The selection of the unit was based upon several situations. We had planned, for some period of time, to attempt a school-wide unit. Our school district has challenged teachers to the area of Economics by presenting them with a Social Studies Guide outlining methods of dealing with the subject. Every teacher in our building has long been aware of the fact that pupils' learning experiences in this area have been of an incidental nature. We have often had occasion to become concerned when new items of clothing went unclaimed after numerous opportunities for pupils to visit Lost and Found, when pupils appeared apathetic over lost money, and when pupils seemingly disregarded responsibilities in caring for school supplies and books.

We met as a group to discuss the possibilities of initiating a unit in Economics for our pupils. One of our first considerations was the preparation needed by teachers in order to do a good job. We invited our elementary supervisor to offer suggestions and guidance. A Committee was formed to obtain information and material sources. Classroom teachers began informal evaluation of pupils' interest by raising pertinent questions for discussion.

After we were convinced such unit held good potential for meeting needs and interests of our student body, we began to explore the scope and sequence for grade levels. The committee met again to draw up major areas adaptable to various levels. Other meetings with teachers served to establish procedures and to clarify objectives.

It was emphasized that each teacher was to use information given as suggestive ideas for his particular situation, and that he would modify and develop as pupils' needs dictated.
Overview

The unit is directed toward increasing pupils' economic awareness through planned activities that will deepen understandings of simple principles such as:

1. Children can have a definite part in the work of getting food, shelter, clothes and other things desirable for better living.
2. Children have a responsibility to use their time, money and materials to the best advantage.

Because the third grader is able to see his position in the home and school rather clearly, he is ready to see himself as a vital member of a community where people live together. Development of simple economic concepts can help to lead him to seeing himself as both a giver and a receiver of the community's goods and services.

II. Objectives

1. To develop in children an understanding of the importance of economics and the nature of economic principles as they relate to them.
2. To develop an understanding that the scarcity problem necessitates organization of economic activities.
3. To broaden understandings of capital resources and wise decision making.
4. To develop children's understanding of the role of government in economics.
5. To deepen appreciation for man's progress in technological advances for making the world a better place in which to live.
6. To help children develop problem-solving abilities in personal and social situations as they relate to the world around them.
Classroom atmosphere can be created through discussion of a film shown for purposes of comparing the way we live with the way people of another country live. Supply a broad range of reading materials for the library corner. Use charts to ask questions that will stimulate thinking on the children's part. Discuss the type of work done by children's parents to show the wide range of occupations engaged in and their importance. Help children prepare a bulletin board of the things they dream of having and the things they are able to have. Discuss reasons why it is not possible to have everything we want. Have children ask parents why they decided to live and work in Columbus.
Area I.

A. What is Economics?

1. Enabling the children to develop an understanding of their everyday experiences in relation to the world around them.

2. Developing problem-solving ability of children as it relates to personal and social problems, basically economic in nature.

Area II.

A. The Scarcity Problem and Ways of Dealing With It.

1. Unlimited wants and limited resources

2. Factors of production
   a. Division of labor and specialization
   b. Natural resources
   c. Human resources

Area III.

A. Capital Resources

1. Circular flow of money

2. Money makes trading easier

3. Present consumption versus saving

Area IV.

A. Government and Economic Life

1. The national, state, and city government are partners.

2. Government services enable us to have things that would be prohibitive in cost for families.
   a. Protection
   b. Schools
   c. Parks
   d. Postal Service
Area I.

A. What is Economics?

**LEARNING EXPERIENCES**

Use questions from a chart that deal with children's spending.

- What have you bought lately?
- How did you decide to buy it?
- Were you pleased with what you received for the price you paid?

Use dramatization to show the effect of children's spending.

- Have one group of children play roles of record company selling Elvis Presley records while another group plays roles of Beatles record company. Have pupils act as customers.

Discuss what might result from a drop off in sales. How many different jobs might be affected?

Discuss the decisions children make when they buy something.

**UNDERSTANDINGS**

Children's spending (demand) affects the prices of ice cream, candy, gum or whatever they buy. These prices affect the amount to be produced. The amount produced affects the number of people employed by the companies that make ice cream, candy, and gum. Industries that supply the companies with raw materials are also affected.

If children decide to buy the Beatles records instead of the Elvis Presley records, production of the first will become greater while production of Elvis Presley records will drop.

Considerations are:

- Do I have enough money?
- Do I really need it?
- Have I waited for a long time to save for it?
- Do I sometimes buy things I wish I hadn't?
- How can I know when I have made a good decision?

Children will understand they have a wider choice than people of earlier days, how new jobs are created when old ones die out, and that some places have more jobs than others.

Man constantly seeks to improve and invent to improve our way of life.

B. Relate pupils' interest in what they wish to be when they are grown to the occupations their grandparents were able to choose.

Use books dealing with occupations (e.g. the I Want To Be books) in the library corner. Emphasize the wide choice of careers there are today.

Use units of Long Ago stories in readers for independent reading. Have children make lists of things replaced by more efficient means.
Area II. A. The Scarcity Problem and Ways of Dealing With It.

LEARNING EXPERIENCES

1. Read the stories of "The Fisherman and His Wife" and "The Three Wishes". Discuss the stories with the class. Invite comments from pupils concerning reasons given for wishing by the story characters.

Suggest that the children draw "dream clouds" of items they would like to receive. Suggest that since they cannot have all the items they should draw another picture of the one item they'd like most to have. Make a bulletin board of "dreams" and realistic choices.

Teach the meaning of the term consumer.

Have the children draw pictures of the family members who go to work and another picture of those in the family who do not. Title them "Producers in Our Family" and "Consumers in Our Family". Compare the pictures.

Have children write stories about the way producers in the family help those who only consume. Extend the meaning through oral discussion to include agencies which provide services and goods to people who are unable to produce.

Dramatize what would happen if the mail man refused to deliver the mail, if the teacher did not teach, if the street cleaner did not clean the streets, and the truck driver refused to do his job.

UNDERSTANDINGS

There is a conflict between our unlimited wants and our limited means of supplying wants.

The problem of decision making is necessary because of limited family income. Family income is a resource.

Every human being is a consumer whose wants for goods and services cannot be completely satisfied because of limited resources.

Everyone in the family is a consumer, but not everyone is a producer. Even our pets consume.

Production represents useful work. Production is a means of supplying wants.

Producers feel a responsibility to those unable to produce just as family producers are supporting the non-producers.

All useful work is important regardless of how much a person earns.
2. FACTORS OF PRODUCTION

LEARNING EXPERIENCES

Division of labor and job specialization can be demonstrated through children's illustrations depicting a scene in which all members of the family attempt to push a lawn mower and one in which Father pushes, Mother rakes, Sister fills the basket, and Mother digs weeds.

ramatize the confusion and time consumed if the entire class attempts doing jobs in the room, e.g., everybody washes the board at one time, straightens shelves at one time, and collects apers at one time. Then compare the difference in time and efficiency when specific duties are assigned to room helpers.

suggest that the children observe the different occupations that can be seen on their way to school. Discuss the interdependence of the bus drivers and their passengers.

See the yellow pages of the telephone directory to show the class the number of specialists who sell services to the community.

help children list the simple machines used in the home and tell how each is used in cooking, cleaning repair work, and yard work.

Plan an exhibit of small machines such as scissors, can opener, egg beater.

Teach the terms goods and services by using magazine pictures that children can use in a team game by placing the pictures under the correct chalkboard headings.

List the products made where the fathers are employed. List the occupations of the fathers that deal in services.

Visit a dairy. Have children observe the different kinds of machines and the jobs they do. Observe the different operations leading up to the finished product. Raw milk for consumer's use.

UNDERSTANDINGS

Specialization increases interdependence and necessitates cooperation. Specialization increases job efficiency.

Specialization saves time and gets the job done better. Cooperative effort results in an attractive classroom.

Large cities offer opportunities for many specialists.

Technological inventions increase efficiency and aid in the division of labor.

Machines help us do work better and faster but human labor is still required.


Services: Sets are bought with money.

Roberta's father produces airplane parts. Penny's mother sells dresses.

Dairies use more machines than men. Work is done faster and better. There are many steps in preparation of operations leading up to the finished product. Raw milk for consumer's use.
LEARNING EXPERIENCES

Read the story "Robby Finds a Friend." Follow up with children observing the flag-raising at school.

Show the filmstrip "Robinson Crusoe." Discuss the fact that one of the first things Crusoe looked for after the shipwreck was his tools.

Use the Golden Encyclopedia for an account of early tools.

Read the story "The Little Red Wagon" to stimulate a discussion of tools needing proper maintenance.

Have children discuss the safety aspect of proper use of tools.

Have children draw a machine they would like to invent for making life easier and more pleasant.

Lack of rain makes our water supply low in the summer. Discuss with the class ways in which we meet the scarcity.

Make a terrarium from a discarded aquarium or large glass jar.

Use children's experiences with Smokey the Bear, posters to discuss the importance of fire prevention.

Read for information about natural resources that are renewable and those that are not.

Show the filmstrip "Using Our Forests Wisely."

Make a list of the things man finds for the use of lumber.

Read stories that reveal the Indians as being nomadic people.

Discuss natural resources used for products manufactured in Columbus. Deepen understandings of our dependence upon other places for supplying some raw materials used in our products.

UNDERSTANDINGS

A pulley serves us in many ways and makes work easier.

Tools are necessary in providing man's needs.

Early tools were made from stone. Man has used his hands and brains to improve tools.

Tools and machines require proper care.

People have to learn how to use tools and machines.

When supply is low, we must conserve.

Nature has provided us with more water and air than we can ever use.

The government sometimes assumes the responsibility of teaching us conservation.

Natural resources are used to satisfy the wants of the people, but there are not enough to supply all our wants.

Heavy use of our natural resources causes man to search for substitutes.

When the land could no longer supply their needs they moved to another place.

Natural resources are not equally distributed.
LEARNING EXPERIENCES

Use the filmsstrip "People, Our Most Valuable Resource.
Discuss the fact that conservation means different things to different people. To the farmer it means taking care of the soil; to the forest ranger conservation means saving trees and wildlife and replacing those that cannot be saved. Conservation of human resources means providing proper and healthful living conditions for people.

Draw upon children's experiences for a discussion of coming to school when they don't feel well as compared to the times they do feel well.

Use puppets to dramatize a situation in which a boy considers reminders of good health habits from parents as "nagging" him, but later realizes he must give up doing many of the things he likes because of colds.

Read a simple health story to stimulate children to list ways of caring for their health.

Make a health booklet by having pupils illustrate the list.

Discuss the role of good health as it relates to "doing jobs well."

Discuss the responsibility of staying well in order to prepare ourselves for worthwhile citizenship through education and training.

Invite the school nurse to visit the class to explain the training, duties, and services of the different kinds of nurses. Have nurse guide discussion to ways boys and girls can form good health habits for everyday living.

UNDERSTANDINGS

In order for people to enjoy healthful living joint efforts are made to satisfy needs of proper recreation, food inspection, and safe water supply.

We are better producers when we are well physically.

We can prevent many illnesses by obeying simple health rules.

Every individual is responsible for using health knowledge in everyday living.

Eating proper foods.
Dressing for the weather.
Drinking lots of milk and water.
Getting enough rest.
Outdoor exercise.
Keeping our bodies clean.

Our nation depends upon strong, healthy men and women. We must start to take care of our minds and bodies while we are young.

There are several kinds of nurses. Nurses train for the particular type of work in which they are interested. Nurses are our friends.

Boys and girls can practice healthful living until it becomes a "way of thinking."
Area III. A. Capital Resources

LEARNING EXPERIENCES

Use a teacher-made chart designed with an outer and inner circle showing the farmer planting cotton and the various stages through which the raw material travels to become a finished product for market, (inner circle). Show steps of the circular flow of money, (outer wheel), as the farmer sells his raw material to the market and sequential steps up to where the customer buys the product from a store.

Set up a simulated situation of a service station with only two gas pumps and two workers. As more people move into the area the service station gets more business and people have to wait. Discuss ways of dealing with the problem.

Use the same procedure by relating it to lemonade stands operated by children. If both stands were in the same area and sold exactly the same product how could they improve their business?

Discuss the various ways people advertise products.

Read stories of how people in early days had to barter for what they needed.


Discuss the problems that came from not having the thing somebody else needed to make a trade.

Raw pictures and write stories about barter. Discuss how money is a better medium of exchange.

UNDERSTANDINGS

The farmer had to have capital to begin the cycle. We save to have money to work for us.

If the owner of the service station passes up buying some things he could put off, he can reinvest his money to buy more pumps, employ more workers, and make more money.

People like to trade where they get good service and might go to a station that could handle its business faster or better.

One stand might give just a little more lemonade than the other, the lemonade could be colored pink, charge a penny or so more and serve a cookie.

Competition causes businesses to work harder and to find ways of improving goods and services.

Freedom to spend makes it necessary for people to tell about the product they have to offer and why they think it is a better choice.

Barter was awkward and inconvenient.

Not everyone wants to take what you have to trade, but everybody takes money for goods or service.
LEARNING EXPERIENCES

5. Cont'd

Invite a coin collector to visit the classroom. Have children (in advance) send questions they would like to have answered about coins.

Area IV. The Government and Economic Life.

1. Make charts about the things a family buys for itself and discuss how it takes longer to buy some of the things because they cost more.

Make a chart about some things people buy as a group because a family would be unable to pay the high cost of such goods and services.

Discuss how some taxes are used for particular purposes.

Use three containers, graduated in size. Label the larger one national; the middle one state; the smallest one city. Show a large United States map. Find Ohio; find Columbus. Demonstrate with the containers the size relationships of the governments in our country. Help the children to relate it to the size of the U.S., the state, and the city on the map.

Make a bulletin board showing ways our government serves us.

UNDERSTANDINGS

Coins have changed down through the ages. Much of our country's history is told through the study of coins. Some coins have become valuable as they have become harder to find. Many people collect coins as a hobby. Other people make a living dealing in coins. Coins are made at mints in Philadelphia and Denver. The government controls our money system. The treasury department is in charge of minting coins.

Families buy food, shelter, and clothing. We must save longer for large items such as homes and cars. We can buy some things and pay as we use them.

Protection against fire and police protection are paid for through taxes. Schools and parks would cost too much for one person to pay.

Gasoline taxes are used to build highways.

We are inside a city. The city is inside a state. The state is inside the United States.

