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ABSTRACT

The thesis reports studies of adolescent boys of I. Q. 135 and above, with relatively low school achievement. Twenty-three Subjects were submitted to a questionnaire and interview which were designed to reveal their reactions to various aspects of school routine and the degree of their dependency on their home environment. An equal number of Controls were chosen from the tops of classes and the same number of teachers were asked to give their forecasts of the answers to the questions.

The Subjects' responses showed that, contrary to theoretical expectations, these adolescent boys showed few feelings of resentment against authority, and that they were almost unanimous in blaming factors within themselves, such as lack of intellectual ambition or plain laziness, for their failure at school. The Controls, too, showed little sign of the rebelliousness usually associated with adolescence, although the teachers had anticipated that this problem would be paramount. Work, however, conducted at equal levels through daily psychotherapy or once-weekly Child Guidance revealed that lack of ambition
and laziness were largely a result of feelings of resentment against teachers or parents, who were blamed in one way or another for the boys' failure at school. This would tend to confirm that the feelings of adolescents are so mixed that it is impossible for them to decipher them clearly and give them expression. Although the majority of both Subjects and Controls were without manifest resentment against their parents and teachers, it was noticeable that disagreements between the two parents or between parents and teachers in such areas as ambition for the child were much more in evidence among the Subjects than among the Controls.

The questionnaire itself was designed in three sections, with the same questions being asked in various contexts in each of them. This was to give the adolescents a chance to display their legendary inconsistency. But, as has already been stated, the inconsistency turned out to be indeed a legend, except in areas which dealt directly with school procedures, such as examinations and home work.
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A STUDY OF CHILDREN OF HIGH INTELLIGENCE WITH RELATIVELY LOW SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT

1. INTRODUCTION.

A. The Problem.

One of the most difficult problems confronting the clinical psychotherapist is the child of superior intellect who systematically fails at school. Even in cases where exploration of possible causes of the failure have been made by other experts, for example, when the clinical psychologist has determined beforehand that the fault cannot be found in the inability to learn; the medical practitioner has already concluded that the difficulty cannot be traced to disease or deformity; and the sociologist, having assessed the home environment, has been unable to pin down the malfunctioning to social factors such as slum housing, overwork or a broken home; even after such assessments have been related to one another, there remain more elusive factors. That the process of investigation is a complicated one for the psychotherapist is shown during the diagnosis of such cases as the following.
Case 1.

A boy of quite outstanding intelligence (chronological age of 8 years 8 months, mental age of 14 years 4 months, I.Q. of 165) had a good vocabulary and use of language comparable to that of an educated adult. During the psychological test, it was noted that all his movements were slow, and he seemed to lack physical energy. His voice, which was never strong, became weaker and more uncertain whenever he met with a difficulty. And although the psychologist explained that he had to try the difficult tests to see how far he could go, any reverse seemed to upset him, as though he expected that he ought to be able to do everything successfully on the intellectual plane. He was left-handed and very clumsy in manual tasks, but this did not bother him much. After the test he told the psychologist that he would like to become an archaeologist and to discover a new type of dinosaur.

The social history further complicated the diagnosis: a history of asthma, wheeziness and frequent colds since the age of 3 years. He also had acute upsets, which required that his mother had to sit up late with him at night. Both parents were observed to be 'highly strung', and his mother had spent some time in a mental hospital. It was she who had diagnosed the cause of his poor school performance. She said: "The school is not organised enough. He needs something concrete to do. He has been very unhappy with one of his teachers, I think this accounts for his silent withdrawal at school." Yet the boy had no theory about his failure, and seemed undisturbed about it.

Case 2.

Another boy of 11 years 4 months, had failed both the 11 plus and entrance examinations to grammar school. His mental age was 16 years 1 month, with an I.Q. of 142. His school had noted that in spite of 'good ideas' in composition work, he got very little done. In arithmetic he had shown a poor number sense. In all of his subjects he had been erratic in responses and could only work on his own. It was impossible for him to share in a piece of group work with other children. Yet, this child viewed
school as 'jolly good'. While he spoke of his dislike for English and Arithmetic, he was enthusiastic about practical subjects such as Handwork, P.T., and Nature Study. He was ambitious to be a farmer and to 'raise crops'. Early on, the therapist had noted he was 'strange', wild and grumpy, well aware of his 'terrifying fantasies'. He suffered from sleeping disturbances - nightmares and inability to go to sleep unless the light was on. He was extremely jealous of his brothers and sisters, whom he attacked physically.

