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CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The systems and institutions of education are under severe attack by the clients they are supposed to serve. While student protests and riots in colleges and universities have been more numerous than disorders in the high schools and have been given more coverage by the news media, disorders in the high schools have not gone unnoticed by responsible persons. Gregory R. Anrig, executive assistant to U.S. Education Commissioner James E. Allen Jr., headed a departmental subcommittee to study unrest in the nation's colleges and high schools, and reported in the summer of 1969 that "it is virtually the universal opinion of experts we have consulted that the colleges will continue to experience disruption, and that high schools will 'blow' on a scale that would make the recent university disruptions seem almost trivial." During the 1968-69-70 school years, news magazines and television news coverage have looked at unrest in the high schools and at innovative high school programs.

The avant-garde of writers to be concerned about the relevancy of public education would include such men as Holt, Kozol, Friedenberg, Kohl, and Goodman. Their writings reveal the dysfunctional

nature of public school education for large portions of the student population. Public education reflects, of course, our past cultural heritage, and the value systems of adult generations, much of which youth find very hypocritical. Halleck\(^2\) theorizes that the hypocrisies of the older generations have always been with us. In the good old days, children became gradually aware of these hypocrisies as they matured through adolescence; but today the various communication media expose children to the hard cynical facts of life even before they enter adolescence. They react negatively to them because they are unable to cope with them and their reaction takes the form of rejection and disdain for institutional authority: the home, the school, the law, and the establishment. But is it only a matter of hypocrisy? Is it not also a matter of changing basic value systems which would occur with or without the communication media?

There is a growing discontentment among youth for the roles they will likely play in the institutions of twentieth and twenty-first century America. They are disenchanted by the prospect that they will be swallowed up by the complexities of technology or the economic system of contemporary life. And then there is the matter of nationalism and the ever present, ugly, and to them purposeless war. Youth feels that nationalism, characteristic of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, is no longer an institution serving the best interests of mankind. And these students have their counterpart all around the world. Margaret Mead writes:

No longer bound by the simplified linear sequences dictated by the printed word, they live in a world in which events are presented to them in all their complex immediacy. In their eyes the killing of an enemy is not qualitatively different from the murder of a neighbor. They cannot reconcile our efforts to save our own children by every known means with our readiness to destroy the children of others with napalm. They know that the people of one nation alone cannot save their own children; each holds the responsibility for all others' children.  

J. Lloyd Trump writes:

The apparent adult interest in war rather than peace, in profits rather than service, in wheeling and dealing rather than legal methods, and so on, mirrors a hypocrisy that young idealists abhor.  

Their value systems are becoming more humanistic and other-oriented. And doing one's thing is not inconsistent with that orientation. When he is doing his thing, he is still functioning within the new universe of humanism and other-oriented values. For example, a decade ago one would have been thought quite bizarre if upon graduation from college he had tripped off to some desolate corner of the United States (VISTA) or the world (Peace Corps) to help some forgotten group of people find a healthier, more productive way of life. A decade ago, had one dropped out of college for a term or two because he wasn't quite sure what he wanted to do with his life he would have been judged by the academic community, and by many still, to be very unstable, indecisive and not likely to succeed at anything. Now colleges are building into their curricula opportunities for human and vocational encounters (the year abroad, the work-term, and the

---


early direct experience in teacher education.) The new order is to succeed on your own terms or those of the new youth subculture and not those of the adult establishment. The new order is to change existing institutions to bring them more in line with the new universe of humanism and other-oriented value systems. The question is whether youth will be able and permitted to renew and regenerate institutions without first destroying them. The Weathermen say 'no'; the Future Teachers of America probably say 'yes.'

Who are these students? For obvious reasons some of them are black. But this research is not about them. This research is about the students who come from successful and affluent upper and middle class white homes. Describing students from New Trier High School in the successful, affluent, educationally progressive atmosphere of Winnetka, Illinois, Wallace Roberts writes:

...the kids of Winnetka are scared, not afraid, but scared, scared to move, to breathe, to live. Not of the bomb, population explosion, famine, black riots, pollution, political repression, Vietnam, or even the draft. They are scared of what they know in the pit of their guts, something that has never been taught them in school or at home: that for them there is no comfort, that continuance is only one possibility, that survival is no longer a matter of personal challenge but of depersonalized threats, that the molds into which they are being forced by parents, schools, and community simply will not fit, that Winnetka, careers, the country club life, the volunteer service with the Junior League, none of that will allow them the same comfort it has afforded their parents.\(^5\)

Nicholas Pileggi describing students active in the underground high school newspapers writes:

They are overwhelmingly white, the children of the comfortable middle class, the bright, scholastically superior progeny of handwringing executives, merchants, dentists, and school teachers.

These students have the ability, the background, and the parental backing to succeed in the systems their parents dominate, but they choose otherwise.

The purpose of these underground newspapers is the realization of student power and involvement in reshaping the adult universe of values presently alien to the youth subculture.

The underground press is, at first, an escape from the carefully delineated boundaries of school activity and opinion. Not surprisingly, therefore, the newest papers tend to be the most ambitious in scope, boldly taking on the great issues in the national arena....

In their open horror and bewilderment over the happenings in the society, the articles in these papers tend to emotional or moralistic generalizations, very serious but simple truths. They convey the teenagers' sense of the outrages happening out there in the world, but also their inability—and lack of equipment—to come to grips with problems that are so vast, so complex, so distant from their own lives.

More specifically, they are concerned with the inadequacies of the educational systems. One article in an underground newspaper began, "We must wipe out this school of death. We must wipe out those teachers of death, we must wipe out this education of death." This sort of copy is, of course, not very welcomed in the schools.

The underground newspaper, dismissed as a potential tool by school administrators in spite of the student initiative and social concern it displays, teaches in another way. As they seek to express their opinions, the students discover that unlike their parents, their college counterparts, the man on the radio or

---


8 Pileggi, Phi Delta Kappan, p. 561.
Inevitably the question of freedom of speech guaranteed by the first amendment is raised, and while the U.S. Supreme Court has not yet specifically ruled on a school newspaper case, it has ruled in another case involving political expression by high school students while the students are in school. In 1969 the Court invalidated a school regulation against the wearing of black armbands by students in school to signify the students' opposition to the Vietnam War. The Court said the freedom of speech exercised did not intrude upon the work of the school or the rights of other students. In 1966 the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, decided two cases on the same day involving political activity in school. In one case the Court ruled that school authorities could not prohibit students wearing buttons which read "One Man, One Vote." In the other case, the Court upheld school authorities in prohibiting the wearing of buttons because the situation created a general disturbance. The latter case raises the question whether one man may not abridge another man's freedom of speech by simply reacting violently to anything he might say. Many attorneys feel that the Supreme Court ruling on black armbands will make it more difficult for school authorities to censor student publications, purge school libraries or curricula of "objectionable" materials, or discipline student protestors.

---

9 Divoky, Saturday Review, p. 84.
11 Burnside v. Byors, 363 F2d 744 (5Cir. 1966).
12 Blackwell v. Issaquena County Board of Education, 363 F2d, 749 (5Cir. 1966).
13 Pileggi, Phi Delta Kappan, p. 552.
Ira Glasser, associate director of the New York Civil Liberties Union, has stated: "In the classroom we teach freedom, but the organization is totalitarian. The kids learn that when the values of freedom and order conflict, freedom recedes."...They now have their own gut-level issue, with all its complexities and subtleties. Unwittingly, the school system has given injustice the relevance the students themselves could not.

Once students begin to see the school as bankrupt, manipulative bureaucracy—and themselves as its most vulnerable victims—the stage is set for the real student movement. 14

During the summer of 1969, the Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, Inc., the College Entrance Examination Board, and the Danforth Foundation sponsored a workshop attended by public school officials and representatives of professional education associations. The workshop recommended:

1) Every school system should anticipate student activism in advance and develop a coping strategy based upon sound information on the issues of rights and privileges of students.
2) The development of new curricula of diversity, integrity, and relevance with particular treatment to the question of education for knowledge of self.
3) Viable programs of independent study taking into consideration that the knowledge which is of most worth is that which is self-learned.
4) Deliberate use of the confrontation as an administrative strategy and the development of a repertoire of techniques for coping with this type of dialogue.
5) A reaffirmation of national goals by a national group such as a President's Commission on National Goals.
6) A new focus on both school system and local school goals.
7) Secondary schools should recognize that youth needs experience in volunteer service as an avenue to adventure and an outlet for its restlessness and enthusiasm. Opportunities for service should be an integral part of the school program.
8) When a situation becomes acute and disruption appears imminent the schools should avail themselves of the concept of the ombudsman. 15

14 Divoky, Saturday Review, p. 89.
Youth seeks changes and the adult generations believe that youth should change slowly until they understand better the complexities of the system. The conflict often is expressed in terms as unimportant as the style of student dress. Ethnocentrism, discussed more fully in Chapter II, is the tendency to be rigid in the acceptance of the culturally alike and in the rejection of the culturally unlike. Ethnocentrism in the form of dress codes is a plague upon our public schools today, consuming a great deal of valuable administrative time and at the least increasing the probability of developing in students shallow, ethnocentric value systems of beliefs. The following quotation appeared in the daily edition of a southwestern Ohio newspaper.

The *** Board of Education met... and heard the report of the Dress Code Committee,... The report was accepted unanimously....

It is the purpose of the Board of Education to maintain good order and discipline to facilitate the educational process without attempting to infringe unnecessarily on the rights of individuals.

Boys' hair styles should be above the collar, the ear, and the eyes. 10

The United States Supreme Court, having previously ruled on such a matter, refused an appeal from a school principal on a decision in which both the District Court and The First Circuit Court of Appeals had ruled that regulations governing hair length were violations of the due process clause of the United States Constitution. The Appeals Court passed over the plaintiff's (the student's) attack on the lack of specific regulations, stating that parents and students alike were aware of the fact that long

hair was not permitted, and proceeded directly to the constitutional issue. ...explicitly rejected any attempt to base the decision on either the First Amendment or on the "right of privacy"...held that the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment "established a sphere of personal liberty for every individual, subject to reasonable intrusions by the state in furtherance of legitimate state interests."

The Court was unable to find any state interest which justified the prohibition in question. "We see no inherent reason why decency, decorum, or good conduct requires a boy to wear his hair short. Certainly eccentric hair styling is no longer a reliable signal of perverse behavior. We do not believe that mere unattractiveness in the eyes of some parents, teachers, or students, short of uncleanliness, can justify the proscription. Nor...does such compelled conformity to conventional standards of appearance seem a justifiable part of the educational process." (Richard v. Thurston, Civil No. 7455; (1st Cir., April 28, 1970)

The newspaper account and the federal court decision are evidence of the ethnocentric element of the authoritarian character of some boards of education. But, the reader may suggest, the board of education will not adopt such a policy once it is cognizant of the Supreme Court's decision. The history of school boards across the country following the Brown decision of 1954 in regard to school integration will not support that claim. And they were given encouragement from high political places. Barry Goldwater said:

I am therefore not impressed by the claim that the Supreme Court's decision on school integration is the law of the land.18

And the student who has just been accused of wrong-doing for his participation in a campus demonstration will ask, "Where does law


and order begin?" The main concern, then, of the problem in this study was the determination of some of the causes of student alienation. Of particular concern is whether there is some subtle social psychological relationship in the elementary school experience just preceding the student's entry into the secondary school. Is it possible to detect and measure latent negative attitudes toward some experience in the elementary school?

Where really does the revolution begin? Is it not highly probable that a combination of genetic and environmental characteristics and circumstances are combining to set the stage for the adolescent revolution and that the background for this break with tradition is being established in the preadolescent years in the development of value systems, achievement motives and personality characteristics? The identification and evaluation of the input and output of this mix would be a formidable undertaking. An evaluation of the writings cited thus far would indicate that high school student activists experience a substantial degree of alienation, a sense of powerlessness over what is happening to them. One question is whether, in the preadolescent experience, the school contributes directly to this alienation through its curriculum or teacher behavior, specifically in the period of the middle grades. Is the upper elementary school unwittingly providing experiences which are directly establishing some of the foundation for an overt alienated reaction later? Are students in the fifth and sixth grades covertly harboring attitudes of alienation which might be related to teacher authoritarianism or dogmatism? Is there an interaction between teacher dogmatism and student personality characteristics in such a way that teacher
dogmatism alienates the student with personality characteristics most valued for success in our culture? This study attempted to assess the relationship of teacher dogmatism with the student's personality characteristics and the student's resulting sense of internal/external control in the learning environment of the classroom.

