

TEACHERS' MANIFEST ANXIETY AND THEIR
ATTITUDES TOWARD CHILDREN'S
BEHAVIORS

By

BLAIR W. SHAW

Diploma in Education
St. Francis Xavier University
Antigonish, N.S., Canada
1961

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1963

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
August, 1964

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

JAN 8 1955

TEACHERS' MANIFEST ANXIETY AND THEIR
ATTITUDES TOWARD CHILDREN'S
BEHAVIORS

Thesis Approved:

Edwin E Vineyard

Thesis Adviser

J. Richard L. Swygman

W. B. Owens

J. B. [unclear]

Dean of the Graduate School

570351

PREFACE

This study was planned and conducted with the valuable assistance of Drs. Edwin E. Vineyard, W. Price Ewens, and J. Paschal Twyman of the Oklahoma State University. It was carried out at the Memorial University of Newfoundland with the co-operation of my students in Education 320, Mental Health and Guidance. Financial support was provided by the Research Committee of the Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland. Many psychologists throughout Canada co-operated in this study by completing the Behavior Schedule and by making many valuable comments.

To these and to the numerous others who assisted in this study, I express my thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PROBLEM	4
Statement of the Problem	4
Limitation of the Study	4
Clarification of Terms	5
Hypotheses	5
III. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
Behavior Schedule Studies	7
Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Studies	10
Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale	14
Summary of the Literature	15
IV. METHOD	17
Instruments	17
Subjects	17
Administration	18
Data Analysis	19
V. RESULTS	21
VI. INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS	30
Hypotheses	30
Summary, Implications, and Suggestions for Further Study	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY	37
APPENDIXES	45

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Manifest Anxiety Scores of Teachers-in-Training at Memorial University of Newfoundland	22
II. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Scores of Teachers- in-Training at Memorial University of Newfoundland . . .	22
III. Chi-square Values for Group Comparisons on Individual Behaviors	23
IV. Chi-square Values for Group Comparisons on Individual Behaviors	27
V. Rank Order Coefficients of Correlation on Total Behavior Schedules	29

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Mental health has come into sharp focus over the past four decades as a major consideration in education. Mental hygienists, including educators, are concerned with this one objective - to develop potentialities of the child for meeting life's situations satisfactorily. Combs' "adequate persons" (6, p. 51), Rogers' "fully functioning persons" (6, p. 84), and Maslow's "people in the process of becoming" (6, p. 234) are all individuals who are meeting life's situations satisfactorily.

Stevenson (97), however, points out that statements of progressive educational policy are so far in advance of actual practice that one is apt to think of them as revolutionary. Historical comparison shows this newness to be more apparent than real. Over the past two millennia leaders in education have been expressing principles very similar to each other and quite in agreement with mental health (97, p. 237). Stevenson suggests that there is need, not for further repetition of the principles of education, but for the determination of the causes of their neglect and a strategy of progress that takes these causes into account.

The immediate need for such study in mental health is dramatically put forth by Dorothy Rogers:

In any random sampling of 100 typical children one or two will commit major crimes and serve time in jail, eight to ten of them will become seriously mentally ill and will have to be admitted for treatment; three or four will be too retarded to become self-supporting unless they receive specialized training;

thirty to fifty of them will be sufficiently maladjusted to add to the statistics of petty crime, vocational failure, chronic unemployment, emotional instability, marital unhappiness or divorce, and to other expressions of failure (83, p. 10).

The important role of the school and in particular the teacher, in mental health is stressed by Abramhamsen (2), Menninger (64, 65), and Strang (98). Bonney stresses the scope of mental health in education:

Mental hygiene is now being considered by some educators as being primarily an attitude which influences the teacher's behavior at all times - in his interpersonal relationships with pupils, in his practices in marking, promoting, and counseling boys and girls, and in other major and minor incidents of the entire school day (12, p. 9).

That such is recognized by educators is indicated by the inclusion of courses in child and adolescent psychology and mental health in teacher-training programs. The role of teacher-personality is, however, not so widely recognized. The need for such consideration is pointed out by Kvaraceus when he states:

the various studies which indicate the types of behaviors considered most serious by teachers and principals suggest that careful analysis should be made of the personalities of the responding and judgment-making respondents. (52, p. 137).

Withall (109) concludes that pedagogical devices and strategies have less impact academically and psychologically on the students than do the socio-psychological forces generated in the classrooms. He suggests that careful study of these forces is essential.

It appears that teacher-personality is considered by mental hygienists as a crucial variable in the psychological development of children. Some teacher-training institutions have designed programs which involve personality process as well as intellectual understanding of human psychology. Examples include the Brooklyn College Teacher Education Program (72) and the program at Sarah Lawrence College (73).

Basic to these programs is self-understanding by teachers as well as understanding mental health principles and techniques. In addition to specially designed courses, individual counseling for the trainees is essential in such programs. Such programs appear to be exceptions from the training of teachers which Symonds (100) criticises as being often of an intellectual level and therefore do not materially effect emotional adjustments.

That teacher-training should be concerned with teacher-personality, but is not adequately doing so is clearly stated by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in its 1962 Yearbook:

The kinds of teachers we provide will be crucial to the production of positive selves in students.

...Adequate personalities have positive effects upon their fellows. It follows that we need to recruit the largest possible number of adequate people to our profession (of teaching). ...Once selected, teacher education institutions must develop the teacher's self to the utmost. ...This calls for acceptance of responsibility for self-development of students by our teachers colleges. ...Just as we expect teachers to become more concerned about the selves of children, teacher education institutions will need to be more concerned about the personalities and selves of teachers in training (6, pp. 116-117).

To plan adequate teacher-training in terms of the importance of teacher-personality, more precise understanding of the relationship between identifiable teacher-personality characteristics and teacher-behavior relevant to the mental health of the students is needed. In this study, concomitants of teachers' classroom behavior (ratings of the "seriousness" of children's behaviors) will be related to the teacher-personality variable of tested manifest-anxiety.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

Teachers interacting with their students affect the personality development, the "mental health" of these students. Assuming that we presently are sufficiently knowledgeable in the area of personality development to be able to usefully manipulate the significant variables to increase the probability of the desired product, it seems important to investigate further the teacher-variables involved.

The specific teacher-variable investigated in this study is manifest-anxiety level. Essentially, this research seeks to compare the ratings of seriousness of student behaviors by high-anxious and low-anxious teachers-in-training. Further, it seeks to compare these high- and low-anxious teachers-in-training to ascertain if differences in attitudes exist as measured by a commonly employed teacher attitude inventory.

The design of the study facilitates comparison of one sample of Newfoundland student teachers with samples drawn from various areas of the United States on Behavior Schedule ratings, Manifest-Anxiety levels, and MTAI scores.

Limitation of the Study

The "mental-health point-of-view" used as a criterion in this study is taken to be the distribution of ratings on the Behavior Schedule

as made by the sample of Canadian psychologists. No attempt is made to validate this criterion.

Manifest-anxiety levels are those determined through the administration of the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. No attempt is made to validate this measure.

Within the sample of student-teachers there is heterogeneity in terms of age, years of training, academic achievement, religious demonstration, geographical origin of the subjects, and teaching experience. Although some of these may be significant variables in the area of this study, to investigate each is beyond its scope.

Clarification of Terms

Mental hygienists - The sample of Canadian psychologists used in this study and described in Chapter IV.

Low-anxious teachers - Those teachers-in-training in the sample used in this study who score at the 30th percentile or below in the distribution of scores on the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale developed in that sample.

High-anxious teachers - Those teachers-in-training who score at the 70th percentile or higher (as described above) on the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale.

Hypotheses

- I. (A) There is no significant relationship between positional affiliation (i.e., whether the respondent group consists of teachers-in-training or mental hygienists) and ratings of the "seriousness" of the behaviors on the revised Wickman Behavior Schedule. Differences will be examined both grossly and item by item.

(B) There is no significant relationship between positional affiliation (i.e., whether the respondent group consists of low-anxious teachers-in-training or mental hygienists) and ratings of the "seriousness" of the behaviors.

(C) There is no significant relationship between positional affiliation (i.e., whether the respondent group consists of high-anxious teachers-in-training or mental hygienists) and ratings of the "seriousness" of the behaviors.

(D) There is no significant relationship between positional affiliation (i.e., whether the respondent group consists of high-anxious or low-anxious teachers-in-training) and ratings of the "seriousness" of the behaviors.

II. There is no significant difference between the high-anxious and low-anxious groups of teachers-in-training on Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory scores.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Psychological Abstracts and the Education Index were searched in this review of the literature relevant to teacher attitudes, mental health point-of-view, and manifest anxiety. Studies pertinent to the scope of this research project were found to fall into the three main areas described below: Behavior Schedule Studies, Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Studies, and Taylor Manifest Anxiety Studies.

Behavior Schedule Studies

Teachers' attitudes toward children's behaviors have been compared with mental hygienists' attitudes toward these behaviors in an attempt to assess the 'mental hygiene point-of-view' of the teachers. Wickman (108) conducted the first comprehensive study of this type in 1926. Teachers in Minneapolis and Cleveland were asked to indicate the types and frequencies of behavior problems in their classrooms. From this survey the fifty most frequently behaviors were selected and arranged in a Behavior Schedule. This Schedule was then given to 511 Cleveland teachers and thirty mental hygienists in child guidance clinics in Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Newark, New Jersey.

The teachers rated each behavior on a scale of seriousness from "of no consequence" to "an extremely grave problem." The mental hygienists rated each behavior on a similar scale; however, the instructions for making the ratings were not identical for both groups. The

teachers rated the behaviors in terms of the present problem in the classroom, while the mental hygienists were instructed to make their ratings in terms of the future development of the child.

These ratings were quantified by using a twenty-point calibrated rule. Mean scale scores were calculated for each group. A rank order correlation of $-.04$ was found to exist between the teachers and the mental hygienists. Behaviors relating to sex, dishonesty, disobedience, disorderliness, and failure to learn were rated as very serious by the teachers, while behaviors relating to withdrawing and recessive characteristics were considered more serious by the mental hygienists.

Wickman concluded that teachers need to have a more general knowledge of what constitutes normal child behavior. He suggested that there should be a general shift in emphasis from the psychology of learning and mental and intellectual differences in children to the psychology of the social development of children with particular reference to the essential differences between child and adult behavior. Further, he pointed out the need for more attention to the emotional and social adjustments of teachers themselves, in order that "they may be able to withstand the shocks of disobedience, defiance, stealing, lying, truancy, and sex behavior which arise from time to time among children." (108, p. 40).