Case 3.

Still another boy, of the same age, with an I.Q. of 150, was terrified of doing anything wrong and deeply worried about his lack of success at school. He often asked his teachers: "Am I very backward?" He had been brought to the Child Guidance Clinic, not because he was at the bottom of his form, but because of numerous tics: he pulled his shirt over his head, threw his head back, made writhing movements with his hands, and blinked his eyes. These traits were combined with uncontrollable attacks of shrieking, and all of these were of an obsessional nature.

Case 4.

A boy of 10 years, with an I.Q. of 160, had excelled in his lessons and had been a good mixer until his last term at elementary school, when, for no apparent reason, he started to play truant. This was discovered when the school got in touch with his parents, thinking the boy was ill. He had shown symptoms of exhibitionism: for example, he spread the most fantastic tales through the school that a black man was kidnapping him; or that he would not be doing any class work as he had been appointed a member of the staff. He got absolutely furious when the boys refused to believe him, or if they laughed at him. The teacher had tried to cope with this behaviour by ignoring him, and she had instructed the staff to do the same, with the result that the boy insisted on being brought before her and, when refused, was really angry. She had noted failure in his school work and diagnosed the trouble as an acute need to get notice from the staff and his schoolmates.
"I am wondering if at the time the trouble started, he got into contact with an adult or an older boy on his way to and from school, who gradually made a strong impression on his very receptive mind. Or whether he got hold of some of the very lurid comics, as some of his fantastic stories (which he applies to himself) savour very much of this kind of literature. I am hoping that, with harder work, to get his teeth into next term, his mind will be distracted from himself. I think a brain such as his needs plenty of interesting material to cope with, and there is a danger in letting it lie fallow."

In these cases we have the views of a parent, teacher, psychotherapist and psychologist regarding the nature and source of the learning difficulty. In the following case, the diagnosis is complicated by conflicting views of parents and specialists.

**Case 5.**

This was an excitable, talkative boy who first came under observation at a chronological age of 10 years 2 months. His mental age at this time was 14 years 6 months, and he had an I.Q. of 143 on the Revised Stanford Binet Form L test. The psychologist who examined him noted that 'while he reads in a rather odd way, in a high-pitched voice, as if he were intoning a service, there were no signs of backwardness either in reading or arithmetic.' By the age of 12 years 10 months, when it was noted that the boy had entered puberty, his emotional disturbance were mirrored in an intelligence test. At that age, his mental age was 17 years 5 months, giving him an I.Q. of 136 on the same test. At the time of this second test the psychologist noted that he was: 'inclined to be careless' and that 'he frequently got muddled and would attempt several answers – never quite sure which was correct.' It appeared to her that this trait was partially the result of obsessional doubting and lack of confidence, but it also showed a need for support in that he frequently wanted to have more explanations than were available even though, when pressed, he was able to find the correct answer with the available information. She concluded:
"I can well understand that he is failing to use his good ability in school, unless there is someone standing at his elbow. On the evidence of the intelligence test alone, one would have said that the boy is emotionally disturbed."

"The School had given the boy a group test about this time and found him 'barely average'. His performance placed him near the bottom of the class in almost every subject. The school noted:

"Our entirely consistent impression of him is of a completely docile, willing and hardworking child who is very far from bright - perhaps because he is very young for his age. He has some, but not outstanding, facility in written English, is very weak in Maths., and his attainment in the remaining subjects is not high; art is reasonable, but again not outstanding."

The father's picture of the boy is precisely the opposite. While he found him unruly, lazy and indolent, he believed his son to be highly intelligent and more than able to hold his own in intelligent grown-up conversation. He also stated that his son had shown extraordinary talent in painting and drawing since the age of 4 years. The father attested to the boy's difficulties with his lessons and believed these were due to his not applying himself. One of the reasons for this lack of application was implied in an account he gave about helping the boy to overcome learning problems:

"I gave him lessons at home and found him very quick to learn. He is now an avid reader and borrows books from the library."

Yet a different picture of the father came from the boy's psychotherapist, who noted:

"Mr. K. is essentially rather impatient and ineffectual and feels that his own intelligence has not found its outlet. His perpetual attitude of grievance, coupled with his indifference to his son would, I think, make it very difficult for any child to succeed."