The teacher's dogmatism and the student's personality characteristics were held as independent variables, and the student's sense of internal/external control was regarded as the dependent variable.

In further defining the problem, it was necessary at this point to hypothesize the conceptual relationship between the various elements of the teacher's dogmatism and the children's personality characteristics.

Some of the characteristics of the dogmatic person are: The coexistence of contradictions within one's belief system. Less knowledge about or differentiation of disbelief systems. Self-aggrandizement as a defense against self-inadequacy. Belief in the cause. Intolerance toward the renegade or the disbeliever. The selective avoidance of contact with facts, events, etc., incongruent with one's belief-disbelief system. And the excessive reliance on positive and negative authority for information or knowledge.

Personality characteristics and some of the behavior characteristics associated with them are as follows: Dominance is accompanied by behavior such as being assertive, self-assured, independent-minded, unconventional, and rebellious. Perseverance is demonstrated by behavior which is determined, emotionally mature, consistently ordered, and conscientious. The venturesome personality likes meeting people, is adventurous, active, impulsive, frivolous, and carefree.
Shrewdness is accompanied by behavior which is socially perceptive and skillful, cool, aloof, realistic in thinking, and insightful regarding self and others.

Consider now some very commonplace experiences of children in the fifth and sixth grade. A social studies text frequently used in the fifth grade concludes a brief treatise of Andrew Carnegie with the statement:

In 1901 Andrew Carnegie sold all of his steel mills and other businesses and retired. During the later years of his life he gave away most of his great fortune. "I started life as a poor man," he once said, "and I wish to end it that way."

Carnegie gave huge sums to schools, colleges, and universities. He gave money to build more than three thousand libraries in cities and towns across America. He gave large amounts to organizations that were working to find ways of preventing war.

A boy whose father is a labor union official and who has already received some instruction regarding the Captains of Industry states that Carnegie had a great deal of money to begin with because he paid his workers so little for working long hours. The teacher replies that that may be true but that Andrew Carnegie did do many fine things. Her words and nonverbal expression communicate the desire that she does not wish him to pursue the matter further. At the end of the reading selection a study question asks, "In what way was Andrew Carnegie a pioneer of the steel industry? In what other way was he a pioneer?" The same boy has the audacity to again make some

---


20 Ibid.

21 Ibid., p. 241.
general reference to working conditions of that period. The teacher stares at him coldly, briefly, and begins to read the next question.

In the same text, a chapter called "The South Today" contains a picture of a man on a ladder in a tree picking oranges. The caption to the picture reads: "Picking and shipping Florida oranges provides many jobs for southern workers and good food for people everywhere." When the teacher directs the students' attention to how carefully the man is hand-picking the fruit, a girl raises her hand, and when the teacher calls on her she explains that a recent church school lesson was about how these workers were poorly paid. Another student speaks up to say she heard and saw this being discussed on television news. The teacher listens patiently but in visible discomfort. She is about to continue the discussion when a boy asks why that kind of information was not included in the social studies book. Still visibly uncomfortable, she explains that the authors probably didn't know about it at the time the book was written, and then she continues to the next point in her lesson plan.

The teacher has conveyed several attitudes to the students in these situations. First of all she has told them that she is really only interested in facts in the social studies textbook; she has an excessive reliance on a positive authority for information or knowledge. In showing her displeasure toward the boy who raised the question about Andrew Carnegie, she has shown an intolerance toward the renegade or the disbeliever. Also she has shown a selective

---

22 Ibid., p. 325.
avoidance of contact with facts which are incongruent with her belief-disbelief system, namely the textbook.

If this is the usual pattern of classroom behavior for this teacher and the children are familiar with it, then they have possibly demonstrated some behavior indicative of the personality characteristics involved in this study. The boy who made the statements about Andrew Carnegie may be displaying a behavior which, if it is repeated often enough, may be a pattern described as being assertive, independent-minded, and possibly determined or adventurous or socially skillful and maybe even insightful of the other person if he is baiting the teacher, albeit in a friendly manner.

Consider now the behavior patterns related to the opposite ends of the continua of these personality characteristics. The submissive personality is dependent, conventional and conforming. The frivolous is impatient, relaxed, indolent and quitting. The shy is withdrawn, self-contained, restrained and careful. The naive is vague, lacking self-insight and credulous. Students possessing these behavior patterns would not be particularly disturbed by the teacher's reluctance to discuss the questions raised. As a matter of fact, being submissive and conforming and credulous, they might feel secure and reinforced with the teacher's pattern of sticking to the textbook in the discussion period. Given an opportunity of pursuing an independent study about the development of labor unions in the United States they would be frustrated and lost without explicit directions about how to proceed. Somehow they have been conquered by the system and are content to actualize their potentialities within the system. These children feel that they can determine
the outcome or reinforcement they seek; they are secure and do not feel powerless.

The first type student, on the other hand, recognizes that this teacher's classroom is a textbook world which will not accept the rest of the real world as he knows it. There is 'life' as it is taught in school and then there is 'life' as it really is. His kind knows that in school they cannot be candid in their knowledge and interests. They must conform and restrain themselves, and this not being in their personality characteristics, they feel unable to control the outcomes and reinforcements they seek. They feel a sense of external control.

In the presence of a high dogmatic teacher, the correlation between personality characteristics and Internal/External Control should be negative and similar to the following:

![Figure 1. Theoretical Correlation in the Presence of a High Dogmatic Teacher.](image-url)
Continuing in this same vein, Henry's observations, though 15 years old, are still typical of many classrooms today.

This essay deals with one aspect of American character, the process whereby urban middle-class children in elementary school acquire the habit of giving their teachers the answers expected of them.

The central issue is that teacher and children are seen to have requirements that are complementary on one level, because teacher wants the children to accept her point of view, and they want to be accepted by her; but these requirements are not complementary on a different level, because the children's emotional organization is different from the teacher's. Hence exact complementarity is never achieved, but rather a pseudo-complementarity, which enables teacher and pupils to extricate themselves from a difficult situation. The example comes from a fifth grade schoolroom:

This is a lesson on "healthy thoughts" for which the children have a special book that depicts specific conflictful events among children. There are appropriate illustrations and text, and the teacher is supposed to discuss each incident with the children in order to help them understand how to handle their emotions.

One of the illustrations is of two boys, one of whom is griping because his brother has been given something he wants himself—a football, I think. The other is saying his brother couldn't help being given it—they'll both play with it.

Teacher: Do you believe it's easier to deal with your thoughts if you own up to them, Betty?
Betty: Yes, it is, if you're not cross and angry.
Teacher: Have you any experience like this in the book, Alice?
Alice tells how her brother was given a watch and she envied him and wanted one too, but her mother said she wasn't to have one until she was fifteen, but now she has one anyway.
Teacher: How could you have helped—could you have changed your thinking? How could you have handled it? What could you do with mean feelings?
Alice seems stymied; she hems and haws.
Teacher: What did Susie (a character in the book) do?
Alice: She talked to her mother.
Teacher: If you talk to someone, you often feel that 'It was foolish of me to feel that way...'
It will have been observed that at first Alice does well, for by docilely admitting that it is good to own up to evil, she correctly interprets the teacher's wish to hear her say that the ancient ritual of confession is still good for the soul; and she continues docile behavior by giving a story of her own envy. However, eventually she muffs the signal, for she says she was gratified anyway; she did get a watch. And the reason Alice muffs the signal is that her own impulses dominate over the signals coming in from the teacher.

Two boys, the "dialogue team," now come to the front of the class and dramatize the football incident.

Teacher, to the class: Which boy do you think handled the problem in a better way?

Rupert: Billy did, because he didn't get angry...It was better to play together than to do nothing with the football.

Teacher: That's a good answer, Rupert. Has anything similar happened to you, Joan?

Joan can think of nothing.

Sylvester: I had an experience. My brother got a hat with his initials on it because he belongs to a fraternity, and I wanted one like it and couldn't have one and his was too big for me to wear, and it ended up that I asked him if he could get me some letters with my initials, and he did.

Betty: My girl-friend got a bike that was 26-inch, and mine was only 24, and I asked my sister what I should do. Then my girl-friend came over and was real nice about it, and let me ride it.

Teacher approves of this, and says: Didn't it end up that they both had fun without unhappiness?

Teacher: I notice that some of you are only happy when you get your own way...You're not thinking this through, and I want you to. Think of an experience when you didn't get what you want. Think it through.

Charlie: His ma was going to the movies and he wanted to go with her, and she wouldn't let him, and she went off to the movies, and he was mad, but then he went outside and there were some kids playing baseball, so he played baseball.

Teacher: But suppose you hadn't gotten to play baseball. You would have felt hurt because you didn't get what you wanted. We can't help feeling hurt when we are disappointed. What could you have done? How could you have handled it?

Charlie: So I can't go to the movies; so I can't play baseball; so I'll do something around the house.
Teacher: Now you're beginning to think! It takes courage to take disappointments. (Turning to the class.) What did we learn? The helpful way... 
Class:...is the healthy way!

We may now ask: Why are these children, whose phantasies our unpublished research has found to contain so many hostile and anxious elements, so docile in the classroom?

We might, of course, start with the idea of the teacher as a parent-figure and the children as siblings competing for teacher's favor...to pit the children against each other....the children's tendency to destructively criticize each other and the teacher's repeated reinforcement of this tendency.... Finally, we cannot omit the teacher's need to be gratified by the attention-hungry behavior of the children.

The teacher in Henry's research is replete with dogmatic characteristics: self-aggrandizement as a defense against self-inadequacy; intolerance toward the renegade or the disbeliever; the selective avoidance of contact with facts and events incongruent with one's belief-disbelief system; and the excessive reliance on a positive authority for information.

In his chapter called "Education for Docility," Silberman identifies similar situations which must be included here.

ITEM: All over the United States, that last week of November 1963, teachers reported the same complaint: "I can't get the children to concentrate on their work; all they want to do is talk about the assassination." The idea that the children might learn more from discussing President Kennedy's assassination— or that like most adults, they were simply too obsessed with the horrible event to think about anything

else—simple didn't occur to these teachers. It wasn't in that week's lesson plan.

ITEM: A scholar studying curriculum reform visits a classroom using a new elementary science curriculum. Arriving a few minutes before the class was scheduled to begin, he sees a cluster of excited children examining a turtle with enormous fascination and intensity. "Now, children, put away the turtle," the teacher insists. "We're going to have our science lesson." The lesson is on crabs.

ITEM: A West Coast elementary school student is discovered by his parents to have abandoned reading E. B. White and the Dr. Doolittle books in favor of Little Golden Books, at his teacher's request. The teacher explains that students are required to submit a weekly book report on a 4 x 6 filing card. If the student were to read books as long as Charlotte's Web or Dr. Doolittle, he would not be able to submit a weekly report, and his reports might be too long to fit on the file card. "I urged him to continue reading those books on his own," the teacher explains, "but not for school."

ITEM: A group of fifth graders decide to put out a class newspaper as an English project. The principal refuses to permit the paper to be distributed to the fifth graders unless the ten-year-old editor re-writes his signed editorial to conform to the principal's view. The editorial reads as follows:

Many of us feel strongly that we have a lack of freedom in school. Maybe adults don't realize what it feels like to be ten or eleven or twelve years old and have to ask permission to go to the bathroom or to throw away a piece of paper, or talk to a teacher. When we are not permitted to leave our seats to go to the project area or the library we know you are saying you don't trust us.

Teachers may be thinking "If we give you this freedom you will just be noisy and fight."


25 Ibid., p. 125.

26 Ibid., p. 126.
But if we students had more freedom we would also accept more responsibility.

School would be a more pleasant place for all of us if there weren’t so many unnecessary rules. Just think, if we had the freedom to talk or whisper while we work. The teacher wouldn’t have to yell and scold so much.

What a great place Traphagen School would be if we had more freedom and responsibility.

The next week this young editor reads in his social studies textbook:

The U.S.S.R. is the largest country on earth. It is at least several hundred times as large as such small European countries as the Netherlands or Denmark. The Russians have many factories, mines, mills, and farms. The Dutch and the Danes, however, have one thing that the Russians lack—freedom.

The Russians cannot choose those who govern the country. They can read only the newspapers, books, and magazines that the Communists think are safe. The government decides what kinds of plays, movies, and even music the Russian people can have.28

Could anyone insist that this young editor does not feel unable to control the outcomes and reinforcements he seeks? This last example illustrates the most pervasive element of dogmatism in the school systems of the United States—isolation—the coexistence of contradictions within the belief-disbelief system. Of course, what constitutes a contradiction is the controversial issue. But then school teachers have a tradition of not being able to deal openly with that, either; controversial issues, that is. Again from Silberman:

27 Ibid., p. 135.

ITEM: A fifth-grader, asked if his social studies class had discussed any aspect of the October 15, 1969, Vietnam Moratorium Day, answers in the negative. "We're doing the American Revolution," he explains.