The National Government serves all the people. The State Government serves all the people in its state. The City Government serves all the people in its city. The three governments are partners.
Culmination

All displays, charts, bulletin boards, art projects, booklets, and reports will be assembled for an Economics Fair. Children are in the process of making coin banks from containers by painting them and decorating them. Our principal has given them permission to sell them at the fair. The money from the sale of banks will be used to buy goldfish for the room. The sale will originate from the Trinket Shop which was originally set up in our activity concerning spending and saving decisions of children.

Pupils attending the fair will be able to ask questions concerning any of the displays. Committees will be prepared to answer. The children will be responsible for arranging the displays in a way that will tell the story of our unit most effectively.

Evaluation

1. Did each child grow in ability to study independently, to find facts and to organize material?

2. Did he grow in the ability to work with others in group activities and to assume responsibility?

3. Do children have a better understanding that specialization requires cooperation?

4. Do children realize the advantages of a system of specialization?

5. Have children grown in understandings of how they can help their families by using their time, money and materials well?

6. Do the children pay more attention to the way in which they spend their money?

7. Do they have an appreciation of work well done?

8. Have they grown in understandings of healthful living?

9. Do they show a greater respect for personal and school property?

10. Have the children grown in problem-solving abilities?

11. Do they appreciate our scientific and technological advancements?
12. Do they understand man's dependence upon natural resources?

13. Do children realize that taxes provide many goods and services?

14. Do they understand that it is wise to forego present consumption to save for worthwhile goals?

15. Are they aware of the need to choose wisely? Have they learned to appreciate their freedom of choice?

III. Skills

Reading:
1. Using books, magazines and newspapers to find information.
2. Reading for enjoyment and for information units of stories pertaining to early times.

Written Expression:
1. Writing stories about their families, their "dreams"; their plans for when they are grown.
2. Preparing reports that others will read.
3. Writing thank you letters.
4. Writing stories about their field trip.

Spelling:
1. Using unit vocabulary in sentences and stories.
2. Alphabetizing unit words.
3. Adding two or three unit words to each week's regular words.
4. Spelling correctly in letters and reports.

Oral Expression:
1. Reporting and sharing with their own class.
2. Participation in discussion.
3. Oral expression through dramatizations.
4. Asking questions of visiting resource people.

Arithmetic:
1. Learning to count money.
2. Learning to use liquid measure.
3. Keeping record of simulated banking and selling activities.
4. Learning to make change.

Marie Campbell
Report of World of Work continued.

It soon became obvious that emphasis of subject material would vary, since different teachers saw each lesson in a different way. This became apparent in viewing different people's reactions to Baer and Roeber's six concepts that affect career development.\(^1\) If the ideas presented by Baer and Roeber are taken the basic concepts underlying the sequential development of the World of Work in elementary school, there must be certain basic questions that relate back to these concepts. An attempt was made to illustrate some questions pertinent to those basic concepts in Figure 1.

Two counselors studied the first fifteen lessons of the Senesh materials used in grade one in an attempt to determine the relationship between the concepts presented in each lesson and Baer and Roeber's basic concepts. Their opinions are presented in Table I.

The teachers presented the lessons according to their own ideas and abilities. Counselors conferred with them occasionally to keep abreast of current happenings; however, counselors were not involved with teaching the units per se. The following outline presents the various activities carried out by the three grades involved in the World of Work Pilot Project.

FIGURE 1

HAS THE CHILD INCREASED IN HIS KNOWLEDGE...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Sociological</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Psychological</th>
<th>Chance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judges A</td>
<td>Judges A</td>
<td>Judges A</td>
<td>Judges A</td>
<td>Judges A</td>
<td>Judges A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRADE 1:

A. Bulletin boards for units.
B. Display of common tools.
C. Charts - Pictures and experience.
D. Drew pictures - homes, people, jobs, etc.
E. Made folders of different groups of people.
F. Discussion of all concepts.
G. Used records.
H. Used extra stories with material.
I. Field trip to bakery and 3M Manufacturing Company.
J. Role played many areas.
K. Scrapbook of family's needs.
L. Games to get concepts (e.g. consumer, producer) across.
M. Filmstrips (e.g. "Helping Each Other At Home", "Houses")
N. Feltboard - many uses.
O. Made milk carton houses and clothespin people to represent themselves.
P. Took pupils around school to show how every one helps relate to family of jobs.

GRADE 2:

A. Flannelgraph - goods, services, identify community and community workers, stores, houses, etc.
B. Experience charts.
C. Maps of neighborhood and community.
D. Listening center for recorded lessons. Let four children decide important parts and report to class.
E. Used discussions.
F. Drew pictures to get concepts (e.g. raw product to consumable product).
G. Field trips to Swan Cleaners, 3M Manufacturing Company, bakery, post office, and walked around the neighborhood.
H. Used advertising quite a bit--which is better? Why? Newspaper helpful, also TV commercials.
I. Made three-dimensional neighborhood mural.
J. Bulletin Boards--who rented or owned houses, etc.
K. Role played--many things, (e.g. buying, selling, neighbors)
L. Made farm folder.
M. Used activity books a great deal.
N. Make scroll of something that impressed them around their neighborhood. (Pictures but no people)
GRADE 3:

A. Drew pictures--father's job, what I'd like to be, homes, etc.
B. Experience chart.
C. Stories about areas discussed.
D. Used newspaper--want ads, buying, selling, etc.
E. Used stories and situational mimeos to develop concept of wise choice making.
F. Music--work songs and unit that traced music from pioneer to present time.
G. Field trip--Art museum, bank, Bordens. Discussion in class of various entertainment type jobs.
H. Bank and auctions to develop concept of save or spend wisely.
I. Kids interviewed parents on why they chose to live in Columbus and reported to class.
J. Bulletin boards.
K. Wrote original play contrasting two families--one wealthy, one not. Presented it to Special Education class.
L. Baked cookies, bought milk for guests to illustrate people can accomplish work better when everyone knows his job and is cooperative.
M. Learned why money system replaced barter. Had coin collection displayed and a coin collector visited the class.
N. School nurse visited to explain her role in school, etc.
O. Used popular people to discover realistic job choices--received an autographed picture of Jerry Lucas--led to discussion of why he is a good basketball player, etc.
P. Election issues to learn about government on all levels.
Q. Used fund raising campaigns to point up ideas of helping those who can not help themselves.
R. Discussion groups--make up problem situations (e.g. broken water faucet--what should a family do) Sometimes, a small group discussion led by a chairman, sometimes, an entire class discussion.
THE EFFECT OF STRUCTURED UNITS ON THE OCCUPATIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDINGS OF PRIMARY CHILDREN

A study conducted as a preliminary to this investigation is included in this final report to the State Department of Education, Division of Guidance and Testing. The preliminary study, "A Study of Occupational Knowledge, Attitudes, and Values of Elementary School Children Concerning Sixteen Selected Occupations" was conducted in grades one, three and five for purposes of assessing children's knowledge, understandings, attitudes and values concerning a number of occupations.

The study reported here was concerned with children in grades one, two and three. This investigation was conducted on an experimental basis to determine the feasibility and practicality of vocational and economic instruction in the primary grades. This study was also concerned with changes in occupational knowledge and understandings as a result of such instruction and the extent to which attitudes and values might be influenced in this total process. The measurement of attitudes and values was known to be a difficult task, especially so in a relatively short period of time and with very young children. Since this whole investigation was conducted on a trial or try-out basis and as few investigations of this type
have been attempted, an attempt to measure the more important areas, such as attitudes and values, was felt to be a top priority.

SRA's "Our Working World" units were included in eight classrooms in Grades one and two. Three classrooms in grade three utilized a teacher prepared unit very similar to "Our Working World." In all, eleven different groups participated on this experimental basis.

For normative and comparative purposes, control groups were selected from the same number of classrooms not using these units.

The determination of teachers to use these units was made by building and grade level. Three buildings within the district were selected. From each of the buildings, a grade level--consisting usually of three teachers--was selected for experimental purposes. The other grades in these buildings not receiving this instruction were designated as control groups.

When the buildings and grade levels had been selected, a survey of all teachers involved indicated a willingness by all to utilize the new materials available. These teachers were then asked to utilize the available materials in any manner they deemed appropriate. It was emphasized that these units were to be used as they, the teachers, thought best. In this
way, it was felt that the final results would not be biased by the fact that teachers might feel pressure to present the material in a particular manner. The teachers were offered any assistance from James Frost, the resident counselors—Darla Coakley, and Tom Hummel—and also this writer, involving any questions or concerns that they might have.

These units are designed to provide children with broad concepts of economic and a vocational nature. The emphasis of the units is on the child, his family, community and environment and the relationship of those within his environment upon each other and upon the group as a whole. The units were not designed to provide children with facts concerning occupations but rather with an understanding of the relationships existing among all occupations and appreciations of the dignity and worthiness of all useful jobs.

The instrument used to measure occupational information was only remotely related to the materials covered in the units themselves. It was felt that if the units were effective with children, a greater interest, awareness and knowledge would develop as a result of the stimulation provided by the units. A broader awareness would be necessary in order to show gains in occupational knowledge based on our measuring instrument. For a description of the instrument used and the scoring criteria employed, see the preliminary study indicated earlier.
Prior to the beginning of the instruction, a pre-test administration was given to a random sample of children in the experimental group—i.e. those receiving instruction with these units—and in the control—i.e. those not receiving instruction in these units or receiving only the regular curricular program. A total of 155 children in grades one, and two, and three were used for comparative purposes—78 control and 87 experimental children. The sample cited above represents approximately 25 per cent of those actually involved in the study. It was not practical or feasible to test all children involved in the study. For this reason sampling procedures were utilized and inferential statistics employed. (At this point, it should be noted that the results of this study can only be applied to the population with which this study was conducted. In a broad sense, the findings might be applied to those students that have attended these grades in the past and also to those students who will attend these grades in these schools in the future.)

The results of the pre-test administration allowed comparisons to be made at the beginning of the study to determine if differences existed initially between the experimental and control groups. The t test, to test for significant differences between the means of two groups, was applied to check for these differences. The t values obtained were negligible, the range
These values indicated that the experimental and control groups did not differ significantly in the amount of occupational knowledge and information present at the outset of the study.

At the conclusion of the study when all units had been completed, a post-test administration of the instrument was conducted with these children to determine if the units had influenced the amount of information possessed by these children. If after the post-test administration, no significant differences were to be found, the logical conclusions would be that the presentation of these units as part of the instruction does not affect the occupational knowledge and information of these children. On the other hand, if significant differences were found in favor of the experimental group, the logical conclusion would be that the special instruction or materials utilized has affected information and knowledge concerning occupations. (Of course, it is recognized that all factors cannot be strictly controlled and that other factors could be present that could affect the outcome of the study. Nevertheless, as many factors as were possible were controlled and allowed for.)

The results of the post-test administration and the statistical test applied to the mean values of the control and experimental groups (t test) are shown in Table I.
### TABLE I

$t$ Test Comparisons of Experimental and Control Groups Concerning Occupational Knowledge and Understandings—Post-test Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL GROUP GRADES 1, 2 and 3.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Group</strong></td>
<td><strong>Experimental Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 78$</td>
<td>$N = 87$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X} = 52.80$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 55.14$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S^2 = 36.53$</td>
<td>$S^2 = 33.04$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t = \frac{n_1 S_1^2 + n_2 S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \left( \frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t = 2.55$</td>
<td>$t @ .05 df = 163, = 1.98$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision: Reject $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$</td>
<td>Accept $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE THREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$N = 22$</td>
<td>$N = 22$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X} = 56.91$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 60.27$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S^2 = 26.08$</td>
<td>$S^2 = 16.16$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t = 2.38$</td>
<td>$t @ .05 df 44, = 2.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision: Reject $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$</td>
<td>Accept $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE TWO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$N = 28$</td>
<td>$N = 37$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X} = 52.46$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 55.32$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S^2 = 11.63$</td>
<td>$S^2 = 23.24$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t = 2.62$</td>
<td>$t @ .05 df 65, = 2.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision: Reject $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$</td>
<td>Accept $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I shows the results of the various comparisons between the experimental and control groups. A comparison was made between the total groups—i.e., a comparison between the composite of all the experimental children with the composite of all the control children. A significant difference was found when the t test was applied to this data concerning the composite or total groups. These results imply that the experimental children had significantly greater scores on occupational knowledge and information than control children.

Significant differences were found between the experimental and control groups in grades 2 and 3. No significant differences were found between the experimental and control groups in grade 1.

In grades 2 and 3, it can be concluded that factors were present in the experimental group which influenced the amount
of information found on the post-test administration. The inclusion of vocational and economic materials or units seems to be a significant factor in the gain of occupational information experienced by these experiential groups.

Although no significant differences were found between the first grade groups, it is of interest to note the comments and reactions of these teachers in another section of this final report.

A general review of the evaluation of attitudes and values on the basis of the pre- and post-test revealed little quantitative information beyond that already reported in this final report.

We are continuing to evaluate the present findings. It is planned that this study be continued throughout the academic year 1967-68 with these same children. This will provide comparisons relating to attitudes and values over a two year period and of a longitudinal nature.

Our findings have revealed that these primary children are in the exploratory phase of development and as such have presented difficulties in determining whether attitudes and values are actually in the process of change or merely appear to be changing as a result of exploration.
Conclusions and Recommendations

It is very apparent that primary children show an interest, an eagerness and a readiness for vocational and economic instruction and information. That children have the capacity to learn more about the World of Work if given the opportunity has been amply demonstrated.

Both the studies reported by this writer supports the conclusion that vocational development is longitudinal as well as of a developmental nature. The recommendations from the preliminary study that planned, systematic and continued programs of instruction throughout the child's academic experience was certainly supported by this study.

Longitudinal studies utilizing various methods and techniques should be attempted to determine the more effective means of aiding children to learn about themselves and also about the World of Work which will be prominent in the future of all their lives.

The importance of vocational development and the processes which facilitate it are not as well known or generally understood as they must be by parents, teachers, and counselors. It is recommended that greater efforts be made to acquaint all those interested in the total development of children with these important facts.
Report on World of Work study continued.

General consensus of the teachers' opinion of the pilot project was very favorable. Although the teachers involved in the project used different ideas and different methodology in the presentation of the materials, nearly all concurred that the lessons had been meaningful to them and to the students.

Several of the teachers evaluated the units consistently throughout the year by checking for certain goals and objectives; others did not use written objectives, but depended on discussions as a means of determining the project's merit.

In general, the teachers felt that the units motivated students to work for work's sake, since that concept was prominent in all the lessons. They also felt that the children became more aware of the role a family plays in society through the use of the lessons. Students' attitudes toward their parents seemed to change—they began to see parents as more than just providers of the necessities of life. Students also felt that parents had the responsibility for teaching their children to make wise decisions, not merely telling them what to do.

