A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL TASKS OF AN

UPPER-ELEMENTARY CLASS IN AREA II OF THE GREENVILLE

COUNTY-CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM AND THE PATTERNS OF

DIRECTION ATTEMPTED FOR BETTER GROUP ACTION

———————

by

Elizabeth Lewis Yandle

Approved by:

Herbert Way
Director of Graduate Study

Isabel F. Jones
Director of Thesis

Uberto Price
Major Professor

C. Elizabeth Putnam
Major Professor

_____
Minor Professor

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL TASKS OF AN

UPPER-ELEMENTARY CLASS IN AREA II OF THE GREENVILLE

COUNTY-CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM AND THE PATTERNS OF

DIRECTION ATTEMPTED FOR BETTER GROUP ACTION

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the School of Education

Appalachian State Teachers College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

by

Elizabeth Lewis Yandle

May 1958

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

It seems reasonable to assume that the children who are in elementary school today will spend their adult lives in a world which will place tremendous stress upon the maturity of the individual. If this assumption is correct, there will be an ever-increasing need for worthy citizenship, and educators will need to use the findings that have been provided in the area of human growth and development in order to prepare these children for the responsibilities of world citizenship.

Tomorrow's citizens may be expected to be effective in their world if they have the inner strength of self-respect and self-confidence, and if they have the skills of problem solving and the ability to analyze problems and arrive at workable conclusions. In other words, these citizens will need creative intelligence.

Many of the countless groups which meet in the world of today are brought together by needs and goals that are of common and immediate interest. Even in these circumstances their members have difficulty in establishing communication. Their work is frequently slowed down by their lack of skill in using the talent and strength that lies in group process. In some cases, the groups that the citizens of the future will form will probably lack the obvious bond of common

interests, since many such groups may be formed by members whose backgrounds are very different in terms of religion, language, culture, and national history. They will, moreover, have the further separation of physical distance. Since there may be a limited amount of time for deliberation upon the solution of problems, clear insight into these problems will be needed if sound group decisions are to be made. It will be necessary for future citizens to be concerned and sympathetic about other peoples with whom they have no geographical contact. Common goals and interests, however, should bring the necessity for group effort and action into clear focus. The citizens of the world of tomorrow will be interdependent, rather than independent, and will need to share ideas, materials, strength, and experiences.

Research of the past fifty years has led educators to think in terms of the individual as an entity, growing and developing from the embryo until death.[1] It is believed that the accomplishment of the individual in his developmental tasks can, through the help of a constructive environment, lead him into a role within society that is increasingly social, co-operative, mature, rational, and thoughtful. It is believed that the key to guiding this accomplishment is

---

[1]Robert J. Havighurst, Human Development and Education (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1953), p. 331.

in accepting the individual at his unique developmental level
and in permitting him to grow at his own rate. At the same
time he must be viewed as an individual-within-the-group, since
he accomplishes his developmental tasks in terms of his social
interaction. The fundamental idea of the developmental pat-
terns of the individual within society has been grasped, but
more study is needed. Additional research is essential in
the area of the individual's growth in the peer and teacher-
interaction in the elementary school.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this
study (1) to investigate the extent to which the concept of
the developmental tasks could be utilized in the case of an
upper-elementary class in the Richard W. Arrington School of
Area II in the consolidated city and county school system of
Greenville, South Carolina, and (2) to present patterns of
direction and growth observed by the investigator while at-
tempting to promote a more effective group-interaction in
the light of the developmental level of each pupil.

Importance of the study. The concept of developmental
tasks is considered by many educators to be one of the most
important in the building of curriculum and in the formation
of school policies and procedures. The educator who understands

the stages of development through which children pass and the
tasks which belong to each stage of development should be in
a position to help in building a system of education which
will promote the maximum of healthy growth and the integration
of the emotional, social, and intellectual aspects of each
child-personality.

The real measure of the growth of an individual, how-
ever, lies in his ability to be effective in interaction with
others. It is impossible to perceive the individual as a
complete being except as he is living in society. Happier
and more efficient group life should depend upon the healthy
development of the individual and upon his realization of the
interdependency among people. In the elementary school there
has been found a need for constant re-evaluation of the prog-
ress of each child toward his own goals and the goals of the
group. The use of objective observation and various projec-
tive techniques was the means by which the investigator
attempted to show the relation between the studies of Child
Growth and Development and Group Dynamics.

Limitations of the study. This study was limited to
(1) one group of thirty children and (2) to the academic
years of 1956-57 and 1957-58.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Developmental task. According to Robert J. Havighurst, a developmental task is a learning which arises at or about a certain period in the life of the individual, successful achievement of which leads to his happiness and to success with later tasks, while failure leads to unhappiness in the individual, disapproval by society, and difficulty with later tasks.[2]

Group dynamics. Group dynamics was interpreted as human interaction in a group.[3]

Group process. This term was used as a synonym for group dynamics.

Peer group. An aggregation of people of approximately the same age who feel and act together was designated as a peer group.[4]

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE THESIS

The remainder of this thesis is organized into four

---

[2]Ibid., p. 2.

[3]A. Harry Passow and Gordon N. MacKenzie, "Research in Group Behavior Shows Need for New Teaching Skills," Nations Schools, XLIX (April, 1952), 71-3.

[4]Havighurst, op. cit., p. 47.

chapters. Chapter II is a review of the selected literature which the investigator found to be within the scope of her study. In this chapter the concept of the developmental tasks is traced from the introduction of the term to its emergence as a theory of education. The investigator found a logical and perhaps an inevitable link between this concept and another concept which has recently received widespread acceptance. This is the concept of group dynamics. Chapter III is a record of the investigator's experience as a teacher in a school system in which the concept of human development has been accepted. Realizing that her role as teacher is an important one in the guidance of her class into a peer group, her impressions and observations are recorded in the application of chosen techniques and theories. An attempt is made to evaluate the experiences and techniques in terms of the findings of research. Chapter IV is an analysis of the data of the investigator's study as it confirmed, supplemented, or differed from the findings of previous research. Chapter V summarizes the methods of the investigator's procedure and the major findings of the study. It makes certain recommendations for the improvement of the program of study and practice in the concept of Child Growth and Development in the school district where the data were gathered.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Although the concept of developmental tasks is one
which has grown and gathered significant meaning largely
within the past twenty-five years, the background of educa-
tional history and philosophy seems to indicate that many
of the great educators of the past had some understanding
of its tenets. Johann Pestalozzi stated in his book, Leonard
and Gertrude, that the aim of education is the natural and
systematic development of all the powers of the individual.[1]

The developmental aspect of educational thought and
research emerged concomitantly with, and perhaps from, the
scientific approach, which came into being around the begin-
ning of this century. The scientific approach included a
new psychology of education and new methods of child study
and gave special attention to the need for more refined
methods of testing. The application of the scientific
method to the study of human nature placed emphasis in edu-
cation upon the individual. This method of educational re-
search is still in process.[2]

---

[1]The John Dewey Society, The American Elementary School,
Thirteenth Yearbook (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953), p. 402.

[2]Walter J. Moore and Celia B. Stendler, "Some Research
Studies in Education and in Related Disciplines Which Suggest
Good Elementary School Practices," The John Dewey Society,
Ibid., p. 289.

The 1930's saw the phenomenal rise and tremendous influence of another movement in educational research--the child development movement. The influence of child development research upon American education is a more subtle one than that of the scientific method. Its implications are not so easily translated into educational practice. It is derived from the data compiled in the fields of cultural anthropology, education, medicine, psychology, and sociology. At present, newer concepts of child growth and development are acquiring greater clarity and emphasis within the findings of continued research.[3]

Robert J. Havighurst, Chairman of the University of Chicago's Committee on Human Development, traced the use of the concept to studies in adolescent society made by Frankwood Williams in 1930. The term "developmental task" was first used by Lawrence K. Frank about 1935 at a conference of the staff of the Progressive Education Association Meeting to Study the Adolescent. Peter Blos, also a member of the staff, was the first to refer to problems of adjustment as "tasks" in print in his book, The Adolescent Personality, published in 1941. At about the same time Dr. Erik Homburger Erikson, then at the Yale Institute of Human Relations,

---

[3]Viola Theman, "Emerging Concepts of Child Growth and Development; What They Suggest for Classroom Practice," The John Dewey Society, Ibid., p. 84.

developed a similar concept in his study of children in the first few years of life. Using a biological analogy of the unique time and place for the development of the various organs in the human fetus, Dr. Erikson suggested that there are equally times for the development of certain aspects of personality in early childhood.[4]

Daniel A. Prescott, Director of the Division of Child Study of the Commission on Teacher Education in the American Council on Education, introduced the concept of the development task to his workshops at the University of Chicago. Havighurst, joining the faculty at the University in 1941, found the term in use and decided to use it in his classes on the Psychology of Adolescence. He, with the collaboration of Prescott and Fritz Redl, wrote a chapter in General Education in the American High School. This was the first publication to give the concept a central role.[5]

Havighurst appears to have accepted the concept of child development and then expanded it to include other aspects of education. In 1943 he served as a consultant to the Harvard Committee on the Objectives of Education in a Free Society. He wrote a thirty-five page report entitled

---

[4]Robert J. Havighurst, Human Development and Education (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953), p. 328.

[5]Ibid., p. 329.

Developmental Tasks and General Education. This report
proved to be in such demand that a staff member of the
United States Department of Agriculture asked permission
to mimeograph copies of it for the use of 4-H club leaders.
The fullest significance of the concept emerged when Havig-
hurst worked with others in 1947-48 on a sequence of three
courses in the field of human development in which the human
individual's development was traced from the embryonic stage
until death. The developmental task now proved to be useful
in the study of adulthood and old age.[6]

The National Council on Family Life made extensive
use of the developmental task concept in 1948. Its report
traced the career of the family from its beginning until the
death of one of its members by describing the developmental
tasks, goals, and responsibilities of each member and the
way by which society might aid people to achieve their tasks
more effectively. Dr. Carolyn Tryon and Jesse Lilienthal,
III, made an important contribution to the study in 1949.
They identified ten areas of growth and defined the develop-
mental tasks for each area at five stages of growth from
infancy to late adolescence. In this aspect of the study
they made clear the idea that the developmental tasks come

[6]Ibid., pp. 330-331.

in coherent series within areas of growth.[7]

The developmental tasks (the learnings which the individual must possess if he is to achieve his place in society as a happy and successful person) arise from three influences upon human learning: (1) the influence of physical maturation, (2) the influence of cultural pressures exacted by the environment, and (3) the influence of aspirations, desires, and values of the emerging personality. These influences are closely interrelated in their effect upon learning.[8]

Viola Theman stated that research on the developmental concept has, on the whole, been marked by a lack of co-ordination and co-operation among the sciences contributing to it. There has been not only a lack of integration of data and of the research utilized, but there is also a dearth of research directed toward the application of previous data and concepts. She found an interrelation of three aspects of the concept which should suggest implications for elementary school teachers. These aspects are:

A. The development of the child as a unique individual

B. The uniqueness of individual as modified by special groups

C. The interaction between the individual and the group[9]

---

[7]Ibid., pp. 331-332.

[8]Ibid., p. 3.

[9]Theman, op. cit., pp. 57-70.

Havighurst believed that the developmental task concept occupies a middle ground between the two opposed theories of education: (1) the theory of freedom, which holds that the child develops best through as permissive an atmosphere as possible, and (2) the theory of constraint, which holds that the child learns to be a worthy adult through restraints placed on him by society. The concept of developmental tasks partakes of the nature of both theories, and it is particularly useful for educators and students who relate behavior to the problems of education.[10]

Woods stated that growth, whether it be mental or physical, social or emotional, proceeds at its own rate in each child. Each child must be studied in relation to the start he had in mental or physical endowment, in relation to his history of health or illness, and the number and kind of experiences in human relationships with adults and children which his years have provided.[11]

Shaftel described the unique rate of child growth and development in this way:

> As the child moves from one phase of development to the next he has to go through numerous transitions--sometimes dramatically abrupt, sometimes slowly and reluctantly. . . . At each stage of his development,

---

[10]Havighurst, op. cit., p. 332.