Consider now the teacher who has a belief-disbelief system which is just the other extreme in the sense that it is extremely open. The dominant, persevering student may now question the social studies textbook, may now write an editorial which takes to task some of the school's procedures or rules and regulations. This does not mean that he can say anything and be unchallenged by the teacher. Indeed, in terms of the demand upon the student's ability, the open but challenging and capable teacher may elicit a much greater effort from the student. But the student will feel that the rejection or acceptance of his own ideas are dependent more upon the capabilities of his own rationale than upon the arbitrary limits set by the teacher. In the atmosphere of open discussion of social studies, or science, or mathematics or school regulations, ultimate truth becomes more vague, there develops less absolute certainty. While this atmosphere is a challenge to the dominant, persevering individual who may thrive upon various amounts of ambivalence which is left to be conquered another day, this atmosphere is not one which lends security to the shy, submissive, and naive individual. He is not that sure of himself, the guidelines and standards are too vague, and ultimately he feels unable to predict the outcomes with any degree of certainty. He feels a sense of powerlessness. The relationship between personality characteristics and Internal/External Control in the presence of a low dogmatic teacher should be positive and similar to the following:

---

20Silberman, Crisis In The Classroom, p. 173.
Problem

Is there a significant relationship between students' personality characteristics and their sense of powerlessness, and is this relationship affected by the teacher's dogmatism?

Hypotheses

The general hypothesis of this study was that students in grades five and six who possess certain personality characteristics would react to teacher dogmatism with predictable attitudes of alienation in terms of measurable internal/external control.

The specific hypotheses are:

(1) In the presence of high dogmatic teachers, students possessing the personality factors of dominance, perseverance, venturesomeness, and shrewdness will have an attitude of greater external control than students possessing the personality factors of submissiveness, frivolousness, shyness, and naivete.
(2) In the presence of low dogmatic teachers, students possessing the personality factors of dominance, perseverance, venturesomeness, and shrewdness will have an attitude of greater internal control than students possessing the personality factors of submissiveness, frivolousness, shyness, and naivete.

**Definitions**

Alienation, as used in this study, is the conceptualization of powerlessness as described by Seeman.\(^30\) Powerlessness is "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks."\(^31\) Expectancy is distinguished from "(a) the objective situation of powerlessness as some observer sees it, (b) the observer's judgment of that situation against some ethical standard, and (c) the individual's sense of discrepancy between his expectation for control and his desire for control."\(^32\) The definition is made operational by an adaptation of Rotter's\(^33\) Internal/External Scale, with subjects scoring highest having the most expectancy for control; that is, the least alienation.

Dogmatism as used in this study is the concept developed by Rokeach.

---


\(^{31}\) Ibid.

\(^{32}\) Ibid.

Long before we were able to define the phenomenon of ideological dogmatism explicitly, it seemed clear that it referred to a number of things: a closed way of thinking which could be associated with any ideology regardless of content, an authoritarian outlook on life, an intolerance toward those with opposing beliefs, a sufferance of those with similar beliefs. To say that a person is dogmatic or that his belief system is closed is to say something about the way he believes and the way he thinks—not only about single issues but also about networks of issues. The closed mind, even though most people cannot define it precisely, can be observed in the "practical" world of political and religious beliefs, and in the more academic world of scientific, philosophic, and humanistic thought. In both of these worlds there is conflict among men about who is right and who wrong, who is rational and who rationalizing, and conflict over whose convictions are dogmatic and whose intellectual. In both sets of worlds ideas—and the people and authority figures responsible for them—are accepted and rejected.  

The concept of dogmatism is made operational by Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale, Form E.  

The personality concepts used in this study are some of the characteristics as theorized by White, Bakan, McClelland, Rogers, and Maslow. Generally, they define the individual's desire to have an autonomous control of his environment; to act in order to effect, control, and predict feedback of his experiences. Some kind of expectancy of control over the outcomes is usually a dimension of the personality theories of these men. The personality concepts are made operational by four of Cattell's fourteen personality
dimensions, measuring submissiveness ↔ dominance, frivolousness ↔ perseverance, shyness ↔ venturesomeness, and naivete ↔ shrewdness. On a scale of 1 to 20, the higher the subject's score, the more dominant, persevering, venturesome or shrewd is the subject's personality dimension.

Summary

No matter at what age level student unrest occurs, it creates the presumption that some form of covert animosity has existed in the preceding age level. Disturbances in the high schools and colleges having been traced to a variety of student alienations, this study has been designed to measure whether covert attitudes of alienation or powerlessness already exist in elementary school students, particularly those possessing personality characteristics which would by their nature be most demanding of some degree of control of the students' environment. The study measured one dimension of the classroom environment which would theoretically tend to limit the students' control: the teacher's dogmatism. The design of the study measured whether there is a relationship between the student's personality, the teacher's dogmatism and the resulting student's alienation.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter develops the concepts and explores related literature of authoritarianism and dogmatism, alienation in the form of powerlessness as identified by a sense of internal versus external control, and certain personality characteristics which it will be shown have a conceptual relationship to dogmatism and alienation.

Authoritarianism and Dogmatism

The progenitors of theory and research in the United States about authoritarianism are Adorno et al. who undertook to discover the psychological roots of anti-Semitism at the close of World War II. The covariation of the attitudes and personality characteristics identified in their research are relevant to the problems challenging American education today. The research was conducted in California in the years just prior to 1950 and the population was comprised of groups of university students, public school teachers, prison inmates, patients in a psychiatric clinic, veterans' groups, labor union groups, and members of service clubs. The research used four paper and pencil scales. The Anti-Semitism (A-S) Scale was a fifty-two item questionnaire used to identify the individual's "stereotyped

negative opinions describing the Jews as threatening, immoral, and categorically different from non-Jews, and of hostile attitudes urging various forms of restriction, exclusion, and suppression as a means of solving the Jewish problem.² The Ethnocentrism (E) Scale identified the tendency to be rigid in the acceptance of the culturally alike and in the rejection of the culturally unlike. Correlation between ethnocentrism and anti-Semitism in the study was .80. Antagonism toward Jews was found to be part of an antagonism toward all subcultures: Negro, Mexican, Chinese, criminal, subnormal, and membership in a small political party.

The third scale developed by the California group in The Authoritarian Personality was the Political and Economic Conservatism (PEC) Scale, designed to reflect an attachment to things as they are, resistance to social change, a reverence for practicality, ambition, and financial success; a notion that most people get pretty much what they deserve, that the rich have earned their wealth and the poor their poverty. The mean correlation for the PEC Scale with the E Scale was .57; with the A-S Scale, .43.

The Implicit Anti-democratic Trends or Potentiality for Fascism (F) Scale was the fourth scale intended to identify:

Conventionalism: a rigid adherence to conventional, middle-class values.

Authoritarian Submission: a submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the ingroup.

Authoritarian Aggression: a tendency to be on the lookout for,

²Ibid., p. 71.
and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values.

Anti-Intraception: an opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded.

Superstition and Stereotype: the belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate, and the disposition to think in rigid categories.

Power and "Toughness": a preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; identification with power figures; over-emphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.

Destructiveness and Cynicism: a generalized hostility, vilification of the human.

Projectivity: the disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.

Sex: exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on."

For the final version of the F Scale correlation with an E Scale that included anti-Semitic items, the measurement was .75; the correlation with the PEC Scale was only .57.

Many of the subjects in the study were individually interviewed, completed Murray's Thematic Apperception Test, and completed projective-type questions. These research techniques revealed that the prejudiced person has extremely positive feelings about himself and his parents; that he suppresses negative feelings about himself or his parents or that he attributes them to an outside origin or cause (ego alien); that he is a status seeker; that he is intolerant
of ambiguity of meaning and ambivalence of value and intolerant of ambiguity in all perception and thought.

In spite of severe criticism of some of the research techniques in *The Authoritarian Personality*, Brown concludes:

On the level of covariation, of one variable correlated with another, the findings of *The Authoritarian Personality* seem to be quite well established. Anti-Semitism goes with ethnocentrism goes with anti-inception goes with idealization of parents and self goes with authoritarian discipline in childhood goes with a rigid conception of sex roles, etc. Two of the presumptive correlates are not well established; status-concern or marginality and the cognitive style characterized by rigidity and intolerance of ambiguity.  

Synthesizing research results about authoritarianism in the classroom or the teacher-student relationship is difficult because there are not yet adequate conceptual distinctions between "authoritarian," "authority," "structure," "nondirectiveness," "permissiveness," "rejection," and "rigidity." For example, the Lewin-Lippitt-White studies, in which three boys' club atmospheres were artificially created, one wherein activities were determined by an adult authority figure, a second by democratic group-decision processes, and a third by a laissez-faire atmosphere with no structure, assessed the effect of these adult-imposed atmospheres on boys. The authoritarian role generated two distinct reactions: (1) a rebellious reaction of aggressive behavior, discontent and attention demands upon the leader and an average constructive work level, or (2) a submissive

---


reaction with a higher level of work output. Wallen and Travers observe that:

Once again, limitations must be examined. First, the description of the study suggests that the authoritarian pattern as employed was not only authoritarian, as we have defined it, but also cold, aloof, and threatening.⁵

Commenting on the studies of Anderson and his associates, which identified a vicious circle of domineering behavior among teachers and students, Wallen and Travers state:

Throughout this research we have observed a distinct tendency to assume that authoritarianism and rejection are highly correlated; that they form, as it were, a syndrome. Such an assumption seems questionable...Tiedeman (1942) found that some students dislike domineering, authoritarian teachers, but once again we observe the confounding of the authoritarian dimension with rejection.⁶

Most significant, it would seem, would be a conceptual distinction between "authority" and "authoritarianism." Broom and Selznick define authority in the following manner:

Legitimacy is power justified by reference to accepted values. When power is made legitimate, it is called authority. By means of legitimation, consent to the exercise of power is gained, and governing is freed from primary reliance on naked force. The quest for legitimacy is universal, but the principles of legitimacy vary: each culture justifies authority in accordance with its major values.⁷


⁶Ibid., p. 477.

"Major values" is a key reference in this definition. One of the repositories of major values in the American culture is the Federal Constitution. Authority cannot be a legitimate use of power unless it is based on values compatible with those major values. Authority based on values which are antithetical to those major values is an exercise of power which is not legitimate. That authority might better be called "authoritarian" if the values upon which it is based are many of those values identified by the A-S Scale, the E Scale, the PEC Scale, and the F Scale, many of which are antithetical to the major values found in our Constitution. When antithetical values find their way into the rationale of legislation, the resulting laws can be declared unconstitutional (the anti-long hair rule.) But the extralegal exercise of authority (or authoritarianism), in the every day decisions of officials and employees in business and industry and education is considerably more difficult to assess though just as antithetical to democratic principles in our culture. Conceptually, we might summarize that major values are to authority what antithetical values are to authoritarianism. If we are able to substantiate a conceptual difference between "authority" and "authoritarianism," we might then find that student unrest is directed more against authoritarianism than authority.