Parents also made several comments on the materials presented. Many parents were surprised by the complex concepts the children were able to grasp, i.e. interest, producer, consumer, etc.
Several parents felt that their children's attitudes toward money and the value of things in general had changed significantly during the year.

The teachers felt that the materials helped toward the goal of getting children to see their place in society and to understand themselves as individuals. This alone, they felt, was reason enough for continuing the project.

In summary, the people involved in the World of Work Pilot Project felt that the entire project was very worthwhile. The children learned important concepts about the World of Work, and also, learned about people and how they fit into society. The materials used as the core for the project were very easily integrated with other school subjects, and in many cases, motivated the children to try harder and produce more work.

Recommendations

After completing the initial phase of the World of Work Pilot Project, the following recommendations are made:

1. That a year long district-wide study of the Social Studies curriculum be initiated in an attempt to integrate the World of Work material into the regular social studies curriculum.
A. If feasible, offer in-service training to participating teachers.

B. That South-Western accept the offer of SRA to send in a specialist to work with the participating teachers.

2. Co-ordinate the elementary World of Work program with the junior high guidance program.

3. Extend the project in the district.
GROUP COUNSELING IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL:

SOCIAL SKILLS GROUPS
"GROUP COUNSELING IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: SOCIAL SKILLS GROUPS"¹

South-Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio, in cooperation with Ohio University, has a resident program for elementary school counselors. This endeavor is partially financed by the federal government under Title VA of the NDEA. As part of the program, various projects are designed and carried out by the residents and their supervisor. As a resident in this program, this writer was involved in many different projects. One responsibility of this writer was particularly interesting; it concerned group counseling with elementary school children.

This type of counseling began approximately halfway through the second nine weeks grading period. After conferring with the principal of one school, it was decided that the counselor would experiment with one group. When it become apparent that the idea had some merit, the project was expanded to two other schools.

The purpose of these groups was to help the members learn more about themselves and other people. To achieve this, the content of the counseling sessions was aimed at the members.

¹This writer is indebted to Dr. Benjamin Cohn for some of the ideas expressed in this brief account of group counseling. Dr. Cohn taught at Ohio University, and it was at that institution that this writer was exposed to his thinking. This writer is further indebted to Mr. James Frost and Dr. Robert Dane who reviewed some of the tapes and offered many helpful suggestions.
interests, attitudes, and feelings. In addition, the members were encouraged to study and comment on the interaction in the group as it happened and to express their opinion as to why people behave the way they do.

It was felt that if the members could learn more about themselves and others, one outcome might be that they would become more effective in their interpersonal relationships. From this premise, the name of Social Skills groups was given to the groups. This was the title used when discussing the project with students, parents, and staff members.

Having briefly outlined the purpose and content of the sessions, it now seems appropriate to describe the role of the counselor. The counselor was the group leader. At the outset of a series of sessions, he was the one member of the group who had a rather complete idea of the purpose of the group. He was in a position to be the prime mover. Accordingly, the counselor set up the structure for the group and tried to have the student members feel relaxed. It was then the counselor's responsibility to bring about interaction among the group members.

The next step was for the counselor to move the group into content which was appropriate in terms of the group's purpose. For example, if a group of girls was discussing rock 'n roll singers, which were presently in vogue, the counselor should
attempt to move the discussion out of the area of factual information about the singers to the members' feelings about the singers and why these idols are important to them. The counselor must attempt to have the members respond to each others feelings, attitudes, and interests.

A question which might be raised here is what responsibilities do the students have? After the group is structured, the members have responsibilities similar to those of the counselor's. They must attempt to interact and move the group along.

The counselor must be aware of how active he needs to be in carrying out his responsibilities. As the student members become more adept in moving the group, the counselor should become less active. This seems to be a crucial point. The counselor should give only as much leadership as the group needs. As the student members become more active in carrying out their responsibilities, the counselor becomes less active in carrying out his.

How does the counselor help accomplish the group's purpose? It seems that several techniques might be useful. First, the counselor can use his attention and support to reinforce appropriate student behavior. Second, he can let his response to, and concern about, a particular member serve as a model to the other members. Third, through questioning and role playing, he may try to bring to light some of the feelings of the members which might then be
discussed. Last, the counselor may attempt to create feelings in members and then to have the group study them. These techniques have been tried in the Social Skills Groups in the South-Western City School system with some success.

The groups contained fifth or sixth grade students of the same sex and from the same school. The sixth grade teachers were asked to pick students for the groups. The counselor suggested to the teachers that the students for a particular group should balance each other. For example, a shy student would be balanced by a more verbal student. Similarly, an aggressive child who is a school discipline problem should be balanced by a child who gets along quite well in school. The idea here was to have contrasting models of behavior present in the group. It was thought that this would facilitate the learning of alternate forms of behavior. This position is not held by some theorists. They hold that groups should be formed on the basis of the members having a common problem. The method used here at South-Western appears to have worked well in this situation.

After the teachers selected a candidate, the counselor met with the students individually to see if each student was willing to participate. At that time, the counselor explained the purpose of the group and the amount of time involved. The
groups were scheduled to meet once a week for approximately thirty minutes. The goal was that each group should meet for at least ten weeks.

At the first meeting, the counselor explained the limits to be used during the sessions. The members were told that there was to be no physical contact between them and that they could not destroy any property in the room. All group proceedings were to be kept confidential by the members. They were also told that only two subjects could not be discussed. These were sexual behavior and personal religious beliefs. These limits have been used by other counselors and they seem to be appropriate for the public school setting.

Having briefly discussed purpose, content, role, technique, and structure, it now seems appropriate to discuss outcomes. Since not all the groups have been completed, any discussion of outcomes would necessarily be incomplete. This, added to the fact that no formal evaluation procedures were built into the project, makes it possible to draw only tentative conclusions about the success of the groups.

It is doubtful that anyone can adequately measure the impact these groups have had on their members. The opportunity to develop close relationships with other group members and experience
a rather free interaction with other people may have a far reaching positive effect on the lives of the members.

Aside from this rather intangible type of outcome, there is the matter of change in observable behavior. In this area, evaluation can be somewhat more concrete. In order to judge whether behavior had changed, observation and feedback were used. A particular member's behavior could be observed as it occurred in the group. Knowledge of behavior change outside the group was obtained by direct observation, feedback from students and staff, and the individual's reporting of his own behavior.

On the basis of this kind of information, it can be said that some behavior changes did occur. Whether all or part of these changes were attributable to the individual's group experience is, of course, a difficult question to answer.

What were some of the observed changes? In several cases, it was found that shy children became more able to express themselves and to interact with other people. There was also some evidence that interpersonal relationships improved for some members. One aggressive child, who was having trouble learning the female role became better adjusted to the school setting. Another, a rather dependent child, became more independent and self-assertive. While the above changes are not all that took place, they are representative of some of the outcomes which were observed.
In summary, it seems as though the experience was worthwhile for both the students and the counselor who were involved. This type of group work might be tried in more elementary schools. Social Skills groups give the members an opportunity for a type of learning and experiencing which is often lacking in present day school programs.
GROUP GUIDANCE: TESTING
The students at South-Western City Schools are involved in a rather comprehensive standardized testing program.

In the elementary schools, one or two tests are given at each grade level. After the pupils leave elementary school, they will continue to be tested in high school, college, and some work situations. Testing, therefore, is something most of these people will be involved in for twelve or more years.

Theoretically, the results obtained from testing programs are often used to make decisions. These decisions are made by institutions about the individuals they contain and by individuals about their own plans. While institutions usually have trained people to interpret results and make appropriate decisions, individuals do not always have the background to use test results meaningfully.

Counselors can be used to interpret results, but often the amount of time spent by counselors in this endeavor is limited by their need to perform other services. If students were more sophisticated in their knowledge of testing, they could, to some extent, evaluate test information about themselves. This would leave the time they have with the counselor for counseling and decision making. This seems a more valuable use of the counselors'
time than having interviews where the counselor attempts to teach the counselee about various derived scores, limits of the tests, validity, etc.

The thesis here is that students can learn about tests through group guidance. This could be started in the elementary grades and continued throughout the school program.

The student could then come to the counselor with some understanding of tests and counseling could proceed rather than information giving.

The following pages contain a group guidance unit on testing. It is designed for sixth grade students and its purpose is to teach some of the strengths, weaknesses, and uses of the test.

This unit was presented to five sixth grade classes. The counselor asked the students to evaluate the unit. Their reactions were generally quite positive. A majority of them stated that they found the unit interesting and informative. They said they would like more information about testing.
Jimmy was six years old when his mother first took him to Northeast Elementary School. It was a fairly new brick building and Jimmy noticed how shiny the floors were. There were some men and women there as great in size as his mother and father. They were called teachers.

They said "How are you today, Jimmy?" You look so nice in your new school clothes."

The school seemed quite pleasant to Jimmy and he did not feel too badly when his mother left and he stayed.

The first grade was fun. He drew pictures, learned to write his name, and learned to line-up all in the first few weeks of school. One day his teacher took a small group of students, including Jimmy, over to a corner of the room. Jimmy was given some pieces of paper with pictures printed on them. He made some lines on the papers with his crayon. He was also asked about the letters of the alphabet. After a while, Jimmy went back to his regular seat. Jimmy and his classmates had just taken the Harrison Stroud Reading Readiness Test.

Jimmy did not know exactly what a test was, but it was not an unpleasant thing to do.

A few days later it was time for parent conferences and Jimmy's mother came to school to talk to Jimmy's teacher. The teacher told the mother that Jimmy had a low score on the test. She also said this probably happened because Jimmy had not gone to kindergarten, and since kindergarten teaches some of the things that were on the test,
Jimmy did not have a fair chance. Mrs. Jones, Jimmy's mother, heard what the teacher said but did not really understand it because something else was going through her mind. She was thinking of all the plans she had for Jimmy. These would have to be changed because Jimmy was not a smart boy.

Several years passed and Jimmy was now in the third grade. It was fall and all the third graders were going to take the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Jimmy had become a better student because he had made up the loss of not having kindergarten. His reading speed was still slow. On this test he scored slightly below average.

Jimmy's mother talked with his third grade teacher. His mother said, "Well, you know Jimmy is really not a bright boy." His teacher said, "I'm not so sure I agree with you. Jimmy scored slightly below average but his slow reading did keep him from finishing the test. You have to be able to read the test and finish it if you are going to do well." Jimmy's mother was looking at the teacher but not really listening. She was thinking that poor Jimmy would never be a great lawyer or president. He was dumb.

Several years passed and Jimmy, who was now called Jim, was in the sixth grade. This year Jim's grade was going to take the California Test of Mental Maturity. The morning before the test, Jim got up feeling just great. He had had a good night's sleep and eaten a good breakfast. It was one of those mornings when a deep breath of cool, crisp autumn air makes you feel as though you could jump and run forever. He felt like working.
When he got to school, Jim was given the test. He really tore into it. He was reading faster than ever before. Time was almost up and he still had several items to go. He made the best guess he could at each and filled in the last answer space just as the examiner said "Stop".

Jim's mother was due for another parent conference. The test results had returned. Jim's teacher said, "Well, Mrs. Jones, I thought you'd like to know how Jim did on his intelligence test." "Don't tell me" said Mrs. Jones, "I already know. He's not smart." The teacher was surprised. "Why, Mrs. Jones, Jim did quite well on this test. His IQ was above average."

Mrs. Jones looked amazed. She heard what the teacher said this time. She had wanted to hear those words "above average" for a long time. She didn't know what had happened to her son, but it had happened. He was smart, and perhaps he would be president or a lawyer after all.

Things were different for Jim from that time on. He could not quite understand why his mother could stay so excited about a test score. She seemed to expect more from him now that he was "smart". Everytime there was a test in school his mother preached to him that he must work and try hard.

In the ninth grade Jim was to take another intelligence test. His mother made him go to bed early. He thought about the test. When he got up the next morning his mother had a large meal ready for him. He was not hungry but his mother insisted that he eat so that he would do well on the test. He ate, but the meal didn't set well.
When he got to school he went to the room where the test was to be given. The materials were passed out, and the directions were read. In the seconds before the examiner said go he felt strange. His lips and tongue were dry and his throat was tight. His hands were cold and wet with perspiration. It seemed as if his stomach would flutter right out of his mouth.

"Go!" the examiner said.

Jim sat there for a moment and then started on the first question. It was not too difficult. On the fifth item he began to have trouble: He could not keep his mind on the test. Thoughts kept coming to him. He could see his mother saying, "You can do well on the test. You're a smart boy." Other thoughts interrupted him. When time was called he was only half through. The breakfast which had set uneasily would not keep its place any longer. He ran out of the room, down the hall, and into the restroom. There he got sick to his stomach. He was weak and shaky. He couldn't understand what was wrong.

When the test scores came back, Jim found out that he had scored quite low. His mother came to school for another parent-teacher conference. She said to the teacher, "I imagine Jim did quite well on the test. He's a pretty smart boy, you know."

"Actually, Jim's scores were quite a bit below average on this test, but I agree that Jim is a fairly bright student. He was so upset during the test that he actually became physically ill. You couldn't expect him to do well under those conditions ........."
Mrs. Jones heard nothing after the "but" in the teacher's explanation. She was almost in tears. Her son was 'dumb again. After three years of being smart, he was just "Poor Dumb Jim".
Jim Jones, who was now beginning his senior year in high school, walked into his counselor's office.

"Mr. Edwards, I've been trying to decide whether or not I should go to college."

"I see" said Mr. Edwards.

"I thought maybe you could give me a test that could decide whether or not I should go" said Jim.

Mr. Edwards replied, "Well Jim, whether you should or not is your decision. No test can decide for you."

"Oh, well what can a test do?"

"A test, or rather the results from it, can give you information which you might use to help make your decision."

"What kind of information," said Jim.

"What kind of information do you feel you need?"

"I'm worried about not making it in college."

"Some tests give information about the ability to do college work. They are often called scholastic aptitude tests."

"That sounds like the kind of test I need," said Jim. "one that can tell how I will do in college."

"Not quite, Jim. The test can only predict how well you might be able to do in college. There is more to college success than ability."
"I guess that's right. If I didn't study I wouldn't make it even if I had ability."

"You've got the idea, Jim."

"Well, I want to take an... an... you know, one of those tests."

"O.K. Jim, I'll arrange it for you."

(Sometime later)

"I came in about my test, Mr. Edwards. How did I do?"

Mr. Edwards did not tell Jim immediately. He was interested in how Jim thought he did. They discussed this and after a while they discussed the results.

Mr. Edwards said, "Jim, 60 out of every 100 people who take this test and get the same score as yours are successful in college."