[11]Elizabeth L. Woods, "Growth and Development of Children," California Journal of Elementary Education, XVIII (February, 1949), 146-152.

the individual faces the problem of relinquishing,
renouncing, or repressing his previously-learned
skills and patterns that he may learn a new skill.[12]

Shaftel further commented that each child, in the pro-
cess of accomplishing his developmental tasks, builds up a
picture of himself. This self-concept is one of the aspects
of uniqueness which characterizes the developmental concept.
A major goal of any teacher should be that of building pro-
ductive self-concepts in her pupils.[13] According to Theman's
study, the other two forces which affect the child's behavior
and cause him to be unique are his potential capacity and
the opportunities presented by his environment. The child's
environmental opportunities may serve to enhance or impede
his potentialities, his goals, and his self-concept. The
environment of a child varies with his own particular family
membership, but it is also known to vary from child to child
within the same family. The primary social unit, the family,
is of supreme importance among the factors influencing the
child. It leaves its impression in terms of values and be-
havior, in terms of concepts of success and achievement. The
child tends to assimilate the feelings, attitudes, values and
purposes of his immediate situation. On the basis of this he

---

[12]Fannie R. Shaftel, "Children's Feelings," Childhood
Education, XXXIII (April, 1957), 358-63.

[13]Ibid.

begins to define his own role and status and to commence the process of assimilation. School behavior is largely the product of the family and the place the family occupies in the social structure of the community.[14]

The studies of Havighurst set forth the theory that many of the developmental tasks never end. Havighurst believed that they recur over a long period of time in varying but closely-related aspects. Success with a recurring task in its earliest phases predicts success in the later phases. The crucial moment for the learning of the task is when it first appears, and newer learnings must be added during later life.[15] Learning to get along with one's age-mates is a good example of the recurring task. The child is introduced into a peer-group in kindergarten or in school at the first-grade level. At the age of nine or ten he has pretty well mastered this task. The coming of adolescence, however, changes the nature of the task, and it must be carried on into a new phase. The observations made by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development brought forth the belief that the minimum time for the accomplishment of almost any task would probably be six months, but that many tasks preoccupy the child for several years, even when he is working

---

[14]Theman, loc. cit.

[15]Havighurst, op. cit., p. 27.

very effectively on them.[16]

Havighurst believed that there is no developmental task of children or adolescents that the school can ignore completely. The tasks are so closely interwoven that difficulty in one task, which may show in the school, is often involved with difficulty in another task for which the school has little direct responsibility. Havighurst felt that the field of education should find the concept important for two reasons: the discovery and the statement of the purposes of education in school, and the timing of educational efforts. Guidance, through the means of school experiences, should help each child toward the achievement of various goals, including those he has set for himself. He should be so guided that he can achieve recognition in the attainment of at least some of his goals. This progress toward goals and achievement of success, to be effective, must be accomplished within a classroom and school where daily experience in democratic living and learning is provided.[17]

Formal education was defined by Havighurst as a procedure set up by society to help children achieve certain

---

[16]Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, Fostering Mental Health in Our Schools (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1950), p. 80.

[17]Havighurst, op. cit., p. 5.

of their developmental tasks. The school specializes in the
tasks involving the learning of mental skills; it is responsi-
ble for providing the materials and the training needed for
the development of reading, writing, and calculating abilities.
The school in American society, however, goes far beyond this
basic program. Since American boys and girls are placed to-
gether in the school by age groups, the school becomes the
place where they may learn the tasks of social development.
American educators have considered the teaching of the tasks
as an important part of the school's responsibility. The
school has also been expected to co-operate with other train-
ing institutes of society (the family, church, industry, and
youth-serving organizations) in the teaching of such tasks as
physical skills, choosing and preparing for an occupation,
preparing for marriage, and learning a scale of values.[18]

Theman listed two implications which may be derived
from the interrelated concepts of the developmental tasks
for elementary school organization, methods, and materials:
(1) the need for an insightful approach to the interrelated
influences shaping human development, and (2) the need for
teachers to recognize, accept, and provide for individual
differences among children, both as individuals and as mem-
bers of a classroom group. Teacher evaluation of any child,

18Ibid., p. 26.

then, should be based on the information found in the answers

to these questions:

1. What is the child trying to accomplish this school year?

2. What assets does he have?

3. What difficulties does he face?

4. What are the school and home doing to help this child achieve his optimum development?[19]

Weber defined curriculum as the total range of experiences, relationships, and conditions provided under school auspices.[20] Every aspect of school living becomes a part of curriculum. Each child brings with him to school the total impact of his out-of-school living. The curriculum that is based on child growth and development makes it possible for each child to grow up in his own pattern different from the patterns of others. It provides experiences in interdependence. Favorable group living contributes to the development of each individual. Cunningham observed that many school guidance programs appear to operate on the basis of individual adjustment alone, assuming that a congregation of well-adjusted individual pupils results in a good group. She believed, however, that good group living requires special skills and

---

[19]Theman, op. cit., p. 82.

[20]Julia Weber, "Child Development Implications for Curriculum Building," Educational Leadership, XI (March, 1954), 343-44.

understandings. It cannot permit the development of the group at the individual's expense. Both groups and individuals have needs. Each recognizes and respects the contributions of the other.[21]

Passow and MacKenzie in their research on group behavior drew certain conclusions. One of these was that individual attitudes, habits, and behavior are anchored in the groups to which a person belongs. Changes in these attitudes and behaviors occur more readily by changing group properties. In concentrating on the individual child, teachers have frequently neglected group procedures which can enhance the productivity and security of the child as a group member.[22]

Group behavior, group dynamics, and group process are all terms used to describe a new area of investigation and study. Passow and MacKenzie observed that since most teaching today occurs in group situations, the main focus should be on the aspects of the group that influence individual learning. The teacher is in a position to influence profoundly the nature of the group and the nature of group influence on individual learning. The major influence on children in the classroom is interaction with others, and

---

[21]Ruth Cunningham and others, Understanding Group Behavior of Boys and Girls (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951), p. 211.

[22]A. Harry Passow and Gordon N. MacKenzie, "Research in Group Behavior Shows Need for New Teaching Skills," Nation's Schools, XLIX (April, 1952), 71-3.

this interaction may either stimulate or retard pupil growth. The progress of pupils, as well as what they learn, is influenced by their social and emotional needs. The greater learning takes place to the extent that the pupil is able to satisfy these needs. The pattern of human relationships in the classroom, or group climate, strongly influences learning. The perceptions, feelings, inter-personal relationships, and perhaps the personality development of pupils all relate directly to the amount of social interaction in the classroom. Groups within the classroom can be organized so as to facilitate or block learning. It requires time and help to organize a class so that it operates as a group. The reported findings of Passow and MacKenzie listed these typical stages of group growth:

A. Self-centeredness--as individuals attempt to establish their place in the leadership hierarchy

B. Frustration and conflict

C. Attempted consolidation of group harmony

D. Individual self-assessment, flexibility of group process, and emphasis upon productivity in problem-solving[23]

Teachers, according to this study, can use group participation to change pupil behavior and attitudes. When group decisions are reached, eagerness to change is independent of

---

[23]Ibid.

personal choice. Teachers can use the group in teaching
problem-solving. This, in particular, is an aspect of
behavior which modern schools seek to foster. Several
studies have shown that individual members profit from group
participation in problem-solving, since the quality of group
work is often higher than the quality of individual effort.[24]

The studies of Lewin, Lippitt, and White upon group
climate and social interaction indicated that the general
feeling-tone which the teacher sets for the group may in-
fluence the behavior of children.[25] Group morale should be
higher in groups which are run democratically than in groups
run on authoritarian or laissez-faire bases. Some classroom
problems that commonly face a teacher, such as discipline
problems, failures in well-planned projects, emotional in-
securities, and resistance to change, may stem from mis-
interpretations or misunderstandings of the group processes
of the class. The teacher may learn that appreciation of
the drives and interrelations of pupils may provide the key
to their behavior and her own.[26]

Havighurst supported these findings in his studies. He
stated that a school class may or may not be a peer group,

---

[24]Ibid.

[25]Moore and Stendler, op. cit., p. 298.

[26]Passow and MacKenzie, op. cit., p. 73.

depending largely on how the teacher reacts to the class and also upon the cultural and religious backgrounds of the children. Children differ greatly in the experiences they bring to the group. Their patterns of behavior toward their peers stem from their habitual responses to their brothers and sisters. Children of very diverse backgrounds will find it difficult to become a peer group.[27]

The peer group, according to Havighurst, provides the setting and the means by which a boy or girl achieves several of the developmental tasks of middle childhood. The peer group can help the child in four specific ways:

1. To get along with age-mates, establishing patterns of behavior, expressing feelings that all can participate in and that give them the feeling of acting in a group

2. To develop a rational conscience and a sense of values

3. To learn appropriate social attitudes

4. To achieve personal independence[28]

From his studies Havighurst advanced other hypotheses. If, as a member of a peer group, a child is able to do the most effective job of working through the developmental tasks he faces in these years, then the role of the teacher becomes a most important one. The school becomes a peer group as the

---

[27]Havighurst, op. cit., p. 47.

[28]Ibid., pp. 48-62.

children react to each other and the teacher. Much as they
may want to have the feeling of belonging together and much
as they need the support that comes from identifying with
children in a group, they are unable to function constructively
as a group unless there are clearly defined limits within
which they are to operate.[29]

In the classroom it is the teacher who must assume
chief responsibility for outlining the activities, for pro-
viding appropriate materials, for defining the goals, the
disciplinary needs, and the rewards. The teacher structures
the group by her choices of certain activities in preference
to others and by her standards with which to judge the be-
havior and achievements of the group. The feelings which the
children have about themselves as a group follow from the
choices the teacher makes. When the teacher makes her choices
of the kinds of activities and materials, the kinds of pro-
cedures, rewards and punishments, she makes them with reference
to her conceptions of what children are like, how they should
behave, and what they ought to learn. The extent to which
her conceptions are based on a sympathetic and objective
understanding of the nature of the children she teaches is
one of the most important factors affecting the peer relations
of the classroom. If the teacher is able to accept the

---

[29]Ibid.

children as they are, with whatever their shortcomings, they will feel at home in the classroom. To the extent that the children feel secure and accepted, they will be able to accept one another. Their feelings will carry over into the relations within the peer group. Children express their anxieties in different ways, but whatever form anxiety takes, it has its repercussions in the peer group relationships. Children become tense and irritable in situations where they are unable to achieve adult approval except by struggling for controls that are beyond their ability to manage easily. These tensions and resentments are often expressed against each other.[30]

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development reported significant findings from research in the field of child development. Adults, particularly teachers and parents, usually ignore the reality of the child society and may even deny its existence. Children are expected to conform to adult expectations. The teacher must make every effort to observe the social organization of the child's world and to accept the fact that she, as an adult, may be excluded from it. She must work with the child society as well as accept it.[31] The report of the American Council on

---

[30]Ibid., pp. 48-71.

[31]Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, op. cit., p. 50.

