

ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF TEACHERS ABOUT
MENTAL HEALTH AND THE CAUSES OF MENTAL
ILLNESS AND THE TEACHERS' CONCEPTIONS
OF THEIR ROLE IN THE
THERAPEUTIC SETTING

By

FRANK JOSEPH PADRONE

Bachelor of Science
Fordham University
New York, New York
1962

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1967

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 1968

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
MAR 13 1969

ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF TEACHERS ABOUT
MENTAL HEALTH AND THE CAUSES OF MENTAL
ILLNESS AND THE TEACHERS' CONCEPTIONS
OF THEIR ROLE IN THE
THERAPEUTIC SETTING

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth D. Sandolf

Thesis Adviser

Donald R. Campbell

Julia Mc Hale

Larry L. Brown

N. N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

704763

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My special appreciation goes to Drs. Kenneth Sandvold and Julia McHale for their guidance, understanding and encouragement over the years. I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Drs. Larry Brown, Stanley Fowler, Rondal Gamble and William Rambo whose advice and criticism have been most helpful, and the financial assistance of the Graduate College of the Oklahoma State University, which in part supported this research. In addition, a very special thanks goes to my wife, Josie, who knows why.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Review of the Literature	3
Summary of Review	11
Statement of the Problem	12
Summary of Hypotheses	13
II. METHOD	15
Sample	15
Instrument	15
Procedure	18
Data Analysis	18
III. RESULTS	22
Description of Data	22
Tests of Significance for Section I	32
Tests of Significance for Section II	50
IV. DISCUSSION	103
V. SUMMARY	116
BIBLIOGRAPHY	118
APPENDIX A	122
APPENDIX B	128
APPENDIX C	144

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Mean Scale Scores	23
II. Significant Values of "F" in One-Way Analysis of Variance	34
III. Significant "q's"	37
IV. Sources of Variance in Four-Way Analysis of Variance	48
V. Comparisons Between Psychiatrists and all Teachers in their Views on Five Emotionally Disturbed Students, by Percentages	51
VI. Comparisons of Teachers' and Psychiatrists' Opinions on Degree of Disturbance by Variables	55
VII. Comparisons of Teachers' and Psychiatrists' Opinions on Extent of Involvement by Variables	71
VIII. Comparisons of Teachers' and Psychiatrists' Opinions as to Whom Referral Should be Made by the Teacher by Variables	87

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Mental health, especially the mental health of children, has become a major concern in Western society over the past several decades. At first, interest centered almost solely on parental and societal child rearing practices as the major causes of mental problems in adults. Surveys of such literature, however, indicate that the findings in investigations of child rearing practices are conflicting and contradictory (Sewell, 1952). It appears that it is not so much the practice as the attitudes and feelings behind it, that may be at fault. Moreover, parental attitudes alone are not the total of adult values to which a child is exposed. There are other relatives such as aunts, uncles and grandparents, and of course there is the teacher and the role of the school.

The teacher's knowledge and understanding of mental health principles may well play a specific and important role in early detection and referral of students with emotional problems. The school is one of the major sources of referral to child guidance clinics. It is, therefore, felt that teachers' attitudes and opinions toward mental health may be reflected in the success or failure of the local clinics to operate effectively for the community.

One of the major problems in working with schools and teachers in the past has been difficulty in communication largely due to a lack of

shared vocabulary and attitudes. The significance of communication between the teacher and those offering psychological services may be seen in a recent study by Baker (1965) which found that 16.8 per cent of recommendations to an elementary school and 27.3 per cent of recommendations to a secondary school were not acted upon by the schools. In addition, the willingness to carry out the psychologist's recommendations was found to be related not only to the frequency and quality of the relations between teacher and psychologist but also to the ability to understand one another's functions and limitations (Baker, 1965).

The burden of initiating this understanding would seem to rest with the psychologist. The present study is an attempt at such a beginning. The general purposes of the study may be seen as twofold: (1) to investigate the attitudes and opinions of teachers toward mental health and the causes of mental illness and (2) to determine the teacher's concept of her role in the therapeutic process.

With regard to the need for the teacher to have the ability to identify emotionally disturbed children it should be noted that she is in an ideal position because of her daily contact with the child. She could detect patterns of behavior that are indicative of psychological problems such as: an inability to learn though adequately intelligent; unsatisfactory interpersonal relations; inappropriate behavior; unhappiness; and repetitive illness after stress (Patrick, 1965).

Patrick further found that teachers in his study were in agreement with the California Personality Inventory 55 per cent of the time. A number of the teachers showed a consistently high ability to pick out emotionally disturbed children, even though the group as a whole missed 27 per cent of the children with problems. From a review of similar

studies Trippe (1963) also reached the conclusion that teachers are in agreement with clinicians' opinions more than was formerly thought.

Review of the Literature

The formal history of an interest in the mental health of problem children in the classroom originated in 1922, when the National Committee for Mental Hygiene established its first Child Guidance Clinic for the purpose of diagnosis and treatment of childhood emotional problems. A more positive mental health approach was taken by Burnham in 1924 with the first of his three important books which was entitled Great Teachers and Mental Health. This book pointed out that the teacher is a key figure in one of the major dyadic relationships upon which mental health is based (Symonds, 1959).

Psychoanalysis and psychotherapy had their impact on education with the introduction of the attitudes of acceptance, permissiveness and nondirectiveness in the classroom situation. In addition, the current interest in group dynamics and small group processes is presently being applied to educational research (Symonds, 1959).

Clark (1963) has pointed out that as a result of public attitude change in Britain towards mental illness there has been an introduction of more advanced treatment programs. It may follow, therefore, from what Clark has found that the attitudes which teachers as a group have toward mental health can be an influential factor not only in the satisfaction of each child's particular emotional needs but also in deciding which child is referred for professional assistance and the type of facilities which are available.

In a study which used advanced college students Altrocchi and EisDorfer (1961) concluded that attitude change toward mental illness cannot be accomplished by exposure to information alone, but that change might be accomplished by experience with psychiatric patients and psychotherapeutic behavior. Ackerly et al. (1960) came to a similar conclusion when he found that field service experience in a child guidance clinic enabled teachers to become familiar with some of the therapeutic methods that might later be used in their classroom. He goes on to indicate that these results were even more satisfying than anticipated, since both the clinic staff and the teachers developed a mutual understanding of one another's roles and the similarity of their ultimate goals.

In contrast, Soderbergh (1964) has pointed out on page 245 that ". . . some veteran public school teachers are excessively dogmatic" with the implication that as a result they would be resistant to change. However, Rabkin (1966) using the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale which is composed of forty statements reflecting "open and closed mindedness," found no significant correlations between dogmatism and age, sex, religion, grade taught or marital status. It would seem, therefore, that the prospect for attitude change among teachers is not so bleak.

Cutter (1961) found that teachers became more active in their mental health efforts following an in-service mental health program which included both staff conferences and consultations. This type of positive action by the teacher in the classroom may also directly influence the students.

An awareness and understanding of the personality structures of her pupils and appropriate reactions by a well-adjusted teacher will do much toward improving the personality traits of the individuals in the classroom (Cutter, 1961, p. 342).

Following the same rationale the Kentucky Department of Mental Health conducts three-week workshops

. . . to assist teachers in understanding the principles of positive mental health and the normal needs of children and to apply this information in creating a more mentally healthy classroom (Clos, 1966, p. 278).

In order to determine the effectiveness of the Kentucky program, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was used to measure the attitude change of teachers in seven different workshops; five were carried on in three consecutive weeks, while the remaining two were conducted over a four-month period. The findings showed that as a result of the workshop experience teacher attitudes changed in a positive direction and that these changes persisted over a nine-month period. It was also found that greater changes took place among teachers who were younger and also among those with less education. There was no mention made of any statistical compensation being applied to the obvious correlation between age and education. Finally a greater change in attitude was seen in those teachers whose workshop experiences were spread out over four months (Clos, 1966).

To increase the awareness of pupils' needs a number of attempts have been made at attitude change during teacher training. Brim (1966) reports on some research carried out at the University of Denver with approximately 200 teacher education students. At pretesting it was found that the faculty had more liberal attitudes toward children than the education students, but at the close of this undergraduate teacher education program the results showed that the two groups were closer due to a student shift toward the faculty position. It was felt that the faculty influenced the students to move in their direction, so that as

the students moved through the program their attitudes became progressively more liberal.

Cohen and Struening (1959) found that educational programs among hospital employees did not favorably change attitudes toward mental illness and mentally ill people as measured by the Opinions About Mental Illness Scale (OMI). On the other hand Costen and Kerr (1962) report a favorable shift in attitudes on the OMI among students before and after a course in abnormal psychology. Quite obviously there are many uncontrolled factors in these studies, such as: students' interest and purpose for taking the course, and the instructor's purpose when teaching it; in short, the mental set of all involved.

In an attempt to reconcile these different findings Dixon (1967) used the OMI scale to compare students, who had different major areas of study, before and after taking various psychology courses. The results were as follows:

The mean differences (t tests) suggest that courses in psychology bring about some favorable changes in students' attitudes toward mental illness. . . . Later interviews with instructors indicated that the changes in attitudes were more closely related to the teacher's position than to the material covered in the text. Further indication of the teacher's effect on students' attitude change was demonstrated by the classes in child psychology and mental hygiene where emphasis was placed upon the interrelationship of early deprivation and mental illness. It is conceivable then that the observed changes are related to the activities of an instructor rather than to the content of the text (p. 50).

The results of this study are cited as having obvious implications for teacher attitude change. Nevertheless, they also bear implications for another area of related interest; that is, the fact that teacher attitudes in and of themselves can affect the student's attitudes outside the realm of the course content.

Freeman and Kassebaum (1960) undertook a study of attitude assessment and change to determine whether the level of education and knowledge of psychiatric concepts were related to attitudes toward mental illness. They found that these two areas were only slightly, if at all, related to the attitudes in question.

Some persons, both in teaching and child guidance work, may react negatively to the thought of joining these two areas because they feel that the two professions are and should remain totally separate. However, as Lindemann in Freeman and Kassebaum (1960), has pointed out, the number of clinics and specialists may not be sufficient in a few years to meet the demands of the schools for services. It, therefore, seems that communication between the two areas would be necessitated.

Indicating that the teacher and psychologist do not have to remain separate, Evoy (1958) introduced some guidelines that the teacher could follow while attending to mental hygiene and concomitantly maintaining her role as teacher. Taking a similar position Arbuckle (1967) has proposed the motto--"Let's Ecumenize," suggesting that by working cooperatively common goals may be achieved more effectively. Almy (1962) proposes that the teacher should be trained in the areas of motivation and psychology, since a child's ability to learn is related to the way in which he copes with emotional conflicts. She feels that without this knowledge it may be difficult for the teacher to recognize the child's needs as a learner.

It has been shown that even if the child's needs and problems are recognized, there may be a tendency not to refer a student for needed services. Zolik and Stotsky (1966) have found that there is a greater reluctance for people to refer for psychiatric services those persons

with whom they are ego involved. A condition of ego involvement was described as existing with a relative or friend, that is a person in whom one may have some emotional investment. In this type of situation there was a tendency for people to try to be of assistance in "straightening things out" rather than referring. It might be assumed that a similar type of ego involvement exists in some school systems. This is indicated by the policy of nonreferral which is found among certain teachers and principals who are apparently in some way threatened by admitting to the presence of a student with emotional problems "in their school!".

With reference to attitudes and opinions which outwardly appear to be based on knowledge, such as causes of mental illness, Haun (1958) analogously related three tales: One of a man who in this day and age believed that the world is flat, another of the medieval practice of capital punishment for "witches" and lastly, James' successful arousal of terror in Turn of the Screw. All three led to the same conclusion: that man cannot tolerate extreme ambiguity and, consequently, must impose order on the world in which he lives. Haun feels that by using this perspective we may better understand the reasons for the attitudes and opinions about social prejudice and for public apathy in what appear to be crucial matters. Employing a somewhat more rigorous approach than this, Nunnally (1959) concluded from his investigation that many of the false beliefs which are found in our general population may serve the very useful function of reducing threat for the believer.

One of the most comprehensive investigations of public attitudes toward mental health was conducted by Woodward (1951). He found that the public had progressed in relinquishing many of its erroneous beliefs

about mental illness and that the image of the psychiatrist had become more positive. Another study was undertaken by Larson (1965) who used a questionnaire to assess the attitudes and opinions of clergymen about mental health. Psychiatric opinions were employed in the design of this questionnaire to determine which attitudes would be considered positive, and which opinions realistic. He found major differences by religion and age, including the following: (1) clergymen from fundamentalist or more conservative religions displayed significantly more unfavorable attitudes about mental health and more unrealistic opinions about the causes of mental illness than did the more liberal group of clergymen; (2) clergymen less than 45 years of age appeared to have more favorable attitudes toward mental health and more realistic opinions about the causes of mental illness than older clergymen.

In preparation for the present research Padrone (1967) conducted a pilot study using a slightly modified version of the first half of Larson's (1965) questionnaire directed at an assessment of the attitudes and opinions of teachers about mental health and the causes of mental illness. The results gave partial support to Larson's (1965) work with the clergy. It was found that younger teachers displayed more positive attitudes and realistic opinions about mental health and the causes of mental illness than did older teachers. It was also demonstrated that teachers from more liberal religions tended to have more favorable attitudes toward mental health and realistic opinions about the causes of mental illness than teachers from more conservative or fundamental religions. Finally, teachers with more than the minimum academic training in psychology required for education majors had more positive

attitudes and realistic opinions than teachers with the minimum number or less of psychology courses.

A slightly modified version of the second portion of Larson's questionnaire is used in the present study to assess the teacher's conception of her role in the therapeutic setting. When used by Larson (1964) with 422 responding clergymen and 30 responding psychiatrists, it was found that clergymen did not tend to refer parishioners for psychiatric service as often as the psychiatrists thought they should and that the clergyman saw himself as playing a larger role in the therapeutic setting than the psychiatrists thought he should. In addition, Catholic priests were found to differ more from psychiatric opinion than were ministers in cases involving sexual matters. Lastly, academic training in pastoral psychology did not bring the clergyman's opinions closer to those of the psychiatrist.

Since both Larson's (1964-65) and Padrone's (1967) research indicate that religion is a significant variable when dealing with attitudes toward the area of mental health, it seems appropriate to cite some of the findings of Allport and Ross (1967) on religion and prejudice. The concept of prejudice seems pertinent in this context, because it deals with what Allport refers to as stereotyped beliefs and opinions which may be what is actually being investigated in the area of attitudes toward mental health. Allport and Ross (1967) found that on the average people who attend church are more prejudiced than those who do not; however, there was a significant--though a minority--number of churchgoers who were less prejudiced than the non-attenders.

It is the casual irregular fringe members who are high in prejudice. Their religious motivation is of the extrinsic order (they use their religion). It is the constant devout internalized members (intrinsic motivation: i.e., they live their

religion) who are low in prejudice (p. 432).

This explanation might also be applicable to the differences found among certain religions.

Allport and Ross (1967) feel that many persons employ a particular cognitive style in their thinking, so that they are indiscriminately proreligious: i.e., anything associated with their stereotype of religion is good. They are also indiscriminately prejudiced, so that anything associated with their stereotype of the minority group is bad.

Summary of Review

Interest in the mental health of problem children in the classroom originated in 1922 when the National Committee for Mental Hygiene established its first child guidance clinic. Since that time contributions have come from a number of areas, including psychoanalysis, psychotherapy and research on small group processes.

The attitudes which the population holds toward mental illness can be very important even to the extent of influencing the type of facilities which are available in the community. It may follow, therefore, that teachers' attitudes can also influence the type of facilities which are available for students. Research with teachers in the area of attitude change suggests that actual experience in a mental health facility is needed for positive attitude change. Mere exposure to information does not appear to be very effective.

It was also found that there may be a reluctance to refer people for psychiatric services when one is ego involved with the person. In addition, the population as a whole may adhere to many of their unfounded beliefs as a defense against anxiety and threat. Finally, it has been

demonstrated that age and religion are two crucial variables in the area of attitudes toward mental health among clergymen and teachers.

Statement of the Problem

In this study the primary goal was to assess the attitudes and opinions of public school teachers toward mental health and the causes of mental illness and the teacher's conception of her role in the therapeutic setting. It was felt that a number of pertinent variables would influence the results of the study. The first two of these, based on Larson's (1964-65) findings with the clergy and Padrone's (1967) findings with teachers, were age and religion. It was, therefore, hypothesized that teachers who were older and from more conservative religions would show more negative attitudes and be less in agreement with psychiatric opinion than teachers who were younger and from more liberal religions.

Since knowledge of a particular area may be related to the attitudes that one has toward that area (Freeman and Kassebaum, 1960), it was reasoned that the number of psychology courses which a teacher had taken would be an influential factor. However, since most teachers are required to enroll in a minimum number of psychology courses as part of their curriculum, a cut-off point was set at the level of nine credits or three courses and for the purposes of this study was considered to be the usual minimum college requirement. It was, therefore, hypothesized that teachers with more than the minimum number of psychology courses would have more positive attitudes toward mental health and would be in closer agreement with psychiatric opinion than teachers with fewer psychology courses.

Exposure to graduate level training is usually viewed as a broadening and enlightening experience for the student. Consequently, it was felt that teachers with graduate school training would have more positive attitudes toward mental health and would be in closer agreement with psychiatric opinion than teachers with no graduate training.

Another group of variables which were investigated but about which no hypotheses were formed is as follows: (1) sex, (2) marital status, (3) place of birth, (4) socio-economic status, (5) grade level taught, (6) college major, (7) rural versus urban schools and (8) knowledge of the availability of mental health facilities.

Summary of Hypotheses

For Section I of the questionnaire:

(1) Age will be inversely related to positive attitudes and realistic opinions.

(2) Teachers from more liberal religions will have more positive attitudes and realistic opinions than teachers from conservative religions.

(3) Teachers with more than the minimum amount of required psychology courses will have more positive attitudes and realistic opinions than those teachers with the minimum amount or less of psychology courses.

(4) Graduate education will be positively related to positive attitudes and realistic opinions.

For Section II of the questionnaire:

(5) Younger teachers will be more closely in agreement with psychiatric opinion than older teachers.

(6) Teachers from more liberal religions will be more in accord with psychiatric opinion than teachers from conservative religions.

(7) Teachers with more than the minimum number of psychology courses will be more closely in agreement with psychiatric opinion than those teachers with the minimum number or with less than the minimum number.

(8) Graduate education will be positively related to agreement with psychiatric opinion.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

A questionnaire assessing teacher's attitudes and opinions towards mental health and the causes of mental illness and the teacher's conception of her role in the therapeutic setting (see Appendix A) was mailed to 1560 public school teachers in the state of Oklahoma.

Sample: A random sample of 1560 public school teachers was chosen from the almost 27,000 teachers in the state. The sample was representative and stratified according to sex, years of teaching experience, grade level taught and population of school district.

Instrument: The questionnaire used in this study is one which was originally designed by Larson (1965) to assess the attitudes of clergymen toward the area of mental health. A personal data sheet requesting information such as age, sex, and religion was added to the beginning. The questionnaire contains two sections which will be discussed separately.

Section I consists of forty-three Likert-type questions designed to assess the respondent's attitudes and opinions toward mental health and the causes of mental illness. Section II is made up of five case history-type descriptions of students which were to be evaluated by the teacher. The desirable responses to the items of Section I of the questionnaire had been decided upon by three psychiatrists and three clinical psychologists (Larson, 1965). Their decisions were based on

how they thought the respondent should reply in order to have positive attitudes and realistic opinions toward the area of mental health. The wording of each question was altered slightly in the present study so that they would apply to teachers in a classroom setting rather than clergymen in a parish.

In addition to a Total Scale score, Section I contains five sub-scales in the following order: (1) a twelve item Adequacy Scale, (2) an eight item Psychiatry Scale, (3) an eight item Responsibility Scale, (4) an eight item General Mental Health Scale and (5) a seven item Causal Scale. The response categories for each question were divided into five Likert-type options ranging from strongly disagree through undecided to strongly agree. The respondent's answers were scored and weighted one through five, with the low scores indicating a favorable standing and the high scores unfavorable. The questions were worded so that to some a "strongly disagree" response was favorable, while to others a "strongly agree" response was favorable.

The meaning attached to Section I of the questionnaire may be viewed operationally as attitudes toward mental health within the orientation of the classroom; this meaning is reflected in the Total Scale score. The five sub-scales may be viewed as giving the following information: the Adequacy Scale; how adequate a teacher feels in dealing with the area of mental health and its problems. A high score on this scale indicates that the teacher feels too adequate and is a negative or unfavorable score, while a low score which is favorable and realistic means that the respondent is aware of her role and her limitations. The Psychiatry Scale; a high score indicates positive attitudes and a low score indicates negative attitudes toward the profession of psychiatry.

The Responsibility Scale; the degree of responsibility the teacher is willing to assume when dealing with emotionally disturbed students. A high score means that the teacher is assuming a disproportionate amount of responsibility in light of her training, while a low score means that her attitudes are favorable and her assessment of her duties and obligations is realistic. The General Scale; attitudes toward such factors as mental hygiene and psychiatric care; a high score indicates positive attitudes and a low score negative attitudes. The Causal Scale; a measure of how realistic the respondent's opinions are concerning the etiology of mental illness, with low scores indicating more realistic opinions.

Section II of the questionnaire consists of five short descriptions of students with different types of personal problems. These descriptions were originally evaluated by fifty-four psychiatrists (Larson, 1966) according to the following criteria: (1) degree of emotional disturbance, (2) extent of involvement of the respondent and (3) to whom referral should be made. These five portrayals were altered slightly in details concerning age, so that they would resemble more closely the teacher-student relationship. Two clinical psychologists and a psychiatrist independently agreed that these changes did not alter the descriptions with respect to the three criteria questions.