"I guess the ones that work make it. It looks like if I want to go and I am willing to work, I'll make it."

"It looks like it," said Mr. Edwards.
Ed Brown, principal at West Hills Junior High School, was walking down the hall of his school towards the guidance and counseling office. He was wearing a short sleeve sport shirt instead of his coat and tie. It was July; the students weren't in school.

Walking into the guidance office, he noticed Bob Richards, a counselor, staring out the window.

"Pretty hot, isn't it, Bob?" said Ed Brown.

"I guess. It seems hotter this summer than last."

"Sure does."

"Say Ed, did you walk all the way down here to talk about the weather?"

"No, I guess I have a problem. Thought maybe we could discuss it," answered Ed.

"Fine, what's the matter?"

"Well, I'm scheduling our new 7th graders for our special foreign language classes. I've got room for 50 students, but there are still 70 kids who want to take the course."

"Sounds like you're trying to figure out which students to choose."

"Right, and I don't know these kids that well."

"Haven't last year's teachers made recommendations?"

"Yes, but they never taught foreign language to this group," said Ed.
"I see, you would like something in addition to the teachers' opinion to go on," replied Bob.

"Yes, I thought there might be a test that would help us decide who should take language."

The counselor nodded.

"The language aptitude test we have is not overly accurate, but when it's combined with the teachers' opinion about a student's motivation and study habits and his previous test scores and grades, you ought to have a fairly good basis to make a judgment."

The principal looked serious when he said, "Fairly good?"

"Well, nothing's perfect, Ed. You have to make a decision and this is the best information you have."
STRONG POINTS OF TESTS

1. Tests gather information about a person's abilities and interests.
2. Information gathered by tests can be used in decision making.
3. Tests can sometimes "predict" success in a particular field.
4. Tests gather information from large numbers of students at the same time.
5. Tests attempt to measure only ability. Since report card grades often reflect conduct and work habits, tests are at times a more accurate measure of a person's ability.

WEAKNESSES OF TESTS

1. Most tests are affected by a person's reading ability (speed and comprehension).
2. A person must try to do well on a test, if it is to be an accurate measure of his abilities.
3. Test performance is somewhat dependent on a person's physical condition, emotional attitude, mental attitude, and the surroundings in which the test is taken.
4. There is no safeguard against guessing.
5. A person may lose points if he does not follow directions.

* Remember: Tests measure your performance, or behavior, on a particular set of questions, at a particular time, in a particular place. They gather information of some value. They do not measure the size of your brain or your heredity. Most important of all, they do not measure your worth as an individual.
1. Budget your time. Do not spend too much time on any one question.

2. Develop a good mental outlook and obtain proper rest and nourishment as preparation for the test.

3. If you have a choice, try to seat yourself or take the test where there will be a minimum of distractions.

4. When you are about to run out of time or if you can't figure out an answer, make the best possible guess you can. (That's probably the one you choose first).
A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENTS AND PARENTS ESTIMATES OF TEST PERFORMANCE AND THE STUDENTS' ACTUAL PERFORMANCE ON THE OHIO SURVEY TEST
A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENT AND PARENT ESTIMATES OF TEST PERFORMANCE AND THE STUDENT'S ACTUAL PERFORMANCE ON THE OHIO SURVEY TESTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to compare: (1) the Ohio Survey Tests (OST) performance of selected fourth and sixth grade children with the students' estimates of their performance; (2) the OST performance of some of these students with test performance estimates made by their parents, and (3) the students' estimates with their parents' estimates.

LIMITATIONS:

The major limitations of this study concerned sampling. The students in this study were not picked at random from the population of all South-Western City Schools elementary students. With but one exception, they were from those schools which have the services of an elementary school guidance counselor. There was evidence, however, that this sample was representative of the school system (See Subjects). Whether or not South-Western is representative of some larger group, for example, all the fourth and sixth grade students in Ohio, is also discussed in the "Subjects" section.
The most critical sampling problem seemed to be with the parents involved in the study. Although an attempt was made to randomly select parents, these participants were largely those who willingly attended test interpretation meetings which were held. There is some evidence that the children of these parents were not representative of the fourth and sixth graders who attended South-Western City Schools (See "Subjects").

There were several factors in the design of the study which place certain limitations on the results. The first of these had to do with the analysis of data. Where appropriate, correlated t-tests were chosen to analyze the difference between means. This type of test cannot measure interaction effects which may have been present if all variables had been combined in a single analysis.

The second limitation in question was the time lapse between the administration and interpretation of the tests. The tests were given in the latter part of September, 1966, and interpreted the following January. This length of time could have made the students' estimates less accurate. It seems, however, that it could be argued that the time lapse would cause the estimates to be closer to the person's self concept than an immediate reaction. As a limitation to the study, this could be rightfully questioned.
The final limitation concerned sex differences found in the OST results. The girls scored significantly (.05) higher than boys in several tests. This factor might not have been taken into account when estimates were made (See "Materials").

**SUBJECTS**

This study took place at South-Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio, and involved a majority of the fourth and sixth grade students in the system. All children in fourth and sixth grades were administered the Ohio Survey Tests.

The norming group for this test consisted of all fourth and sixth graders in the state who took the test. A question which might be posed is whether South-Western students were typical of the state group. The evidence seemed to indicate that this system was not representative of the state group. All means for South-Western were significantly lower (.05) than their counterparts in the state (See Table I). It should not be concluded that South-Western's students were lower than the general population of the fourth and sixth graders in the state. It was likely that the students in the state who took the test were not representative of the total state population. Some areas of the state were not well represented among the group of Ohio students who took the test.
### TABLE I

**Difference between means for state and school system** *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TESTS</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEM</th>
<th>DIFF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOURTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>45682</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>45692</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>45631</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>45587</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIXTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>39338</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>39337</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>39339</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>39316</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All differences are significant (Alpha level .05)
The student subjects were fourth and sixth graders (N = 667 and 625, respectively) at selected South-Western City Schools elementary schools. Of the 2,140 fourth and sixth grade students who took the Ohio Survey Tests, 1,292 were included in the study. There was evidence that these subjects were representative of the total number of fourth and sixth graders in the system. The means for the sample were very similar to the means for the entire school system. Analysis has shown that no significant differences (.05) existed between the sample and the corresponding system means (See Table II). The parent subjects had children in the fourth and/or the sixth grades in the selected schools. All the parents whose children attended the fourth and/or sixth grades in the selected schools were invited to test interpretation meetings. The parent sample consisted of parents who attended the meetings. The N for fourth grade parents was 114, and the N for parents of sixth graders was 82. These samples of parents and their children do not seem to be typical of parents and children in South-Western. The parent sample was heavily weighted in favor of the systems' higher economic areas. Hence, the children of parents who attended were not representative of the student sample. Children of parents who attended had means significantly higher (.05) than the means for the entire sample (See Table III). This, as stated earlier, was a definite limitation to the study.
TABLE II

Differences between means for school system and system sample *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TESTS</th>
<th>SCHOOL SYSTEM</th>
<th>SYSTEM SAMPLE</th>
<th>DIFF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No significant differences (Alpha level .05)

TABLE III

Differences between means for system sample and parent sample's children *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TESTS</th>
<th>SYSTEM SAMPLE</th>
<th>PARENT SAMPLE</th>
<th>DIFF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fouth</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>58.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>34.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>40.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>61.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>34.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>49.144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All differences are significant (Alpha level .05)
In summary, it seems that the school system is lower than the state group who took the test. The sample drawn of this school system appears typical of South-Western. The parent sample and their children, however, do not appear to be representative of the school system.

MATERIALS

Two types of materials were used in this study. A test was employed to measure students' performance in various areas, and printed materials were used to interpret test scores to students and to collect data.

Ohio Survey Tests (OST) - The OST contained four separate tests. There was the academic ability test, designed to measure the ability to learn, the Reading Achievement Test, the English Expression Achievement Test, and the Mathematics Achievement Test. The OST were administered to fourth, sixth, eighth, and tenth grade students in Ohio school systems which purchased these tests and accompanying scoring services from the Division of Guidance and Testing, Ohio State Department of Education. Written materials which describe the tests in detail and give complete technical data are available from the Division of Guidance and Testing.
Since the purpose of this study is to compare test performance with perceptions of performances, it seems important that the test be both reliable and valid. The OST technical manual reports the reliabilities for the fourth grade Academic Ability, Reading, English, and Mathematics tests to be .947, .947, .929, .914 respectively. The reliabilities for the corresponding sixth grade tests are .932, .912, .929, .888. Some work concerning the validity of the tests has been done by the South-Western elementary guidance staff. In an unpublished study done by South-Western using the sixth grade at one school, it was found that the OST had a substantial relationship to semester grades in several subjects.

The test scores for the sample of South-Western's students showed rather clear sex difference. The means for fourth grade girls in Academic Ability, Reading, English, and Mathematics were significantly higher (.05) than the corresponding means for boys.

Similar findings were obtained at the sixth grade level. There the girls scored significantly higher (.05) on the Academic Ability and Mathematics tests. On the remaining tests for girls, the means were higher but the differences were not significant. (See Table IV). The effect that these sex differences might have on the study was mentioned earlier in the "Limitations" section.
TABLE IV

Differences between means for girls and boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TESTS</th>
<th>GIRLS</th>
<th>BOYS</th>
<th>DIFF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Fourth</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>61.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>37.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>43.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Sixth</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>61.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>35.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>52.394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
South-Western Student Bulletin (SWSB) - The SWSB consisted of three parts. The first part had one section entitled "What Your Ohio Survey Test Scores Mean." A brief description of each test was given. This was designed to help the student remember the tests he took. Another section was "How Did you Do on the Tests?". The content of this section was aimed at teaching the student the meaning of percentile ranks or Ohio percentiles, the term used by the OST. (See Appendix, p. 314).

The second part was entitled "How Do You Think You Did on the Tests?". After the student had recalled what tests were taken and had an understanding of Ohio percentiles, he was given this part so that he might estimate his performance in terms of Ohio percentiles.

The last part of the bulletin contained the students' test scores. There was a section here on which he could draw a profile.

PROCEDURES AND DATA COLLECTION

In mid-September, the OST was administered to all fourth and sixth grade students at South-Western. The test answer sheets were sent away to be machine scored and it was several months before the scores were returned.

When the results were returned, the elementary guidance staff began scheduling sessions to interpret the results to students. In addition, afternoon or evening test interpretations were arranged for parents.
The interpretations to students were made to classroom size groups and usually lasted about thirty to forty-five minutes. The students were given the first part of the SWSB. After the counselor felt that the students remembered what the tests had been about and had a knowledge of Ohio percentiles, he gave them the part on which they were to estimate their performance in terms of Ohio percentiles. On completing this, the students received their scores and constructed a profile. All materials were then collected including the test scores and profiles. The pupils were told that the scores would either be given to their parents at the interpretation meetings or, in the event the parents did not attend, the scores would be returned to the teachers and then passed out.

The counselors telephoned a random sample of parents asking them to attend a test interpretation meeting and to participate in the study. In addition, an invitation was extended to all parents of fourth and sixth graders to come to the interpretation meeting. Each school was scheduled to have either an afternoon or evening meeting for its parents.

It became apparent that many of the people who had been called and had agreed to participate were not attending the meetings. It was decided, therefore, that the parents who did attend the meetings, whether they were part of the random sample or not, should become the subjects in the study.
The parent meetings were usually opened with some general comments about tests and norms. After this, the discussion was centered on the OST, and copies of the SWSB were given to parents. After the counselor felt that the parents were sufficiently familiar with the OST and Ohio percentiles, they were asked to estimate their child's performance. This was done in the same manner as their children had done it in school. The counselor and helpers then passed out their children's scores, and the meeting was ended.

In the manner described above, it was possible to collect a large amount of data on estimates of performance. As stated, these data were collected from students, concerning their own performance, and from parents, concerning their child's performance. In the next section, the analysis of these data is described.

DATA ANALYSIS

In the previous section, it was stated that students and parents estimated performance. It was decided that the estimates should be compared to actual performance in terms of differences and relationships. Difference techniques were used to see if students or parents estimated the students' performance significantly higher or lower (.05) than their actual performance. In addition, tests were computed to see if parents' estimates differed
significantly from those of their children.

A student's estimate of his performance or his parents' estimate of his performance could not be considered independent of his actual performance. Parents' and their children's estimate would also not be independent. For this reason, it was decided that correlated t-tests should be used.

One scaling problem had to be overcome. The estimates were on a percentile scale, and this scale was not the same as the raw scores used to measure actual performance. Each estimate was transformed into a raw score equivalent. This was done by taking an estimate and comparing it to charts which contained the Ohio percentiles and corresponding raw scores. The charts were based on the norms for the state. When the transformation was completed, all comparisons could be made on the same scale.

As stated earlier, the relationships between estimates and actual performance and between student and parent estimates were also of interest. Product-moment correlation coefficients were computed to measure the degree of relationship.

In accordance with the purpose of the study, three main comparisons were made: (1) student estimate to student performance, (2) parent estimate to student performance, and (3) student estimate to parent estimate. These three comparisons were made for each of the four tests at the fourth and sixth grade levels. In
addition, the same comparisons were made for each sex separately. This brought the total number of comparisons to seventy-two.

The above analyses were based on data from eleven schools. It was felt that comparisons by school would also be of interest. No sex breakdown was used in the by school comparisons because this would have cause very small N's in some of the analyses. Some schools were omitted when there was not a sufficiently large sample to justify analysis.

Looking at the data by schools generated 10 t-values and 108 correlation coefficients. These were in addition to the 72 of each mentioned above. All correlated t-tests and product-moment correlations were run at the Ohio University computer center under the direction of Dr. Charles Harrington. Dr. Harrington also served as statistical consultant for this study.

After the data were returned to South-Western, interesting questions arose concerning differences between variances and differences between correlations coefficients. Tests to determine the significance of these differences were calculated by members of the elementary guidance staff. The number of comparisons was, of course, limited by the amount of time that the counselors could spend on research activities.
RESULTS

Student Estimates to Performance - School System (See Table V)

In the comparison of the fourth grade students' estimates to their actual performance, the means of the estimates were significantly higher (.05) than the means of the actual performance in Academic Ability, Reading, English, and Mathematics. These same results were found when the data were analyzed by sex. Similar results were found at the sixth grade level. The twelve estimated means at the sixth grade level were significantly higher than the corresponding actual performance means.

Concerning the degree of relationship between estimates and test scores, the correlation coefficients for all fourth graders were as follows: Academic Ability, \( r = .205 \); Reading, \( r = .241 \); English, \( r = .212 \); Mathematics, \( r = .135 \). All these coefficients were significant at the .05 level. The r's for girls and boys separately ranged from .051 to .220. Of the eight correlation coefficients, five were significant (.05).

