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CHAPTER I

PRESENTATION OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Among social scientists there is an increasing awareness of social class phenomena. The literature in the field is extensive and is increasing continuously.¹ One aspect of this interest in social class, as it pertains to education, which has recently received particular attention is the relationship of the social origins of teachers to professional adjustment.²

Statement of the Problem

The statement of the problem is as follows: Are elementary public school teachers who have been upwardly mobile occupationally more helpful, as measured by the Anderson-Brewer "Dominative-Socially Integrative" observation scheme, to children of lower and upper occupational status families than teachers who have not engaged in upward occupational mobility?

This statement of the problem suggests certain specific questions. They are:

¹ See Harold W. Pfautz, "The Current Literature on Social Stratification," American Journal of Sociology, LVIII (January, 1953), 391-418. The author compiled a partial bibliography of 333 titles over an eight-year period immediately before the time of writing.

1. To what extent does the amount of attention the student receives from the teacher vary with the occupational status background of the student?

2. To what extent does the proportion of helpful, i.e. socially integrative, contacts a lower status pupil (lower five pupils of each class) receives from the teacher depend upon the occupational status background of the teacher?

3. To what extent does the proportion of helpful, i.e. socially integrative, contacts an upper status pupil (upper five pupils of each class) receive from the teacher depend upon the occupational status background of the teacher?

A description of how the "lower five pupils of each class" and the "upper five pupils of each class" were selected is to be found in Chapter III of this study.

Significance of the Problem

Koehn reports that some of the teachers in his study evidently favored their lower status pupils over their higher status pupils. To did not indicate the occupational background of these particular teachers but he did raise the question: Do teachers, who have spent most or all their lives in a "middle-class environment," tend to be domineering?  


4Ibid., p. 141.
Brookover recognizes a hypothesis similar to this one. He also suggests a contrary hypothesis to the effect that upwardly mobile teachers (he uses the term "striving middle-class teachers")

... would be most critical of lower-class students... Such teachers may, in this way, get a great deal of ego satisfaction out of their own achievements and discourage or condemn any child who does not appreciate the nature of their achievement. 5

It is a postulate of modern learning theory that learning, change in behavior, is most likely to occur when experiences are both meaningful to the learner and occur in a non-threatening situation. 6

If the assumption that occupationally mobile teachers are more helpful toward lower status children than occupationally stable teachers is well taken, and if the postulate concerning learning climate is accepted, it might be hypothesized that:

1. In the classroom the behavior of the occupationally mobile teacher toward lower-class students would be more integrative than that of other teachers.

2. These teachers would be more likely to foster a classroom climate wherein the lower-class student would feel less threat, i.e. a climate more suitable for learning.


Perhaps insight gained from this study will help answer the question: What kind of teachers can best work with the lower status child on the basis of full understanding? This in turn could add to the knowledge pertaining to the relationship of the social origin of teachers to professional adjustment.

Definition of Terms

The terms to be defined are those pertaining to classroom behavior and those pertaining to social origin.

The terms which follow pertain to classroom behavior.

Contact.—A contact is a verbal communication of a teacher directed toward an individual child.

Classroom climate.—Classroom climate is "... the emotional tone or quality of interpersonal feeling arising from group interaction." 7

Dominative behavior.—Dominative behavior is behavior which restricts or threatens the personal status of an individual. 8

Integrative behavior.—Integrative behavior is behavior which "attempts" to reduce anxiety and conflict in others. 9

---


9 Ibid., pp. 9-10.
The terms which follow concern to social origin.

Social class.—A social class is a segment of a social community whose members share the same status position. There are many approaches to the concept of social class "... all of which refer to some differentiation among the population of a society."10 Because there seems to be more data available on occupational status many investigators utilize occupation as the "... defining mark of class."11 This study in dealing with occupational status is concerned with a more restrictive approach to social class.

Occupational status.—Occupational status is the hierarchical position an individual has because of the prestige ranking of his occupation.12 The terms, higher occupational status and lower occupational status are intended to be descriptive of the status of individuals in relationship to the status of teachers in terms of the North-Hatt ranking.13

Mobile teachers.—Mobile teachers are teachers whose fathers' occupations (when the teacher completed elementary school) are listed at least five points lower than teaching on the North-Hatt scale.

Non-mobile teachers.--Non-mobile teachers are teachers whose fathers' occupations (when the teacher completed elementary school) are listed as comparable to teaching (or slightly higher) on the North-Hatt scale.

Implicit in these definitions of mobility is the assumption that a female teacher and her father can be judged on the same continuum. This matter will be discussed in Chapter III of this study where the North-Hatt classification system is described in more detail.

Value orientations.--Value orientations are ideas which expound the judgments of the relative worth of things a person must express in order to achieve and maintain his position in a particular social system.14

Delimitation of the Study

In order to answer the question asked in the statement of the problem and the suggested sub-questions it appeared desirable and expedient to establish the following limitations.

1. This study was limited to the observation of certain selected third-grade classes and third-grade teachers.

2. Fifty teachers were observed. Twenty-five of these teachers had not been "occupationally mobile." The other twenty-five were teachers who had been "occupationally mobile." The method of selecting these teachers will be discussed in Chapter III of this study.

---

14Williams, op. cit., pp. 372-373.
3. This study concerned itself, insofar as possible, with the social and personal qualities of each teacher as manifested by her immediate contacts with her students—not with her technical skill.

4. Only women teachers were included because teachers at the elementary level are predominantly women; to include the few men teachers available would have complicated the results.15

5. Only unmarried teachers or teachers whose husbands' occupations were comparable in rank to that of teaching were included.

6. The measurement of integrative and dominative behavior was limited to that behavior which could be identified according to the classifications of the Anderson-Brewer scale. Although Anderson and Brewer did not make a practice of using the terms "integrative" and "democratic" interchangeably they stated they were the same.16

Sources and Availability of Data

The primary sources of data were:

1. The recordings of observations.

---


2. The information gained from interviews with teachers, or taken from personnel files when available. These data concerned their occupational background, marital status, occupational status of husband, age, degrees held, and years of teaching experience. The use of this information will be explained in more detail in Chapter VII of this study.

3. Information pertaining to the occupational background of the students. In most school systems this information was kept as a part of the class records. In other instances this information was obtained from the principal's office.

Summary

An attempt has been made to state the problem in such a way as to reflect the explicit frame of reference of the study. In order to answer the question asked in the statement of the problem and the suggested sub-questions certain limitations were established and the more important terms and concepts to be used in this study were defined. The significance of the problem was discussed in terms of current concern of researchers with the relationship of the social origin of teachers to professional adjustment.
CHAPTER II

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL FINDINGS WHICH APPEAR TO HOLD IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS STUDY

The conception of a research study does not occur in a vacuum. It develops out of what is usually a rather complex system of hypotheses and constructs (syntheses).