In 1936 Ellis and Miller (32) conducted a study of the attitudes of Denver teachers using the Wickman design with the exception that the teachers were given the same instructions as were given the mental hygienists in the earlier study. The correlation between the Denver teachers and Wickman's mental hygienists was $.49$. It is not possible to determine whether this much higher agreement between the teachers

and the mental hygienists is due to a change in the directions or to a change in teachers' attitudes.

A much higher rank order correlation between teachers (from the same school systems used by Wickman) and sixty-three mental hygienists was found by Mitchell (66) in 1940. This was of the order of .70. His mental hygienists correlated only .21 with Wickman's mental hygienists; however, this may have been due to the fact that in Mitchell's study the mental hygienists were given the same directions as the teachers.

Another study carried out in 1940 by Thompson (103) used twenty-three of Wickman's behaviors and identical instructions for both teachers and mental hygienists. A correlation of .219 was found between these groups. Other interesting findings of this study were: 1) ranking of the behaviors by teachers more closely agreed with the rankings by parents than by child psychologists, 2) the rankings by female teachers agree somewhat better with rankings by the child psychologists than do the rankings by male teachers, and 3) rankings by Negro and white parents, children, and teachers reveal no racial difference.

Schrupp and Gjerde (89) used Wickman's design precisely in their 1951 study in California. They found a correlation of .56 between their teachers and their clinicians, a correlation of .88 between their clinicians and Wickman's mental hygienists, and a correlation of .09 between Wickman's teachers and their clinicians.

Other studies indicating greater congruence in the attitudes of teachers and mental hygienists include two in 1955; one by Hunter (48) and the other by Stouffer and Owens (96), and another in 1957 by Brandt (13).

Clark (20) and Amos and Washington (3) found that teachers were

still more concerned with problems which affected the "smooth functioning" of the group or threatened the position of the teacher. Berlin (10) reviewed the literature in 1959 and concluded that there have been changes in the attitudes of both teachers and clinicians toward child behavior and a consequent higher agreement between the two groups.

Pinckney used the Wickman technique in 1959 to compare students' ratings of the behaviors before and after a course in psychology. He found a shift from a pre-course correlation of $-.069$ with clinicians and a post-course correlation of $.663$. However, he does not attempt to evaluate this shift in terms of the predicted behavior of the student-teachers when they are interacting with children.

These studies appear to support the growing evidence that a shift is in fact taking place in teachers' attitudes and that this shift is in the direction of the 'mental hygiene point-of-view.' Such a trend is probably related to changes in teacher training and more general psychological understanding by the population, but the evidence developed in the studies above does not support conclusions relative to actual classroom behavior of teachers. Limitations exist in the method used in the studies and in the assumption that such paper-and-pencil measures are in fact highly related to actual behavior. Studies of "faking" by subjects on such psychological measures point clearly to the possibility that teachers may in fact be learning how they 'should' respond on such tests without having changed their predispositions to respond to actual behavior.

Minnesota Teacher Attitude

Inventory Studies

The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was devised by Leeds

and Cook (58) to differentiate teachers who maintain with students a state of harmonious relationship characterized by mutual affection and sympathetic understanding from those teachers who do not maintain this relationship to such a high degree. Careful research involving empirical selection and weighting of items led to the conclusions by the authors that "the attitudes of teachers toward children and school work can be measured with high reliability, and that they are significantly correlated with teacher-pupil relations found in the teachers' classrooms." (25, p. 1). The authors maintain that "it can be assumed that the attitudes of a teacher are the result of the interdependence of this multitude of factors, and therefore, that attitudes afford a key to the prediction of the type of social atmosphere a teacher will maintain in the classroom. (25, p. 1).

The reliability of the MTAI as determined by the split-half method ranges between .87 and .92 (25). The validity of the Inventory was determined by correlating the MTAI scores with three criteria: pupils' ratings of teachers (.46), principals' ratings of teachers (.45), and experts' ratings of teachers (.49), and with composites of these criteria (.60).

A further validity study which was carried out by Callis (22) found the MTAI scores to correlate with the observers' mean ratings .40, with the students' ratings .49, with the principals' ratings .19, and with the composite of the three criteria .46.

The ratings by the students of the over-all "goodness" of the school is also related to the teachers' MTAI scores. Hoyt and Cook (45) found this correlation to be moderate (.31 to .38) and unrelated to the sex differences of the students.

It is important to note the low correlation between the principals' ratings and the MTAI scores in the Callis study, especially, since the original selection of the "good-rapport" and "non-good-rapport" groups in the Inventory construction was made by the principals.

The susceptibility of the MTAI to faking was studied by administering the Inventory with standard instructions and to the same group with instructions to fake. Correlations were .53 for the sequence of standard preceeding faking instructions and .78 for the reverse sequence. On the basis of this evidence, the authors conclude that the Inventory is only slightly susceptible to faking.

Rabinowitz (78) however, found that in his sample of New York teachers their MTAI scores (and other test measures) failed to correlate significantly with their measure of teacher-pupil rapport in elementary classrooms as measured by the use of an observation schedule.

The question of the validity of the MTAI is still one to be investigated further, possibly through a factor analysis of the Inventory as well as through more precise definition and determination of the teachers' classroom behavior.

Some further insight into the value of the MTAI is provided by Rocchio (82) who found that after a course in mental hygiene his groups showed a significant increase in MTAI scores. However, when the upper twenty-five per cent in the pre-course MTAI administration were compared with their post-course MTAI scores, no significant increase was found. Rocchio concludes that the attitudes measured by the MTAI are basic and deeply rooted in the personality of the teacher and that such attitudes are not changed by a course in mental hygiene as such courses are usually given. This conclusion seems to be a

statement with its own worth but does not seem to be justified on the basis of the evidence presented since the total-group pre-course - post-course comparison did show a significant increase in MTAI scores. If such an increase is due to a change in knowledge as opposed to a change in attitude, the knowledge factor may have been a significant one in the stability of the scores of the pre-course high MTAI group.

This area was further investigated by La Bue (53) who found that knowledge of educational psychology, child development, and child behavior are significantly related to teacher attitudes as measured by the MTAI. Attitudes measured by the MTAI are, however, not significantly related to such traits as objectivity, friendliness, emotional stability, personal relations, and others as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. La Bue concluded that if traits such as those measured by the Survey are important for the purpose of maintaining harmonious teacher-pupil relationships, they must be assessed by means other than the MTAI. The use of "good rapport" in teacher-pupil relationships as the criterion upon which the empirical construction of the MTAI depended was however, subject to the variable of the principals' personalities. "Good rapport" teachers were those so evaluated by the principals and therefore may in fact have been distinguished by factors other than those in the authors' description of "good rapport." This may account for La Bue's findings. Eason (33) found a significant increase in MTAI scores following a course in Educational Psychology which tends to support La Bue's position. However, Eason found a low correlation between scores on subject matter mastery and MTAI scores.

Saunders (88) found higher mean MTAI scores in universities and

teachers colleges than in liberal arts colleges. Hoyt and Cook (45) found correlations of .31 to .38 between pupils' ratings of their schools and the MTAI scores of their teachers. These studies may lend support to the possibility that high MTAI scores are associated with a more permissive atmosphere.

Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale

This scale of fifty items (plus buffer items) was constructed by Taylor (102) for use in experimental studies of the role of drive or motivation in performance. She had five clinicians designate which of approximately 200 items from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory were indicative of manifest anxiety according to Cameron's definition (18).

The scale was administered to 1971 students in introductory psychology at the State University of Iowa. The distribution of scores had a mean of 14.56, the eightieth percentile was 21, and the twentieth percentile was 7.

The test-retest coefficient after three weeks yielded a Pearson product-moment coefficient of .89. Over five months a coefficient of .82 was found.

Further work with the scale was done to compare "normal" and neurotic and psychotic individuals. With the abnormal population ($N = 103$) a median score of 34 was found. This is equivalent to the 98.8 percentile of the normal subjects used in the university study. It should be noted, however, that the "normal" population included all students in the introductory psychology course with no further description of their characteristics.

Moss (70) found that the TMAS was a sensitive indication of clinical anxiety in his juvenile patients. Bendig (9) identified five factors in the TMAS. Two of these appear to be similar to Eysenck's neuroticism factor and another seems to be a combination of Eysenck's neuroticism and introversion factors. Davids (29) found that authoritarianism as measured by the F-scale with Harvard undergraduates is positively correlated with manifest anxiety as measured by the TMAS and negatively with measures of intellectual functioning and clinical assessments of ego structure.

Lauterback (55), however, found that clinical ratings of anxiety made independently by psychiatrists and psychologists were highly in agreement but not significantly correlated with TMAS scores.

An interesting study by Brown (14) in an actual school situation divided teachers into three groups on the basis of tests of neuroticism and anxiety. (Eysenck's Maudsley Personality and TMAS). The most neurotic or anxious third showed greatest deterioration under stressful supervision, the low-anxious improved, and the middle group changed little. In cases of deterioration, the "personal" aspects of teaching (teacher-pupil contact, poise, etc.) showed greatest change in a negative direction.

Summary of the Literature

The "mental health point-of-view" of teachers as assessed by the use of Behavior Schedules has improved considerably over the past four decades. There is some evidence that changes in teacher-training are causal factors, but no attempt has been made to identify the relevant personality characteristics.

Closely related to the "mental health point-of-view" is the "good rapport" criterion of the MTAI. There is considerable evidence that this measure is quite reliable, but its validity is based on ratings by pupils, principals, and "experts" and appears to require further investigation and interpretation. Attempts to relate MTAI scores to personality measures have not yielded any clear results.

The Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale seems to be adequately reliable and valid as a gross measure of anxiety. Positive correlations have been found between the TMAS and neuroticism, authoritarianism, and deterioration in the "personal" aspects of teaching under stress supervision.

CHAPTER IV

METHOD

Instruments

Behavior Rating Schedules. Wickman's Behavior Schedule (see Appendix A) with slightly modified instructions and scoring system was used. For each of the fifty behaviors, a nine-point scale-of-seriousness was drawn to the right. Captions reading: slightly serious, moderately serious, and extremely serious were placed at the top of each page, arranged from left to right to coincide with the numerical values which ranged from one to nine.

Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. The standard test booklet and answer sheet for hand scoring was used.

Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. A Biographical Inventory (see Appendix A) containing the fifty items of the TMAS and the fifteen L scale items of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory was used. The other items in the Biographical Inventory were not used in this study although the subjects completed them.

Subjects

Student Teachers. Students enrolled in Education 320, Mental Health and Guidance, at Memorial University of Newfoundland comprised the sample of student teachers. These subjects were in the third year of a four year degree program in the Faculty of Education. The

median age was 20 years and approximately one third of the total sample had taught in a public school for one or more years.

Mental Hygienists. A sample of one hundred psychologists was drawn from the Directory of the Canadian Psychological Association. The criterion for selection was an indication that the area of specialization was in one of: clinical, counseling, educational, personality, or child psychology.

Administration

The Behavior Schedule was sent to each of the one hundred psychologists with a covering letter (see Appendix A) and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Sixty-six replies were received (forty-seven of which were usable) and so no follow-up was carried out.

The Behavior Schedule and the Biographical Inventory (TMAS) were administered to the student teachers during a regular lecture period in November, the third month of the first semester. The instructions printed on each of these were read aloud. No further directions were given. From the ninety-eight student teachers, ninety-eight usable Biographical inventories were collected, and ninety-seven usable Behavior Schedules were collected. One Schedule was incomplete.

The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was administered to this same class of student teachers approximately one month after the administration of the Schedule and the Biographical Inventory. Of the ninety-eight subjects who took the first two measures, ninety-two completed the MTAI. This difference of six was due to absentees on the day the MTAI was administered.

Data Analysis

From the total sample of teachers-in-training, low-anxious and high-anxious subjects were selected by first eliminating those subjects with an L score of eight (1.89 standard deviations above the mean) or higher, and then grouping the remaining subjects into those above the seventieth percentile on the TMAS (high-anxious) and those below the thirtieth percentile (low-anxious). The mean anxiety score and the standard deviation were calculated for each of the following groups: the total group of teachers-in-training, the total group less those with an L score of eight or above, the low-anxious group, and the high-anxious group. To evaluate the significance of the differences between the low- and high-anxious groups on anxiety scores, the F test of homogeneity of variance and the t test of significance of differences between means were calculated.

The Behavior Schedules completed by the teachers-in-training and the mental hygienists were scored by assigning a numerical value from one to nine on each of the fifty behaviors rated by each subject. These values were assigned in accordance with the place on the rating scale where the subject indicated his evaluation of the seriousness of the behavior by placing a check mark. The frequencies of ratings on each of the nine seriousness levels were tabulated for each of the comparison groups on each behavior.

The comparison of the seriousness ratings of the behaviors by the various comparison groups was made by using the chi-square test. To facilitate this analysis the three lowest numerical values of seriousness (one to three) on each behavior were grouped to become the "low-seriousness" rating. Similar groupings of the three middle seriousness

values (four to six) and of the high seriousness values (seven to nine) were made. This three-fold classification of seriousness values was used in the three column chi-square tests used for the following comparisons: total teacher group with mental hygienists, low-anxious teachers with high-anxious teachers, low-anxious teachers with mental hygienists, and high-anxious teachers with mental hygienists. These comparisons were made on each of the fifty individual behaviors and on the total of the fifty behaviors.

To enable a direct comparison of the teacher-mental hygienist congruence in this study with the teacher-mental hygienist congruence of earlier studies, the median seriousness value on each behavior for each of the comparison groups was calculated. Using these median values rank-order coefficients of correlation were calculated for each of the group comparisons described in the preceding paragraph.

The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory scores were analysed by the calculation of the mean and standard deviation for the total group and for the low- and high-anxious groups. These latter two groups were compared on MTAI scores by the use of the F test and the t test of significance of difference between means.

All values (chi-square, F, t, and rho) were examined for significance at the .05 level. Where chi-square values indicate a significant relationship between group membership and ratings of the behaviors, the direction (rating the behavior more serious or less serious than the comparison group) was determined by inspection.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

Ninety-seven teachers-in-training completed usable Behavior Schedules and Biographical Inventories (TMAS). Of this number, ninety-two completed the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. The difference in numbers was due to absentees at the second testing session. From a total of one hundred psychologists to whom Behavior Schedules were sent, sixty-six replies were received including forty-seven completed Behavior Schedules which were usable.

The Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale scores of the teachers-in-training (Table I) show a significant difference (.01 level) between the means of the low-anxious and high-anxious groups. The thirtieth percentile is 12.20 and the seventieth percentile is 19.83. Cut-off points for the low and high-anxious groups were taken as 12.00 and 20.00 respectively. An F test of homogeneity of variance between these groups yielded an F value of 1.8717. The critical value for F at .05 (30,24) is 1.94.

The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory scores of the teachers-in-training (Table II) show a non-significant (.05) difference between the means of the low- and high-anxious groups. An F test between these groups yielded an F value of 1.0175. The critical value for F at .05 (27, 22) is 2.00.

The analysis of the ratings of the seriousness of the individual behaviors by the various comparison groups yielded data indicating a

significant relationship on thirty-two of the fifty behaviors in the mental hygienists - total teacher group comparison, but on only three of the fifty behaviors was there a significant relationship when the low- and high-anxious teachers were compared. These data are presented in Table III.

TABLE I
MANIFEST ANXIETY SCORES OF TEACHERS-IN-TRAINING AT
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Significance
Total group	97	16.26	7.38		
Total group with L score adjustment	88	16.68	7.20		
Low-anxious	25	8.44	2.80	17.77	.01
High-anxious	31	24.74	3.83		

TABLE II
MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY SCORES OF TEACHERS-
IN-TRAINING AT MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Significance
Total group	92	35.47	26.31		
Low-anxious	23	42.61	26.16	1.355	N.S. (critical value at .05 = 2.008)
High-anxious	28	32.54	26.39		

TABLE III

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR GROUP COMPARISONS ON INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIORS

Behavior	Teachers Compared with Mental Hygienists	Low-Anxious Teachers Compared with High-Anxious Teachers
1. Tardiness	22.786**	2.361
2. Truancy	2.677	1.210
3. Destroying School Materials	3.256	1.732
4. Untruthfulness (lying)	9.407**	0.090
5. Imaginative Lying	13.154**	0.088
6. Cheating	10.722**	1.502
7. Stealing	11.087**	6.000*
8. Profanity	24.093**	0.746
9. Smoking	1.817	1.339
10. Obscene Notes, Pictures, Talk	10.279**	2.964
11. Masturbation	21.051**	1.664
12. Heterosexual Activity (with opposite sex)	19.726**	1.804
13. Disorderliness (violation of classroom discipline)	15.872**	3.293
14. Whispering and Note- Writing	15.570**	0.023
15. Interrupting (talkative- ness)	19.493**	2.489
16. Restlessness (overactivity)	4.682	1.358
17. Inattention	12.486**	1.659
18. Lack of Interest in Work	3.843	2.359
19. Carelessness in Work	24.614**	1.480
20. Laziness	13.220**	3.254
21. Unreliableness (irrespon- sible)(evasion of duties)	1.840	2.909
22. Disobedience	27.739**	1.558
23. Impertinence (insubordina- tion and defiance)	12.188**	1.672
24. Cruelty and Bullying	3.621	0.881

TABLE III (continued)

25. Quarrelsomeness (annoying other children)	2.776	1.949
26. Tattling	3.740	1.055
27. Stubbornness (contrariness)	28.300**	4.150
28. Sullenness (sulkiness)	14.035**	6.217*
29. Temper Tantrums	2.574	1.350
30. Impudence, Impoliteness, Rudeness	20.610**	3.462
31. Selfishness (and unsports- manship)	12.514**	6.681*
32. Domineering, Overbearing, Dictatorial	8.071*	1.916
33. Shyness, Bashfulness	11.528**	1.870
34. Sensitiveness	29.677**	2.373
35. Unsocial, Withdrawing	3.886	3.694
36. Overcritical of Others	6.969*	4.876
37. Thoughtlessness (forget- ting)	6.719*	0.248
38. Inquisitiveness, Meddle- someness	5.017	1.891
39. Silliness, "Smartness," Attracting Attention	14.788**	3.223
40. Unhappy, Depressed, Dissatisfied	3.180	0.187
41. Resentful	0.570	0.362
42. Nervousness	10.708**	0.407
43. Fearfulness (easily frightened)	2.842	0.575
44. Enuresis (wetting self)	3.444	0.077
45. Dreaminess	5.904	1.793
46. Slovenly in Personal Appearance	21.064**	5.968
47. Suspiciousness	23.209**	0.304
48. Physical Coward	6.296*	0.702
49. Easily Discouraged	12.155**	0.450

TABLE III (continued)

50. Suggestible (accepts suggestion of anyone)	1.700	0.304
---	-------	-------

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

The comparison of the high-anxious teachers with the mental hygienists indicated a significant relationship between positional affiliation and seriousness ratings on thirty-two of the fifty behaviors. However, when the low-anxious teachers were compared with the mental hygienists on the ratings of the seriousness of the individual behaviors there was a significant relationship between positional affiliation and seriousness ratings on only twenty-three of the fifty behaviors. These data are presented in Table IV.

Chi-square values for the comparison of the various groupings on the over-all Behavior Schedule indicate that there is a significant relationship (.001 level) between positional affiliation and ratings of the seriousness of the behaviors when the teachers were compared with the mental hygienists, when the low-anxious teachers were compared with the high-anxious teachers, when the low-anxious teachers were compared with the mental hygienists, and when the high-anxious teachers were compared with the mental hygienists. For this significance a chi-square of 86.661 was required. The following chi-square values were found: teachers compared with mental hygienists, 567.479; low-anxious teachers compared with high-anxious teachers, 98.160; low-anxious teachers compared with mental hygienists, 304.541; high-anxious

teachers compared with mental hygienists, 420.009.

The earlier studies comparing teachers and mental hygienists on ratings of behaviors used rank order correlation in their analyses. For purposes of direct comparison of the relevant parts of this study with these earlier studies, correlation data are presented in Table V.