The correlations for all sixth graders ranged from .114 to .226. When the data was broken down by sex, the r's ranged from .174 to .348. All of these relationships, whether they were broken down by sex or not, were significant at the .05 level.
### TABLE V

**t-Values and Correlation Coefficients -**

Test to Student Estimate - School System

| Grade 4 | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | X | Y | Sx | Sy | rxy | t |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **G** |
| **Boys** | 344 | 56.785 | 67.564 | 18.875 | 10.078 | .109 | -9.798* |
| **Girls** | 323 | 61.025 | 68.533 | 17.492 | 10.853 | .214* | -7.290* |
| **Both** | 667 | 58.838 | 68.033 | 18.328 | 10.464 | .205* | -12.397* |
| **R** | **D** | **G** | **Both** | 344 | 31.029 | 42.140 | 14.695 | 9.363 | .217* | -13.192* |
| **Boys** | 323 | 37.306 | 44.012 | 13.619 | 9.412 | .220* | -8.167* |
| **Girls** | 667 | 34.069 | 43.046 | 14.517 | 9.426 | .241* | -15.167* |
| **E** | **B** | **G** | **Both** | 344 | 36.631 | 47.672 | 13.943 | 8.626 | .171* | -13.569* |
| **Boys** | 323 | 43.786 | 49.306 | 12.788 | 8.099 | .121* | -6.944* |
| **Girls** | 667 | 40.096 | 48.046 | 13.856 | 8.408 | .212* | -14.793* |
| **M** | **A** | **D** | **G** | 344 | 24.180 | 34.858 | 10.684 | 7.470 | .051 | -15.571* |
| **Boys** | 323 | 26.381 | 32.966 | 10.073 | 7.311 | .077 | -9.878* |
| **Girls** | 667 | 25.246 | 33.942 | 10.443 | 7.448 | .135* | -18.745* |

| Grade 6 | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | X | Y | Sx | Sy | rxy | t |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **G** |
| **Boys** | 313 | 60.345 | 70.741 | 15.386 | 7.971 | .196* | -11.580* |
| **Girls** | 312 | 61.881 | 70.526 | 14.565 | 8.115 | .242* | -10.278* |
| **Both** | 625 | 61.112 | 70.634 | 14.989 | 8.037 | .114* | -14.921* |
| **R** | **D** | **G** | **Both** | 313 | 32.824 | 40.955 | 11.012 | 6.907 | .346* | -13.334* |
| **Boys** | 312 | 35.644 | 41.179 | 10.432 | 6.038 | .348* | -9.707* |
| **Girls** | 625 | 34.232 | 41.067 | 10.810 | 6.484 | .220* | -15.101* |
| **E** | **B** | **G** | **Both** | 313 | 45.904 | 57.265 | 13.294 | 8.481 | .174* | -13.891* |
| **Boys** | 312 | 52.394* | 57.885 | 12.699 | 6.730 | .212* | -7.432* |
| **Girls** | 625 | 49.144 | 57.574 | 13.390 | 7.657 | .137* | -14.547* |
| **M** | **A** | **D** | **G** | 313 | 25.661 | 32.514 | 8.334 | 6.075 | .321* | -14.110* |
| **Boys** | 312 | 26.420 | 31.369 | 7.984 | 5.421 | .341* | -10.963* |
| **Girls** | 625 | 26.040 | 31.942 | 8.163 | 5.782 | .226* | -16.628* |

* Equal to or greater than the state mean
* Significant at the .05 level
Student Estimates to Performance - By School (See Table VI)

The differences between the estimate and performance means for fourth grade, when the means were analyzed by schools, were found to be significant (.05) in 35 or 36 cases. School "five" did not show a significant difference (.05) on the fourth grade Academic Ability Test.

Similar results were found at the sixth grade level. Again, the t-value for school "five" in Academic Ability was the only such value which was not significant (.05).

The relationship between fourth graders Academic Ability estimates and performance for the nine schools ranged from $r = .034$ to $r = .364$. Three of the nine values were significant at the .05 level. For the other tests, the ranges were as follows: Reading, $-.182$ to $+.396$ with four of nine significant (.05) r's; English, $-.100$ to $+.367$ with two significant (.05) r's; and Mathematics, $.005$ to $+.192$ with no significant (.05) r's.

The correlation coefficients for the sixth grade by school comparison were somewhat higher. The ranges of these coefficients for the ten schools were as follows: Academic Ability, $.044$ to $.534$ with eight significant (.05) r's; Reading, $.052$ to $.527$ with eight significant (.05) r's; English, $-.008$ to $.552$ with seven significant (.05) r's; and Mathematics, $.020$ to $.634$ with eight significant (.05) r's.
### TABLE VI

**t-Values and Correlation Coefficients - Test to Student Estimate - By School**

**GRADE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>$S_x$</th>
<th>$S_y$</th>
<th>$r_{xy}$</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58.667</td>
<td>68.313</td>
<td>20.662</td>
<td>10.583</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47.936</td>
<td>62.532</td>
<td>17.087</td>
<td>12.183</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57.657</td>
<td>68.086</td>
<td>18.810</td>
<td>11.126</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46.477</td>
<td>72.136</td>
<td>15.718</td>
<td>13.266</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68.964*</td>
<td>72.405</td>
<td>16.575</td>
<td>9.539</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>60.149</td>
<td>68.658</td>
<td>16.884</td>
<td>7.536</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>63.752*</td>
<td>67.468</td>
<td>16.654</td>
<td>8.223</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53.975</td>
<td>66.247</td>
<td>16.665</td>
<td>10.052</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56.058</td>
<td>65.551</td>
<td>15.004</td>
<td>12.087</td>
<td>.301*</td>
<td>-4.871*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.250</td>
<td>42.250</td>
<td>14.209</td>
<td>12.722</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25.340</td>
<td>42.723</td>
<td>14.081</td>
<td>9.047</td>
<td>-.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.629</td>
<td>44.829</td>
<td>15.581</td>
<td>7.820</td>
<td>.396*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39.524*</td>
<td>46.560</td>
<td>13.268</td>
<td>8.187</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33.789</td>
<td>43.649</td>
<td>13.779</td>
<td>7.548</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>35.716</td>
<td>42.560</td>
<td>14.073</td>
<td>8.772</td>
<td>.304*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32.901</td>
<td>42.914</td>
<td>14.029</td>
<td>7.294</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32.812</td>
<td>38.174</td>
<td>13.147</td>
<td>12.251</td>
<td>.250*</td>
<td>-2.861*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42.812</td>
<td>48.125</td>
<td>13.368</td>
<td>7.889</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31.240</td>
<td>45.468</td>
<td>13.821</td>
<td>7.983</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41.657</td>
<td>49.571</td>
<td>14.572</td>
<td>7.465</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.614</td>
<td>48.341</td>
<td>12.141</td>
<td>11.540</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>46.429*</td>
<td>52.119</td>
<td>12.452</td>
<td>7.764</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>40.956</td>
<td>49.149</td>
<td>13.126</td>
<td>6.974</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>42.661</td>
<td>48.110</td>
<td>13.852</td>
<td>7.548</td>
<td>.229*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37.099</td>
<td>49.074</td>
<td>12.591</td>
<td>6.612</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-7.284*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36.551</td>
<td>45.696</td>
<td>13.033</td>
<td>11.136</td>
<td>.367*</td>
<td>-5.551*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Equal to or greater than the state mean

(Continued) * Significant at the .05 level
## TABLE VI (Con't)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| M       | 1 35 | 25.800 | 30.371 | 5.984  | 5.391  | .102  | -3.542* |
| A       | 2 36 | 23.056 | 30.222 | 8.579  | 5.243  | .431* | -5.447* |
| T       | 3 45 | 21.533 | 29.778 | 7.057  | 6.633  | .304* | -6.840* |
| H       | 4 46 | 23.391 | 33.000 | 7.028  | 5.680  | .390* | -9.166* |
| E       | 5 81 | 29.741 | 32.778 | 6.899  | 5.000  | .181  | -3.525* |
| N       | 6 109| 30.450 | 33.394 | 8.287  | 5.090  | .634* | -4.795* |
| D       | 7 95 | 26.642 | 31.716 | 8.088  | 5.690  | .313* | -5.955* |
| I       | 8 62 | 22.935 | 31.565 | 7.983  | 6.540  | .564* | -9.847* |
| N       | 9 49 | 24.204 | 32.143 | 7.323  | 5.719  | .491* | -8.267* |
| D       | 10 49| 25.959 | 30.347 | 7.530  | 6.566  | .623* | -4.969* |

* Equal to or greater than the state mean
* Significant at the .05 level
Parent Estimates to Performance - School System (See Table VII)

The next set of comparisons involved the estimates which parents made concerning the performance of their children. The mean for parent estimates of fourth graders was significantly (.05) higher for three of the four OST means. Academic Ability was the exception. The t-tests based on the data for boys followed this pattern. As for the girls, no significant differences were found between the mean for parent estimate and the mean for actual performance on the ability or achievement tests. These findings indicate that the parents of fourth grade girls were somewhat more accurate in estimating level of performance than the parents of fourth grade boys.

At the sixth grade level, the results were somewhat different. Parents rated their children significantly (.05) higher on all tests. Significant differences (.05) were also found when the data were divided according to sex.

The degree of relationship in the fourth grade between performance and parent estimates was as follows: Academic Ability, \( r = -.176 \); Reading, \( r = -.189 \); English, \( r = -.167 \); and Mathematics, \( r = -.163 \). Only the \(-.189\) was found to be significant (.05). The \( r \)'s for girls were also negative and ranged from \(-.324\) to \(-.021\), the \(-.324\) being significant (.05). The results obtained for boys were different. These \( r \)'s varied between .192 and .275; two of these \( r \)'s were significant (.05).
### TABLE VII

**t**-values and Correlation Coefficients - Test to Parent Estimates - School System

#### Grade 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
<th>(\bar{Y})</th>
<th>(S_x)</th>
<th>(S_y)</th>
<th>(r_{xy})</th>
<th>(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Boys 63</td>
<td>64.048</td>
<td>69.413</td>
<td>18.819</td>
<td>12.029</td>
<td>.204*</td>
<td>-1.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls 51</td>
<td>70.588</td>
<td>70.784</td>
<td>13.144</td>
<td>10.893</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both 114</td>
<td>66.974</td>
<td>69.474</td>
<td>16.776</td>
<td>11.545</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-1.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Boys 63</td>
<td>35.587</td>
<td>40.302</td>
<td>14.928</td>
<td>11.167</td>
<td>.275*</td>
<td>-2.339*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls 51</td>
<td>42.784</td>
<td>45.706</td>
<td>11.288</td>
<td>7.414</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>-1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both 114</td>
<td>38.807</td>
<td>42.719</td>
<td>13.841</td>
<td>10.001</td>
<td>-.189*</td>
<td>-2.253*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Boys 63</td>
<td>42.254</td>
<td>46.841</td>
<td>13.457</td>
<td>8.925</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>-2.543*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls 51</td>
<td>49.843</td>
<td>51.137</td>
<td>10.441</td>
<td>6.991</td>
<td>-.324*</td>
<td>-0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both 114</td>
<td>45.649</td>
<td>48.763</td>
<td>12.726</td>
<td>8.363</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>-2.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Boys 63</td>
<td>28.619</td>
<td>33.143</td>
<td>11.846</td>
<td>8.942</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>-2.679*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls 51</td>
<td>30.961</td>
<td>34.137</td>
<td>9.276</td>
<td>6.122</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>-1.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both 114</td>
<td>29.667</td>
<td>33.588</td>
<td>10.791</td>
<td>7.791</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>-2.927*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Grade 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
<th>(\bar{Y})</th>
<th>(S_x)</th>
<th>(S_y)</th>
<th>(r_{xy})</th>
<th>(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Boys 44</td>
<td>66.205</td>
<td>71.932</td>
<td>16.179</td>
<td>9.355</td>
<td>.741*</td>
<td>-3.400*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls 38</td>
<td>63.947</td>
<td>74.316</td>
<td>13.299</td>
<td>7.933</td>
<td>.642*</td>
<td>-6.255*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both 82</td>
<td>65.159</td>
<td>72.988</td>
<td>14.867</td>
<td>8.750</td>
<td>.719*</td>
<td>-6.744*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Boys 44</td>
<td>38.091</td>
<td>40.818</td>
<td>11.379</td>
<td>9.156</td>
<td>.767*</td>
<td>-2.474*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls 38</td>
<td>38.842</td>
<td>43.737</td>
<td>10.694</td>
<td>6.757</td>
<td>.712*</td>
<td>-3.992*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both 82</td>
<td>38.439</td>
<td>42.171</td>
<td>11.005</td>
<td>8.216</td>
<td>.778*</td>
<td>-4.880*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Boys 44</td>
<td>51.205</td>
<td>56.909</td>
<td>12.538</td>
<td>8.274</td>
<td>.714*</td>
<td>-4.289*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls 38</td>
<td>55.263</td>
<td>59.921</td>
<td>11.603</td>
<td>7.235</td>
<td>.540*</td>
<td>-2.927*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both 82</td>
<td>53.085</td>
<td>58.305</td>
<td>12.210</td>
<td>7.908</td>
<td>.693*</td>
<td>-5.358*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Boys 44</td>
<td>28.477</td>
<td>32.455</td>
<td>8.901</td>
<td>7.096</td>
<td>.688*</td>
<td>-4.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls 38</td>
<td>27.500</td>
<td>34.053</td>
<td>8.023</td>
<td>6.303</td>
<td>.516*</td>
<td>-5.605*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both 82</td>
<td>28.024</td>
<td>33.317</td>
<td>8.468</td>
<td>6.575</td>
<td>.647*</td>
<td>-7.317*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
For sixth graders, the relationships between parent estimate and actual performance were markedly different from the results found in the fourth grade. The correlation for Academic Ability was $r = .719$; for Reading, $r = .778$; for English, $r = .693$; and for Mathematics, $r = .647$. When boys and girls were separated, the correlations for boys on the four tests ranged from .688 to .767, and the girls coefficients ranged from .516 to .712. All of the $r$'s for the sixth grade were significant at the .05 level.

**Parent Estimate to Performance - By School (See Table VIII)**

As for the relationship between parent estimates and performance in the several schools, the findings at the fourth grade were varied. School "five" had $r$'s for the tests ranging from -.181 to -.033. In contrast, school "seven" had $r$'s ranging from .407 to .601. The $r$'s for school "seven" were all significant (.05). Parents in the schools studied did not rate their children significantly higher than their actual performance. In most cases, however, the estimate means were somewhat higher.