The selection of a problem and the choosing of particular research tools are in themselves activities involving value judgments.¹ When the researcher collects data he collects them in terms of concepts that are the product of previous ideas, experiences, and values. In other words, concepts are abstractions and have meaning only in terms of some frame of reference.² While there are precautions which may be taken to lessen the subjectivity of the researcher's activities, the only realistic approach to the problem of the researcher's own biases seems to be to recognize and define the major concepts relevant to the study.³ These should include those concepts which were operative in the formulation of the problem and influential during the carrying out of the investigation. Such a summary of principles is useful in two ways. First, it helps the researcher keep alert to his

²Ibid., p. 42.
³Withall, op. cit., p. 4.
biases and presuppositions. Secondly, it helps other workers better understand the methodology and findings of the study. Therefore, it seems desirable to review briefly some of the psychological and sociological research findings which comprise the conceptual context within which this study was made.

The studies relevant to this investigation fall into two categories:

1. Those concerning the socio-occupational status of teachers with implications for teacher-pupil interrelationships.

2. Those concerning classroom climate influences on learning.

Studies Concerning Teacher Status and Teacher Background

Reports on the social position of teachers made by Sims,5 Brookover,6 Hall, et al.,7 Richey,8 Mueller and Mueller,9

5Ibid., p. 1.
Richey, Phillips and Fox, Anderson, Barnett, and Havighurst and Neugarten indicate that teachers in the public schools of America are usually identified with the middle class, that their origins in the social system are lower than middle class, and that the social status of the teacher tends to rise as the grade level taught becomes higher.

It is also assumed that teachers identify with the middle class and tend to perpetuate the values of that class. Sims found that of the teachers studied 85 per cent identified themselves with the middle class. Two per cent of the teachers identified with the lower-upper class and 13 per cent identified with the upper-lower class.

Another study is that of Hoehn who noted the number of statements which have appeared in recent literature to the

---


15 Sims, op. cit., p. 333.
effect that teachers behave more favorably toward high status than toward low status pupils. We made a study of the classroom behavior of a limited number of elementary teachers in charge of classrooms composed of both middle class and lower class children. The findings of the study did not support the hypothesis that teachers tend to have a greater number of individual contacts with "high status" pupils, but that their contacts with these students were "better" in terms of mental hygiene implications.16

Classroom Climate Influence on Learning

The classroom is such an organization that the teacher is in a position to define the leadership role and the social climate. Through attitudes as well as words the teacher can provide a situation in which almost any kind of group can be established.17

Although different terminology is often used, most of the studies concerning classroom climate have been attempts to describe democratic and autocratic teachers and compare the effectiveness of these two. These studies indicate that democratic behavior tends to promote and autocratic behavior tends to hinder the adjustment of pupils.

If a teacher is to be able to help students achieve and maintain a state of mental health, she must be constructive

16 Yoeha, op. cit.
and friendly, she must be secure enough to accept the child as he is rather than to try to divert his purposes to her own and to use teaching as a means of self expression. Above all, a teacher should promote originality. The result of such behavior is that students are more spontaneous, appreciative, and responsive. Productivity is increased particularly in those activities which require problem solving. Boredom, fatigue, and frustration are reduced; therefore policing and harsh discipline are not necessary.

Discriminatory treatment (having favorites), rigidity and authoritarianism are generally conceded to be destructive


20 Ibid. 21 Lewin, op. cit., p. 25.

22 Ralph White and Ronald Lippitt, "Leader Behavior and Member Reaction in Three 'Social Climates'," in Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, editors, Group Dynamics: Research and Theory (Evanston, 1953), pp. 570-611.


25 White and Lippitt, op. cit.

26 Lewin, op. cit., p. 25.
of pupil adjustment. It seems that when a child is tense, overly dependent, dissatisfied, and alone in an hostile environment his perception and adjutive abilities are crippled. Because the student sees no order, no "good" in his environment, he can have no purpose, no individuality and no concern for the wishes and desires of others. Instead of expressing himself creatively he is destructive and brutal. In this world of force he sees everyone as a potential enemy of everyone else. While he is basically non-conforming and rejective of constituted authority and discipline, he will endeavor to please the autocratic teacher and to become her "pet." He uses his position as "favorite" to enable him to bully and boss the other children.

Summary

In the literature just reviewed is the suggestion that it would be in the classroom of the domineering (authoritarian) teacher that the child of poor occupational background would likely suffer most. The characteristic behavior of the

---

27 Ibid., p. 27.
28 Harold H. Anderson and Joseph E. Brewer, op. cit., 79.
29 Lewin, op. cit.
30 Helen Hall Jennings, Sociometry in Group Relations (Washington, 1945), pp. 4-5.
31 Harold H. Anderson and Joseph E. Brewer, op. cit., 79.
32 Ibid.
dominative teacher is of such a nature as to create a climate less conducive to "good" mental health and learning, especially in the case of the children of lower occupational status families.
CHAPTER III

COLLECTION OF DATA

Data collecting consisted of several steps. First the essential tools to be used were selected. A second step was to determine which schools, classrooms and students were to be observed. Teachers not only needed to be selected; it was necessary that they be matched in terms of several variables so that any differences between the two groups might be assumed to be related to teacher origin. The last step involved was that of making the observations.

Selection of Tools for Gathering Data

Two instruments were used for gathering data. They were the McGee modification of the Anderson-Brewer Socially Dominative-Socially Integrative Observation Scheme, and the North-Hatt scale for the ranking of occupations. (Examples of these instruments are to be found in the Appendix of this study.)

The McGee Modification of the Anderson-Brewer Scale

Harold E. Anderson, Joseph Brewer, et al. from 1935 to 1946 made a series of studies designed to:

1. Locate and define two types of behavior significant for educational processes and individual growth.
2. Develop new instruments to measure these types of behavior.