Education stated that the gradual emergence of the child society occurs when a number of children of school age come together and do things together through a considerable period of time. Daily interaction among classmates gradually builds up a series of feelings toward one another (relationships) that imply different roles for different individuals in their group activities. Children come to see themselves and others as belonging to a group in terms of these roles, and they accord different status or prestige value to these roles.[32]

The adult society which children imitate in play has a variety of roles and status relationships which children explore and attempt to duplicate to some extent in interacting with one another. Sex also influences the child society. The activities and attitudes that characterize the two sexes in American society have been emphasized by adults from very early childhood and are brought into the classroom. The games which children play have a variety of prestige-carrying roles in the child society. These factors influence the child society. Many others also cause various children to be attracted to one another and to group themselves into cliques. Each clique has its own characteristic culture and code of conduct.[3]

[32]American Council on Education, Helping Teachers Understand Children (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1945), p. 276.

[33]Ibid., pp. 276-77.

Wiles considered the most urgent problem of any class to be that of learning to live with associates so that the living is effective toward the solving of individual and group needs. Each pupil must feel that he belongs to the group. He must feel at ease and successful and that he, above all, has a responsibility to the group. According to Wiles, many classroom problems in human relations center around the teacher's concept of leadership. If leadership is a contribution that a boy or girl makes to the establishment and carrying out of group purposes, then everyone has a chance to be a leader. In a true group situation the leadership shifts. Many types of leadership are possible, and cooperation is encouraged. The creative intelligence of all members is shared. A group has attained maturity when it has accepted the responsibility for its own actions and has become self-directing.[34] Theman suggested that one might think of the group as a constellation of mutually interrelated and interacting dynamic forces in which the group affects the individual, the individual affects other individuals, and each individual affects the group.[35]

Moore and Stendler found that research in group

---

[34]Kimball Wiles, Teaching for Better Schools (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952), pp. 59 and 133.

[35]Theman, op. cit., p. 70.

dynamics has also been concerned with role-taking and role-playing and their therapeutic implications. The concept of role was clarified by social psychologists as a pattern or type of social behavior which seems situationally appropriate to an individual in terms of the demands and expectations of those in his group. Children take or play many different roles throughout the day--son, daughter, pupil, peer group member, boy or girl, and age group. These are culturally-defined roles. They also play other roles which are related both to the situation and to their individual personalities-- the aggressor, the blocker, the recognition-seeker, the self-confessor, the playboy, the dominator, and the help-seeker. Children in a classroom situation may be trained for a particular task by having them enact a role before the group. Role-playing has been used in the classroom to bring about behavior change. This procedure has the advantage of helping a child to see himself as others see him and of making him realize the effect of some of his actions on others.[36]

Havighurst recognized that inner conflicts within the individual child may be so strong that he is unable to establish any constructive relationships with the other children. He may be unable to exercise a sufficient degree of control over his actions to make himself at all acceptable to the

---

[36]Moore and Stendler, op. cit., p. 299.

other children. Sometimes the child is so preoccupied by his own trouble that he does not even seem to be aware of his rejection by the other children. He probably will not be accepted until he is able to modify his behavior. The most important thing the teacher can do is to help him understand that she can accept him as a person of worth. In helping children establish better relationships with a group, all the teacher can do is to create a situation in which it might be possible to see the child in a new role.[37]

Arthur Foshay summarized his research by saying that the problems to be solved in the elementary curriculum have to do with helping children to live in a world where rapid transition makes even the old problems look new. The desired end of the curriculum, through the means of units and projects, individual mental health, group processes, and the other present-day dynamic educational methods, is the development of children who can act with others effectively to deal with change and successive crises.[38]

From a review of the literature on the two concepts, it appears that a welding together of the developmental task concept and the concept of group dynamics is not merely

---

[37]Havighurst, op. cit., pp. 75-76.

[38]Arthur W. Foshay, "Changing Interpretations of the Elementary School Curriculum," John Dewey Society, op. cit., p. 129.

possible, but highly effective in educating elementary school children to be capable of solving their problems as individuals in social groups. If the mastery of each developmental task at the unique time of its arrival indicates the mastery of others, then it seems reasonable to assume that boys and girls who have acquired skills in the solving of the problems met in school living will continue to exercise those skills toward the solving of problems as they advance in maturity and responsibility. The solving of group tasks appears to be effective when the groups are composed of mature individuals.

Havighurst, perhaps more than any other individual educator, advanced the theory of the developmental tasks. In brief, he stated that the individual meets tasks throughout his life that are important to his well-being and that these tasks have a unique time of emergence in the life of each individual. Successful mastery of each task seems to insure the successful mastery of the other tasks, whereas difficulty in the mastery of a task seems to predict difficulty in the mastery of others. Havighurst considered the cultural environment a significant influence upon individual achievement in his necessary learnings. He expressed the theory that the concept is neither authoritarian nor permissive in nature, but that it partakes of the tenets of both points of view.

Tryon and Lilienthal made the concept significant in the field of education by defining five stages of human growth from infancy to adolescence and by identifying the tasks which are considered necessary learnings at each stage. According to Theman, more co-ordinated study on the developmental concept is needed. There appears to be a definite need for study upon the application of data to practice in the actual learning experience in schools.

Cunningham concluded that the growth and development of the individual and group are necessarily interrelated. Passow and MacKenzie emphasized the role of the teacher in the development of the individual as a group member. This emphasis was also brought out by the reports of the American Council on Education and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum. These reports also identified the concept of the roles within the child society. The research of Moore and Stendler defined the categories of characteristic roles within the typical group and reported a therapeutic value in dramatization of group-role situations.

CHAPTER III

THE GROUP STUDIED AND THE TECHNIQUES USED

The school system under which this study was made had,
for the space of a generation, been guided by philosophical
principles that children learn most effectively through
activity and experience. These principles affirmed that
children become responsible, self-directing citizens of
the larger community through years of practice at being
responsible, self-directing participants in classroom and
school communities. The teachers within the system were
accustomed to experimentations and sensitive to the relation-
ship between community life and the interests of the pupils.
It was, therefore, possible to undertake and carry on a pro-
gram of the study of how children grow and develop because
the need for such understanding was recognized and because
administrators and teachers were skilled at working together
experimentally. The program based on Child Growth and Develop-
ment came as an outgrowth of the activity-centered curriculum.
It was launched at the beginning of the school year of 1940-
41.

The director of the school district's observational
program was chosen as consultant on Child Growth and Develop-
ment. She studied at the teachers' workshop at the University
of Chicago and then introduced a three-year program of

in-service study for teachers of the district. They observed

selected pupils in as many aspects of daily school living as

possible and wrote anecdotes of their behavior. These anec-

dotes were analyzed and discussed at group sessions in an

effort to explain how children develop, how they learn, and

why they behave as they do. The consultant had been charged

with the particular task of revising the cumulative records

and the methods of reporting pupil progress to parents.

The investigator went into this school system with

only one year's experience in teaching. She was in sympathy

with the basic concepts of group dynamics and the develop-

mental tasks as the result of her accumulated experience

with and study of children. She was, however, completely

inexperienced with the curriculum procedures in practice in

Area II as well as the dynamics of teacher-pupil planning.

Her year of teaching had been spent in a school system that

was also unique in its curriculum concepts but was, basically,

authoritarian in nature.

She received her introduction to the Greenville County

School System in the customary in-service program of pre-

planning conferences. There were four conference centers

located at school buildings in the city. The investigator

was assigned to a center which had for its topic of study

and discussion "Improving Our Relationships with Other Teachers."

This pre-planning experience of three days' length served her

chiefly as orientation into the consolidated system of city and county schools. This consolidation had taken place only a few years before, and problems had arisen which seemed to require time for their solution. The investigator learned from her participation in her discussion group that Area II observed principles of education and practices which were not accepted in the other three areas. Teachers in the other areas seemed, on the whole, not to be in sympathy with these principles and practices.

The pre-planning program further included three days of conferences for teachers and their principals at the schools where they taught. The Richard W. Arrington School had just been completed by the month of September, 1956. The school is located in northwestern Greenville at a point midway between communities, where two separate schools had formerly served the residents. These communities are the Union Bleachery Village, a textile-mill village, and Sans Souci. The elementary school in Sans Souci had been greatly overcrowded, whereas the school building in the Union Bleachery Village was a wooden structure which had outlived its usefulness. The total number of children who had attended this school in the preceding year was fewer than two hundred. The Arrington School was built in answer to the need for a new school in a community characterized by new residential areas and the movement of large numbers of

families with children into these areas.

In the three days of planning before the opening of the school year, the investigator received much of her induction into the teaching field of Area II. At this period of her orientation she observed the contrast between the concepts of teaching she had known and those which were in practice in Area II. Supplies had been ordered the preceding year, and they were to be paid for from the material fees paid by pupils. Basal texts (such as spelling books, arithmetics, and readers), as well as books and other materials to be used in unit studies, were to be ordered from the central depot of teaching materials known as the Materials Bureau. The investigator also observed that the teachers in Area II carefully arranged their classrooms according to "Centers of Interest." Concepts of learning in subject and broad-field areas were provided, as much as possible, by concrete objects. Visual instruction was provided, in part, by story-significant pictures. Large chart-sheets, neatly lettered and often decorated, were a part of the centers of interest and gave guiding concepts in that area.

At the pre-planning period at Arrington School, the investigator met with the other fifth-grade teacher to consider the cumulative records of all pupils who were to be enrolled in the fifth grade. She had been told that the

fifth-grade boys and girls were the only groups which were
to be drawn from both the former Union Bleachery and the
Sans Souci Schools. The purpose in considering the records
at this point was to select, as carefully as possible, two
classes of boys and girls which might be formed into effec-
tive peer groups. The other teacher had taught for a number
of years in Area II and was in a position to know the per-
sonality traits of many of the pupils. Where dissension
between pupils seemed to be a threat, pupils were separated.

Dissension, not only among pupils but among the par-
ents of the pupils, seemed to be a threat to the new school.
There appeared to be certain decided differences between the
attitudes, and probably the sub-cultural level, of the citi-
zens of the Union Bleachery Community and the citizens of
Sans Souci. The Union Bleachery Village was widely known in
the educational hierarchy of Area II as a closely-knit com-
munity united by the bonds of employment within the same
industry, affiliation with community institutions (especially
the churches), and pride in the community. Its citizens
were reluctant to give up the school in their midst. There
had been ample playground space, and pupils, in most cases,
lived within a few minutes' walk of the school. The Sans
Souci Community gave the appearance that its citizens were
striving to grow away from identification with the textile
industry and to become identified with the social level of

middle class. This community seemed less closely united by bonds of common interest. Although a number of industries had their locations in and near this neighborhood, many residents of Sans Souci held positions in other parts of Greenville as salespersons, office employees, and other types of employment not associated with the textile industry. From the evaluations of teachers and other educators the task of welding these two communities into one dynamic school unit seemed extremely difficult; some felt that its attainment was impossible. The problem chosen by the principal and teachers of the Arrington School for their in-service study throughout the year was "Bringing Communities Together and Understanding Children Better Through Home Visits, Conferences, and Records."

The school year began on Thursday, September 6, 1956. The investigator enrolled thirty-one pupils in her fifth-grade section.[1] Their ages ranged from nine years, five months, to thirteen years, six months. Woody S. was the youngest pupil, having been started in a private school at the age of five. Jack H., a pupil of very limited ability, was the eldest. The investigator had the advice of the Area II psychologist concerning Jack. Although his I. Q. of 83 proved that he had learning capacity, Jack, by fifth grade, seemed to have lost both courage and interest. For the entire year the investigator

---

[1]See Appendix A.

worked with Jack in individual teaching using first-grade readers and other primary materials.