At the sixth grade level, the results seemed consistent with the values obtained on a system-wide basis. Only one t-value was not significant at this level. The parents generally rated their children significantly (.05) higher than actual performance.
## TABLE VIII

**t-Values and Correlation Coefficients - Test to Parent Estimate - By School**

**GRADE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Sx</th>
<th>Sy</th>
<th>r&lt;sub&gt;xy&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71.917</td>
<td>72.306</td>
<td>15.979</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72.133</td>
<td>68.967</td>
<td>14.795</td>
<td>11.598</td>
<td>.537*</td>
<td>1.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.167</td>
<td>43.806</td>
<td>12.214</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>-0.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40.667</td>
<td>42.167</td>
<td>13.368</td>
<td>8.883</td>
<td>.607*</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48.278</td>
<td>50.028</td>
<td>10.430</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49.033</td>
<td>48.867</td>
<td>13.543</td>
<td>8.169</td>
<td>.601*</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.083</td>
<td>33.917</td>
<td>9.658</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.967</td>
<td>33.100</td>
<td>10.321</td>
<td>7.097</td>
<td>.592*</td>
<td>-0.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Sx</th>
<th>Sy</th>
<th>r&lt;sub&gt;xy&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>69.636</td>
<td>74.727</td>
<td>13.124</td>
<td>.781*</td>
<td>-2.818*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64.800</td>
<td>71.433</td>
<td>13.637</td>
<td>8.067</td>
<td>.834*</td>
<td>-4.421*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.864</td>
<td>45.864</td>
<td>7.536</td>
<td>.566*</td>
<td>-1.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.233</td>
<td>40.167</td>
<td>10.102</td>
<td>7.240</td>
<td>.827*</td>
<td>-2.778*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.864</td>
<td>60.591</td>
<td>10.611</td>
<td>.498*</td>
<td>-2.401*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51.200</td>
<td>56.233</td>
<td>13.187</td>
<td>8.016</td>
<td>.810*</td>
<td>-3.368*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.182</td>
<td>34.364</td>
<td>6.638</td>
<td>.636*</td>
<td>-3.697*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.033</td>
<td>32.567</td>
<td>8.919</td>
<td>7.006</td>
<td>.657*</td>
<td>-3.643*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
The relationships between estimate and score for the two schools were as follows: school "five" r's ranged from .498 to .781; and school "seven" r's ranged from .657 to .834. All the r's for the sixth grade were significant (.05).

Parent Estimate to Student Estimate - School System (See Table IX)

The last major comparison was between the estimates of parents and the estimates of students. At the fourth grade level, there was no significant (.05) difference between the estimate of parents and the estimates of their daughters. Therefore, these parents and their children rated performance at similar levels. The boys and their parents did differ significantly (.05) in Reading, English, and Mathematics. When the data for the sexes were combined, significant (.05) differences were found in Reading, English, and Mathematics.

The amount of relationship between parents and fourth graders estimates varied. With the data combined, the r's for Academic Ability, Reading, English, and Mathematics were .188, .365, .076, and .105, respectively. Only the .365 was significant (.05). For the girls and their parents, the r's ranged from .224 to .470. Two of the four values were significant (.05). They were .470 for Reading and .299 for Mathematics. As for the boys, there were no significant (.05) relationships between their estimates and those of their parents. The r's ranged from -.081 to .228.
### TABLE IX

**t-Values and Correlation Coefficients - Parent Estimate to Student Estimates - School System**

**GRADE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Sx</th>
<th>Sy</th>
<th>rxy</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic (A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67.983</td>
<td>69.517</td>
<td>11.827</td>
<td>11.220</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-0.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71.167</td>
<td>71.521</td>
<td>10.610</td>
<td>9.689</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>69.398</td>
<td>70.407</td>
<td>11.362</td>
<td>10.566</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading (R)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40.000</td>
<td>43.800</td>
<td>11.096</td>
<td>8.839</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-2.085*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46.021</td>
<td>45.979</td>
<td>6.988</td>
<td>8.599</td>
<td>.470*</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>42.676</td>
<td>44.769</td>
<td>9.918</td>
<td>8.760</td>
<td>.365*</td>
<td>-2.058*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English (E)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46.500</td>
<td>50.467</td>
<td>8.806</td>
<td>7.034</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>-3.092*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51.292</td>
<td>52.104</td>
<td>6.540</td>
<td>7.727</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>-0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48.630</td>
<td>51.194</td>
<td>8.345</td>
<td>7.360</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-2.491*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Math (M)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32.917</td>
<td>36.617</td>
<td>8.947</td>
<td>6.413</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>-2.750*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34.146</td>
<td>34.938</td>
<td>6.137</td>
<td>5.471</td>
<td>.299*</td>
<td>-0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>33.463</td>
<td>35.870</td>
<td>7.814</td>
<td>6.044</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-2.672*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Sx</th>
<th>Sy</th>
<th>rxy</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic (A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71.310</td>
<td>72.667</td>
<td>9.126</td>
<td>6.491</td>
<td>.419*</td>
<td>-1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74.444</td>
<td>71.917</td>
<td>7.777</td>
<td>8.188</td>
<td>.425*</td>
<td>1.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72.756</td>
<td>72.321</td>
<td>8.621</td>
<td>7.284</td>
<td>.397*</td>
<td>0.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading (R)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40.357</td>
<td>42.000</td>
<td>9.084</td>
<td>5.392</td>
<td>.561*</td>
<td>-1.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43.889</td>
<td>43.139</td>
<td>6.395</td>
<td>6.034</td>
<td>.479*</td>
<td>0.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41.987</td>
<td>42.526</td>
<td>8.104</td>
<td>5.688</td>
<td>.522*</td>
<td>-0.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English (E)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56.452</td>
<td>60.333</td>
<td>8.184</td>
<td>5.295</td>
<td>.572*</td>
<td>-3.732*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60.056</td>
<td>58.806</td>
<td>6.887</td>
<td>7.103</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>58.115</td>
<td>59.628</td>
<td>7.778</td>
<td>6.200</td>
<td>.335*</td>
<td>-1.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Math (M)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32.333</td>
<td>34.214</td>
<td>6.716</td>
<td>4.842</td>
<td>.437*</td>
<td>-1.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.278</td>
<td>32.444</td>
<td>6.111</td>
<td>4.626</td>
<td>.335*</td>
<td>1.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33.231</td>
<td>33.397</td>
<td>6.477</td>
<td>4.795</td>
<td>.355*</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
At the sixth grade level, there was only one significant difference between parent and student estimates. That one was between the boys and their parents on the English test.

The measures of relationship at the sixth grade level appear markedly different from those found at the fourth grade level. At the fourth grade level, three of twelve correlation coefficients were significant (.05), but at the sixth grade level, eleven of twelve relationships were significant. When the sixth grade data for the sexes were combined, the r's ranged from .355 to .552. These were all significant (.05). For the boys, relationships varied between .419 and .572. These were also significant (.05). The correlation coefficients between the estimates of girls and their parents ranged from .194 to .479. The hypothesis of no relationship (.05) could not be rejected for .194, but it could be for the other values. This evidence indicates that there was more relationship between boys and their parents than the girls and their parents.

Parent Estimate to Student Estimate - By School (See Table X)

In the by school comparisons, none of the t-values at the fourth grade level were significant, and only one value was significant at the sixth grade level. As far as relationships were concerned, there were no significant relationships at the fourth grade.
### TABLE X

**t-Values and Correlation Coefficients – Parent Estimate to Student Estimate – By School**

#### GRADE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>$\bar{Y}$</th>
<th>$S_X$</th>
<th>$S_Y$</th>
<th>$r_{XY}$</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.C.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>71.618</td>
<td>73.118</td>
<td>13.057</td>
<td>8.090</td>
<td>-0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69.036</td>
<td>69.071</td>
<td>10.973</td>
<td>8.848</td>
<td>-0.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.D.G.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43.235</td>
<td>46.735</td>
<td>11.468</td>
<td>8.058</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.321</td>
<td>43.286</td>
<td>8.358</td>
<td>9.233</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.N.G.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49.559</td>
<td>52.941</td>
<td>9.842</td>
<td>8.297</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48.607</td>
<td>51.214</td>
<td>7.997</td>
<td>6.350</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.T.H.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.412</td>
<td>36.971</td>
<td>8.951</td>
<td>6.250</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.786</td>
<td>33.714</td>
<td>7.094</td>
<td>5.098</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GRADE 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sch. No.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>$\bar{Y}$</th>
<th>$S_X$</th>
<th>$S_Y$</th>
<th>$r_{XY}$</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.C.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73.474</td>
<td>73.053</td>
<td>7.784</td>
<td>6.753</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71.759</td>
<td>71.448</td>
<td>8.007</td>
<td>7.665</td>
<td>.641*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.D.G.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.053</td>
<td>44.105</td>
<td>5.452</td>
<td>5.269</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.517</td>
<td>41.483</td>
<td>7.104</td>
<td>5.698</td>
<td>.668*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.N.G.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.526</td>
<td>59.789</td>
<td>5.806</td>
<td>7.821</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56.586</td>
<td>58.897</td>
<td>7.917</td>
<td>6.366</td>
<td>.744*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.T.H.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.579</td>
<td>33.105</td>
<td>5.470</td>
<td>4.988</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.931</td>
<td>33.138</td>
<td>6.834</td>
<td>5.370</td>
<td>.510*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
At sixth grade level, one school had r's for the four tests ranging from .510 to .744. All these were significant (.05). The other school had r's ranging from -.161 to .077. None of these were significant (.05).

Other Findings - In addition to the consideration of relationships and differences between means, a study of data revealed that there was a difference between the variability of how a student actually scored and the variability of perceptions of performance. Whether students or parents estimated test performance, they did so with less variability than the actual test scores had contained. Estimates seemed to be more tightly grouped than scores.

In order to test whether or not the differences between the variances occurred by chance, t-tests for the differences between related variances were computed. For reasons of convenience, t-tests were computed with the data for the sexes combined, although it might be mentioned that the variances obtained with sexes separate followed the same pattern as the variances with sexes combined.

At the fourth grade level, there was significantly (.05) more variability in test scores than in the students' estimates of their performance. This was true for all tests. Significant t-values were also found for all the sixth grade tests (See Table XI).
TABLE XI

Differences between the variances of estimates and test scores *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TESTS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STUDENT'S ESTIMATES - TEST SCORES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>109.495</td>
<td>335.916</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>15.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>88.849</td>
<td>210.743</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>11.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>70.694</td>
<td>191.989</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>13.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>55.473</td>
<td>109.056</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>8.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIXTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>64.593</td>
<td>224.670</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>16.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>42.042</td>
<td>116.856</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>13.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>58.630</td>
<td>179.292</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>14.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>33.432</td>
<td>66.635</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>9.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARENT'S ESTIMATES - TEST SCORES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOURTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>133.287</td>
<td>281.434</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>4.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.020</td>
<td>191.573</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>3.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>69.940</td>
<td>161.951</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>4.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>60.700</td>
<td>116.446</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>3.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIXTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76.563</td>
<td>221.028</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>7.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>67.502</td>
<td>121.110</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>4.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>62.536</td>
<td>149.084</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>5.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43.231</td>
<td>71.707</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>3.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All differences significant (Alpha level .05)
Another question which arose when the data was being studied was, did the sixth graders rank themselves more accurately than fourth graders? Specifically, were the correlations between estimates and performances higher for sixth graders? Once again, for convenience, the data for the sexes were combined. The $r$'s were transformed into Fisher's $Z$'s and a critical ratio was computed between the $r$'s of fourth and sixth graders. No significant (.05) differences were found between the $r$'s for any of the four tests (See Table XII).

The same type analysis was performed between the $r$'s for the parents of fourth and sixth grade students. The findings here were different than those obtained for the students. The relationships between estimates and performance were significantly (.05) higher for the parents of sixth graders than for the parents of fourth graders. This was true for the four tests: Academic Ability, Reading, English, and Mathematics (See Table XII).

Critical ratios were computed to see if the parents and children were more in agreement at the sixth grade level than parents and children at the fourth grade level. There was no significant (.05) difference found between the $r$'s for parents and children at the two grade levels. Although the relationships between parents' and children's estimates were higher for sixth graders on all four tests, the differences were not great enough
TABLE XII

Differences Between r's at the Fourth and Sixth Grade Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARE</th>
<th>TESTS</th>
<th>FOURTH TO SIXTH</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests to Student</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests to Parent</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent to Student</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
to reject the hypothesis that these discrepancies occurred by chance (See Table XII).

The last comparisons made concerned the differences between correlation coefficients for boys and girls. Did the boys and the girls differ as to the degree of relationship between their estimates and performance? For fourth graders, no significant (.05) differences were found for any of the tests. At the sixth grade level, no significant (.05) differences were found between the r's for boys and girls on any of the tests. (See Table XIII).

When comparisons were made between the parents of boys and the parents of girls to see if the parents of either sex had a higher relationship between an estimate of their child's performance and the actual performance, the following results were obtained. The parents of fourth grade boys showed significantly (.05) more agreement between estimate and performance on the English and Mathematics test. On the Academic Ability and Reading tests, however, the parents of boys and girls did not differ significantly (.05). At the sixth grade level, no significant (.05) differences were found for any of the tests (See Table XIII).

Concerning the relationship between estimates, a by-sex comparison was made to see if there was a significantly (.05) higher relationship between the boys and their parents than between the girls and their parents. At the fourth and sixth grade level,
### TABLE XIII

Differences Between r's for Boys and Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARISON</th>
<th>TESTS</th>
<th>BOYS TO GIRLS</th>
<th>DIFF</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test to</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>344 .11</td>
<td>323 .21</td>
<td>-1.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>344 .22</td>
<td>323 .22</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>344 .17</td>
<td>323 .12</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>344 .05</td>
<td>323 .08</td>
<td>- .390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>313 .20</td>
<td>312 .24</td>
<td>- .500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>313 .35</td>
<td>312 .35</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>313 .17</td>
<td>312 .21</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>313 .32</td>
<td>312 .34</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test to</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>63  .20</td>
<td>51  -.02</td>
<td>1.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>63  .28</td>
<td>51  -.21</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>63  .23</td>
<td>51  -.32</td>
<td>2.871*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>63  .19</td>
<td>51  -.20</td>
<td>2.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>44  .74</td>
<td>38  .64</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>44  .77</td>
<td>38  .71</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>44  .71</td>
<td>38  .54</td>
<td>1.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>44  .69</td>
<td>38  .52</td>
<td>1.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT to</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>60  -.08</td>
<td>48  .24</td>
<td>-1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOUDENT</td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>60  .01</td>
<td>48  .47</td>
<td>-2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>60  .29</td>
<td>48  .22</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>60  .11</td>
<td>48  .30</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to</td>
<td>Acad.</td>
<td>42  .42</td>
<td>36  .43</td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Rdg.</td>
<td>42  .56</td>
<td>36  .48</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>42  .57</td>
<td>36  .19</td>
<td>1.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>42  .44</td>
<td>36  .34</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
no significant differences were found between the sexes concerning agreement between parents and children. (See Table XIII).