3. Discover new data about the dynamics of pupil-teacher relationships in actual classroom situations.

In a previous study Anderson found that it was possible to measure the behavior of young children if the behavior was recorded as "contacts" and divided into two groups or categories. One category was "dominative behavior"; the other, "integrative behavior."¹

A second study of preschool children revealed that:

1. Dominative tend to incite domination.

2. Integrative behavior was also circular.

3. Dominative was psychologically different from and psychologically unrelated to integrative behavior.²

In a critical discussion of the Anderson-Brewer process Brookover says

"Anderson asserts that voluntary social contributions, problem-solving behavior, expressions of spontaneity, and initiative are desirable in a democratic society, and that domination and high frequencies of either conforming or nonconforming behavior are undesirable. If these assumptions are accepted, it follows that the teaching of dominative teachers is more likely to result in student behavior unacceptable in a democratic society."


society. When these assumptions are viewed in the light of the capitalistic emphasis on competition, and the persistence of many authoritarian patterns in our society, however, the answer is not so clear. This does not mean there is no relation between voluntary co-operation or spontaneity and the democratic ideal, but that these modes of conduct may not be the most conducive to adjustment in our present society. 3

In the earlier studies the procedure was to make a descriptive recording of the teacher's contacts with each child in the room. Helen H. Brewer found that the categories of teacher contacts could be so arranged as to form a continuum. She also discovered that the methods developed for the kindergarten were applicable at higher levels. 5 There was a tendency to dominate boys more than girls. 6

In a further study of teachers' classroom behavior, Anderson and Brewer revised the earlier procedure of observation and applied it to second, fourth and sixth grades. Satisfactory reliability was found at all levels. 7

In 1946 two longitudinal studies were added to this series. 8 The dominative and socially integrative contacts of


5Harold H. Anderson and Helen M. Brewer, op. cit.

6Ibid., 376.

7Harold H. Anderson and Joseph E. Brewer, op. cit.

8Anderson, et al., op. cit.
two second-grade teachers toward their students were measured. These two teachers had been observed, for purposes of another study, one year earlier. A comparison of these two sets of observational data revealed that the behavior patterns of these particular teachers were persistent from one year to the next. The next step in the study was to reobserve the behavior of the children now that they were in the third grade and under different teachers. The authors reported that there was a tendency for the children's behavior to change with different teachers.

The second longitudinal study described in this report concerned the behavioral changes of two groups of third-grade teachers and their children between the fall months and the months of January and February. The findings of this study showed that as the year progressed the integrative teacher became more integrative in terms of individual contacts and the dominative teacher became more dominating.9

The Anderson-Brewer procedure for recording teacher behavior required an observer's tallying teacher-pupil contacts into one of twenty-three categories of interpersonal contacts.

In 1955 McGee was able to group these twenty-three categories into eight more general categories. These are not, in the truest sense of the word, intended to form a

9Ibid., p. 153.
continuum, rather they are intended to be used as a means of facilitating observation. Four of these categories are of dominative behavior and four are of integrative behavior.

**Dominative categories.**

1. Teacher told pupils each step to take so that future steps were uncertain to a large degree.
2. Teacher dictated the particular work tasks and work companions.
3. Teacher was intolerant of ideas or suggestions made by pupils; teacher interrupted pupils; put talked pupils.
4. Teacher insisted on strict order at all times; commanded pupils; gave an order to be obeyed at once.

**Integrative categories.**

1. Teacher sketched general steps to group goals; choice was allowed in alternative procedures.
2. Teacher left division of tasks to the group and allowed members to work with companions of own choice.
3. Teacher encouraged group discussion and decisions; teacher exchanged ideas with pupils; asked opinions of pupils.
4. Teacher guided pupils and made suggestions without being mandatory.

The purpose of the time sampling was to obtain a representative sample of dominative-socially integrative behavior.

The validity of this method is primarily a function of the amount and distribution of the time spent in observation or of the number, length, and distribution of the separate observations or time samples. As contrasted with the experimental method, it is a form of controlled observation in which the observer, the method of recording, and the manner of selecting the behavior

---

to be observed are subject to control rather than the situation in which observations are made. 11

Any researcher preparing to use observational methods should answer these questions:

1. Is the proposed situation one in which the personnel of the group does not change during the observation period?

2. Is it a situation with which the subjects are familiar?

3. Is it of uniform duration from day to day?

4. What effect will observation have on the subjects?

Usually the first three questions could be answered in the affirmative when the situation selected was a classroom. As for number four, investigators have found that:

1. Observer consciousness was a negligible factor at the early age levels. 12

2. For effective use of controlled observation at higher levels it was "... usually necessary to secure rapport with the subjects in advance or to conceal from them ... the exact nature of the observations." 13

3. The presence of observers is less disturbing in situations in which visitors are a common occurrence. 14

---

12 Ibid.
13 Ibid.
4. Observation is less disturbing when the observer's attention is frequently shifted from one individual to another.  

Pilot study.--During the month of January, 1957, a pilot study was conducted. The purposes of this pilot study were to determine whether the Anderson-Brewer scale would be a suitable instrument for this study (in terms of the above questions), to acquire skill in making observations in terms of the categories of the scale and to develop a form to be used for tallying teacher contacts. Four classrooms were observed for these purposes.

The actual data were collected later in the Spring--from February until the middle of May. When the observer began collecting these data it was found that the third-grade children studied reacted in a rather friendly, spontaneous way and this feeling tone was reflected by the observer. After their initial reaction the children usually "settled down" to their daily routine. The observer accepted them and their offered friendship; therefore, they accepted him. Also the attitude of the teacher had a great influence on the attitude of the children. In some of the classrooms first observed the observer found that rapport with the teacher had not been completely established before entering the classroom. The children seemed to be able to sense this strained

15Arrington, op. cit., p. 32.
relationship and were conscious of the presence of the observer during the entire length of the stay. The data from these observations were not included in this study. When the researcher noted the effect of lack of rapport with the teacher on his own rapport with the children, "the time lost in making the observations was made up to experience." Thereafter the observer was more careful in establishing suitable relationships with the teacher before entering the classroom for purposes of observation. No further difficulty was noted.

In almost every school system in which observations were made the observer knew either an administrator, a curriculum director or one of the senior teachers. Through these individuals it was possible to meet the teachers to be observed. These teachers were given a generalized description of the nature and purpose of the study. At this point one of the limitations of the study should be noted. To a large degree the effect the observation had on the subjects (the teachers) was dependent upon how diplomatically the researcher concealed the exact nature of the observation.

North-Hatt Prestige Ranking of Occupations

Roe made a summary evaluation of the scales of occupational prestige made in America since 1934 and stated that the North-Hatt scale was "the most comprehensive of such
The fact that it has a wide range of classifications made the North-Hatt scale especially adaptable to this study.

Cecil G. North and Paul K. Hatt made a study to rank 90 occupations according to prestige. Two thousand nine hundred people interviewed in the nation-wide survey were asked to evaluate each of the 90 occupations in accordance with a five-point scale. The "don't know" answers were discarded. Theoretically, according to the procedure for translating ratings into a standardized score, an occupation could receive between 20 and 100 points.