Reliability coefficients (test-retest) have been reported by Larson to be in excess of .85 (personal communique). In addition, an internal consistency procedure found that the items discriminated very well between those scoring in the upper and lower quartiles (Larson, 1965).

In support of the validity of this questionnaire three factors may be mentioned: (1) face validity; (2) the accepted expert opinion of

psychiatrists and clinical psychologists concerning the responses that would be judged positive (Larson, 1965) and (3) significantly more positive responses by those teachers who had taken more psychology courses (Padrone, 1967).

Procedure: Questionnaires were mailed to 1300 teachers. Two weeks later follow-up postcards were sent to these same teachers reminding them to return their questionnaires, if they had not already done so. The number of returns was unsatisfactory. So an additional 260 questionnaires were mailed two weeks later. No follow-up postcards were sent to this second group of teachers.

Data Analysis: The results of both Section I and II were evaluated for all teachers, followed by an evaluation of the results on both sections of the questionnaire for different groups of teachers according to the following personal data variables: sex; age; marital status; state of birth; county (by population) in which the respondent taught; religion; amount of education; area of academic concentration; number of psychology courses; geographical location of schools from which various degrees were earned; population of the town in which the respondent taught (rural: less than 25,000; urban: more than 25,000); grade level taught; whether or not the counseling of students was part of the respondent's responsibilities; father's education and whether or not the respondent had access to mental health facilities for her students.

The variable of religion should be given special consideration. In all there were twenty-six religious groups for which mean scores were computed, including a category for "no affiliation." In addition, religions were pooled into the following groups according to Larson (1964) and Mead (1951): Fundamentalist, Conservative, Catholic and

Conventional. The specific religions included in each of these groups were:

Fundamentalist

Apostolic	Latter-Day Saints
Assembly of God	Nazarene
Church of God	Pentecostal
Seventh-Day Adventist	

Conservative

Baptist	Churches of Christ
Church of Christ Scientist	Congregational Christian
Church of the Brethren	First Christian

Conventional

Christian Reformed Church	Methodist
Disciples of Christ	Presbyterian
Evangelical United Brethren	Protestant Episcopal
Lutheran	United Church of Christ
United Universalist Associations (Unitarian)	

Mean scores were computed on the Total Scale and each of the sub-scales for the twenty-six religious groups and for each of the four religious classifications.

The evaluation of the data for each of the sections was carried out in the following three phases: (1) a frequency distribution was obtained for each item on the entire questionnaire, i.e., how each respondent answered each question, including those from the personal data section; (2) group mean scores were calculated for each of the six scales in Section I of the questionnaire according to each of the personal data variables listed above and (3) tests of significance were conducted.

For Sections I and II of the questionnaire frequency distributions were compiled for each item for all respondents. In addition, subgroups were formed according to the forementioned personal data variables, in order to compare each subgroup's responses on all items in the questionnaire (Shoemaker, 1968).

On Section I of the questionnaire weighted mean scores were computed for the Total Scale and each of the subscales for all teachers and for the various subgroups of teachers according to the previously cited personal data variables. All questions in this section which were not answered were treated as if the respondent had answered by checking "undecided."

The final phase of the evaluation of the data of Section I was carried out by making a number of specific comparisons. Within each of the personal data variables there are a number of levels: e.g., marital status has five levels: (1) single, (2) married, (3) widowed, (4) divorced and (5) those who did not answer this item. A simple one-way Analysis of Variance was carried out on each of the twenty-nine personal data variables for each of the six scale scores, in order to determine if any significant differences existed among the levels of each variable. In order to determine where the significant differences were within each of these Analyses of Variance (AOV), the Duncan Multiple-Range test was used (Steel and Torrie, 1960). Alpha was set at the .05 level.

In addition, a complex AOV was carried out in order to take into consideration the interaction effects of those variables about which hypotheses were postulated. In order to avoid the problem of empty cells, which would almost certainly be encountered when using numerous levels on each of 4 variables in an AOV, each variable was compared at two levels. This was accomplished by either pooling the data, such as was done with age or omitting those levels with a relatively small "n." Since the data were in disproportionate subclasses, the following

linear regression model was used in the analysis: $Y = u + A_i + R_j + E_k + P_l + (AR) + (AE) + (AP) + (RE) + (RP) + (EP) + \text{Lack of Fit} + \text{Within Cells SS}$ (Graybill, 1961).

A complex AOV was computed from this model in which R (Religious affiliation), A (Age), E (Education--college versus graduate school) and P (Psychology courses) are correlation coefficients between the score and the corresponding variable, with all other variables held constant. This analysis considered only first-order interactions.

Section II of the questionnaire includes five short descriptions of students with various problems. The teachers were asked to evaluate these five portrayals by answering the following three questions about each: (1) degree of emotional disturbance; (2) extent of teacher involvement and (3) to whom the student should be referred. The teachers' opinions in this study were compared to the original professional psychiatric opinions (Larson, 1966) through the use of the Chi Square technique with alpha set at the .05 level (Steel and Torrie, 1960).

In addition, differences among teachers in answering these questions were sought within each of the same personal data variables which were cited above; e.g., differences among teachers by age, education, and religion. A simple observational comparison of the percentage distributions between groups of teachers was used to find these differences.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Of the 1560 questionnaires mailed approximately 35 per cent (550) were returned. However, six of these were almost totally incomplete and it was decided that they could not be meaningfully included in the analysis. The investigation, therefore, was carried out using the remaining 544 completed questionnaires; 34.8 per cent of the original sample.

Description of Data

The findings of the study will be presented in three parts: (1) a general description of the respondents as a total group and by personal data variables; (2) a statement of the group mean scores for each of the six scales in Section I of the questionnaire and group frequency scores for each question in Section II of the questionnaire, according to the personal data variables; and (3) the findings of the tests of significance.

The total group of respondents, when examined according to sex, includes a distribution in which the number of females exceeds the number of males by more than a 2:1 ratio (see Table I for a general description of the group by "N"). The group of teachers was evenly distributed by age except in the 60-69 age range which was found to be only one fourth as large as the other age groups. The overwhelming majority of this sample indicated they were married (84.5%), while the remainder

TABLE I
MEAN SCALE SCORES

GROUP	N	ADEQ.	PSYCH.	RESP.	GEN.	CAUSAL	TOTAL
<u>SEX</u>							
Blank	32	33.719	17.750	23.438	21.906	22.188	119.000
Male	156	34.295	18.756	24.609	20.449	22.526	120.635
Female	356	32.152	18.329	24.534	19.927	22.702	117.643
<u>AGE</u>							
Blank	26	34.192	20.269	24.846	22.346	20.846	122.500
20-29	129	32.070	17.705	24.240	18.488	23.217	115.721
30-39	122	32.369	18.484	23.803	18.943	22.639	116.238
40-49	120	33.917	18.058	25.325	20.083	22.517	119.900
50-59	110	33.091	18.536	24.745	21.255	23.045	120.673
60-69	37	32.162	20.189	23.919	25.946	20.811	123.027
<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>							
Blank	26	33.192	19.115	24.154	23.615	22.808	122.885
Single	41	31.585	18.585	24.341	19.561	22.488	116.561
Married	438	32.694	18.498	24.445	20.055	22.564	118.256
Widowed	20	34.450	18.500	25.950	21.550	22.700	123.150
Divorced	19	37.263	15.158	24.789	18.632	23.895	119.737
<u>STATE OF BIRTH</u>							
Blank	8	32.750	19.000	26.250	20.750	23.125	121.875
Oklahoma	377	33.029	18.475	24.393	20.366	22.618	118.881
Not Oklahoma	159	32.459	18.252	24.635	19.755	22.604	117.704
<u>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA OF BIRTH</u>							
Blank	10	33.200	18.500	25.900	20.000	23.400	121.000
Northeast	24	32.458	17.458	25.125	19.167	21.792	116.000
Southeast	12	34.833	19.083	25.000	20.917	22.917	122.750
North Central	44	31.977	18.909	22.682	19.250	22.614	115.432
South Central	449	32.927	18.437	24.541	20.392	22.610	118.906
West	5	31.000	15.200	28.800	14.200	25.400	114.600
<u>COUNTY IN WHICH TEACHING BY POPULATION</u>							
Blank	9	32.667	21.000	25.778	26.667	21.778	127.889
300,000 +	199	34.020	18.156	25.136	18.784	22.794	118.889
40,000 - 299,999	90	33.089	18.444	24.300	20.500	22.200	118.533
25,000 - 39,999	94	30.947	19.117	23.702	21.447	22.362	117.574
Less than 25,000	151	32.377	18.179	24.126	20.675	22.861	118.219

TABLE I (Continued)

GROUP	N	ADEQ.	PSYCH.	RESP.	GEN.	CAUSAL	TOTAL
<u>RELIGION</u>							
Blank	3	42.333	23.000	27.667	18.333	22.667	134.000
Baptist	194	32.851	18.639	24.067	21.149	22.330	119.036
Catholic	15	32.200	15.867	25.867	16.800	22.933	113.667
Church of Christ	51	32.784	19.255	25.059	21.137	22.588	120.824
Disc. of Christ	34	33.294	19.000	25.735	18.647	23.441	120.118
Methodist	119	32.857	17.798	24.345	19.798	22.731	117.529
Presbyterian	47	33.894	16.957	24.255	18.489	22.447	116.043
Episcopal	11	34.182	16.545	26.909	16.636	23.091	117.364
<u>RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION</u>							
No Preference	10	32.600	21.300	25.800	21.700	23.600	125.000
Fundamental	22	29.364	20.227	23.182	21.227	21.545	115.545
Conservative	260	33.058	18.815	24.446	21.338	22.381	120.038
Catholic	15	32.200	15.867	25.867	16.800	22.933	113.667
Conventional	236	32.949	17.915	24.623	19.131	22.953	117.572
<u>EDUCATION</u>							
Blank	1	50.000	16.000	30.000	17.000	25.000	138.000
College	226	31.836	18.500	23.673	19.752	22.553	116.314
Graduate School	317	33.533	18.366	25.057	20.517	22.662	120.316
<u>YEARS OF GRADUATE SCHOOL</u>							
Blank	42	32.905	19.262	25.381	21.643	23.190	122.381
None	226	31.854	18.504	23.712	19.850	22.531	116.451
One Year or less	144	32.139	18.563	24.743	19.874	22.944	118.264
Two Years	92	34.533	17.402	25.217	20.076	22.141	119.370
Three Years	20	36.100	18.500	26.250	20.650	21.950	123.450
Four Years	20	38.350	19.200	24.500	23.400	23.000	128.450
<u>COLLEGE MAJOR</u>							
Blank	14	37.070	17.570	25.570	24.860	22.360	127.430
Education	279	32.935	18.674	24.849	20.079	22.789	119.326
<u>Not Education</u>	251	32.538	18.179	24.032	20.060	22.450	117.259
Psychology	9	35.222	18.000	24.000	19.778	20.667	117.667
Not Psychology	521	32.704	18.447	24.470	20.075	22.662	118.359
Blank	14	37.070	17.570	25.570	24.860	22.360	127.430

TABLE I (Continued)

GROUP	N	ADEQ.	PSYCH.	RESP.	GEN.	CAUSAL	TOTAL
<u>COLLEGE - MAJOR FIELD</u>							
Education	277	32.921	18.614	24.823	20.108	22.809	119.274
Social Science	92	34.446	18.054	24.609	20.783	22.261	120.152
Natural Science	54	30.444	18.296	23.481	19.981	22.630	114.833
Humanities	81	31.728	17.951	23.889	19.099	22.963	115.630
Business	26	32.846	19.769	23.923	20.346	20.962	117.846
Blank	14	37.070	17.570	25.570	24.860	22.360	127.430
<u>COLLEGE - MINOR FIELD</u>							
None	55	32.109	18.709	24.236	19.800	22.491	117.345
Education	91	33.044	17.626	24.198	19.736	22.165	116.769
Social Science	125	33.288	19.080	24.888	19.912	23.496	120.664
Natural Science	77	33.403	19.260	25.065	20.844	22.000	120.571
Humanities	129	31.093	17.519	23.969	19.426	22.550	114.558
Business	22	35.909	19.409	24.091	20.136	22.818	122.364
Blank	45	34.840	18.470	25.000	23.490	22.440	124.240
<u>GRADUATE MAJOR</u>							
Blank	27	33.000	18.960	23.700	21.190	23.520	120.370
Education	218	34.220	18.124	25.353	20.725	22.560	120.982
Social Science	19	34.895	18.947	24.895	20.474	22.947	122.158
Natural Science	17	32.000	20.059	24.765	20.353	21.824	119.000
Humanities	28	30.000	18.036	25.286	18.786	22.250	114.357
Business	7	32.143	20.286	24.571	20.429	22.286	119.714
<u>BACHELOR DEGREE</u>							
Oklahoma	472	32.765	18.591	24.405	20.250	22.644	118.655
Not Oklahoma	58	33.862	16.638	25.328	19.034	22.396	117.259
Blank	14	31.860	19.930	23.930	23.070	22.790	121.570
<u>BACHELOR DEGREE</u>							
Northeast	8	31.750	15.125	25.500	16.250	22.875	117.500
Southeast	7	35.000	18.429	26.000	20.429	23.143	123.000
North Central	20	34.400	17.850	25.900	19.350	23.000	120.500
South Central	494	32.818	18.472	24.399	20.209	22.595	118.492
West	1	30.000	8.000	31.000	19.000	20.000	108.000
Blank	14	31.860	19.930	23.930	23.070	22.790	121.570
<u>MASTER DEGREE</u>							
Blank	6	33.830	22.330	23.170	22.830	23.170	125.330
None	317	31.984	18.338	23.984	19.855	22.710	116.871
Oklahoma	195	34.021	18.615	25.205	20.595	22.415	120.851
Not Oklahoma	26	34.577	17.000	25.615	20.692	22.962	120.846

TABLE I (Continued)

GROUP	N	ADEQ.	PSYCH.	RESP.	GEN.	CAUSAL	TOTAL
<u>MASTER DEGREE</u>							
Northeast	6	40.333	21.833	26.000	24.500	21.000	133.667
Southeast	3	37.333	24.000	31.333	30.000	24.333	147.000
North Central	7	32.000	13.429	22.571	20.714	23.286	112.000
South Central	205	33.946	18.468	25.254	20.415	22.444	120.527
Blank	6	33.830	22.330	23.170	22.830	23.170	125.330
<u>DOCTORAL DEGREE</u>							
None	538	32.792	18.413	24.476	20.171	22.625	118.476
Oklahoma	1	31.000	18.000	24.000	20.000	19.000	112.000
Not Oklahoma	2	44.000	18.500	27.500	28.000	22.500	140.500
<u>NUMBER OF PSYCHOLOGY COURSES</u>							
Blank	72	34.111	19.278	24.028	22.667	22.417	122.500
None	7	31.286	14.714	26.714	18.857	22.000	113.571
One to Three	195	30.764	18.872	23.964	20.631	22.231	116.462
Four to Six	197	33.431	18.162	24.949	19.381	23.193	119.117
Seven or more	73	35.822	17.397	24.904	18.904	22.384	119.411
<u>GRADE TAUGHT - BY YEAR</u>							
Kinder. to Third	165	33.655	18.309	25.182	20.552	22.824	120.521
Fourth to Sixth	74	33.419	18.257	25.243	20.135	22.324	119.378
Seventh to Ninth	89	31.404	17.809	23.191	18.876	22.236	113.517
Tenth to Twelfth	182	32.330	18.500	24.110	20.093	22.604	117.637
Blank	34	34.410	20.440	24.940	22.560	23.380	125.740
<u>GRADE TAUGHT - BY LEVEL</u>							
Blank	34	34.412	20.441	24.941	22.559	23.382	125.735
Elementary	238	33.550	18.277	25.172	20.408	22.676	120.084
J.H.S.	90	31.511	17.856	23.289	18.933	22.222	113.811
High School	182	32.330	18.500	24.110	20.093	22.604	117.637
<u>TOWN WHERE TEACHING - BY POPULATION</u>							
Blank	18	32.333	17.611	23.944	21.000	22.500	117.389
0 - 10,000	258	31.841	18.411	24.391	21.140	22.733	118.516
10,001 - 25,000	56	31.893	18.554	23.643	20.375	22.482	116.946
25,001 - 50,000	48	34.063	18.125	23.479	20.438	21.688	117.792
50,001 - 100,000	23	36.261	19.609	25.478	17.522	23.087	121.957
100,001 - 400,000	141	34.206	18.383	25.262	18.638	22.730	119.220

TABLE I (Continued)

GROUP	N	ADEQ.	PSYCH.	RESP.	GEN.	CAUSAL	TOTAL
<u>TOWN WHERE TEACHING</u>							
Rural	314	31.850	18.436	24.258	21.003	22.688	118.236
Urban	212	34.396	18.458	24.882	18.925	22.533	119.193
Blank	18	32.333	17.611	23.944	21.000	22.500	117.389
<u>COUNSELING OF STUDENTS</u>							
Blank	25	37.120	19.360	25.960	22.000	22.360	126.800
Yes	140	36.714	18.821	25.793	20.757	22.579	124.664
No	379	31.153	18.206	23.913	19.865	22.654	115.792
<u>FATHERS' EDUCATION</u>							
Blank	9	30.000	21.330	23.330	23.330	23.330	122.330
0 - 5	59	32.559	18.797	23.695	22.136	22.542	119.729
6 - 8	183	33.142	18.689	24.410	20.568	22.486	119.295
High School	166	32.392	18.175	24.867	20.066	22.699	118.199
College	80	33.700	17.500	24.400	18.563	23.362	117.525
Grad. School	38	33.737	18.553	25.026	18.632	21.947	117.895
<u>ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH FACILITIES</u>							
Yes	318	33.789	18.135	24.893	19.425	22.689	118.931
No	153	31.575	18.843	23.634	20.922	22.608	117.582
Do Not Know	43	30.488	18.442	24.465	22.326	22.395	118.116
Blank	30	32.930	19.200	24.630	21.570	22.300	120.630

were evenly distributed among the single, widowed and divorced groups. More than twice as many of the respondents were born in Oklahoma than in any other state, with an even greater number (82.5%) from the south central portion of the country. In addition, the majority of the teachers (65.4%) indicated that they taught in Oklahoma or Tulsa county.

Twenty-six different religious affiliations were represented, with the most numerous being from the Baptist (N = 194) and Methodist (N = 119) denominations. Of the four general religious classifications, the conservative (N = 260) and conventional (N = 236) groups comprised 91 per cent of all the respondents.

The educational background of the respondents revealed that 55 per cent of them have had some graduate school training, with 56 per cent of these having one year or less. With reference to major area of academic concentration, most of the teachers in the sample (55%) indicated that their college major was education, while 78 per cent of those with graduate training stated that education was their major area of concentration at the graduate level. Almost half of the respondents (49%) indicated that they had taken more than the minimum number of psychology courses. The majority of the teachers (93.2%) were educated in the south central area of the United States and most taught elementary school (46.6%).

In addition, most of those in the sample (60%) teach in rural areas of the state. Almost one third (30%) of those who answered the questionnaire reported that the counseling of students was part of their designated duties, while more than one half of the respondents (55%) stated that they had access to mental health facilities for their students.

A more detailed view of the frequency distributions resulting from an evaluation of the data according to some of the most important personal data variables revealed a number of noteworthy characteristics. These characteristics will be described by the terms "more than" or "less than." Such terms do not describe an actual numerical relationship but are proportional to the ratio of the levels of each variable in the sample.

When sex was used as the variable against which all other variables were evaluated, it was found that there were more females (32.0%) from a state other than Oklahoma than there were males (22.2%); males (71%) exceeded females (49.8%) on the variable of graduate education, while there were more females (57.2%) than males (43.9%) who had a college major in the area of education. Males predominated among high school teachers (60.5%) but the reverse was true at the elementary school level; males also outnumbered females on the variables of more than the minimum number of psychology courses (62.5% to 54.7%, respectively) and counseling of students (33.3% to 23.5%, respectively).

When age was the variable against which all other variables were evaluated, it was found that there were more men in the 30-39 age group (33.9%) than in any other age group. Those teachers over thirty years of age included in their ranks twice as many respondents with graduate training than without graduate training (253::135), whereas, among the 20-29 year old teachers the reverse was true (45::84). There were more respondents in the 40-49 (56.5%) and 60-69 (57.5%) groups who did not major in education, while 62.9 per cent of those over forty years of age and 53.8 per cent of those under forty years of age had more than the minimum number of psychology courses. In addition, 64 per cent of those

from rural areas were over forty years of age, while 56.5 per cent were less than forty years of age.

By the variable of marital status it can be seen that there were more females than males (32::3) among those who were divorced and widowed and, as would be expected, there were more single individuals in the 20-29 age group (43.5%) than in any other age group.

With reference to state of birth it can be noted that 40 per cent of those born in Oklahoma were conventional Protestants, while 50.9 per cent of those who were not born in Oklahoma were in this group. There was more graduate training among the teachers born in Oklahoma (61%) and, also, five times more of them than those from other states did not respond to the item on number of psychology courses.

Among the various religious classifications of Fundamental, Conservative and Conventional it was found that there were slightly more females in the conservative group (65.9%) than in the conventional group (55.6%), and fewer respondents from rural areas in the conventional group (48.0%) than in the conservative group (70.3%). In addition, there was an even distribution by age among the religious classifications. Within the specific religions themselves, it was found that among Episcopalians there were more females (90.9%); the Methodists as a group were somewhat older than the others (73.9% over forty), whereas, the Baptists (51.0% under forty) and Catholics (53.3% under forty) were both slightly younger. Lastly, among Presbyterians there were more respondents (42.5%) from states other than Oklahoma than from Oklahoma.