TABLE IV

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR GROUP COMPARISONS ON INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIORS

Behavior	Low-Anxious Teachers Compared with Mental Hygienists	High-Anxious Teachers Compared with Mental Hygienists
1. Tardiness	16.480**	6.527*
2. Truancy	1.323	3.253
3. Destroying School Materials	1.970	2.320
4. Untruthfulness (lying)	4.116	5.720
5. Imaginative Lying	8.711*	9.022*
6. Cheating	6.658*	2.858
7. Stealing	8.895*	4.263
8. Profanity	15.843**	11.945**
9. Smoking	1.779	1.798
10. Obscene Notes, Pictures, Talk	3.582	10.793**
11. Masturbation	10.953**	21.643**
12. Heterosexual Activity (with opposite sex)	10.325**	14.143**
13. Disorderliness (violation of classroom discipline)	9.665**	8.804*
14. Whispering and Note-Writing	13.284**	12.563**
15. Interrupting (talkativeness)	13.234.**	11.044**
16. Restlessness (overactivity)	3.155	9.521**
17. Inattention	7.005*	8.640*
18. Lack of Interest in Work	0.670	6.305*
19. Carelessness in Work	11.040**	18.873**
20. Laziness	3.044	11.842**
21. Unreliableness (irrespon- sible)(evasion of duties)	0.114	4.057
22. Disobedience	12.498**	12.148**
23. Impertinence (insubordina- tion and defiance)	7.104*	9.322**
24. Cruelty and Bullying	3.937	1.053
25. Quarrelsomeness (annoying other children)	0.562	14.784**

TABLE IV (continued)

26. Tattling	2.517	1.928
27. Stubbornness (contrariness)	8.615*	17.744**
28. Sullenness (sulkiness)	7.281*	6.645*
29. Temper Tantrums	3.547	1.405
30. Impudence, Impoliteness, Rudeness	7.510*	13.074**
31. Selfishness (and unsports- manship)	1.543	17.607**
32. Domineering, Overbearing, Dictatorial	1.960	9.392**
33. Shyness, Bashfulness	6.195*	10.038**
34. Sensitiveness	17.993**	22.950**
35. Unsocial, Withdrawing	1.032	6.166*
36. Overcritical of Others	8.878*	1.013
37. Thoughtlessness (forgetting)	6.521*	4.510
38. Inquisitiveness, Meddlesome- ness	2.530	6.000*
39. Silliness, "Smartness," Attracting Attention	4.493	12.557**
40. Unhappy, Depressed, Dissatis- fied	4.598	4.973
41. Resentful	0.229	1.036
42. Nervousness	3.186	8.763*
43. Fearfulness (easily frightened)	0.216	1.377
44. Enuresis (wetting self)	1.292	1.220
45. Dreaminess	1.781	7.503*
46. Slovenly in Personal Appearance	11.779**	12.855**
47. Suspiciousness	14.306**	16.054**
48. Physical Coward	4.934	7.073*
49. Easily Discouraged	4.310	4.289
50. Suggestible (accepts sug- gestion of anyone)	1.348	0.596

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE V

RANK ORDER COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION ON TOTAL BEHAVIOR SCHEDULES*
 (Based on Ranked Median Values)

	High-Anxious Teachers	Mental Hygienists
Teachers - Total group		.793
Low-Anxious Teachers	.908	.765
High-Anxious Teachers	--	.847

*All significant at .01 level.

CHAPTER VI

INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

Hypotheses

The ratings of the fifty behaviors on the Behavior Schedule as made by the teachers and the mental hygienists indicate that there is a significant relationship between positional affiliation and evaluation of the seriousness of these behaviors. The chi-square value developed from this comparison was significant at the .001 level. This value allows us to reject the null hypothesis (I. A) which states that there is no significant relationship between the variables of group membership and ratings of the behaviors.

When these two groups were compared on each of the fifty behaviors, a significant chi-square value was found for thirty-two of the behaviors. On twenty-eight of these the chi-square value was significant at the .01 level and on the other four the significance level was .05. This indicates that on each of these thirty-two behaviors a relationship exists between the composition of the respondent group (whether it consists of teachers-in-training or mental hygienists) and the ratings of the seriousness of the behaviors. Inspection of the data revealed that only two of the thirty-two behaviors were rated less serious by the teachers than by the mental hygienists. These behaviors were sullenness and suspiciousness. For the other twenty-eight behaviors, no significant relationship was found between positional affiliation and the ratings of the behaviors.

Since 1927, various studies have compared the ratings of the seriousness of children's behaviors as made by teachers and mental hygienists. These studies suggest that there may be a considerable move toward the "mental-health point-of-view" by teachers since the rank order correlation between the groups has tended to increase (1927, $r = -.04$, 1940, $r = .70$; 1951 $r = .56$). However, this study, which indicates that there is a significant relationship between the composition of the group and the distributions of the seriousness ratings for each behavior and for the total schedule, yields a rank order correlation of .793 (significant at the .01 level) between the groups. This evidence indicates that the rank order analysis may be masking the real differences which exist in the ratings of the behaviors by the comparison groups.

Although this limitation in the analysis of comparative ranks is recognized, a comparison of the behaviors obtaining extreme ranks in earlier studies with the behaviors obtaining extreme ranks in this study may prove useful. When the mental hygienists' ratings in this study were compared with the 1951 clinicians' ratings (89), it was found that the same three behaviors received the highest ranks (highest seriousness ratings). These were unsocial - withdrawing, depressed, and cruelty. Of the ten most serious in the 1951 study, six were similarly rated by the mental hygienists in this present study. These were unsocial - withdrawing, depressed, cruelty, fearfulness, suspiciousness, and nervousness. With the exception of nervousness, these same behaviors were included in the ten behaviors rated most serious by the mental hygienists in the 1927 study (108).

It appears that there is some consistency in the behaviors considered by mental hygienists as "most serious." A somewhat similar

consistency exists in the ratings by the teachers in the various studies. Of the ten behaviors rated as most serious by the 1951 teachers, six were similarly rated by the teachers-in-training in this study (depressed, cruelty, stealing, destroying school materials, untruthfulness, and impertinence). With the exception of "depressed" these same behaviors were included in the ten rated most serious by the teachers in the 1927 study (108). A notable exception to the consistency of the ratings by the teachers in the various studies is found in the sex-related behaviors. Heterosexual behavior, obscene notes and pictures, and masturbation were included in the ten most serious behaviors as rated by the teachers in 1927 and in 1951, but they were not included in the ten most serious behaviors in this study. Such an apparent change may be due to actual differences in the social values and behaviors, or to differences in the teacher-personalities of the various decades and/or geographical locations, or to changes in the extent to which teachers have "learned to respond" appropriately without actual attitude changes.

However, the significant lack of congruence between the ratings of the behaviors by the teachers as compared to the ratings by the mental hygienists in this study points up the fact that teachers probably react to such behaviors of children in a way differing from the "mental health point-of-view." Such a conclusion is, however, subject to the validity of the assumption that such ratings of the seriousness of the behaviors by teachers is in fact closely related to teacher-behavior toward such behaviors of children. Although this is a reasonable assumption based on the nature of attitudes as predispositions to respond to stimuli, no attempt was made in this study to test its validity.

Hypotheses I. B, I. C, and I. D were formulated to test the

relationship between manifest anxiety and the way in which teachers-in-training rated the "seriousness" of the behaviors.

The comparison of the ratings of the behaviors by the low- and high-anxious teachers on the over-all schedule yields a chi-square value significant at the .001 level and, therefore, allows us to reject null hypothesis I. D which states that there is no significant relationship between positional affiliation (whether the respondent group consists of low- or high-anxious teachers) and the ratings of the "seriousness" of the behaviors. However, comparison of these groups on each of the fifty individual behaviors (using chi-square tests) indicates that on only three of these behaviors is there a significant relationship between positional affiliations and the ratings. These behaviors are stealing, sullenness, and selfishness.

The analysis of the data relevant to hypotheses I. B (no significant relationship between positional affiliation and ratings of the behaviors for the low-anxious teachers - mental hygienists comparison) and I. C (no significant relationship between positional affiliation and ratings of the behaviors for the high-anxious teachers - mental hygienists comparison) provides more insight into the relationship between manifest anxiety and the way in which teachers rate behaviors.

The chi-square value developed from the comparison of the ratings of the total of fifty behaviors by the low-anxious teachers and the mental hygienists was significant at the .001 level. This allows us to reject null hypothesis I. B. The chi-square value developed from the comparison of the ratings of the total of fifty behaviors by the high-anxious teachers and the mental hygienists was significant at the .001 level. This allows us to reject null hypothesis I. C.

Comparison of the low-anxious teachers with the mental hygienists on individual behaviors indicates that there is a significant relationship between positional affiliation and ratings on twenty-three of the fifty behaviors. Eleven of these were significant at the .01 level and twelve at the .05 level. Of these twenty-three, only four were peculiar to the low-anxious group. That is, the other nineteen also show a significant relationship between positional affiliation and ratings in the high-anxious teachers - mental hygienists comparison. The four behaviors were cheating, stealing, overcritical of others, and thoughtlessness.

Comparison of the high-anxious teachers with the mental hygienists on individual behaviors indicates that there is a significant relationship between positional affiliation and ratings on thirty-two of the fifty behaviors. Eleven of these were significant at the .01 level and twenty-one at the .05 level. Of these thirty-two behaviors, thirteen were peculiar to the high anxious group. That is, on these behaviors a significant relationship was found between positional affiliation and ratings for the high-anxious teachers - mental hygienists comparison but not in the low-anxious teachers - mental hygienists comparison. The thirteen behaviors were: unsocial - withdrawing, dreaminess, nervousness, physical coward, silliness, inquisitiveness, selfishness, quarrelsomeness, laziness, domineering, obscene notes, restlessness, and lack of interest in work. Further, six of these behaviors did not show a significant relationship in the teacher total-group - mental hygienists comparison. These were: unsocial - withdrawing, dreaminess, restlessness, quarrelsomeness, lack of interest in work, and inquisitiveness.

It appears, therefore, that high-anxious teachers show less congruence with mental hygienists than do low-anxious teachers on the ratings of these behaviors of children. The ratings of these behaviors by the subjects may be considered as a gross assessment of attitudes toward these behaviors. That the attitudes of the low-anxious teachers differ from the attitudes of the high-anxious teachers is indicated by the analysis of the teachers' Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory scores. However, this difference was not statistically significant at the .05 level.