The pupils' cumulative records were one of the most unique and valuable features of the program of Child Growth and Development as it was in effect in Area II. The form of record was one which provided for a comprehensive study of the pupil in the light of each area of growth and development. These areas were designated for study, in both tabulated and descriptive-narrative form, as follows:

I.   The Physical Area

II. The Affection Area

III. The Peer Culture Area

IV. The Socialization Area

V.   The Self-Developmental Area

VI. The Self-Adjustive Area

VII. Hypotheses

When the pupil entered school his record was begun. It included significant facts of his pre-school developmental history as well as anecdotes of his school living in terms of his areas of growth and development. As the pupil moved through the grades, each teacher studied his record, adding dated anecdotes of his behavior. In this record-form, developmental patterns could be observed and guided. From a study of her pupils' cumulative records the investigator felt that she achieved a deeper understanding and insight than she

otherwise would have had. She believed that the records gave particularly valuable insight into the cultural influences exercised upon each pupil by his family and community. The next steps in her efforts to understand her pupils were the visits to as many homes as possible and the beginning of her recording of anecdotes on newer aspects of the developmental history of each child.

The homes of all pupils were visited except those where both parents worked until a late hour.[2] The investigator was enabled to make her visits in a strange community chiefly through the help of the mother of one of her pupils. This mother placed her car and herself as chauffeur at the disposal of the investigator. The parents in the homes that were visited seemed, almost without exception, pleased and completely at ease during the visit. They were apparently accustomed to the annual visit from the teachers of their children. There was no home where the family seemed to lack the necessities for comfortable living. The investigator observed that there was a television set with a large screen in each home. Three homes seemed to be a little less economically secure than others. These were the homes of Mike H., Jack H., and Pat R. All families except Pat's, however, had paid the materials fee of $3.00 and the book fee of $4.00.

---

[2]See Appendix B.

One family appeared to be completely out of its social and economic setting. This was the family of Tom W. Mr. W. was a college graduate with a degree in engineering. He and Mrs. W. were partners in a business which they had established on the first floor of a large house on one of the obviously more expensive residential streets in the Sans Souci Community. The family (who had entered the community from Oak Ridge, Tennessee, several years before) lived upstairs in the house. There were five children who were cared for by three housekeepers (or governesses), two during the day and one at night. Tom's mother appeared ill at ease and somewhat annoyed at the visit of the investigator at a time when the father was not present. She assumed that the visit was for the purpose of discussing the academic work of their son, and she was critical of the curriculum and the grading system.

The pupils whose homes were not visited were all former Sans Souci pupils. Although there were also pupils of the former Union Bleachery School who had both parents working, the investigator was able to visit such homes before or after a change in work shift at the plant. These were the homes of Johnny C., Larry D., Woody S., and Jimmy W. The investigator was particularly impressed by the fact that all the parents whom she visited spoke of wanting their children to work in the "top group."

The investigator gained some knowledge of the achievement level of each of her pupils from anecdotes written into the cumulative records. In addition, she observed her pupils and gave diagnostic tests in order to place them in groups according to their ability. One of the characteristics of Area II that made it unique and highly commended in the educational field was the fact that pupils were grouped heterogeneously into grades. This type of grouping was designed to prevent pupils from identifying with a "fast" or "slow" grade. The investigator established her groups in reading, arithmetic, and spelling on a temporary basis. As pupils gained in understanding and skill, they moved into other groups. Although the investigator tried to avoid referring to any group in terms of comparison (such as "first," "second," or "third" arithmetic group), she discovered that pupils and parents alike showed keen sensitivity to grouping. They seemed to resent the use, even temporarily, of any books that were below grade level.

The curriculum of Area II schools was unique also in its basis on units and interest groups. Activity-learning was the core of the curriculum. Early in the school year the investigator was given the opportunity of observing the classroom procedures of an experienced teacher. This observation gave particular emphasis to pupil-planning with the teacher. Pupils defined areas in which they felt an interest

or a need to explore and set up activities. Using this observation and other information gained from in-service preplanning and from associates, the investigator attempted to set up procedures in accord with pupils' expressed interests. Committees for investigation of selected studies were formed. Reading materials on several levels of difficulty were ordered from the Materials Bureau. The first small group-interests grew out of the daily sharing period.

Each day began with a group experience. Devotions were followed by a sharing period in which news of interest was reported. Pupils were accustomed to bringing "surprises." These were objects of interest to the children who brought them, and their identity was to be guessed after the bringer gave out one or more clues. This experience, with its emphasis on logical guesses and questioning, seemed to be the basis of approach in the activity-centered curriculum, and these objects very often led to an interest-group and study. The first interest-groups arising were as follows:

How are seeds carried to places where they can grow?

What are diamonds made of?

What is the difference between insects and spiders?

What is the Solar System?

The group sharing times were considered valuable periods for discussing plans for the day and solving problems common to the group. The investigator noted that group

participation in sharing news and surprises came from fewer
than one third of the class. Group discussion of attitudes
and problems took place among only a few pupils. These pupils,
in many cases, appeared to be attention-seekers, especially
Ken H. and Tom W. Ronnie H. and Larry D. seemed united by a
desire to find a comic situation in any kind of discussion.
They chose to sit next to each other at sharing times, appar-
ently for this purpose. At this time conflicts among person-
alities were developing among the boys. Ronnie H., the largest
in size, quickly became a leader. He was very aggressive in
his relations with classmates of both sexes. Larry H. seemed
to choose the role of class clown. He and Ronnie were often
a team which threatened any efforts toward group-planning.
Tom W. was rejected by his classmates from the beginning of
the year. His role seemed to be that of critic, or blocker.
He further sought recognition by bringing expensive play-
things and books to school. He did not share or permit these
things to be handled by others but usually played with them
during work periods. The girls were not characterized by any
such outward conflicts.

The principal of the Arrington School was an educator
of long experience in the area, both as teacher and as super-
visor. She was completing advanced study in the Institute
of Child Growth and Development at the University of Maryland.
She offered assistance to her teachers, particularly to new

teachers, and she gave valuable aid to the investigator in observing the group and setting up the first phase of the major social studies unit. Shortly after this observation in October, 1956, the principal suggested to the investigator that a worthy goal for the class would be its development into a peer group. She advised that all instructional efforts be directed toward and subject to this over-all goal.

Recognizing that one of her greatest challenges lay in working more effectively with Ronnie, the class bully, the investigator chose him for her case study in the first-year section of the three-year, in-service study in Child Growth and Development. This case study involved a careful analysis of the data in Ronnie's record and the writing of anecdotes on all aspects of his behavior over a period of several months. In addition, the investigator made a life-space survey of all features of his physical environment with which he came into contact each day. She interviewed a former teacher and studied samples of his creative work. These studies led to the formulating of hypotheses concerning the developmental tasks on which the pupil was working and how he could be helped to achieve success in them.

In early November the investigator gave a friendship test based on the question, "What boys or girls would you like to have at your table to work with?" This same question was used throughout the study. The results of the

November, 1956, test[3] seemed to indicate that the boys made
choices from among classmates they had known in the schools
they formerly attended. Girls seemed to be making choices of
friends they had not formerly known.

The investigator applied some of the techniques learned
from her Child Growth and Development Study to her entire
class so as to understand more clearly the self-concepts,
family relationships, desires, and frustrations of each pupil.
She believed that the insight she hoped to acquire could aid
her in helping the class toward becoming a peer group. One
technique was to ask each pupil to draw a map of the neighbor-
hood where he lived, including details of church, playground,
drugstore, and other significant features of a residential
area. Another piece of creative work with projective possi-
bilities was a picture-map called "My Island of Delight."
These maps, picturing some features of the desire-life of
the pupil, most often depicted such things as convertible-
type cars, hot-dog stands, pretty dresses, amusement parks,
motorboats, riding horses, and trees growing money. Money
was an important item in every one of the maps. Larry D.
pictured himself in a gun battle with criminals.

Creative writing turned out to be one of the more
penetrating means of revealing the feelings of the pupils.

---

[3]See Appendix C-I.

The following titles were subjects for compositions in the school year 1956-57:

1. Who I Am
2. Good Times and Work With My Family
3. Christmases I Remember
4. My Christmas Holiday
5. My Greatest Disappointment
6. If I Had One Day To Do As I Pleased With
7. How I Am Punished At Home
8. My Best Friend
9. What I Like (or Dislike) About School
10. What I Hope To Be Twenty Years From Now
11. My Hobbies
12. An Adult Friend

In the fall of 1956 the investigator organized an excursion for her class to the Children's Nature Museum in Charlotte, North Carolina. This trip was a culminative activity to the unit on the Solar System, and it was made by chartered bus, with mothers accompanying the class as adult assistants. The class planned the trip together, discussed the important exhibits to be observed, and made a chart of these plans to be evaluated after the return. Such excursions were one of the successful practices of the activity-centered curriculum of Area II.

The investigator attempted to guide her class into

an understanding of typical roles played by children in their
many group situations through the reading of children's books
and stories. This was intended as a means of helping the
pupils to identify themselves in fictional personalities and
to guide them toward accepting themselves and their peers.
After the reading, the selections were discussed. The books
read to the group during the school year of 1956-57 were
the following:

Charlotte's Web	E. B. White
The Hundred Dresses	Eleanor Estes
Little House in the Big Woods	Laura Ingalls Wilder
Little House on the Prairie	Laura Ingalls Wilder
On the Banks of Plum Creek	Laura Ingalls Wilder
By the Shores of Silver Lake	Laura Ingalls Wilder
The Long Winter	Laura Ingalls Wilder
Little Town on the Prairie	Laura Ingalls Wilder
Farmer Boy	Laura Ingalls Wilder

The books written by Wilder seemed to have a special
appeal for the class. The investigator thought that they
were the stories best suited to her need for bringing family
and other human relationships into focus. They were based
on real-life experiences of the author's life in frontier
days on the American prairies, and they revealed the growth
and development of each member of a family. The pupils were
able to understand and identify themselves with human emotions

and experiences similar to some of their own emotions and experiences.

The year was one of the most intense learning for the investigator, through group discussions with colleagues, through the two in-service programs of study, and through the continuing interpretation of data in the cumulative records. November and March were the months designated for parent-teacher conferences.[4] Each pupil's parents were given an appointment for an individual conference with the teacher. If parents were unable to meet the schedule, they were urged to make another appointment for an individual conference. At these conferences (which were held in the afternoon or on certain scheduled evenings for working parents), samples of the pupil's work were presented and interpreted. Parents were given the opportunity to ask questions, express points of view toward school procedures, and they were particularly urged to help the teacher plan for guiding the pupil to grow and develop more fully in all aspects of his school life. The conferences were one of the most important features of Area II's program of evaluation. Although both parents of a pupil were urged to come to conferences, there was only one case in November, 1956, where both parents came.[5]

---

[4] See Appendix D.

[5] See Appendix D.

Otherwise it was the mother of the pupil who came. Except

for the mothers of Woody S. and Jimmy W., all mothers ex-

pressed themselves as accepting the progress of their chil-

dren. Mrs. S. was critical of the fact that Woody was work-

ing below his grade level in arithmetic. She stated that he

had always been in the "fastest groups," and she wanted him

to bring home his books every day. Mrs. W. appeared dis-

pleased with the report on her son's classroom behavior,

but she and the investigator were able to work out a plan

together for helping Jimmy understand his role and responsi-

bility as a member of his class.

Progress reports went out late in January, 1957. These

reports were a printed form letter with blank spaces for re-

porting the status of the pupil's work in eight subject fields.

The pupil's achievement was stated, as well as suggestions

as to how the parents might help him. The parents of Ken H.

did not come to the fall conference but came unexpectedly

on their lunch hours for a conference after receiving his

progress report.

The friendship test of January, 1957, indicated the

gradual acceptance of peers.[6] There was evidence that Tom W.

was accepted by three boys. This fact came from an interesting

group experience. Tom reported to the principal after a number

---

[6]See Appendix C-II.

of fights and other conflicts, particularly with Ronnie.
He admitted to her that he needed friends, mentioning Ricky
E., Ronnie, and Jack. He said that if they would help him
he would try to act in a way that would make the entire
class accept and like him. A conference with the three
boys named brought out their agreement to be friends with
Tom and to help him. For three weeks Tom was accepted in
the various groups in all aspects of school. The chosen
friends stuck to their program, but apparently Tom had not
yet progressed to the stage of giving friendship. His chosen
friends, one by one, rejected him again.