With respect to the college versus graduate school dichotomy of educational experience, it was found that among those with graduate training there was a greater number of respondents who were female

(60.0%), older (61.4% over forty), from Oklahoma (73.7%), and who had more psychology courses (69.3% had more than the minimum number). In addition, 40.8 per cent of those who reported some graduate school training were high school teachers and 34.9 per cent were counselors, whereas, 28.5 per cent of those without graduate school training were high school teachers and only 15.5 per cent of this group were counselors.

With reference to years of graduate education, it was found that among those with two or more years of graduate school 54.5 per cent were not education majors.

The distribution of the data according to the number of psychology courses revealed that there were more younger teachers among those with less than the minimum number of psychology courses (59.3% were less than forty years old), whereas, more than half of those respondents who had seven or more psychology courses were over forty years of age (58.3%). In this latter group more of the respondents (48.6%) than expected (40.0%) were from urban areas, and more (54.1%) than expected (47.3%) had not majored in education.

Among those who teach in urban areas there were fewer respondents over fifty years of age (20.0%) than among those who teach in rural areas (25.1%). In addition, there were more teachers from conservative religions in rural areas (56.8% of rural area respondents were conservative while 35.7% of urban area respondents were conservative) and slightly more education majors in these same areas (55.4% of rural respondents and 50.2% of urban respondents were education majors).

With respect to the grade taught by the respondent, it was found that at the elementary level 90 per cent of the teachers were females,

whereas, the sexes were equally represented at the high school level. Further, among high school teachers there were more from conservative religions (52.4% as compared to 44.4% and 45.3% at the junior high school and elementary school levels, respectively), more with graduate school training (67.0% as compared to 52.8% and 54.3% at the junior high school and elementary levels, respectively), and slightly more from rural areas (68.6% as compared to 55.2% and 40.9% for junior high school and elementary levels, respectively). The group was almost evenly distributed with respect to age, except for a slight tendency for the younger respondents to be over represented at the junior high school level.

Among those who reported to have included in their duties the counseling of students it was found that there were more males than females (38.4% were males as compared to an expected rate of 30.5%) and as a group they were somewhat older (62.2% over forty years compared to an expected 52.5%), with more graduate training (76.4% compared to an expected of 58.3%), and likely to be employed in a high school (43.5% as compared to an expected of 35.6%). In addition, it was found that 60 per cent of the counselors had more than the minimum number of psychology courses, whereas, 45 per cent of those who were not counselors had more than the minimum number of courses.

Tests of Significance for Section I

A list of all means on the six scales of Section I of the questionnaire may be found in Table I. These means represent the weighted scale scores of teachers grouped according to the personal data variables.

One hundred and sixty-one one-way Analyses of Variance (AOV) were employed with these means. This analysis yielded forty-nine significant differences (see Table II for significant "F's") so that differences were not found on all of the personal data variables or on all of the six scales. (A table of Sources of Variance for all AOV's may be found in Appendix B.)

A further analysis of the pairs of means (two at a time) was carried out with the use of the Duncan Multiple-Range test (see Table III for significant "q's"). Significant differences were found between one hundred and fifty pairs of means; of these, eighty-one included as one of the pairs a group which did not respond to the item. In 88.9 per cent of these cases the group which left the item "Blank" had more negative attitudes than the group to which it was being compared.

The variable of age, considered at each of the five ten-year intervals, revealed that those in the 60 to 69 year age group were significantly more negative on the General Scale ($P < .05$) than any of the other age groups including those subjects who did not respond to this age question. Those subjects who did not answer this item were more negative in their attitudes on the General Scale ($P < .05$) than either the 20-29, 30-39 or 40-49 year old group. In addition, the 50-59 year old group was less positive ($P < .05$) than the 20-29 and 30-39 year old group on this same scale.

The 60-69 year old group and those who did not answer the item on age were found to have more realistic opinions on the Causal Scale ($P < .05$) than any other age group. However, on the Total Scale the 60-69 year old group and those who had not responded to the age question were significantly more negative ($P < .05$) in their attitudes toward

TABLE II
SIGNIFICANT VALUES OF "F" IN ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Variable	Scale	F	Probability Level
<u>Age</u>	Psych.	2.15	.01
	Gen.	12.76	.01
	Causal	3.76	.01
	Total	2.97	.02
<u>Marital Status</u>	Psych.	2.03	.01
	Gen.	2.96	.02
<u>County in Which Teach</u>	Gen.	7.11	.01
<u>Religion</u>	Psych.	2.16	.05
	Gen.	3.33	.01
<u>Religious Classification</u>	Psych.	3.11	.01
	Gen.	5.92	.01
	Total	2.13	.01
<u>Education: College or Graduate School</u>	Adeq.	4.33	.05
	Resp.	8.85	.01
	Total	8.03	.01
<u>Years of Graduate Education</u>	Adeq.	3.16	.01
	Resp.	2.11	.10
	Total	3.47	.01
<u>College Major: Education or Non-Education</u>	Gen.	4.48	.05
	Total	3.50	.05
<u>College Major: Psychology or Non-Psychology</u>	Gen.	4.49	.05
	Total	2.33	.01
<u>College Major by Area of Concentration</u>	Adeq.	2.56	.05
	Gen.	3.08	.05
	Total	3.04	.05

TABLE II (Continued)

Variable	Scale	F	Probability Level
<u>College Minor</u>			
	Psych.	2.01	.10
	Gen.	3.66	.01
	Total	3.96	.01
<u>Number of Psychology Courses</u>			
	Adeq.	4.91	.01
	Psych	2.60	.10
	Gen.	5.41	.01
	Total	2.35	.10
<u>Bachelor Degree: Oklahoma or Non-Oklahoma</u>			
	Psych.	4.30	.05
	Gen.	2.78	.10
<u>Master Degree: Oklahoma or Non-Oklahoma</u>			
	Resp.	2.60	.05
	Total	3.24	.05
<u>Master Degree by State</u>			
	Psych.	4.16	.01
	Gen.	2.91	.05
	Total	4.09	.01
<u>Town Where Teach: Rural or Urban</u>			
	Adeq.	4.72	.01
	Gen.	8.11	.01
<u>Town Where Teach by Population</u>			
	Gen.	4.39	.01
<u>Grade Taught by Years</u>			
	Resp.	2.66	.05
	Gen.	2.63	.05
	Total	5.14	.01
<u>Grade Taught by Level</u>			
	Resp.	3.19	.05
	Gen.	3.30	.05
	Total	6.33	.01

TABLE II (Continued)

Variable	Scale	F	Probability Level
<u>Counseling of Students</u>			
	Adeq.	22.13	.01
	Resp.	7.38	.01
	Total	21.72	.01
<u>Fathers' Education</u>			
	Psych.		.10
	Gen.		.05
<u>Access to Guidance Clinic</u>			
	Adeq.	2.93	.05
	Gen.	5.02	.01

TABLE III
SIGNIFICANT "q's"*

Positive Attitude		Negative Attitude	Adeq.	Psych.	Resp.	Gen.	Causal	Total
<u>Age</u>								
20-29	vs	60-69				7.46		7.31
30-39	vs	60-69				7.01		6.79
40-49	vs	60-69				5.86		3.13
50-59	vs	60-69				4.69		
Blank	vs	60-69				3.60		
20-29	vs	Blank				3.86		6.78
30-39	vs	Blank				3.40		6.26
40-49	vs	Blank				2.26		
20-29	vs	50-59				2.77		
30-39	vs	50-59				2.31		
60-69	vs	20-29					2.41	
Blank	vs	20-29					2.37	
Blank	vs	50-59					2.20	
60-69	vs	30-39					1.83	
Blank	vs	30-39					1.79	
60-69	vs	40-49					1.70	
60-69	vs	50-59					2.23	
Blank	vs	40-49					1.67	
<u>Marital Status</u>								
Divorced	vs	Blank				4.98		
Single	vs	Blank				4.05		
Married	vs	Blank				3.56		

TABLE III (Continued)

Positive Attitude		Negative Attitude	Adeq.	Psych.	Resp.	Gen.	Causal	Total
<u>County</u>								
100,000 to 300,000	vs	Blank				7.88		
40,000 to 100,000	vs	Blank				6.17		
10,000 to 25,000	vs	Blank				5.99		
25,000 to 40,000	vs	Blank				5.22		
<u>Religion:</u>								
Cath.	vs	Blank		5.43				
Episc.	vs	Blank		4.76		5.06		
Presbyt.	vs	Blank		4.34		4.90		
Meth.	vs	Blank		3.50				
Episc.	vs	Bapt.				4.51		
Cath.	vs	Bapt.				4.35		
Episc.	vs	Ch. of Christ				4.50		
Cath.	vs	Ch. of Christ				4.34		
<u>Religious Classification</u>								
Cath.	vs	Blank		7.13				
Convent.	vs	Blank		5.09				
None	vs	Blank		4.62				
Conserv.	vs	Blank		4.19				
<u>Education:</u>								
College	vs	Graduate	1.70		1.38			3.82

TABLE III (Continued)

Positive Attitude		Negative Attitude	Adeq.	Psych.	Resp.	Gen.	Causal	Total
<u>Years of Graduate Education</u>								
None	vs	Four	6.50					12.00
One or Less	vs	Four	6.20					10.18
Blank	vs	Four	5.45					9.08
<u>College Major</u>								
Not Educ.	vs	Blank				4.79		8.10
Educ.	vs	Blank				4.77		10.17
<u>College Major</u>								
Psych.	vs	Blank				5.08		
Not Psych.	vs	Blank				4.78		
<u>College Major</u>								
N.S.	vs	Blank	6.63			4.94		12.60
Hum.	vs	Blank	5.34			5.76		11.80
Educ.	vs	Blank				4.74		8.15
Bus.	vs	Blank				4.70		9.58
S.S.	vs	Blank				4.07		6.91
<u>College Minor</u>								
Hum.	vs	Blank				4.06		7.47
None	vs	Blank				3.75		3.67
Educ.	vs	Blank				3.69		6.89
S.S.	vs	Blank				3.57		
Bus.	vs	Blank				2.64		

TABLE III (Continued)

Positive Attitude		Negative Attitude	Adeq.	Psych.	Resp.	Gen.	Causal	Total
<u>Number of Psychology Courses</u>								
1 - 3	vs	Seven +	5.05					
None	vs	Blank				3.81		
<u>Master Degree by State</u>								
N. East	vs	S. East				6.50		
N. Cen.	vs	S. East		11.19		9.25		35.00
Blank	vs	S. East				7.81		21.66
S. Cen.	vs	S. East		9.53		9.59		26.48
N. Cen.	vs	N. East						21.66
N. Cen.	vs	Blank		8.90				
N. Cen.	vs	S. Cen.		5.03				
<u>Town by Population</u>								
50,000 to 100,000	vs	0 - 10,000				3.61		
100,000 to 400,000	vs	0 - 10,000				2.76		
10,000 to 25,000	vs	0 - 10,000				1.02		
50,000 to 100,000	vs	Blank				3.47		
100,000 to 400,000	vs	Blank				2.36		
50,000 to 100,000	vs	25,000 to 50,000				2.92		
100,000 to 400,000	vs	25,000 to 50,000				1.80		

TABLE III (Continued)

Positive Attitude		Negative Attitude	Adeq.	Psych.	Resp.	Gen.	Causal	Total
<u>Town by Population</u> (Continued)								
50,000 to	vs	10,000 to						
100,000		25,000				2.85		
100,000 to	vs	10,000 to						
400,000		25,000				1.74		
50,000 to	vs	100,000 to						
100,000		400,000				1.12		
<u>Grade Taught by Year</u>								
7 - 9	vs	4 - 6			2.05			
7 - 9	vs	Blank				3.68		12.22
10 - 12	vs	Blank				2.46		8.10
4 - 6	vs	Blank				2.42		6.35
K - 3	vs	Blank				2.00		5.21
7 - 9	vs	K - 3				1.69		7.00
7 - 9	vs	4 - 6				1.26		5.86
<u>Grade Taught by Level</u>								
J.H.S.	vs	Elem.			1.88			
H.S.	vs	Elem.			1.06			
J.H.S.	vs	Blank			1.65	3.62		11.92
J.H.S.	vs	H.S.			.82			
H.S.	vs	Blank				2.46		8.10
Elem.	vs	Blank				2.15		4.90

TABLE III (Continued)

Positive Attitude		Negative Attitude	Adeq.	Psych.	Resp.	Gen.	Causal	Total
<u>Counseling</u>								
No	vs	Blank	5.97					11.00
No	vs	Yes	5.56					8.87
<u>Fathers' Education</u>								
College	vs	0 - 5				3.57		
Grad.	vs	0 - 5				3.50		
College	vs	6 - 8				2.00		
Grad.	vs	6 - 8				1.93		
<u>Access to Guidance Clinic</u>								
Not Known	vs	Yes	3.30					
No	vs	Yes	2.20					
Blank	vs	Yes	.86					
Not Known	vs	Blank	2.44					
No	vs	Blank	1.36			.64		
Not Known	vs	No	1.08					
Yes	vs	Not Known				2.90		
No	vs	Not Known				1.40		
Blank	vs	Not Known				.76		
Yes	vs	Blank				2.11		
Yes	vs	No				1.49		

*Alpha = .05

mental health. These findings on age offer partial support for the original hypothesis.

On the variables of both marital status and county in which the respondent was teaching the only significant difference was found to be on the General Scale ($P < .05$), with those who did not answer the items showing significantly more negative attitudes. The differences by religion on both the Psychiatry and General Scales ($P < .05$) gave this same result. In addition, both Baptists and members of the Church of Christ were significantly more negative in their attitudes than those of the Episcopal, Catholic or Presbyterian faiths ($P < .05$) on the General Scale. This finding offers partial support for the original hypothesis. Though the mean differences were in the predicted direction, the only significant difference to appear on the variable of religious classification involved those who did not answer the item. They were significantly more negative in their attitudes on the Psychiatry Scale ($P < .05$) than all other groups except the Fundamentalists.

The variable of education led to a number of significant differences. Those respondents who had attended graduate school were found to be significantly more negative ($P < .05$) in their attitudes on the Adequacy, Responsibility and Total Scales. Among those who did attend graduate school the respondents with four years or more of this experience were significantly more negative in their attitudes on the Adequacy Scale ($P < .05$) than were those with one, two, three or no years of graduate education. Similar findings appeared on the Total Scale ($P < .05$) with those respondents having four years or more of graduate school being more negative in their attitudes than those with one, two, three or no years. This finding is contrary to the hypothesis. However,

the respondents who made up the graduate group were somewhat older.

No differences were found among respondents by specific academic areas of concentration except for those who did not answer the item. This group was significantly more negative in their attitudes by college major (education vs not education), on the General and Total Scales ($P < .05$) and by whether or not they majored in psychology on the General Scale ($P < .05$). The same findings appeared on the Adequacy, General and Total Scales ($P < .05$) by graduate area of academic concentration and on the General and Total Scales ($P < .05$) by college minor.

The item concerning the number of psychology courses the respondent had taken revealed that those teachers who had seven or more psychology courses had more negative attitudes on the Adequacy Scale ($P < .05$) than those who had one to three psychology courses. This finding does not support the original hypothesis.

In a number of instances no significant differences resulted from the use of the Duncan Multiple-Range test, even though there had been a significant overall "F" in the AOV. The variables with which this occurred were: Bachelor degree (Oklahoma or not Oklahoma) on the Psychiatry Scale; Master degree (Oklahoma or not Oklahoma) on the Responsibility and Total Scales and town (rural vs urban) on the Adequacy and General Scales. However, when the variable of Master degree was considered by state, a number of differences emerged. Those respondents who had earned their degree in the southeastern portion of the country showed significantly more negative attitudes than those from the north-central, south-central and northeast on the Total, General and Psychiatry Scales ($P < .05$). In addition, the respondents with Master degrees from the northeast and south-central showed significantly more negative attitudes

on the Psychiatry Scale ($P < .05$) than those from the north-central, while those from the northeast were found to have significantly more negative attitudes on the Total Scale ($P < .05$) than those from the north-central.

A number of significant differences resulted when the data were considered according to the population of the town in which the respondent taught. On the General Scale it was found that those teachers from towns (or cities) with populations from 50,001 to 100,000 and 100,001 to 400,000 were significantly more positive in their attitudes ($P < .05$) than those from towns with a population of less than 10,000, 10,000 to 25,000 and 25,001 to 50,000 and those who did not answer this item. Teachers from towns of 50,001 to 100,000 were significantly more positive ($P < .05$) in their attitudes on this same scale than those from towns of 100,001 to 400,000, while those respondents from towns with less than 10,000 were significantly more negative ($P < .05$) in their attitudes than all other groups except those who did not answer the item.

The grade level (by year) which the respondents taught produced a number of significant differences. Respondents who taught grades seven through nine and ten through twelve were found to be more positive in their attitudes on the Responsibility Scale ($P < .05$) than those who taught grades kindergarten through three and four through six. On both the General and Total Scales those who taught the seventh through ninth grades were more positive in their attitudes than those who taught grades kindergarten through three and four through six ($P < .05$). The teachers who did not answer this item showed more negative attitudes than all other groups on the General and Total Scales ($P < .05$). The variable of grade taught by level revealed some similar differences in

that junior high school and high school teachers were more positive than those who did not answer the item on the same scale ($P < .05$). On both the General and Total Scale those who did not answer the item were more negative in their attitudes than respondents at all levels of teaching ($P < .05$), while those who taught at the junior high school level were more positive on the Total Scale ($P < .05$) than those at the elementary school level.

Teachers who reported the counseling of students as part of their designated duties were found to be more negative in their attitudes on both the Adequacy and Total Scales ($P < .05$) than teachers who did not counsel students, while those who did not answer the item were more negative than either group on both of these scales ($P < .05$). The Duncan Multiple-Range test did not find any differences on the Responsibility Scale (there was a significant "F" for this scale); nevertheless, the means bore the same relationship to one another as above.

Father's level of education--an indirect estimate of socioeconomic status--showed that on the General Scale those respondents whose fathers had attended college or graduate school were more positive in their attitudes ($P < .05$) than those whose fathers had attended only grade school. However, it was found that father's education was closely related to the age of the respondent.

The variable of access to mental health facilities (or guidance clinics) for students revealed that those who did have access were more negative in attitude on the Adequacy Scale ($P < .05$) than those who did not, didn't know or didn't answer the item. On the General Scale the reverse was found; that is, those who did not have access to mental health facilities were more negative in their attitudes ($P < .05$) than

those who had access. The teachers who did not answer this question were more negative in their attitudes than either of the other two groups ($P < .05$), while those who answered that they did not know whether or not they had access to mental health facilities for students showed more negative attitudes ($P < .05$) than all three groups. However, this variable also seems to have been related closely to the factor of age.

This contamination of effects by the influence of other variables, such as age, has been encountered in numerous instances in this research. The complex AOV conducted on the four major variables in this study eliminated the confounding of these results, and consequently offers a clearer picture of the effects of these variables (see Table IV).

When considering the variable of age, while holding the effects of psychology courses, religion and education constant, it was found that older teachers showed significantly more negative attitudes on the General and Total Scales ($P < .001$). The religious affiliation of the respondent, adjusted for age, was also found to influence results. Those respondents from conservative religions expressed significantly more negative attitudes than those from conventional religions on the Psychiatry Scale ($P < .01$), the General Scale ($P < .001$) and the Total Scale ($P < .05$). In addition, the number of psychology courses, adjusted for age, religious classification and education, that a teacher had taken led to paradoxical results. Those teachers who had more than the minimum number of psychology courses were more negative on the Adequacy Scale ($P < .001$) than teachers with the minimum number or less; whereas, on the General Scale teachers with more than the minimum number of psychology courses were more positive in their attitudes ($P < .01$) than those with the minimum number or less. No significant differences were

TABLE IV
SOURCES OF VARIANCE IN FOUR-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source*	DF	M.S.	F	Prob. Level
<u>Adequacy Scale</u>				
A	1	122.935	N.S.	**
R/A	1	.063	N.S.	
E/R,A	1	44.780	N.S.	
P/A,R,E	1	1071.922	12.239	.001
AR	1	90.704	N.S.	
AE	1	102.944	N.S.	
AP	1	15.483	N.S.	
RE	1	106.592	N.S.	
RP	1	96.525	N.S.	
EP	1	126.409	N.S.	
Error	358	87.578		
<u>Psychiatry Scale</u>				
A	1	28.969	N.S.	
R/A	1	160.702	6.001	.01
E/R,A	1	.522	N.S.	
P/A,R,E	1	98.442	N.S.	
AR	1	.954	N.S.	
AE	1	2.827	N.S.	
AP	1	51.712	N.S.	
RE	1	.221	N.S.	
RP	1	91.290	N.S.	
EP	1	75.737	N.S.	
Error	358	26.775		
<u>Responsibility Scale</u>				
A	1	66.059	N.S.	
R/A	1	7.624	N.S.	
E/R,A	1	35.551	N.S.	
P/A,R,E	1	32.594	N.S.	
AR	1	.159	N.S.	
AE	1	18.166	N.S.	
AP	1	34.756	N.S.	
RE	1	2.886	N.S.	
RP	1	1.860	N.S.	
EP	1	67.693	N.S.	
Error	358	25.779		

TABLE IV (Continued)

Source *	DF	M.S.	F	Prob. Level
<u>General Scale</u>				
A	1	525.764	15.459	.001
R/A	1	694.771	20.375	.001
E/R,A	1	3.426	N.S.	
P/A,R,E	1	260.485	7.639	.01
AR	1	10.758	N.S.	
AE	1	7.796	N.S.	
AP	1	8.849	N.S.	
RE	1	2.414	N.S.	
RP	1	3.824	N.S.	
EP	1	25.285	N.S.	
Error	358	34.010		
<u>Causal Scale</u>				
A	1	20.201	N.S.	
R/A	1	27.350	N.S.	
E/R,A	1	10.439	N.S.	
P/A,R,E	1	53.132	N.S.	
AR	1	16.898	N.S.	
AE	1	10.441	N.S.	
AP	1	16.599	N.S.	
RE	1	48.875	N.S.	
RP	1	.474	N.S.	
EP	1	19.372	N.S.	
Error	358	14.769		
<u>Total Scale</u>				
A	1	1851.810	8.479	.001
R/A	1	979.407	4.484	.05
E/R,A	1	340.731	N.S.	
P/A,R,E	1	387.189	N.S.	
AR	1	305.940	N.S.	
AE	1	184.657	N.S.	
AP	1	2.371	N.S.	
RE	1	483.481	N.S.	
RP	1	8.415	N.S.	
EP	1	9.518	N.S.	
Error	358	218.399		

*A = Age

R = Religious Classification

E = Education (College vs Graduate School)

P = Psychology Courses

/ = Adjusted for

**N.S. = Not Significant

found among teachers according to education, that is, whether or not they attended graduate school. Lastly, no significant interactions were found among the four variables.

