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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine and analyze the relationships between teacher morale as determined by the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire and the ability to establish rapport with pupils as determined by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. Although a limited amount of research has been done in the area of teacher morale, professional literature and recent studies indicated that more research was needed to determine the scope and intensity of the relationships between these two variables as they relate to group attitudes and performance.

The purpose of this study was to discover possible implications from the relationships between teacher morale and the ability to establish rapport with pupils and other selected personal and professional characteristics. The knowledge acquired in such an investigation may enable teachers and administrators to facilitate better working relationships among all teachers, pupils, and administrators.
Hypotheses

Consistent with the statement of the problem, five hypotheses were proposed as follows:

1. That no correlation exists between teacher morale and the ability to establish rapport with pupils which is not due to chance.

2. That there is no significant relationship between teacher morale and personal characteristics of sex, age, marital status, religious affiliation, and parents' vocation which is not due to chance.

3. That there is no significant relationship between teacher morale and professional characteristics of salary, teaching experience, and education which is not due to chance.

4. That there is no significant relationship between mean morale score and school size which is not due to chance.

5. That there is no significant relationship between mean morale score and school organizational level and type (elementary) which is not due to chance.

Background and Significance of the Study

Monroe (14, p. 320) emphasized the need for additional research in the area projected in this study. He said:

Very little research has been done to establish the cruciality of various faults and defects that are
known to exist (in the classroom). Although much has been discovered about the conditions that are directly associated with learning difficulties in general, relatively little is known concerning the actual causes of any given fault or deficiency. This whole field merits extended research.

Beecher (3) observed that the most important single source of evidence on teacher effectiveness is the relationship between the teacher and the pupil. That this relationship is vital both to the emotional climate of the classroom and the morale of the teacher is apparent simply by weight of time and association involved.

Wall (21) studied teachers and other educators in their relative positions along a continuum which was attitudinally democratic, liberal, and progressive at one end and authoritarian, conservative, and traditional at the other. He found that it is possible to measure a person's place on such a continuum by using a valid and reliable attitude scale.

It was reported in the Fourth Mental Measurements Yearbook (5, p. 801) that the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was developed specifically to measure the relative position of a teacher on such a continuum as noted above. It was also stated that the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory scale is valid and reliable for predicting a teacher's ability to establish rapport with pupils.
Price (16) in a study found that the possibility of distortion on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was minimized if the test was given to individuals in such a manner that response set would be negligible. A person was not as motivated to distort when tests were administered under formalized or anonymous conditions.

In 1932 Haggerty (7, pp. 545-549) studied the need for developing methods of teaching compatible with the ideals of democratic living. He suggested that studies which had attempted to predict teaching success had failed to show significant reliability because they had overlooked the essential element in the teaching situation—teacher-pupil rapport.

It was reported in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research (14, p. 751) that the goals of teaching in a democratic society have been pretty well clarified. Now there is a need for research studies which will help to identify patterns of teaching which are compatible with these goals. Case studies, behavior analysis, systematic observations of adjustmental symptoms, and teacher-pupil questionnaires and rating scales are techniques that may profitably be employed to these ends. One of the primary questions projected in this area of needed research is that of the effect of personal security and happiness of the teacher on the learning situation.
Brookover (4, pp. 285-287) conducted a study to determine if a teacher who had a high degree of "person-person" interaction also ranked high in teaching efficiency. The results showed a significantly high positive relationship between information gained from his "person-person" scale and the Purdue Rating Scale.

Watson (23) evaluated an intensive study of an out-of-school situation which has definite implications for educators. After several years of investigation the Western Electric Company concluded that individual and group morale were the major factors in determining the quality and quantity of production by their employees. Watson's interpretation of the findings observed that morale was improved when employees were permitted to participate democratically in the planning of their work and when the leadership was friendly and democratic rather than autocratic.

The 1944 yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, Morale for a Free World (2, p. 255), said that morale is more than tenacity; it is a state of mind which maintains each person as a member of the working group.

Watson (23) studied the characteristics which promote high morale and discovered that interpersonal relationships
involving both leader and members was perhaps the most important factor to all concerned.

Klein (11) said that personal relationships are the pivot for mental health both within the individual and within the group. The emotional atmosphere within the work situation, whether it is full of suspicion and unhappiness, or full of purposeful activity, is a determining force for either low or high individual and group morale.

Walsh (22) studied the relationships between a person's psychological needs and his job preferences. Results of the study indicated that an individual may be either satisfied or frustrated by the duties of his job, and that he is likely to change jobs to satisfy certain needs and avoid frustrations.

Roth (19) in a study of teacher job dissatisfaction found that there appeared to be no significant relationship between teacher morale and general school conditions. He observed that it is important that teachers are encouraged to investigate causes of unsatisfactory conditions and relationships in their schools.

A research bulletin of the National Education Association (15, pp. 38-41) indicated that 31 per cent of the married teachers would not teach if they could start again. Another 16 per cent were undecided. Only 58 per cent of the single men stated that they would teach again, while
21 per cent definitely would not. Lesser per cents were recorded as unfavorable for single and married women.

Redl (18, pp. 231-234) suggested that when either the teacher or pupil is frustrated because of some psychological object in the classroom, the frustration and "emotional toll" for all concerned can be very high. However, teachers who are not aware of the basic principles of mental hygiene or unable to translate this knowledge into practice are not likely to be effective or happy in their work.

Hemphill (9, p. 42) reported that, in the case of individuals in the teaching profession, there was some evidence that characteristics of work groups, as portrayed by his Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire, are related to job satisfaction. He observed that the behavior of individuals was influenced in large measure by the groups in which they interacted. Studies reported for business enterprises, air crews, sports teams, and teaching staffs emphasized this relationship.

It was reported in Hemphill's monograph for his Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire (9, p. v) that the instrument should be useful for studies concerned with the integrity, morale, and other characteristics of groups and their relationships to individuals. It was reported that reliability was established with several groups, two of
which were teaching staffs, and data are provided concerning the internal consistency of the items and the inter-correlation of the thirteen dimension scores. Validity was established for the instrument, according to Hemphill, since obvious differences that were known to exist among groups reflected in the dimension scores. Other studies using the instrument have been completed in the areas of leadership, productivity, and morale.

This study of the relationships between teacher morale and the ability to establish rapport with pupils should be helpful to educators in helping to clarify the various implications in emotional climate and academic and social achievement of teacher-pupil relationships and individual and group morale.

Limitations of the Study

The study of the relationships between teacher morale and the ability to establish rapport with pupils was limited to certain selected white or integrated public schools in the Dallas metropolitan area consisting of Collin, Dallas, Denton, and Ellis Counties.

Teachers selected for the study included a minimum of forty each from elementary, junior high, and senior high school organizational levels and from small, middle-size, and large schools.
The variables that were treated in the study were:
(1) teacher morale, (2) teacher ability to establish rapport with pupils, (3) personal characteristics of sex, age, marital status, religious affiliation, and parents' vocation, and (4) the professional characteristics of salary, teaching experience, school type (elementary), education, school size, and school organizational level.

Basic Assumptions

1. The teacher occupies a vital, integral position within the classroom situation, and his personal happiness or difficulty is reflected in the pupils and the educative process. Redl (18) speaks of this as "emotional chain reactions."

2. The Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire is a valid and reliable instrument for determining teacher morale.

3. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory is a valid and reliable instrument for determining teacher ability to establish rapport with pupils.

Procedure for Collecting Data

The schools in the universe selected for this study were grouped for stratified random sampling according to organizational level and number of classroom teachers. Organizational level (elementary, junior high, and senior
high) were those reported in the Texas Education Agency's Public School Directory for 1959-60 (20). For the purposes of this study small schools were defined as those having from one to eight teachers, middle-size schools as having from nine to twenty-five teachers (elementary) and nine to forty teachers (junior high and senior high), and large schools as having twenty-six or more teachers (elementary) and forty-one or more teachers (junior high and senior high).

The study included visits to each school and the administration to as many teachers as were made available, with a minimum of 50 per cent participating, three instruments: (1) the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire, (2) the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, and (3) the Personal and Professional Data Inventory developed for this purpose.

Personal data included sex, age, marital status, religious affiliation, and parents' vocation. Professional data included salary, teaching experience, school size, school organization, teaching level, and education.

Procedure for Treating Data

The data assimilated from the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, and the Personal and Professional Data Inventory
are treated in Chapter III. Correlations using the Pearson product-moment technique were employed to test the hypothesis that no correlation exists between teacher morale and the ability to establish rapport with pupils. Correlations were computed between the morale dimension scores and the teacher-pupil rapport variable and between the rapport factor scores and the morale variable.

Analysis of variance has been utilized to test the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between teacher morale and personal characteristics of sex, age, marital status, religious affiliation, and parents' vocation. Analysis of variance has also been utilized to test the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between teacher morale and professional characteristics of salary, teaching experience, school size, school organization, teaching level, and education.

Analysis of variance has been utilized to test the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the mean morale score and school size and organizational level.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions were adapted from Good (6) and are consistent with the purposes of this study:
1. Teacher morale is defined as the collective feelings and attitudes of a teacher or teachers as related to their duties, responsibilities, and goals.

2. Rapport is defined as an interpersonal relationship of mutual confidence and trust which elicits maximum response.

3. Interpersonal relationships are defined as the intercommunication between or among the minds of two or more persons; they may be mutually facilitating or mutually frustrating both in substance and in influence.

4. School is defined as that division of the school organization under the direction of a principal, part time principal, or head teacher.

5. Administrator is defined as the principal, part time principal, or head teacher responsible for the management and direction of the school.

6. Universe is defined as the aggregate of all the schools and individuals from which the sample is taken.

With the problem of the study set forth, it was deemed appropriate to proceed next to the psychological constructs of morale and rapport and then examine the rationale employed in the development of the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory.
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CHAPTER II

TEACHER MORALE AND TEACHER-PUPIL RAPPORT

Psychological Construct of Morale

The Midwestern Psychological Association meeting in 1957 in Chicago conducted a symposium of industrial morale which has implications for education. The first and most difficult problem which was presented to the symposium was the definition of the psychological construct known as morale.

Robert M. Guion, chairman, reported in Personnel Psychology (20, p. 62) that at least eight different definitions of morale are widely used. He presented these and explained why the last was chosen for the purposes of the symposium:

1. "Morale is the absence of conflict." This definition is negative in nature.

2. "Morale is a feeling of happiness." A person might be happy at work but not because of it and possibly in spite of it.

3. "Morale is good personal adjustment." This is proved inadequate by the fact that adjustment relates to the individual, while morale only refers to a relationship within groups.
4. "Morale is ego-involvement in one's job." Guion found this definition difficult to define operationally and conceptually. He observed that the concept may prove useful later after more research and study have been made in the area of morale.

5. "Morale is the extent of 'we-feeling' or cohesiveness of the group." This appears to be oversimplified and ignores the individual.

6. "Morale is a collection of job-related attitudes." Here morale is defined as being neither an attribute of groups or individuals but in terms of the environment in which the individual and group work.

7. "Morale is the personal acceptance of the goals of the group." This is one of the most widely accepted definitions of morale. It considers morale an attribute of the individual but one which exists only in reference to a group of which he is a member.