Resolving differences of opinion between parties concerning which values are consistent with major values and which are antithetical would be facilitated by the condition of openmindedness conceptualized by Rokeach. There are things we believe and things

---

we do not believe. These are organized into belief systems and disbelief systems:

The belief system is conceived to represent all the beliefs, sets, expectancies, or hypotheses, conscious and unconscious, that a person at a given time accepts as true of the world he lives in. The disbelief system is composed of a series of subsystems rather than merely a single one, and contains all the disbeliefs, sets, expectancies, conscious and unconscious, that, to one degree or another, a person at a given time rejects as false. 9

These belief-disbelief systems are organized along a continuum and are composed of several disbelief subsystems. For example, a person believes in the Catholic religion; he does not believe in the Methodist, Buddhist, etc., religions. The belief-disbelief dimension has the property of isolation which is the potential reluctance to see that two beliefs are intrinsically related which leads to the coexistence of logically contradictory but related beliefs within the same belief system. Another element of isolation is the accentuation of differences and minimization of similarities between belief and disbelief systems; a person who believes strongly in Catholicism will insist that it has absolutely nothing in common with Communism. The element of irrelevance is the insistence that a relevant fact in the disbelief system is irrelevant. Another characteristic of isolation is the outright denial of contradictory facts. Another property of the belief-disbelief system is differentiation which is the articulation or richness of detail about beliefs and disbeliefs; that is, does a person have as much knowledge about his disbelief systems as he has about his belief systems; and how does knowledge of one disbelief system compare to knowledge about another. A third property

9 Ibid.
is the comprehensiveness of the system which is the pure quantity of knowledge possessed.

Rokeach organizes the belief-disbelief system along another dimension having the central region, intermediate region, and the peripheral region. The central region contains the primitive beliefs which are those having to do with color, form, sound, etc., self-concept and concept of others. The intermediate region relates to authority in the sense of its being the source of information. Positive authority is responsible for one's beliefs; negative authority for one's disbeliefs. It contains the degree of arbitrary reliance on authority. It contains a continuum of positive and negative authority. It contains the degree of reliance on absolute authority which in turn evaluates people as being absolutely faithful or unfaithful, loyal or disloyal depending upon whether they believe in absolute authority. In this region an opinionated statement is any statement which tells whether the speaker accepts or rejects a particular idea or belief and whether the speaker accepts or rejects people depending on whether they agree or disagree with this idea. The specific content of a belief is a simple description of its substance. The formal content of a belief is a description of its origin in authority; i.e., whether it was absolute or arbitrary reliance. The peripheral region contains the beliefs growing out of the formal content of the intermediate region. This is, if we know that a person has an arbitrary reliance in the absolute authority of the Catholic Church, we are able to predict many peripheral beliefs as a result of our knowledge about the formal content of the intermediate region.
The third organization of belief-disbelief systems relates to a time-perspective dimension and relates to whether one is excessively concerned for the past, present or future, one to the exclusion of the other two.

Using these criteria, Rokeach evaluates the open and closed nature of one's belief-disbelief systems. His objective is to disassociate dogmatism from any ideology believing that no matter what the ideology, the belief system that accompanies it functions independently in being open or closed. Rokeach's definition of authority relates to the source of information rather than the legitimate use of power as described earlier in this paper. The two concepts may not be related, but they do not seem to be incompatible.

Next we consider the literature and research related to alienation in the sense of powerlessness as that concept is made operational by the empirical research relating to internal versus external control.

**Alienation and Powerlessness**

In 1959, Seeman\(^\text{10}\) summarized the theories relating to alienation and delineated five variants: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement. We are concerned here with the variant powerlessness, which Seeman conceived as "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks."\(^\text{11}\) It is a social-psychological view, which,

---


\(^{11}\) Ibid., p. 784.
while it does not treat powerlessness from the standpoint of objective conditions in society, does not mean that these conditions must be ignored in research dealing with meaninglessness.

In this version of alienation, then, the individual's expectancy for control of events is clearly distinguished from (a) the objective situation of powerlessness as some observer sees it, (b) the observer's judgment of that situation against some ethical standard, and (c) the individual's sense of discrepancy between his expectation for control and his desire for control.

Finally, the use of powerlessness as an expectancy means that this version of alienation is very closely related to the notion (developed by Rotter) of "internal versus external control of reinforcements." The latter construct refers to the individual's sense of personal control over the reinforcement situation, as contrasted with his view that the occurrence of reinforcements is dependent upon external conditions, such as chance, luck, or the manipulation of others.12

Srole conceptualized the individual's internal-external control of reinforcements along a eunomia-anomia continuum representing variations in interpersonal integration with particular social fields as "global" entities. "Eunomia" denotes a well-ordered condition in a society or state and refers to the individual's generalized, pervasive sense of "self-to-others belongingness," while "anomia" is a confused condition in a state or society and refers to the individual's "self-to-others distance" and "self-to-others alienation." The continuum is determined by more than the contemporary situation. These conditions include:

12 Ibid., p. 784-5.
...the socialization processes of his interpersonal relationships during childhood and adolescence, as these have conditioned the interpersonal expectations, value orientations, and behavioral tendencies of his current personality structure.

Accordingly, individual eunomia-anomia is viewed as a variable contemporary condition having its origin in the complex interaction of social and personality factors, present and past. In short, the condition is regarded as a variable dependent on both sociological and psychological processes.14

Srole viewed the whole social-political structure as the universe which would determine the individual's internal-external control. He assessed this relationship with such statements as, "There's little use writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man."15

Lefcourt16 identifies research in which task structures are varied to induce a specific expectancy of high or low control, thus making the internal-external dimension the dependent variable in a given, explicit situation of contemporary dimensions.

Internal-external control can then be viewed as having two dimensions: first, as a macrocosmic accumulation being determined by the interaction of psychological characteristics and sociological experiences, and resulting in a somewhat stable personality characteristic, referred to as social control. It expresses a relationship with the world or with society in general. The second dimension is a reaction to a contemporary situation, such as a task structure.

14 Ibid., p. 711.
15 Ibid., p. 712.
and resulting in an attitude of control toward that situation and relevant to that situation only and not the world in general. This is referred to as task control.

Summarizing some findings relating to social control, James found a curvilinear relationship between control and personal adjustment: extreme internals and extreme externals appearing less adjusted. Holden and Simmons found a correlation between control and the F Scale, to be interpreted as reflecting the successful measurement in both scales of the degree to which individuals see the world as containing powerful forces that they cannot influence. Externality has been successfully predicted as being stronger among ethnic minority groups than among white groups. In investigations concerned with learning and achievement-related variables, the internal control construct has some positive correlation when the materials are relevant to the subjects' goal strivings. In studies by Odell a significant relationship was found with subjects high in externality showing greater tendencies to conform. Crown and


Liverant assessed the conformer as one who has low expectancies of success in socially evaluative situations, as reflected in a high external control or defensive Level-of-Aspiration pattern. Liverant and Scodel perceived control was found to differentiate behavior in the risk-taking situation, low externals revealing a greater tendency toward self-regulation with regard to objective probabilities.

Some task control findings are that Phares found that categorizing a situation as skill compared to chance, leads the subject to use the results of his past performance in formulating expectancies for future performances. Blackman found that when the subject perceives that he is able, through some modicum of personal activity, to predict the events occurring in a given situation, he becomes more accurate in his perception of changes in the situation. Considering social learning theory and the effects of reinforcement, Rotter discusses internal/external control in a manner which suggests a distinction between social control and task control:


A generalized attitude, belief, or expectancy regarding the nature of the causal relationship between one's own behavior and its consequences might affect a variety of behavioral choices in a broad band of life situations. Such generalized expectancies in combination with specific expectancies act to determine choice behavior along with the value of potential reinforcements. These generalized expectancies will result in characteristic differences in behavior in a situation culturally categorized as chance determined versus skill determined, and they may act to produce individual differences within a specific condition.

Specific expectancies regarding the causal nature of behavior-outcome sequences in different situations would also affect behavior choice. From social learning theory one would anticipate that the more clearly and uniformly a situation is labeled as skill or luck determined, in a given culture, the lesser the role such a generalized expectancy would play in determining individual differences in behavior.27

Rotter continues his discussion by noting that a distinction between skill and chance will affect and determine individual behavior. A strongly implied problem seems to suggest that at any given moment, the dynamic dimension of social control, considered by Rotter a variable of personality dimension, is immediately caught up in the feedback of its own task control experiences, thus presenting the challenge to measure both (social control and task control) at the same time in order to adequately distinguish the quantum of each. There seems to be no research which has attempted to do this.

Rotter then continues to discuss the origin of control-drive in personality theories.

**Related Personality Concepts**

In discussing internal-external control Rotter explains that reinforcement acts to strengthen an expectancy that a particular behavior or event will be followed by that reinforcement in the

future, Rotter states:

Expectancies generalize from a specific situation to a series of situations which are perceived as related or similar. Consequently, a generalized expectancy for a class of related events has functional properties and makes up one of the important classes of variables in personality description.28

This concept of expectancy is very similar to Srole's concept of control discussed earlier. Many writers have converged on a belief that expectancy for control is characteristic of all species of life and that they explore and attempt to master the environment. White describes the core tendency of personality as:

...the attempt to produce effects through one's actions (effectance motivation), and as the attempt to achieve competence in one's functioning (competence motivation.)29

The need for effectance is in the small baby as he begins to direct his behavior toward people and things in his environment. As his knowledge and experience increases, so does his competence. Effectance and competence needs seek a condition of fulfillment of self. But to the extent that survival needs are not met, competence motivation is preempted. Given the individual expectancy for internal control as a dimension of personality, a substantial change in external control, diminishing internal control, will result in frustration, alienation, and a sense of powerlessness.

28 Ibid.
Maddi summarizes and distinguishes these related personality theories. He reports that Angyal adds "autonomy," a functioning that leads the person to be separate from other people and the physical environment; the person seems

...to be striving basically to assert and to expand his self-determination. He is an autonomous being, a self-governing entity that asserts itself actively instead of reacting passively like a physical body to the impacts of the surrounding world...This tendency expresses itself in spontaneity, self-assertiveness, striving for freedom and for mastery.

David C. McClelland defines the core tendency of personality as minimizing large discrepancies between expectations and occurrence, while maximizing small discrepancies between expectation and occurrence. The individual has an innate ability to experience pleasant feelings, or positive affect, and unpleasant feelings, or negative affect. Negative affect is an obnoxious feeling and there is an innate tendency to avoid it which is determined by the interaction between expectancies and occurrences.

For Carl R. Rogers the core of personality is the tendency of man to actualize his potentialities which is biological pressure to fulfill one's genetic blueprint whatever difficulty is created by the environment. Important characteristics of self-actualization are a positive regard for self and others and an openness to experience.


Maddi, Personality Theories, p. 128.

Ibid., p. 67.
Abraham Maslow views the core tendency of personality as the push toward actualization of inherent potentialities. The push is the self-actualizing tendency. In addition, he recognizes the push to satisfy needs ensuring physical and psychological survival, a tendency more appropriately called succorance, rather than fulfillment. The actualizing tendency is a matter of natural selection for good growth because the result will probably feel good, taste good, or otherwise give pleasure or delight. Core characteristics are the need for self-actualization and the need for cognitive understanding. Fulfillment of self-actualization is realized through creative living, peak experiences, unselfish love, and unbiased understanding. Personality traits identified with fulfillment of self-actualization are: (1) realistic orientation, (2) acceptance of self, others, and the natural world, (3) spontaneity, (4) task orientation, rather than self-preoccupation, (5) sense of privacy, (6) independence, (7) vivid appreciativeness, (8) spirituality that is not necessarily religious in a formal sense, (9) sense of identity with mankind, (10) feelings of intimacy with a few loved ones, (11) democratic values, (12) recognition of the difference between means and ends, (13) humor that is philosophical rather than hostile, (14) creativity, and (15) nonconformism.

A more detailed explanation of the four personality characteristics being used as independent variables in this study is appropriate at this point. While questioning the conclusiveness of Cattell's theory and research of personality characteristics,

34 Ibid., p. 80.
Maddi\textsuperscript{35} does note the striking similarities of the empirical evidence of Guilford\textsuperscript{36} and Cattell\textsuperscript{37}. Layton\textsuperscript{38} states that while Cattell's personality characteristics are not adequate for individual counseling, they are sufficient for use as a research tool.

Porter and Cattell\textsuperscript{39} describe the four (there are fourteen for children of the age level in this study) characteristics as follows, including the popular and technical names and the related behavior characteristics listed in descending order of frequency of association in research.

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., p. 373.
\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 470.
\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., p. 466.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Score</th>
<th>Factor E</th>
<th>High Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Tech.) SUBMISSIVENESS, E-</td>
<td>versus</td>
<td>DOMINANCE, E+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pop.) SUBMISSIVE</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>DOMINANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Assertive, Self-Assured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Independent-Minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindly, Soft-Hearted</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Hard, Stern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Solemn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional, Conforming</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Unconventional, Rebellious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily Upset</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Tough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sufficient</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Attention-Getting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the ascendance-submission studies with Allport's test, it is known that dominance tends to be positively correlated to some extent with social status and is somewhat higher in established leaders than in followers. However, the correlation is higher with attempted leadership than accepted leadership. Nevertheless, (the) experiment (R. B. Cattell and G. F. Stice, The psychodynamics of small groups, Office of Naval Research, 1953) shows that groups in which all members are on the high side in Dominance show more effective role interaction and more truly democratic procedure. They "feel free to participate," they readily raise group problems, and they criticize group defects.