As a result of these findings, three of the four hypotheses for Section I of the questionnaire were partially accepted. It was confirmed that: (1) age was inversely related to positive attitudes and realistic opinions and (2) teachers from more liberal religions had more positive attitudes and realistic opinions than teachers from conservative religions. In addition, it was partially confirmed that teachers with more than the minimum number of psychology courses had more positive attitudes and realistic opinions than those teachers with the minimum number or less. The hypothesis concerning graduate education was rejected.

Test of Significance on Section II

Section II of the questionnaire which compared the opinions of psychiatrists and teachers concerning five case history-like descriptions of students resulted in numerous significant differences. Teachers as a group ($N = 544$) differed significantly from psychiatrists as to the degree of disturbance exhibited in each of the five student portrayals ($P < .001$)(see Table V). These differences reflected the strong tendency of the teachers to consistently underestimate the degree of emotional disturbance presented. Significant differences ($P < .001$) were also found in all descriptions relative to the amount of assistance that the teacher should give. It should be noted that in the first three descriptions of students, the teachers saw themselves as being of more assistance than did the psychiatrists, whereas in the last two cases

TABLE V

COMPARISONS BETWEEN PSYCHIATRISTS AND ALL TEACHERS IN THEIR VIEWS ON
FIVE EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED STUDENTS, BY PERCENTAGES

The Degree of Emotional Disturbance which
Should Be Found by the Teacher

		1	2	3	4	Total
<u>Jane</u>	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		27.3%	31.1%	41.6%	534
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>John</u>	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			17.3%	82.7%	539
	$\chi^2 = 13.86$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>Barbara</u>	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		30.2%	49.6%	20.2%	540
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>Ted</u>	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			53
	Teachers	72.3%	27.7%			538
	$\chi^2 = 82.14$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>Fred</u>	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		25.2%	40.6%	34.1%	539
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE V (Continued)
The Extent of Involvement of the Teacher

		1	2	3	4	Total
<u>Jane</u>	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			50.7%	49.3%	533
	$\chi^2 = 14.15$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>John</u>	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			33.8%	66.2%	538
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>Barbara</u>	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	1.9%	16.0%	61.0%	21.1%	539
	$\chi^2 = 59.23$	DF = 3	P < .001			
<u>Ted</u>	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	15.9%	84.1%			536
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>Fred</u>	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		5.4%	33.6%	61.0%	558
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE V (Continued)

To Whom Referral Should Be Made by the Teacher

		1	2	3	4	Total
<u>Jane</u>	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			27.3%	72.7%	534
	$X^2 = .58$	DF = 1	P - Not Significant			
<u>John</u>	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			6.3%	93.7%	536
	$X^2 = 65.65$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>Barbara</u>	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		27.5%	7.1%	65.4%	535
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>Ted</u>	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		96.8%	3.2%		536
	$X^2 = 59.49$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>Fred</u>	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			44.9%	55.1%	535
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			

this situation was reversed.

The question of to whom referral should be made led to significant differences ($P < .001$) on all cases but the description of Jane. In this case, almost three-fourths of both the psychiatrists and teachers were of the opinion that this girl should be referred to psychological or psychiatric personnel. In the case of John, who is the student exhibiting some paranoid ideation, the difference between teachers and psychiatrists results from the fact that more teachers than psychiatrists felt he should be referred to psychological or psychiatric personnel; whereas in the case of Fred, the student with sexual problems, the difference found is a result of fewer teachers than psychiatrists feeling he needed psychological or psychiatric help.

The following section will present a series of comparisons of psychiatric and teacher ratings according to certain personal data variables of the teacher. When the judgments of teachers (by sex) were contrasted to those of psychiatrists on the degree of emotional disturbance exhibited in each of the five student descriptions, significant differences were found between the groups ($P < .001$) on each of these (see Table VI). An observational comparison between male and female teachers by percentage showed that females were in closer agreement with psychiatrists than were male teachers on the first three student descriptions.

Separate comparisons of psychiatrists to teachers who were 20-39 years old and to teachers who were 40-69 years old, also led to the finding of significant differences for each description. Older teachers were in closer agreement with psychiatric opinion than were younger teachers on the descriptions of Jane and Fred. In both cases there was

TABLE VI

COMPARISONS OF TEACHERS' AND PSYCHIATRISTS' OPINIONS
ON THE DEGREE OF EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE BY VARIABLES

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
(a) By Teachers' Sex: Males						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		34.6%	32.0%	33.3%	153
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			23.2%	76.8%	155
	$X^2 = 90.77$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		44.5%	42.6%	12.9%	155
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	74.2%	25.8%			155
	$X^2 = 28.47$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		32.9%	41.9%	25.2%	155
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
(b) By Teachers' Sex: Females						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		24.7%	31.3%	44.0%	352
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			14.4%	85.6%	353
	$X^2 = 52.26$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		24.6%	52.3%	23.1%	354
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	72.8%	27.2%			353
	$X^2 = 56.69$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		21.8%	40.1%	38.1%	354
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VI. (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
<u>(c) By Teachers' Age: 20-39 Years</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		36.5%	32.5%	30.9%	249
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			21.3%	78.7%	249
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		33.2%	50.4%	16.4%	250
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	85.6%	14.4%			250
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		32.4%	42.8%	24.8%	250
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(d) By Teachers' Age: 40-69 Years</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		19.9%	29.5%	50.6%	261
	$X^2 = 79.67$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			13.2%	86.8%	265
	$X^2 = 29.01$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		27.5%	49.4%	23.1%	265
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	61.6%	38.4%			263
	$X^2 = 8.17$	DF = 1	P < .005			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		18.6%	38.3%	43.1%	264
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VI (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
<u>(e) By Teachers' Marital Status: Married</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		28.4%	31.9%	39.7%	430
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			17.2%	82.8%	436
	$X^2 = 6.23$	DF = 1	P < .025			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		29.7%	50.3%	19.9%	437
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	74.1	25.9%			436
	$X^2 = 42.07$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		26.1%	42.0%	31.9%	434
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(f) By Teachers' Marital Status: Not Married</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		24.4%	29.5%	46.1%	78
	$X^2 = \text{None}^*$					
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			19.2%	80.8%	78
	$X^2 = 20.31$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		33.3%	51.3%	15.4%	78
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	69.2%	30.8%			78
	$X^2 = 8.45$	DF = 1	P < .005			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		19.2%	38.5%	29.5%	78
	$X^2 = 32.84$	DF = 2	P < .001			

*Chi square was not computed because of too few subjects in a cell.

TABLE VI (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
<u>(g) By Teachers' State of Birth: Oklahoma</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		27.6%	31.1%	41.3%	370
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			18.2%	81.8%	373
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		28.2%	50.1%	21.7%	373
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	71.9%	28.1%			374
	$X^2 = 54.89$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		22.8%	42.5%	34.7%	372
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(h) By Teachers State of Birth: Not Oklahoma</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		27.6%	31.4%	41.0%	156
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			15.2%	84.8%	158
	$X^2 = 27.47$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		35.2%	47.8%	17.0%	159
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	75.3%	24.7%			158
	$X^2 = 32.15$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		30.2%	37.7%	32.1%	159
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VI (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
<u>(i) By Teachers' County Where Teaching: Population above 40,000</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		26.9%	34.6%	38.5%	283
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			17.8%	82.2%	287
	$X^2 = 80.40$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		31.0%	47.9%	21.1%	288
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	76.3%	23.7%			287
	$X^2 = 63.63$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		27.0%	43.8%	29.2%	288
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(j) By Teachers' County Where Teaching: Population less than 40,000</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		27.7%	27.7%	44.6%	242
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			16.5%	83.5%	243
	$X^2 = 54.21$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		28.8%	51.9%	19.3%	243
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	67.8%	32.2%			242
	$X^2 = 21.76$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		21.9%	37.6%	40.5%	242
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VI (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
(k) By Teachers' Religious Classification: Conservative						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		31.5%	28.8%	39.7%	257
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			17.1%	82.9%	257
	$X^2 = 64.54$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		28.3%	47.7%	24.0%	258
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	66.1%	33.9%			257
	$X^2 = 18.37$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		18.6%	41.1%	40.3%	258
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
(l) By Teachers' Religious Classification: Conventional						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		23.8%	32.0%	44.1%	231
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			16.2%	83.8%	235
	$X^2 = 49.67$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		31.1%	51.5%	17.4%	235
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	77.8%	32.2%			234
	$X^2 = 58.58$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		30.8%	41.5%	27.7%	234
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VI (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
<u>(m) By Teachers' Level of Education: College</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		30.8%	30.4%	38.8%	224
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			17.5%	82.5%	224
	$X^2 = 59.61$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		28.1%	51.9%	20.0%	224
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	79.8%	20.2%			223
	$X^2 = 65.34$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		24.6%	40.6%	34.8%	224
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(n) By Teachers' Level of Education: Graduate School</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		24.9%	31.4%	43.7%	309
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			17.1%	82.9%	315
	$X^2 = 79.61$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		31.7%	48.0%	20.3%	315
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	67.2%	32.8%			314
	$X^2 = 26.13$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		25.8%	40.8%	33.4%	314
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VI (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
(o) <u>By Teachers' College Major: Education</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		31.5%	28.3%	40.2%	276
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			17.3%	82.7%	278
	$\chi^2 = 71.56$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		28.8%	49.6%	21.6%	278
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			53
	Teachers	73.4%	26.6%			278
	$\chi^2 = 47.26$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		28.0%	36.0%	36.0%	278
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
(p) <u>By Teachers' College Major: Non-Education</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		22.5%	34.4%	43.1%	244
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			16.6%	83.4%	247
	$\chi^2 = 56.55$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		31.5%	50.4%	18.1%	248
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	72.8%	27.2%			246
	$\chi^2 = 39.34$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		22.7%	46.6%	30.7%	247
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VI (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Distrub.	Severe Disturb.	N
<u>(q) By Teachers' Number of Psychology Courses: None to 3</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		31.2%	28.1%	40.7%	199
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			21.0%	79.0%	200
	$X^2 = 89.72$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		28.5%	54.5%	17.0%	200
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	73.9%	26.1%			199
	$X^2 = 35.45$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		25.5%	43.0%	31.5%	200
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(r) By Teachers' Number of Psychology Courses: 4 or More</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		39.6%	32.7%	42.5%	266
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			14.9%	85.1%	269
	$X^2 = 43.75$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		32.6%	46.7%	20.7%	270
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	73.6%	26.4%			269
	$X^2 = 46.73$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		27.9%	39.4%	32.7%	269
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VI (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
<u>(s) By Teachers' Town Where Teaching: Rural</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		28.4%	27.7%	43.9%	310
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			18.3%	81.7%	312
	$X^2 = 94.75$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		30.1%	50.6%	19.3%	312
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	67.4%	32.6%			310
	$X^2 = 33.74$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		24.4%	36.0%	39.6%	311
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(t) By Teachers' Town Where Teaching: Urban</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		26.6%	33.8%	39.6%	207
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			17.1%	82.9%	211
	$X^2 = 52.40$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		29.4%	48.8%	21.8%	211
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	77.7%	22.3%			211
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		26.5%	46.4%	27.1%	211
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VI (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
<u>(u) By Teachers' Grade Taught: Elementary</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		27.4%	27.4%	45.2%	234
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			15.3%	84.7%	235
	$X^2 = 40.71$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	54
	Teachers		24.3%	50.6%	25.1%	235
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	70.1%	29.9%			234
	$X^2 = 27.92$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		21.7%	40.9%	37.4%	235
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(v) By Teachers' Grade Taught: Junior High School</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		35.2%	30.7%	34.1%	88
	$X^2 = \text{None}^*$	DF = 2				
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			13.6%	86.4%	88
	$X^2 = 7.23$	DF = 1	P < .010			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		38.2%	44.9%	16.9%	89
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	81.8%	18.2%			88
	$X^2 = 31.41$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		26.1%	42.0%	31.9%	88
	$X^2 = 61.28$	DF = 2	P < .001			

*Chi square was not computed because of too few subjects in a cell.

TABLE VI (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
<u>(w) By Teachers' Grade Taught: High School</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		24.0%	35.2%	40.8%	179
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			20.9%	79.1%	182
	$X^2 = 80.40$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		32.5%	51.6%	15.9%	182
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	66.5%	33.5%			182
	$X^2 = 13.67$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		28.6%	42.3%	29.1%	182
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(x) By Teachers' Regular Counseling Duties: Yes</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		27.0%	27.0%	46.0%	137
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			16.4%	83.6%	140
	$X^2 = 31.06$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		32.9	48.6%	18.5%	140
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	67.9%	32.1%			140
	$X^2 = 12.73$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		22.9%	39.3%	37.8%	140
	$X^2 = 95.57$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VI (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
<u>(y) By Teachers' Regular Counseling Duties: No</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		27.2%	32.3%	40.5%	375
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			17.3%	82.7%	375
	$\chi^2 = 96.96$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		29.5%	49.5%	21.0%	376
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	74.7%	25.3%			375
	$\chi^2 = 71.95$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		26.3%	41.5%	32.2%	376
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(z) By Teachers' Access to Guidance Clinic: Yes</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		27.5%	31.3%	41.2%	313
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			15.9%	84.1%	315
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		30.4%	47.8%	21.8%	316
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	73.4%	26.6%			316
	$\chi^2 = 53.98$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		24.1%	44.6%	31.3%	316
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			

TABLE VI (Continued)

		No Evidence	Mild Disturb.	Mod. Disturb.	Severe Disturb.	N
<u>(z¹) By Teachers' Access to Guidance Clinic: No</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists		1.8%	11.1%	87.0%	54
	Teachers		25.3%	32.0%	44.7%	150
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			17.1%	82.9%	152
	$\chi^2 = 38.17$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		3.7%	48.2%	48.2%	53
	Teachers		28.9%	53.3%	17.8%	152
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	52.8%	47.2%			54
	Teachers	71.5%	28.5%			151
	$\chi^2 = 21.28$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	27.8%	54
	Teachers		27.0%	32.2%	40.8%	152
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

a tendency for younger teachers to consider those students less disturbed than did psychiatrists or older teachers, thereby refuting the age hypothesis.

The variables of marital status and state of birth were found not to exert any influence on the relationship between teacher and psychiatric judgment; in each case they remained significantly different from one another ($P < .001$). The tendency here, as elsewhere, was for the teacher to underestimate the severity of the disturbance. The county in which the teacher was employed (less than 40,000 population or more than 40,000 population) and the teachers' religious affiliation (conservative or conventional) also produced significant differences between teachers and psychiatrists in all five cases. Teachers from a smaller county and more conservative religion tended to judge the case of Fred as exhibiting more severe disturbance than both psychiatrists and those from larger counties or conventional religions. This latter finding offers partial support for the hypothesis concerning religion.

The variables pertaining to education (college vs graduate school) and number of psychology courses (minimum requirement vs more than minimum) all led to significant differences between teachers and psychiatrists, with no differences among teachers resulting from these two variables. This finding is not in accord with the hypotheses made concerning graduate education and number of psychology courses.

Finally, significant differences between psychiatrists' and teachers' judgments ($P < .001$) were found according to the remaining variables of town where respondent was employed (rural vs urban), grade level taught (elementary, junior high school, and high school), counseling of students (yes or no) and access to guidance clinic (yes or no).

On severity of disturbance in the case of Fred, respondents from rural towns tended to be further from agreement with psychiatric opinion than those from urban towns. These teachers judged him to be severely disturbed more frequently than urban teachers or psychiatrists.

A comparison between psychiatrists' and teachers' opinions on the extent of teacher involvement in the five student descriptions, by personal data variables of the teacher, revealed significant differences between male teachers and psychiatrists ($P < .001$) on three of the five descriptions (see Table VII). They were in agreement on the extent of teacher involvement in the cases of Barbara and Fred, whereas, female teachers and psychiatrists were in agreement only on the case of Jane.

Younger teachers were found to be in agreement with psychiatrists in the case of Barbara and significantly different in all others ($P < .001$); older teachers were in agreement with psychiatrists in the case of Jane, while being significantly different in all others. Therefore, the hypothesis concerning age was not supported.

Teachers who were not married were in agreement with psychiatrists concerning their involvement in the case of Jane but were significantly different from psychiatrists with respect to all other cases, as were those teachers who were married.

Two points of agreement were found between psychiatrists and teachers according to teachers' state of birth: (1) teachers who were born in Oklahoma agreed with psychiatrists on the case of Fred and (2) those who were not born in Oklahoma agreed with the psychiatrists on the case of Jane. Agreement was also found between teachers who were employed in a county with less than 40,000 population and psychiatrists in the case of Barbara.

TABLE VII

COMPARISONS OF TEACHERS' AND PSYCHIATRISTS' OPINIONS
ON THE TEACHERS' EXTENT OF INVOLVEMENT BY VARIABLES

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
(a) By Teachers' Sex: Males						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			59.9%	40.1%	152
	$X^2 = 18.54$	DF = 1	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			42.6%	57.4%	155
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	3.2%	23.2%	53.5%	20.0%	155
	$X^2 = 1.35$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	23.9%	76.1%			155
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		7.7%	46.5%	45.8%	155
	$X^2 = 5.16$	DF = 2	P Not Significant			
(b) By Teachers' Sex: Females						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			47.6%	52.4%	351
	$X^2 = 3.55$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			30.4%	69.6%	352
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	1.1%	12.2%	64.9%	21.8%	353
	$X^2 = 29.54$	DF = 3	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	12.6%	87.4%			350
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		4.5%	27.2%	68.0%	353
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
<u>(c) By Teachers' Age: 20-39 Years</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			55.6%	44.4%	248
	$X^2 = 17.26$	DF = 1	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			36.9%	63.1%	249
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	2.0%	18.8%	57.6%	21.6%	250
	$X^2 = 1.11$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	16.9%	83.1%			249
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		5.6%	37.7%	56.7%	249
	$X^2 = 42.59$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(d) By Teachers' Age: 40-69 Years</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			44.5%	55.5%	256
	$X^2 = .39$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			29.5%	70.5%	264
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	1.9%	12.9%	65.1%	20.1%	264
	$X^2 = 15.14$	DF = 3	P < .005			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	15.3%	84.7%			262
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		4.5%	32.6%	62.9%	264
	$X^2 = 64.71$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
<u>(e) By Teachers' Marital Status: Married</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			52.1%	47.9%	430
	$\chi^2 = 15.85$	DF = 1	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			33.3%	66.7%	435
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	2.1%	14.2%	61.7%	22.0%	436
	$\chi^2 = 14.30$	DF = 3	P < .005			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	15.9%	84.1%			434
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	66.7%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		4.4%	35.6%	60.0%	435
	$\chi^2 = 82.15$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(f) By Teachers' Marital Status: Not Married</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			42.3%	57.7%	78
	$\chi^2 = 0$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			35.9%	64.1%	78
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	0.0%	20.5%	65.4%	14.1%	78
	$\chi^2 = \text{None}^*$	DF = 3				
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	15.4%	84.6%			78
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		9.0%	26.9%	64.1%	78
	$\chi^2 = 21.52$	DF = 2	P < .001			

*Chi square was not computed because of too few subjects in a cell.