8. "Morale is the extent to which an individual's needs are satisfied and the extent to which the individual perceives that satisfaction as stemming from his total job situation." High morale under this concept, Guion explained, would be reflected by a minimum of frustration-instigated conflict, by many favorable attitudes, by well-adjusted employees who can become ego-involved in their mutual endeavor, and by a high degree of cohesiveness.
Guion (20, pp. 62-63) observes that five attributes necessary to an adequate concept of morale were found in this latter definition: (a) The dynamic complexity of morale is recognized. It reflects the fact that morale is not a concept with a single dimension but a construct of many components. It requires that the factors be defined in terms of individual needs. (b) It relates morale basically to the individual, although groups can also be described in terms of morale. Such group descriptions, however, take as their point of departure the satisfactions of the members of the group. This is to take the position that group morale is based to a great extent upon the morale of the members within it. (c) The latter definition relates morale to the work situation and not simply to generalized traits. (d) The role of motivation is recognized in this definition, and it implies that a member of a group may perceive his several needs as being satisfied by the work situation. (e) The definition can apply to all types of employees and all types of work situations. It may be equally applicable to salesmen or college professors, authors or psychologists themselves.

It was noted that the definition (of teacher morale) adapted from Good's *Dictionary of Education* (18, p. 264) is very similar to the one selected by Guion for the psychological symposium and encompasses the five attributes cited
above. It states that teacher morale is defined as "the collective feelings and attitudes of a teacher or teachers as related to their duties, responsibilities, and goals."

Guttell (7, pp. 48-63) reinforced the above concepts of the psychological construct of morale in that he distinguished structure, syntality, and synergy in the term. Structure is defined as encompassing the behavior of individuals toward one another, status characteristics, and reciprocal role relationships. Syntality is synonymous with individual personality and includes the group decisions, performance, and internal (group) interaction whether it is effectively discharged or not. Synergy then refers to the dynamic factors, the energy total of individual efforts contributed to group action.

Stagner (39, pp. 64-70) defined the concept of morale in terms of an individual-group relationship. He said that it "is an index of the extent to which the individual perceives a probability of satisfying his own motives through cooperation with the group." He stated further that there is no such phenomenon as morale in general, but that the state of an individual's morale must be gauged relative to a specific group, such as a company, a work group, or a faculty.

Stagner said that morale is not a meaningful term if the individual is seeking individual goals through
individualistic action. From the subjective view, if he does not perceive himself as a member of the group, the term morale is simply not relevant. While he may be objectively a member of the group, if his actions are taken in an individualistic fashion, then it must be concluded that his morale is low. Nevertheless, as some researchers have emphasized, the individual productivity may be high. Morale and efficiency have a complex but not necessarily a linear relationship.

High morale can exist when the group member perceives himself as part of the group and believes in the probability that a course of action will achieve both his and the group goals. Group goals have become individual goals and are important to the member because they provide a route to personal goals which are not inherent in the group.

Stagner (39, pp. 68-70) summarized his motivational analysis in three phases: (a) the private goals of the individual, (b) the group goals, and (c) the perceived relationship between these two sets of goals. Morale, then, derives from the fact that the group member sees himself as a component of the group and his goals as contiguous with the group goals. One who wishes to raise the morale of a group needs to create a situation where the group and individual goals coincide to the greatest possible extent.
Cronbach and Meehl (14, pp. 281-302) pointed out that a construct such as morale is defined by a "network of associations or propositions which relate various observables (or additional constructs) to one another." It is possible to learn more of a particular construct by increasing the exactness of the components in the network, through observation or some type of measurement of the component relationships. The measurement of morale, then, is to measure the several variables within the network and ascertain their interrelationships.

Katzell (26, pp. 71-78) stated that morale is more of a hypothetical construct than an empirically proved variable. It is a construct that has been evolved to help explain inter-group relationships and differences in effectiveness under certain conditions. This is the concept proposed to explain why one army will fight under great adversity while another will surrender, why one faculty or work group will show higher productivity than another, given equivalent conditions and incentives.

Marx (31, pp. 235-247) observed that many hypothetical constructs, or concepts, provide the model for study and research by which the measurement becomes more accurate and by which the validity may be measured.

Katzell's conceptual definition of morale (26, pp. 71-78) is that of "a condition of congruent motivation among
members of a group, resulting in relatively high levels of energy-expenditure toward common goals having positive valence." The kinds of variables which need to be explored and analyzed relative to morale include: (a) the member's understanding and identification of group goals, (b) the extent to which the incentive system provides positive reinforcements, (c) the extent to which group goals are realized, (d) the cohesiveness of the group, and (e) the level of work satisfaction, viewed as a function of the relative levels of individual goal realization and frustration. However, it must be noted that high work satisfaction is not synonymous with morale, since the former can result from realizing personal goals while the group goals may be ignored partially or completely.

Types of measures which were suggested by Katzell to measure certain variables include: measures of job satisfaction, audits of the work situation, job situation questionnaires, and behavioral or performance measures. He stated that morale probably will always be expressed in terms of factorial scores. The variables probably will include various attitudes, organizational and situational attributes, personality attributes, and performance measurements. Some factors would contribute to the morale equation positively, some negatively; some would act as suppressor variables. The final analysis of the construct
of morale will depend on the research into the contributing variables and their interrelationships within the whole network.

Morale as an Interrelated Variable

The close relationship between morale and group efficiency is so generally recognized that industry and other management are spending millions of dollars studying how to improve this energizing spirit, or force. Elsbree and Reutter (15) made this observation and added that many factors enter into the fabric of the matter. Some of the factors concern the individual, some his working conditions, and others the interrelationships of these and personalities, but one of the most noteworthy focal points of concern which has received little attention is that of the teacher's personal problems and difficulties. These merit extended research and attention.

Kaplan (25, p. 407) mentioned several factors relative to teacher morale and how intimate the teacher's psychological outlook is to the whole mental health of the school. Three deterrents to total school morale are the professional pressures exerted both from within and without the school, the community expectations, and relations with the school authorities. The teacher finds himself almost completely absorbed with the pupil's life by working with him
in school and working on his papers and other matters that concern him outside of school.

Lang (27, p. 10) discussed morale in the context of great work pressures and expectations. He observed that a mentally healthy person can deal constructively with reality at its worst, but a person who finds it impossible, or very difficult, to maintain a high level of confidence and positive attitudes will not likely secure satisfaction from struggle or by turning adversity into accomplishment. To meet reality in the right way, Lang said that the individual must feel internal security and, second, security in his relationships with his fellow workers, students in the classroom, or family members. The ultimate aim of every teacher to guide his students toward maturity will not be achieved by an individual who is overly hampered by anxieties and tensions brought about by insecurity in his school relationships.

Lieberman (30, p. 468) discussed this situation relative to favoritism in the classroom. He stated that numerous studies such as that reported by Hollingshead reveal that preferential treatment is accorded children of higher social status by teachers who experience high levels of tensions about their own status and refuse to examine their own backgrounds and motives for going into teaching. Lieberman also stated that social advancement, not social
service, is the main inducement for those who enter teaching.

McKinney (32) discussed morale in terms of the "integrated personality." Without departing from the concepts already presented, he observed that the well-adjusted person, the high morale individual, possesses dominant motives which give him direction or he follows a dominant philosophy which accomplishes the same purpose. The person with either high or low morale perceives this relative to his relations with other people. The people with whom he works give him the perspective which reflects his level of morale and working efficiency.

Hilgard (23, pp. 491-492) explored the implications of a number of industrial experiments relative to morale and working efficiency and concluded that the social environment is much more important to good morale and high production quotas than physical environment. The social factor is important even in work of a menial, repetitive nature. In his studies Hilgard concluded that good working companions, or relationships, rate high in workers' views of job satisfaction. Social environment often was found to rank higher than pay.

Yarborough (44, p. 130) in a study of Illinois teachers found that the support given to their discipline
problems with the students in their charge was the most important factor in their morale.

Similarly Becker (5) found a definite set of expectations among Chicago teachers with respect to their principals. Of three that he listed, the principal's supporting the teacher in his relationships with pupils and parents was at the top of the list.

Chase (8, pp. 1-4) in his study of teacher morale related to professional leadership found that teachers' praise or censure of principals was clearly related to the belief that his role is primarily to bolster the teacher in his classroom relationships. This was found to be significantly higher in schools with low morale where teachers felt insecure and frustrated. In the high morale schools, Chase found that the teachers still emphasized the principal's helpfulness in solving problems of pupil adjustment and classroom instruction.

**Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire**

The **Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire** (Appendix A) was developed for use in the Ohio State Leadership Studies by John K. Hemphill. The work was an early attempt to measure and explore the dimensions of social groups which seem to be common to all interrelationships. Two uses of the methods thus developed were
projected: first, to provide data for research studies which attempt to test hypotheses relative to group characteristics; second, to produce information of practical use to administrators and executives who are interested in the morale and integrity of groups or organizations.

Hemphill (21, p. 1) observed that it was becoming increasingly clear that the behavior of an individual was in a large measure influenced by the group of which he was a member or with which he worked. However, dependable knowledge about how to promote and maintain effective and satisfying group relationships was not nearly as abundant as the recognized need. While army officers, athletic coaches, and school superintendents were well aware that their success and the success of their enterprises was dependent upon the groups with which they worked, and that this group success was critically dependent upon unit morale, they still did not have an abundance of knowledge about the many and varied factors involved or the inter-relationships of these variables.

In his monograph on situational factors in leadership published in 1949, Hemphill first began to isolate the variables that were later employed in the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire. In 1950 Hemphill and Westie published an account of the development of the dimensions instrument in the Journal of Psychology (22).
The developed instrument (Appendix A) consists of 150 statements about the characteristics of groups. The respondent to the instrument expresses his answers for a specific group by indicating to what degree he regards his statement as reflecting an attitude toward, perception of, or impressions or knowledge about a group or organization. The response continuum proceeds from definitely true to mostly true to both true and false to mostly false to definitely false. The 150 items are arranged to yield scores on thirteen group factors, or dimensions. These thirteen dimensions are indicated and defined as follows (21, pp. 2-5):

1. **Autonomy** is the degree to which a group functions independently of other groups and occupies an independent position in society. It is reflected by the degree to which a group determines its own activities, by its absence of allegiance, deference and/or dependence relative to other groups.

2. **Control** is the degree to which a group regulates the behavior of individuals while they are functioning as group members. It is reflected by the modifications which group membership imposes on complete freedom of individual behavior and by the amount of intensity of group-derived government.

3. **Flexibility** is the degree to which group activities are marked by informal procedures rather than by adherence to established procedures. It is reflected by the extent to which duties of members are free from specification through custom, tradition, written rules, regulations, codes of procedure, or even unwritten but clearly prescribed ways of behaving.

4. **Hedonic tone** is the degree to which group membership is accompanied by a general feeling of pleasantness or agreeableness. It is reflected by the frequency of laughter, conviviality, pleasant
anticipation of group meetings, and by the absence of griping and complaining.

5. **Homogeneity** is the degree to which members of a group are similar with respect to socially relevant characteristics. It is reflected by relative uniformity of members with respect to age, sex, race, socio-economic status, interests, attitudes, and habits.

6. **Intimacy** is the degree to which members of a group are mutually acquainted with one another and are familiar with the most personal details of another's lives. It is reflected by the nature of topics discussed by members, by modes of greeting, forms of address, and by interactions which presuppose a knowledge of the probable reaction of others under widely differing circumstances, as well as by the extent and type of knowledge each member has about other members of the group.

7. **Participation** is the degree to which members of a group apply time and effort to group activities. It is reflected by the number and kinds of duties members perform, by the voluntary assumption of non-assigned duties and by the amount of time spent in group activities.

8. **Permeability** is the degree to which a group permits ready access to membership. It is reflected by absence of entrance requirements of various kinds, and by the degree to which membership is solicited.

9. **Polarization** is the degree to which a group is oriented and works toward a single goal which is clear and specific to all members.