The occupations listed on the North-Hatt scale were classified into groups. The government offices on the list rated highest while non-farming laboring jobs rated lowest. Public school teachers received a rating of 78 (of a possible 100). Teachers were ranked 36 (the rankings were "1" through 90 with rank "1" highest). In the study there was a consistency of ratings with the exception that all occupational classes rated their own and related occupations higher than did other groups.17


Selection of Schools and Classrooms

The data used in this study were collected in the school systems of twelve towns in seven north central Texas counties. The towns ranged in size from 3,000 to 15,000. Six towns ranged in size from 3,000 to 6,000, one had a population of 3,500 and five were towns with populations from 13,000 to 15,000.

Schools were selected in areas where the occupational distribution was believed to be fairly normal. For this reason no oil towns, boom towns, strictly rural villages, "bedroom cities," or small cities were included in the study.

The fifty classrooms were selected with regard to the range of occupational background represented. During the later stages of data collecting secondary considerations (such as the age of the teacher) played a minor but not critical part in the selection of classrooms.

Selection of Students

Third grades were used for purposes of observation. Hoehn's study was made concerning third grades and therefore could be used as a valuable reference point.\(^\text{18}\) It is possible that significance of the present study is increased by its being designed to recheck some of Hoehn's findings.

A few days before the observations were to be made, a list of the children's names and a list of their father's

\(^{18}\) Hoehn, \textit{op. cit.}
occupations were obtained. In almost all of the schools this background information was on file cards; therefore, it was not necessary to ask for information concerning specific students.

The upper five students in each class as well as the lower five students in each class were identified according to the ranking of their father's occupation on the North-Hatt scale.

A total of 500 students, of whom 257 were boys and 243 were girls, was included in the study. There were 122 boys in the classrooms of mobile teachers and 135 boys in the classrooms of non-mobile teachers. These students were selected from a classroom population of 1,547 third-grade students. This population figure refers only to those students who were present during the time the researcher was working in the classrooms.

The mean occupational rank of the fathers of the high status students was 31.2. For comparative purposes it might be noted that the rank of a captain in the regular army is 31.5. The mean occupational rank of the fathers of the low status students was 66.2. In comparison a barber ranks 66 and a factory worker ranks 64.5 on the scale. Means of 31.2 and 66.2 represent a difference of 35 points or 38 per cent of the range on the North-Hatt scale.

These means indicate that the range of the occupations of the fathers of the students observed were from a normal
distribution. In other words, the two groups of students represented the extreme thirds in terms of North-Hatt rating as well as the extreme thirds of the classroom in terms of family occupational background.

Selection of Teachers

Classrooms to be utilized for observation purposes were selected in terms of student composition, not in terms of teachers. Therefore, data concerning the teachers were not gathered until all observations had been made. This procedure made it necessary to make observations in considerably more than fifty classrooms, but the researcher felt this was the best way to reduce personal bias in the observational situation.

Twenty-five occupationally mobile and twenty-five occupationally non-mobile teachers were selected for this study. Selection was made in terms of the occupational status of the teacher's father at the time she graduated from elementary school. Occupational status was determined in terms of the classifications of the North-Hatt scale. The mean occupational rank of the fathers of the group of mobile teachers was 45.3. In comparison a machinist ranks 45 on the scale. The mean occupational rank of the fathers of the non-mobile teachers was 25.5. By comparison, a civil engineer is ranked 23 on the North-Hatt scale. There was a 20-point difference in the means of the two groups. This differential constitutes about 22 per cent of the total range of the North-Hatt scale.
In Chapter I the question was raised as to whether a female teacher and her father may be judged on the same occupational continuum. There are two things to be considered in examining this question. One consideration is whether occupational ratings for women are comparable to those for men. The second is the effect occupational mobility of the father has on the child.

In studies of the status of women's occupations, the rank of teachers compares favorably with the rank of teachers on the North-Hatt scale. Havighurst and Neugarten seem to suggest that mobility is a two-generation process. The first generation makes the money; the second acquires the education, attitudes and status symbols befitting their economic position in the community. Thus, economic (occupational) mobility on the part of the teacher's father is probably not of critical importance. Until she graduated from elementary school, the mobile teacher-to-be lived in a lower class sub-culture. It was in this milieu that her first value orientations and self concepts were acquired.

---


In order to keep the two groups of teachers (mobile and non-mobile) as homogeneous as possible, selection was made with respect to several factors. This matching was done in order that statistically significant differences between the behavior of the two groups could be assumed to be related to the occupational mobility or stability of the teachers. The two groups were matched in terms of marital status, number of years of teaching experience, age, size of class taught and degrees held.

Marital status.--There were four single women in each of the two groups of teachers.

Number of years of teaching experience.--Teachers were matched on this basis because twice as many first-year teachers report excessive trouble in their classes as do teachers with twenty years of teaching experience. Less experienced teachers are also likely to be more maladjusted.

The mean years of teaching experience of the group of non-mobile teachers included in this study was 15.2 years. The range of teaching experience was from 7 years to 25 years. The mean years of teaching experience of the mobile teacher group was 16.9. The range of teaching experience was from 5 years to 27 years.


Age.--As teachers become older (up to about 60 years of age) they have "less trouble" with students and become better adjusted. There is probably a relationship between age and amount of experience. "Social origin may have a different influence upon a teacher's behavior during his first years of teaching than later." As the mobile teacher grows older, she is more likely to be dissatisfied with her choice of teaching as an occupation. As a result she may become bitter and hostile toward her students. This change in attitude of teachers will be discussed in Chapter V.

The mean age of the group of non-mobile teachers was 42.3 years. The oldest teacher in this group was 51 years of age and the youngest teacher was 27 years of age. The mean age of the group of mobile teachers was 43.5. The oldest teacher in this group was 40 years of age and the youngest teacher was 28 years of age.

Size of class.--"... there is a close relationship between class size and the amount of pupil misbehavior. There is some evidence to indicate that when class size moves from 30 to 40, problems with pupils tend at least to double." 27

24 Beck, op. cit.
26 Stiles, op. cit., p. 66.
The average number of students in classrooms of the mobile teachers was 31. There were 35 students in the largest class observed and 26 students in the smallest class observed. The mean number of students in the classrooms of non-mobile teachers was 29. There were 36 students in the largest class observed and 26 students in the smallest class observed.

Degrees.--Degrees supposedly indicate an equal amount of training. Fifteen mobile teachers held a Master's degree and ten mobile teachers held a Bachelor's degree. Nine non-mobile teachers held a Master's degree and sixteen non-mobile teachers held a Bachelor's degree.

Gathering Data

As has already been indicated, the method employed in the present study for quantifying teacher behavior is based upon a time-sampling device. The procedure for recording teacher behavior required an observer to tally teacher contacts according to the categories in which they fell and with whom the contacts were made.