In this last section, the analysis was limited. Often the data was not analyzed by sexes or by school when these kinds of comparison actually would have been possible. Two factors account for this, one theoretical and the other practical. Sometimes comparing sexes or schools would have resulted in small N's. It was felt that inferences from such small groups would not be too valuable. Moreover, time demands and pressures of other duties did not permit an exhaustive analysis for all data.

CONCLUSIONS

One prupose of statistics is to enable a researcher to make inferences. A small group, or sample, is studied; and on the basis of what is found, inferences are made concerning a larger group or population. The sample is intended to be representative of the population. In this study, samples of students and parents were drawn from the South-Western City School District.

As far as the students are concerned, it seems reasonable to say that the sample was representative of all fourth and sixth graders in the school system. The conclusions drawn in this section should apply to this school system. In addition, it is possible that South-Western is representative of other school systems. For this reason, what follows might be applicable to other districts.
In this study, it can be safely said that the South-Western students rated themselves higher than they actually performed. This was true of both fourth and sixth graders and for both sexes at these levels. Overrating was found in all the schools studied, even when a particular school scored at or above the state norms. In only one case at the fourth and one at the sixth grade (out of 72 comparisons) did the differences fail to be significant. It must be concluded, therefore, that children such as those studied tend to overestimate their performance.

In addition to this, the students had difficulty ranking themselves accurately. For fourth graders, the relationships were low and in some cases one could not clearly say a relationship even existed. The results for sixth graders also followed this pattern.

Even when the fourth graders were comparing themselves within their own schools, there was usually not much agreement between estimate and performance. The sixth graders had varying amounts of success ranking themselves within their own schools. In some cases, there was a substantial degree of relationship between estimates and performance and in others there was none. It appears, therefore, that students had problems ranking themselves, especially in a group as large as a school system. The fourth
graders also had difficulty ranking themselves within their schools. In the ability to rank themselves in the school system, no significant differences were found between the sexes or between the fourth and sixth grades.

The parents of fourth grade boys tended to rate their children higher than their actual performance. This occurred on three of four tests. This did not appear to be the case when parents rated their fourth grade daughters. Here the discrepancy between estimate and performance was not too great. When the data was combined across sexes, differences were found in three of four tests. These appear to have been obtained because of the rather substantial difference between the estimates of parents and their boys' performance.

On the whole, relationships between fourth graders' performance and their parents estimates were low, often negative. In many cases, the parents must have had little or no idea of their child's rank among his classmates in the district.

Parents of sixth graders overrated their children's performance. This was also true when the sexes were studied separately. The relationships between estimate and performance was markedly higher at this grade level. Parents did quite well ranking their children.
For the school system, in general, parents tended to overrate their children. Parents did a rather poor job of ranking their children in the fourth grade. This was in contrast to the very respectable job done by sixth grade parents. It must be remembered, however, that the children and parents in this portion of the study were not typical of the system. Care must be taken when generalizing these conclusions to other groups.

When the data was analyzed by schools, the sixth grade findings supported the above conclusions. The findings at fourth grade as far as relationships were concerned, were unexplainably inconsistent.

Generally, fourth grade boys rated themselves higher than their parents did. This trend was also found in English at the sixth grade level.

Agreement between parents and children as far as rankings were concerned appeared to be greater at the sixth grade level. Little agreement between parents and children was found at the fourth grade level.

When the data was analyzed by school, the findings were uncertain at best. They seemed to support the thesis that the differences between parents' and children's estimates were not too great. In one school, it seemed that agreement in ranking increased from fourth to sixth grade.
As far as the original purposes of this study are concerned, this research demonstrated the following: (1) Students have trouble estimating the level of their performance and their rank among their classmates, (2) Many parents experience similar difficulties when estimating their child's performance, although ranking ability increased between fourth and sixth grade. (3) In general, parents and students estimated performance at a somewhat similar level, especially sixth graders and their parents and, although the differences in correlations were not significant, agreement in ranking seemed to increase from fourth to sixth grade.

In addition to these findings which related to the original purposes of study, the general observation was made that estimates are not nearly as variable as actual performance. Estimates of parents and children clustered in a much smaller range than the abilities of the children.

There are probably a great many explanations for the discrepancies between estimates and performance, but only one will be considered here.

It seems likely that there is a breakdown in communication between the people that have information about children and the parents and the children themselves. Further, it seems likely that group and individual guidance aimed at closing the gap between estimates and performance might be indicated. If a program could
be implemented which would give parents and children the best information available, then estimates might be more accurate. It is felt that there are many implications here for self concept and decision making; however, these will not be discussed at this time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering the findings of this study, the following recommendations are offered: (1) This study might be repeated using district instead of state norms, (2) The study might be repeated using a more adequate parent sample, (3) A study might be carried out which would determine if group and individual guidance can cause estimates of performance to become more accurate.
WHAT YOUR OHIO SURVEY TEST SCORES MEAN

**Academic Ability** - On this test you worked with numbers and words. Your score shows your ability to learn school work and what you, your parents, and teachers might expect of you.

**Reading Achievement** - Your reading score shows you how well you know what words mean and how well you can read and understand sentences and paragraphs.

**English Expression Achievement** - Your score shows how well you can tell words that are correctly spelled; how well you can tell when words are correctly used in sentences; and how well you can tell if capital letters, periods, commas and other punctuation marks are used correctly.

**Mathematics Achievement** - Your mathematics score shows you how well you are able to find the answers to new problems. These problems were like some that you have done in arithmetic.

How did you do on the tests?

In a few minutes, your test scores will be given to you. You will have a score for each test you took. The scores will be numbers between 0 and 100.

These numbers tell you how well you did on the tests you have taken. You may not know what the numbers mean. Read further, you will find out.
OHIO PERCENTILES

Suppose you could learn if you were among the highest, the lowest, or near the middle of all the girls and boys who took the test, wouldn't this give you some idea of how you compare to others in your grade? Many thousands of boys and girls from Ohio took the test. It is not easy to talk about such large numbers. It would be easier if you could just think of how well you did in a group of 100 boys and girls.

Think how these one hundred boys and girls might have done on the test. A few would have high scores, a few would have low scores, and there would be many with in between scores—just like the thousands of boys and girls who took the test (including you). Remember these 100 boys and girls.

To help you learn more about percentiles, here are some "pretend" scores. Let's say they are for a boy named John Smith. Look at the sample.

SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>John Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Ability</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%TILES</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now look at the row of numbers on the sample. The numbers after OHIO %TILE tell you how well you did on the test. OHIO %TILE means OHIO PERCENTILE. Say out loud (Ohio per-cent-tile). You need to know what an OHIO PERCENTILE is because this number tells you how well you did in a group of one hundred boys and girls like you read about above.

Find the Ohio Percentile under "READING" on the sample. Write the score here. This number means that John Smith was higher on the test than 61 boys and girls in a group of one hundred students in his grade.
Think of one hundred boys and girls standing in line on a hill. Pretend that the person highest up the hill would also be highest on the test. The lowest person on the hill would be lowest on the test.

Since John Smith had 61, show where he would be, then draw a line at John's place on the hill. This shows that out of one hundred boys and girls in John's grade, he is higher than 61 of them.

Your OHIO PERCENTILE will tell you where you are in a group of one hundred boys and girls in your grade. You have an OHIO PERCENTILE for each of the different tests you have taken.

Before you receive your scores, you are going to have to write down how you think you did on the test. You will be given a profile like the one on which you will place your real scores. This profile will have four lines of men. Each line will be like the sample you worked with above. There will be a line for Academic Ability - total, Reading, Expression, and Mathematics. Look at the instructions for filling out "How Do You Think You Did on the Test".
HOW DO YOU THINK YOU DID ON THE TEST

1. What do you think your score is for Academic Ability? How many boys and girls do you think are below you? Go up the hill marked Academic until you pass the number of people that you think had scores below yours. Draw a man at that place so you can tell where you think you are in Academic Ability.

2. What do you think your score is for Reading? Go up the hill for Reading until you pass the number of people you think had scores below yours. Draw a man.

3. Do the same for English Expression and Mathematics.
You can see that you have OHIO PERCENTILES for Academic Ability, Reading, English Expression and Mathematics. Below are lines and men like the one used in the sample before. There is a line for Academic Ability, Reading, English Expression and Mathematics.

1. Look at your Ohio Percentile for Academic Ability. How many boys and girls are below you. Go up the hill marked Academic until you pass the number of people your Ohio Percentile tells you to pass. Draw a man at that place.

2. Look at your Ohio Percentile for Reading. Go up the hill for Reading until you pass the number of people your Ohio Percentile tells you to pass. Draw a man.

3. Do the same for English Expression and Mathematics.

On the "hill" the grey area in the middle represents the average or what about half the children would be expected to do. The area to the right of this is above average and the area to the left of the grey is below average scores.

Write in the word that tells about your Ohio Percentile. (Average, Above Average, Below Average)

ACADEMIC ABILITY

READING SCORE
TEST EVALUATION: SIXTH GRADE OHIO SURVEY
TEST AND CALIFORNIA TEST OF MENTAL MATURITY
TEST EVALUATION: SIXTH GRADE OHIO SURVEY TEST AND CALIFORNIA TEST OF MENTAL MATURITY

INTRODUCTION

As part of the testing program at South-Western, the Ohio Survey Tests (OST) were administered in late September to fourth and sixth graders. Approximately four weeks after the completion of this testing, the California Test of Mental Maturity (CTMM) was administered to sixth grade classes. One of the Ohio Survey Tests was the Academic Ability Test, designed to measure a student's ability to learn school work. The CTMM, a scholastic aptitude test, was designed to give information about a student's potentialities. It seems that a school would be primarily interested in a student's potential to learn its curriculum. For this reason, it seemed that the school would make approximately the same use of the OST and CTMM. This raised the question, "Why were both tests given in a four week period?" Would one of the tests give enough information about students?

PURPOSE

The main purpose of this study was to evaluate the CTMM and the OST Academic Ability test in terms of their relationship to each other and their respective relationships to semester grades. In addition, the Reading, English, and Mathematics tests of the OST were compared to the CTMM, OST Academic Ability Test and grades.
SUBJECTS

The subjects for this study were 43 boys and 59 girls in the sixth grade at a selected elementary school in the South-Western District. This school was considered in William Zeitler's unpublished doctoral dissertation to be typical of the South-Western District.¹

MATERIALS

1. The California Short Form Test of Mental Maturity, Elementary 1957: California Test Bureau
2. The Ohio Survey Tests, 1966: Division of Guidance and Testing, State of Ohio, Department of Education

DATA COLLECTION

A three by five card was coded for each student. On this card, information for fifteen variables was recorded. These variables are described more fully in Tables I, II, III.

DATA ANALYSIS

The above information was sent to Ohio University where, under the direction of Dr. Charles Harrington, it was analyzed on the IBM/360 computer. The data were analyzed by means of a product-moment correlation analysis. The data were analyzed with the sexes separate and for the total sample.

When the data were returned to South-Western, the correlations were tested for significance. Also, some of the data were studied for sex differences using a test for differences between independent correlations.

No attempt was made to test the significance between correlations in a given table. The t-test for the difference between related correlations coefficients requires lengthy computations and the number of possible comparisons would have been prohibitive.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

In evaluating tests, one is always concerned with reliability. A Kuder-Richardson (Formula 21) estimate of reliability was computed for each test. The reliability coefficient for the CTMM, \( N = 102 \), was .83. For the OST, Academic Ability Test - Total, the \( r \) for the same group was .88. These data suggested that the reliability of the OST Academic Ability Test was probably higher than the CTMM.

Concerning the degree of relationship between these tests, Table I shows the correlation between CTMM total raw score and OST Academic Ability total raw score as .775. Since these were both scholastic aptitude tests, a correction for attenuation was used to obtain a more accurate measure of their relationship. After correction, the \( r \) between the two tests was .91. This would
TABLE I  
(N = 102)  
Intercorrelations Between Fifteen Variables 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at .05 level 

1. California Test of Mental Maturity - Total (raw score)  
2. California Test of Mental Maturity - Non Language (raw score)  
3. California Test of Mental Maturity - Language (raw score)  
4. California Test of Mental Maturity - Intelligence Quotient  
5. Ohio Survey Test - Academic Ability - Verbal (raw score)  
6. Ohio Survey Test - Academic Ability - Mathematics (raw score)  
7. Ohio Survey Test - Academic Ability - Total (raw score)  
8. Ohio Survey Test - Reading (raw score)  
9. Ohio Survey Test - English (raw score)  
10. Ohio Survey Test - Mathematics (raw score)  
11. Grades - Reading (1st semester)  
12. Grades - English (1st semester)  
13. Grades - Mathematics (1st semester)  
14. Grades - Science (1st semester)  
15. Grades - Total (1st semester)
seem to confirm the fact that these two tests did measure similar potentialities.

The total scores of both tests demonstrated a substantial degree of relationship to semester grades. In general, it appeared that the OST Academic Ability Test had a slightly higher correlation with grades (See Table I).

No attempt was made to interpret the 315 intercorrelations which are found in the three tables. Many interesting comparisons can be made with these figures, and the reader is invited to study them in regard to his specific interests.

One comparison which was made concerned the sex differences on the OST Academic Ability - Mathematics variable. This test was compared with fourteen other variables. The girls had significantly (.05) higher correlation coefficients for these than the boys did (See Tables II, III, and IV).