10. **Potency** is the degree to which a group has primary significance for its members. It is reflected by the kind of needs which a group is satisfying or has the potentiality of satisfying, by the extent of readjustment which would be required of members should the group fail, and by the degree to which a group has meaning to the members with reference to their central values.

11. **Stability** is the degree to which a group persists over a period of time with essentially the same characteristics. It is reflected by the rate of membership turnover, by frequency of reorganizations and by the constancy of group size.

12. **Stratification** is the degree to which a group orders its members into status hierarchies. It is reflected by differential distribution of power, privileges, obligations, and duties and by asymmetrical patterns of differential behavior among members.
13. **Viscidity** is the degree to which members of the group function as a unit. It is reflected by absence of dissension and personal conflict among members, by absence of activities serving to advance only the interests of individual group members, by the ability of the group to resist disrupting forces, and by the belief on the part of the members that the group does function as a unit.

Scores on these thirteen group dimensions provide a profile of an individual's perception and attitude toward his membership within a group. A profile based on the responses of all members of a group (or on a sample of all members) gives a description of the particular group as it appears to its members. Thus, the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire may be used either to assess an individual's orientation toward the group of which he is a member or to obtain a description of the dimensions, or characteristics, of a group as seen by its members.

The standard population was composed of five subsamples. Sample A was made up of 100 respondents' descriptions of 100 miscellaneous groups. Each of the 100 persons cited described a different group. This sample differs from the other four in that each respondent selected from his experience one of the groups of which he was a member and described that group by completing the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire. The other four samples consist of a smaller number of groups with each group being described by two or more of its members.
Sample A then was expected to contain more heterogeneity in the kinds of groups described than the other four.

Sample B was composed of descriptions supplied by 130 members of the faculty of a liberal arts college. Each of these persons provided descriptions of his department considered as a group. Two or more descriptions were secured from eighteen departments. The data were secured anonymously except for the identification of the specific departments. Approximately one third of the members of the several departments contributed to the data, ranging from two in the geology department to twenty-three in the English department.

Sample C was compiled from 185 women office employees of a large insurance company. These respondents worked in clerical jobs in the home office of the company.

Sample D consisted of 215 college students who were members of nine different organizations, which in turn were affiliated with the religious council of a university. These data, or descriptions, were collected with strong emphasis on anonymity.

Sample E was composed of descriptions of school staffs by 320 public school teachers. The school staffs described included nineteen total city systems, nineteen high school staffs, and seven elementary school staffs. Biographical information concerning the 320 respondents in this sample is presented in Table I which follows.
TABLE I

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION CONCERNING 320 PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS COMPOSING SAMPLE E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical Variable</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 and under</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 or more</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Present System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sum of per cents does not always equal 100.0 due to rounding.
From this table it is seen that 73 per cent of the teachers are women, the majority of them being between thirty and fifty-nine years of age. Fifteen per cent of the respondents had less than five years of teaching experience and over half had been teaching in the schools they described for at least six years.

Table II presents data concerning the types of school units that were described, their sizes in terms of number of staff members and the number and per cent of respondents who described each type of unit.

**TABLE II**

**TYPE OF GROUPS COMPOSING SAMPLE E, TOTAL NUMBER IN EACH GROUP, AND THE NUMBER AND PER CENT DESCRIBING EACH GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>Number in Unit</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Per Cent of Unit Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total City School Systems</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Staffs</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Staffs</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2886</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the responses of the public school teachers with the responses of the other samples indicated that they differ in the following respects:

1. The school unit is observed to exercise moderately high control over the conduct of its teachers (Control).
2. The unit is described as relatively less intimate than other groups in the standard population (Intimacy).

3. The school unit is seen to be moderately difficult to join as a staff member (Permeability).

4. The teachers regard the school unit as relatively important to them as a group (Potency).

5. The school unit is seen to be a relatively autonomous group by the teachers (Autonomy).

6. The school unit is regarded by teachers to be relatively heterogeneous in membership (Homogeneity).

7. The school is seen by the teachers as a relatively stable group with little turnover or change in its basic characteristics (Stability).

8. There is a tendency for the teachers to regard their group as requiring considerable participation but with little emphasis on stratification (Participation and Stratification).

The difference between this sample of group descriptions and the total standard population is generally as expected. The school units included large school systems in which high intimacy among most members could not occur, and it is unlikely that very homogeneous groups
of the larger sizes would be assembled. Moderately low permeability is consistent with the general educational attainment criterion for entry into the teaching profession. The view of stability is not inconsistent with the professional character of public school teaching as a vocation. Potency of these units reflects the high involvement of public school teachers in their jobs.

Hemphill observed also that the normative data available to date should not be construed to represent any possible grouping that might occur or be found, but that the meaning and definition of the term "standard population" as employed in his use of the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire is that which is provided by the five sub-samples which make up the total sample of 950 cases.

The reliability of the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire was tentatively determined by correlation of odd and even items on the instrument. The means, standard deviations, and reliability estimates are presented in Table III.
### Table III

Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities of Group Dimension Scores Describing 100 Groups in Sample A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Dimension</th>
<th>Raw Score Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Estimates of Reliability*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Autonomy</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Control</td>
<td>31.46</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Flexibility</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hedonic Tone</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Homogeneity</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Intimacy</td>
<td>51.18</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Participation</td>
<td>33.95</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Permeability</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Polarization</td>
<td>38.02</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Potency</td>
<td>47.90</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Stratification</td>
<td>36.02</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Viscidity</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimates are based on the correlation of odd versus even items corrected for full length of the dimension.

It may be noted that the estimated reliabilities of the dimension scores vary greatly with the dimension. The scores for Stability and Hedonic Tone are based on responses to fewer items than the others, which may account for their lower reliabilities.

By way of comparison, Table IV presents estimates of the reliability of the dimension scores for three samples for which these data were available.
### Table IV

**ESTIMATES OF RELIABILITY OF GROUP DIMENSION SCORES FROM THREE STUDIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Dimension</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Groups (N = 100)</th>
<th>College Departments (N = 130)</th>
<th>Public School Systems (N = 83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic Tone</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneity</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeability</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potency</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratification</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscidity</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be seen that there is considerable variation from sample to sample. This is probably due to factors associated with the relative homogeneity of the types of groups involved in each and, in part, to the relevance of the items included within a given dimension area to the respondent's attitudes toward his group.

Table V presents intercorrelations among the thirteen group dimensions scores for each of three samples of respondents: the 100 miscellaneous groups (Sample A), a sample of 130 college faculty members from nineteen departments (Sample B), and a sample of 320 teachers from forty-six public school systems (Sample E).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Autonomy</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0h</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Control</td>
<td>-02-27</td>
<td>03 21</td>
<td>17 16</td>
<td>13 07</td>
<td>05 07</td>
<td>15-10</td>
<td>03 21</td>
<td>02 07</td>
<td>-06-16</td>
<td>06 18</td>
<td>06-24</td>
<td>22 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Flexibility</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hedonic Tone</td>
<td>-16-09</td>
<td>02-33</td>
<td>12-03</td>
<td>15-06</td>
<td>17-10</td>
<td>-09-15</td>
<td>03 08</td>
<td>04 01</td>
<td>-20-14</td>
<td>04 32</td>
<td>-28-33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Homogeneity</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Intimacy</td>
<td>18-11</td>
<td>03-10</td>
<td>06 08</td>
<td>17-22</td>
<td>10-02</td>
<td>-09-13</td>
<td>-10-16</td>
<td>03 08</td>
<td>-08 02</td>
<td>13-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Participation</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>37 21</td>
<td>60 37</td>
<td>-12 02</td>
<td>27 30</td>
<td>36 23</td>
<td>20 17</td>
<td>-32-39</td>
<td>61 57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Permeability</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11 10</td>
<td>09 09</td>
<td>09 01</td>
<td>15 20</td>
<td>08-04</td>
<td>30 21</td>
<td>-19-15</td>
<td>19 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Polarization</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>17 09</td>
<td>09 15</td>
<td>09 26</td>
<td>20 31</td>
<td>13 10</td>
<td>03-07</td>
<td>31 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Potency</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>32 17</td>
<td>32 17</td>
<td>32 22</td>
<td>07 41</td>
<td>03-39</td>
<td>15 10</td>
<td>06-12</td>
<td>22 02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Stability</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>10-42</td>
<td>-07 16</td>
<td>-06-32</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>10-42</td>
<td>07 41</td>
<td>03-39</td>
<td>15 10</td>
<td>06-12</td>
<td>22 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Stratification</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>20 31</td>
<td>13 10</td>
<td>03-07</td>
<td>31 20</td>
<td>01-14</td>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>19 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Viscidity</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04-06-10</td>
<td>-06-10</td>
<td>-06-10</td>
<td>04 02</td>
<td>04 02</td>
<td>04 02</td>
<td>04 02</td>
<td>04 02</td>
<td>04 02</td>
<td>04 02</td>
<td>04 02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: The correlation coefficients are arranged within each cell of the matrix as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous Groups</th>
<th>College Faculty</th>
<th>School Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decimal points have been omitted.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It may be seen that a comparison of the three intercorrelations for specific pairs of group dimensions scores in Table V indicates that the value of specific intercorrelations depends upon the characteristics of the group samples. For example, the correlation between Stability and Control is .01 for the sample of 100 miscellaneous groups which contrasts with the -.20 for the sample of respondents from the college departments. Hemphill observes in his monograph (21, p. 33) that until sufficient experience is accumulated concerning those parameters of group populations which account for major differences in correlations between pairs of dimensions, the question of revision to reduce the number will be highly suspect.

Hemphill claimed validity for his instrument on the basis that obvious differences that are known to exist among groups are reflected in the dimensions scores. The Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire was held to be valid on the basis of affirmative answers to the following three questions based upon five profiles which will be cited later (21, p. 34):

1. Do individuals who belong to the same group give similar descriptions on the questionnaire?

2. Are obvious differences among groups of differing general classes reflected in the dimension score?
3. Are the Group Dimensions scores related to variables of group behavior and/or performance?

Profiles of five groups attested to the validity of the questionnaire. They included:

1. A random sample of five members in a department of instruction within a midwestern university.

2. Five active members of a religious group associated with a large university.

3. Five randomly selected members of a small office group in an insurance company.

4. Two subjects in a four-man laboratory group working under conditions of "acceptance."

5. Two subjects in a four-man laboratory group working under conditions of "rejection."

Further evidence of the validity of the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire for the purposes of this study was observed in that it recognizes the five attributes cited as necessary to an adequate concept of morale measurement in Chapter II (p. 18). These included:

(1) the dynamic quality of morale encompassing several factors or variables, (2) the necessary relationship of the individual to the group and the group to individuals, (3) the necessary relationship of morale to the work situation, (4) the role of motivation and needs relative
to work, and (5) the application of the construct, or the instrument, to all types of groups.

**Teacher-Pupil Rapport**

Liberty, freedom, and equality find no better expression anywhere in America than they do in the public school classrooms. Ironically, however, it is this democratic spirit that creates many problems among the school children of the nation. The great respect which the teacher receives from the school patrons and the tremendous influence she exerts in the lives of the pupils in her charge places a great responsibility on her. Her favorable response assists her pupils in making favorable adjustments to school life and expectations and acts as an incentive to achievement. A negative response on her part brings insecurity and may cause some of her pupils to seek relief in retirement or misbehavior.

A majority of American school teachers are admirable men and women who possess a good understanding of the pupil. Many of these are able and willing to combine tact, patience, and teaching skill to their own enjoyment of teaching as well as to the interest and welfare of their pupils. Their lessons are characterized by spontaneity. They seldom have discipline problems, because their pupils enjoy a great measure of freedom in planning and working in
the classroom situation. This type of teacher who enjoys her work and skillfully assists her pupils in developing their skills and understanding is a great asset to the total school program.