In March, 1957, the second parent-teacher conferences
were held. Although there was a larger attendance of par-
ents at conferences and parents seemed pleased and communi-
cative in their interviews with the investigator, two con-
ferences revealed displeasure of parents with the school
experiences of their children. Nancy C.'s mother repeatedly
stated that Nancy could do a higher level of academic work.
Mrs. C. said that she did not blame the investigator, but
that she wanted Nancy to have lots more homework and to be
"made" to work harder. A study of Nancy's record revealed
that Mrs. C. had been very displeased with the teacher of the
preceding year who had told her that Nancy was incapable of
accomplishing the level of study she demanded.

Both parents of Woody S. came to the conference in

March. Woody's record and the investigator's observation seemed to show that he was under great parental pressure to achieve recognition in his subjects. He was the youngest pupil in the class, being a full year ahead of his age-group. The investigator had suggested to Mrs. S. in November that Woody might profit from being allowed to repeat fifth grade in order to be with his age level. Mrs. S. had very little to say during this conference, however, since Mr. S. completely dominated the attempted conference.

When the year was half over, the investigator asked her principal if she might teach the same class through the sixth grade. She felt that two years might show more significant results in the emergence of a peer group. This permission was granted. Near the end of the school year the principal taught for the investigator for a day while she was closing her records for the year. As a result of the day's experience, the principal advised that certain pupils be placed in another sixth-grade group, since this class was one with unusual group conflicts. Ronnie, Larry, Woody, and Jimmy S. were selected to enter another sixth grade.

The school year of 1957-58 began with the usual pre-planning in-service conferences on August 27, 1957. Dr. John Kurtz of the Institute of Child Growth and Development at the University of Maryland was leader of the conference center which the investigator chose as her field of need and

interest, "Improving Our Ways of Working with Children."
Dr. Kurtz' topic for planning and discussion was "Enabling
Our Children to Learn." He seemed to underscore the need
for improving the human relations in school living. A re-
mark, often restated by Dr. Kurtz, was as follows:

> Children are earnestly, conscientiously, and contin-
> ually working at the job of growing up--even when they
> seem not to have any goals at all and when we cannot
> approve their methods of working on these goals. Chil-
> dren's goals and aspirations are like our own.

The need for deeper, more hypothetical, and systematic
study of what children are like and how they learn seemed to
be recognized by the teachers attending the conference.

The Arrington School began its second year on Tues-
day, September 3, 1957. The investigator, after enrolling
her sixth grade, found that four other pupils of her former
fifth grade did not return to the school, having moved out
of the district. These pupils were Jimmy B., Margaret C.,
Jack H., and Tom W. In addition to the remaining twenty-two
of her former fifth-grade pupils the investigator enrolled
five new pupils: Connie P., Brenda S., Bobby D., Jeff D.,
and Ken R.

Two weeks after the beginning of school the principal
asked the investigator to accept two boys who seemed unsuited
to a fourth-fifth grade combination class. In social maturity,
rather than in intellectual maturity, they seemed better suited
to a sixth grade. These pupils were Dennis J. and Bill S.

Near the end of the month the final pupil was added to the group, bringing the enrollment to thirty pupils. This pupil was Carolyn B.

The investigator began her second year with Area II by recording a number of anecdotes on each pupil during the course of the first six weeks of school. She found that the pupils whom she had taught the year before showed noticeable physical and emotional maturation over the summer months. She secured the cumulative records of her new pupils except that of Brenda, who had transferred from a Spartanburg school. She chose for her most important goal for the year a more efficient use of group dynamics than she had been able to promote in the preceding year. She felt that in the fifth grade the pupils had been characterized by the conflict which preceded group consolidation. In the sixth grade she hoped that her class might show more harmonious group life.

She took an interest inventory, asking likes and dislikes under ten headings.[7] The inventory asked that choices be expressed, not only concerning activities at school but preferences and conflicts concerning out-of-school life. The investigator planned to base her choices of class activities and curriculum on this inventory. Boys indicated a preference for science and history studies, while girls

---

[7]See Appendix E.

mentioned an interest in "things happening now." The con-
cluding item of the inventory was a question asking for
expression of friendship choices. The results of several
individual replies indicated no rejections at all. "I like
everybody," was the typical reply. Other pupils stated
definite preferences and rejections.[8]

The class voted on a "Supreme Court" to decide the
forms of discipline. A class log was begun for the purpose
of recording experiences in human relationships in school
living, but within a few weeks it seemed to fail in its pur-
pose. Pupils who volunteered as weekly secretaries (Betty M.,
Nancy N., and Jo Ann D.) seemed to wait until the end of
their week to make the entire week's entries at one time
before sending it to the succeeding secretary. The Supreme
Court remained, but it became necessary at times for the
investigator to modify the rather severe penalties it recom-
mended.

Early in the year it became evident to the investigator
that the girls of the class were entering upon a new phase
of development--early adolescence. They asked if they might
wear "pink" lipstick. Further significance of this develop-
mental phase was evident from friendship choices. In the
preceding year the strongest and most unchanging friendship

---

[8]See Appendix C-IV.

group was the one with which Betty M., Nancy N., Eileen B., Margaret C., Becky D., and Nancy C. identified themselves. Margaret was no longer with the group, but the others continued to choose each other. This group seemed further distinguished by frequent quarrels, which often disturbed the entire class. The quarrels were soon resolved within the group. These pupils seemed to ignore the rights, happiness, and almost the existence of the other members of the class. There seemed to be two rivals for the leadership of this group, Betty and Nancy N. Eileen usually identified with Nancy N. Nancy C. was often not a chosen member of this group. She seemed to approach first one leader, then the other, playing them against each other so as to find acceptance for herself with either. The investigator was usually informed and consulted whenever a quarrel ensued in this group.

Rebellion against adult authority seemed to be another adolescent characteristic which revealed itself among certain of the girls, especially in the group described in the preceding paragraph. This attitude appeared to decline among the remainder of the girls after the first two months of school. In the impromptu seating at the beginning of school, it was apparent that several other girls made some effort toward acceptance in the strongest girls' group, but soon withdrew and identified with other groups.

Although the investigator hoped that there would be

more interest in activities where boys and girls could work
and play together, it was soon obvious that the girls were
developmentally now considerably ahead of the boys. Ken R.
and Jeff D. were a year younger than most of the members of
the class, having come from combination-grade classes. They
had had their tenth birthdays in the spring of the preceding
year. These boys were quickly accepted by their peers. Al-
though the boys seemed to be interested in collection hobbies
and improving their athletic skills, the girls, in most cases,
refused to play active games, preferring to sit on the steps
and talk. The seemingly incessant talking was characteristic
of the girls at this period of their development.

In the course of trying to establish classroom standards
of desirable working habits, the investigator discovered a
need for sex education among the girls. Much of their whisper-
ing proved to be the exchange of such information as they had
in the form of obscene stories. This fact came to the investi-
gator's attention as she talked with some of the girls to find
a reason for the constant talking. She reported the need to
the principal, who recommended a conference with the parents
of the girls who had been spoken of as whispering the stories.
The investigator attempted to set up as informal an atmosphere
as possible in the conference, which was held in the class-
room. The principal was also present, but in the role of
participant rather than leader. The investigator opened the

discussion with the question, "What do you think of smutty stories?" The composite answer from the seven mothers was: "We don't approve, but we do enjoy and tell them sometimes—all of us." With this insightful reply as the basis for understanding, the investigator attempted to lead the mothers to understand that their daughters' interest in such stories was natural and was based on a need for real information. Most of the mothers seemed surprised that their daughters were "old enough" for such guidance. They seemed to dread the prospect of approaching their daughters with this matter. All wanted some sort of pamphlet that the girls could read, and a large proportion of the group of mothers asked if the principal or the investigator could not "talk" to the girls. The conference came to an end with the mothers' agreement to give their daughters information to the degree they thought necessary. The investigator agreed to send for informative pamphlets. Neither the principal nor the investigator was satisfied with the results of the conference. The mothers seemed unable to establish a close relationship with their daughters and seemed to consider this aspect of development a responsibility the school might accept.

The major social studies unit for the sixth grade in Area II was the general theme of "The Westward Movement." The investigator used the interest of the class in Bible

personalities as the guidepost for the first phase of the unit, choosing the book of Genesis with the story of the Creation as contrasted with what the science of anthropology has advanced concerning the growth of human beings in group living. She hoped to cover the entire story of Man's continual westward movement over the period of the whole school year. Three committees were set up. One chose "Early Man." This seemed to be the most desirable study. Another committee explored the civilizations of the Nile Valley and the Fertile Crescent. The third committee studied the civilization of the Greek peninsula. One of the interesting aspects of the unit was the comparison of the Greek myths with the well-known Bible stories from Genesis. The generalization desired from the study of the unit was:

> Human beings found that they could live together more happily than by living alone, even though it meant that they would have to give up individual freedom for the happiness and protection of all.

Near the end of this unit the class was visited by the curriculum consultant, who observed as one committee shared its findings. The investigator considered that the reporting was very poorly done after three weeks of work in the committee and planning with the teacher. The consultant, however, congratulated her upon the progress she had made within a year. Upon learning of the investigator's disappointment in the results of the committee's study, she remarked that boys and

girls find it difficult to be interested in anything except that which touches their own lives. The culmination of the unit was a visit to the Bible Lands Museum of Bob Jones University. This experience made a more profound impression upon the class's understanding than any other aspect of the unit.

The class in the sixth grade seemed less interested in identifying with fictional characters. There appeared to be much less interest in books which the investigator read aloud. She read both <u>Tom Sawyer</u> and <u>Huckleberry Finn</u> in the first half of the sixth grade. There seemed to be less interest in reading among members of the class than there had been in the preceding year.

The investigator continued to ask for original writings of a self-revealing nature. These were the titles for writings in the sixth grade:

My Life Story

My Vacation

My Trip to Bob Jones University

On My Way to School (Life-space)

How I Like Best to Spend Saturday

My Church and I

My Dreams

Class Behavior--How It Can Be Improved

It Makes Me Mad!

My School Life Up To Now

Things I Need To Improve About Myself

My Sixth Grade Class and I

The writings seemed to indicate that the boys and girls were growing more skilled in viewing themselves as individuals. They now seemed to show a deeper insight into their own true feelings and motives. Criticism of teachers was usually constructive.

Early in December the class took the Lorge-Thorndyke Intelligence Test, Level 3, both the verbal and the non-verbal batteries.[9] The investigator gave the tests in two groups. She believed that she succeeded in establishing an atmosphere of confidence. When the results of the tests were returned, she believed that, allowing for the fact that one group intelligence test is no more than an estimate of the individual's ability to learn, they tallied with what she had observed of the ability of each pupil.

In January, 1958, the investigator gave her final friendship test.[10] This test was significant in that a large majority of the pupils were no longer giving the names of class members they disliked. The investigator interpreted this fact to mean that pupils more and more were accepting

---

[9] See Appendix F.

[10] See Appendix C-V.

their classmates. She heard another interpretation at an
in-service study, however, which suggested that such replies
indicated a fear of not being accepted.

At the conclusion of her study the investigator was
convinced that at least one clique existed in her class. This
clique seemed to identify itself with certain attributes of
social acceptance among adolescence, such as attractive clothes,
use of current slang, skill in the latest dance-craze, and in
other teen-age fads. Both the teacher and the remainder of
the class were excluded from this clique. A statement on the
remaining members of the class by one of the clique was: "They
are all right, but we're just not interested in the same things."
The boys of the class seemed to be characterized by co-opera-
tion during this second year with the same class. Since sev-
eral of their former classmates were no longer with them, they
seemed, on the whole, to work together harmoniously in the
classroom and play happily on the playground.