The mean score for the low-anxious teachers was 42.61 and the mean score for the high-anxious teachers was 32.54. The standard deviations were 26.16 and 26.39 respectively. On the basis of these data we fail to reject the null hypothesis (II.) which states that there is no significant difference between these two groups on MTAI scores. Such a finding may be due to the global nature of the MTAI, the influence of learning "how to respond" in this area of applied psychology, to the non-existence of real differences between the low- and high-anxious groups in terms of attitudes, or to any combination of these and other factors. However, the difference which was found between the groups is sufficient to warrant further study in this area.

Summary, Implications, and Suggestions for Further Study

The problem of assessing the relationship between teachers-in-training and mental hygienists on their ratings of the seriousness of common behaviors of children was the general focus of this study. Specifically, this study attempted to assess the relationship between the

personality variable of teachers' manifest anxiety and the congruence of the teachers' ratings of the behaviors with the mental hygienists' ratings of the behaviors. The question was, "To what extent is the teacher's anxiety related to her mental health point-of-view?"

The data collected indicate that teachers-in-training rate the behaviors differently from the way in which the mental hygienists rate them. Although less clear, there is evidence that manifest anxiety is related to the way in which the teachers rate the behaviors. The low-anxious teachers show greater congruence with the mental hygienists in their ratings of the behaviors than do the teachers of the total group. The high-anxious teachers show less congruence with the mental hygienists than do the low-anxious teachers, but the difference between high-anxious teachers and the teachers of the total group is not similarly evidenced.

Such findings, although limited in scope and precision, point up the need to reconsider our teacher-training programs in terms of teacher personality. The incongruence between teachers and mental hygienists in their ratings of the children's behaviors may be considered a reflection of differing attitudes toward such common behaviors. That attitudes are a product of learning is not only true, but offers an optimistic prospect for teacher-training. That attitudes are related to personality factors (in this study, manifest anxiety) suggests the need for more refined selection of trainees in teacher-education and the inclusion of a purposely designed "personality process" for those admitted to such training. The design of such a dimension in teacher-training appears to be one of the promising possibilities in the attempt to make public education a more fruitful process in the development of "adequate personalities."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abramovitz, A. B., and Elaine Burnham. "Exploring potentials for mental health in the classroom." Ment. Hyg. New York, 43: (April, 1959), 253-259.
2. Abrahamsen, David, et al. "Status of mental hygiene and child guidance facilities in public schools in the United States." J. Pediatrics. 46: (1955), 107-18.
3. Amos, Robert T., and Reginald M. Washington. "A comparison of pupil and teacher perceptions of pupil problems." J. Educ. Psychol. 51: (1960), 255-258.
4. Anderson, G. Lester. "Educational psychology and teacher education." J. of Ed. Psych. XLI (October, 1950), 362-65.
5. Anderson, H. H., and J. E. Brewer. "Studies of teachers' classroom personalities," II: "Effects of teachers' dominative and integrative contacts on children's classroom behavior." Applied Psychology Monograph No. 8. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, June, 1946.
6. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. Washington: National Education Association, 1962.
7. Barr, A. S. "The nature of the problem." J. Exp. Educ. 30: (1960), 5-29.
8. Barr, A. S., et al. Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness: A Summary of Investigations. Madison, Wisconsin: Dembar, 1961, 156 p.
9. Bendig, A. W. "Identification of item factor patterns within the manifest anxiety scale." J. Consult. Psychol. 22: (1958), 158.
10. Berlin, Harry. "Teachers' and clinicians' attitudes toward the behavior problems of children: A reappraisal." Child Development. 30: (March, 1959), 9-25.
11. Bernard, H. W. Mental Hygiene for Classroom Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1952.
12. Bonney, Merl E. Mental Health in Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1960.

13. Brandt, R. M., and H. V. Perkins. "Teachers change as they study children." Childhood Education. 34: (1957-58), 218-220.
14. Brown, Alan F. "Teaching under stress." The Canadian Administration. 1: (March, 1962), 6.
15. Brubacker, John S. "Teacher education - development." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 1960, 1452.
16. Bruce, William F. "Psychology functioning in the educating of teachers." J. Ed. Psychol. 43: (1952), 92-100.
17. Buros, O. K. The Fourth Mental Measurement Yearbook. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1953.
18. Cameron, N. The Psychology of Behavior Disorders: A Bio-social Interpretation. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1947.
19. Caskey, Owen L. "Teacher inconsistency and guidance readiness." J. Counsel. Psych. 7: (1960), 58-61.
20. Clark, Elmer J. "Teacher reactions toward objectionable pupil behavior." Elementary School Journal. 51: (1951), 446-49.
21. Callis, Robert. "Change in teacher-pupil attitudes related to training and experience." Ed. and Psych. Meas. 10: (1950), 718-27.
22. Callis, Robert. "The efficiency of the MTAI for predicting interpersonal relations in the classroom." J. Applied Psych. XXXVII (April, 1953), 82-85.
23. Cole, David L. "The prediction of teaching performance." J. Educ. Res. 54: (1960), 345-48.
24. Cook, D. L. "Notes on the relationships between MTAI and GZTS scores for three levels of teacher experience." J. Ed. Res. 55: (May, 1962), 363-7.
25. Cook, W. W., C. H. Leeds, and R. Callis. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. Minneapolis: published by the authors, 1949.
26. Cook, W. W., C. H. Leeds, and R. Callis. Minnesota Teacher Inventory Manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1951.
27. Cox, D. "Objective and empirical study of the effects of laboratory experience in a professional education course prior to student teaching." J. Exp. Ed. 29: (5607), 89-94.
28. Darrow, H. D. "Effects of a participation program on the attitudes of prospective teachers at Indiana State Teachers College." Teach. Col. J. 31: (November, 1959), 18-21.

29. Davids, Anthony. "Some personality and intellectual correlates of intolerance of ambiguity." J. Abn. Social Psychol. 51: (1955), 415-20.
30. Dornbusch, Sanford M. and Calvin F. Schmid. A Prime of Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1955.
31. Downie, Norville M. and C. R. Bell. "The Minnesota teacher attitude inventory as an aid in the selection of teachers." J. Ed. Res. (1953), 699-704.
32. Ellis, D. B. and L. W. Miller. "Teachers' attitudes and behavior problems." J. of Educ. Psych. 27: (October, 1936), 501-511.
33. Eson, M. E. "Minnesota teacher attitude inventory in evaluating the teaching of educational psychology." J. Ed. Psych. 47: (May, 1956), 271-5.
34. Evans, Louise. "The inter-relationships between manifest anxiety and certain behavioral and descriptive variables." Dissertation Abstracts. 16: (1956), 383-84.
35. Fishman, Joshua A. "The MTAI in an American minority-group school setting" Differences between test characteristics for norm and non-norm populations. J. Educ. Psychol. 48: (1957), 41-51.
36. Gage, N. L. "A method for 'improving' teacher behavior." Journal of teacher education. XIV No. 3, (September, 1963), 261.
37. Gage, N. L. "Explorations in teachers' perceptions of pupils." Journal of Teacher Education. 9: (March, 1958), 97-101.
38. Gage, N. L. and George Suci. "Social perception and teacher-pupil relationships." J. Ed. Psychol. 42: (1951), 144-52.
39. Gaier, Eugene L. and Stewart Jones. "Do teachers understand classroom behavior?" Understanding Children. 20: (1951), 104-9.
40. Glidewell, John C. and others. "Methods for Community Health Research." U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Public Health Service N. D., 22.
41. Goodenough, Eva. "The forced choice techniques as a method of discovering effective teacher personality." Journal of Educational Research. Vol. 51, (1957), 25-31.
42. Green, Bert F. "Attitude measurement." Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. 1, Lindzey, Gardner (ed.) Addison-Wesley. Ch. 9.
43. Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

44. Howsam, Robert B. New Designs for Research in Teaching Competence. San Francisco: California Teachers Association, 1960, 48 p.
45. Hoyt, Cyril J., and Walter W. Cook. "The predictive validity of the MTAI based on pupil attitude toward school." J. Teach. Educ. 10: (1959), 42-44.
46. Hoyt, C. J., and W. W. Cook. "The stability of MTAI scores during two to seven years of teaching." J. Teacher Educ. 11: (1960), 487-491.
47. Hunt, J. McV. (ed.). Personality and the Behavior Disorders. New York: Ronald Press, 1944.
48. Hunter, E. C. "Changes in teachers' attitudes toward children's behavior over the last thirty years." Mental Hygiene. Vol. 41 (1957), pp. 3-10.
49. Jersild, Arthur T. When Teachers Face Themselves. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955.
50. Kearney, N. C., and P. D. Rocchio. "Using the Minnesota teacher attitude inventory in counseling prospective teachers." Personnel and Guid. J. 34: (November, 1955), 159-60.
51. Klausmeier, Herbert, and Donovan Swanson. "Evaluating a course in educational psychology." Journal of Ed. Res. XLIII (May, 1950), 678-87.
52. Kvaraceus, William C. "Behavior problems." Encyclopedia of Educ. Res. Third Ed. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1960, pp. 137-43.
53. LaBue, A. C. "Teachers' classroom attitudes." J. Teach. Ed. 10: (October, 1959), 433-34.
54. Lange, Phil C. "A study of concepts developed by students in an undergraduate course in the psychology and practice of teaching." J. Ed. Res. XXXVI (May, 1943), 641-61.
55. Lauterbach, Carl G. "The taylor A scale and clinical measures of anxiety." J. Consult. Psychol. 22: (1958), 314.
56. Laycock, S. R. Mental Hygiene in the School. Toronto: Copp-Clark, 1960.
57. Leeds, C. H. "A second validity study of the Minnesota teacher attitude inventory." Elem. Sch. J. 52: (1952), 398-405.
58. Leeds, Carroll H., and Walter W. Cook. "The construction and differential value of a scale for determining teacher-pupil attitudes." J. Exp. Ed. XVI (December, 1947), 149-59.