However, there are countless teachers in American schools who remain indifferent to the part they play and the influence they exert in the life of a pupil. These teachers judge pupils by the completeness with which they fit into rigidly established procedures and the extent to which they conform to the standards as interpreted by the school personnel.

Riebe and others (36) in their discussion of the classroom observed that all persons, and especially elementary and high school pupils, act in large measure as others expect them to act. The elementary school pupils particularly desire the approval of their teachers and other adults and will nearly always respond to positive and cooperative attitudes. While this is somewhat true in the high school years, the authors observe that here the teacher must view the individual pupils more in the context of groups because the approval of peers is quite strong.

Gordon (19) stated that the first step in working closely and effectively with pupils is the establishment of rapport. His definition of this working relationship is consistent with the definition employed in this study,
holding that it involves mutual and sustained interest, trust, and respect on the part of teacher and pupil.

While not too much has been determined about the way a teacher's personality and attitudes will influence class behavior, several studies have indicated that this impact is the most vital factor in the total learning situation. Perkins' study (33, pp. 115-118) shows that the climate in the classroom is set early in the term and remains fairly stable, and that the teacher's attitudes and behavior are vital in the climate-setting process.

Gordon (19) suggested two major requirements for teachers in providing the kind of constructive classroom leadership which will elicit maximum response and productivity from their pupils. First, the teacher must be the kind of person who engenders warmth and good will and, thereby, is able to maintain a relatively informal atmosphere for work. The teacher must be the type of person who reflects, by his manner and attitudes, a respect for the individual regardless of his socio-economic status or academic ability. The knowledge of techniques in working with pupils in the classroom situation, while important, is no substitute for basic respect. Second, the teacher must have the ability to remain a flexible individual who continually grows in personality and academics but also is adaptive to group needs. The successful teacher is one who
can realize personal goals and ambitions through the success of her class and not in spite of it.

Steinbrock (41) in his study of elementary school teachers with contrasting success recorded that (1) recognized success in teaching seems to be related more to wholesome and constructive attitudes toward pupils than to professional acts and responsibilities, (2) teachers who experience little success in teaching tend to be annoyed by a greater number of elements in the classroom situation and by more trivial aspects of childhood behavior, and (3) teaching success is dependent upon a number of factors, none of which is totally differentiating.

Rocchio (37) studied teacher-pupil relationships in a midwestern public school system of about 300,000 population. He concluded from his study that those teachers who were "liked" scored significantly higher on rapport than those who were "disliked." He also found significant differences relative to teacher-pupil rapport among teachers who had taught more than five years as compared to those with less experience and among teachers of academic subjects as compared with those who taught in non-academic fields.

Aaron (1) also studied teachers' attitudes toward various pupil behavior problems. He concluded that there was no significant change in teachers' attitudes toward
behavior problems from the earlier study by Wickman (43) in 1928. The problems still causing most concern in the classroom were annoying and disorderly behavior and the aggressive pupil who will challenge the teacher's authority. Aaron observed further that teachers in her study appeared more concerned with the cited problems than with helping pupils to meet their emotional needs.

The Nature of Teacher Attitudes

The term "teacher attitude" is often found in psychological literature, but there is some disagreement relative to the implications of the construct. Good (18) observed that an attitude is a state of mental and emotional readiness to react to situations, persons, or things in a manner which is in harmony with previously conditioned patterns of response. Hilgard (23, pp. 491-492) has termed attitudes as a disposition to give favorable, neutral, or unfavorable responses to ideas, persons, situations, or objects. Cronbach (13) held that attitudes are the meanings attached to certain objects or ideas and which influence acceptance or rejection of that thing. Ferguson (16, 17) stated that attitudes are the acceptance value of a belief.

It may be noted that all of the cited definitions or concepts of the construct of attitudes encompass an emotional feeling for or against some psychological object.
Remmers and Gage (35) observed that attitudes are not merely mental images or verbalized ideas, but they take on meaning only in relation to some object, situation, or stimulus. Like the construct "morale," attitudes are not genuine entities in themselves; they have meaning only in the context of relationship with other psychological phenomena.

It was observed in the 1950 Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook (2, pp. 300-306):

"Across the country, in courses in child development, education, psychology, guidance, and counseling; in professional workshops; in in-service teacher-education programs; and in professional group meetings—over and over again, teachers are saying, "We feel that teaching would be more rewarding if we could get along better with children."

"The problem is that of creating a good psychological climate in the classroom. As used here, good climate means the friendly, informal atmosphere of the school which is characterized by acceptance and permissive attitudes of the adults toward the pupils.

In short, the above emphasizes the importance—the necessity—of classroom situations characterized by good, positive teacher attitudes which will result in teacher-pupil rapport in the best sense.

It was reported in the 1952 yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (3) that it is surprising how many classroom teachers there are who believe that an outward expression of warm and friendly feelings for pupils will necessarily result in undermined
authority. In projecting this further, the writer said (3, p. 289):

For too long the achievement of certain academic standards has been the main if not the sole criterion for admission to most teacher training institutions, with little or no assessment of the candidate’s reason for wanting to teach, emotional orientations toward children, or general stability of personality.

Prescott (34) observed that psychiatrists are agreed that pupils as they grow and develop gradually should be given the privilege and responsibility for initiating and regulating their own behavior. Self discipline, clearly, is more to be desired and a higher goal to reach than enforced order. Prescott went on to say that teachers should be selected for their intelligence, their sympathetic insight with children’s needs and behavior and for their skill in getting along and establishing rapport with pupils.

In the 1950 yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Fostering Mental Health in Our Schools (2), it was reported that where the emotional climate of the classroom is such that pupils and teacher alike can express their feelings openly, then a relationship is found that is characterized by mutual respect, acceptance, and high morale.

Kaplan (25, p. 319) reported a study in which 33,000 pupils from grades one through twelve wrote on the subject,
"The Teacher Who Helped Me Most." The qualities mentioned most often were:

1. Cooperative, democratic attitude
2. Kindliness and consideration for the individual
3. Patience
4. Interest in pupils' problems
5. Flexibility
6. Wide interest
7. Good disposition and consistent behavior
8. Fairness and impartiality
9. Sense of humor
10. Good personal appearance and pleasing manner.

It may be seen that nearly all of the qualities cited above as observable in those teachers who were truly helpful to their students are characteristic of the democratically oriented teacher with sound mental health and a warm personality.

While there appears to be no panacea for the selection of good teachers for American classrooms, the foregoing and other studies demand that consideration be given to the personal attributes, the traits and attitudes, of the prospect in addition to academic qualifications. Teachers are needed who can guide the pupils in their charge to become self-regulating and self-controlled individuals. The techniques for this type of teaching are found in discipline through affection, recognition, acceptance, and self-esteem.
Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory

The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was originally constructed by Leeds in a doctoral study (28) at the University of Minnesota. Revisions were made in the original instrument by Leeds and Robert Callis who had been interested in the change in teacher-pupil attitudes relative to training and experience.

According to those who validated the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory instrument (11), attitudes afford a prediction of the kind of social atmosphere that a teacher will be able to maintain in the classroom.

Several earlier studies in the area of teacher-pupil relations in the classroom context influenced the work of those who developed the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. Wickman (43) had thirty mental hygienists to rate fifty behavior problems of pupils that had been previously rated by public school teachers, and then compared the results of the two ratings. He observed that public school teachers tend to characterize ideal behavior for pupils as that which is totally submissive to routine, authority, and not counter to the teacher's standards of classroom order.

Leeds disapproved of such a philosophy of teacher-pupil relationships in observing that the most vital job of the teacher in achieving a good working atmosphere is that of creating a friendly classroom situation among the
teacher and pupils (29). Teachers who are tolerant of mistakes and go far in making the pupil feel secure are those who contribute to the positive working situation. It was also observed that the ability of a teacher to develop self-reliance and maintain discipline is important, though often exaggerated.

The technique decided upon by Leeds for the instrument which was developed and later called the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory has been termed by Bird as the method of summated ratings. The person being tested lists his answers to the test items on a five-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Cook and Leeds (10, pp. 399-403) reported in Educational and Psychological Measurement that a five-point scale was used instead of Strong's three-point scale in order that a closer discrimination could be made in the respondent's reactions.

The original scoring weights for the test items employed a formula developed by T. L. Kelly, and subsequently was utilized by Strong in his vocational test. The scoring weights for each item ranged minus four to plus four.

The original test as developed by Leeds had two forms which covered the teacher's attitudes toward pupils in a wide variety of topics. The two forms differed mainly in
their wording of the questions and contained 378 items. One form of the *Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory* listed the questions in an affirmative way, and the other listed them negatively. Two hundred public school teachers were requested to complete both forms of the trial test. Administrators in seventy schools located in three states were secured to assist in locating 200 teachers for the study. With the help of each administrator, selection was made of 100 teachers who maintained good teacher-pupil relations and 100 teachers who were considered poor in their relations with their pupils in the classroom.

From the responses of these 200 teachers on each of the test items, statistical analysis was made and 164 items were selected. The final bases for selection of the test questions from the 756 items included: (1) items that were not ambiguous in meaning, lacking clarity, or poorly stated, (2) items which did not duplicate any other item in content, (3) items whose chi-square values seemed to differentiate between the good and poor teachers, (4) items which showed a response pattern which was difficult to interpret.

The mean score for the 100 "good" teachers was 131.0 as compared with the mean of -32.0 for the "poor" teachers.

In order to validate the revised instrument now consisting of 164 items, Leeds secured the cooperation of 100
unselected middle-grade teachers. These teachers were situated in schools of cities ranging from 1,000 to over 10,000 inhabitants. The rationale for using the middle-grade levels in the validation work was that intermediate grade pupils are sufficiently mature to reply to questions, but they would not be as "sophisticated" in their replies as pupils in upper grades.

The teacher-pupil inventory was administered to the 100 unselected teachers. Then their scores were tabulated, and the responses on the 164 items of the highest twenty teachers were compared with those of the lowest twenty in the group. The chi-square statistic was utilized to calculate the probability of the instrument differentiating between the responses of the two extreme groups. Over 64 per cent of the 164 items showed a significant difference at the 5 per cent level between the top teachers and those in the bottom group. The 100 unselected teachers were also scored on the basis of three ratings: (1) personal observation by Leeds, (2) the pupil's attitudes toward his teacher, and (3) the principals under whom the teacher worked.

The rationale underlying this rating technique was based upon the following (12): (1) the assumption that a person skilled in the field of teacher-pupil relations could visit a classroom situation and validly judge the
social climate which prevailed, (2) the assumption that the attitudes which pupils have toward their teacher is a close reflection of the converse, (3) the assumption that a school principal who had worked closely with the teacher for a period of time could ascertain the emotional relationship between teacher and pupils and, further, could discriminate between those with high and low rapport. Therefore, the measured attitudes of teachers toward pupils and pupils toward teachers should be highly related.

Leeds, using a revised form of Baxter's *Rating of the Teacher's Personal Effectiveness*, visited all of the 100 classrooms of the individual teachers used in the study and rated them on the following criteria (4): (1) creating a friendly atmosphere, (2) establishing a feeling of security, (3) maintaining discipline, (4) exerting a stabilizing influence, (5) developing pupil self-reliance.

A second rating was obtained from the pupils of the 100 unselected teachers participating in the study. Leeds devised a fifty-item questionnaire called *My Teacher* in order to obtain from the pupils the teacher's qualities on: (1) treatment of pupils, (2) interest in children, (3) disposition, (4) sense of humor, (5) status in the pupil's mind, and (6) teaching ability.