The class appeared to be heterogeneous in chronological
age and in intellectual ability. The cultural background
appeared more homogeneous than heterogeneous, although there
was evidence that the families of some pupils were moving into
a higher sub-cultural level. The family of Betty was one of
these. Mr. and Mrs. M. grew up in the community near the
Union Bleachery Village, but Mr. M. studied Pharmacy as a
veteran student and now owned a super-market type of drug

store in Sans Souci.

In the sixth grade the pupils seemed to be working on a wider divergence of developmental tasks than they had been in the fifth grade. The boys seemed still to be in the stage of pre-adolescence with their interest in sports, clubs, and hobbies. The girls, apparently without exception, gave evidence of working on the tasks of adolescence. In the second year of the investigator's study there seemed to be none of the individual antagonism which had been typical of many of the boys the year before. Although there seemed to be an over-all atmosphere of acceptance and tolerance, this class did not become a peer group in the sixth grade.

CHAPTER IV

THE ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In attempting to analyze the data she gathered from
her study, the investigator was again aware of her lack of
experience and orientation in the activity-centered curricu-
lum. The study of the individual pupil in terms of his
developmental tasks presented no such difficulties as the
curriculum did. She also lacked a background of under-
standing of the sub-cultural level of the community where
the Arrington School was located. This level was described
as an industrial community rapidly seeking to rise into the
level known as "white-collar." She felt that an analysis
of her study would have to be made and interpreted in the
light of (1) her unfamiliarity with the permissive point
of view toward the learning process and (2) the contrast
between the attitudes she felt her class should have and
the attitudes the class revealed itself as having. In evalu-
ating the findings of her research, the investigator con-
sidered them to represent both confirmation of previously
gathered data and divergence from these data.

Confirmation of earlier data seemed to be apparent in
two particular areas of the investigator's research: (1) the
three-year program of in-service study on Child Growth and
Development, and (2) the arrangement of the data to be

collected in the individual cumulative records. These areas were the particular responsibility of the consultant on Child Growth and Development when the concept was put into practice in 1940. The in-service program also made extensive use of the cumulative record in its case-study method. Both the study-program and the record-form appeared to have made use of the studies of Tryon and Lilienthal, which defined the areas of growth and the tasks unique to each of the areas.[1] Both the in-service program and the record provided for the formulating of working hypotheses seemed to be based on the questions suggested by Theman.[2] The investigator, however, found it significant that none of the records of her pupils contained any hypotheses. The hypotheses she formed in her own case study were apparently not referred to again after the requirements for the in-service study had been completed. She concurred with Theman[3] that there seemed to be a dearth of application of previous data. Although it was evident that teachers observed and wrote anecdotes with obvious care, there appeared to be a lack of co-ordinated effort toward putting the data into use.

The investigator believed that the data she obtained

---

[1]Supra, p. 10.

[2]Supra, p. 17.

[3]Supra, p. 11.

also confirmed previous research in the emphasis which was
placed upon the role of the teacher in the creation of a
peer group from a class and in the guidance of group aspects
of school living. The concept of the group in Area II, how-
ever, seemed not to have reached the point where group pro-
cess was recognized and utilized as a means of achieving
mature behavior. The class which the investigator taught
seemed to react as a congregation of individuals, even in
the unit activities where projects were undertaken by groups
of pupils. As Cunningham observed,[4] the program of Child
Growth and Development in Area II appeared to reason that a
group of well-adjusted individuals would inevitably result
in a productive and well-adjusted group.

The data gathered in this research seemed to indicate
a divergence from earlier data in one aspect of the concept
of the developmental tasks. Although the basic tenets of
Havighurst's concept were accepted as educational theory in
Area II, it was evident that one of his theories had not
found general acceptance. Havighurst observed that the con-
cept was neither authoritarian nor permissive in its attitude
toward education, but it occupied a mid-point between the two.[5]
It was obvious that in Area II the developmental tasks concept
had been grafted on to the permissive activity-centered

[4]Supra, p. 17.

[5]Supra, p. 12.

curriculum which had been in practice for more than twenty years before the developmental program was accepted. Perhaps it was reasoned that the growth and development of the individual pupil could proceed more efficiently in such a curriculum than in a school environment which was teacher-directed.

In analyzing other findings of her research the investigator concluded that she had not been able to create an effective peer group from the class she taught in fifth and sixth grades. She believed that there were several reasons for this, in addition to the ones mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. One reason was the limitation of the time of the study. A longer period of time was needed to create a peer group in this particular school at a time when community relations among parents of pupils seemed uncertain. It was for the investigator a time of rapid and concentrated learning, and she felt that more time, orientation, and planning were needed. Teachers in Area II appeared to be under great pressure to accomplish the many obligations toward their pupils in the classroom as well as in the observation and study of their growth and development.

Havighurst stressed the cultural background of the individual in explaining the implications of the developmental tasks concept.[6] One of the most outstanding attitudes of the

---

[6]Supra, pp. 20-21.

parents of the pupils the investigator taught seemed to be their ambition for themselves and their children. A number of parents seemed oblivious to the facts concerning their children's abilities and needs as the investigator found them to be from observation of behavior patterns. Their attitude toward academic achievement seemed to be at variance with the attitude held by administrators and the concepts in practice. The pupils appeared to be keenly competitive in most aspects of school living. The investigator, recognizing that much of this attitude was influenced by the parental attitude, believed that it was very unlikely that a peer group could be developed from such a class in a short time.

The investigator concluded that the teachers and administrators of Area II, after sixteen years in the practice of the concept of Child Growth and Development, were at the stage of gathering additional data. The basic concept advanced by Havighurst was the foundation of the program, but it had been applied to the permissive curriculum concept for which the area had received recognition. Newer implications of the concept seemed to be coming in each year from the Institute of Child Growth and Development at the University of Maryland. The investigator found that data were gathered and recorded, but this data did not appear to be applied to any noticeable degree. Study of the individual pupil's growth and development seemed to be an all-inclusive study.

Although the peer group concept was an important aspect of
the educational program, the study of roles within groups
and group behavior had not been recognized as a need. Chil-
dren seemed to be under the pressure of parental striving
for social prestige. This pressure appeared to make har-
monious group relations difficult. The investigator's
evaluation of her study was that, although a peer group
was not created, more time and more experience in group
dynamics on the part of pupil and teacher would have resulted
in achieving this goal.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Two concepts of education which have received wide acceptance and acclaim seem to be necessarily related in the goals they have sought to achieve. These are the concepts of the developmental tasks and the concept of group dynamics. The concomitant learning which might result from a guidance program that applied both concepts seems to be the theory that healthy growth and development of individuals will assure the healthy growth and development of groups. Citizens of the world of today have been made aware of the importance of intercommunication and interdependence of groups in solving problems common to all peoples. It seems reasonable to suggest that educators might begin at the level of the elementary school to guide pupils toward becoming mature adults who are also members of mature groups. Earlier research appeared to justify this theory. The study undertaken by the investigator attempted to apply the theory to classroom situations. The data were gathered in a school system which seemed appropriate for the study, since it practices the concept of the developmental tasks and is also known for its practice of educational principles based on activity-learning in fields of interest to community life. Since it was a learning process for the investigator, she recorded her

findings in chronological order, evaluating the results of her observations and the techniques as they were utilized. Evidences of certain findings and techniques were recorded in the appendixes. The data gathered in the study were analyzed in Chapter IV, as it supported or differed from earlier data.

The investigator believes that, while she did not seem to prove the point of her theory, her findings are of value to her experience as a teacher and to the field of human relations in the classroom of the elementary school. She chose for her research a school area where the principles of child growth and development are accepted and practiced, and she found there a program of observation and evaluation. Teachers were learning the skills of studying child development through the interpretation of written observations and the pupil's creative work. The community where the investigator made her study appeared to be in a state of transition from the industrial to the middle-class level of society. Children who lived in the community seemed to be under pressure from their parents to achieve recognition in academic accomplishment. This striving for prestige was at variance with the curriculum of Area II, which had been planned to guide pupils toward development in all aspects of their school living rather than in scholastic achievement alone. The data gathered by the investigator seemed to give evidence that her

pupils remained a selection of individuals brought together as a class. They did not become a peer group. She believes that she herself lacked some skill in group guidance, but she feels also that the competitive attitudes which the pupils had internalized from their family backgrounds also hindered them from learning to work together on problems important to the entire group.

The data were gathered in a district where the curriculum in use is based on the principles that democratic behavior results from learning through activities based on units chosen by the pupils themselves. The investigator believes that this curriculum is in danger of becoming stereotyped since pupils gave evidence of choosing materials and units which provided little challenge or opportunity for research. The pupils seemed to work on their unit interests as individuals or as small cliques.

At the time the study was made, Area II of Greenville County had recently been consolidated with other areas into a city-county system. Many of the features which in the past had distinguished this area seemed to have been lost. Although the administrators of Area II were trying to retain as many of the permissive characteristics as possible, one of the outstanding benefits of the program, that of the orientation for new teachers, had by this time all but disappeared.

The pupils whom the investigator taught were a

heterogeneous group of boys and girls. The mean intelligence quotient of the class was found to be within the normal range. At the beginning of the study the pupils appeared to be working on the developmental tasks of late childhood, but by the time the study was concluded, the girls seemed to have arrived at the level of early adolescence. The class did not become a cohesive group. There was evidence that the pupils were working on individual tasks to the extent that group process did not become possible.

As a result of her research the investigator concluded that the teachers in Area II were at the stage of making studies of their individual pupils in terms of their developmental tasks. Under the circumstances of the changes wrought by consolidation and the nature of the growth and development of the parents of the pupils, this stage may well have been as far as they were able to proceed with the study. It was evident that there had been little opportunity for school and home to work together in this community. The community in which the Arrington School is situated is one which has been built since about 1945, but there are also pupils from an older community, the Union Bleachery Village. The goal adopted by the principal and the faculty of the Arrington School was that of bringing communities together in such a way that parents might learn the skills of group-planning for the growth of the school as a community center. There seemed

to be a great need for parents and teachers to work together for deeper understanding of the patterns of growth and development in children and the pattern of learning based on the unique development of the individual child.

Although the investigator feels that she was not able to guide her pupils toward forming a peer group, she believes that she was able to guide them toward skill in recognizing their own attitudes and toward accepting all the attributes of their real selves. The creative writings of the pupils seemed to indicate growth in this skill.

The data appeared to reveal that the study of the individual pupil through the observance of pupil behavior had been effective in guiding teachers to recognize the uniqueness of the individual in his pattern of growth and development. The investigator believes, however, that simplification of the details of the cumulative records might enable teachers to have more time and thought for formulating hypotheses on the pattern of the pupil's growth and development and for making recommendations for his guidance in the future. In this way data which represented earlier study might be put into experimental practice and then evaluated in terms of its effectiveness. The data indicated that teachers were in need of a greater amount of orientation into the concepts of the developmental tasks and the group process. In particular, new teachers were in need of this

orientation. Pre-planning workshops of perhaps two weeks' length might give teachers the background of understanding and preparation needed for the study of their pupils, as well as for the skills needed in classroom group interaction. The investigator believes that her findings carried previous research on the two concepts into the field of classroom experiences in group learning based on the growth of individuals. There seems to be a need for further application of earlier data to actual experience in guiding elementary school pupils toward achieving maturity, both as individuals and as members of groups. This guidance, to be really effective, should be directed by teachers and other educators who have sympathetic understanding and skill in dealing with human relations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

American Council on Education. Elementary Curriculum in
    Intergroup Relations. Intergroup Education in Co-
    operating Schools, Work in Progress Series. Washington,
    D. C.: American Council on Education, 1950. 249 pp.