Among adult occupations, Dominance (E+) is most associated with callings requiring boldness and courage. The highest recorded values are for firemen and airmen, and the lowest for clerks. In children, Dominance tends to be associated with disobedience and rejection of authority—also with delinquency if there is instability at the same time. \[40\]

\[40\] Ibid., p. 28.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Score</th>
<th>Factor G</th>
<th>High Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Tech.) SUPER EGO WEAKNESS G- versus</td>
<td>SUPER EGO STRENGTH, G+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pop.) FRIVOLOUS</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>PERSEVERING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quitting, Fickle</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Perserving, Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frivolous</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding, Impatient</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Emotionally Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed, Indolent</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Consistently Ordered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undependable, Delinquent</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregards Obligations to People</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Attentive to People and Rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This factor...is indicative of controlled rather than emotional behavior, is characterized most by energy and persistence at its positive pole...this factor best depicts the regard for moral standards, the tendency to drive the ego and to restrain the id... Subjectively, the G+ person views himself as correct in, and a guardian of, manners and morals, persevering, planful, able to concentrate, cautious in thinking before he speaks, and preferring efficient people to other companions. In ratings of children, the negative or G- pole associates itself with lying, showing off, stealing, destruction of property, and lack of control of temper.

Further research has to be done on the G factor and its measurement, but meanwhile, it should be regarded in some circumstances more as a desire to look right socially, than a true super-ego measure.41

---

41 Ibid., p. 30.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Score</th>
<th>Factor H</th>
<th>High Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Tech.) THRECTIA H-</td>
<td>versus</td>
<td>PARMIA, H+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pop.) SHY</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>VENTURESOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy, Withdrawn</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Adventurous, Likes Meeting People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiring in Face of Opposite Sex</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Active, Overt Interest in Opposite Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloof, Cold, Self-Contained</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Responsive, Genial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apt to be Embittered</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrained, Conscientious</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Impulsive and Frivolous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Interests</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Emotional and Artistic Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful, Considerate, Quick to See Dangers</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Carefree, Does not See Danger Signals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a well-defined factor which has been repeatedly discovered both in ratings and in questionnaires. The H- child shows the withdrawn, careful, "well-behaved" syndrome which sometimes precedes psychological difficulties. The H- individual reports himself to be intensely shy, slow, and impeded in expressing himself, disliking occupations with personal contacts, preferring one or two close friends to crowds, avoiding large parties or open competition, fearful of new situations, somewhat spiteful and distrustful, but very considerate of others' sensitivities, and not feeling able to keep in contact with all that is going on around him.42

---

42Ibid., p. 31.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Score</th>
<th>Factor N</th>
<th>High Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Tech.) NAIVETE, N-</td>
<td>versus</td>
<td>SHREWDNESS, N+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pop.) SIMPLE</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>SHREWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially Unalert</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Socially Percipient and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skillful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vague and Sentimental Mind</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Exact and Realistic in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company-Seeking</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Cool, Aloof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking Disciplined Taste</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Aesthetically Fastidious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking Self Insight</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Insightful Regarding Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naive, Credulous</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Insightful Regarding Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor N has resemblances most notably to a rating factor, K, which has the similar emphasis on polish and fastidiousness, but not so much on aloofness and shrewdness, as here. The N+ person is a clear thinker with a trained, realistic, but sometimes expedient approach to problems; the N- person is a vague, sentimental, incontinent person, who may get along well with people in a primitive, heart-to-heart understanding, but has little self-discipline in anticipating the usual reactions of others, and is apt to be slow and awkward. 43

43 Ibid., p. 34.
Related Research

Investigating the personality determinants in attitudes toward visibly disabled persons, Noonan et al.\textsuperscript{44} found that authoritarianism, as measured by Adorno's F Scale, held a negative correlation ($-0.68$ p $< 0.05$) with positive attitudes toward the visibly disabled.

The subjects were 240 college females in beginning psychology classes.

These findings raise an interesting question concerning negative attitudes toward any kind of disability by authoritarian classroom teachers.

In a study (by Goldberg) to determine whether attitudes toward authority and school work are associated with differential perception of teachers' behaviors and school performance, 254 8th and 9th grade boys classified as high or low on the California F Scale, Flexibility Scale, and Compulsivity Scale rated teacher behavior and reported the amount of school work performed. High compulsives perceived teachers as significantly less authoritarian than did low compulsives and did less work when the teacher was perceived as nonauthoritarian.\textsuperscript{45}

The above study is similar to the study in this paper in that students' personality characteristics were independent variables in students' assessment or reaction to perceived teacher attitudes. Cattell\textsuperscript{46} found that intelligence, personality traits and motivational traits contribute about equally, with correlations of between $0.5$ and


6, to the variance of scholastic achievement criterion. As might be expected, progress in the greater sense of emotional learning and socialized behavior is more highly correlated with personality factors than with ability factors. Super ego strength (G) correlated .15 with achievement. Venturesomeness (H) correlated .54 with achievement. Dominance (E) correlated -.43 with achievement. As a motivation factor, super ego correlated .44 with achievement and submissiveness (the opposite end of the continuum from dominance) correlated .150 with achievement. Cattell noted in a subsequent study the dubious value of the motivational factor of submissiveness correlating with achievement. In this latter study, Cattell also noted, in discussing the correlations of personality characteristics and teacher-assigned grades, that

...the main contrast presented by the correlations...is that improvement in class grader is negatively related to Dominance (E), Adventurousness (h), and Intelligence and positively related to Q4 (Ergic Tension) and O (Guilt Proneness.) This may reflect some of the inescapable situational differences between the evaluation of grades by teachers and the impersonal scores on achievement tests.

This suggestion of systematic differences in the personality influences making on the one hand for good achievement performance gain in an impersonal examination on a fixed day, and on the other, for gain in performance watched over from day to day in the classroom, is deserving of more research. Evidently, as seen in the classroom, the dominant and adventurous individual is not seen as making at this period the progress expected of him. Is this a contrast effect in perception due to the discrepancy between the confidence shown in his personality and what he actually achieves, influencing the teacher's evaluation adversely? Or is it that at this

---

juncture the incentives, in classroom work, for the "extravert" lose some of their appeal so that he neglects classroom work (though still actually doing as well in the important examinations)? Or is it that the guilt prone, sensitive child receives (like the less intelligent) more attention from the teacher and gets more sympathetically evaluated in those personal appeal valuations which enter into the grade but not into the standard test achievement measures?  

This study suggests that this "unsympathetic" evaluation of the dominant student is related to the teacher's dogmatism and the resulting student's alienation.

In a study involving sixth grade Spanish American children in New Mexico, Cordova found no correlation between alienation and level of acculturation nor between alienation and level of achievement, but powerlessness did correlate .52 with the type of teacher expectation of the Spanish American student.

In an experimental study regarding internal/external control as an independent variable, Morrison evaluated the effects of different kinds and degrees of teacher reinforcement on internal and external children. She found that internal children learn more than external children. Internal children have more positive attitudes than do external children. In some areas of achievement, learning of external children is more affected by praise and encouragement of the teacher than is learning of internal children. External children gain more in learning by low criticism than do

48 Ibid., p. 42.

49 Ignacio Cordova, "The Relationship of Acculturation, Achievement and Alienation Among Spanish American Sixth Grade Students," (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1968.)

internal children. The teacher's use of student's ideas will affect learning in external children more than in internal children, and will change external children's orientation more than it will change internal children's orientation.

Considering the relationship between I/E control and personality, Rotter\(^1\) states:

> Perhaps less clear is the relationship of internal versus external control of reinforcement to the notion of "ego control." Although the concept of ego control is not always defined similarly, it seems to contain the ideas of confidence and ability to deal with reality. While it seems likely that the individuals at both extremes of the internal versus external control of reinforcement dimension are essentially unrealistic, it is not as likely that the people toward the middle of the distribution are less confident. We do have indications, however, that the people at either extreme of the reinforcement dimension are likely to be maladjusted by most definitions, and, to the extent that ego control is another type of definition of maladjustment, it would bear some curvilinear relationship to the variable we are concerned with here.\(^2\)

Although it is not clear, it seems that Rotter's reference to Internal External Control at this point is in the context of being a characteristic of personality. This conclusion would agree with the findings of James reported earlier on page 37.

**Summary**

The writer has attempted to show conceptually that the child is born with the desire to control his environment. As he grows, his social and psychological experiences expand and further develop his sense of social control which Rotter identifies as a dimension of his personality. Cattell has identified other personality

---

\(^1\) Rotter, *Psychological Monographs*, p. 4.

characteristics which contain elements of desire or expectancy for control. In a given series of task situations, such as a classroom, the child finds that his ideas and beliefs are different from those held by the teacher, and will not be accepted in situations where the teacher is dogmatic because the teacher will tend to accentuate the differences or not even be familiar with the child's beliefs. The result is the student's frustration and sense of powerlessness.

We turn now to the design of the study and the collection of the data.
CHAPTER THREE

DESIGN OF THE STUDY AND COLLECTION OF THE DATA

In order to test the hypotheses of this study, the first task was to develop a design for the study which would determine if teacher dogmatism did indeed have some relationship to the students' sense of powerlessness. The assumption was made that the optimum relationship between teacher dogmatism and student powerlessness was present in the self-contained classroom. Therefore, the second task was to identify self-contained classrooms. The third task was to collect the data. The fourth task was to make a preliminary examination of teacher dogmatism scores. The fifth task was to make a preliminary examination of scores on the children's personality questionnaire. The sixth task was to make a preliminary examination of scores of the children's sense of powerlessness as measured on the internal/external scale. The last task, which is in Chapter IV, is to analyze the data.

Design

In order to assess the effect of high and low teacher dogmatism upon the student, the classrooms were divided into three groups on the basis of the teachers' dogmatism scores. Teachers scoring in the highest quartile of dogmatism scores comprise the High Dogmatism Group. Teachers scoring in the lowest quartile
of dogmatism scores comprise the Low Dogmatism Group, and teachers scoring between these high and low groups comprise the Middle Dogmatism Group. An analysis of difference of students' scores from these three groups was the basis for testing the hypotheses in this study.

The first specific hypothesis states that a student with a strong dominant personality characteristic will experience a sense of powerlessness or external control in the presence of a highly dogmatic teacher. The scale being used to identify the student on the dominance/submissiveness continuum identifies the dominant characteristic with the greater numerical value on the scale. A sense of externality is identified with the lesser numerical value on the internal/external continuum. A graphic description of the dominant student's sense of externality in the presence of a highly dogmatic teacher is shown in Figure 3.

![Figure 3. Reaction Paradigm of the Dominant Student to the High Dogmatic Teacher](image)
In other words, the hypothesis states that the higher the student scores on the dominance/submissiveness scale, the lower he will score on the internal/external scale.

On the other hand, the hypothesis states that the submissive student will react with a predictable sense of internality in the presence of a high dogmatic teacher. The submissive student’s reaction is graphically shown in Figure 4.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 4. Reaction Paradigm of the Submissive Student to the High Dogmatic Teacher**

In other words, the hypothesis states that the lower the student scores on the dominance/submissiveness scale, the higher he will score on the internal/external scale.

When both types of student personality characteristics, dominant and submissive, are in the presence of the high dogmatic teacher, a graphic description of their internal or external sense of control is shown in Figure 5.
Figure 5. Reaction Paradigm of Submissive and Dominant Students to the High Dogmatic Teacher

This paradigm suggests that whether the dominant student or submissive student is being considered, the relationship between the student's score on the personality scale should be inverse to the score on the internal/external scale. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient will reveal if these relationships do in fact exist. The relationship of internal/external control to the other three personality characteristics will be assessed in the same manner.

The second specific hypothesis states that a student with a strong dominant personality characteristic will experience a sense of internal control in the presence of a teacher possessing a low level of dogmatism. The same type scale is being used to quantify the personality characteristic and the internal/external control. A graphic description of the dominant student in the presence of a low dogmatic teacher is shown in Figure 6.
In other words, the hypothesis suggests that the more dominant the student the greater will be his sense of internal control in the presence of the low dogmatic teacher. The submissive student will react to the low dogmatic teacher with a predictable sense of external control as shown in Figure 7.
Again combining the two types of student personalities, the direct relationship between personality characteristics and internal/external control are depicted in Figure 8.

![Diagram showing the relationship between personality characteristics and internal/external control.](image)

**Figure 8. Reaction Paradigm of the Submissive And Dominant Student to the Low Dogmatic Teacher**

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient will assess if these direct relationships do in fact exist.

Student reaction to the middle range of teacher dogmatism will logically be a combined modification of the reaction to the two extremes of dogmatism. Though not specifically stated in the hypotheses, the implication is that student reaction will result in less intense feelings of internal/external control. Figure 9 is a graphic example of those reactions.
Figure 9. Reaction Paradigm of the Submissive and Dominant Student to the Teacher in the Middle Dogmatism Group

This implied relationship of little or no significance will be assessed by the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient.