59. Leton, D. A. "Evaluation of course methods in teaching child development." J. Ed. Res. 55: (November, 1961), 118-22.
60. Luker, Arno H. "Determination of relative values of topics for undergraduate courses in psychology for the education of teachers." J. Ed. Res. 44: (1951), 687-94.
61. McNemar, Quinn. Psychological Statistics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
62. Marcuse, Frederick L. "On methods of teaching elementary psychology." J. Ed. Psychol. 42: (1951), 236-40.
63. Mathews, W. Mason, et al. "A research evaluation of an action approach to school mental health." Amer. J. Orthopsychiat. 31: (1961), 320-46.
64. Menninger, Karl A. "Present trends in psychanalytic theory and practice." Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic No. 8, (1944), 14-17.
65. Menninger, William C. "Mental health in our schools." Ed. Leadership. 7: (1950), 510-23.
66. Mitchell, John C. "A study of teachers' and mental hygienists' ratings of certain behavior problems of children." J. of Educ. Res. 36: (December, 1942), 292-307.
67. Mitzel, Harold E. "Teacher effectiveness, criteria." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 1960, p. 1481.
68. Morlan, George K. "A student project in educational psychology." J. Ed. Psychol. 42: (1951), 241-45.
69. Morse, William C. "A research evaluation of an action approach to school mental health - the mental hygiene delemma in public education." Amer. J. Orthopsychiatry. 31: (1961), 324-31.
70. Moss, C. S., and Waters, T. J. "Intensive longitudinal investigation of anxiety in hospitalized juvenile patients." Psychol. Reports. 7: (1960), 279-80.
71. Murphy, Lois Barclay. "Teaching procedures in educational psychology." J. Ed. Psych. XLIII (January, 1952), 16-22.
72. National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Teacher-Education: The Decade Ahead, Report of the DeKalb Conference. The Commission. 1955, 363 p.
73. National Society of College Teachers of Education. Committee on Ed. Psych. Educational Psychology in Teacher Education. The Society. 1953, 99 p.

74. Northway, Mary L., ed. Well Children, A Progress Report. Toronto: Institute of Child Study, University of Toronto, 1955.
75. Ojemann, Ralph H. "School community programs." R. Ed. Res. 26: (1956), 479-501.
76. Ojemann, Ralph H. and others. "The effects of a 'causal' teacher-training program and certain curricular changes on grade school children." J. Exp. Ed. 24: 95-144.
77. Popham, W. James, and Robert R. Trimble. "The Minnesota teacher attitude inventory as an index of general teaching competence." Educ. Psychol. Measmt. 20: (1960), 509-12.
78. Rabinowitz, William and Tra Rosenbaum. "A failure in the prediction of pupil-teacher rapport." J. Educ. Psychol. 49: (1958), 93-98.
79. Rankin, P. T. and J. M. Dorsey. "The Detroit school mental health project." Mental Hygiene. Vol. 37, (1953), 228-48.
80. Rath, L. E. "Some recent researches in helping teachers understand children." J. Educ. Sociology. 21: (1947), 205-11
81. Rocchio, Patrick Domininc. "Teacher-pupil attitudes as related to teachers' personal characteristics and pupil adjustment." Dissertation Abstr. 16: (1956), 711-12.
82. Rocchio, P. D. and N. C. Kearney. "Does a course in mental hygiene help teachers?" Und. the Child. 25: (June, 1956), 91-94.
83. Rogers, Dorothy. Mental Hygiene in Elementary Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1957, 10.
84. Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison, and Appraisal. American Council on Education. 1960.
85. Ryans, David G. "Teacher behavior theory and research: implications for teacher education." J. of Teacher Educ. XIV No. 3, (September, 1963).
86. Ryans, David G. "Teacher effectiveness, prediction." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 1960, 1486.
87. Sandgreen, D. L. and L. G. Schmidt. "Does practice teaching change attitudes toward teaching?" J. Ed. Res. 49: (May, 1956), 673-80.
88. Saunders, Jack O. L. "The relationship of preparatory program contributions to teacher competencies." J. Ed. Res. 49: (1956), 697-702.

89. Schrupp, Manfred H. and Clayton M. Gjerde. "Teacher growth in attitudes toward behavior problems of children." J. Ed. Psychol. 44: (1953), 203-14.
90. Sello, Saul B. and David K. Trites. "Attitudes." Ency. of Ed. Res. (3rd edition). New York: The MacMillan Co., 1960.
91. Shaffer, L. F. and E. J. Shoben. The Psychology of Adjustment. (2nd edition). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1956.
92. Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.
93. Staff of the div. on child development and teacher personnel. Helping Teachers Understand Children. Amer. Council on Ed. 1945, 468 p.
94. Stinnett, T. M., (ed.). "Principles underlying an effective program of teacher education." J. Teach. Ed. 4: (1953), 228-29.
95. Stinnett, T. M. and Charles M. Clarke. "Teacher education programs." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1960, 1461.
96. Stouffer, George A. W., Jr. and Jennie Owens. "Behavior problems of children as identified by today's teachers and compared with those reported by E. K. Wickman." J. Ed. Res. 48: (1955), 321-31.
97. Stevenson, George S. Mental Health Planning for Social Action. McGraw-Hill, 1956, 358 p.
98. Strang, Ruth M. "Mental health." Encyclopedia of Ed. Research. (1960), 823.
99. Symonds, P. M. "Change in self attitudes following a course in mental hygiene." J. of Educational Research. Vol. 35. (1942), 321-25.
100. Symonds, P. M. "Personality and the teacher." J. of Educational Research. Vol. 40. (1946-47), 652-61.
101. Symonds, P. M. "Supervision as counseling." Teachers College Record. Vol. 43. (1941-42), 49-56.
102. Taylor, Janet A. "A personality scale of manifest anxiety." J. of Abnormal and Social Psychology. No. 2. (1953), 285.
103. Thompson C. E. "The attitudes of various groups toward behavior problems of children." J. Abnorm. Soc. Psych. 35: (1940), 120-25, 188-89.
104. U. S. National Advisory Mental Health Council, Community Services Committee, subcommittee on Evaluation of Mental Health Activities. Evaluation in Mental Health: A Review of the Problem of Evaluating Mental Health Activities. U. S. Public Health Service Publication, No. 413. (1955), 292 pp.

105. Vertein, L. D. "Study of the personal-social and intellectual characteristics of a group of state college students preparing to teach." J. Exp. Ed. 30: (December, 1961), 159-92.
106. Walker, Wárrren, et al. "The psychiatric interview and teacher training." Mental Hygiene. 40: (1956), 406-12.
107. Wall, Bartholomew D. "Education's mental hygiene dilemma." Ment. Hyg. New York. 44: (1960), 569-77.
108. Wickman, George T. Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes. Commonwealth Fund. 1928, 247 p.
109. Withall, John. "Mental health - teacher education research projects." J. Teacher Educ. XIV. No. 3. (September, 1963).

APPENDIX A

1. Letter to the Mental Hygienists
2. Behavior Rating Schedule
3. Biographical Inventory

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

ST. JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND, CANADA

Faculty of Education
December 4, 1964

I am conducting a research study of the relationship between tested manifest anxiety and "mental hygiene point-of-view" in student teachers. One step in this project is to establish a new Wickman mental hygiene criterion. To establish this criterion I am asking a sample of Canadian "mental hygienists" to complete a Behavior Rating Schedule, one of which is enclosed. I shall be very grateful if you could take the time to make the ratings and return the Schedule in the enclosed envelope.

Although the composite ratings of behaviors by professionals in the area of mental health have questionable validity as a criterion of "mental hygiene point-of-view," the method is being used in this study with its limitations recognized. The instructions for the completion of the Behavior Schedule are very similar to those given to the teachers in Wickman's early study. Even here there are certain limitations which are easily recognizable, but the design of the study is such as to require identical instructions for both the mental hygienists and the teachers.

It would be very helpful if you could return the Behavior Schedule with your ratings before the middle of December. Although there is no need to sign your name, I will carefully consider any comments you may make.

Thank you very much for helping me in this study.

Yours truly,

Blair W. Shaw

A LIST OF BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS HAS BEEN TABULATED ON THE ATTACHED SHEETS. THE LIST WAS OBTAINED BY A PREVIOUS QUESTIONNAIRE TO SCHOOL TEACHERS IN WHICH THEY WERE ASKED TO REPORT ON THE KINDS OF UNDESIRABLE BEHAVIOR THEY HAD ENCOUNTERED IN THEIR TEACHING EXPERIENCES. (WICKMAN, 1928).

YOU ARE REQUESTED TO RATE EACH OF THESE BEHAVIOR ITEMS ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE OF SERIOUSNESS OF THE PARTICULAR BEHAVIOR FOR ANY CHILD. IN OTHER WORDS, HOW UNDESIRABLE IS IT FOR ANY CHILD TO MANIFEST THE BEHAVIOR DESCRIBED IN THIS LIST OF PROBLEMS?

YOUR RATINGS WILL BE MADE BY MARKING ON A "SCALE OF SERIOUSNESS" PROVIDED FOR THIS PURPOSE. A LINE HAS BEEN DRAWN TO THE RIGHT OF EACH BEHAVIOR ITEM. EACH LINE HAS NINE DIVISIONAL POINTS TO DENOTE THE DEGREE OF SERIOUSNESS IN ANY CHILD. SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS FOR MAKING YOUR RATINGS ARE GIVEN BELOW.

PLEASE DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME OR IDENTIFY YOURSELF IN ANY WAY.

THANK YOU FOR COOPERATING IN THIS PROJECT.

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. FIRST READ THE LIST OF BEHAVIOR ITEMS ON THE TWO SHEETS ATTACHED.
2. THEN ANSWER THE QUESTIONS OF THE DEGREE OF SERIOUSNESS OF EACH BEHAVIOR ITEM WHEN MANIFESTED BY ANY CHILD BY MAKING A CHECK MARK () AT ANY POINT ON THE LINE ACCORDING TO THE CAPTIONS AT THE TOP OF THE PAGE.
3. YOU MAY MAKE YOUR RATING AT ANY POINT ON THE LINE.
4. AVOID RATING HOW FREQUENTLY ANY PARTICULAR BEHAVIOR OCCURS IN CHILDREN. RATE ONLY HOW SERIOUS OR UNDESIRABLE IT IS FOR ANY CHILD WHEN IT DOES OCCUR.

HOW SERIOUS (OR UNDESIRABLE) IS THIS BEHAVIOR IN ANY CHILD?