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
<u>(g) By Teachers' State of Birth: Oklahoma</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			53.1%	46.9%	369
	$X^2 = 16.69$	DF = 1	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			34.9%	65.1%	373
	$X^2 = 4.21$	DF = 1	P < .050			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	1.9%	15.8%	61.4%	20.9%	373
	$X^2 = 9.54$	DF = 3	P < .025			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	16.1%	83.9%			372
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		4.8%	33.5%	61.7%	373
	$X^2 = 3.47$	DF = 2	P Not Significant			
<u>(h) By Teachers' State of Birth: Not Oklahoma</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			45.5%	54.5%	156
	$X^2 = .54$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			31.2%	68.8%	157
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	1.9%	15.8%	60.8%	21.5%	158
	$X^2 = 76.17$	DF = 3	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	15.4%	84.6%			156
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		7.0%	35.0%	58.0%	157
	$X^2 = 27.22$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
<u>(i) By Teachers' County Where Teaching: Population Above 40,000</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			50.5%	49.5%	283
	$X^2 = 7.28$	DF = 1	P < .010			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			33.1%	66.9%	287
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	2.1%	16.7%	61.8%	19.4%	288
	$X^2 = 8.21$	DF = 3	P < .050			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	16.8%	83.2%			286
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		6.3%	35.1%	58.3%	288
	$X^2 = 52.05$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(j) By Teachers' County Where Teaching: Population Less Than 40,000</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			50.6%	49.4%	241
	$X^2 = 23.00$	DF = 1	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			34.7%	65.3%	242
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	1.7%	15.3%	60.3%	22.7%	242
	$X^2 = 4.84$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	14.1%	85.9%			241
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		4.5%	33.1%	62.4%	245
	$X^2 = 57.84$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
<u>(k) By Teachers' Religious Classification: Conservative</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			65.7%	44.3%	255
	$X^2 = 11.47$	DF = 1	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			34.8%	65.2%	256
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	1.9%	16.3%	58.0%	23.7%	257
	$X^2 = 2.5$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	19.0%	81.0%			258
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		4.3%	30.5%	65.2%	256
	$X^2 = 75.51$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(l) By Teachers' Religious Classification: Conventional</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			45.7%	54.3%	232
	$X^2 = .91$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			34.0%	66.0%	235
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	2.1%	15.7%	64.3%	17.9%	235
	$X^2 = 9.87$	DF = 3	P < .005			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	15.8%	84.2%			234
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		6.4%	36.2%	57.4%	235
	$X^2 = 36.99$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
<u>(m) By Teachers' Level of Education: College</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			51.6%	48.4%	223
	$X^2 = 7.34$	DF = 1	P < .010			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			35.0%	65.0%	223
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	2.7%	14.7%	59.8%	22.8%	224
	$X^2 = 4.15$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	14.9%	85.1%			222
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		5.4%	28.3%	66.3%	223
	$X^2 = 73.27$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(n) By Teachers' Level of Education: Graduate School</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			49.8%	50.2%	309
	$X^2 = 6.62$	DF = 1	P < .025			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			33.1%	66.9%	314
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	53
	Teachers	1.3%	16.9%	61.8%	20.0%	314
	$X^2 = 6.94$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	16.6%	82.4%			313
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		5.4%	37.6%	57.0%	314
	$X^2 = 44.82$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
<u>(o) By Teachers' College Major: Education</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			48.7%	51.3%	277
	$X^2 = 4.27$	DF = 1	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			30.9%	69.1%	278
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	33.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	2.2%	16.2%	59.7%	21.9%	278
	$X^2 = 5.03$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			54
	Teachers	18.4%	81.6%			277
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		5.4%	32.0%	62.6%	278
	$X^2 = 67.73$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(p) By Teachers' College Major: Non-Education</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			53.5%	46.7%	242
	$X^2 = 11.34$	DF = 1	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			37.8%	62.2%	246
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	1.6%	16.2%	61.9%	20.3%	247
	$X^2 = 5.90$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	12.7%	87.3%			245
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		5.7%	36.6%	57.7%	246
	$X^2 = 39.30$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
<u>(q) By Teachers' Number of Psychology Courses: None to 3</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			48.2%	51.8%	199
	$X^2 = 2.59$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			36.7%	63.3%	199
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	2.5%	14.0%	61.3%	22.1%	199
	$X^2 = 5.40$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	15.7%	84.3%			198
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		5.0%	32.0%	62.8%	199
	$X^2 = 49.04$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(r) By Teachers' Number of Psychology Courses: 4 or More</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			51.9%	48.1%	266
	$X^2 = 9.37$	DF = 1	P < .005			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			33.1%	66.9%	269
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	1.9%	18.1%	59.6%	20.4%	270
	$X^2 = 3.54$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	17.5%	82.5%			268
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		6.3%	37.2%	56.5%	269
	$X^2 = 38.12$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
<u>(s) By Teachers' Town Where Teaching: Rural</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			51.8%	48.2%	309
	$\chi^2 = 10.65$	DF = 1	P < .010			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			36.0%	64.0%	311
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	2.6%	13.2%	62.4%	21.8%	311
	$\chi^2 = 13.97$	DF = 3	P < .010			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	14.8%	85.2%			310
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		4.2%	33.4%	62.4%	311
	$\chi^2 = 74.61$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(t) By Teachers' Town Where Teaching: Urban</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			50.2%	49.8%	207
	$\chi^2 = 4.95$	DF = 1	P < .050			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			31.8%	68.2%	211
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	.9%	19.4%	58.8%	20.9%	211
	$\chi^2 = 1.66$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	17.2%	82.8%			209
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		7.6%	35.0%	57.4%	211
	$\chi^2 = 35.94$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
(u) <u>By Teachers' Grade Taught: Elementary</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			47.9%	52.1%	234
	$X^2 = 4.01$	DF = 1	P < .050			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			33.6%	66.4%	235
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	2.1%	17.9%	58.3%	21.7%	235
	$X^2 = 1.18$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	15.9%	84.1%			232
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		6.4%	28.1%	65.5%	235
	$X^2 = 75.10$	DF = 2	P < .001			
(v) <u>By Teachers' Grade Taught: Junior High School</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			47.1%	52.9%	87
	$X^2 = .73$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			25.0%	75.0%	88
	$X^2 = 50.89$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	.0%	14.6%	61.8%	23.6%	89
	$X^2 = \text{None}^*$	DF = 3				
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	13.5%	86.5%			89
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		4.5%	34.1%	61.4%	88
	$X^2 = 16.78$	DF = 2	P < .001			

*Chi Square was not computed because of too few subjects in a cell

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
<u>(w) By Teachers' Grade Taught: High School</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			55.3%	44.7%	179
	$X^2 = 11.83$	DF = 1	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			38.7%	61.3%	181
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	2.2%	15.5%	61.3%	21.0%	181
	$X^2 = 3.68$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	17.1%	82.9%			181
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		5.0%	40.9%	54.1%	181
	$X^2 = 17.99$	DF = 2	P < .001			
<u>(x) By Teachers' Regular Counseling Duties: Yes</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			60.6%	39.4%	137
	$X^2 = 18.12$	DF = 1	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			37.1%	62.9%	140
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	2.9%	22.1%	62.9%	12.1%	140
	$X^2 = 9.44$	DF = 3	P < .025			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	21.4%	78.6%			140
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		7.9%	37.9%	54.2%	140
	$X^2 = 17.72$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
<u>(y) By Teachers' Regular Counseling Duties: No</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			46.8%	53.2%	374
	$X^2 = 2.69$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			31.8%	68.2%	374
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	1.3%	13.9%	60.8%	24.0%	375
	$X^2 = 11.82$	DF = 3	P < .010			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	14.5%	15.5%			373
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		4.3%	32.6%	63.1%	374
	$X^2 = 2.74$	DF = 2	P Not Significant			
<u>(z) By Teachers' Access to Guidance Clinic: Yes</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			50.2%	49.8%	313
	$X^2 = 7.34$	DF = 1	P < .010			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			32.4%	67.6%	315
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	.9%	16.5%	63.3%	19.3%	316
	$X^2 = 10.66$	DF = 3	P < .025			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	13.3%	86.7%			315
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		5.7%	36.8%	57.5%	315
	$X^2 = 47.90$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VII (Continued)

		Handle Alone	Major Assist.	Some Assist.	Referral Only	N
<u>(z¹) By Teachers' Access to Guidance Clinic: No</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			42.6%	57.4%	54
	Teachers			52.3%	47.7%	149
	$X^2 = 1.55$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			5.6%	94.4%	54
	Teachers			35.1%	64.9%	151
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists	1.8%	20.4%	53.7%	24.1%	54
	Teachers	2.1%	15.2%	57.6%	24.5%	151
	$X^2 = .59$	DF = 3	P Not Significant			
Ted	Psychiatrists	83.0%	17.0%			53
	Teachers	17.4%	82.6%			149
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists		5.6%	55.6%	38.9%	54
	Teachers		4.6%	30.5%	64.9%	151
	$X^2 = 43.77$	DF = 2	P < .001			

Few differences were found among teachers by religious classification. Those from a conservative faith agreed with psychiatrists in one of five cases (Barbara), while those from conventional faiths agreed with psychiatrists in the case of Jane. This finding does not support the original hypothesis concerning religion. Similarly, no differences appeared between teachers according to their level of education (college vs graduate school), since they were both in accord with psychiatrists on the case of Barbara and had similar percentage distributions in all other cases. As a result, the hypothesis concerning level of education is also not supported.

By college major (education vs not education) and number of psychology courses (three or less vs four or more) teachers were also found to be in agreement with psychiatrists in the case of Barbara. The latter finding does not concur with the hypothesis concerning psychology courses.

Among rural teachers there was no agreement with psychiatrists concerning extent of involvement, whereas among urban teachers agreement was found again in the case of Barbara. Elementary teachers also agreed with psychiatrists in the case of Barbara, as did high school teachers, whereas junior high school teachers agreed in the case of Jane.

Teachers who counsel students as part of their designated duties or have access to mental health facilities for the students were found to be less in agreement with psychiatrists concerning involvement than were those who did not have access to mental health facilities for their students or those who do not counsel students. This latter group was found to be in agreement with psychiatrists in two of the five cases, while the former group differed significantly from psychiatrists in all

five cases.

In general, the differences between teachers and psychiatrists concerning extent of teacher involvement were the result of a tendency by the teachers to see themselves as giving more assistance than do the psychiatrists.

A comparison of teachers' and psychiatrists' opinions as to whom referral should be made according to the personal data variables revealed a number of instances in which teachers and psychiatrists were in agreement (see Table VIII). Female teachers were found to be in agreement with psychiatrists in the case of Jane, whereas males were significantly different from psychiatrists in all cases. Similarly, older teachers agreed with psychiatrists concerning this girl's description, while younger teachers opinions differed from psychiatrists on each case. This finding leads to the rejection of the hypothesis concerning age.

On the variables of marital status, state of birth, and county where teaching, each of the pairs of teacher groups agreed with psychiatric opinion on referral concerning Jane and differed on all other student descriptions.

With reference to the variable of religion, it was found that teachers from more conventional religions concurred with psychiatric opinions concerning the case of Jane, whereas teachers from more conservative religions were significantly different from psychiatrists on every student description. This finding offers additional support to the hypothesis on religion. With respect to the level of education, teachers with graduate school training and those with only college training both agreed with psychiatrists concerning the referral of Jane.

TABLE VIII

COMPARISONS OF TEACHERS' AND PSYCHIATRISTS' OPINIONS
AS TO WHOM REFERRAL SHOULD BE MADE
BY THE TEACHER BY VARIABLES

		No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
<u>(a) By Teachers' Sex: Males</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			34.6%	65.3%	153
	$X^2 = 6.09$	DF = 1	P < .025			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			11.0%	89.0%	155
	$X^2 = 8.49$	DF = 1	P < .005			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		30.3%	4.5%	65.2%	155
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		99.4%	0.6%		155
	$X^2 = \text{None}^*$	DF = 1				
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			39.6%	60.4%	154
	$X^2 = 19.01$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(b) By Teachers' Sex: Females</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			23.9%	76.1%	351
	$X^2 = .71$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			4.5%	95.5%	352
	$X^2 = 54.45$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		26.0%	8.4%	65.7%	350
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		96.0%	4.0%		350
	$X^2 = 32.44$	DF = 1	P < .001			

*Chi Square was not computed because of too few subjects in a cell.

TABLE VIII (Continued)

	No One	Non-Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
(b) <u>By Teachers' Sex: Females (Continued)</u>					
Fred			24.5%	75.5%	53
			47.2%	52.8%	352
	$X^2 = 95.87$	DF = 1	P < .001		
(c) <u>By Teachers' Age: 20-39 Years</u>					
Jane			25.9%	74.1%	54
			31.7%	68.3%	249
	$X^2 = 4.30$	DF = 1	P < .050		
John			20.4%	79.6%	54
			6.4%	93.6%	249
	$X^2 = 29.95$	DF = 1	P < .001		
Barbara			1.9%	71.7%	53
			30.1%	65.9%	249
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001		
Ted			84.9%	15.1%	53
			99.6%	.4%	249
	$X^2 = \text{None}^*$	DF = 1			
Fred			24.5%	75.5%	53
			40.6%	59.4%	249
	$X^2 = 34.74$	DF = 1	P < .001		
(d) <u>By Teachers' Age: 40-69 Years</u>					
Jane			25.9%	74.1%	54
			23.8%	76.2%	261
	$X^2 = .58$	DF = 1	P Not Significant		
John			20.4%	79.6%	54
			6.1%	93.9%	264
	$X^2 = 37.51$	DF = 1	P < .001		
Barbara			1.9%	71.7%	53
			25.6%	66.6%	261
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001		

*Chi Square was not computed because of too few subjects in a cell.

TABLE VIII (Continued)

		No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
(d) <u>By Teachers' Age: 40-69 Years (Continued)</u>						
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		93.9%	6.1%		262
	$X^2 = 16.53$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			50.2%	48.8%	261
	$X^2 = 93.12$	DF = 1	P < .001			
(e) <u>By Teachers' Marital Status: Married</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			27.6%	72.4%	431
	$X^2 = .55$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			6.0%	94.0%	435
	$X^2 = 55.73$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		26.4%	6.9%	66.7%	432
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		97.0%	3.0%		434
	$X^2 = 49.60$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			46.5%	54.5%	433
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
(f) <u>By Teachers' Marital Status: Not Married</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			26.9%	73.1%	78
	$X^2 = .04$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			7.7%	92.3%	78
	$X^2 = 7.75$	DF = 1	P < .010			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	54
	Teachers		34.6%	9.0%	56.4%	78
	$X^2 = \text{None}^*$	DF = 2				

*Chi Square was not computed because of too few subjects in a cell.

TABLE VIII (Continued)

		No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
<u>(f) By Teachers' Marital Status: Not Married (Continued)</u>						
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		94.9%	5.1%		78
	$X^2 = 6.05$	DF = 1	P < .025			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			41.0%	59.0%	78
	$X^2 = 13.37$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(g) By Teachers' State of Birth: Oklahoma</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			28.6%	71.4%	370
	$X^2 = 1.46$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			5.6%	94.4%	373
	$X^2 = 50.05$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		26.2%	6.2%	67.6%	370
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		96.7%	4.3%		373
	$X^2 = 33.99$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			42.0%	58.0%	369
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(h) By Teachers' State of Birth: Not Oklahoma</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			23.7%	76.3%	156
	$X^2 = .39$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			8.3%	91.7%	157
	$X^2 = 14.21$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		30.6%	8.9%	60.5%	157
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VIII (Continued)

	No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
(h) <u>By Teachers' State of Birth: Not Oklahoma (Continued)</u>					
Ted		84.9%	15.1%		53
		99.4%	0.6%		155
	$X^2 = \text{None}^*$	DF = 1			
Fred			24.5%	75.5%	53
			51.3%	48.7%	158
	$X^2 = 61.19$	DF = 1	P < .001		
(i) <u>By Teachers' County Where Teaching: Population Above 40,000</u>					
Jane			25.9%	74.1%	54
			26.5%	73.5%	283
	$X^2 = .05$	DF = 1	P Not Significant		
John			20.4%	79.6%	54
			6.0%	94.0%	287
	$X^2 = 37.05$	DF = 1	P < .001		
Barbara		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
		30.3%	6.6%	63.1%	287
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001		
Ted		84.9%	15.1%		53
		97.2%	2.8%		285
	$X^2 = 33.58$	DF = 1	P < .001		
Fred			24.5%	75.5%	53
			43.3%	56.6%	286
	$X^2 = 54.98$	DF = 1	P < .001		
(j) <u>By Teachers' County Where Teaching: Population Less Than 40,000</u>					
Jane			25.9%	74.1%	54
			27.7%	72.3%	242
	$X^2 = .40$	DF = 1	P Not Significant		
John			20.4%	79.6%	54
			6.2%	93.8%	242
	$X^2 = 30.06$	DF = 1	P < .001		
Barbara		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
		23.8%	7.5%	68.6%	239
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001		

TABLE VIII (Continued)

		No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
<u>(j) By Teachers' County Where Teaching: Population</u>						
<u>Less Than 40,000 (Continued)</u>						
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		96.3%	3.7%		242
	$X^2 = 24.45$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			46.2%	53.8%	240
	$X^2 = 61.40$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(k) By Teachers' Religious Classification: Conservative</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			32.3%	67.2%	256
	$X^2 = 6.52$	DF = 1	P < .025			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			5.5%	94.5%	256
	$X^2 = 35.14$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		25.0%	7.8%	67.2%	256
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		96.9%	3.1%		255
	$X^2 = 28.46$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			41.6%	58.4%	255
	$X^2 = 40.15$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(l) By Teachers' Religious Classification: Conventional</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			20.7%	79.3%	232
	$X^2 = 3.28$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			6.0%	94.0%	235
	$X^2 = 30.19$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		30.2%	6.5%	63.3%	232
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VIII (Continued)

		No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
<u>(l) By Teachers' Religious Classification: Conventional (Continued)</u>						
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		96.2%	3.8%		234
	$\chi^2 = 23.11$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			49.8%	50.2%	233
	$\chi^2 = 80.52$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(m) By Teachers' Level of Education: College</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			26.9%	73.1%	223
	$\chi^2 = .12$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			4.9%	95.1%	223
	$\chi^2 = 30.98$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		26.5%	5.8%	67.7%	223
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		96.9%	3.1%		223
	$\chi^2 = 24.89$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			43.2%	56.3%	224
	$\chi^2 = 44.87$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(n) By Teachers' Level of Education: Graduate School</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			27.4%	72.6%	310
	$\chi^2 = .31$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			7.3%	92.7%	314
	$\chi^2 = 33.05$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		28.3%	7.7%	84.0%	311
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VIII (Continued)

		No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
<u>(n) By Teachers' Level of Education: Graduate School (Continued)</u>						
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		96.8%	3.2%		312
	$X^2 = 34.43$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			45.9%	54.1%	310
	$X^2 = 76.08$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(o) By Teachers' College Major: Education</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			32.1%	67.9%	277
	$X^2 = 5.60$	DF = 1	P < .025			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			6.5%	93.5%	278
	$X^2 = 33.19$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		26.0%	7.6%	66.4%	277
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		97.1%	2.9%		278
	$X^2 = 58.67$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			49.1%	50.9%	277
	$X^2 = 90.59$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(p) By Teachers' College Major: Non-Education</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			21.4%	78.6%	243
	$X^2 = 2.57$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			6.5%	93.5%	246
	$X^2 = 29.25$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		30.2%	5.7%	64.1%	245
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VIII (Continued)

		No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
(p) <u>By Teachers' College Major: Non-Education (Continued)</u>						
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		96.7%	3.3%		244
	$X^2 = 26.60$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			39.3%	60.7%	244
	$X^2 = 29.82$	DF = 1	P < .001			
(q) <u>By Teachers' Number of Psychology Courses: None to 3</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			26.4%	73.6%	197
	$X^2 = .01$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			7.5%	92.5%	199
	$X^2 = 20.03$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		24.2%	6.6%	69.2%	198
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		97.0%	3.0%		198
	$X^2 = 22.50$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			43.2%	56.8%	199
	$X^2 = 37.67$	DF = 1	P < .001			
(r) <u>By Teachers' Number of Psychology Courses: 4 or More</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			26.7%	73.3%	266
	$X^2 = .14$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			5.2%	94.8%	269
	$X^2 = 38.25$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		29.6%	6.4%	64.0%	267
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VIII (Continued)

		No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
<u>(r) By Teachers' Number of Psychology Courses: 4 or More (Continued)</u>						
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		97.8%	2.2%		268
	$X^2 = 34.58$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			47.4%	52.6%	266
	$X^2 = 75.20$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(s) By Teachers' Town Where Teaching: Rural</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	53
	Teachers			28.1%	71.9%	310
	$X^2 = .74$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			6.8%	93.2%	311
	$X^2 = 35.67$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		24.7%	6.5%	68.8%	308
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		96.5%	3.5%		310
	$X^2 = 32.27$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			44.6%	35.4%	307
	$X^2 = 67.21$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(t) By Teachers' Town Where Teaching: Urban</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			26.1%	73.9%	207
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 1	P < .001			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			6.2%	93.8%	211
	$X^2 = 26.34$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		30.8%	7.6%	61.6%	211
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VIII (Continued)

		No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
(t) <u>By Teachers' Town Where Teaching: Urban (Continued)</u>						
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		97.1%	2.9%		210
	$X^2 = 24.56$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			43.1%	56.9%	211
	$X^2 = 39.57$	DF = 1	P < .001			
(u) <u>By Teachers' Grade Taught: Elementary</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			25.5%	74.4%	234
	$X^2 = .01$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			3.8%	96.2%	235
	$X^2 = 39.74$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		26.1%	8.5%	65.4%	234
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		95.7%	4.3%		232
	$X^2 = 21.06$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			51.3%	48.7%	234
	$X^2 = 90.73$	DF = 1	P < .001			
(v) <u>By Teachers' Grade Taught: Junior High School</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			29.5%	70.5%	88
	$X^2 = .51$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			2.3%	97.7%	88
	$X^2 = 15.98$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		37.9%	5.7%	56.4%	87
	$X^2 = \text{None}^*$					

*Chi Square was not computed because of too few subjects in a cell.