Along with the first two ratings, the principals rated the teachers on the basis of: (1) attitudes toward pupils,
(2) personality adjustment, (3) attitudes of pupils toward the teacher, (4) disciplinary ability, and (5) the approach to teaching relative to subject-matter versus personal technique.

The correlations of the rating devices with the results of the teacher-pupil inventory were as follows:
(1) inventory versus principals rating of teachers, .45; (2) inventory versus pupil rating of teachers, .46; and (3) inventory versus three validating criteria combined, .60.

The reliability of the test, using the Spearman-Brown, split-half method, was .909.

Many studies using the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory have been concluded in addition to the early validation work. Work in this area has been done by Medley, Coleman, Hardy, Cook, Kearney, Rocchio, Callis, and others in addition to Leeds. The following implications from these and the validation studies may be cited:

1. Leeds (28) and Callis (6, p. 83) have experimentally proved that the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory measures teacher-pupil relationships with a validity of approximately .60.

2. Leeds (28) studied the relationships of teacher attitudes to such variables as sex, age, teaching experience, marital and parental status, amount of training, and
grade level of teaching and observed that only grade level and age seem to be significantly related to the teacher’s ability to establish rapport with pupils.

3. The reliability of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory as determined by the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula using the split-half method was observed to be .909 (28). The reliability of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory as determined by Callis (80) on a test-retest basis was found to be .84. Stein and Hardy (40) in a study of normal school students in Canada found a reliability coefficient of .92.

4. Coleman (9, p. 237) observed that where important factors were to be affected by the outcome of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, there was a tendency to distort the responses. With Price, cited in Chapter I, he concluded that if the instrument were administered under such conditions as to minimize anxiety (anonymously), then there would be much less motivation to distort. Sorenson (38, p. 193) came to the same conclusion in his study involving 406 prospective elementary and secondary teachers. He observed that signing the instruments definitely affected their scores, although the attempts to "fake" the responses resulted in cross variation, with some scores improving and others moving in the negative direction.
In the course of the study an attempt was made to incorporate the findings and observations made by earlier writers into the present study, so that both the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory would be utilized appropriately and with optimum validity. The findings and statistical accumulations in Chapter III were in large measure made possible by the earlier efforts and research of the scholars mentioned in this chapter.
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CHAPTER III

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER MORALE AND TEACHER–PUPIL
RAPPORT AND OTHER SELECTED FACTORS

The Population

In the course of this study the schools in the universe were grouped according to size and organizational level as outlined in the procedure for collecting data and then stratified random sampling was used to secure the cell populations. Size was stratified according to the number of classroom teacher units, with slight variation between elementary schools and those classified as secondary.

Small schools were defined as those having from one to eight teachers, middle-size schools as those having from nine to twenty-five (elementary) and nine to forty (junior high and senior high), and large schools as having twenty-six or more (elementary) and forty-one or more teachers (junior high and senior high).

Initial contact with the school administrator was established by letter and followed up by a personal visit. The purposes of the study were outlined and explained, and in most instances cooperation was secured.
With one major exception the school administrators who were unable to cooperate in the study were of two types: those who had already committed their teachers to other studies or were engaged in in-service programs at the time, and those who frankly explained that they did not sympathize with research studies. The major exception to these two types was a school system which had internal problems and a high level of anxiety about morale study.

A schedule was developed in the spring of 1960 for personal visitation to each of the schools sampled and cooperating in the study. Where possible, the teachers were brought together in faculty meeting for the testing period of approximately one hour duration. Where this was not possible, the instruments and instructions were distributed to the teachers participating and the materials were collected shortly afterward. In no case was less than 50 per cent of the faculty involved in the testing.

It was strongly stressed that all of the data accumulated in the study was to be kept strictly confidential. Code numbers instead of names were utilized for schools and for individual teachers, and this anonymity is maintained in the reporting of this study.

Three instruments were completed by the respondents:
(1) the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire,
(2) the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, and (3) the
Personal and Professional Data Inventory. Personal data included sex, age, marital status, religious affiliation, and parents' vocation. Professional data included salary, teaching experience, school size, school organization, type (elementary), and education.

Table VI, below, illustrates the nine-cell breakdown of the school population in the study according to organizational type and the number participating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Per Cent of Units Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Size</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Size</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Size</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While a very small percentage of the middle-size elementary schools in the universe were used in the study, it may be seen in Table VI that a very high percentage of the
units in the small junior high cell were used. This disparity in percentages was due entirely to the number of schools in the cells.

As stated in Chapter I (p. 8) a minimum of forty teachers was utilized in each of the nine cells, and with a minimum of two schools in each cell. Table VII, below, illustrates the number of respondents in each cell.

**TABLE VII**

**NUMBER OF TEACHERS COMPOSING POPULATION, TOTAL NUMBER IN EACH GROUP, AND THE NUMBER AND PER CENT DESCRIBING EACH SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Per Cent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Size</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Size</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Size</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4310</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total number of teachers in each cell of the universe is an approximation, derived from figures supplied by school administrators and/or their secretaries. This means that the percentage responding is also an approximation.*

The percentage of teacher respondents shown in Table VII varies from 4.7 per cent in the cell for middle-size
elementary schools to 65.1 per cent in the cell for the small junior high group. As in Table VI this disparity in percentages is seen to result from the fact that one cell contains 870 teacher units while the other cell contains only 63, with only a few small school districts organized on a junior high basis.

Among the instruments employed in this study was the Personal and Professional Data Inventory (Appendix B), which elicited such data as sex, age, marital status, salary, teaching experience, and others.

Approximately three out of four of the respondents in the study were female teachers. Less than 10 per cent were under twenty-five years of age, while nearly 6 per cent were over fifty-five years of age. The remaining age groups were equally spread among the other 85 per cent. Over three out of four of the persons assisting in the study were married, with slightly over 14 per cent single and approximately 7 per cent either widowed or divorced. Ninety-three per cent of the respondents were of a Protestant faith, with nearly 2 per cent of the Catholic faith and over 4 per cent reporting a faith not specified in the inventory. There were none of the Jewish faith reporting. Relative to parents' vocations, there appeared to be an even spread among the types listed, with over 18 per cent listing a vocation in the "other" category. Inspection of those that were specified indicated that a majority of
those cited in this category were farmers. The results of the tabulation of these personal data are illustrated in Table VIII, below.

### Table VIII
**Personal Data of the Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data of Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Vocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietor, Manager</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk, Salesman</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Worker</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled Worker</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Worker</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sum of per cents does not always equal 100.0 because of rounding.
The results of the tabulation of the professional data of the respondents are illustrated in Table IX, below.

**TABLE IX**

**PROFESSIONAL DATA OF THE RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data of Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-15 years</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 25 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State minimum</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above state minimum</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra pay for extra duties</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than bachelor's degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Master's degree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Elementary only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self contained</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platoon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sum of per cents does not always equal 100.0 because of rounding.

Less than 5 per cent of the respondents had taught less than one year, and nearly 8 per cent more than
twenty-five years. The middle categories of teaching experience were about evenly distributed, with 26 per cent teaching from seven to fifteen years. Relative to the annual salary scale, over 47 per cent received the state minimum salary under the Foundation program, with almost as many receiving pay above the minimum scale. Over 5 per cent reported extra pay for extra duties. Over 64 per cent of the respondents in the study held the bachelor's degree only, while 29 per cent reported the master's degree. Of the 125 elementary school respondents, 83 per cent reported the self-contained classroom type, with 15 per cent reporting the departmental type and one not responding. None reported to be utilizing the platoon type of elementary school organization.

Teacher Morale and Teacher-Pupil Rapport

The teacher morale and teacher-pupil rapport data collected during the spring of 1960 were assimilated from the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, and the Personal and Professional Data Inventory and processed through the IBM "704" computer at Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College. As projected in Chapter I (p. 9), coefficients of correlation using the Pearson product-moment technique were computed between teacher morale as measured by the Group Dimensions
Descriptions Questionnaire and teacher ability to establish rapport with pupils as measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. The results of these computations, both of total and factorial scores, are presented in Table X, below.

**TABLE X**

**CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TEACHER MORALE AND TEACHER–PUPIL RAPPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Morale Factors and Total</th>
<th>Teacher–Pupil Rapport Factors** and Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratification</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic Tone</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potency</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscidity</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeability</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneity</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The morale factors are listed above in the order of their inclusion on the scoring key.

**The teacher–pupil rapport factors listed above are: (1) moral status, (2) discipline, (3) principles of child development, (4) personal reactions of teachers, and (5) principles of education.

In Table X the most meaningful single correlation of coefficient is that calculated between the total morale
score and the total teacher-rapport score. This $r$ is seen to be .274. In order to test the null hypothesis (Chapter I, p. 2) that there is no correlation between teacher morale and teacher ability to establish rapport with pupils, the critical ratio ($r$) was calculated from the formula:

$$ GR = \frac{r-0}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-1}}} $$

From substitution in this formula, the critical ratio for the $r$ between teacher morale and teacher ability to establish rapport with pupils was established as 5.21. The hypothesis that there is no difference is thus rejected at better than the .01 level of significance.

This indication of a high level of significance between teacher morale and teacher-pupil rapport supports Watson's findings cited in Chapter I (pp. 4-5), who observed that characteristics of good interpersonal relationships within groups seemed to promote high morale, while a lack of such good relationships seemed to damage high individual and group morale.

Klein, also cited in Chapter I (p. 5), observed in his study that morale seems to be very closely related to mental attitude and mental hygiene. Further he stated that
difficulties with individual and group morale seemed to be rooted in the social environment, and that personal relationships, as those which exist in the classroom situation, were seen to be the pivot for good mental health and attitudes. The findings of this study relative to the $r$ of .274 between teacher morale and teacher-pupil rapport seem to support the thesis established by Watson, Klein, and other investigators.

Of the thirteen morale factors in Table X, correlations were highest with the teacher-pupil rapport variable relative to hedonic tone (.35), stability (.32), viscosity (.30), and participation (.27).

Hedonic tone is defined in Chapter II (p. 28) as the degree to which group membership is accompanied by a general feeling of pleasantness or agreeableness. It is reflected by the frequency of conviviality and laughter and by the absence of complaining and grumbling. Hedonic tone would seem to reflect several of the vital characteristics involved in the establishment of teacher-pupil rapport in the classroom situation, and the high positive correlation between it and the rapport variable supports this idea.

Stability is defined in Chapter II (p. 29) as the degree to which a group persists over a period of time with essentially the same characteristics. It would seem that stability in the school situation would be closely related
to good interpersonal relationships among both teachers and pupils. This is suggested in Steinbrook's study cited in Chapter II. He observes that teacher success and over-all attitude toward the profession is more closely related to wholesome attitudes toward pupils, consistency, and constructiveness than to many other factors. He states further that failure in the classroom, and subsequent morale difficulties, tends to be associated with teachers who are annoyed with a greater number of aspects of the classroom situation and pupils' behavior characteristics. Teachers who tend to be annoyed by trivialities, Steinbrook adds, are also given to inconsistencies and instability. The findings of this study seem to bear out these points.

Vicispidity is defined in Chapter II (p. 30) as the degree to which members of the staff function as a unit. It is reflected by absence of dissension and personal conflict among individual group members, by absence of activities serving to advance only the interests of individual members, by the ability of the group to resist disrupting forces, and by the belief on the part of the members that the group, whether faculty or class, does function as a unit. Aaron, cited in Chapter II (p. 44), stated in her study that there was a significant difference between teacher-pupil rapport established in a permissive emotional climate and in an autocratic emotional climate.
This high positive relationship between viscosity and teacher-pupil rapport indicates agreement between the findings of this study and those of Aaron.