	SLIGHTLY SERIOUS	MODERATELY SERIOUS	EXTREMELY SERIOUS
Tardiness.....			
Truancy.....			
Destroying School Materials..			
Untruthfulness (lying).....			
Imaginative Lying.....			
Cheating.....			
Stealing.....			
Profanity.....			
Smoking.....			
Obscene Notes, Pictures, Talk			
Masturbation.....			
Heterosexual Activity (with opposite sex).....			
Disorderliness (violation of classroom discipline).....			
Whispering and Note-writing..			
Interrupting (talkativeness)..			
Restlessness (overactivity)...			
Inattention.....			
Lack of Interest in Work.....			
Carelessness in Work.....			
Laziness.....			
Unreliableness (irrespon- sible)(evasion of duties)...			
Disobedience.....			
Impertinence (insubordina- tion and defiance).....			

HOW SERIOUS (OR UNDESIRABLE) IS THIS BEHAVIOR IN ANY CHILD?

	SLIGHTLY SERIOUS	MODERATELY SERIOUS	EXTREMELY SERIOUS
Cruelty and Bullying.....			
Quarrelsomeness (annoying other children).....			
Tattling.....			
Stubbornness (contrariness).....			
Sullenness (sulking).....			
Temper Tantrums.....			
Impudence, Impoliteness, Rudeness.....			
Selfishness (and unsportsman- ship).....			
Domineering, Overbearing, Dictatorial.....			
Shyness, Bashfulness.....			
Sensitiveness.....			
Unsocial, Withdrawing.....			
Overcritical of Others.....			
Thoughtlessness (forgetting).....			
Inquisitiveness, Meddlesome- ness.....			
Silliness, "Smartness," Attracting Attention.....			
Unhappy, Depressed, Dissatis- fied.....			
Resentful.....			
Nervousness.....			
Fearfulness (easily frighten- ed).....			

HOW SERIOUS (OR UNDESIRABLE) IS THIS BEHAVIOR IN ANY CHILD?

	SLIGHTLY SERIOUS	MODERATELY SERIOUS	EXTREMELY SERIOUS
• Enuresis (wetting self).....			
Dreaminess.....			
• Slovenly in Personal Appearance.....			
• Suspiciousness.....			
Physical Coward.....			
• Easily Discouraged.....			
• Suggestible (accepts sugges- tion of anyone).....			

BIOGRAPHICAL INVENTORY

Do not write or mark on this booklet in any way. Your answers to the statements in this inventory are to be recorded only on the separate Answer Sheet.

The Statements in this booklet represent experiences, ways of doing things, or beliefs or preferences that are true of some people but are not true of others. Read each statement and decide whether or not it is true with respect to yourself. If it is true or mostly true, blacken the answer space in column T on the Answer Sheet in the row numbered the same as the statement you are answering. If the statement is not usually true or is not true at all, blacken the space in column F in the number row. Answer the statements as carefully and honestly as you can. There are no correct or wrong answers. We are interested in the way you work and in the things you believe. Sometimes it may be difficult to make a decision, but please answer every item either true or false without skipping any.

REMEMBER: Mark the answer space in column T if the statement is true or mostly true; mark the answer space in column F if the statement is false or mostly false. Be sure the space you blacken is in the row numbered the same as the item you are answering. Mark each item as you come to it; be sure to mark one and only one answer space for each item. Here is an example:

T F

I would like to be an artist II

If you would like to be an artist, that is, if the statement is true as far as you are concerned, you would mark the answer space under T. If the statement is false, you would mark the space under F.

If you have any questions, please ask them now.

DO NOT MARK ON THIS BOOKLET

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. I have never felt better in my life than I do now. | 6. I have often met people who were supposed to be experts who were no better than I. |
| 2. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job. | 7. I am easily embarrassed. |
| 3. I blush as often as others. | 8. It makes me nervous to have to wait. |
| 4. I get mad easily and then get over it soon. | 9. I sweat very easily even on cool days. |
| 5. People often disappoint me. | 10. I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try to do something. |

11. I like to know some important people because it makes one feel important.
12. I have often felt that I faced so many difficulties I could not overcome them.
13. I have periods in which I feel unusually cheerful without any special reason.
14. I cannot keep my mind on one thing.
15. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.
16. I like to let people know where I stand on things.
17. Often my bowels don't move for several days at a time.
18. I often find myself worrying about something.
19. My table manners are not quite as good at home as when I am out in company.
20. I do not have as many fears as my friends.
21. At times I think I am no good at all.
22. I think nearly anyone would tell a lie to keep out of trouble.
23. I do not tire quickly.
24. At times I have been worried beyond reason about something that really did not matter.
25. I would rather win than lose in a game.
26. At periods my mind seems to work more slowly than usual.
27. I am more self-conscious than most people.
28. I am a very nervous person.
29. I am not afraid to handle money.
30. My family does not like the work I have chosen (or the work I intend to choose for my life work).
31. At times I feel like swearing.
32. I think a great many people exaggerate their misfortunes in order to gain the sympathy and help of others.
33. I am the kind of person who takes things hard.
34. My feelings are hurt easier than most people.
35. I worry over money and business.
36. My parents and family find more fault with me than they should.
37. I often dream about things I don't like to tell other people.
38. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.
39. I am liked by most people who know me.
40. I have reason for feeling jealous of one or more members of my family.
41. It takes a lot of argument to convince most people of the truth.
42. At times I lose sleep over worry.
43. Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an advantage rather than lose it.

44. Sometimes I become so excited that I find it hard to get to sleep.
45. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure that I was not seen, I would probably do it.
46. No one cares much what happens to you.
47. I am against giving money to beggars.
48. I feel anxious about something or someone almost all of the time.
49. I find it hard to make talk when I meet new people.
50. Most anytime I would rather sit and daydream than do anything else.
51. Life is often a strain for me.
52. I gossip a little at times.
53. I have diarrhea ("the runs") once a month or more.
54. At times I am so restless that I cannot sit in a chair for very long.
55. At times I feel like smashing things.
56. Criticism or scolding hurts me terribly.
57. I am often sick to my stomach.
58. I usually expect to succeed in things I do.
59. I am very confident of myself.
60. I cry easily.
61. Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know very little.
62. I am often afraid that I am going to blush.
63. I have nightmares every few nights.
64. I don't like to face a difficulty or make an important decision.
65. I certainly feel useless at times.
66. It does not bother me particularly to see animals suffer.
67. I have a great deal of stomach trouble.
68. Sometimes when I am not feeling well, I am cross.
69. When embarrassed I often break out in a sweat which is very annoying.
70. It makes me uncomfortable to put on a stunt at a party even when others are doing the same sort of thing.
71. I have very few headaches.
72. I am happy most of the time.
73. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
74. My hands and feet are usually warm enough.
75. What others think of me does not bother me.
76. I am not at all confident of myself.
77. I feel hungry almost all the time.

78. I have very few quarrels with members of my family.
79. At times I feel like swearing.
80. I do not often notice my heart pounding and I am seldom short of breath.
81. At times my thoughts have raced ahead faster than I could speak them.
82. I am usually calm and not easily upset.
83. I am about as nervous as other people.
84. I do not read every editorial in the newspaper every day.
85. I work under a great deal of strain.
86. Often I can't understand why I have been so cross and grouchy.
87. At times I feel that I am going to crack up.
88. I do not like everyone I know.
89. At times I am all full of energy.
90. I wish I could be as happy as others.
91. I often think, "I wish I were a child again."
92. I do not always tell the truth.
93. It makes me impatient to have people ask my advice or otherwise interrupt me when I am working on something important.
94. I have been afraid of things or people that I knew could not hurt me.
95. I worry quite a bit over possible troubles.
96. Once in a while I laugh at a dirty joke.
97. I have had periods in which I carried on activities without knowing later what I had been doing.
98. I find it hard to set aside a task that I have undertaken, even for a short time.
99. My sleep is restless and disturbed.
100. I get angry sometimes.
101. I can easily make other people afraid of me, and sometimes do for the fun of it.
102. I practically never blush.
103. I am never happier than when alone.

APPENDIX B

1. Observed Frequencies of Seriousness Ratings
2. Ranks of Individual Behaviors by Comparison Groups

OBSERVED FREQUENCIES OF SERIOUSNESS RATINGS

Behavior	Subjects	Slightly Serious	Moderately Serious	Extremely Serious
1. Tardiness	Teachers (N=97)	44	49	4
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	39	7	1
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	9	15	1
	High-Anxious (N=30)	17	12	1
2. Truancy	Teachers (N=97)	19	48	30
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	6	30	11
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	3	13	9
	High-Anxious (N=30)	7	13	10
3. Destroying School Materials	Teachers (N=97)	7	46	44
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	5	28	14
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	1	13	11
	High-Anxious (N=30)	3	13	14
4. Untruthfulness	Teachers (N=97)	12	39	46
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	7	30	10
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	3	11	11
	High-Anxious (N=30)	4	12	14
5. Imaginative Lying	Teachers (N=97)	31	39	27
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	29	14	4
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	7	11	7
	High-Anxious (N=30)	9	12	9
6. Cheating	Teachers (N=97)	7	48	42
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	12	23	12
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	1	12	12
	High-Anxious (N=30)	4	14	12
7. Stealing	Teachers (N=97)	8	28	61
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	3	27	17
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	0	7	18
	High-Anxious (N=30)	3	10	17

	Teachers (N=97)	24	46	27
	Mental Hygienists			
8. Profanity	(N=47)	31	13	3
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	5	12	8
	High-Anxious (N=30)	9	12	9
	Teachers (N=97)	62	21	14
	Mental Hygienists			
9. Smoking	(N=47)	25	8	4
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	14	7	4
	High-Anxious (N=30)	20	8	2
	Teachers (N=97)	20	44	23
10. Obscene Notes,	Mental Hygienists			
Pictures,	(N=47)	22	20	5
Talk	Low-Anxious (N=25)	6	15	4
	High-Anxious (N=30)	5	14	11
	Teachers (N=97)	31	37	30
	Mental Hygienists			
11. Masturbation	(N=47)	32	12	2
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	9	9	7
	High-Anxious (N=30)	8	12	13
	Teachers (N=97)	23	31	43
12. Heterosexual	Mental Hygienists			
Activity	(N=47)	23	20	4
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	8	7	10
	High-Anxious (N=30)	5	11	14
	Teachers (N=97)	24	56	17
13. Disorder-	Mental Hygienists			
liness	(N=47)	27	19	1
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	5	18	2
	High-Anxious (N=30)	10	14	6
	Teachers (N=97)	67	26	4
14. Whispering	Mental Hygienists			
and Note	(N=47)	46	1	0
Writing	Low-Anxious (N=25)	17	8	0
	High-Anxious (N=30)	21	9	0
	Teachers (N=97)	53	40	4
	Mental Hygienists			
15. Interrupting	(N=47)	43	4	0
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	14	9	2
	High-Anxious (N=30)	18	12	0