It seems reasonable to expect that students would have a more intense reaction to the extremes of teacher dogmatism. That is, the greater the teacher's dogmatism, the greater will be the sense of external control of the dominant student. The greater the teacher's dogmatism, the greater will be the sense of internal control of the submissive student. These extremes of the students' sense of control will be reflected by a greater standard deviation of the internal/external scores. Since the intensity of sense of control is related to the teacher's dogmatism, a greater standard deviation on the internal/external scores will occur in the high dogmatism group than in the middle dogmatism group.

It seems reasonable to expect the same intensity of reaction to the low dogmatic teachers. The lower the teacher's dogmatism the greater will be the sense of internal control of the dominant
student. The lower the teacher's dogmatism, the greater will be the sense of external control of the submissive student. A greater standard deviation on the internal/external scores will occur in the low dogmatism group than in the middle dogmatism group.

Therefore, it would further substantiate the hypotheses if it could be shown that the standard deviation of the internal/external scores was greater in the high dogmatism group as compared to the middle dogmatism group, and greater in the low dogmatism group as compared to the middle dogmatism group. The F test will be used to assess the null hypothesis of no difference between the population variances.

Selection of the Sample

It should first be recalled about the context of the problem that an attempt is being made to determine covert alienation attitudes among the children of families who are more or less in the mainstream of the power structure of the community either in a local or national dimension. That is, the study is not concerned with children who may be alienated for reasons of racial discrimination or low social-economic class. Therefore, based on the writer's own personal experience of eight years as an elementary school supervisor in the area of southwestern Ohio, and with the very able assistance of many central office personnel, a sample of forty-one self-contained classrooms was identified in southwestern Ohio. It was desirable that the classrooms be self-contained in order to obtain the maximum teacher-pupil interaction effect of the teacher's dogmatism. Forty-one teachers and 1185 fifth and sixth grade students were involved
in the study. No attempt was made to control or determine the effect of grading systems, grouping patterns, or any of the many other organizational characteristics which may theoretically and operationally have an effect upon a student's sense of internal/external control.

Collection of the Data

Two classroom visits were required to collect the data. The first visit was during the week of May 11, 1970; the second during the week of May 18. The reader should recall that on May 4, four students were shot to death by national guardsmen on the campus of Kent State University and that by May 18 several hundred college and university campuses were closed across the country. The persistent question is whether these national events could have had any effect upon the data. Time did not permit the development of an instrument to assess such an effect upon the results of this study.

On the first visitation to the classroom, Form A of the "Children's Personality Questionnaire" was administered. The questionnaire booklets with an answer sheet inserted were distributed in the classroom to each student. (See Appendix A.) After the name, age, grade, and sex had been entered on the answer sheet, the writer said to the students something like this: "I would like to find out what you think about a number of ideas. The booklet you have is called 'What You Do and What You Think,' and I would like you to indicate the choice in each statement which most nearly tells how

---

you feel. There are no right or wrong answers. It's your opinion, like which do you like best — chocolate or vanilla ice cream? There is no correct answer. It's just what you happen to like. Now, you follow along while I read the directions.

"Read each statement and mark an X on the side that fits you better. Some questions will not have the words just the way you want them, but mark every one the best you can. You may ask for help if you don't know a word. Just raise your hand and the teacher will come to your desk. Do not work long on one question. Mark it and go right on to the next one. MARK EVERY ONE. Most of the questions have two boxes to choose from but other questions have three boxes. Always look at ALL the boxes and pick just one of them for your answer.

"Let's read the first one together and you mark your choice on the answer sheet; do not mark on the questionnaire booklet.

1. When visiting a new building do you like to have someone show you around □ or □ do you like to find your own way."

The writer then moved quickly about the room to see if each student was marking the answer sheet in an appropriate way. The writer then read the second question:

"2. When a child laughs at you do you feel badly □ or □ do you laugh too."

The writer quickly checked again, making any desirable suggestions, frequently assisted by the classroom teacher. Form A consisted of 140 items and because there was no time limit, the writer moved to the next classroom leaving the first classroom to the assistance of the classroom teacher. In a similar manner just described, three or four classrooms could be started on the questionnaire before it would be the approximate time for some students in the first classroom to be finishing the questionnaire. The writer
moved repeatedly among the classrooms collecting the questionnaires and answer sheets as the students finished. The writer checked each answer sheet to be certain that it had been completed.

During the second week, the writer administered Form B of the "Children's Personality Questionnaire," (see Appendix A), and the Internal/External Scale adapted from Rotter and others, (see Appendix B), and Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale, (see Appendix C.) The Internal/External Scale was stapled to the answer sheet for the "Children's Personality Questionnaire" and inserted in the questionnaire booklet. After the materials were distributed and students had put their names, age, sex and grade on the answer sheet, they were directed to the Internal/External Scale which was called "Student Questionnaire." At this point the teacher was handed the Dogmatism Scale called "Teacher Questionnaire" and asked to complete it. The writer continued with the instructions to the students.

It was assumed that it would be very important at this point to keep the teacher occupied with her questionnaire so that she did not walk about the room looking over the shoulders of the students to investi-
gate the answers being put down on the Internal/External Scale.

The directions to the students proceeded as follows: "The 'Student Questionnaire' contains some statements about how some students feel about their school. I would like you to indicate how you agree or disagree with these statements. You follow along while I read the directions.

The following list of statements tells how some students feel about school and their classroom. Draw a circle around the number before each statement to indicate how you agree or disagree with the statement. BE SURE TO MARK EVERY STATEMENT. Mark the statement -2 if you strongly disagree; -1 if you disagree a little; 0 if you are undecided; +1 if you agree a little; and +2 if you strongly agree.

Begin each statement with the phrase 'IN THIS SCHOOL, STUDENTS LIKE MYSELF...'. Let's try the first one together. 'IN THIS SCHOOL, STUDENTS LIKE MYSELF...believe that a kid can be whatever he wants to be.' Now draw a circle around the number: -2, -1, 0, +1, or +2 which indicates how you agree or disagree." The writer checked about the room to see if the students were marking the papers in a correct manner. The writer did one more item with the students and then directed them to complete the Student Questionnaire and the answer sheet for Form B on the "Children's Personality Questionnaire" as they had done the week before. The Student Questionnaire required about three to five minutes to complete the 22 items. Occasionally the teacher would remark that the students were not completing the same questionnaire as the teacher; it was usually satisfactory to confirm that they were not. Whenever the teacher asked what the research was measuring, she was told that a study was being made of teacher and students' attitudes. Most teachers
were interested in the idea and said they wanted to see a summary of the findings.

As noted above, students completed the Internal/External Scale in three to five minutes. As was the procedure in the first classroom visit, the writer proceeded to the next classroom in order to start that classroom on the questionnaires. The writer had three to four classrooms involved at one time in answering the questionnaires (if that many classrooms were available and scheduled for inclusion in the study.) Many students would be finished with the Internal/External Scale before the writer left the classroom. However, an 'after the fact' evaluation raises the question whether the students felt sufficiently free to answer the questions candidly with the teacher in the classroom. Consistent with the procedure established in the first classroom visit, the students would usually keep their answer sheets and personality questionnaire booklets at their desks until the writer returned to the classroom to collect them. Teachers did not assist in collecting or handling the materials in any way.

All of the instruments used to collect the data had to be hand scored. The "Teacher Questionnaire" was quickly scored, but the "Children's Personality Questionnaire" and the Internal/External Scale required full time work for two months. The raw scores were then transferred to Digitek scan-sheets, and then to computer cards. Computer analysis was begun on The Ohio State University campus and completed on the Miami University campus in Oxford, Ohio. An analysis of the data by classrooms appears in Appendix D.
analysis gives the teacher's dogmatism score, and the mean scores for the students' scores on the internal/external scale and personality questionnaire.

**Teacher Dogmatism**

Teacher Dogmatism was measured by Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale Form E. The Scale measures open and closed mindedness on a numerical continuum from 40 to 280, the higher score identifying the more closed minded individual. The mean score for the thirty-three teachers retained in the study was 139.46 and the standard deviation was 28.17. (Of the original forty-one classrooms in the study, eight were removed from the study in the process of developing the Internal/External Scale. See Appendix E.) The mean score and standard deviation for these thirty-three teachers are quite similar to scores obtained by Rokeach on Form E at The Ohio State University: 142.6/27.6; 143.8/22.1; and 141.3/22.2 for means and standard deviations respectively. The writer obtained a mean of 130 and a standard deviation of 21 from forty-seven female students in two classes of sociology of education at Western College in Oxford, Ohio, in October, 1970.

In accordance with the design of the study, the thirty-three classrooms were grouped in quartiles according to the teacher's dogmatism scores. The lowest quartile had nine classrooms with the lowest teacher dogmatism scores ranging from 95 through 116

---

4Ibid.
5Ibid., P. 96.
with a mean of 105.22 and a standard deviation of 9.09. The middle
dogmatism scores comprised of fifteen classrooms in the second and
third quartiles had teacher dogmatism scores ranging from 119
through 154 with a mean of 137.86 and a standard deviation of 7.66.
The highest quartile had the highest teacher dogmatism scores rang­
ing from 160 through 223 with a mean of 175.56 and a standard devia­
tion of 19.33.

A test for a significance of difference between the mean dog­
matism scores yielded z values. of 49.99 for the difference between
the low and middle dogmatism groups, and 28.68 for the difference
between the middle and high dogmatism groups. In each case the
null hypothesis was rejected at the .001 level. These data are
summarized in Table I.

| TABLE I |
| COMPARISON OF MEAN DOGMATISM SCORES | |
| FOR HIGH, MIDDLE, AND LOW DOGMATISM GROUPS | |
| | Standard | Mean | Deviation | z value |
| High Dogmatism Group | 175.56 | 19.33 | 28.68* |
| Middle Dogmatism Group | 137.86 | 7.66 | 48.00* |
| Low Dogmatism Group | 105.22 | 8.09 | *p < .001 |

6 In this study, tests for significant differences between
means utilize the procedure outlined in Basic Statistical Methods,
per & Row, Publishers, 1965, pp. 132-3. The difference between the
means is given as a z value which is the ratio of the difference
between the means to the standard error of the difference between
the means. The formula is:

\[ z = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{s_1^2 + s_2^2}}, \]

in which \( s_1 \) and \( s_2 \) are the standard

\[ \sqrt{s_1^2 + s_2^2}, \]

errors of the two sample means.
In the high dogmatism group, the mean of 175.56 and standard deviation of 19.33 was unusually high due to an extreme score of 223 which probably should not have been retained in the study. Without this score, the mean would have been 169.25 and the standard deviation 9.55. Discounting this one high score, the mean scores of the high dogmatism group and middle dogmatism group would still be significantly different.

As is intended in the design of the study, the dogmatism groups represent significantly different teacher populations.

**Personality Characteristics**

The "IPAT Children's Personality Questionnaire" was used to assess fourteen personality characteristics. Although the study used only four of the characteristics, the students completed the entire questionnaire because the items were intermixed as to make it not feasible for the students to complete only the needed items. There are two forms to the questionnaire, each to be given at a different time. Each form contains 140 items, or a total of 280 items for the total questionnaire. Since each form was given on separate occasions and some students were not present on both occasions, only 889 students of the original 1185 completed both forms.

Both forms of the questionnaire had to be hand scored. The raw scores were then summarized. They measure the personality characteristics on a numerical continuum from 0 to 20. The higher the score, the more the score tends to identify the subject as possessing

the personality characteristic of first reference in the genre. For example, a score of 15 on a continuum from 0 to 20 of the personality characteristic of dominance/submissiveness indicates that the subject tends more toward dominance than submissiveness because 15 is closer to 20 than to 0 and because "dominance" is the characteristic of first reference in the genre "dominance/submissiveness."

In order to consider students from both grade levels as part of the total population in the study without affecting the data for some reason related to their grade level, it was necessary to test for a significant difference in the personality scores in relation to the grade level. Tests for these differences yielded z values of 1.95 for Dominance/Submissiveness (extremely close to being significant at the .05 level); .72 for Persevering/Frivolous; .32 for Venturesome/Shy; and .61 for Shrewdness/Naivete, none of which indicated a significant difference between the means at the .05 level. These findings indicated that students from the fifth and sixth grades could be considered as a single population without bringing to the total group any significant differences of personality based on grade level. Table II describes these findings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>By Grades</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>z value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominance/Submissiveness</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persevering/Frivolous</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venturesome/Shy</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewdness/Naivete</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the z values are significant at the .05 level

**Internal/External Control**

As the concept of internal/external control was developed in Chapter II, it was pointed out that the literature has identified two dimensions, one being a sense of control in the general social scheme of things, and the other being one's sense of control in a given situation or task. Because the study is focused upon the student in a given classroom situation, it was necessary to develop an Internal/External Scale which would measure the student's attitude of control in his classroom. The detailed explanation of the development of this instrument is contained in Appendix B.