Participation is defined in Chapter II (p. 29) as the degree to which members of the faculty apply time and effort to group activities. This factor is highly significant in the establishment of good interpersonal relationships and success in the classroom. This finding agrees with Stagner, cited in Chapter II (p. 19), who held that group morale and success were raised by the creation of a situation where group and individual goals coincide to the greatest possible extent.

Of the thirteen morale factors in Table X, correlations were lowest between the teacher-pupil rapport variable and control (-.37). This high negative correlation is seen to exist because the teacher-pupil rapport variable as measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, as discussed in Chapter II, assumes that the ability to establish and improve interpersonal relationships increases with permissiveness and decreases with autocracy and a rigid emotional climate. Studies by Wall, Beecher, Haggerty, Brookover, Gordon, Perkins, Rocchio, and others discussed in Chapters I and II bear out this positive relationship between teacher-pupil rapport and a mentally healthful, permissive classroom atmosphere. The
negative relationship between control and teacher-pupil rapport bears out the findings of the investigators cited and others as well. Teachers who tend to be more permissive in the classroom do not unduly regulate the behavior of pupils within the classroom, while they do encourage group-derived government (control) rather than the authoritarian type.

Of the thirteen morale factors in Table X, no apparent relationship seems to exist between teacher-pupil rapport and polarization (.01), potency (−.01), and homogeneity (.01). Potency is defined in Chapter II (p. 29) as the degree to which a group has primary significance for its members. Polarization is defined as the degree to which a group is oriented and works toward a single goal which is clear and specific to all members. Homogeneity is defined as the degree to which members of a group are similar with respect to socially relevant characteristics. It is reflected by relative uniformity of members with respect to age, sex, race, socio-economic status, interests, attitudes, and habits. With respect to these three morale factors which have been reflected as having a neutral relationship to teacher-pupil rapport: (1) polarization is minimized in the classroom situation where the teacher views each pupil's ability and needs individually and where a pupil is allowed to pursue the class goals at his own
speed and on his own level of attainment; (2) potency might seem to reflect some of the characteristics of teachers and groups who establish good interpersonal relationships, but the peculiar role of the school in the pupils' lives may account for this neutral relationship; (3) the very concept of free public education in the United States and the several localities explains the neutral correlation between homogeneity and teacher-pupil rapport. The pupils are neither homogeneous in background, socio-economic status, personality, nor interests and attitudes.

Table XI, below, presents the thirteen morale factor means and their stanine values. The stanine values are based on the distribution of raw scores describing 950 groups on each of the dimensions. In order to facilitate their interpretation, the raw scores on the thirteen morale dimensions of the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire were converted into normalized scores which are expressed in terms of stanines (standard nines). Stanine refers to one level of a standard nine and is used to specify scores based on a distribution with the following characteristics:

1. Stanine score 9 is assigned to raw scores that are grouped in the highest 4 per cent of the standard population.

2. Stanine score 8 is assigned to raw scores that are grouped in the next lower 7 per cent of the standard population.
3. Stanine score 7 is assigned to scores in the next 12 per cent.
4. Stanine score 6 is assigned to raw scores in the next lower 17 per cent.
5. Stanine score 5 is assigned to the next lower 20 per cent.
6. Stanine score 4 is assigned to the next lower 17 per cent.
7. Stanine score 3 is assigned to the next lower 12 per cent.
8. Stanine score 2 is assigned to the next lower 7 per cent.
9. Stanine score 1 is assigned to the lowest 4 per cent of raw scores based on the standard population.

TABLE XI
MORALE FACTORS, RAW SCORE MEANS, NUMBER OF ITEMS, AND STANINE VALUES FOR 374 RESPONDENTS IN THIS STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morale Factors</th>
<th>Items on the GDBQ</th>
<th>Raw Score Mean</th>
<th>Stanine Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42.09</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratification</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.78</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic Tone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potency</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49.52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscidity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.06</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeability</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.54</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.93</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.69</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.62</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is seen in Table XI that ten of the morale factor scores were assigned stanine values of 5, which represents the middle 20 per cent of the standard population or about average. Two morale factor scores were assigned stanine values of 6. Control and potency were assigned stanine values which placed them above 60 per cent and below 23 per cent of the standard population. Reflected in these two factors are: (1) the moderately high control of the school over the conduct of its teachers, and (2) the importance (potency) of the school unit to teachers as a group. It seems appropriate to stress here that the stanine values in Table XI include all of the raw scores of the 374 respondents, those who scored high and those who scored low on the instruments.

One morale factor score was assigned a stanine value of 4, which places the respondents in the study relative to intimacy above 23 per cent and below 60 per cent of the standard population. The school units represented in the data of Table XI included large school systems in which high intimacy among its members could not possibly occur. This also probably reflects moderately low intimacy among teachers in the middle-size and small schools who tend to be conservative in their relationships.

The extremely close grouping of the morale factor score values about the fifth stanine (middle 20 per cent)
seems to indicate two things: (1) the respondents in this study were very similar in many respects to those included in the standard population, since two of the five groups in the standard group were teachers with similar personal and professional backgrounds, and (2) with a more widely diversified use of the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire, more meaningful comparisons may be made between teachers and members of all types of groups.

Table XII, below, presents the five teacher-pupil rapport factor means and the total score mean with its standard deviation as measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. The total possible score ranged from -150 (Authoritarian) to 150 (Permissive). The total number of items on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory is 150, but several of the factor items overlap so that the total shown is not the sum of the test items.

**TABLE XII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher-Pupil Rapport Factors</th>
<th>Items on the MTAI</th>
<th>Raw Score Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral status</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-3.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of child development</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reactions of teachers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of education</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td><strong>11.97</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This mean for all groups combined corresponds to percentile ranks varying from slightly above the 50th down to the 15th, depending upon training, experience, and level of teaching (7).
From Table XII it is seen that the total teacher-pupil rapport variable mean is 11.97, which is nearly twelve points above the median in the direction of permissiveness. Discipline is the only factor mean which falls below the median and in the direction of authoritarianism. Moral status with the highest number of test items shows the highest mean with 3.04 for the 374 respondents in the study.

Teacher Morale and Personal and Professional Characteristics of Teachers

The findings of this study relative to teacher morale and the personal and professional characteristics of teachers are summarized in Tables XIII and XIV, below. The personal characteristics include sex, age, marital status, religious affiliation, and parents' vocation. Professional characteristics include teaching experience, annual salary, and education.

As projected in Chapter I (p. 11), analysis of variance, F ratio, is the statistic utilized to test: (1) the second hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between teacher morale and the personal characteristics of sex, age, marital status, religious affiliation, and parents' vocation which is not due to chance, and (2) the third hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between teacher morale
and professional characteristics of salary, teaching experience, and education which is not due to chance.

TABLE XIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TEACHER MORALE AND THE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF 374 TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>17721137.</td>
<td>53.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>371.</td>
<td>57534438.</td>
<td>806.</td>
<td>0.0658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>7553336.</td>
<td>2.9935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>23386614.</td>
<td>2.9935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>21949372.</td>
<td>877.</td>
<td>0.9777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>17900656.</td>
<td>877.</td>
<td>0.9777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 55</td>
<td>368.</td>
<td>4469412.</td>
<td>802.</td>
<td>0.9777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>10594347.</td>
<td>2.9935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>59137200.</td>
<td>2.9935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3054250.</td>
<td>610.</td>
<td>0.7060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2255487.</td>
<td>451.</td>
<td>0.7060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>368.</td>
<td>207025.</td>
<td>568.</td>
<td>0.7060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>70229904.</td>
<td>2.9935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>1635922.</td>
<td>451.</td>
<td>0.7060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>000000.</td>
<td>451.</td>
<td>0.7060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3036306.</td>
<td>759.</td>
<td>3.9161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>369.</td>
<td>365513.</td>
<td>777.</td>
<td>3.9161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' vocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>13832481.</td>
<td>2.9935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietor</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>15337844.</td>
<td>2.9935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk, salesman</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>9989556.</td>
<td>2.9935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled worker</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>12200868.</td>
<td>2.9935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>373.</td>
<td>5799826.</td>
<td>2.9935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>4170994.</td>
<td>695.</td>
<td>0.5497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>367.</td>
<td>14136326.</td>
<td>807.</td>
<td>0.5497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level of confidence.
Examination of Table XIII, above, indicates that only one of the five personal characteristics is significantly related to the morale of the 374 teacher respondents. Religious affiliation with a variance of 3.9161 is significant at better than the .01 level of confidence. However, examination of the respondents' data relative to this factor shows that seven teachers of the Catholic faith of the total 374 had a mean score of 433.4 as contrasted with 427.5 for two teachers who claimed no religious affiliation. With 348 respondents posting a mean of 449.2 and 16 respondents who checked the "other" space posting 435.6, it would seem hazardous to attach more than a possible significance to the mean score extremes posted by only 2 per cent of the respondents.

Sanford and Holt writing in the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (9, p. 94) stated that at least a moderate amount of stimulating ethico-religious ideals is necessary for high individual or group morale. This postulate seems to be borne out in the findings of this study, since the highest mean is represented by Catholics who are generally accepted to be devout, while the low extreme mean is represented by respondents who claimed no religious affiliation. Even with this possibility apparent, it seems expedient to view these findings as tentative because of the small number of respondents representing the extremes.
Sex with a variance of .0658 is not significant. The mean score for male respondents is 448.7, with a mean score of 449.3 for female respondents. This agrees with five studies in *The Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (?) which report neither positive nor negative relationships between sex and several aspects of teaching effectiveness. A variance of 3.02 was necessary for sex to be significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Age with a variance of .9777 is not significant. The mean score extremes were 458.1 for respondents under twenty-five years of age and 446.0 for respondents between forty-six and fifty-five years of age. A variance of 2.23 was necessary for age to reach a .05 level of significance.

Marital status with a variance of .7060 is not significant. The mean score extremes for other than two isolated cases were 452.8 for widowed respondents and 437.6 for divorced respondents. The only respondent who omitted this response posted the high mean of 458.0. A variance of 2.23 was necessary for significance at the .05 level of confidence. This finding agrees with that of Rocchio cited in Chapter II (p. 44) who concluded that there was no significance in the mean scores in his study relative to marital status.

Parents' vocation with a variance of .5497 was not significant. The mean scores for the various vocational
backgrounds were closely grouped, with sixty-seven respondents whose parents' vocation was professional in nature posting a mean of 454.4 and the respondents who checked the unskilled group posting a mean of 445.7. A variance of 2.12 was necessary for parents' vocation to be significant at the .05 level of confidence.

From the findings discussed above relative to teacher morale and the personal characteristics of teachers, it seems appropriate to accept the second hypothesis of this study which states that there is no significant relationship between teacher morale and the personal characteristics of sex, age, marital status, and parents' vocation. The part of the hypothesis relative to teacher morale and religious affiliation is tentatively rejected, with the reservations cited above.

Examination of Table XIV, below, illustrates that none of the professional characteristics of teachers is significantly related to teacher morale. Teaching experience with a variance of 1.1254 is not significant. The mean score extremes ranged from a high of 454.2 for respondents in the 7-15 year bracket to 440.8 for twenty-nine respondents who checked the bracket of over 25 years' experience. A variance of 2.12 would have been significant at the .05 level of confidence.
Salary with a variance of 2.2525 is not significant, although a variance of 2.62 would have been significant at the .05 level of confidence. Again the means were closely grouped, with 449.1 for 177 respondents reporting the annual state minimum, 448.3 both for 170 respondents reporting an annual salary above the state minimum and 20 respondents who reported extra pay for extra duties. The high mean was for 7 respondents who reported in the "other" category. These posted a mean of 476.4. Inspection of the instruments indicated a strong possibility that the 7 respondents were athletic coaches who might have been paid set stipends not based on a salary scale.