Observations were made in non-consecutive five-minute intervals. The observations in each classroom were continued until the teacher had made one hundred contacts with the ten children who had been selected. Differences in teacher contacts with pupils of different status are likely to be most evident in individual contacts and since the teacher's contacts with all the children were not recorded, no group
contacts were recorded. An attempt was made to keep all
the observational periods equally representative of the
various classrooms with respect to the time of day and
subject matter area.

It has been determined that instead of taking a few
samples of teacher behavior over a period of several weeks
it is possible to make more intensive observations over a
smaller span of time and still obtain a reasonably repre-
sentative sample of teacher’s contacts with individual
children. In this study, in practically all of the class-
rooms, the observations were completed over a period of two
school days. The more domineering the teacher, the shorter
was the length of time required for the observer to record
one hundred contacts. Anderson found that the reliability
of observations was higher for domineering behavior than for
integrative behavior. Therefore the fact that less time
was spent in observing a teacher who was more domineering
probably did not affect the quality of the data.

Under certain conditions a seating chart could be used
as an index of dominance or of pupil status. However, in
this study the seating charts were not utilized in this way.
The teachers made the seating charts as a favor to the

26 Dorothy E. Clifton, "Dominance and Socially Integrative
Behavior of Twenty-five Second Grade Teachers," unpublished
doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of
Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 1944.

27 Harold H. Anderson and Helen M. Brewer, op. cit., 126.
researcher. Many teachers who later proved to be integrative made a chart of the seating arrangement used only during the early morning orientation. During this short period the children were seated alphabetically in order to facilitate the collection of lunch money. After this, the children were allowed to move into positions or groups of their choice. Obviously such a chart would give a distorted picture of the actual climate of such a classroom.

When the observer arrived in a classroom the first task was to learn to identify, by their first names, the ten children who were to be observed. After a few days of practice the observer became skilled at learning to identify these children quickly. Usually this identification of students required from fifteen to twenty minutes. If there was any doubt as to the identity of any particular child after the observations had begun the observer could refer to the seating chart, make inquiry, or look at the notes which described each child being observed. This checking could be done in the five-minute intervals between observation intervals.

Hoehn found it better for the observer to take a position at the front of the room. He felt this facilitated the memorizing of names and created less distraction.\(^30\) This researcher sat at the side of the room near the back.

\(^30\) Hoehn, op. cit., p. 73.
The Anderson-Brewer scale was supposedly inclusive in that every contact of the teacher with any of the ten individuals being observed could be classified in one of the categories. Observation using such a scale was also continuous (within the five-minute periods). No acts observed in a given five-minute interval were omitted except by error. There was no category for "undetermined contacts" therefore many contacts could possibly have been assigned into either of two or three categories. Perhaps this was one of the most difficult problems encountered in the recording of observation data. Bales has made an effort "... to standardize systems for recording and categorizing various kinds of interaction."31 One of the results of Bales' research was a set of rules for resolving classification dilemmas. These rules were utilized in the present study as criteria for determining to which category a contact (in question) would be assigned. The rules are as follows:

Rule 1. View each act as a response to the last act of the last other person, or as an anticipation of the next act of the next other. Rule 2. Favor the category more distant from the middle. Classify the act in the category nearer the top or the bottom of the list.32

Summary

In order that the data to be utilized in this study could be collected in a systematic way, two instruments were


32Bales, op. cit., pp. 91-92.
used. These measuring devices were the He Gee modification of the Anderson-Drewer Socially Dominative-Socially Integrative Observation Scheme, and the North-Hatt scale for the ranking of occupations. In addition, Bales' rules for resolving classification dilemmas were used as criteria to facilitate the accurate recording of observational data.

Schools, in which classes were to be observed, were selected in towns of about the same population category and in areas where the population distribution was believed to be fairly normal.

The basic plan undertaken in this study was to compare a selected group of mobile teachers with a group of non-mobile teachers with regard to behavior toward children of various occupational levels. Therefore an attempt was made to match the two groups of teachers in terms of the number of years of teaching experience, age, size of class, and kind of degrees held. This was done so that statistically significant differences between the two groups could be assumed to be associated with occupational mobility—or lack of it.

Data concerning the occupational background of the students and observational data were collected before the data concerning the occupational background of the teacher in an effort to avoid biased observation. The order and methods of collecting data were described.
CHAPTEIVR IV  
FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the data collected in the manner described in the last chapter and to summarize the findings obtained from such an analysis. This analysis shall consist of:

1. A comparison of the magnitude and kind of contacts of the mobile and non-mobile teachers.

2. A restating of each of the questions suggested by the statement of the problem in the form of a null hypothesis.

3. A testing of each hypothesis in terms of the comparison.

**Magnitude and Kind of Contacts**

**Contacts of the mobile teachers.**—The mobile teachers gave 866 integrative contacts to the students from higher occupational backgrounds and 559 integrative contacts to the students who were from lower occupational backgrounds. In other words, the students from higher occupational backgrounds received 307 more integrative contacts than did the students whose parents had a lower occupational status.

The mobile teachers gave 653 dominative contacts to the students from lower occupational backgrounds and 422 dominative contacts to the students who were from the higher
occupational backgrounds. The children from the lower occupational backgrounds received 231 more dominative contacts from the mobile teachers than did the children who were of higher status.

Contacts of the non-mobile teachers. The non-mobile teachers gave 807 integrative contacts to the students from higher occupational backgrounds and 553 integrative contacts to the students from lower occupational backgrounds. The students from the higher occupational backgrounds received 250 more integrative contacts than did the students from the lower occupational backgrounds.

These teachers gave 646 dominative contacts to the low occupational background students and 494 to the students of high occupational status. Thus they gave 156 more dominative contacts to the students from the lower occupational backgrounds.

The contacts of individual teachers toward various students, the mean number of different kinds of contacts teachers gave various students and the range of contacts of each group of teachers are shown in the Appendix of this study.

Hypotheses

In Chapter I, three questions were suggested by the statement of the problem. They were:

1. To what extent does the amount of attention the student receives from the teacher vary with the occupational status background of the student?
2. To what extent does the proportion of helpful, i.e. integrative, contacts a lower status pupil (lower five pupils of each class) receives from the teacher depend upon the occupational status background of the teacher?

3. To what extent does the proportion of helpful, i.e. integrative, contacts an upper status pupil (upper five pupils of each class) receives from the teacher depend upon the occupational status background of the teacher?

Hypotheses related to these questions are:

1. There is no difference in the amount of attention a mobile teacher gives an occupationally high and an occupationally low student.