TABLE VIII (Continued)

		No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
<u>(v) By Teachers' Grade Taught: Junior High School (Continued)</u>						
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		98.9%	1.1%		89
	$X^2 = 13.56$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			35.6%	64.4%	87
	$X^2 = 5.83$	DF = 1	P < .025			
<u>(w) By Teachers' Grade Taught: High School</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			28.5%	71.5%	179
	$X^2 = .62$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			9.9%	90.1%	181
	$X^2 = 12.18$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		22.7%	6.1%	71.2%	181
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		97.8%	2.2%		181
	$X^2 = 21.81$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			38.9%	61.1%	180
	$X^2 = 20.15$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(x) By Teachers' Regular Counseling Duties: Yes</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			31.4%	68.6%	137
	$X^2 = 2.15$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			7.4%	92.6%	140
	$X^2 = 15.15$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		33.8%	8.6%	57.6%	139
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VIII (Continued)

		No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
<u>(x) By Teachers' Regular Counseling Duties: Yes (Continued)</u>						
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		95.7%	4.3%		139
	$X^2 = 12.61$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			43.8%	56.2%	137
	$X^2 = 127.56$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(y) By Teachers' Regular Counseling Duties: No</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			23.8%	75.2%	375
	$X^2 = .19$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			5.6%	94.4%	374
	$X^2 = 50.35$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		25.7%	6.2%	69.1%	373
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		97.6%	2.4%		373
	$X^2 = 46.83$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			44.8%	55.2%	375
	$X^2 = 83.53$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(z) By Teachers' Access to Guidance Clinic: Yes</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			24.3%	75.7%	313
	$X^2 = .43$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			4.4%	95.6%	315
	$X^2 = 49.44$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		28.0%	6.7%	65.3%	314
	$X^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			

TABLE VIII (Continued)

		No One	Non- Psych. Personnel	Medical Personnel	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel	N
<u>(z) By Teachers' Access to Guidance Clinic: Yes (Continued)</u>						
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		97.5%	2.7%		314
	$\chi^2 = 36.63$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			44.7%	55.3%	313
	$\chi^2 = 70.15$	DF = 1	P < .001			
<u>(z¹) By Teachers' Access to Guidance Clinic: No</u>						
Jane	Psychiatrists			25.9%	74.1%	54
	Teachers			29.3%	70.7%	150
	$\chi^2 = .90$	DF = 1	P Not Significant			
John	Psychiatrists			20.4%	79.6%	54
	Teachers			9.3%	90.7%	151
	$\chi^2 = 11.51$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Barbara	Psychiatrists		1.9%	26.4%	71.7%	53
	Teachers		26.0%	8.0%	66.0%	150
	$\chi^2 = > 100$	DF = 2	P < .001			
Ted	Psychiatrists		84.9%	15.1%		53
	Teachers		97.3%	2.7%		150
	$\chi^2 = 17.96$	DF = 1	P < .001			
Fred	Psychiatrists			24.5%	75.5%	53
	Teachers			46.4%	53.6%	151
	$\chi^2 = 38.98$	DF = 1	P < .001			

This finding leads to the rejection of the hypothesis concerning graduate education.

Teachers who did not major in education were found to be in closer agreement with psychiatrists than those who did major in education; the former were in accord with psychiatric opinion on the case of Jane, while the latter differed significantly from psychiatric opinion on each case.

The number of psychology courses taken by a teacher was not found to affect her referral policy. Teachers with both the minimum and more than the minimum number of psychology courses were in agreement with psychiatrists concerning the case of Jane and disagreed significantly concerning all other cases. Rural teachers were found to be in closer agreement with psychiatrists concerning referral as demonstrated by their agreement with psychiatric opinion in the case of Jane, whereas urban teachers were significantly different from psychiatrists on all cases.

Teachers agreed with psychiatrists about the case of Jane at each level of the variables of grade taught, whether or not they counseled students and whether or not they had access to mental health facilities for their students. Teachers were significantly different from psychiatrists on each of the same variables for all other descriptions.

It might be suggested that the case of Jane led to such a great deal of agreement because her pathology was too obvious. However, teachers were found to disagree with psychiatrists by almost every variable concerning the referral of John, due to the fact that as a group they felt he should be referred for psychiatric services more

frequently than did the psychiatrists; so that this objection is unfounded.

CHAPTER IV.

DISCUSSION

It has been shown in the previous chapter that of the four hypotheses proposed for Section I of the questionnaire, two were confirmed (Age and Religion); one was supported (Number of Psychology Courses) and one was rejected (Education). Since numerous significant differences were found when investigating the variable of age, it appears justified to consider this one of the most important variables. A number of other studies including Larson (1965) and Padrone (1967) have had similar results.

There are some obvious reasons for these findings. The first one encountered might be referred to as a "dated educational experience." Those individuals who are 50 years of age or older received the majority of their higher education prior to World War II. This war led to a greater concern for psychiatric problems; not only did the medical profession become involved, but also the universities and to some extent, the general public became more concerned. As a result, concepts of mental disorders and their treatment began to be revised. These changes undoubtedly influenced those who were university students during and after the war.

Another factor accounting for these results, which cannot be totally separated from the above, is the generally more progressive and more liberal attitudes which are found among the younger generations. Whether

circumstances lead to these changes in individuals or the other way around is not our concern here. It is simply apparent that younger people are, in the main, more liberal and progressive in their thinking than older persons. This consideration has become almost a truism.

It was also found that the most positive age group on the Causal Scale was comprised of those persons who were 60-69 years old. This was the only finding that did not lend support to the age hypothesis. This result might be explained by the fact that older respondents were found to have more psychology courses than younger respondents, so that as a result of this training their opinions on the causes of mental illness may be more realistic. It should also be noted that there were only thirty-seven respondents in this age group, which is one third to one fourth the size of each of the other age groups. As a result this group may not be representative of those teachers who are 60-69 years of age.

From the one-way AOV's it was found that the variable of religion did not produce the significance expected between the conservative and conventional groups, although it did produce some slight tendencies in the predicted direction as demonstrated by the differences between means. However, when the variable of age was held constant in the complex AOV, substantial differences were found to exist among teachers from conservative and conventional religions; thereby confirming the religious hypothesis.

The additional confirmation of the religious hypothesis through the comparison of Episcopalians to members of the Baptist and Church of Christ religions was not influenced by age nor was it influenced by education. It was solely a religious difference, as far as could be

detected from the frequency distributions. This finding offers further support for the conservative versus liberal group hypothesis. Such a result may be the consequence of some fundamental theological or philosophical difference between the denominations in question.

The failure to confirm the hypothesis concerning whether or not the respondent had any graduate training may have resulted from a number of factors. First, it is possible that the sample distribution of this variable (58.3% have some graduate school training) is not representative of the population of teachers as a whole. Secondly, this group tended to be somewhat older than those without graduate training. This distribution of age had influenced the results of the one-way analysis, but in the complex AOV the age factor was held constant. Lastly, and most probably correct is that this variable might not have any bearing on attitudes toward mental health.

The hypothesis concerning the number of psychology courses taken by each respondent led to conflicting results. Teachers with more than the minimum number of psychology courses were significantly more negative on the Adequacy Scale and significantly more positive on the General Scale than those with the minimum number or less. These paradoxical results could be explained by the fact that those teachers with more psychology courses feel more adequate in their dealings with students who are having difficulties and that these teachers may very well be more adequate as a result of their training in psychology. Such an explanation coincides nicely with this group's performance on the General Scale.

As can be seen in Table III, 54 per cent of all the significant differences found between means included as one of the pair, a group which did not answer the particular item; that is, they left it "blank."

It was also found that in 88.9 per cent of these comparisons this "blank" group had significantly more negative attitudes than the group to which it was being compared. This group which did not answer certain items was not made up of the same subjects on each of the omitted variables. The personal data obtained from the questionnaires revealed that those teachers who had left items blank comprised mainly two groups: (1) those who did not answer certain groups of questions on the personal data variables, such as sex, age and marital status, or all questions on education and (2) those who randomly omitted items. The former group was more numerous and it would appear that these omissions were possibly calculated, as opposed to the apparent randomness of omissions found in the latter group.

A number of explanations could be posited for the consistently negative attitudes found in the group. It should be pointed out that they did appear to have something in common; as a group they tended to be older, and older people were found to have more negative attitudes on this questionnaire. It might also be suggested that older people tend to be more defensive and as a result would omit certain items or that some of the personal data questions pertain to events in the past and a sixty year old teacher simply may not recall the number of psychology courses she had taken.

It should also be pointed out that the data for this study were collected in the midst of a particular atmosphere among teachers. At the time the questionnaires were mailed, the teachers as a group were contending for higher wages and better working conditions. They were threatening the state legislature with national sanctions against the school system and a possible strike. These threats were met in turn

with warnings of reprisals from officials. The atmosphere was one of tension, suspicion and distrust. So, to suggest that some teachers might not have wished to identify themselves in any possible way, may not be such an inappropriate assumption. In addition, it is also possible that in this atmosphere only the more "courageous" and/or interested teachers may have responded to this questionnaire, thereby reducing the number of differences found as a result of more group homogeneity in the returned questionnaires.

With respect to the differences found among teachers by grade taught, it appears that elementary school teachers have more negative attitudes than either high school or junior high school teachers. The elementary teachers consistently showed more negative attitudes by being willing to assume a disproportionate amount of responsibility. It could be argued, however, that relative to junior high school and high school teachers the elementary teacher should accept more responsibilities. In addition, it should also be pointed out that as a group, elementary teachers were older, while junior high school teachers tended to be younger.

The differences among teachers according to area of the country from which they received their Master degrees are tenuous at best, because of the very small number in each group. Any generalizations to areas of the country based on such a sample size would be totally unfounded.

Teachers from larger urban centers were found to be more positive in their attitudes than those from smaller towns. A frequency distribution of this data by age reveals that there are more teachers over forty years of age from rural towns than urban centers. As a result this

difference would seem to be attributable to age.

The finding that teachers who counsel students score more negatively is a deceptive one. The difference may be attributed to the fact that these teachers feel more adequate relative to teachers who do not counsel students. As a result it would seem that in this situation such a score could be considered a positive indicator, since teachers who are doing counseling should be more adequate in this area.

The information obtained concerning the educational level of the respondents' father was actually an indirect assessment of the socioeconomic status of the family of origin. This type of estimation was considered superior to using the socioeconomic status of the present family of the respondent, because most school teachers it would seem have incorporated the values of the middle class culture in our society. Therefore, it was felt that some differences might be found as a result of the socioeconomic environment in which the respondent was reared. However, this variable was also influenced by the age factor, since older teachers tended to report the lower educational level for their fathers.

The fact that teachers who have access to mental health facilities for their students score negatively on the Adequacy Scale and positively on the General Scale reflects a finding that has occurred a number of times in this study; that is, certain respondents feel more adequate or accept more responsibility than others, when their experience and immediate situation demand that they do. For example, a teacher who counsels students or is interested enough in the area of mental health to take the time and the energy to refer a student for professional services may feel more adequate or responsible than a teacher who is not

involved in this area. The point is that teachers are being compared not only to some outside criteria, but also among themselves. Therefore, it is both expected and desired that groups with certain responsibilities and activities would score significantly higher than their colleagues on scales such as those of Adequacy and Responsibility.

Of the four hypotheses relating to Section II of the questionnaire, three must be rejected. There were no noteworthy differences among teachers as to their agreement with psychiatric opinion according to age, number of psychology courses and graduate or college education. The only hypothesis to receive partial support was the one concerning religion. On the evaluations of degree of disturbance and referral policy, teachers from conventional religions were somewhat more in agreement with psychiatrists than teachers from conservative religions.

In general it can be said that teachers (1) tended to underestimate the severity of disturbance exhibited by a student, (2) saw themselves as being of more assistance than did the psychiatrists and (3) referred students to non-psychiatric or psychological personnel much more frequently than did the psychiatrists.

The fact that teachers tend to underestimate disturbance is a finding that should be taken seriously. Four of the five student descriptions depict persons with rather severe emotional problems. To overlook these or dismiss them as phases of development is to do an injustice to the student who is in need of help.

The question of disagreement on degree of assistance does not appear to be as serious. Certainly there can and should be cooperation between teachers and mental health facilities, such as child guidance clinics. The extent of teacher involvement can usually be arranged so as to

satisfy all concerned. Guidance clinics seldom complain about over zealous teachers. The complaint is usually quite the opposite. In addition, if teachers are as interested as these responses seem to suggest, then lectures, conferences and workshops held in conjunction with the local mental health facilities might meet with great enthusiasm.

The differences found according to referral policy are also somewhat encouraging. Three of the four disturbed students were consistently referred to psychiatric or medical personnel. It is hoped that the medical personnel would notice the seriousness of the problem and refer the student for more appropriate services.

Consideration of three of the student descriptions may help to clarify some of the factors operating in the teachers evaluations. John was consistently considered moderately to severely disturbed by most of the teachers and was even referred by the teachers directly for psychiatric services more often than the psychiatrists felt he should be referred. This did not happen with any other case. The distinguishing factor about John is that he is liable to act out his aggression and as a result become dangerous to others. Whereas in the cases of Fred and Barbara such danger and such concern on the part of the teacher is not present.

This is not intended to suggest that the teachers' concern in John's case is ill-founded but rather that more concern should be exhibited in the cases of students who are not direct threats to society, such as Fred and Barbara. Both of these students have serious problems and are suicidal risks; Barbara as a result of her depression and Fred as a result of his sexual conflict. Nevertheless, there were consistently large numbers of teachers who felt that both of these students were

mildly disturbed and that Barbara should not be referred for psychiatric or medical services.

A comparison between the results of Section I and Section II of the questionnaire leads to the possible conclusion that teachers do not do what they say they'll do. For example, with respect to the hypotheses, younger teachers were not in closer agreement with psychiatrists than older teachers concerning an actual case, whereas, their attitudes were found to be more positive than older teachers. Teachers with more than the minimum number of psychology courses had shown both more negative and positive attitudes on Section I than teachers with the minimum number or less; nevertheless, there were no differences between the groups in an actual situation. The consistency found on both sections relative to religious classification is tenuous at best and, therefore, not convincing enough to warrant a different conclusion.

In addition, whether one places more emphasis on the results of Section I of the questionnaire reflecting differences in attitudes among teachers or Section II showing that almost all teachers disagree with professional opinion, when confronted with an actual situation, or weighs both equally, it appears from the findings in this study that more extensive programs for teachers are needed in the area of mental health.

This conclusion is supported by letters which a number of teachers enclosed with their questionnaires. For example: "I know my training is not adequate but I am the counselor and I must try to help as much as I can . . ." Another teacher wrote:

. . . actual experiences over a thirty-five year period in the classroom have given me what I believe to be an above average understanding and success with situations involving behavior. (However) I still feel very inadequate.

I strongly believe this to be true of most teachers as our required training does not include much in this area. I think it would be most helpful to us in recognizing these difficulties. . . .

And lastly:

There is a tremendous need for a thorough rapport between teacher and psychologist . . . our best attempts are . . . just scratching the surface. Our training schools for teachers need to . . . build it into their required curriculum.

These are representative excerpts of the sentiments expressed in letters and accompanying notes jotted onto the questionnaire itself.

When critically evaluating all that has been presented, a number of considerations become worthy of attention. First and foremost this survey was conducted through the mail to insure voluntary and anonymous responses. Though these conditions were desirable for practical reasons, there arises as a result many methodological problems. Those individuals who did not respond, 65.2 per cent in all, can never be replaced. No valid estimation can be made of the change in the results had this group or any large portion of them been included. Consequently, any generalizations to the entire population from which this sample was drawn must be made with caution.

In addition, the sample size in many of the smaller intercomparisons also might be an influential factor which would defy generalization. For example, there were only thirty-seven respondents in the 60-69 age category.

A final consideration is in the statistical area. One hundred and sixty-one AOV's were conducted in all. Approximately eight of these could have been significant by chance at the .05 level of confidence. There were, however, forty-nine significant "F's" found. Which of these, if any, occurred by chance cannot be determined.

The main conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that the teacher's training in the area of mental health is inadequate for the job she must do. This is evidenced by certain negative attitudes which were based on ignorance and fear: ignorance concerning one's limitations and knowledge of mental health principles and symptoms of emotional disturbance, including appropriate steps to be taken; and fear of the unknown--as pointed out in Chapter I--which serves to maintain one's prejudiced and outmoded attitudes and opinions.

Both this ignorance and fear could be considerably reduced by training programs in our universities for those preparing for teaching and by lectures, joint staff conferences on selected cases and summer programs and workshops for those who are presently teaching. By remedying this situation, the teacher could become more sensitive to emotional problems and more helpful to the student who is in need.

Most people can detect a problem of blossoming paranoid reaction such as the case of John, but it is more subtle problems of depression and conflict, such as Barbara and Fred which are ignored. If students with these types of problems can be identified and referred for professional assistance, the outcome can be hopeful; whereas, if they are left to suffer their own misery and despair, the outcome all too often is tragic.

As a result of the three hypotheses which were confirmed in varying degrees in Section I of the questionnaire, a few measures directed at changing the present state of affairs will be suggested. Summer programs and workshops, as mentioned above, could be conducted for those who are now teaching. These programs might be modeled after those which have been found to be successful by the Kentucky Department of Mental Health.

In addition, the aid of the more progressive clergy from conservative religions could be enlisted in an attempt to promote attitude change. Further research, similar to that conducted by Allport and Ross (1967) should be undertaken to determine whether their extrinsic and intrinsic religious factors are applicable (see Chapter I). If these factors are operating, the forementioned clergy could be shown that those with more stereotyped attitudes and opinions may be in Allport's terms, "using their religion" rather than "living it." Such a finding could lead to more interest and commitment on the part of the clergy to programs of attitude change.

With reference to those in teacher training programs, it would seem that there should be an increase in the number of psychology courses. These students could even be encouraged to minor in Educational Psychology. However, additional research, employing before and after measures with more of an experimental approach should be conducted prior to any such changes. Since most of the teachers with more psychology courses probably enrolled in them on a voluntary basis, they may have had more positive attitudes at the start. Therefore, all such questions should be answered before undertaking any programs directed toward attitude change.

The results of this study also suggest some implications for future research in this area. It may be more profitable to present descriptions of actual situations to the group being investigated rather than questions concerning the abstract "shoulds" and "should nots" of mental health. As noted in Chapter I, there seems to be a tendency for people to behave differently when they are ego-involved in a situation. Such

vivid descriptions may help to engender ego involvement in the situation and may explain some of the differences among teachers in performances on Section I and Section II of this questionnaire.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

A questionnaire assessing teacher attitudes and opinions toward mental health, the causes of mental illness and the teacher's conception of her role in the therapeutic setting was mailed to 1560 public school teachers in the state of Oklahoma. The questionnaire contained two sections. Section I consisted of a Total attitude score and scores on the following sub-scales: Adequacy, Psychiatry, Responsibility, General and Causal. Section II consisted of five short descriptions of students with different types of emotional problems. The teacher was instructed to evaluate each description according to the following three criteria: (1) degree of emotional disturbance; (2) extent of teacher involvement and (3) to whom referral should be made. These judgments were then compared to judgments of psychiatrists that had been previously gathered.

The hypotheses which were postulated for Section I of the questionnaire were: (1) older teachers would show more negative attitudes than younger teachers; (2) respondents from conventional religions would be more favorable in their attitudes than those from conservative or more fundamental religions; (3) teachers with four or more psychology courses would show more positive attitudes than those with three or less; (4) teachers with graduate school training would have more favorable attitudes than teachers without graduate school training. The same four hypotheses were postulated for Section II of the questionnaire.

Of the four hypotheses dealing with Section I of the questionnaire the first two were confirmed, the third was supported and the last was rejected. For Section II of the questionnaire three of the four hypotheses were rejected, while the one concerning religion received moderate support.

On Section II of the questionnaire, it was found that teachers (1) tended to underestimate disturbance; (2) saw themselves as being of more assistance than did the psychiatrists and (3) referred students for psychiatric services less frequently than did the psychiatrists.

It was concluded in the study that teachers' training and knowledge in the area of mental health are inadequate. Some suggestions were offered for improving the situation and some of the implications for future research were discussed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerly, Spafford S., Bernstein, L., Erwin, E. and Helen Noble. Fostering mental health in the classroom. Journal of Teacher Education, 1960, 2, 365-369.
- Almy, Millie. Intellectual mastery and mental health. Teachers College Record, 1962, 63, 468-478.
- Allport, Gordon W., and Ross, Michael J. Personal religious orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5 (4), 432-443.
- Altrocchi, John and EisDorfer, Carl. Changes in attitudes toward mental illness. Mental Hygiene, 1961, 45, 563-570.
- Arbuckle, Dugald S. Counselor, social worker, psychologist: "Let's Ecumenize." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 532-540.
- Baker, Herbert L. Psychological services: From the school staff point of view. Journal of School Psychology, 1965, 3, 36-42.
- Brim, Burl J. Attitude changes in teacher education students. Journal of Educational Research, 1966, 59 (10), 441-445.
- Clark, D. H. Administrative psychiatry. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1963, 109, 178-201.
- Clos, Marjorie. Evaluation of mental health workshops in Kentucky. Journal of Educational Research, 1966, 59, 278-281.
- Cohen, J. and Struening E. L. Factors underlying opinions about mental illness in the personnel of a large mental hospital. American Psychologist, 1959, 14, 339 (Abstract).
- Costin, F. and Kerr, W. D. The effects of an abnormal psychology course on students' attitudes toward mental illness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1962, 53, 214-215.
- Cutter, Richard L. A research evaluation of a school mental health program. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1961, 31, 339-346.
- Dixon, Calvert R. Courses in psychology and students' attitudes toward mental illness. Psychological Reports, 1967, 20, 50.
- Evoy, John J. Mental hygiene and the teacher. Education, 1958, 78 341-345.