It should be remembered that in scoring the Internal/External Scale, the higher score is indicative of the greater sense of
internality; the lower score is indicative of a sense of externality or powerlessness. The possible scoring range is a continuum from 16 to 80. The mean score for the entire population was 58.36 with a standard deviation of 8.10.

As in the situation with the personality characteristics, it is necessary to assess whether the students from the fifth and sixth grades may be considered as one population without their internal/external control scores contributing an influence on the basis of their grade level. A test for a significant difference between the means for the fifth and sixth grades yielded a z value of .50 which was not significant at the .05 level. It was then possible to proceed in a manner regarding the fifth and sixth grade as a total population without a significant difference on the basis of grade level. See Table III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>z value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>58.49</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>58.36</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant at the .05 level

Now we turn in Chapter IV to an analysis of the data by teacher dogmatism levels and an evaluation of the hypotheses.
CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND TESTING THE HYPOTHESES

Having collected the data and determined that no significant difference existed between the mean scores on the basis of grade level, it was necessary to regroup the data in order to test the hypotheses. This was done on the basis of quartiles according to teacher dogmatism scores. As explained in Chapter III, the lowest quartile had nine classrooms with teacher scores ranging from 95 to 116 and containing 220 students. This quartile comprises what is called in this study the low dogmatism group. The second and third quartiles together contain fifteen classrooms whose teacher dogmatism scores range from 119 to 154 and include 424 students. These two quartiles comprise what is called in this study the middle dogmatism group. The fourth quartile had nine classrooms with teacher dogmatism scores ranging from 160 through 223 and includes 235 students. This quartile comprises what is called in this study the high dogmatism group.

It should be recalled that the problem in this study is determining whether there is a significant relationship between students' personality characteristics and their sense of internal/external control which is significantly affected by the teacher's dogmatism. A restatement of the hypotheses is desirable at this point.
Hypotheses

The general hypothesis of this study was that students in grades five and six who possess certain personality characteristics would react to teacher dogmatism with predictable attitudes of alienation in terms of measurable internal/external control.

The specific hypotheses are:

(1) In the presence of high dogmatic teachers, students possessing the personality factors of dominance, perseverance, venturesomeness, and shrewdness will have an attitude of greater external control than students possessing the personality factors of submissiveness, frivolousness, shyness, and naivete.

(2) In the presence of low dogmatic teachers, students possessing the personality factors of dominance, perseverance, venturesomeness, and shrewdness will have an attitude of greater internal control than students possessing the personality factors of submissiveness, frivolousness, shyness and naivete.

It should also be recalled from a description of the personality questionnaire that the personality factors of dominance, perseverance, and venturesomeness, and shrewdness would be indicated by high scores on those questionnaires. The student's sense of external control would be indicated by a low score on the internal/external scale.

In order to determine the relationship of each one of these personality characteristics of the students to the students' sense of internal/external control, a Pearson product-moment correlation
was computed on the students' scores. These correlation coefficients were computed by dogmatism groups.

In order to substantiate the first specific hypothesis, it would be necessary that the correlation coefficient between the scores of each of the personality characteristics and the internal/external score be a significantly negative correlation in the high dogmatic group. That is, the students' scores on the dominance/submissive dimension should correlate negatively with their scores on the internal/external scale. The students' scores on the perseverance/frivolousness dimension should correlate negatively with their scores on the internal/external scale. The students' scores on the venturesomeness/shyness dimension should correlate negatively with their scores on the internal/external scale. And the students' scores on the shrewdness/naivete dimension should correlate negatively with their scores on the internal/external scale. This would substantiate the hypothesis that as the students' personality characteristics of dominance, etc, increase in the presence of high dogmatic teachers, the students' internal control decreases.

Secondly, it would be necessary that the correlation coefficients in the high dogmatism group be significantly greater than the correlation coefficients at the middle dogmatism level.

In order to substantiate the second specific hypothesis, it would be necessary that the correlation coefficient between the scores of each of the personality characteristics and the internal/external score be a significantly positive correlation in the low dogmatism group. That is, the students' scores on the dominance/submissive dimension should correlate positively with their scores
on the internal/external scale. The students' scores on the perseverance/frivolousness dimension should correlate positively with their scores on the internal/external scale. The students' scores on the venturocomoness/shyness dimension should correlate positively with their scores on the internal/external scale. And the students' scores on the venturocomoness/shyness dimension should correlate positively with their scores on the internal/external scale. This should substantiate the hypothesis that as the students' personality characteristics of dominance, etc. increase in the presence of low dogmatic teachers, the students' internal control increases.

Also, in order to substantiate the second specific hypothesis, it would be necessary that the correlation coefficients in the low dogmatism group be significantly greater than the correlation coefficients at the middle dogmatism level.

Testing the Hypotheses: I/E and Dominance/Submissiveness

The scores on the personality dimension of dominance/submissiveness had a correlation coefficient of -.12 with the scores on the internal/external scale in the high dogmatism group. The correlation coefficient was -.18 in the middle dogmatism group and -.20 in the low dogmatism group. There were no significant differences between the correlation coefficients. See Table IV.
TABLE IV
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
OF STUDENTS' DOMINANCE/SUBMISSIVENESS SCORES
WITH STUDENTS' INTERNAL/EXTERNAL SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

These findings do not support the first specific hypothesis in that the correlation coefficient in the high dogmatism group should have been a significantly negative correlation which it is not. The correlation coefficient in the low dogmatism group should have been a significantly positive one and instead it is a significantly negative correlation coefficient. This significantly negative correlation coefficient in the low dogmatism group does not support the second specific hypothesis. Also the hypotheses are not supported because the correlation coefficients in the high and low dogmatism groups should have been significantly larger than the correlation coefficient in the middle dogmatism group which they are not.

It is interesting to note that these correlation coefficients present a pattern from the high dogmatism group to the low dogmatism group which is just the opposite of that which was hypothesized. The only significant correlation coefficient of the three presented in this comparison is a negative one in the low dogmatism group. This suggests that the more open the belief system held by the teacher
the more alienated is the student who possesses the dominant personality characteristic. This may indicate that in the presence of a low dogmatic teacher, a student is more inclined to express openly a sense of powerlessness. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that any conclusive finding is being made other than that the correlation coefficients reported in Table IV do not support the hypotheses in this study.

Testing the Hypotheses: I/E and Perseverance/Frivolousness

The scores on the personality dimension of perseverance/frivolousness had a correlation coefficient of +.37 with the scores on the internal/external scale in the high dogmatism group. The correlation coefficient was +.34 in the middle dogmatism group and +.35 in the low dogmatism group. There were no significant differences between the correlation coefficients. See Table V.

TABLE V
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
OF STUDENTS' PERSEVERANCE/FRIVOLOUSNESS SCORES
WITH STUDENTS' INTERNAL/EXTERNAL SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>+.37*</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>+.34*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>+.35*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

These findings do not support the first specific hypothesis in that the correlation coefficient in the high dogmatism group should have been a significantly negative correlation and it is
instead a significantly positive correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficient in the low dogmatism group does support the second specific hypothesis in that the correlation coefficient in this group should be a significantly positive one which it is. However, the correlation coefficient in the low dogmatism group is not significantly larger than the correlation coefficient in the middle dogmatism group. Nor is the correlation coefficient in the high dogmatism group significantly larger than the correlation coefficient in the middle dogmatism group. The hypotheses are not supported by the fact that the correlation coefficients in the high and low dogmatism groups are not significantly larger than the correlation coefficient in the middle dogmatism group. Although the correlation coefficient in the low dogmatism group does support the second specific hypothesis, when they are taken together, (as they must be,) the correlation coefficients do not support the hypotheses.

Testing the Hypotheses: I/E and Venturesomeness/Shyness

The scores on the personality dimension of venturesomeness/shyness had a correlation coefficient of +.17 with the scores on the internal/external scale in the high dogmatism group. The correlation coefficient was +.24 in the middle dogmatism group and +.20 in the low dogmatism group. There were no significant differences between the correlation coefficients. See Table VI.
TABLE VI
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
OF STUDENTS' VENTURESONESS/SYNESS SCORES
WITH STUDENTS' INTERNAL/EXTERNAL SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>+.17</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>+.24*</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>+.20*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

These findings do not support the first specific hypothesis in that the correlation coefficient in the high dogmatism group should have been a significantly negative correlation and it is instead a significantly positive correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficient in the low dogmatism group does support the second specific hypothesis in that the correlation coefficient in this group should be a significantly positive one which it is. However, the correlation coefficient in the low dogmatism group is not significantly larger than the correlation coefficient in the middle dogmatism group. Nor is the correlation coefficient in the high dogmatism group significantly larger than the correlation coefficient in the middle dogmatism group. The hypotheses are not supported by the fact that the correlation coefficients in the high and low dogmatism groups are not significantly larger than the correlation coefficient in the middle dogmatism group. Although the correlation coefficient in the low dogmatism group does support the second specific hypothesis, when they are taken together, (as they must be,) the correlation coefficients do not support the hypotheses.
Testing the Hypotheses: I/E and Shrewdness/Naivete

The scores on the personality dimension of shrewdness/naivete had a correlation coefficient of -.33 with the scores on the internal/external scale in the high dogmatism group. The correlation coefficient was -.37 in the middle dogmatism group and -.37 in the low dogmatism group. There were no significant differences between the correlation coefficients. See Table VII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

The correlation coefficient for the scores on the shrewdness/naivete scale and the internal/external scale support the first specific hypothesis in that the correlation coefficient is significant and negative. The correlation coefficient in the low dogmatism group does not support the second specific hypothesis in that the correlation coefficient is positive when it should have been negative. Also the hypotheses are not supported by the fact that the correlation coefficients in the high and low dogmatism groups are not significantly larger than the correlation coefficient in the middle dogmatism group. Although the correlation coefficient in the high dogmatism group does support the first specific hypothesis,
when they are taken together, (as they must be,) the correlation coefficients do not support the hypotheses.

**Testing the Hypotheses: Summary**

The findings do not support the hypotheses. None of the correlations are consistently negative in the high dogmatism group nor consistently positive in the low dogmatism group. Both of these conditions would be necessary to support the hypotheses.

**Related Findings: Internal/External Control**

It will be recalled that it would further substantiate the hypotheses if it could be shown that the standard deviation of the internal/external scores was greater in the high dogmatism group as compared to the middle dogmatism group, and greater in the low dogmatism group as compared to the middle dogmatism group. Therefore, it is desirable to continue an investigation of the students' internal/external scores in the three dogmatism groups. The mean score for the high dogmatism group was 57.07, 53.30 for the middle dogmatism group, and 50.03 for the low dogmatism group. The gradual increase in the mean score from high to low dogmatism groups would seem to indicate that students in the presence of low dogmatic teachers have a greater sense of internal control than students in the presence of high dogmatic teachers. However, a test for a significant difference between the means indicates that none exists. See Table VIII.
TABLE VIII
COMPARISON OF MEAN INTERNAL/EXTERNAL SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>z value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>57.87</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>58.30</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>58.98</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not inconsistent with the hypotheses that there should be no significant differences between the means of the internal/external scores at the various dogmatism levels. In the high dogmatic group, the dominant student with a sense of external control and the submissive student with a sense of internal control would merely exchange position with one another on the internal/external scale in moving to the low dogmatic group. This mutual change of sense of control would maintain the same mean internal/external statistic.

However, as has already been suggested, students with either a low dogmatic teacher or a high dogmatic teacher might be expected to react more strongly to the dogmatism than students with teachers of normal range dogmatism. That is, students with high or low dogmatic teachers would register a more intense sense of internal or external control. This could be evidenced by a greater standard deviation on the internal/external scale in the presence of high and low dogmatic teachers than in the presence of teachers in the middle dogmatism group. This is in fact the case, in that the standard deviation for the high and low dogmatism groups is 8.12 and 8.40 respectively, while the standard deviation for the middle dogmatism group is 7.93. This suggests a curvilinear relationship between the teacher's dogmatism and the student's intensity of
internal/external control. However, an F test indicated the difference among the variances is not significant. See Table IX.