2. There is no difference in the amount of attention a non-mobile teacher gives an occupationally high and an occupationally low student.

3. There is no difference in the kind of contacts (dominative or integrative) received by occupationally low and occupationally high students from mobile teachers.

4. There is no difference in the kind of contacts (dominative or integrative) received by occupationally low and occupationally high students from non-mobile teachers.

5. There is no difference in the relative amount of dominative behavior of mobile and non-mobile teachers toward the low status student.

6. There is no difference in the relative amount of integrative behavior of mobile and non-mobile teachers toward the high status student.
Findings

The preceding hypotheses were tested using Chi square. The 5 per cent level of significance was used.

There were no statistically significant differences in:
1. The amount of attention the group of non-mobile teachers gave occupationally high and occupationally low students. \(X^2 = 3.20\). \(P < .05\).

2. The amount of attention the group of mobile teachers gave occupationally high and occupationally low students. \(X^2 = 2.30\). \(P < .05\).

3. The relative amount of integrative contacts of mobile and non-mobile teachers toward the high status student. \(X^2 = .96\). \(P < .05\).

Statistically significant differences were found in the following instances:

1. The group of mobile teachers gave more integrative contacts to the occupationally high students and more domi-native contacts to the occupationally low students. \(X^2 = 113.5\). \(P > .001\).

2. The group of non-mobile teachers gave more domi-native contacts to occupationally low students and more integrative contacts to occupationally high students. \(X^2 = 63.45\). \(P > .001\).

3. The group of mobile teachers were relatively more domi-native toward low status pupils than were the group of non-mobile teachers. \(X^2 = 3.97\). \(P > .05\).
Summary

Data concerning the magnitude and kind of contacts were presented. An analysis of these data revealed that within the limits of this study:

1. There was no difference in the amount of attention either group of teachers gave occupationally high and occupationally low students.

2. Both groups of teachers gave more integrative contacts to students from high occupational backgrounds and more dominative contacts to students from low occupational backgrounds.

3. There was no difference in the relative amount of integrative contacts of mobile and non-mobile teachers toward the high status student.

4. However, the teachers who had engaged in occupational mobility tended to behave in a comparatively more dominative manner toward students from low occupational backgrounds.
CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

There are apparently two major approaches which may be made with reference to an interpretation of the findings of this study. One approach is to emphasize the similarities between the two groups of teachers in terms of classroom behavior; the other is to emphasize the differences between the two groups.

Similarities

Both groups of teachers gave more integrative contacts to students from high occupational backgrounds and more dominative contacts to students from low occupational backgrounds. This type of reaction is in agreement with the observations and findings of several researchers concerning the manner in which teachers tend to favor the high status student and perpetuate social class distinctions.¹

¹W. Lloyd Warner, Murchia Acker and Kenneth Bells, Social Class in America (Chicago, 1940).

Allison Davis and John Dollard, Children of Bondage (Washington, 1940).


A. B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York, 1949).

Clifton, op. cit. Mosbr. op. cit.
For example, W. L. Warner and associates suggest that "middle-class teachers tend to bring to their classrooms a middle-class ideology...."\(^2\) Inevitably, they judge their students by middle-class standards.\(^3\) In consequence teachers are likely to expect lower status students to be "bad."\(^4\) Such students may want to fight, curse, get poor grades and have trouble at school with the teacher because to him and his family and friends these things may represent success.\(^5\)

It has also been suggested that lower-class students are handicapped in that a number of tests of mental ability contain too many items upper class students are familiar with but that lower-class students, because of their environment, have never before encountered.\(^6\) As a result, teachers may think of low status students as "dull" and place them in a "special section."\(^7\)

Many teachers do not seem to realize that the modern school curriculum is highly verbalistic and frequently is


\(^7\)W. L. Warner, R. J. Havighurst and M. B. Loeb, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-78.
centered upon situations and experiences foreign to the lower-class student. 9

Another manifestation of the negative attitude of teachers toward lower status children is that they often refer to all "problem children" or to all students of low ability as lower-class students. 9 This is in agreement with the finding of West that people of different social strata look upon social status and upon the "qualities" of members of these various strata in terms of their own social positions. 10

Teachers may sometimes feel it degrading to work with classrooms composed of predominantly lower status students. 11 Becker has suggested that this may be one of the factors influencing the spatial mobility of teachers. 12

There was no significant difference in the number of integrative contacts the two groups of teachers gave occupationally high students. Because the atmosphere of the


11E. L. Warner, R. J. Havighurst and M. E. Lock, op. cit., p. 76.

school is natural to the high status student, as Mercer and Carr point out, he "fits into the pattern" and lives up to the expectations of his teachers.\(^{13}\) Another explanation might be that the mobile teacher is afraid of the verbalizations of the high status student\(^ {14}\), and that as a child in a lower-class background, she may have learned to think of giving compliments and praise as signs of insincerity. Because of this background, the mobile teacher would not hesitate to use more overtly aggressive measures in her dealings with lower status students. Therefore mobile teachers tend to be more dominative toward lower status students than non-mobile teachers, but not more integrative toward high status students (at least in terms of the verbal kind of contacts measured in this study). Domination is possibly more accepted or tolerated than favoritism (excessive integrative contacts toward the high status student).\(^{15}\)

There was no significant difference in the amount of attention (total number of dominative and integrative contacts) the two groups of teachers gave occupationally high and occupationally low students. This is in agreement with the

---


\(^{14}\) Stiles, *op. cit.*, p. 347.

finding of Hoehn (see page 12 of this study), that teachers do not necessarily tend to have a greater number of individual contacts with high status students. In other words, domination and integration are matters of quality rather than quantity. Excessive contacts could mean either domination or integration.

"When all is said and done, the teacher will inevitably be an exemplar for the class with the most social energy. At the present time in America, that is the middle class."17 Because of the pressures of the administration and the middle-class community the teacher, mobile and non-mobile, will have to appear to stand for middle-class values even if she does not completely believe in them. "A lower-middle class teacher... will strive for upward mobility and therefore will set high value on middle-class behavior wherever he goes."20

Differences

Non-mobile teachers are relatively more domimative toward high status students than are mobile teachers.

16 Hoehn, op. cit.
17 W. L. Warner, R. J. Havighurst and M. B. Loeb, op. cit., p. 171.
18 Ibid., pp. 104-105.
19 Ibid., p. 104.
20 W. L. Warner, R. J. Havighurst and M. B. Loeb, op. cit., p. 171.
Non-mobile teachers, because of their status, are probably not as afraid to be domineering toward upper status students as are mobile teachers.