Educational level with a variance of only .4791 was not significant. The means relative to teacher morale and education ranged from a high of 458.0 for an unspecified respondent to 436.0 for 2 respondents with less than a bachelor's degree. The other means representing most of the respondents were 448.9 for 241 respondents with the bachelor's degree, 451.1 for 110 with the master's degree, and 443.4 for 20 with above the master's degree. A variance of 2.39 was necessary for significance at the .05 level of confidence. Table XIV, below, illustrates the professional characteristics of teachers relative to teacher morale.
TABLE XIV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TEACHER MORALE AND THE PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF 374 TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>3222025.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>15694361.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>14577300.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-15 years</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>20219459.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15929340.</td>
<td>900.</td>
<td>1.1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 years</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>5635540.</td>
<td>800.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td>35702237.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above state</td>
<td></td>
<td>34159115.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra pay for extra duties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4020354.</td>
<td>1788.</td>
<td>2.2525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1588889.</td>
<td>794.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
<td>380192.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>48557109.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>22387642.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above master's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3932071.</td>
<td>386.</td>
<td>0.4791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>209764.</td>
<td>806.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus from the findings discussed above relative to teacher morale and the professional characteristics of teaching experience, salary scale, and education, it seems appropriate to accept the third hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between teacher morale and professional characteristics of teachers which is not due to chance.
Teacher Morale and School Size, School Organization, and School Type (Elementary)

The findings of the assimilation and statistical treatment of the data in this study relative to teacher morale and school size, school organization, and school type (elementary) are presented in Table XV, below. The analysis of variance, F ratio, was again utilized to test: (1) hypothesis four which states that there is no significant relationship between the mean morale score and school size which is not due to chance, and (2) hypothesis five which states that there is no significant relationship between the mean morale score and school organizational level (elementary, junior high, and senior high) and type (elementary only) which is not due to chance.

It is observed that the thirty-three schools sampled for this study ranged in size from a one-teacher school to several schools with above fifty classroom teacher units. The morale score means were 451.4 for small schools, 450.9 for middle-sized schools, and 445.1 for large schools. Small schools were defined in Chapter I as those having from one to eight classroom teacher units, middle-sized schools as having from nine to twenty-five teachers (elementary) and nine to forty (junior high and senior high), and large schools as having twenty-six or more (elementary) and forty-one or more (junior high and senior high). The
range is seen to be only 6.3 for size, with small schools highest and large schools lowest in mean score.

The morale score mean was 446.3 for elementary schools, 447.3 for junior high schools, and 453.7 for senior high schools. The range in mean scores for organizational level is seen to be 7.4 with senior high schools highest and elementary schools lowest.

The highest single morale score mean among schools according to size and organizational level was 459.1 for the middle-size senior high cell. The lowest was 440.7 for the large elementary school cell. The range is seen to be 18.4.

**TABLE XV**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TEACHER MORALE AND SCHOOL SIZE, ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL, AND SCHOOL TYPE (ELEMENTARY)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>2892.9999</td>
<td>1446.4999</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3838.0000</td>
<td>1919.0000</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size and organization</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>7531.9999</td>
<td>1882.9999</td>
<td>2.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School type (elementary only)</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self contained</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20658730.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platoon</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>657805.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmentalized</td>
<td></td>
<td>4556630.</td>
<td>8267.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>195364.</td>
<td>721.</td>
<td>11.47**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**Significant at the .01 level of confidence.
On examination of Table XV, it is observed that the analysis of variance statistic, F ratio, establishes significant relationship between teacher morale and total school size and organizational level with a variance of 2.41, with a .05 level of confidence. School size with a variance of 1.85 is not significant by itself, and neither is school organization with a variance of 2.45.

The fourth hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between the mean morale score and school size is thus accepted, although it is observed again that size and organization combined do establish a variance at the required confidence level.

That part of the fifth hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between the mean morale score and school organizational level (elementary, junior high, and senior high) is also accepted.

That part of the fifth hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between the mean morale score and school type (elementary) is tentatively rejected because of the variance of 11.47, with a confidence level above .01. Examination of the data relative to elementary school type (self-contained, platoon, departmentalized, or other) reveals that 2 isolated cases checking the platoon type posted a mean morale score of 573.5, while the other types posted mean scores of 445.7
for 104 self-contained type, 455.5 for 20 departmentalized type, and 442.0 for the single respondent who checked the "other" category. Further examination of the respondents' instruments reveals that the two individuals who posted the very high mean morale score of 573.5 possibly were confused by the terminology. Hence, it is observed that the part of the fifth hypothesis relative to school type and teacher morale is rejected, but only tentatively and with caution. It is believed that further examination of this relationship is needed before any full acceptance is made.

It may be observed in summary of this chapter that the findings of this study generally agree with findings of other studies relative to the considerations and implications under investigation. It now follows that these conclusions and recommendations be set forth.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem with which this study was concerned was that of determining and analyzing the relationships between teacher morale and teacher ability to establish rapport with pupils and other selected variables. Instruments utilized included the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire for teacher morale, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory for teacher ability to establish rapport with pupils, and the Personal and Professional Data Inventory for other selected variable information.

The purpose of this study was to discover possible implications from a study of teacher morale and other variables cited above which might enable teachers and administrators to effect better working relationships among all members of the school, including teachers, administrators, and pupils.

The psychological construct of morale was found to be only moderately well established in professional literature. While the exact definitions of morale vary, there is general acceptance that morale can be measured and that it
is an integral part of success in any group endeavor. It is generally agreed that morale is not a static phenomenon, but that it is dynamic and consists of several factors. Morale and job efficiency are seen to be fairly closely related.

The interrelationships within the school and the classroom are seen to be vital to the success both of the individuals involved and the educational purposes of the school. It seems to be generally accepted in the professional literature that rapport between and among individuals can be measured and that it is not static but dynamic in nature. It is often observed that the relationship between the teacher and the pupil is one of the most important factors in the success or failure they achieve together. In this relationship, there is mutual dependency.

The qualities of the teacher which seem to contribute to the ability to establish a good working relationship include:

1. a democratic attitude
2. patience
3. helpfulness
4. consideration for the individual
5. flexibility
6. interest in pupils and their problems
7. consistency
8. a certain amount of devotion to the total school program.

The Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation between teacher morale and ability to establish rapport with pupils was calculated to be .274. From this a critical ratio was computed to be 5.21. This established a level of significance at better than .001.

Moderately high correlations of coefficient were computed between several teacher morale factors and teacher-pupil rapport. These included: hedonic tone (.35), stability (.32), viscosity (.30), and participation (.27). A high negative correlation between teacher-pupil rapport and the morale factor of control was established (-.37). Very low correlations were seen between teacher-pupil rapport and polarization (.01), potency (-.01), and homogeneity (.01).

Correlations of coefficient between teacher morale and the teacher-pupil rapport factors were: principles of child development (.18), personal reactions of teachers (.14), principles of education (.16), discipline (.20), and moral status (.11).

Raw score means were computed for the thirteen morale factors and stanine value scores assigned for interpretation. Ten of the factors were assigned stanine scores of 5
which is the middle 20 per cent of the standard population. Two factors were assigned stanine scores of 6, which placed them above 60 per cent and below 23 per cent of the standard population. One factor was assigned a stanine score of 4, which placed it above 23 per cent of the standard population and below 60 per cent. The close grouping of the morale factor scores about the 5th (middle) stanine seemed to indicate: (1) that the respondents were similar to members of the standard population, and (2) that the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire may be utilized in a more meaningful way when widely diversified use has been made of the instrument by groups.

Teacher-pupil rapport factor score means were computed and found to be: 2.34 (principles of child development), 2.19 (personal reactions of teachers), 1.70 (principles of education), -3.59 (discipline), and 8.04 (moral status). The total mean score for teacher-pupil rapport as measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was calculated to be 11.97, with a standard deviation of 13.51.

Analysis of variance, the F ratio, was utilized to calculate the significant relationship between teacher morale and the personal and professional characteristics of teachers. The results and level of significance included: sex, .0658 (not significant); age, .9777 (not significant); marital status, .7060 (not significant); religious
affiliation, 3.9161 (significant at the .01 level); parents' vocation, .5497 (not significant); teaching experience, 1.1254 (not significant); annual salary, 2.2525 (not significant); and education, .4791 (not significant).

Analysis of variance, the F ratio, was also utilized to calculate the significant relationship between teacher morale and school size, school organization, and school type (elementary). The results were: size, 1.85 (not significant); organization, 2.45 (not significant); school size and school organization, 2.41 (significant at the .05 level); school type (elementary only), 11.47 (significant at better than the .01 level).

Conclusions

From the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered in this study, with the recognition of limited progress in this area of instrument development, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. There exists a positive relationship between teacher morale and the ability to establish rapport with pupils.

2. There exists no apparent relationship between teacher morale and personal characteristics of sex, age, marital status, and parents' vocation.
3. There appears to exist a positive relationship between religious affiliation and teacher morale, although the data of this study are not deemed sufficient to establish completely this relationship.

4. There exists no apparent relationship between teacher morale and professional characteristics of teaching experience, annual salary, and education.

5. There exists no apparent relationship between teacher morale and school size.

6. There exists no apparent relationship between teacher morale and school organization.

7. There exists an apparent positive relationship between the combination of size and organizational level and teacher morale.

8. There appears to exist a positive relationship between teacher morale and school type (elementary), but the data of this study are not deemed sufficient to establish completely this relationship.

9. Evidence seems to support the concept that morale is a multi-factored variable, and this study tentatively accepts the Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire as an acceptable means of ascertaining the morale dimensions of groups.

10. There exists a vital responsibility on the part of personnel administrators to scrutinize closely the
personality characteristics of prospective teachers and those in the school system to eliminate those mentally and emotionally unsuitable to work with pupils.

11. There exists a joint responsibility of faculty and administration continually to study teacher morale and attempt to improve it.

It is hoped that the conclusions from this study will assist in the improvement of teacher morale and the educational offering in schools throughout the country.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that public school administrators in charge of personnel additions more closely scrutinize the personality characteristics of prospective teacher employees, so that more pronounced deviates and chronic misfits may be eliminated from the teaching profession.

2. It is recommended that administrative and teacher committees be more cognizant of the morale implications within the school system and with the schools, and that at appropriate intervals outside personnel be brought in to sample and evaluate the morale level of the school personnel.

3. It is recommended that teachers who have persistent difficulties with personal relationships among
faculty members and pupils be counseled by appropriate persons, either to improve the situation by mutual concern and effort or eliminate those teachers who are surely a damaging influence on pupils.

4. It is strongly recommended that state officials and school administrators strive for adequate salary schedules so that qualified personnel may be secured and retained and those who are not qualified may be dismissed.

5. The data and analysis encompassed in this study seem to suggest that the following studies be made:

   (1) that of the relationships between teacher morale and religious affiliation.

   (2) that of the relationships between teacher morale and school type (elementary: self-contained, platoon, departmentalized, et cetera).

   (3) that of the relationships between teacher morale and the teacher self-concept.

   (4) that of teacher morale and its relationship to teaching effectiveness, particularly with respect to the use of case studies.