**TABLE IX**
**COMPARISON OF STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF INTERNAL/EXTERNAL SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings raise serious questions about the Internal/External Scale used in this study. The literature reported in Chapter II identified two dimensions of internal/external control: one relating to one's attitude toward society in general and the other relating to a task. It was the intention of the scale used in this study to identify internal/external control related to the task, (the classroom,) But the resulting correlations, some positive and some negative, with the different personality characteristics raise an inference that internal/external control has been measured in this study as another personality characteristic, instead of as an attitude toward a given task. The task, (the classroom,) does cover a considerable amount of time, the school year. It will be recalled that Rotter stated:

*Expectancies generalize from a specific situation to a series of situations which are perceived as related or similar. Consequently, a generalized expectancy for a class of related events has functional*
properties and makes up one of the important classes of variables in personality description.

Although the questionnaire made a considerable effort to identify the sense of control in the classroom with such characteristics as the introductory phrase "IN THIS SCHOOL, STUDENTS LIKE MYSELF..." as well as with the content of the items referring specifically to classroom activities, the student's attitude toward the classroom by the end of the year when this data was collected may have become a rather well-integrated dimension of his personality.

Further, as Cattell has the personality characteristics scaled, his findings also bear positive and negative relationships to one another as evidenced by the following:

**CORRELATIONS AMONG FACTOR SCALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominance/ Submissiveness</th>
<th>Perseverance/ Frivolousness</th>
<th>Venturesomeness/ Shyness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance/ Frivolousness</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venturesomeness/ Shyness</td>
<td>+.06</td>
<td>+.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Shrewdness/ Naivete          | +.37                      | -.29                    | -.15

The point is that internal/external control has a positive or a negative correlation with the different personality characteristics

---


just as the four characteristics have positive and negative correlations with one another. All of this gives credence to the possibility that internal/external control has been measured in this study as a dimension of personality instead of just a sense of control in a given task.

**Related Findings: Personality Characteristics**

The design of this study was to regard the personality characteristics as independent variables. An analysis of these four personality characteristics in the three dogmatism groups yielded interesting data which may serve as implications for further study. In this section of the study, each of the four personality characteristics is examined in terms of its mean score in each dogmatism group.

**Dominance/Submissiveness**

While the mean scores for dominance/submissiveness were greater at the high and low dogmatism levels than the middle level, the differences were not statistically significant. See Table X.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>z value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perseverance/Frivolousness

The mean scores for perseverance/frivolousness steadily increase from the low dogmatism group to the high dogmatism group, although the differences between the means are not significant. See Table XI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>z value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Venturesomeness/Shyness

The highest mean score for the venturesomeness/shyness personality dimension is in the middle dogmatism group. This is the same level for the highest correlation between this personality characteristic and internal/external control. However, none of the differences between the means are significant. See Table XII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>z value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shrewdness/Naivete

The highest mean score for this personality dimension is in the low dogmatism group. The next highest score is in the high dogmatism group. The lowest score is in the middle dogmatism group. There is no significant difference between the means in the high and middle dogmatism groups. There is, however, a significant difference in the mean scores between the middle and low dogmatism groups. See Table XIII.

TABLE XIII
COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR SHREWDSNESS/NAIVETE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>z value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01

Conclusion

The problem of this study was to determine if a significant relationship existed between the student's personality characteristics and his sense of powerlessness, and if this relationship was affected by the teacher's dogmatism. While the findings do support a significant relationship between the student's personality characteristics and his sense of powerlessness, this relationship is not significantly affected by the level of teacher dogmatism.
Implications for Further Study

The discussion of the problem in Chapter I indicated that many persons writing about student unrest in colleges and high schools believed the unrest was caused in part by student alienation or powerlessness relating to a variety of events from within the student's immediate environment to matters in national foreign policy. It was the hypotheses of this study that student attitudes of alienation were also developing in the years immediately preceding the period of student activism, and were developing in a relationship to teacher dogmatism. The results of this study do not substantiate these hypotheses. But the findings of significant relationships between student internal/external control and student personality characteristics persist in raising a number of implications for further study.

(1) Two of the personality characteristics, dominance/submissiveness and shrewdness/naivete, correlate negatively with internal/external control. The other characteristics, perseverance/frivolousness and venturesomeness/shyness, correlate positively. If internal/external control is a variable which is dependent upon personality characteristics, these correlations suggest that personality characteristics may tend to counteract one another. In considering this counterbalancing effect of personality characteristics and internal/external control, it should be remembered that this study was concerned with only four of Cattell's personality characteristics. What significant relationship might the other personality characteristics have with the student's sense of internal/external control? Which of these characteristics might be significantly affected by teacher dogmatism?
(2) It has been suggested that the internal/external scale developed in this study may have measured expectancy of control as a personality dimension in relation to society in general. It was intended to measure expectancy in a given task situation, which was the classroom of a teacher with a given level of dogmatism. In order to more definitely identify and distinguish expectancy in general as compared to expectancy in a given task situation, can instruments be developed which would identify both of these dimensions of expectancy?

(3) This study attempted to identify only the effect of teacher dogmatism upon the student's sense of internal/external control. It is obvious that other characteristics of the educational system would have an effect upon the student's sense of internal/external control. What effects would other characteristics such as grouping or grading have upon the student's expectancy?

(4) Cattell reports that a profile similarity index has been developed for various abilities and behavior patterns, such as a delinquent, a neurotic, or someone with creative artistic gifts. The profile provides an estimate of the goodness of fit between the individual profile and the pattern found among the type to which it is being compared. Could a profile similarity index be found for highly alienated students as compared to students with a high sense of internal control? Could a profile similarity index be found for students in the presence of highly dogmatic teachers as well as in the presence of low dogmatic teachers? Could a profile be identified for students in various grouping situations?

\[\text{Ibid., p. 39.}\]
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APPENDIX B

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR
INTERNAL/EXTERNAL CONTROL

The concept of internal/external control was made operational with the development of a student questionnaire containing 22 Likert-type items adapted from the research of Rotter, Bialer, Cordova, and Morrison.¹ In the process of developing this questionnaire, items were administered to students from the fifth and sixth grades on an individual basis. Following each individual administration, the student was questioned concerning his understanding of the main idea in each item and his understanding concerning key words or phrases. Where any inconsistencies were evident in the item, the item was either changed or eliminated. On two occasions, students suggested a complete rewording of items that resulted in eliminating the ambiguity while retaining the original idea of the item. Three of these interview-type sessions were held with approximately fifteen students in each session. The result of this procedure was the 22-item questionnaire shown in Table I.

TABLE XIV
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The following list of statements tells how some students feel about school and their classroom. Draw a circle around the number before each statement to indicate how you agree or disagree with the statement. BE SURE TO MARK EVERY STATEMENT. Mark the statement -2 if you strongly disagree; -1 if you disagree a little; 0 if you are undecided; +1 if you agree a little; and +2 if you strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN THIS SCHOOL, STUDENTS LIKE MYSELF...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***believe that a kid can be whatever he wants to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***believe that we get credit if we really try.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***believe that school is unfair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***believe that people who use their abilities can become leaders in class projects and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***don't understand why we get the grades we do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***are always willing to admit mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***feel that we often get punished when we don't deserve it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***believe that poor grades are caused by bad luck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***believe that just a few students do most of the special things in our school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***believe that when nice things happen to you, it is only good luck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***believe that if you really study, tests are always fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***believe that trusting to luck is not as good as trying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***believe that we get to do what we want to do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XIV continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Unagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...believe that just a few students do most of the special things.

| -2                | -1      | 0     | +1             | +2             |

...believe that if people are mean to you, it could be because you did something to make them mean.

| -2                | -1      | 0     | +1             | +2             |

...believe it is best to cover up one's mistakes.

| -2                | -1      | 0     | +1             | +2             |

...believe it is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.

| -2                | -1      | 0     | +1             | +2             |

...believe that getting good grades is a matter of hard work.

| -2                | -1      | 0     | +1             | +2             |

...believe that no matter how hard you try, some people just don't like you.

| -2                | -1      | 0     | +1             | +2             |

...believe that failure results from one's own mistakes.

| -2                | -1      | 0     | +1             | +2             |

...believe you are what you are because you were born that way.

| -2                | -1      | 0     | +1             | +2             |

...believe that any student who is lonely doesn't try to be friendly.
In order to avoid response set by the subjects, half of the items are positive and half are negative; that is, in half of the items a high internality will be expressed by strongly agreeing with the statement while in the other half, high internality will be expressed by strongly disagreeing with the item.

Following the collection of the data, eight classrooms were randomly selected for item analysis to determine which items discriminated significantly between internal control and external control. From the 187 subjects in these eight classrooms, the 40 highest scores and the 40 lowest scores were selected. A tabulation was then made of the manner in which each subject responded to each item. A chi square analysis identified those items, significant at various levels, which were contributing to high or low scores. This group of eight classrooms was not included in the rest of the study. An additional eight classrooms were randomly selected and the same analysis was made as a reliability measurement of the first analysis. A summary of the analysis of the two groups appears in Table II. This second group, however, was returned to the study in order to maintain a minimum of thirty classrooms in the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IN THIS SCHOOL, STUDENTS LIKE MYSELF...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that a kid can be whatever he wants to be</td>
<td>3#</td>
<td>2.384#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2##</td>
<td>1.692##</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that we get credit if we really try.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that school is unfair.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that people who use their abilities can become leaders in class projects and activities.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...don't understand why we get the grades we do.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...are always willing to admit mistakes.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...feel that we often get punished when we don't deserve it.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that poor grades are caused by bad luck.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that just a few students do most of the special things in our school.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that when nice things happen to you, it is only good luck.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that if you really study, tests are always fair.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that trusting to luck is not as good as trying.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that we get to do what we want to do.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that just a few students do most of the special things.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XV - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...believe that if people are mean to you, it could be because you did something to make them mean.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe it is best to cover up one's mistakes.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe it is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that getting good grades is a matter of hard work.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that no matter how hard you try, some people just don't like you.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe that failure results from one's own mistakes.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...believe you are what you are because you were born that way.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ...believe that any student who is lonely doesn't try to be friendly. | 2  | 1.177   *
|                                                                      | 4  | 3.587   *

#statistics for first group of eight classrooms.
##statistics for the second group of eight classrooms.
*not significant at the .05 level.

Items were then identified to be included in the analysis of data on the basis of two criteria: (1) that the chi square analysis of the data remained significant at the .05 level in both groups, and (2) that an equal number of positively and negatively stated items be included in the scale. The items retained for analysis are listed in Table III.
TABLE XVI
ITEMS RETAINED FOR INTERNAL/EXTERNAL CONTROL

The retained items stated in a positive form were:

...believe that we get credit if we really try.

...believe that people who use their abilities can become leaders in class projects and activities.

...are always willing to admit mistakes.

...believe that if you really study, tests are always fair.

...believe that trusting to luck is not as good as trying.

...believe that if people are mean to you, it could be because you did something to make them mean.

...believe that getting good grades is a matter of hard work.

...believe that failure results from one's own mistakes.

The retained items stated in a negative form were:

...believe that school is unfair.

...don't understand why we get the grades we do.

...feel that we often get punished when we don't deserve it.

...believe that poor grades are caused by bad luck.

...believe that just a few students do most of the special things in our school.

...believe that when nice things happen to you, it is only good luck.

...believe it is best to cover up one's mistakes.

...believe you are what you are because you were born that way.
APPENDIX C

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions:

For each statement indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement. In the blanks provided insert the number of the comment which best describes how you feel about the statement.

+3 = Agree Very Much
+2 = Agree on the Whole
+1 = Agree a Little
-1 = Disagree a Little
-2 = Disagree on the Whole
-3 = Disagree Very Much

Please use one of the above numbers for each statement. It is important that we have a response from you for each item. Mark clearly the + or - before each number.

___ In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

___ Once I get wound up in a heated discussion, I just can't stop.

___ A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.

___ In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.

___ There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against it.

___ Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.

___ There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.

___ In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."

It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.

The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.

Most people just don't know what's good for them.

Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.

A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.

It is better to be a dead hero than a live coward.

It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.

There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.

Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.

Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.

In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.

If given a chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.

Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.

While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.

I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.
A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.

The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.

Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.

It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinion of those one respects.

When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.

It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.

In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.

Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.

The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.

My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.

The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.

In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.
APPENDIX D

BASIC CLASSROOM DATA

Column A - Teacher Dogmatism Score
Column B - Dominance/Submissiveness Mean Score
Column C - Perseverance/Privolousness Mean Score
Column D - Venturesomeness/Shyness Mean Score
Column E - Shrewdness/Naive Mean Score
Column F - Internal/External Mean Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>61.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>59.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>53.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>51.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>58.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>58.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>55.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>55.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>60.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>54.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>55.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>60.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>57.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>53.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>57.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>61.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>57.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>57.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>58.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>60.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>55.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>55.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>53.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>58.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>57.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>59.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>58.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>55.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>63.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>56.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>54.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>61.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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