Mobile teachers were found to be more domineering toward lower status students than were non-mobile teachers. Brookover has suggested that such teachers "would be most critical of lower-class students." This was discussed in more detail on page three of this study. Perhaps an explanation for this behavior is that mobile teachers, as new members of the middle class, are over-identifying. Therefore, the more pronounced domination of lower status students on the part of mobile teachers might be explained as the result of her over-enthusiastic attempt to imitate the behavior of non-mobile teachers.

Mobile teachers behaved in a more domineering manner toward low status students than did non-mobile teachers. In Chapter II, domineering behavior was described as self-defensive behavior. Thus a question is raised as to why some mobile teachers find it necessary to be more domineering toward low status students. Keeping the limitations of this study in mind, this question will be approached by examining

---


what current theory suggests regarding the behavior of the mobile person.

Current theories will be presented which describe fear, rigidity, power orientation, low self concept and over-identification as traits of the mobile person. These traits will not be presented as being characteristic of all mobile people or of all mobile teachers. Nor will it be suggested that a given mobile teacher possesses all of these traits. Furthermore there is no intention to give the impression that these traits are totally lacking in non-mobile people or that these traits are related only to mobility.

Bonner suggests that the mobile person is likely to have a low self concept. The person with a low self concept is likely to become cynical, distrustful and resentful. When the mobile person is unable to pursue the success goals of work and prestige which he holds in high esteem, he may tend to rely on vicarious achievements. The student who has the most to achieve is probably the low status student. It seems that if the mobile teacher expends most of her effort in trying to "mobilize" the low status student, the effect might be that he is robbed of his individuality. The person who is threatened in this way will likely be rebellious and


negativistic. Later he may become apathetic in a way that is often mistaken for introversion.

Current research indicates that the mobile person tends to be afraid of people of lower social status. They seem to remind him of his social origins and of the possibility of failure. They may keep him aware of the consequences of loss of status. The usual reaction to such a threat seems to be to resort to authoritarian techniques in an effort to maintain status.

According to Benedek, fear encourages obsessive attention to routine, detail and symbol. The teacher who drives himself is probably more likely to drive others. The fearful person may view weakness not only as a danger, but as a disgrace. This would be unfortunate for the low status student because he is systematically denied some of the rest.

powerful inducements to learning—emotional and social reward.\textsuperscript{32}

It has been suggested that fear tends to become generalized.\textsuperscript{33} If a mobile teacher sees the low status student as a threat, her reaction might be to blame him for her own mistakes and shortcomings.

The teacher who has been socially mobile is rigid, and is likely to consider authoritarian methods as best.\textsuperscript{34} Stiles suggests she may "feel at ease when confronting a direct threat, but uncomfortable in the face of verbal conflict."\textsuperscript{35} She cannot spontaneously express herself.\textsuperscript{36} A repressed person often builds up tension until he can build it up no more. Then he may vent in a torrent of hostility toward a socially and psychologically weak person who is at his mercy. Thus the mobile teacher probably feels safer in expressing her hostility to the low status student who is directly, rather than verbally threatening.

Mobile teachers tend to be power oriented.\textsuperscript{37} A power oriented person views the world as hostile and feels that

\textsuperscript{32}Wood, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 204.

\textsuperscript{33}Herbert A. Carroll, \textit{Mental Hygiene: The Dynamics of Adjustment} (New York, 1952), p. 166.

\textsuperscript{34}Stiles, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 49-50.

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., p. 47.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid.

be must control others in order to protect himself. His inferiors must constantly give verbal evidence that they recognize his status and position. To the extent that the mobile teacher is power oriented, she sees her students as persons to be dominated to satisfy her own needs or as children whose parents are able to enhance her social position.

The mobile teacher may have entered teaching of necessity and with the expectation of its being a temporary arrangement. Later she found herself caught in a web. When all hope of ever being "successful" is gone, she tends to become defeated, negativistic and hateful. She could possibly be envious, bitter, and bedegrudging because life is passing her by. By hurting others she could bring them down to her own level. She would not want to hurt the student—just make him dependent on her.

Usually people who hurt others "have gone through a series of humiliating experiences" themselves. This is in agreement with the findings of Ellis that upwardly mobile

---

41 Ibid., pp. 250-251.
women have usually suffered rejection and humiliation in their home communities.\textsuperscript{44}

The mobile teacher is more likely to be resentful of her status as a woman.\textsuperscript{45} This resentment is directed toward her students—particularly toward the boys and the low status students.\textsuperscript{46}

**Summary**

The similarities in the behavior of the two groups of teachers were interpreted in the light of current research findings concerning the manner in which middle-class teachers tend to favor the high status student and perpetuate social class distinctions.

The differences in the behavior of the two groups of teachers were discussed in terms of current research findings describing the behavior of mobile teachers.

\textsuperscript{44}Evelyn Elizabeth Ellis, "A Study of the Correlates of Upward Social Mobility Among Unmarried Career Women," American Sociological Review, XVII (October, 1952), 550-563.

\textsuperscript{45}Stiles, op. cit., pp. 40-41.

\textsuperscript{46}Frederic W. Terrin, "The Occupational Roles of Teachers," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (September, 1955), 251-260.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine whether elementary public school teachers who have been upwardly mobile occupationally are more helpful to children of lower and upper occupational status families than teachers who have not engaged in upward occupational mobility. This study proposed to answer this question by partially describing several aspects of the behavior of certain selected elementary teachers in actual classroom situations.

The basic plan undertaken in the present research was to compare a selected group of non-mobile teachers with regard to behavior toward children of various occupational levels. An attempt was made to match the two groups of teachers in terms of number of years of teaching experience, age, size of class and kind of degrees held. This matching was done in order that statistically significant differences that might be found between the two groups could be assumed to not be associated with things other than social origin.

An analysis of the data indicated that there was no significant difference in the amount of attention either group of teachers gave occupationally high and occupationally low students. Both groups of teachers were more integrative
toward high status students and more dominative toward low status students. Mobile teachers were comparatively more dominative toward the low status students.

The findings of this study were discussed according to the similarities and differences between the two groups of teachers. The similarities in the behavior of the two groups were interpreted in the light of research findings concerning the manner in which teachers tend to favor the high status student and to perpetuate social class distinctions. The mobile teachers' fear of verbalizations and their regarding praise as a sign of insincerity were given as possible explanations of the fact that the mobile teachers were not more integrative toward high status students than were the non-mobile teachers. Another explanation was that domination was probably more accepted than favoritism.

Mobile teachers were found to be comparatively more dominative toward low status students than were non-mobile teachers. Research findings describing the behavior of mobile teachers were discussed as possible explanations of this discriminatory behavior.