- Freeman, Howard E. and Kassebaum, G. Relationship of education and knowledge to opinions about mental health. Mental Hygiene, 1960, 44, 43-47.
- Graybill, Franklin. An Introduction to Linear Statistical Models. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1961.
- Haun, Paul. Attitudes about mental health. Mental Hygiene, 1959, 43, 351-357.
- Larson, Richard F. Clerical and psychiatric conceptions of the clergyman's role in the therapeutic setting. Social Problems, 1964, 11 (4), 419-428.
- Larson, Richard F. Attitudes and opinions of clergymen about mental health and causes of mental illness. Mental Hygiene, 1965, 49, 51-59.
- Larson, Richard F. Attitudes and opinions of clergymen about mental health in Oklahoma. Unpublished research, 1966.
- Mead, Frank S. Handbook of Denominations in the United States. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1951.
- Nunnally, Jim C. and Bobren, Howard. Attitude change with false information. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1959, 23, 260-266.
- Padrone, Frank J. Attitudes and opinions of teachers toward mental health and the causes of mental illness. Unpublished thesis, 1967.
- Patrick, S. M. Identifying the emotionally disturbed. Catholic School Journal, 1965, 65, 47-48.
- Rabkin, Leslie Y. The dogmatism of teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 1966, 17, 47-49.
- Sewell, William H. Infant training and personality of the child. American Journal of Sociology, 1952, 58, 150-159.
- Shoemaker, David M. A Fortran IV program for subgroup analysis of questionnaire data. Behavioral Science, 1968, in press.
- Soderbergh, Peter A. Dogmatism and the public school teacher. Journal of Teacher Education, 1964, 15, 245-251.
- Steel, R. G. and Torrie, J. H. Principles and Procedures of Statistics. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Symonds, Percival M. Mental health in the classroom. Journal of Social Issues, 1959, 15, 1-7.
- Woodward, Julian L. Changing ideas on mental illness and its treatment. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 443-454.

Wyatt, Gertrude. Mental health planning and psychological guidance in the Wellesley Elementary Schools. Understanding the Child, 1957, 26, 68-71.

Zolik, Edwin S. and Stotsky, Bernard. Relationships between problem labeling and treatment referrals by laymen. Community Mental Health Journal, 1966, 2 (2), 114-120.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

SECTION I

Place a check in the appropriate column after each question indicating whether you Strongly Agree, Mildly Agree, are Undecided, Mildly Disagree or Strongly Disagree with the statement.

1. My training and experiences are such that I feel competent to take on most cases of emotional disturbance among my students.
2. Most emotionally disturbed students need more help than I can give.
3. I do not have the background to help emotionally disturbed children.
4. I view the emotionally disturbed student as an interesting and challenging case.
5. My training and experience in handling emotionally disturbed students are adequate.
6. My background severely limits my having much success with emotionally disturbed children.
7. I do not know what to do for many of my emotionally disturbed students.
8. In general, I feel quite comfortable in caring for emotionally disturbed students.
9. I have a good grounding in helping emotionally upset children.
10. I feel pretty competent and comfortable in talking with students about their personal problems.
11. I dread to see emotionally disturbed students come in.
12. I have had practically no contact with the field of psychiatry.
13. On the whole, psychiatrists are very competent.
14. The psychiatrist's attitude toward the patient and his problem is for the most part a positive one.
15. I have been greatly impressed by the results of psychiatric treatment.

16. Of all the areas in teaching, I am least interested in counseling.
17. The criticism that psychiatry overemphasizes the sexual aspects of life is not a valid one.
18. Psychiatrists are too evasive when it comes to facing a problem.
19. In my opinion there are more "odd balls" in psychiatry than in any other profession.
20. Psychiatric treatment takes too much time and gets too poor results.
21. I feel the work of the psychiatrist conflicts with the work of the teacher.
22. I am too busy to deal with the emotionally disturbed student.
23. The satisfaction gained in helping the emotionally disturbed student far offsets the disadvantages of the time involved.
24. When you get right down to it, emotionally disturbed students should not be a teacher's responsibility.
25. Frankly, I just do not have the time to take care of emotionally disturbed students.
26. The teacher cannot do much for emotionally disturbed children except refer them to a psychiatrist.
27. I feel the majority of emotionally disturbed students should be handled by teachers.
28. There is no reason why the teacher should not practice some therapy.
29. Mental health is largely a matter of trying hard to control the emotions.
30. The best way to mental health is by avoiding morbid thoughts.
31. The good psychiatrist acts like a father to his patients.
32. Books on "peace of mind" prevent many persons from developing nervous breakdowns.
33. If a person concentrates on happy memories, he will not be bothered by unpleasant things in the present.
34. The main job of the psychiatrist is to explain to the patient the origin of his troubles.
35. When a person is recovering from a mental illness, it is best not to discuss the treatment he has had.

36. The solution for most emotional disturbances can be found through prayer.
37. Drinking too much is a cause of mental illness.
38. Not enough will power, lack of self-control, is a cause of mental illness.
39. Masturbation (playing with oneself or self-abuse) is a cause of mental illness.
40. Sex habits are a cause of mental illness.
41. Trouble getting along with one's husband or wife is a cause of mental illness.
42. Trouble getting along in school is a cause of mental illness.
43. A rundown physical condition is a cause of mental illness.

SECTION II

The following are five short descriptions of students who might come to you seeking advice. After each of these descriptions there are three statements concerning (1) the degree to which you feel that this student is emotionally disturbed, (2) the extent to which you feel you should be involved in assisting this student and (3) to whom you would recommend this student be referred. Place a check in the column which most closely approximates your opinion.

1. Jane Smith appears to be a pleasant young girl. She is active in both school and church activities and is considered a good girl. She states she conversed with God shortly after seeing a strange star a few weeks ago. Later, in a vision she saw and heard God talking with his angels. She also got a glimpse of the Devil and the fires of Hell. She repeatedly hears a strange voice telling her what to do and how to behave. Jane wants to know whether to obey the voice.

No.	1	2	3	4
79	I feel that this student shows evidence of being . . .			
	Not Disturbed ()	Mildly Disturbed ()	Moderately Disturbed ()	Severely Disturbed ()
80	In dealing with this student I would . . .			
	Handle Alone ()	Be of Major Assistance ()	Be of Some Assistance ()	Refer Only ()

No.	1	2	3	4
81	I would recommend this student be referred to . . .			
	No One ()	Non-Psych. Personnel ()	Medical Personnel ()	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel ()

2. John Brown is a boy in his early teens. During the last two years he has become very suspicious. He comes to you because his mother insists that he seeks help. John does not trust anybody, and he is sure that everybody is against him. Sometimes he thinks the people that he sees on the streets are talking about him or following him around. Recently he began to curse his mother terribly, then hit her and threatened to kill her because he said she was working against him, too, just like everyone else.

No.	1	2	3	4
82	I feel that this student shows evidence of being . . .			
	Not Disturbed ()	Mildly Disturbed ()	Moderately Disturbed ()	Severely Disturbed ()

83	In dealing with this student I would . . .			
	Handle Alone ()	Be of Major Assistance ()	Be of Some Assistance ()	Refer Only ()

84	I would recommend this student be referred to . . .			
	No One ()	Non-Psych. Personnel ()	Medical Personnel ()	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel ()

3. Barbara Thompson's father died five years ago when she was seven years old. She is an only child and lives with her mother. She is very quiet; she does not talk much to anyone, including her mother. She acts as if she is afraid of people, especially youngsters her own age. She won't go out with anyone and whenever someone comes to visit her mother, she stays in her room until the person leaves. She just stays by herself and daydreams about her father.

No.	1	2	3	4
85	I feel that this student shows evidence of being . . .			
	Not Disturbed ()	Mildly Disturbed ()	Moderately Disturbed ()	Severely Disturbed ()
86	In dealing with this student I would . . .			
	Handle Alone ()	Be of Major Assistance ()	Be of Some Assistance ()	Refer Only ()
87	I would recommend this student be referred to . . .			
	No One ()	Non-Psych. Personnel ()	Medical Personnel ()	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel ()

4. Ted Johnson is a respectable high school senior who is happy and cheerful, has a good job prospect and is fairly well satisfied with it. He is always busy and has quite a few friends who think he is easy to get along with. After graduation he plans to marry a nice young girl he is engaged to. He is, however, worried because his future wife is not a member of his church and he is concerned that "religious problems" may develop.

No.	1	2	3	4
88	I feel that this student shows evidence of being . . .			
	Not Disturbed ()	Mildly Disturbed ()	Moderately Disturbed ()	Severely Disturbed ()
89	In dealing with this student I would . . .			
	Handle Alone ()	Be of Major Assistance ()	Be of Some Assistance ()	Refer Only ()
90	I would recommend this student be referred to . . .			
	No One ()	Non-Psych. Personnel ()	Medical Personnel ()	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel ()

5. Fred Jones is an average looking adolescent boy. He comes to you for counsel. He complains of regular headaches and that he is working too hard. Then--without any preliminaries--he starts talking about sexual problems. He is afraid that he is perverted and has been bothered with homosexual thoughts. He claims to have had no heterosexual contact, but masturbates a great deal. He wants advice and help to make him normal. He tends to go off into a long monologue about his sex life and is difficult to interrupt.

No.	1	2	3	4
91	I feel that this student shows evidence of being . . .			
	Not Disturbed ()	Mildly Disturbed ()	Moderately Disturbed ()	Severely Disturbed ()
92	In dealing with this student I would . . .			
	Handle Alone ()	Be of Major Assistance ()	Be of Some Assistance ()	Refer Only ()
93	I would recommend this student be referred to . . .			
	No One ()	Non-Psych. Personnel ()	Medical Personnel ()	Psychol. or Psych. Personnel ()

APPENDIX B

SOURCES OF VARIANCE IN ONE-WAY ANALYSES OF VARIANCE

	Source	DF	SS	MS	F
<u>Sex</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Sex	2	523.383	261.691	2.975
	Error	541	47578.727	87.946	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	Sex	2	34.986	17.493	.645
	Error	541	14661.292	27.100	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Sex	2	38.336	19.493	.66
	Error	541	15701.621	29.023	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Sex	2	129.322	64.661	1.83
	Error	541	19073.414	35.256	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Sex	2	9.781	4.890	.32
	Error	541	8260.214	15.268	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Sex	2	976.562	488.281	2.01
	Error	541	131101.937	242.323	
<u>Age</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Age	5	313.992	62.798	.71
	Error	538	47788.117	88.25	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	Age	5	288.261	57.652	2.15
	Error	538	14408.017	26.780	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Source		DF	SS	MS	F
<u>Age (Continued)</u>					
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Age	5	171.781	34.356	1.190
	Error	538	15568.176	28.937	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Age	5	2036.086	407.217	12.760
	Error	538	17166.650	31.908	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Age	5	207.137	54.027	3.630
	Error	538	7999.850	14.869	
Total	Total	543	132078.50		
	Age	5	3545.812	709.162	2.968
	Error	538	128532.687	238.908	
<u>Marital Status</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Marital	4	500.460	125.115	1.416
	Error	539	47601.648	88.310	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	Marital	4	218.646	54.662	2.034
	Error	539	14477.633	26.860	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Marital	4	49.051	12.263	.400
	Error	539	15690.906	29.111	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Marital	4	412.424	103.106	2.957
	Error	539	18790.313	34.861	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Marital	4	34.007	8.502	.556
	Error	539	8235.988	15.280	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Marital	4	1138.063	284.516	1.171
	Error	539	130940.437	242.932	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Source		DF	SS	MS	F
<u>State of Birth</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	State	2	36.438	18.219	.205
	Error	541	48065.672	88.846	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	State	2	8.326	4.163	.153
	Error	541	14687.953	27.150	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	State	2	31.711	15.855	.546
	Error	541	15708.246	29.036	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	State	2	44.313	22.156	.625
	Error	541	19158.424	35.413	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	State	2	2.082	1.041	.068
	Error	541	8267.914	15.283	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	State	2	242.813	121.406	.498
	Error	541	131835.688	243.689	
<u>State of Birth by Geographical Location</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Loc.	5	105.320	201.064	.236
	Error	538	47996.789	89.213	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	Loc.	5	90.025	18.005	.663
	Error	538	14606.254	27.149	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Loc.	5	270.590	54.118	1.882
	Error	538	15469.367	28.753	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Loc.	5	268.420	53.684	1.525
	Error	538	18934.316	35.194	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Loc.	5	62.285	12.457	.816
	Error	538	8207.711	15.256	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

	Source	DF	SS	MS	F
<u>State of Birth by Geographical Location (Continued)</u>					
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Loc.	5	990.063	198.012	.812
	Error	538	131088.439	243.659	
<u>County in Which Teach</u>					
Adeq.	Total	542	48097.516		
	County	4	652.070	163.018	1.848
	Error	538	47445.445	88.189	
Psych.	Total	542	14684.582		
	County	4	128.301	32.375	1.185
	Error	538	14556.281	27.056	
Resp.	Total	542	15697.508		
	County	4	179.441	44.860	1.555
	Error	538	15518.066	28.844	
Gen.	Total	542	19188.217		
	County	4	963.670	240.917	7.113
	Error	538	18224.547	33.875	
Causal	Total	542	8269.609		
	County	4	43.313	10.828	.708
	Error	538	8226.297	15.291	
Total	Total	542	132007.500		
	County	4	913.750	228.438	.937
	Error	538	131093.750	243.669	
<u>Religion</u>					
Adeq.	Total	480	42739.871		
	Religion	7	76.031	10.862	.120
	Error	473	42663.840	90.198	
Psych.	Total	480	13308.672		
	Religion	7	412.602	58.943	2.162
	Error	473	12896.070	27.264	
Resp.	Total	480	13847.687		
	Religion	7	218.055	31.151	1.080
	Error	473	13629.632	28.815	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Source		DF	SS	MS	F
<u>Religion (Continued)</u>					
Gen.	Total	480	16893.225		
	Religion	7	792.797	113.257	3.327
	Error	473	16100.428	34.039	
Causal	Total	480	7306.521		
	Religion	7	55.637	7.948	.518
	Error	473	7250.885	15.330	
Total	Total	480	113084.875		
	Religion	7	1601.563	228.795	.954
	Error	473	111483.313	235.694	
<u>Religious Classification</u>					
Adeq.	Total	535	47854.070		
	Rel. Class.	4	556.375	139.094	1.561
	Error	531	47297.695	89.073	
Psych.	Total	535	14564.391		
	Rel. Class.	4	333.348	83.337	3.109
	Error	531	14231.043	26.800	
Resp.	Total	535	15499.523		
	Rel. Class.	4	100.160	25.040	.863
	Error	531	15399.363	29.001	
Gen.	Total	535	19047.463		
	Rel. Class.	4	813.385	203.346	5.921
	Error	531	18234.078	34.339	
Causal	Total	535	8172.832		
	Rel. Class.	4	67.980	16.995	1.114
	Error	531	8104.852	15.263	
Total	Total	535	130605.000		
	Rel. Class.	4	2066.688	516.672	2.134
	Error	531	128538.312	242.068	
<u>College or Graduate Education</u>					
Adeq.	Total	542	47807.734		
	Ed.	1	379.883	379.883	4.333
	Error	541	47427.852	87.667	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Source		DF	SS	MS	F
<u>College or Graduate Education (Continued)</u>					
Psych.	Total	542	14690.426		
	Ed.	1	2.373	2.373	.087
	Error	541	14688.053	27.150	
Resp.	Total	542	15709.551		
	Ed.	1	252.797	252.797	8.848
	Error	541	15456.754	28.571	
Gen.	Total	542	19192.521		
	Ed.	1	77.240	77.240	2.186
	Error	541	19115.281	35.333	
Causal	Total	542	8264.328		
	Ed.	1	1.578	1.578	.103
	Error	541	8262.750	15.273	
Total	Total	542	131700.687		
	Ed.	1	1926.688	1926.688	8.031
	Error	541	129774.000	239.878	
<u>Years of Graduate Education</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Years	5	1373.813	274.762	3.163
	Error	538	46728.297	86.856	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	Years	5	141.902	28.380	1.049
	Error	538	14554.377	27.053	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Years	5	289.848	57.970	2.108
	Error	538	15450.109	28.718	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Years	5	340.637	68.127	1.943
	Error	538	18862.100	35.060	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Years	5	63.563	12.712	.833
	Error	538	8206.434	15.254	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Years	5	4125.125	835.025	3.468
	Error	538	127953.375	237.832	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

	Source	DF	SS	MS	F
<u>College Major: Education vs Non-Education</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Major	2	275.938	137.969	1.560
	Error	541	47826.172	88.403	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	Major	2	42.596	21.298	.786
	Error	541	14653.684	27.086	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Major	2	105.098	52.249	1.818
	Error	541	15634.859	18.900	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Major	2	312.650	156.325	4.476
	Error	541	18890.086	34.917	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Major	2	16.125	8.063	.528
	Error	541	8253.871	15.257	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Major	2	1689.500	844.750	3.594
	Error	541	130389.000	241.015	
<u>College Major: Psychology vs Non-Psychology</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Major	2	311.133	155.566	1.761
	Error	541	17790.977	88.338	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.179		
	Major	2	12.049	5.025	.221
	Error	541	14684.230	27.143	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Major	2	18.734	9.367	.322
	Error	541	15721.223	29.060	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Major	2	313.383	156.691	4.487
	Error	541	18889.354	34.916	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Major	2	36.234	18.117	1.190
	Error	541	8233.762	15.220	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

	Source	DF	SS	MS	F
<u>College Major: Psychology vs Non-Psychology (Continued)</u>					
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Major	2	1129.125	564.563	2.332
	Error	541	130949.375	242.050	
<u>College Major by Area of Concentration</u>					
Adeq.	Total	517	46024.719		
	Area	4	899.438	224.859	2.556
	Error	513	45125.281	87.964	
Psych.	Total	517	13827.750		
	Area	4	48.865	12.216	.454
	Error	513	13778.890	26.859	
Resp.	Total	517	15037.309		
	Area	4	132.145	33.036	1.137
	Error	513	14905.164	19.055	
Gen.	Total	517	18676.211		
	Area	4	437.896	109.474	3.079
	Error	513	18238.314	35.552	
Causal	Total	517	7897.813		
	Area	4	28.512	7.128	.464
	Error	513	7869.300	15.340	
Total	Total	517	125892.375		
	Area	4	2919.313	729.828	3.044
	Error	513	122973.063	139.714	
<u>College Minor by Area of Concentration</u>					
Adeq.	Total	521	46828.922		
	Area	5	650.789	130.158	1.454
	Error	516	46178.133	89.493	
Psych.	Total	521	14368.408		
	Area	5	174.355	54.871	2.009
	Error	516	14094.053	27.314	
Resp.	Total	521	15216.473		
	Area	5	103.117	20.623	.703
	Error	516	15113.355	29.289	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

	Source	DF	SS	MS	F
<u>College Minor by Area of Concentration (Continued)</u>					
Gen.	Total	521	18548.072		
	Area	5	634.634	126.929	3.655
	Error	516	17913.430	34.716	
Causal	Total	521	7891.836		
	Area	5	147.277	29.455	1.962
	Error	516	7744.559	15.009	
Total	Total	521	128433.375		
	Area	5	4747.750	949.550	3.961
	Error	516	123685.625	239.701	
<u>Graduate Major by Area of Concentration</u>					
Adeq.	Total	315	17986.672		
	Area	5	546.586	109.317	1.234
	Error	310	27440.086	88.516	
Psych.	Total	315	8633.124		
	Area	5	106.221	21.244	.772
	Error	310	8526.903	27.506	
Resp.	Total	315	8763.684		
	Area	5	71.967	14.393	.513
	Error	310	8691.717	28.038	
Gen.	Total	315	10628.191		
	Area	5	105.580	21.116	.621
	Error	310	10522.611	33.944	
Causal	Total	315	4724.340		
	Area	5	39.773	7.950	.526
	Error	310	4684.566	15.112	
Total	Total	315	78749.563		
	Area	5	1186.875	237.375	.948
	Error	310	77562.688	250.202	
<u>Number of Psychology Courses</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Number	4	1691.398	422.850	4.910
	Error	539	46410.711	86.105	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Source		DF	SS	MS	F
<u>Number of Psychology Courses (Continued)</u>					
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	Number	4	278.326	69.582	2.601
	Error	539	14417.953	26.750	
Resp.	Total	543	17539.957		
	Number	4	158.008	39.592	1.366
	Error	539	15581.949	28.909	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Number	4	741.684	185.421	5.413
	Error	539	18461.053	34.251	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Number	4	103.945	25.986	1.715
	Error	539	8166.051	15.150	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Number	4	2264.259	566.063	2.350
	Error	539	129814.250	240.843	
<u>Bachelor Degree Oklahoma vs Non-Oklahoma</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Degree	2	76.594	38.297	.431
	Error	541	48025.516	88.772	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	Degree	2	229.867	114.934	4.298
	Error	541	14466.412	26.740	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Degree	2	48.539	24.270	.836
	Error	541	15691.418	29.004	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Degree	2	195.375	97.688	2.780
	Error	541	19007.361	35.134	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Degree	2	3.551	1.775	.116
	Error	541	8266.445	95.280	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Degree	2	229.125	114.563	.470
	Error	541	131849.375	243.714	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Source		DF	SS	MS	F
<u>Bachelor Degree by State</u>					
Adeq.	Total	542	48093.922		
	State	4	104.297	16.074	.292
	Error	538	47989.625	89.200	
Psych.	Total	542	14587.559		
	State	4	126.387	31.597	1.175
	Error	538	14461.172	26.880	
Resp.	Total	542	15697.508		
	State	4	72.336	18.084	.622
	Error	538	15625.172	29.043	
Gen.	Total	542	19201.311		
	State	4	255.090	63.772	1.810
	Error	538	18946.220	35.216	
Causal	Total	542	8364.224		
	State	4	5.992	1.498	.097
	Error	538	8257.121	15.348	
Total	Total	542	131966.375		
	State	4	740.438	185.109	.758
	Error	538	131225.938	243.914	
<u>Master Degree Oklahoma vs Non-Oklahoma</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Degree	3	588.070	196.023	2.227
	Error	540	47514.039	87.989	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	Degree	3	153.906	51.302	1.904
	Error	540	14542.373	26.930	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Degree	3	224.246	74.749	2.601
	Error	540	15515.711	28.733	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Degree	3	116.041	38.680	1.094
	Error	540	19086.695	35.346	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Degree	3	15.539	5.180	.338
	Error	540	8254.457	15.286	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