Several years later, after the father had discontinued home instruction, he made the following comments about his son's worry over his lessons:

"He makes no progress, and is distressed about his homework - cries over it, sits up late at night over it,
is nervous about going to school, and now has added to it the loss of a friend, who deserted him for another boy."

Here we observe a common dilemma: the therapist focuses on the parent's attitude; the school points to intellectual deficiencies and personality problems; the parent focuses on the environment - by implication, improper teaching and other social influences, such as loss of a friend. Let us consider the school's argument first.

B. The Nature of Intelligence.

A discussion of the use of intelligence inevitably involves the question of the origin of intellectual gifts. A hundred years ago it was generally believed that intellectual endowment could be traced directly to social class. And Galton produced statistical evidence that persons of intellectual superiority could, in fact, be traced to the middle and upper social classes.(1) Galton and his predecessors, such as Thomas Brown and Johann Hebart, were concerned with adult subjects whose genius had been evaluated on the basis of social accomplishments. There were no satisfactory objective tools available for measuring intelligence. The development of intelligence tests by Binet in 1908 laid the foundation for researches in these areas. If wide variations in intelligence could be observed in pre-school children who
had not been extensively exposed to environmental influences, then the whole question of constitutional factors became an important consideration.

Further complications were added to these by Freud's investigations into the role of parental care during the infant years. His hypothesis that environment during infancy was largely responsible for emotional development, meant that purely personal considerations like the relationship between a child's father and mother, independent of social class, could inhibit intelligence, and that even the best educational influences might prove ineffective in overcoming this inhibition, since they did not affect the child until the infantile pattern, inhibitory or otherwise, had been firmly established - before the child could grasp rationally what was happening. A high natural intelligence, according to this theory, might even be an additional impediment to its own development, since the curiosity of a highly intelligent infant would lead, in some families, to the discovery of contradictory loyalties, typically to the father and to the mother, which presented the infant at the age of 2 or 3 years with problems so insoluble that its highly intelligent parents, coming to them as adults, were entirely baffled. It was useless to expect that a toddler would be able
to reconcile disputes which were inflaming his grown-up parents, and the residue of unsolved conflicts was liable to permeate the later development of the child and to be repeated, in one form or another, in all later learning situations.

This possibility, that the manifestations of intelligence could be inhibited by neurosis, as well as ill health, lack of stimulation, restricted environmental opportunities, at an age earlier than the age at which it was practicable to give intelligence tests or formal education, greatly complicated the problem of assessing intelligence objectively. Thanks to it, there were now at least three different, and sometimes conflicting, intelligences to be measured in the average school child:

1. the constitutional intelligence, which could be considered as usually hereditary in origin:

2. the constitutional intelligence, as altered by the predominant cultural pattern in the child's environment:

3. the effective intelligence, which might be considered as the product of the other two as modified by unconscious conflicts, usually inhibiting.

That none of these categories could be isolated and tested separately was, of course, an additional problem. What is equally important is that each of these three categories was often thought of and tested as a separate
component. It was believed, for example, that constitutional intelligence could be increased by manipulation of the cultural background. Equally, but quite differently, others believed that a change in the cultural background could alter the second without affecting the first category. As for the neurosis, it was often assessed independently of any measurement of intelligence. The resulting historical confusion is still a major difficulty in establishing criteria of intelligence. These complications have not only obscured the educator's task of determining the intellectual capabilities of pupils, but have made it evermore difficult to diagnose and to correct problems of learning.

The father who had observed improvement in his son's performance as the result of home instruction, would have most certainly been encouraged by Rousseau, who advised parents to assume this responsibility:

"Mercenary man! do you expect to purchase a second father for your child? Do not deceive yourself; it is not even a master you have hired for him, it is a flunkey, who will soon train such another as himself." (2)