_____. Helping Teachers Understand Children. Prepared
    by the Staff of the Division on Child Development and
    Teacher Personnel for the Commission on Teacher Educa-
    tion. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education,
    1945. 468 pp.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development,
    National Education Association. Fostering Mental Health
    in Our Schools. Washington, D. C.: Association for Super-
    vision and Curriculum Development, National Education
    Association, 1950. 320 pp.

Cunningham, Ruth, and others. Understanding Group Behavior
    of Boys and Girls. New York: Bureau of Publications,
    Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1951.

Davis, W. Allison, and Robert J. Havighurst. Father of the
    Man. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947. 245 pp.

Detjen, Ervin Winfred, and Mary Ford. Elementary School
    Guidance. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.,
    1952. 266 pp.

Erickson, Erick Homberger. Childhood and Society. New York:
    W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1950. 397 pp.

Havighurst, Robert J. Developmental Tasks and Education.
    Second edition. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1952.

_____. Human Development and Education. New York: Long-
    mans, Green and Co., 1953. 338 pp.

Havighurst, Robert J., and others. Adolescent Character and
    Personality. Committee on Human Development, the University
    of Chicago. New York: J. Wiley, 1949. 315 pp.

Lindgren, Henry Clay. Mental Health in Education. New York:
    Henry Holt and Company, 1954. 561 pp.

Olson, Willard C. Child Development. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1949. 417 pp.

Prescott, Daniel Alfred. Emotion and the Educative Process. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1938. 323 pp.

Snygg, Donald, and Arthur W. Combs. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1949. 386 pp.

Tippett, James S. Schools for a Growing Democracy. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1936. 338 pp.

Warner, W. Lloyd, Robert J. Havighurst, and Martin B. Loeb. Who Shall Be Educated? 190 pp.

Wiles, Kimball. Teaching for Better Schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1952.

Witmer, Helen Leland, and Ruth Kotinsky. Personality in the Making. The Fact-finding Report of the Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. 454 pp.

B. BOOKS: PARTS OF SERIES

John Dewey Society. The American Elementary School. Thirteenth Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.

Proceedings of the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth. Raleigh, North Carolina: Health Publications Institute, 1951. 363 pp.

C. PERIODICAL ARTICLES

Anderson, William F., Jr. "Teaching Is Not Enough," Progressive Education, XXXII (March, 1955), 61-2.

Bain, Winifred E. "It's Fun and Brings Results," Childhood Education, XXXI (December, 1954), 176-8.

Chittenden, Gertrude E., and others. "Developmental Tasks: How We Can Help," Journal of Home Economics, XLV (October, 1953), 579-83.

Cribbin, James J. "Mental Health of Pupils: A Teacher's Responsibility," Teachers College Record, LVII (April, 1956), 463-68.

Havighurst, Robert J. "The Development of the Ideal Self in Childhood and Adolescence," Journal of Educational Research, XL (December, 1946), 24-57.

_____. "Moral Character and Religious Education," Religious Education, LI (May-June, 1956), 163-69.

_____. "Poised at the Crossroads of Life: Suggestions to Parents and Teachers of Young Adolescents," School Review, LXI (September, 1953), 329-36.

_____. "What Adolescence Is Like," National Parent-Teacher, XLV (September, 1950), 26-8.

James, C. Evans, "Trends in Child Development Research," Childhood Education, XXIX (October, 1952), 73-6.

Jersild, Arthur T. "The Administrator and Child Development," NEA Journal, XXXVII (May, 1948), 285-6.

_____. "Child Development and the Curriculum," NEA Journal, XXXVII (February, 1948), 92-3.

Lerch, Albert M. "The School's Difficult Role," School Executive, LXXV (March, 1956), 102-3.

Lindgren, Henry Clay. "The Effect of the Group on the Behavior of the Individual," Education, LXXIII (February, 1953), 383-7.

Morgan, Winona L. "New Approaches to Child Development," Journal of Home Economics, XLV (January, 1953), 13-6.

Muse, Paul F. "The Nature of Child Growth and Development," Teachers College Journal, XX (January, 1949), 60-6.

Neubauer, Peter B. "The Child's Growth Toward Maturity," Child Study, XXIII (Summer, 1956), 31-4.

Ojemann, Ralph H. "School-Community Program," Review of Educational Research, XXVI (December, 1956), 479-99.

Olson, Willard C. "The Philosophy of Growth," NEA Journal, XXXVII (January, 1948), 28-9.

Passow, A. Harry, and Gordon N. MacKenzie. "Research in Group Behavior Shows Need for New Teaching Skills," Nation's Schools, XLIX (April, 1952), 71-3.

Prescott, Daniel A. "Is Child Study a New Fad?" NEA Journal, XXXIX (October, 1950), 507-8.

Reeves, Katherine. "And We Who Teach Them--," Grade Teacher, LXXIII (June, 1956), 8-9.

Ryan, W. Carson. "The Emerging Concept of Mental Health in Education," Review of Educational Research, XXVI (December, 1956), 417-28.

Shaftel, Fannie R. "Children's Feelings," Childhood Education, XXXIII (April, 1957), 358-63.

Stott, Leland H. "Mental Health and Developmental Hygiene," Education, LXIX (January, 1949), 271-4.

Thelen, Herbert A. "Engineering Research in Curriculum Building," Journal of Educational Research, XLI (April, 1948), 577-96.

Tryon, Caroline, and Jesse W. Lilienthal, III. "Guideposts in Child Growth and Development," NEA Journal, XXXIX (March, 1950), 188-9.

Tyler, Ralph W. "We Are Learning More and More About Human Behavior," NEA Journal, XLIV (October, 1955), 426-9.

Watson, Helen T. "Some Effects of Our Schools on the Mental Health of Children," Journal of School Health, XXV (September, 1955), 179-86.

Weber, Julia. "Child Development Implications for Curriculum Building," Educational Leadership, XI (March, 1954), 343-6.

Witty, Paul A. "Interest and Success--The Antidote to Stress," Elementary English, XXXII (December, 1955), 507-13.

_____. "Promoting Growth and Development Through Reading," Elementary English, XXVII (December, 1950), 493-500.

Woods, Elizabeth L. "Growth and Development of Children," California Journal of Elementary Education, XVII (February, 1949), 146-52.

Zirbes, Laura. "The Challenge of Children's Needs," Childhood Education, XXV (May, 1949), 417-9.

D. ESSAYS AND ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

Foshay, Arthur W. "Changing Interpretations of the Elementary School Curriculum," The American Elementary School, Harold G. Shane, editor. Thirteenth Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953. Pp. 104-30.

Hymes, James L., Jr. "Better Humans, Better Citizens," The American Elementary School, Harold G. Shane, editor. Thirteenth Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953. Pp. 363-83.

Moore, Walter J., and Celia B. Stendler. "Some Research Studies in Education and in Related Disciplines Which Suggest Good Elementary School Practices," The American Elementary School, Harold G. Shane, editor. Thirteenth Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953. Pp. 281-317.

Theman, Viola. "Emerging Concepts of Child Growth and Development: What They Suggest for Classroom Practice," The American Elementary School, Harold G. Shane, editor. Thirteenth Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953. Pp. 57-86.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

PUPILS ENROLLED IN THE INVESTIGATOR'S FIFTH GRADE
ON SEPTEMBER 6, 1956

Girls	Boys
Eileen B.	Jimmy B.
Leslie Ann B.	Johnny C.
Margaret C.	Larry D.
Joyce C.*	Ricky E.
Nancy C.	Mike H.
Jo Ann D.	Ken H.
Mary D.	Ronnie H.
Becky D.	Gene H.
Mary Jo H.	Jack H.
Betty M.	Lester McG.
Nancy N.	Steve M.
Pat R.	Grady S.
Linda R.	Jimmy S.
Lynn S.	Woody S.
Sandra T.	Jimmy W.
	Tom W.

PUPILS WHO FORMERLY ATTENDED THE SANS SOUCI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Eileen B.	Ricky E.
Margaret C.	Ken H.
Nancy C.	Lester McG.
Mary D.	Steve M.
Becky D.	Tom W.
Mary Jo H.	
Nancy N.	
Linda R.	
Lynn S.	
Sandra T.	

PUPILS WHO FORMERLY ATTENDED THE UNION BLEACHERY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Leslie Ann B.	Jimmy B.
Jo Ann D.	Johnny C.
Betty M.	Larry D.
Pat R.	Mike H.
	Ronnie H.
	Gene H.
	Jack H.
	Grady S.
	Jimmy S.
	Woody S.

*Joyce C. was the only pupil to enter the Arrington School
from a school out of these two communities. She transferred
from the Johns Street Elementary School in Area III.

APPENDIX B

LIST OF PUPILS WHOSE HOMES WERE VISITED IN OCTOBER, 1956

In October, 1956, the investigator made visits to the homes of these pupils:

<u>Girls</u>	<u>Boys</u>
Leslie Ann B.	Jimmy B.
Jo Ann D.	Johnny C.
Mary Jo H.	Larry D.
Betty M.	Ricky E.
Nancy N.	Mike H.
Pat R.	Ronnie H.
Linda R.	Gene H.
Sandra T.	Jack H.
	Lester McG.
	Steve M.
	Grady S.
	Jimmy S.
	Woody S.
	Jimmy W.
	Tom W.

LIST OF PUPILS WHOSE HOMES WERE NOT VISITED IN OCTOBER, 1956

Eileen B.*
Joyce C.*
Nancy C.*
Margaret C.*
Rebecca D.*
Lynn S.**

*The parents of these pupils worked until a late hour.

**The parents of this pupil were not at home when the visit was made.

Appendix C-I. Matrix Table Showing Results of Friendship Test

November, 1956

Pupils Chosen or Rejected; + = Choice   − = Rejection

Pupils Making Choices or Rejections	Eileen B.	Leslie A. B.	Margaret C.	Nancy C.	Joyce C.	Jo Ann D.	Becky D.	Mary D.	Mary Jo H.	Betty M.	Nancy N.	Pat R.	Linda R.	Lynn S.	Sandra T.	Jimmy B.	Johnny C.	Larry D.	Ricky E.	Mike H.	Ken H.	Gene H.	Ronnie H.	Jack H.	Lester M.	Steve M.	Woody S.	Jimmy S.	Grady S.	Jimmy W.
Eileen B.		−	+	+		+		−						−																
Leslie A. B.	+													+	+															
Margaret C.	+		+	−	+																		−	−						
Nancy C.	+		+		+													−									−			
Joyce C.			−					−					+	+																
Jo Ann D.	+	+			+													−					−							−
Becky D.			+					−	−	+	+	−																		
Mary D.			−	+		−						−	+		+															
Mary Jo H.	+	−		+	+					−	−																			
Betty M.	+	−		−		+					+																			
Nancy N.	+			+						+																				
Pat R.	+						+		+																					
Linda R.	+			+		+												−	−						−		−			
Lynn S.		+		+												−		−	−						−					
Sandra T.	+	+	−			−				−			+																	
Jimmy B.																+					−	+	+		−					
Johnny C.																		+	−					−		+	+			
Larry D.								−												−					−					
Ricky E.			−	−		−																+			+		+			
Mike H.																+	−								−	+			+	−
Ken H.						−	+									−	−					+				+				
Gene H.			−																			+		−	+					+
Ronnie H.	+																					+			+					
Jack H.																−	−	−				+			+					
Lester M.																+	+					−			+	−				
Steve M.																+	+					+								
Woody S.																+		−	+	+	−	−								
Jimmy S.			−		−		−										+					+				+				
Grady S.																+	−	+									+			
Jimmy W.																+			−	−		+			−			+		
Tom W.		−						−									−							+	+	+				