	Source	DF	SS	MS	F
<u>Master Degree Oklahoma vs Non-Oklahoma (Continued)</u>					
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Degree	3	1339.188	779.729	3.237
	Error	540	129739.313	240.258	
<u>Master Degree by State</u>					
Adeq.	Total	226	21043.871		
	State	4	300.621	75.155	.804
	Error	222	20743.250	93.438	
Psych.	Total	226	6093.401		
	State	4	424.475	106.119	4.155
	Error	222	5668.927	25.536	
Resp.	Total	226	6042.424		
	State	4	190.398	47.600	1.805
	Error	222	5852.025	26.360	
Gen.	Total	226	7837.516		
	State	4	389.996	97.499	2.906
	Error	222	7447.520	33.547	
Causal	Total	226	3078.618		
	State	4	31.083	7.771	.565
	Error	222	3047.535	13.728	
Total	Total	226	54120.281		
	State	4	3714.469	928.617	4.089
	Error	222	50405.813	227.053	
<u>Town Where Teach: Rural vs Urban</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Town	2	825.414	412.707	4.722
	Error	541	47276.695	87.388	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	Town	2	12.154	6.077	.224
	Error	541	14684.125	27.143	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Town	2	54.852	27.426	.946
	Error	541	15685.105	28.993	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Town	2	558.943	279.472	8.109
	Error	541	18643.793	34.462	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Source		DF	SS	MS	F
<u>Town Where Teach: Rural vs Urban (Continued)</u>					
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Town	2	3.309	1.654	.107
	Error	541	8266.688	15.280	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Town	2	142.438	71.219	.292
	Error	541	131936.063	243.874	
<u>Town Where Teach by Population</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Town	5	915.969	183.194	2.088
	Error	538	47186.141	87.707	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.179		
	Town	5	49.662	9.932	.364
	Error	538	14646.617	27.224	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.95		
	Town	5	203.676	40.735	1.410
	Error	538	15536.281	28.878	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Town	5	752.525	150.505	4.389
	Error	538	18450.211	34.294	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Town	5	53.066	10.613	.699
	Error	538	8216.930	15.273	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Town	5	525.688	105.137	.429
	Error	538	131552.813	244.522	
<u>Grade Taught by Years</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Grade	4	448.883	112.221	1.269
	Error	539	47653.227	88.410	
Psych.	Total	543	14606.279		
	Grade	4	177.283	44.321	1.645
	Error	539	14518.996	16.937	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Source		DF	SS	MS	F
<u>Grade Taught by Years (Continued)</u>					
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Grade	4	304.344	76.086	2.656
	Error	539	15435.613	28.638	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Grade	4	367.836	91.959	2.631
	Error	539	18834.900	34.944	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Grade	4	46.281	11.560	.758
	Error	539	8223.715	15.257	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Grade	4	4852.875	1213.213	5.139
	Error	539	127225.625	236.040	
<u>Grade Taught by Level</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Level	3	410.158	136.753	1.548
	Error	540	47691.852	88.318	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	Level	3	173.574	57.858	2.151
	Error	540	14522.705	26.894	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Level	3	273.840	91.280	3.187
	Error	540	15466.117	28.641	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Level	3	245.871	115.290	3.301
	Error	540	18856.865	34.920	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Level	3	34.801	11.600	.760
	Error	540	8235.195	15.250	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Level	3	4487.563	1495.854	6.330
	Error	540	8235.195	236.280	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Source		DF	SS	MS	F
<u>Counseling of Students</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Counsel.	2	3637.766	1818.883	22.130
	Error	541	44464.344	82.189	
Psych.	Total	543	14696.279		
	Counsel.	2	62.033	31.017	1.238
	Error	541	14634.246	27.050	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Counsel.	2	417.871	208.936	7.377
	Error	541	15322.086	18.322	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Counsel.	2	166.852	83.426	2.399
	Error	541	19035.885	35.186	
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Counsel.	2	2.375	1.188	.077
	Error	541	8267.621	15.282	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Counsel.	2	9818.625	4909.313	21.723
	Error	541	122259.875	225.989	
<u>Access to Guidance Clinic</u>					
Adeq.	Total	543	48102.109		
	Access	3	769.219	256.406	2.925
	Error	540	47332.891	87.654	
Psych.	Total	543	15696.279		
	Access	3	71.449	23.816	.879
	Error	540	14624.830	27.083	
Resp.	Total	543	15739.957		
	Access	3	164.418	54.806	1.900
	Error	540	15575.539	18.844	
Gen.	Total	543	19202.736		
	Access	3	521.174	173.725	5.020
	Error	540	18681.563	34.595	

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Source		DF	SS	MS	F
<u>Access to Guidance Clinic (Continued)</u>					
Causal	Total	543	8269.996		
	Access	3	6.762	2.254	.147
	Error	540	8263.234	15.302	
Total	Total	543	132078.500		
	Access	3	327.313	109.104	.447
	Error	540	131751.188	243.984	
<u>Fathers' Education</u>					
Adeq.	Total	425	38521.042		
	Educ.	4	216.828	54.207	.633
	Error	421	36036.343	85.597	
Psych.	Total	425	12134.687		
	Educ.	4	227.300	56.824	2.070
	Error	421	11533.803	27.396	
Resp.	Total	425	12364.746		
	Educ.	4	136.906	34.226	1.200
	Error	421	11927.972	28.332	
Gen.	Total	425	14027.589		
	Educ.	4	346.681	86.670	2.760
	Error	421	13200.437	31.355	
Causal	Total	425	6477.422		
	Educ.	4	48.119	12.029	.890
	Error	421	6342.255	15.065	
Total	Total	425	107278.750		
	Educ.	4	191.875	47.969	.200
	Error	421	102947.688	244.531	

APPENDIX C.

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES FOR ALL SUBJECTS

No.	1	2	3	4	N
79	(19	127)*	166	222	534
80	(13	22	235)	263	533
81	(20	97	29)	388	534
82	(2	12	79)	446	539
83	(3	19	160)	356	538
84	(2	10	22)	504	538
85	(9	154)	268	109	540
86	10	86	329	114	539
87	(26	121)	38	350	535
88	389	(127	21	1)	538
89	85	(111	294	46)	536
90	(118	401)	(2	15)	536
91	(115	121)	219	184	539
92	(5	24)	181	328	538
93	(10	12	218)	295	535

Sex: Males

79	(13	40)	49	51	153
80	(8	8	75)	61	152
81	(14	31	8)	100	153
82	(2	6	28)	119	155
83	(1	11	54)	89	155
84	(2	5	10)	138	155
85	(5	64)	66	20	155
86	5	36	83	31	155
87	(12	35)	7	101	155
88	115	(35	3	1)	155
89	37	(36	71	11)	155
90	(51	103)	(0	1)	155
91	(6	45)	65	39	155
92	(2	10)	72	71	155
93	(4	3	54)	93	154

*All frequencies in parentheses were combined in computing X^2 .

APPENDIX C (Continued)

No.	1	2	3	4	N
-----	---	---	---	---	---

Sex: Females

79	(6	81)	110	155	352
80	(5	14	148)	184	351
81	(6	62	16)	267	351
82	(0	6	45)	302	353
83	(2	8	97)	245	352
84	(0	5	11)	336	352
85	(2	85)	185	82	354
86	4	43	229	77	353
87	(11	80)	29	230	350
88	257	(79	17	0)	353
89	44	(68	205	33)	350
90	(61	275)	(2	12)	350
91	(8	69)	142	135	354
92	(2	14)	96	240	353
93	(5	9	151)	186	352

Age: 20-39 Years

79	(13	78)	81	77	249
80	(6	12	120)	110	248
81	(13	57	9)	170	249
82	(1	9	43)	196	249
83	(0	11	81)	157	249
84	(1	4	11)	233	249
85	(4	79)	126	41	250
86	5	47	144	54	250
87	(12	63)	10	164	249
88	214	(33	2	1)	250
89	42	(56	129	22)	249
90	(60	188)	(0	1)	249
91	(10	71)	107	62	250
92	(1	13)	89	146	249
93	(4	9	88)	148	241

APPENDIX C (Continued)

No.	1	2	3	4	N
Age: 40-69 Years					
79	(6	45)	77	132	261
80	(7	5	102)	142	256
81	(6	38	18)	199	261
82	(1	3	31)	230	265
83	(3	6	69)	186	264
84	(1	5	10)	248	264
85	(4	69)	131	61	265
86	5	34	172	53	264
87	(11	56)	23	174	261
88	162	(84	17	0)	263
89	40	(50	149	23)	262
90	(52	194)	(2	14)	262
91	(5	44)	101	114	264
92	(3	9)	86	166	264
93	(5	2	124)	130	261

Marital Status: Married

79	(19	103)	137	171	430
80	(11	15	198)	206	430
81	(18	78	23)	312	431
82	(2	12	61)	361	436
83	(2	15	128)	290	435
84	(2	8	16)	409	435
85	(7	123)	220	87	437
86	9	62	269	96	436
87	(20	94)	30	288	432
88	323	(97	15	1)	436
89	69	(90	241	34)	434
90	(97	324)	(1	12)	434
91	(13	101)	183	139	436
92	(2	17)	155	261	435
93	(5	11	181)	236	433

APPENDIX C (Continued)

No.	1	2	3	4	N
-----	---	---	---	---	---

Marital Status: Single

79	(0	19)	23	36	78
80	(1	5	27)	45	78
81	(1	14	6)	57	78
82	(0	0	15)	63	78
83	(1	2	25)	50	78
84	(0	1	5)	72	78
85	(0	26)	40	12	78
86	0	16	51	11	78
87	(4	23)	7	44	78
88	54	(19	5	0)	78
89	12	(15	43	8)	78
90	(16	58)	(1	3)	78
91	(2	13)	30	33	78
92	(2	5)	21	50	78
93	(3	0	29)	45	78

State of Birth: Oklahoma

79	(15	87)	115	153	370
80	(11	17	168)	173	369
81	(15	72	19)	264	370
82	(1	11	56)	305	373
83	(2	15	113)	243	372
84	(1	7	13)	352	373
85	(4	101)	187	81	373
86	7	59	229	78	373
87	(19	78)	23	250	370
88	269	(87	17	1)	374
89	60	(79	203	30)	372
90	(82	275)	(2	14)	373
91	(9	76)	158	129	372
92	(2	16)	125	230	373
93	(4	11	140)	214	369

APPENDIX C (Continued)

No.	1	2	3	4	N
State of Birth: Not Oklahoma					
79	(4	39)	49	64	156
80	(2	4	65)	85	156
81	(5	22	10)	119	156
82	(1	1	22)	134	158
83	(1	4	44)	108	157
84	(1	3	9)	144	157
85	(4	52)	76	27	159
86	3	25	96	34	150
87	(6	42)	14	95	157
88	119	(35	4	0)	158
89	24	(30	87	15)	156
90	(36	118)	(0	1)	155
91	(6	42)	60	51	159
92	(3	8)	55	91	157
93	(6	1	74)	77	158

County Where Teaching by Population:
More Than 40,000

79	(11	65)	98	109	283
80	(5	14	124)	140	283
81	(12	48	15)	208	283
82	(2	5	44)	236	287
83	(1	11	83)	192	287
84	(2	6	9)	270	287
85	(4	85)	138	61	288
86	6	48	178	56	288
87	(17	70)	19	181	287
88	219	(61	7	0)	287
89	48	(60	157	21)	286
90	(67	210)	(1	7)	285
91	(11	67)	126	84	288
92	(3	15)	101	168	288
93	(6	7	111)	162	286

APPENDIX C (Continued)

No.	1	2	3	4	N
-----	---	---	---	---	---

County Where Teaching by Population:
Less Than 40,000

79	(8	59)	67	108	242
80	(8	8	106)	119	241
81	(8	47	12)	175	242
82	(0	7	33)	203	243
83	(2	8	74)	158	242
84	(0	4	11)	227	242
85	(4	66)	126	47	243
86	4	37	146	55	242
87	(8	49)	18	164	239
88	164	(64	13	1)	242
89	34	(51	133	23)	241
90	(49	184)	(1	8)	242
91	(4	49)	91	98	242
92	(2	9)	81	153	245
93	(4	5	102)	129	240

Religious Classification: Conservative

79	(6	75)	74	102	257
80	(5	13	124)	113	255
81	(8	58	18)	172	256
82	(0	7	37)	213	257
83	(1	7	81)	167	256
84	(1	4	9)	242	256
85	(4	69)	123	62	258
86	5	42	149	61	257
87	(12	52)	20	172	256
88	170	(69	17	1)	257
89	49	(57	130	22)	258
90	(63	184)	(0	8)	255
91	(4	44)	106	104	258
92	(1	10)	78	167	256
93	(3	3	100)	149	255

APPENDIX C (Continued)

No.	1	2	3	4	N
Religious Classification: Conventional					
79	(9	46)	74	102	231
80	(6	6	94)	126	232
81	(8	31	9)	184	232
82	(2	4	32)	197	235
83	(2	8	70)	155	235
84	(1	4	9)	221	235
85	(5	68)	121	41	235
86	5	37	151	42	235
87	(12	58)	15	147	232
88	182	(48	4	0)	234
89	37	(45	130	22)	234
90	(48	177)	(2	7)	234
91	(9	63)	97	65	234
92	(3	12)	85	135	235
93	(5	7	104)	117	233

College or Graduate Education: College

79	(6	63)	68	87	224
80	(5	9	101)	108	223
81	(6	43	11)	163	223
82	(0	5	34)	184	223
83	(1	8	69)	145	223
84	(1	1	9)	212	223
85	(2	61)	116	45	224
86	6	33	134	51	224
87	(7	52)	13	151	223
88	178	(38	7	0)	223
89	33	(43	130	16)	223
90	(47	169)	(1	6)	223
91	(5	50)	91	78	224
92	(1	11)	63	148	223
93	(4	7	87)	126	224

APPENDIX C (Continued)

No.	1	2	3	4	N
-----	---	---	---	---	---

College or Graduate Education: Graduate School

79	(13	64)	97	135	309
80	(8	12	134)	155	309
81	(14	53	18)	225	310
82	(2	7	45)	261	315
83	(2	11	91)	210	314
84	(1	9	13)	291	314
85	(7	93)	151	64	315
86	4	53	194	63	314
87	(19	69)	24	199	311
88	211	(88	14	1)	314
89	52	(67	164	30)	313
90	(71	231)	(1	9)	312
91	(10	71)	128	105	314
92	(4	13)	118	179	314
93	(6	5	131)	168	310

College Major: Education

79	(12	75)	78	111	276
80	(9	15	111)	142	277
81	(12	61	16)	188	277
82	(1	6	41)	230	278
83	(1	14	71)	192	278
84	(1	7	10)	260	278
85	(5	75)	138	60	278
86	6	45	166	61	278
87	(13	59)	21	184	277
88	204	(64	10	0)	278
89	51	(46	153	27)	277
90	(66	204)	(1	7)	278
91	(8	70)	100	100	278
92	(0	15)	89	174	278
93	(4	7	125)	141	277

APPENDIX C (Continued)

No.	1	2	3	4	N
College Major: Non-Education					
79	(7	48)	84	105	244
80	(4	5	120)	113	242
81	(8	32	12)	191	243
82	(1	6	34)	206	247
83	(2	4	87)	153	246
84	(1	3	12)	230	246
85	(4	74)	125	45	248
86	4	40	153	50	247
87	(13	61)	14	157	245
88	179	(56	10	1)	246
89	31	(63	132	19)	245
90	(47	189)	(1	7)	244
91	(7	49)	115	76	247
92	(5	9)	90	142	246
93	(6	5	85)	148	244

Number of Psychology Courses: None to 3

79	(11	51)	56	81	199
80	(5	5	86)	103	199
81	(8	36	8)	145	197
82	(2	5	35)	158	200
83	(1	9	63)	126	199
84	(1	5	9)	184	199
85	(6	51)	109	34	200
86	5	28	122	44	199
87	(11	37)	13	137	198
88	147	(43	8	1)	199
89	31	(36	113	18)	198
90	(40	152)	(2	4)	198
91	(8	43)	86	63	200
92	(4	6)	64	125	199
93	(5	6	75)	113	199

APPENDIX C (Continued)

No.	1	2	3	4	N
Number of Psychology Courses: 4 or More					
79	(6	60)	87	113	266
80	(6	12	120)	128	266
81	(10	48	13)	195	266
82	(0	4	36)	229	269
83	(2	8	79)	180	269
84	(1	4	9)	255	269
85	(3	85)	126	56	270
86	5	49	161	55	270
87	(13	66)	17	171	267
88	198	(60	11	0)	269
89	47	(66	131	24)	268
90	(70	192)	(0	6)	268
91	(6	69)	106	88	269
92	(1	16)	100	152	269
93	(3	2	121)	140	266

Town Where Teach: Rural

79	(10	78)	86	136	310
80	(9	11	140)	149	309
81	(14	55	18)	223	310
82	(0	8	49)	255	312
83	(1	10	101)	199	311
84	(1	5	15)	290	311
85	(5	89)	158	60	312
86	8	41	194	68	311
87	(18	58)	20	212	308
88	209	(83	17	1)	310
89	46	(66	168	30)	310
90	(66	233)	(2	9)	310
91	(7	69)	112	123	311
92	(3	10)	104	194	311
93	(4	8	125)	170	307

APPENDIX C (Continued)

No.	1	2	3	4	N
Town Where Teach: Urban					
79	(9	46)	70	82	207
80	(4	11	89)	103	207
81	(6	37	11)	153	207
82	(2	4	30)	75	211
83	(2	9	56)	144	211
84	(1	5	7)	198	211
85	(4	58)	103	46	211
86	2	41	124	44	211
87	(8	57)	16	130	211
88	164	(43	4	0)	211
89	36	(45	113	15)	209
90	(48	56)	(0	6)	210
91	(8	48)	98	57	211
92	(2	14)	74	121	211
93	(6	3	82)	120	211

Grade Taught: Elementary

79	(6	58)	64	106	234
80	(7	12	93)	122	234
81	(6	42	12)	174	234
82	(0	5	31)	199	235
83	(2	9	68)	156	235
84	(0	5	4)	226	235
85	(4	53)	119	59	235
86	5	42	137	51	235
87	(11	50)	20	153	234
88	164	(54	16	0)	234
89	37	(40	130	25)	232
90	(44	178)	(0	10)	232
91	(4	47)	96	88	235
92	(1	14)	66	154	235
93	(4	4	112)	114	234

APPENDIX C (Continued)

No.	1	2	3	4	N
-----	---	---	---	---	---

Grade Taught: Junior High School

79	(4	27)	27	30	88
80	(1	2	38)	46	87
81	(7	18	1)	62	88
82	(0	1	11)	76	88
83	(0	1	21)	66	88
84	(0	0	2)	86	88
85	(1	33)	40	15	89
86	0	13	55	21	89
87	(5	28)	5	49	87
88	72	(15	1	0)	88
89	12	(19	51	7)	89
90	(19	69)	(0	1)	89
91	(3	24)	37	28	88
92	(0	4)	30	54	88
93	(1	1	29)	56	87

Grade Taught: High School

79	(8	35)	63	73	179
80	(5	6	88)	80	179
81	(7	31	43)	128	179
82	(3	6	30)	144	182
83	(1	7	62)	11	181
84	(2	4	12)	163	181
85	(3	56)	94	29	182
86	4	28	111	38	181
87	(8	33)	11	129	181
88	121	(49	3	9)	182
89	31	(45	92	13)	181
90	(45	132)	(1	3)	181
91	(7	45)	77	53	182
92	(4	5)	74	98	181
93	(4	7	59)	110	180

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

No.	1	2	3	4	N
Counseling of Students: Yes					
79	(6	31)	37	63	137
80	(4	7	72)	54	137
81	(7	25	11)	94	137
82	(1	3	19)	117	140
83	(2	9	41)	88	140
84	(1	3	6)	130	140
85	(4	42)	68	26	140
86	4	31	88	17	140
87	(11	36)	12	80	139
88	95	(37	8	0)	140
89	30	(38	60	12)	140
90	(39	94)	(1	5)	139
91	(2	30)	55	53	140
92	(3	8)	53	76	140
93	(3	2	55)	77	137
Counseling of Students: No					
79	(12	90)	121	152	375
80	(8	12	155)	199	374
81	(13	65	15)	282	375
82	(1	8	56)	310	375
83	(0	9	110)	255	374
84	(1	5	15)	353	374
85	(5	106)	186	79	376
86	5	52	228	90	375
87	(15	81)	23	254	373
88	280	(85	9	1)	375
89	54	(68	220	31)	373
90	(76	288)	(1	8)	373
91	(13	86)	156	121	376
92	(2	14)	122	236	374
93	(7	9	152)	207	375

VITA

Frank Joseph Padrone

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF TEACHERS ABOUT MENTAL HEALTH AND THE CAUSES OF MENTAL ILLNESS AND THE TEACHERS' CONCEPTIONS OF THEIR ROLE IN THE THERAPEUTIC SETTING

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in New York City, New York, July 10, 1939, the son of Frank and Mary Padrone; married to Vita J. Negri, 1965.

Education: Graduated from Fordham Preparatory High School in 1958; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Fordham University, with a major in Psychology, in June, 1962; continued on with two years of graduate study in Psychology at Hofstra University; was granted the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University, with a major in Psychology, in May, 1967; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in July, 1968.

Professional experience: Has been employed at the Oklahoma State University Hospital and Clinic as Clinical Psychologist from September, 1966, to August, 1968.