Chavasse, in his advice to parents in 1889, (3) would not have gone to this extreme, but pointed to limitations in formal education, particularly that of the intellectually gifted child. He was far surer of his advice than modern psychologists:
"If a child is precocious, the best thing to do is to restrain him, to send him to a quiet country place, free from excitement. When he is sent to school, give directions to the master that he is not on any account to tax his intellect, and keep him from those institutions where a spirit of rivalry is maintained. Medals and prizes are well enough for those who have moderate abilities. Brilliant abilities, without exceptional bodily physique, should not be overworked. The clever, intellectual child, whose brain is overstrained at the expense of the body, may win prizes at school but too often takes a poor place in the competition of after life. The body should be principally cultivated in early life, the growing brain being readily exhausted by premature learning. If a schoolmaster does not heed the warning that he is not to work a naturally talented pupil to the full extent of his ability, the pupil should be at once taken away from him. From the schoolmaster's point of view, such a pupil is only too often valued and urged forward as a showy advertisement of the school. His opinion of what is the full extent of a clever student's ability is therefore a very biased and untrustworthy one. Be very judicious, also, in listening to any opinion expressed by a teacher that 'a pupil is talented but lazy', and that he or she 'could do better if he tried', and so forth. A growing youth has to put a considerable amount of energy into his physical development, and that should never be allowed to suffer for the sake of silly cramming for useless certificates. On the other hand, a schoolmaster's advice and observation as to the direction in which the student's capabilities are most capable of development, is of the greatest value. A good schoolmaster is much more of a leader than a driver. Nervous children who are restless, fidgety and excitable require special care, even if they be not in the early stages of chorea or St. Vitus' Dance."

In contrast to Rousseau and Chavasse, G. Stanley Hall, an early psychologist, believed that a gifted pupil had no learning difficulties which skilled school teachers could not remedy. In his work on Adolescence, he described the type of industry required to stimulate learning.
would agree with the teacher in Case 4, who mentioned the "danger in letting it (an alert brain) lie fallow."

"... the teacher should teach, demonstrate, address his efforts more to the upper and less to the lower half of his class, forage widely and incessantly, and bring everything within reach in his field to them. Every good illustration from popular science, charts, diagrams, curves, tabulations, apparatus, and the full resources of the library should be turned on, the lecture method purged of its admitted limitations, made the most of...and designed to provoke reaction by frequent personal questions, even repetitions or discussions on the spot...every zest-provoking device should be in his repertory of resources. He should teach every topic broadly and comprehensively, and instead of disparaging mere information it should ooze from his every pore. Mental awakening should be his goal...frontier questions galore should be raised that can not be answered. Answers should be few and problems many, for the reverse practice stunts by a sense of finality. The test of success here is the number of interests and the intensity of curiosity aroused far more than the size of the body of knowledge laid away in the memory." (4)

In the preceding pages, we have accepted the psychologists' definition of intelligence and have examined some of the theories regarding pupils' failure to use it in their school subjects. The very subject of the thesis indicates a difference between intelligence and the use of it, or achievement. It begs a theoretical question which is ancient, and still by no means solved. Yet, the acceptance of the test results as defining intelligence is in line with tradition. Long before there was any agreement on the nature of the unitary quality called intelligence, a large number of measurements had been
made of the various functions which are today regarded as its constituents. In fact it would seem that a whole science grew up concerned with measuring qualities which could not be synthesized under any unified concept. This is not to say attempts were not made at definition, but many of these were initially made by experts in other scientific fields - astronomy, physics, neurology, mathematics and biology. For example, it has been said that the modern usage of "intelligence as an unitary entity was a gift to psychology from biology through the instrumentality of Herbert Spencer." (5) His theories of intelligence, which ran parallel to his evolutionary systems, focussed on the analytic and synthetic aspects, the essential function being that of adaptation to an increasingly complex environment.

"The Law of Evolution holds of the inner world as it does of the outer world. On tracing up from its low and vague beginnings, the intelligence which becomes so marvellous in the higher beings, we find that under whatever aspect contemplated, it presents a progressive transformation of like nature with the progressive transformation we trace in the universe as a whole, no less than in each of its parts. If we study the development of the nervous system, we see it advancing in integration, in complexity, in definiteness. If we turn to its functions, we find these similarly show an ever-increasing inter-dependence, an augmentation in number and heterogeneity, and a greater precision. If we examine the relations of these functions to the actions going on in the world around, we see that the correspondence between them progresses in range and amount, becomes continually more complex and more special, and advances through differentiations and integrations like those everywhere going on." (6)
From this theory, it followed that during the growth of the individual child:

"the fundamental capacity of cognition progressively differentiates into a hierarchy of more specialized abilities." (7)

Thus, Spencer used the term intelligence to designate the base from which special functions, such as the sensory, associative, perceptual, etc., developed. And in line with his evolution argument, he traced individual endowment to hereditary factors. While many psychologists, such as Spearman, and biologists, such as Weismann, have taken issue with Spencer's over-emphasis of hereditary factors and the intimate link he made between body and mind, it would be useless to deny his far-reaching influence on psychologists until this day. Flugel wrote in 1945:

"...indeed, there is no doubt that, after Darwin, Spencer has done more than any other to introduce the developmental point of view into biology and science generally." (8).