Concerning the original purpose of the study, the following conclusions were drawn: (1) The OST Academic Ability Test was as reliable or more reliable than the CTMM, (2) Both tests measured similar factors, (3) The predictive efficiency of the OST Academic Ability Test was good or better than that for the CTMM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.300*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.139*</td>
<td>0.088*</td>
<td>0.233**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.187*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.236*</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>0.128*</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.230*</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.101*</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.174*</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.037*</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.069*</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.051*</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.291*</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.092*</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>0.240*</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.146*</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.098*</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.222*</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.106*</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.155*</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not Significant at .05 level
** Intercorrelation significantly different (.05) for boys and girls

1. California Test of Mental Maturity - Total (raw score)
2. California Test of Mental Maturity - Non Language (raw score)
3. California Test of Mental Maturity - Language (raw score)
4. California Test of Mental Maturity - Intelligence Quotient
5. Ohio Survey Test - Academic Ability - Verbal (raw score)
6. Ohio Survey Test - Academic Ability - Mathematics (raw score)
7. Ohio Survey Test - Academic Ability - Total (raw score)
8. Ohio Survey Test - Reading (raw score)
9. Ohio Survey Test - English (raw Score)
10. Ohio Survey Test - Mathematics (raw score)
11. Grades - Reading (1st semester)
12. Grades - English (1st semester)
13. Grades - Mathematics (1st semester)
14. Grades - Science (1st semester)
15. Grades - Total (1st semester)
**TABLE III**
*(N = 59)*

Intercorrelations Between Fifteen Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.644*</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.658*</td>
<td>.662*</td>
<td>.657*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.879*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.271*</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.613*</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.552*</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.768*</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.243*</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.566*</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.587*</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.232*</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.646*</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.648*</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *Not significant at the .05 level

- Intercorrelations significantly different (.05) for boys and girls

1. California Test of Mental Maturity - Total (raw Score)
2. California Test of Mental Maturity - Non Language (raw score)
3. California Test of Mental Maturity - Language (raw score)
4. California Test of Mental Maturity - Intelligence Quotient
5. Ohio Survey Test - Academic Ability - Verbal (raw score)
6. Ohio Survey Test - Academic Ability - Mathematics (raw Score)
7. Ohio Survey Test - Academic Ability - Total (raw score)
8. Ohio Survey Test - Reading (raw score)
9. Ohio Survey Test - English (raw score)
10. Ohio Survey Test - Mathematics (raw Score)
11. Grades - Reading (1st semester)
12. Grades - English (1st semester)
13. Grades - Mathematics (1st semester)
14. Grades - Science (1st semester)
15. Grades - Total (1st semester)
### TABLE IV

Differences Between Intercorrelations for Boys and Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARISON</th>
<th>N (boys)</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>N (girls)</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level

* See Table I, II, or III to identify comparisons
The other tests of the OST were also found to have a substantial relationship with semester grades. The predictive ability of these tests, along with the Academic Ability Test, seemed to be adequate for school purposes.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings of this study and a knowledge of the use to which test results are put, it is recommended that the administration of the CTMM, which closely follows the OST, should be discontinued.
SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

The evaluation section of this report is made up of three parts. First, a report on the activities of the resident counselors in the schools. The reader is referred to the following sections of the "Description of Methods Used to Evaluate the Project," part 2c for a summary of counselor contacts, part 2e for the end of year evaluation by teachers and principals, and part 2f, the activity logs prepared by the resident counselors. The second area refers to sections 2a, b, and d which concerns reports of the various studies completed by counselors. The reader should refer to the Table of Contents to locate these reports. Each report contains conclusions and recommendations relevant to the study. The third part, the evaluation prepared by the consultant staff follows below.
REPORT OF THE ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE PROJECT
SOUTH-WESTERN CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Submitted by J. Melvin Witmer, Assistant Professor
and Dean L. Hummel, Chairman
Department of Guidance, Counseling, and Student Personnel
College of Education
Ohio University
June 23, 1967

INTRODUCTION

This report is an evaluative summary of the resident counselor project in the South-Western City Schools, one of several districts participating in elementary school guidance projects in the state of Ohio for the year 1966-67. Regularly scheduled visitations were held, both at the local South-Western schools and on the university campus by Ohio University staff of the Department of Guidance, Counseling, and Student Personnel with administrators, teachers, and pupil personnel specialists including the elementary school counselors of the schools in the district. This report is a statement of the results of the project, the conclusions that can be made about the activities of the year, and the recommendations made for consideration in planning future projects and continuing the development of an elementary school guidance program in the South-Western City Schools.

Consultation was given and assistance provided by two resident school counselors from Ohio University in planning and carrying out their work as school counselors in the elementary schools, and in conducting several research projects. In presenting a report of this project the
cooperation and unqualified support of the staff at South-Western City Schools must be recognized as contributing to any success which the project has had. The statements made in this report are based upon interviews held with staff personnel in the school district during several visitations and the individual reports which have been presented in the previous sections of this final report of the resident counselor project. Two research projects which are near completion, but which have not been included in this report are: (1) Comparison of Test Performance Estimates and Actual Test Performances, and (2) Comparison of the California Test of Mental Maturity and the Ohio Survey Test for Sixth Graders in a Selected School.

RESULTS

1. In performing the counseling and consulting roles of the elementary guidance function, the two resident counselors made the following minimum number of contacts with pupils, parents, and staff: (a) 607 pupil contacts (521 individual sessions and 86 pupils in group sessions) (b) 583 teacher interviews, (c) 113 parent conferences, and (d) 140 referrals to pupil personnel specialists and outside agencies. Sixty per cent of the referrals were considered as having personal-social problems and forty per cent as having educational problems. With two exceptions, the number of referrals increased with each grade level. In addition to the above, seventy-one different groups received an interpretation of test scores.

2. The desirable features of the counseling service mentioned most often by the teachers in a questionnaire evaluation were counseling with pupils individually and in groups, communication with staff and parents, and interpretation of test results to pupils and parents.
3. Suggestions made by teachers and principals in the questionnaire evaluation for modifying or improving the present program included limiting the counselor's duties so that he would have more time to counsel with pupils, observing pupils in the classroom, more adequately communicating with teachers and parents, and doing follow-up work with pupils. Teachers and principals expressed the need for a full-time counselor for each building.

4. There was a large measure of agreement between teacher perception and counselor perception in a study of the functions of the elementary school counselor. Most of the functions included in the study were acceptable to teachers. There was some divergence of opinion in the areas of assisting teachers to prepare and present to classroom groups information concerning mental health, social relations, study habits, manners, and honesty, and concepts dealing with our working world.

5. A study was conducted with selected third grade pupils and teachers to evaluate several intelligence tests. Rank-order correlations were computed to determine the relationship between six intelligence tests and an achievement test, between the intelligence tests and teacher rank, and between the achievement test and teacher rank. Correlations between teacher ranks and tests ranged from .32 to .94. Between the intelligence tests and an achievement test the correlations ranged from .34 to .84. The correlations ranged from .74 to .88 between teacher ranks and the achievement tests. The intelligence tests considered most adequate for use in grade three include the Lorge-Thorndike Multi-Level, the California Test of Mental Maturity, Short Form, 1963, and the Otis Short or Long Form.

6. An evaluation was made of parent reaction to and understanding of achievement test scores from the Ohio Survey Test presented by the
counselors at a meeting of parents for interpretation of individual test scores. A content analysis indicated that parent estimates of their child’s achievement tended to be higher than the test scores. Parents were unable to account for differences between the test scores and their estimates, and in general felt their children had no work habits that would limit their test performance. Most parents felt their children had no serious educational problems, but those who did usually felt that the home, school, and student needed to work toward improvement.

7. A case study was conducted by one of the resident counselors to illustrate how an entire personnel team collaborated to identify problem areas and provide assistance to a pupil in personal, social, and school adjustment.

8. A group guidance project was conducted with a class of third graders who were individually oriented in their work and play activities rather than group oriented. Teacher observation of changes in classroom behavior indicated an increased willingness on the part of the class to help students who had been absent, new friendships developed among the pupils (mostly boys), and pupils showed greater ability to share ideas with the class. A social acceptance scale was used to determine whether there was any greater acceptance by the group for eight selected pupils. Five of the eight pupils made positive changes that were significant. In general there appeared to be an increase in sensitivity by the class members to the needs of others.

9. A pilot project was conducted in planning and presenting a social studies unit on the world of work in grades one, two, and three. General consensus of the teachers of the pilot project was very favorable. The teachers felt that the materials helped the children to understand
themselves as individuals and their place in society. Pupils became more aware of the role a family plays in society. The materials used as the core for the project were easily integrated with the school subjects, and in many cases seemed to motivate the children toward better achievement. Counselor consultation with the teachers was important throughout the planning and presenting stages of the unit.

10. An experimental study was conducted in order to assess changes in the occupational knowledge and understandings of primary children in grades one, two, and three. This study was also concerned with the extent to which attitudes and values might be influenced by this process. There were eleven experimental groups and the same number of control groups. The treatment was the use of a unit on the world of work in which pupils received vocational and economic instruction. A pre-test and a post-test were administered. There were significant differences between the experimental and control groups in favor of the experimental groups in grades two and three for occupational knowledge. No significant differences were found between the experimental and control groups in grade one. The inclusion of vocational and economic materials or units seemed to be a significant factor in the gain of occupational information by the experimental groups. It was apparent that primary children showed an interest, an eagerness, and a readiness for vocational and economic instruction and information.
CONCLUSIONS

1. A major factor which contributes to the effectiveness of the counselor is the extent to which he is able and willing to communicate with pupils, teachers, the administrative and pupil personnel staff, and the parents. The counselor is a key person in the communication network of the educational team which attempts to individualize and personalize the learning experiences for the child.

2. The elementary teachers of the South-Western City Schools seemed to have an adequate understanding of the role and functions of the elementary school counselors, at least as it had been defined since there was no wide divergence between the teachers' perception and the counselors' perception of the functions, although teacher opinions were more conservative than those of counselors.

3. Teachers were able to predict more accurately the rank of the pupils on an achievement test than they could predict the rank of the pupils on the several intelligence tests used in the study. There was a substantial to high relationship between teacher rankings and the different intelligence tests, and a high relationship between teacher rankings and the achievement test. The larger variation between teacher rankings and intelligence tests might have been due to such factors as different abilities being measured by the intelligence tests or in the ability of the different teachers to assess their pupils for intelligence.

4. Parents seemed to overestimate the achievement of their children as it was measured by a standardized achievement test.

5. A team approach to group guidance including the teacher and a counselor, appeared to help pupils in the class develop new friendships, work together more effectively on group tasks, and become more sensitive to the needs of others.
6. If the number of personal contacts are used to indicate the importance of the different guidance functions, then consulting with teachers and parents would be first, counseling with pupils second, and coordinating pupil referrals third.

7. Approximately the same percentage of pupils were considered as having personal-social problems as educational problems, although a slightly larger percentage were considered as having problems primarily of a personal-social nature.

8. Teachers considered counseling with pupils individually and in groups, communicating (consulting) with teachers and parents, and interpreting test results to pupils and parents as the more desirable features of the counseling service.

9. Teachers favored limiting the counselor's secondary duties so that he would be free to counsel with pupils, study child behavior, and confer with teachers and parents. Teachers and principals indicated the need for a full-time counselor in each building.

10. The teachers who planned and presented a social studies unit on the world of work in grades one, two, and three indicated that the project provided motivation which carried over to other aspects of learning, developed a better understanding of themselves and the role of the family in society, and increased their knowledge about how people earned a living. Teachers as well as parents, observed changes in pupil attitudes and values.

11. Children in the primary grades, except for grade one, showed a significant change in occupational knowledge gained as a result of vocational and economic instruction. This study supports the concept that vocational development is longitudinal as well as developmental in nature.
12. The results of the resident counselor project have shown that the professional growth of a school counselor is substantially enhanced through a resident counselor program.

13. The total staff of the district - instructional, curriculum, administrative, and pupil personnel - has responded to the stimulus of the resident counselor project through their support, cooperation, innovation of ideas, and addition of counseling services for next year.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Although the role of the elementary school counselor needs to be periodically reappraised, there is a need for further study of the effectiveness of the present activities in which the counselors are engaged.

2. Continued emphasis should be placed on close working relationships between the counselors and the other pupil personnel specialists. More frequent staff meetings might be one means of facilitating even better communication.

3. There needs to be a more concentrated effort toward helping parents gain a more realistic perception of the academic aptitude and achievement of their children and how they might compare with local groups as well as state or national groups. Group meetings for interpretation of test results to parents should be continued.

4. Further use of group guidance and group counseling should be made to improve such aspects of personal-social relations as social acceptance, cooperation, self-understanding, and sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others. Sociometric inventories and/or other appropriate instruments should be used to measure changes which occur as a result of the group experiences.

5. The use of vocational development materials should be continued and might be expanded to include more groups at the primary level with some consideration of extending the program into several classes at the intermediate level to conduct longitudinal studies of the vocational development of children. Continuous evaluation should be made of the vocational development of boys and girls as a result of the vocational and economic instruction. Further efforts should be made to evaluate changes in attitudes and values.
6. Resident counselors should continue to work with primary grade teachers to develop and conduct units of instruction in areas pertaining to the world of work and economics.

7. It is recommended that priority be given to such guidance functions as counseling with pupils individually and in groups, studying the behavior of children in the classroom, and improving communications with staff and parents. A full-time counselor is recommended for each building to implement the above functions to a greater extent.

8. Continued assistance to the resident counselors should be provided by the staff from the Department of Guidance, Counseling, and Student Personnel through such consulting services as evaluating ideas and plans, reviewing tapes of counseling sessions, and providing technical assistance in educational testing and research.

9. Continued study and experimentation should be carried out with such guidance activities as individual and group counseling, vocational and economic instruction, and interpretation of test scores to pupils and parents. Obviously not all of the recommendations of this report can be carried out, but it seems important that if research is going to be conducted, the quality of the research should be the major consideration rather than the quantity. There is a need at this stage in the development of elementary guidance to quantify some of the functions which have been identified as the counselor's role.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

1. School-university cooperation to enrich an on-going elementary guidance program through the use of resident counselors in a supervised experienced has been demonstrated.

2. Guidelines for an elementary guidance program can be established. In the present situation, an Elementary Guidance Handbook was used. However, specific role functions for the counselor must be flexible.

3. Time in a building and limiting the spectrum of counselor responsibilities are important considerations for increasing counselor effectiveness.

4. Enrichment of an ongoing program is contingent upon the try-out of new ideas which come with new personnel.

5. Research, both new and continuing, has been demonstrated to be a vital part of an elementary guidance program.

6. An organized elementary guidance program becomes an important factor to increase teacher involvement in guidance activities.

Recommendations

1. Resident counselor project be continued.

2. An effort should be made to increase the time a counselor spends in each building.
3. Limit the range of the counselor's activities to give him more time with children.

4. School-university cooperation be utilized to provide for continuing education of the elementary school guidance staff.

5. Continue the sequential development of the "World of Work" in the elementary grades so as to utilize information gained in the pilot project. Make this information available to the curriculum study committee during the coming year.