	Teachers (N=97)	48	36	13
	Mental Hygienists			
16. Restlessness	(N=47)	25	21	1
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	13	9	3
	High-Anxious (N=30)	15	8	7
	Teachers (N=97)	21	57	19
	Mental Hygienists			
17. Inattention	(N=47)	23	21	3
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	8	10	7
	High-Anxious (N=30)	6	17	7
	Teachers (N=97)	20	53	24
	Mental Hygienists			
18. Lack of	(N=47)	15	26	6
Interest in	Low-Anxious (N=25)	7	13	5
Work	High-Anxious (N=30)	4	16	10
	Teachers (N=97)	22	58	17
	Mental Hygienists			
19. Carelessness	(N=47)	29	18	0
in Work	Low-Anxious (N=25)	8	13	4
	High-Anxious (N=30)	8	13	9
	Teachers (N=97)	20	63	14
	Mental Hygienists			
20. Laziness	(N=47)	23	22	2
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	7	16	2
	High-Anxious (N=30)	6	16	8
	Teachers (N=97)	12	61	24
	Mental Hygienists			
21. Unreliable-	(N=47)	7	33	7
ness	Low-Anxious (N=25)	3	18	4
	High-Anxious (N=30)	5	15	10
	Teachers (N=97)	10	50	37
	Mental Hygienists			
22. Disobedience	(N=47)	22	20	5
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	2	15	8
	High-Anxious (N=30)	4	13	13
	Teachers (N=97)	11	45	41
	Mental Hygienists			
23. Impertinence	(N=47)	12	28	7
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	2	13	10
	High-Anxious (N=30)	5	11	14

24. Cruelty and Bullying	Teachers (N=97)	8	39	50
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	2	13	32
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	2	12	11
	High-Anxious (N=30)	2	11	17
25. Quarrelsome- ness	Teachers (N=97)	13	60	24
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	11	28	8
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	4	16	5
	High-Anxious (N=30)	3	16	11
26. Tattling	Teachers (N=97)	32	55	10
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	23	19	5
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	8	15	2
	High-Anxious (N=30)	10	15	5
27. Stubbornness	Teachers (N=97)	22	64	11
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	32	14	1
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	8	16	1
	High-Anxious (N=30)	7	16	7
28. Sullenness	Teachers (N=97)	19	62	16
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	21	15	11
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	6	18	1
	High-Anxious (N=30)	5	16	9
29. Temper Tantrums	Teachers (N=97)	12	52	33
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	8	29	10
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	1	15	9
	High-Anxious (N=30)	4	16	10
30. Impudence	Teachers (N=97)	17	55	25
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	25	18	4
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	5	17	3
	High-Anxious (N=30)	5	15	10
31. Selfishness	Teachers (N=97)	19	53	24
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	16	30	1
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	7	16	2
	High-Anxious (N=30)	4	15	11

	Teachers (N=97)	14	57	26
	Mental Hygienists			
	(N=47)	11	32	4
32. Domineering	Low-Anxious (N=25)	5	15	5
	High-Anxious (N=30)	4	15	11
	Teachers (N=97)	17	35	45
	Mental Hygienists			
	(N=47)	17	21	9
33. Shyness	Low-Anxious (N=25)	3	12	10
	High-Anxious (N=30)	5	9	16
	Teachers (N=97)	18	45	34
	Mental Hygienists			
	(N=47)	27	19	1
34. Sensitiveness	Low-Anxious (N=25)	3	16	6
	High-Anxious (N=30)	5	13	12
	Teachers (N=97)	10	31	56
	Mental Hygienists			
	(N=47)	2	17	18
35. Unsocial Withdrawal	Low-Anxious (N=25)	2	11	12
	High-Anxious (N=30)	3	6	21
	Teachers (N=97)	15	62	19
	Mental Hygienists			
	(N=47)	16	26	5
36. Overcritical of Others	Low-Anxious (N=25)	1	18	6
	High-Anxious (N=30)	7	19	4
	Teachers (N=97)	46	46	5
	Mental Hygienists			
	(N=47)	33	13	1
37. Thoughtless- ness	Low-Anxious (N=25)	10	13	2
	High-Anxious (N=30)	14	14	2
	Teachers (N=97)	61	34	2
	Mental Hygienists			
	(N=47)	38	8	1
38. Inquisitive- ness	Low-Anxious (N=25)	17	8	0
	High-Anxious (N=30)	18	11	2
	Teachers (N=97)	33	49	15
	Mental Hygienists			
	(N=47)	31	15	1
39. Silliness	Low-Anxious (N=25)	10	14	1
	High-Anxious (N=30)	9	15	6

40. Unhappy, Depressed	Teachers (N=97)	6	30	61
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	0	17	30
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	2	6	17
	High-Anxious (N=30)	2	6	22
41. Resentful	Teachers (N=97)	16	60	21
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	6	32	9
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	3	16	6
	High-Anxious (N=30)	5	17	8
42. Nervousness	Teachers (N=97)	15	33	49
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	8	28	11
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	3	10	12
	High-Anxious (N=30)	3	10	17
43. Fearfulness	Teachers (N=97)	16	39	42
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	4	25	18
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	2	12	11
	High-Anxious (N=30)	4	12	14
44. Enuresis	Teachers (N=97)	26	31	30
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	8	22	17
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	7	11	7
	High-Anxious (N=30)	8	12	9
45. Dreaminess	Teachers (N=97)	25	58	14
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	21	19	8
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	8	14	3
	High-Anxious (N=30)	5	21	4
46. Slovenly in Personal Appearance	Teachers (N=97)	30	59	8
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	33	14	0
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	7	18	0
	High-Anxious (N=30)	11	14	5
47. Suspicious- ness	Teachers (N=97)	27	45	13
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	4	19	24
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	7	16	2
	High-Anxious (N=30)	10	17	3

48. Physical Coward	Teachers (N=97)	34	54	13
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	26	20	1
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	11	10	4
	High-Anxious (N=30)	10	15	5
49. Easily Discouraged	Teachers (N=97)	11	32	35
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	10	29	8
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	2	14	9
	High-Anxious (N=30)	4	15	11
50. Suggestible	Teachers (N=97)	16	38	31
	Mental Hygienists (N=47)	11	23	13
	Low-Anxious (N=25)	3	14	8
	High-Anxious (N=30)	5	15	10

RANKS OF INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIORS BY COMPARISON GROUPS
(Based on the Median Value for Each Behavior by
the Various Groups)

Behavior	Ranks			
	Mental Hygienists	Total Teachers	Low-Anxious Teachers	High-Anxious Teachers
1. Unhappy, Depressed, Dissatisfied	1	2	2	1
2. Cruelty and Bullying	2	4	6	2.5
3. Unsocial, Withdrawing	3	3	4	2.5
4. Suspiciousness	4	35	33	36.5
5. Stealing	5	1	1	4
6. Fearfulness	6	11	10.5	10.5
7. Destroying School Materials	7	7	7	9
8. Enuresis	8	27	28	22.5
9. Untruthfulness	9	6	8	7.5
10. Nervousness	10	5	5	5
11. Truancy	11	26	18	16
12. Domineering, Overbearing	12	17	26.5	20
13. Resentful	13	24	13	16
14. Cheating	14	8	3	13
15. Quarrelsomeness	15	18	32	24.5
16. Temper Tantrums	16	15	14	22.5
17. Unreliableness	17	16	26.5	19

18. Shyness, Bashfulness	18.5	17	26.5	20
19. Sullenness, Sulkiness	18.5	37	35.5	26
20. Easily Discouraged	20	13.5	10.5	21
21. Overcritical of Others	21	25	15	16
22. Impertinence	22.5	9	9	7.5
23. Suggestible	22.5	20	19.5	16
24. Selfishness	24	22	24	24.5
25. Lack of Interest in Work	25	19	25	16
26. Dreaminess	26	38	29	36.5
27. Disobedience	27	12	12	12
28. Obscene Notes, Pictures, Talk	28	31	30.5	32.5
29. Tattling	29	42	41.5	36.5
30. Laziness	30.5	33	38	30
31. Heterosexual Activity	30.5	13.5	16.5	10.5
32. Inattention	32	30	35.5	30
33. Impudence, Impoliteness	33	21	21.5	28
34. Physical Coward	34	39	44	39
35. Restlessness	35	46	45	44
36. Disorderliness	36	29	21.5	34
37. Sensitiveness	37	23	23	27
38. Carelessness in Work	38	36	41.5	32.5

39. Stubbornness	39	40	37	40
40. Slovenly in Physical Appearance	40.5	43	40	43
41. Profanity	40.5	28	19.5	41
42. Silliness, "Smartness"	42	41	46	42
43. Imaginative Lying	43	34	30.5	36.5
44. Masturbation	44	32	34	30
45. Thoughtlessness	45	45	43	45
46. Tardiness	46	44	39	46
47. Smoking	47	49	48	49
48. Interrupting	48	47	47	47
49. Inquisitiveness, Meddlesomeness	49	48	50	48
50. Whispering and Note Writing	50	50	49	50

VITA

Blair W. Shaw

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: TEACHERS' MANIFEST ANXIETY AND THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD CHILDREN'S
BEHAVIORS

Major Field: Student Personnel and Guidance

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Glace Bay, N.S., Canada, October 6, 1937,
the son of Simon W. and Johanna Shaw.

Education: Attended St. Ann's Elementary and High Schools from
1942 to 1953; studied at St. Francis Xavier University 1953-
55 and 1960-61 where the Diploma in Education was received
in 1961; received the Bachelor of Science degree from the
Oklahoma State University, with a major in psychology, in
May, 1963.

Professional Experience: Taught grades 8, 9, and 10 as principal
of the Birch Grove School, C.B., N.S., 1955-56; was employed
as loans manager in consumer credit at various Central Canadian
locations 1956-59; taught school on various Northern Ontario
Indian Reservations 1961-62, during which time served as
president of the Manitoulin Federal Teachers Association;
presently engaged as Lecturer in Educational and Counseling
Psychology, Memorial University of Newfoundland and serving
as a member of the Research Committee and Chairman of the
Newfoundland Guidance Association.