The findings of this study seem to justify the views of those educators who have and are currently working for added attention and resources for the schools of the nation. It is deemed appropriate to press for continued constructive criticism of school situations which, because
of this lack of attention and resources, daily are threatening the mental health of countless American school children.
APPENDIX A
Group Dimensions Descriptions Questionnaire

by John K. Hemphill
and
Charles M. Westie

This test was developed during the course of research conducted by the Personnel Research Board Laboratory, Ohio State University. It is distributed for the authors by Educational Testing Service for experimental purposes only. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction or use prohibited. Copyright 1956 by John K. Hemphill and Charles M. Westie.
The questions which follow make it possible to describe objectively certain characteristics of social groups. The items simply describe characteristics of groups; they do not judge whether the characteristic is desirable or undesirable. Therefore, in no way are the questions to be considered a "test" either of the groups or of the person answering the questions. We simply want an objective description of what the group is like.

1. The group has well understood but unwritten rules concerning member conduct.
2. Members fear to express their real opinions.
3. The only way a member may leave the group is to be expelled.
4. No explanation need be given by a member wishing to be absent from the group.
5. An individual's membership can be dropped should he fail to live up to the standards of the group.
6. Members of the group work under close supervision.
7. Only certain kinds of ideas may be expressed freely within the group.
8. A member may leave the group by resigning at any time he wishes.
9. A request made by a member to leave the group can be refused.
10. A member has to think twice before speaking in the group's meetings.
11. Members are occasionally forced to resign.
12. The members of the group are subject to strict discipline.
13. The group is rapidly increasing in size.
14. Members are constantly leaving the group.
15. There is a large turnover of members within the group.
16. Members are constantly dropping out of the group but new members replace them.
17. During the entire time of the group's existence no member has left.
18. Each member's personal life is known to other members of the group.
19. Members of the group lend each other money.
20. A member has the chance to get to know all other members of the group.
21. Members are not in close enough contact to develop likes or dislikes for one another.
22. Members of the group do small favors for one another.
23. All members know each other very well.
24. Each member of the group knows all other members by their first names.
25. Members are in daily contact either outside or within the group.
26. Members of the group are personal friends.
27. Certain members discuss personal affairs among themselves.
28. Members of the group know the family backgrounds of other members of the group.
29. Members address each other by their first names.
30. The group is made up of individuals who do not know each other well.
31. The opinions of all members are considered as equal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directions Summarized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A = Definitely true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = Mostly true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = Both true and false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = Mostly false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E = Definitely false</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. The group's officers hold a higher status in the group than other members.

33. The older members of the group are granted special privileges.

34. The group is controlled by the actions of a few members.

35. Every member of the group enjoys the same group privileges.

36. Experienced members are in charge of the group.

37. Certain problems are discussed only among the group's officers.

38. Certain members have more influence on the group than others.

39. Each member of the group has as much power as any other member.

40. An individual's standing in the group is determined only by how much he gets done.

41. Certain members of the group hold definite office in the group.

42. The original members of the group are given special privileges.

43. Personal dissatisfaction with the group is too small to be brought up.

44. Members continually grumble about the work they do for the group.

45. The group does its work with no great vim, vigor, or pleasure.

46. A feeling of failure prevails in the group.

47. There are frequent intervals of laughter during group meetings.

48. The group works independently of other groups.

49. The group has support from outside.

50. The group is an active representative of a larger group.

51. The group's activities are influenced by a larger group of which it is a part.

52. People outside the group decide on what work the group is to do.

53. The group follows the examples set by other groups.

54. The group is one of many similar groups which form one large organization.

55. The things the group does are approved by a group higher up.

56. The group joins with other groups in carrying out its activities.

57. The group is a small part of a larger group.

58. The group is under outside pressure.

59. Members are disciplined by an outside group.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.
60. Plans of the group are made by other groups above it.

61. The members allow nothing to interfere with the progress of the group.

62. Members gain a feeling of being honored by being recognized as one of the group.

63. Membership in the group is a way of acquiring general social status.

64. Failure of the group would mean little to individual members.

65. The activities of the group take up less than ten per cent of each member’s waking time.

66. Members gain in prestige among outsiders by joining the group.

67. A mistake by one member of the group might result in hardship for all.

68. The activities of the group take up over ninety per cent of each member’s waking time.

69. Membership in the group serves as an aid to vocational advancement.

70. Failure of the group would mean nothing to most members.

71. Each member would lose his self-respect if the group should fail.

72. Membership in the group gives members a feeling of superiority.

73. The activities of the group take up over half the time each member is awake.

74. Failure of the group would lead to embarrassment for members.

75. Members are not rewarded for effort put out for the group.

76. There are two or three members of the group who generally take the same side on any group issue.

77. Certain members are hostile to other members.

78. There is constant bickering among members of the group.

79. Members know that each one looks out for the other one as well as for himself.

80. Certain members of the group have no respect for other members.

81. Certain members of the group are considered uncooperative.

82. There is a constant tendency toward conniving against one another among parts of the group.

83. Members of the group work together as a team.

84. Certain members of the group are responsible for petty quarrels and some animosity among other members.

85. There are tensions between sub-groups which tend to interfere with the group’s activities.

86. Certain members appear to be incapable of working as part of the group.

87. There is an undercurrent of feeling among members which tends to pull the group apart.

88. Anyone who has sufficient interest in the group to attend its meetings is considered a member.

89. The group engages in membership drives.
Directions Summarized
A = Definitely true
B = Mostly true
C = Both true and false
D = Mostly false
E = Definitely false

90. New members are welcomed to the group on the basis "the more the merrier."

91. A new member may join only after an old member resigns.

92. A college degree is required for membership in the group.

93. A person may enter the group by expressing a desire to join.

94. Anyone desiring to enter the group is welcome.

95. Membership is open to anyone willing to further the purpose of the group.

96. Prospective members are carefully examined before they enter the group.

97. No applicants for membership in the group are turned down.

98. No special training is required for membership in the group.

99. Membership depends upon the amount of education an individual has.

100. People interested in joining the group are asked to submit references which are checked.

101. There is a high degree of participation on the part of members.

102. If a member of the group is not productive he is not encouraged to remain.

103. Work of the group is left to those who are considered most capable for the job.

104. Members are interested in the group but not all of them want to work.

105. The group has a reputation for not getting much done.

106. Each member of the group is on one or more active committees.

107. The work of the group is well divided among members.

108. Every member of the group does not have a job to do.

109. The work of the group is frequently interrupted by having nothing to do.

110. There are long periods during which the group does nothing.

111. The group is directed toward one particular goal.

112. The group divides its efforts among several purposes.
113. The group operates with sets of conflicting plans.

114. The group has only one main purpose.

115. The group knows exactly what it is to get done.

116. The group is working toward many different goals.

117. The group does many things that are not directly related to its main purpose.

118. Each member of the group has a clear idea of the group's goals.

119. The objective of the group is specific.

120. Certain members meet for one thing and others for a different thing.

121. The group has major purposes which to some degree are in conflict.

122. The objectives of the group have never been clearly recognized.

123. The group is very informal.

124. A list of rules and regulations is given to each member.

125. The group has meetings at regularly scheduled times.

126. The group is organized along semi-military lines.

127. The group's meetings are not planned or organized.

128. The group has an organization chart.

129. The group has rules to guide its activities.

130. The group is staffed according to a table of organization.

131. The group keeps a list of names of members.

132. Group meetings are conducted according to "Robert's Rules of Order."

133. There is a recognized right and wrong way of going about group activities.

134. Most matters that come up before the group are voted upon.

135. The group meets any place that happens to be handy.

136. Members of the group are from the same social class.

137. The members of the group vary in amount of ambition.

138. Some members are interested in altogether different things than other members.
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Directions Summarized
A = Definitely true
B = Mostly true
C = Both true and false
D = Mostly false
E = Definitely false

139. The group contains members with widely varying backgrounds.
140. The group contains whites and Negroes.
141. Members of the group are all about the same age.
142. A few members of the group have greater ability than others.
143. A number of religious beliefs are represented by members of the group.
144. Members of the group vary greatly in social background.
145. All members of the group are of the same sex.
146. The ages of members range over a period of at least 20 years.
147. Members come into the group with quite different family backgrounds.
148. Members of the group vary widely in amount of experience.
149. Members vary in the number of years they have been in the group.
150. The group includes members of different races.
DIRECTIONS:

Record your answer to each of the items on the answer sheet which is furnished you for that purpose. Make no marks on the question booklet itself. Be sure that you are using the special I.B.M. pencil provided for use with the answer sheet.

In considering each item go through the following steps:

1. Read the item carefully.
2. Think about how well the item tells something about the group you are describing.
3. Find the number on the answer sheet which corresponds with the number of the item you are considering.
4. After each number on the answer sheet you will find five pairs of dotted lines lettered A, B, C, D, or E.

   If the item you are considering tells something about the group which is definitely true blacken the space between the pair of dotted lines headed by A.

   If the item you are considering tells something which is mostly true, blacken the space between the pair of lines headed by B.

   If the item tells something which is to an equal degree both true and false, or you are undecided about whether it is true or false, blacken the space between the pair of lines headed by C.

   If the item you are considering tells something which is mostly false, blacken the space between the pair of lines headed by D.

   If the item you are considering tells something about the group which is definitely false, blacken the space between the pair of dotted lines headed by E.

5. When blackening the space between a pair of lines, fill in all the space with a heavy black line from the special I.B.M. pencil. If you should make an error in marking your answer, erase thoroughly the mark you made and then indicate the correct answer.

6. In rare cases where you believe that an item does not apply at all to the group or you feel that you do not have sufficient information to make any judgment concerning what the item tells about the group, leave that item blank.

7. After you have completed one item, proceed to the next one in order. You may have as long as you need to complete your description. Be sure the number on the answer sheet corresponds with the number of the item being answered in the booklet.
CODE NUMBER

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA INVENTORY

Directions: Please check in the appropriate blank spaces below. Remember that all of the information given on this inventory and the instruments to follow is coded by number and will remain completely anonymous.

Personal Data

1. Sex
   1) Male
   2) Female

2. Age
   1) Under 25
   2) 25 to 35
   3) 36 to 45
   4) 46 to 55
   5) Above 55

3. Marital Status
   1) Single
   2) Married
   3) Divorced
   4) Widowed
   5) Other (Specify)

4. Religious Affiliation
   1) Protestant
   2) Catholic
   3) Jew
   4) None
   5) Other (Specify)

Professional Data

6. Teaching Experience
   1) Less than 1 year
   2) 1 to 3 years
   3) 4 to 6 years
   4) 7 to 15 years
   5) 16 to 25 years
   6) Over 25 years

7. Annual Salary
   1) Minimum state salary
   2) Above minimum state salary
   3) Extra pay for extra duties
   4) Other (Specify)

8. Education
   1) Below Bachelor's degree
   2) Bachelor's degree
   3) Master's degree
   4) Above Master's degree

9. Organization Type (Elementary teachers only)
   1) Self-contained primarily
   2) Platoon primarily
   3) Departmentalized primarily
   4) Other (Specify)
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Articles

Baxter, Bernice, "Rating Teachers' Personal Effectiveness," Journal of the National Education Association, XXVII (March, 1938), 81.

Callis, Robert, "The Efficiency of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory for Predicting Interpersonal Relations in the Classroom," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, XXXVII (February, 1955), 85.


Haggerty, M. E., "The Crux of the Prognosis Problem," *School and Society*, XXXV (1932), 545-549.


Marx, M. H., "Intervening Variable or Hypothetical Construct?" Psychological Review, LVIII (1951), 235-247.


Publications of Learned Organizations


Monographs


Halpin, Andrew W., The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents, Monograph Series No. 4, School of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1956.

Hemphill, John K., Group Dimensions, Research Monograph No. 87, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1956.


Unpublished Materials


Roth, Lester James, "A Technique for Determining the Sources of Teacher Job Dissatisfactions," unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1956.