Appendix C-I. Matrix Table Showing Results of Friendship Test

January, 1957

Pupils Chosen or Rejected; + = Choice − = Rejection

Pupils Making Choices or Rejections	Eileen B.	Margaret C.	Joyce C.	Nancy C.	Jo Ann D.	Becky D.	Mary D.	Mary Jo H.	Betty M.	Nancy N.	Pat R.	Linda R.	Lynn S.	Sandra T.	Jimmy B.	Johnny C.	Larry D.	Ricky E.	Mike H.	Ken H.	Gene H.	Ronnie H.	Jack H.	Lester M.	Steve M.	Woody S.	Jimmy S.	Grady S.	Jimmy W.	Tom W.
Eileen B.					+		−	+	+	−		−																		
Margaret C.				−	+			−	+	−			+																	
Joyce C.	−			−		−	+	+				+																		
Nancy C.	+				+				+											−				−	−					
Jo Ann D.	+	+										+						−		−	−									
Becky D.	+	+					−	−		+		−																		
Mary D.	+	+				−			+	−									−											
Mary Jo H.		+					+		−	−	−		+																	
Betty M.	+					+			+											−		−		−						
Nancy N.		+	−			+						+								−				−						
Pat R.	+					+			+											−		−								
Linda R.		+				+							+							−		−							−	
Lynn S.	+			−		+	−		−	+																				
Sandra T.	+				+		−	−		−			+																	
Jimmy B.																+				−		+				+				−
Johnny C.															+		+	−								+				
Larry D.							−								+					−		+				−			+	
Ricky E.	−												−							−		+	+							+
Mike H.															+	−									+		+	+		−
Ken H.															−		+				+				−		+			−
Gene H.															+		+				−			+				−	−	
Ronnie H.																	+					+								+
Jack H.																	−			−	−		+							+
Lester M.															−	+	−								+	−		+		
Steve M.																	+					+								+
Woody S.															+	+	−		+	−		−								
Jimmy S.																+						+							+	
Grady S.	−			−		−									+				+						+					
Jimmy W.				−											+	−						−			+	+				
Tom W.															−	+			−			+	+							

Appendix C-III. Matrix Table Showing Results of Friendship Test
May, 1957

Pupils Chosen or Rejected; + = Choice − = Rejection

Pupils Making Choices or Rejections	Eileen B.	Margaret C.	Joyce C.	Nancy C.	Jo Ann D.	Becky D.	Mary D.	Mary Jo M.	Betty M.	Nancy N.	Pat R.	Linda R.	Lynn S.	Sandra T.	Jimmy B.	Johnny C.	Larry D.	Ricky E.	Mike H.	Ken H.	Gene H.	Ronnie H.	Jack H.	Lester M.	Steve M.	Woody S.	Jimmy S.	Grady S.	Jimmy W.
Eileen B.						+		+	+	−	−	−																	
Margaret C.				−		+				−	−	+																	
Joyce C.		−		−		−						+	+	+															
Nancy C.	+	−				−	−			+	+														−			−	
Jo Ann D.	+						−				+	+							−			−							
Becky D.	+	+		−					−		−		+																
Mary D.		−	+	−				+		−		+									−								
Mary Jo M.		+		−				+		−		+									−								
Betty M.		−	+	+					+			+									−								
Nancy N.	−	−	+				−		+																				+
Pat R.	+	+				+			−		−	−		−															
Linda R.		+				+						+												−		−	−		
Lynn S.		−	+			+		−	+															−					
Sandra T.				−			−	+		−		+	+																
Jimmy B.																+					+				+				+
Johnny C.															+				+							+			
Larry D.							−								+							+					+		+
Ricky E.				−				−									+			−	+					+	+		
Mike H.																	+								+	+		+	
Ken H.															−	+					+			−	+				
Gene H.															+	+						−	+			−			
Ronnie H.															+	+						−			+			+	+
Jack H.																+				−			−	+		+	−		
Lester M.															−				−	−				+	+		+		
Steve M.																		−	+	−		+				+			
Woody S.															+	+	−		+	−				+					
Jimmy S.																													
Grady S.	−	−		−			−								+	+	+									+			
Jimmy W.						+										−	+				−		−			+		+	+
Tom W.																−	+		−				+		+				

Appendix C-IV. Matrix Table Showing Results of Friendship Test
October, 1957

Pupils Chosen or Rejected; + = Choice − = Rejection

Pupils Making Choices or Rejections	Eileen B.	Carolyn B.	Joyce C.	Nancy C.	Jo Ann D.	Becky D.	Mary D.	Mary Jo H.	Betty M.	Nancy N.	Connie P.	Pat R.	Linda R.	Brenda S.	Lynn S.	Sandra T.	Johnny C.	Jeff D.	Bobby D.	Ricky E.	Mike H.	Ken H.	Gene H.	Dennis J.	Lester M.	Steve M.	Ken R.	Bill S.	Grady S.	Jimmy W.
Eileen B.			+	+					+	+																			−	−
Carolyn B.	+		+	+	+				+	+	−		−											−					−	−
Joyce C.				+	+	+					+																			
Nancy C.	+	+				−			+	+		−																		
Jo Ann D.		+	+					+			+		+											−					−	−
Becky D.	+		+					+	+																				−	−
Mary D.																														
Mary Jo H.			+				−		−	−		+			+		+		+			−	−				+			−
Betty M.	+		+						+																					
Nancy N.	+		+			−				+																	−			
Connie P.						+		−				+	+	−																
Pat R.						−			+	+							+									+			+	
Linda R.																	+									+			+	
Brenda S.	+	+	+			+			+	+		+																		
Lynn S.	−	−				+	+		+					+		+														
Sandra T.			+			−					−		+	−	+															
Johnny C.																														
Jeff D.																								+			+	+	+	+
Bobby D.																					+		+	+			+	+		
Ricky E.																					+									
Mike H.																									+	+	+		+	+
Ken H.																	+			+	+							+		
Gene H.											+					+	+	+		−	+			−	+			−		
Dennis J.	−		−	+			−	+	+			+					+				+	−	−				+	+	−	+
Lester M.																	+			+	+						+			
Steve M.																	+	+	+											
Ken R.											+							+	+							+				+
Bill S.																	+	+	+							+				+
Grady S.						−											+	+								+			−	−
Jimmy W.																	+	+								+	+			

Appendix C-Ⅴ   Matrix Table Showing Results of Friendship Test
January, 1958

Pupils Chosen or Rejected;   + = Choice   − = Rejection

Pupils Making Choices or Rejections	Eileen B.	Carolyn B.	Joyce C.	Nancy C.	Jo Ann D.	Becky D.	Mary D.	Mary Jo H.	Betty M.	Nancy N.	Connie P.	Pat R.	Linda R.	Brenda S.	Lynn S.	Sandra T.	Johnny C.	Jeff D.	Bobby D.	Ricky E.	Mike H.	Ken H.	Gene H.	Dennis J.	Lester M.	Steve M.	Ken R.	Bill S.	Grady S.	Jimmy W.
Eileen B.		+		+		+	−																							
Carolyn B.	+		+	+																										
Joyce C.						+	+				+																			
Nancy C.						+			+	+																				
Jo Ann D.									+	+		+				+				−								−	−	
Becky D.	+								+	+																				
Mary D.		+						+			−	+	−																	
Mary Jo H.		+							+			+																		
Betty M.	+							+		+																				
Nancy N.		+						+	+																					
Connie P.						+						+		+							−				−				−	
Pat R.	−			+			−			−	+			+																
Linda R.		+						+						+	+	+														
Brenda S.		+						+	+																					
Lynn S.	−								−	−			+	+		+														
Sandra T.								−		−	+	+	−	+																
Johnny C.																		+									+			+
Jeff D.																	+				+						+	+		
Bobby D.																	+						+				+			
Ricky E.																		+					+	−			+	−	−	
Mike H.																	+							+					+	
Ken H.																	+	+					−				+		−	
Gene H.																		+	+								+			
Dennis J.																		+		+					+					
Lester M.																		+	+		−						+	−	−	
Steve M.																			+								+			+
Ken R.																	+		+	+										
Bill S.																	+			−	+	+							−	
Grady S.																	+		+								+			
Jimmy W.																	+								+	+				

APPENDIX D

PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCES

Parent-teacher conferences were held for the following pupils in November, 1956:

Jimmy B.	Eileen B.
Larry D.	Margaret C.
Mike H.	Joyce C.
Ronnie H.	Nancy C.
Gene H.	Jo Ann D.
Lester McG.	Mary D.
Steve M.	Mary Jo H.
Grady S.	Betty M.
Jimmy S.	Nancy N.
Woody S.	Linda R.
Jimmy W.	Lynn S.
	Sandra T.*

Parent-teacher conferences were held for the following in March, 1957:

Jimmy B.	Eileen B.
Johnny C.	Margaret C.
Larry D.	Joyce C.
Ricky E.	Nancy C.
Mike H.	Jo Ann D.
Ronnie H.*	Mary D.
Gene H.	Mary Jo H.
Lester McG.	Betty M.
Steve M.	Nancy N.
Grady S.	Linda R.
Jimmy S.	Lynn S.
Woody S.*	Sandra T.
Jimmy W.	
Tom W.	

*Both parents attended the conference.

APPENDIX D (continued)

Parent-teacher conferences were held for the following
pupils November, 1957:

Johnny C.	Eileen B.
Jeff D.	Carolyn B.
Bobby D.	Nancy C.
Ricky E.	Jo Ann D.
Mike H.	Mary D.
Ken H.	Mary Jo H.
Steve M.	Betty M.
Ken R.	Nancy N.
Jimmy W.	Connie P.
	Linda R.
	Pat R.
	Brenda S.
	Lynn S.
	Sandra T.

APPENDIX E

PUPIL-INTEREST INVENTORY--OCTOBER, 1957

1. Three wishes that I would like to have come true.

2. Things that I would like to learn more about at school.

3. Subjects that I do not like to study.

4. What I like best about school.

5. What I like least about school.

6. What I like best away from school.

7. What I like least (or dislike most) away from school.

8. What I want to be or to do when I grow up.

9. The most interesting thing that I have done in the past week.

10. One of the places that I like to go in Greenville.

11. One of the happiest days of my whole life.

12. My three best friends in my class.

APPENDIX F

CLASS RECORD FOR LORGE-THORNDIKE INTELLIGENCE TEST, LEVEL 3
DECEMBER 10, 1957

Name	C. A.	Verbal I. Q.	Non-Verbal I. Q.
Carolyn B.	11-3	108	99
Eileen B.	11-5	101	103
Joyce C.	11-4	84	95
Nancy C.	11-11	87	86
Jo Ann D.	11-7	107	103
Becky D.	11-11	76	63
Mary D.	11-5	82	77
Mary Jo H.	12-8	82	68
Betty M.	11-7	103	106
Nancy N.	11-3	108	115
Connie P.	11-4	97	98
Pat R.	11-9	88	51
Linda R.	12-1	112	89
Brenda S.	12-2	82	78
Lynn S.	10-10	102	93
Sandra T.	12-0	90	97
Girls' group mean		94.2	88.8
Girls' group range		76-112	51-115
Johnny C.	11-5	102	88
Jeff D.	10-7	129	94
Bobby D.	12-6	68	58
Ricky E.	11-8	103	84
Mike H.	12-0	76	57
Ken H.	12-1	84	68
Gene H.	11-7	97	106
Lester McG.	11-0	114	98
Steve M.	11-7	113	96
Ken R.	10-7	126	75 (?)*
Grady S.	11-3	76	89
Bill S.	12-4	(?)**	69
Jimmy W.	11-6	84	97
Boys' group mean		97	83.3
Boys' group range		76-129	57-106

*Ken R.'s score did not appear to be indicative of his real ability. A retesting was suggested.

**Bill S.'s reading ability was very low. He was unable to read the test and so gave it up.