Conclusions

Considering the findings of this study, the implications of the findings (both discussed in Chapter V) and the limitations of the study (discussed in Chapter II) the conclusions reached are as follows:
1. Low occupational background tends to affect the observable behavior characteristics of teachers toward children from lower occupational status homes.

2. The mobile teacher is more domineering (less helpful) toward the low status pupil.

3. The behavior of the mobile teacher is more likely to create a climate less conducive to "good" mental health and learning for students from lower occupational status families.

4. The differences in the behavior of the two groups of teachers seemed to be differences in degree, not in kind. This seemed to suggest that there are basic similarities in the behavior of the two teacher groups in that they both tend to favor the high status student and perpetuate social class distinctions.

Recommendations

In the light of the foregoing conclusions, the recommendations from this study are as follows:

1. If teachers are to work with the lower-class child on the basis of full understanding, they must become aware of the social structure of their society and receive systematic instruction in the identification of social classes and the "norms" of social class behavior.

2. Perhaps it is the job of the institutions concerned with the preparation of teachers to re-examine their policies in regard to the recruitment and preparation of prospective elementary teachers.
3. In the recruitment program selection should probably be a continuous process. More attention should be given to the personality characteristics of prospective teachers.

4. An adequate number of qualified counselors should be provided for individuals preparing to enter the teaching profession.

5. It seems that no amount of the conventional kind of preparation would likely change the behavior of the teacher who has strong needs to dominate. Therefore, teacher preparing institutions might provide a program which emphasizes sound emotional growth as well as academic proficiency.

Suggestions for Further Research

A number of questions which might be the basis for further investigations are suggested by this study. Among them are the following:

1. Are mobile teachers more domineering toward boys than are non-mobile teachers?

2. In this study classes were chosen which contained a range of occupational background. What effect would a homogeneous class (in terms of occupational background) have on the behavior of teachers of different social origin?

3. What can the teacher preparing institution do to prepare its graduates to cope with the problems created by social stratification as it is associated with education?

4. Does the spatial mobility of some teachers serve as a substitute for occupational mobility?
5. As mobile teachers grow older do they tend to adopt the behavior patterns of non-mobile teachers?

6. If teachers are given systematic instruction in the identification of social-class status of pupils, would this new understanding of social class bring about significant changes in teachers' relations with their students?
APPENDIX A

MCGEE MODIFICATION OF THE ANDERSON-BREWER SCALE

Dominative categories.

1. Teacher told pupils each step to take so that future steps were uncertain to a large degree.

2. Teacher dictated the particular work tasks and work companions.

3. Teacher was intolerant of ideas or suggestions made by pupils; teacher interrupted pupils; out talked pupils.

4. Teacher insisted on strict order at all times; commanded pupils; gave an order to be obeyed at once.

Integrative categories.

1. Teacher sketched general steps to group goals; choice was allowed in alternative procedures.

2. Teacher left division of tasks to the group and allowed members to work with companions of own choice.

3. Teacher encouraged group discussion and decisions, teacher exchanged ideas with pupils; asked opinions of pupils.

4. Teacher guided pupils and made suggestions without being mandatory.

## APPENDIX B

### NORTH-HAFT SCALE

**Occupations Ranked According to Prestige**  
(based on 2,920 interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Title</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Supreme Court Justice</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Governor</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet member in the federal government</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomat in the U. S. Foreign Service</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of a large city</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College professor</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative in Congress</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government scientist</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County judge</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of a department in a state government</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the board of directors of a large corporation</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Physicist</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil engineer</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline pilot</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist who paints pictures that are exhibited in galleries</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner of factory that employs about 100 people</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociologist</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant for a large business</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biologist</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician in a symphony orchestra</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author of novels</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain in the regular army</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building contractor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Title</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor in the public schools</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school teacher</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Agricultural Agent</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad engineer</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm owner and operator</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official of an international labor union</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio announcer</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper columnist</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-operator of a printing shop</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained machinist</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare worker for a city government</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaker</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter on a daily newspaper</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of a small store in a city</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance agent</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant farmer—one who owns livestock and machinery and manages the farm</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling salesman for a wholesale concern</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground director</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policeman</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad conductor</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail carrier</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile repairman</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage mechanic</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local official of a labor union</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-operator of lunch stand</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal in the regular army</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine operator in a factory</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk in a store</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman who owns his own boat</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar motorman</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk route man</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant cook</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck driver</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumberjack</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling station attendant</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer in a night club</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Title</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm hand</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal miner</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi driver</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad section hand</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant waiter</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock worker</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night watchman</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes presser in a laundry</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soda fountain clerk</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartender</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharecropper—one who owns no livestock or equipment and does not manage farm</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage collector</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street sweeper</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe shiner</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Score: 69.8

APPENDIX C

CHI SQUARE TABLES

I. Total number of contacts given various students

A. Total contacts of mobile teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contacts to low status students</th>
<th>Contacts to high status students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>1268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.30, \quad p < .05. \]

B. Total contacts of non-mobile teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contacts to low status students</th>
<th>Contacts to high status students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>1301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.20, \quad p < .05. \]

II. Type of contacts received by various students from mobile teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dominative Contacts</th>
<th>Integrative Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low status students</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High status students</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 113.6, \quad p > .001. \]

III. Type of contacts received by various students from non-mobile teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dominative Contacts</th>
<th>Integrative Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low status students</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High status students</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 63.45, \quad p > .001. \]
APPENDIX C--Continued

IV. Relative dominance of mobile and non-mobile teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Status Students</th>
<th>Low Status Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile teacher</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mobile teacher</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.97, \quad P > .05. \]

V. Relative integration of mobile and non-mobile teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Status Students</th>
<th>Low Status Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile teacher</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mobile teacher</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .96, \quad P > .05. \]
## Appendix D

### Contacts of Mobile Teachers Toward Various Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Number</th>
<th>Dominative Contacts</th>
<th>Integrative Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Students</td>
<td>Low Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean:**
- Integrative Contacts: High = 34.16, Low = 22.36

**Range:**
- Dominative Contacts: High = 7 to 44, Low = 1 to 44
- Integrative Contacts: High = 7 to 49, Low = 4 to 49
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### APPENDIX E

**CONTACTS OF NON-MOBILE TEACHERS TOWARD VARIOUS STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Number</th>
<th>Dominative Contacts</th>
<th>Integrative Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Students</td>
<td>Low Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean:**
- Dominative Contacts: 19.76
- Integrative Contacts: 22.12

**Range:**
- Dominative Contacts: 3 to 50
- Integrative Contacts: 8 to 57
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