Yet, his emphasis on the adjustment of the individual to an increasingly complex environment which, in the cases we have cited, includes school, would lead us to question the assessments of the psychologists.

Piaget's elaborate theories of intelligence have been partially based on Spencer's early work. Piaget believed that:
"...the process of intelligence is a product of an active and indissoluble collaboration between experience and thought...all intelligence is a form of biological adaptation or adjustment." (9)

Like Spencer, Piaget was not so much interested in comparing the intelligence of various individuals, but more in the development of the thought process in the individual child. Thus, his measurements were consistent with his definition of the word:

"Intelligence is a simple generic term to indicate the superior forms of organisation or equilibrium, namely, those which are achieved by cognitive structurings."(10)

Here he implies continuity from the 'lowest type of cognitive and motor adaptation to the highest forms of thought.' Thus, intelligence will vary at different developmental stages of the child, and it is with these he is primarily concerned.

Earlier, Spencer's emphasis on synthesis and analysis was elaborated by experimental psychologists such as Ebbinghaus, Galton and Binet, whose measurement devices may be said to have effectively distracted early psychologists from the more basic task of adequately defining intelligence.

For example, Ebbinghaus advanced the theory that:

"mental powers have in general...a formal nature...they are determined only by the form of the operation, not by the subject-matter to which the operation is applied." (11)
He thus devised tests which brought together a number of performances by men who had distinguished themselves for intelligence in ordinary life, and concluded that such performances 'invariably consist in bringing together a multitude of independent concomitant impressions into a unitary, meaningful whole.' Thus, the basic nature of intelligence was that of "combining". Spearman objected to such tests and definitions of general intelligence because they did not test an entirely independent faculty, and there was only a slight correlation between the various tests.

Like Ebbinghaus, Binet and Terman were more interested in the use of intelligence - how it works - than in what it was. Yet, each of them attempted definitions. For example, in 1905, Binet and Simon defined intelligence in terms of a single factor:

"There is in intelligence...one fundamental organ, an organ whose defectiveness or alteration has the most importance for practical life: this is judgment..."(12)

Later, Binet stated:

"Comprehension, invention, direction and censorship: intelligence lies in these four words." (13)

Of the tests based on the first theory, Vernon commented:

"His scale, however, was composed of tests which would differentiate older from younger children."
The only criterion that they were measuring judgement, etc., was his own opinion." (14)

And Spearman noted:

"...the fact that the practical success of Binet's procedure really derived from a theory quite opposed to that of any formal power appears to have escaped notice... It would seem as if, in thus flitting hither and thither, Binet can nowhere find a theoretical perch satisfactory for a moment even to himself." (15)

From a study of his tests, it is evident that Binet regarded intelligence as a collection of special faculties, such as initiative, practical sense, memory, judgement, adaptation to life, etc. When we are reminded that Binet and Simon were commissioned by the French Government to develop tests which would enable the schools to separate dull from bright pupils, it is understandable that the tests which they devised measured abilities that depended upon school training, and were in keeping with their later definition of intelligence - the ability to learn. And it is evident that this originally meant the ability to learn in school. It was this practical use of the tests in meeting practical needs, which accounts for the rapid spread of his tools. And it is not surprising that the importance attached to test results led to conscientious efforts on the part of the authors to standardize them; and to painstaking investigations on the part of other psychologists to determine the reliability of the tests themselves. Naturally, this
statistical activity distracted attention from the more philosophical trend of establishing what it was they were measuring in the first place. Nor is it surprising that one of Binet's successors gave the following definition:

"Intelligence is what the tests measure." (16)

Here, he seems to recognize the division of labour between the psychometricians (or test researchers) and the psychologists. The dilemma inherent in this side-tracking of the more basic definition of intelligence is still topical, and has been discussed in contemporary works on psychology as frequently as it was debated thirty years ago. Leona Tyler writes:

"It is, of course, easy enough to examine the questions and tasks that have proved themselves most satisfactory for intelligence testing from Binet's time down to the present. In verbal tests, subjects have been asked to define words or recognize their meanings, work simple arithmetic problems, complete analogies, analyze similarities and differences, recognize absurdities, follow directions and answer commonsense questions. Performance tests have been made up from boards, pictures, puzzles... mazes and drawing assignments...but when we try to identify something that all these tasks have in common, logic and intuition fail us. Do they all require the same intellectual trait, or are many different capacities involved? Can a person be good at one of these things but poor at the others? If so, what does 'intelligence' rating mean so far as he is concerned?..." (17)

Attempts to answer such questions as these were made by Spearman and a long line of Factor Analysts, whose theories and statistical methods derived from his work. It was Spearman:
...who first realized the full importance of correlation for psychology, who devised newer and simpler methods of calculation, who elaborated methods for correction of the errors inherent in the 'crude' correlation coefficient, and who by much further work, both mathematical and experimental, showed how mental tests could be used to attack an all-important problem of general psychology." (18)

Spearman's Two-factor Theory was first published in an article in 1904 - General Intelligence Objectively Measured and Determined, in the American Journal of Psychology. It was elaborated in two works: The Nature of Intelligence and the Principles of Cognition, 1923; and The Abilities of Man, 1927. In these works, Spearman reported that all cognitive tests with which he had to deal overlapped or were positively correlated, and that some of these correlations were much higher than others. He was able to demonstrate from his researches that an underlying common factor, which he called g (or general ability) accounted for the correlations which he had observed. Vernon discusses the nature of g and specific factors:

"Although Spearman wisely refused to identify g with intelligence or any other quality whose definition was controversial, he suggested that it depends on the general mental energy with which each individual is endowed. The S-factor he compared to a large number of mechanisms or engines, which could be activated by this energy. They are largely affected by education and training, whereas g is innate and ineducable." (19)

Vernon further shows that 'the two-factor theory provides a logical basis for devising satisfactory tests of g:'
"We need not, like Binet, choose tests or items which appear to involve judgment (or whatever we think intelligence consists of). Instead, tests are taken which have been proved by correlational analysis, to have high g-loadings. Each of these tests will have some specific content, but as these 3-factors are, by definition, independent, when we combine several tests the various s's will tend to cancel out, leaving us with a purer measure of g." (20)

Spearman's original work proved productive, and many other theories have been built up by such psychologists as Burt, Thomson, Thorndike, Brown, Cattell and others, in an attempt either to confirm or refute it. These workers, known collectively as Factor Analysts, still form a major approach in psychology, and it is in the work of Spearman that they find a common ancestry.

In his investigations of school children, Burt attempted to make practical applications of Spearman's methods and to verify the experimental result of Spearman and Meumann, as well as to introduce new experiments of his own. The study aimed:

"...to determine whether higher mental functions would not show a yet closer connection with 'general intelligence' than was shown by simple mental functions such as sensory discrimination, motor reaction, etc..." (21)

The tests were carried out in two Oxford schools, where he chose two groups of boys: those from a "superior" elementary school, of the lower middle class; and subjects from a "high class" preparatory school - sons of eminent intellectuals. The study dealt with three main questions regarding: "general intelligence":
1. Can its presence be detected and its amount measured?

2. Can its nature be isolated and its meaning analyzed?

3. Is its development predominantly determined by environmental influences and individual acquisitions, or is it rather dependent upon the inheritance of a racial character or family trait?

It is significant to note here that in Burt's, as well as other large scale experiments by Brown and Stephenson, the researchers were concerned not only with corroborating and extending Spearman's principles, but also tried, by comparing their results with the opinions of headmasters and teachers, to establish the validity of the tests as an index of intelligence.

In Burt's early school investigations, in which he was assisted by Flugel and others, the subjects' intelligence were first estimated by the Headmaster, from his long personal experience of the boys concerned. It seemed to the investigators that his grading was as nearly perfect as a grading based on personal impressions could be. Then a variety of tests were given by the psychologists, including dotting machines, mirror and alphabet tests, memory, etc. From these tests, the workers were able to arrange the group of boys in their order of intelligence. It was found that these were decidedly more accurate than the order given by the masters, based on personal experience
during several years. This included masters' assessments in scholastic examinations. For example, when the memory of the children was tested according to the Meumann method, which had already been used on some 800 children in Zurich schools, it was found that:

"...immediate memory was correlated to a considerable, but not high degree with intelligence as estimated by the Headmaster's grading; and to a significantly higher degree with intelligence as estimated by the results of examinations, particularly of the examination in literary subjects..." (22)

From investigations such as this, Burt reached the following conclusions:

"...the present examination system tends to test mainly that aspect of intelligence which manifests itself in memory, to the neglect of other manifestations of intelligence, and to the inclusion of other factors of memory which distort even this manifestation of intelligence. There is clear evidence also that at both schools the Headmaster's estimate is also biased toward memory, since the correlations of the memory test with the other provisional estimates of Intelligence are much lower... We conclude that the superior proficiency of Intelligence tests on the part of the boys of superior parentage was inborn. And thus, we seem to have proved marked inheritability in the case of mental character..." (23)

The tests results also supported Spearman's Two-factor theories, that:

"...there is a general factor making for efficiency in all mental activities, that this factor is essentially cognitive or directive, and that the greater part of the individual variance found in this factor is attributable to differences in genetic constitution..." (24)

Burt further concludes:

"...parental intelligence, therefore, may be inherited, individual intelligence measured, and general intelligence analyzed; and they can be analyzed, measured
and inherited to a degree which few psychologists hitherto legitimatelly ventured to maintain..." (25)

Later on, Burt's memorandum on The Distribution of Relations of Educational Abilities (1917) was a landmark, since it provided clear evidence (which Spearman continued to ignore) of verbal, numerical, and practical group factors in school subjects, in addition to a general factor. (26)

Sir Godfrey Thomson, who was Spearman's chief critic, took exception to both the principles and techniques employed by Spearman. For example, he pointed out that factors were only mathematical symbols, that the mind was not divided into unitary factors, but was a 'rich, comparatively undifferentiated complex of innumerable influences; on the psychological side, an intricate network of possibilities of communication.' He showed that predictions could not be more accurately made on the basis of scores reached by the Factor Analysts than on the basis of the original test scores from which the factor scores were derived. He was able to eliminate the "general factor" by establishing the existence of "primary abilities" which overlap. Burt objected to this solution in both theory and practice:

"When the general factor accounts for much more of the variance than any single group factor, or indeed than all the group factors put together, there is no theoretical gain in closing one's eyes to its presence, and in educational practice the rash assumption that the general factor has at length been demolished, has done much
more to sanction the impractical idea that in classifying children according to their varying capacities, we need no longer consider their degree of general ability, and have only to allot them to schools of different types according to their special aptitudes..." (27) 

He continued:

"One might as well argue that, because a general factor can be demonstrated common to all sensory activities, therefore this factor is simply and solely a capacity for sensory discrimination." (28)

He referred to writers who argued that the common factor to mental and scholastic activities was not cognitive but conative:

"When a pupil lagged behindhand in nearly every subject, the teacher was apt to lay the blame on what Dr. Ballard dubbed the 'general factor of laziness.' Conversely, when a bright child forged ahead in all he undertook, he found himself applauded as a paragon of industry and held up to his fellows as a model of zeal; 'genius', said the apostles of the gospel of work, 'is just an infinite capacity for taking pains.'" (29)

The Multiple Factor approach, one of the best known methods of psychological analysis, was developed by Thurstone and his colleagues who found a number of primary mental abilities which overlapped, rather than a general factor underlying all mental activity. He isolated such primary abilities as: perceptual speed, word fluency, verbal comprehension, reasoning, space, number. (30) Peel noted that:

"...the data from which Thurstone obtained his primary abilities can be analysed equally well to give a general factor, group factors and specific factors, resembling the British view put forth by Thomson and Burt. In some of his more recent work, Thurstone finds a place for a general factor which in many ways resembles Spearman's 'G'" (31)
Thorndike, who agreed with Thurstone in his definition of intelligence as a capacity to form associations, questioned his theory of "primary abilities":

"In spite of the devoted attention of Thurstone and other able workers, factorial analysis has not so far increased our equipment of adequate tests of pure abilities much, if at all." (32)

Thorndike stressed the independence of specific abilities, and defined intelligence as the grand total of numerous specific abilities. Others, such as Maxwell Garnett, preferred the term factor of will to that of intelligence. Watson took issue with the factor as innate, and called attention to the importance of environment in creating and developing intelligence. And Burt later extended his definition to include total adjustment. Does intelligence consist in invention, or the capacity to form associations, as Thorndike stressed? Is it, as Knight stated, 'the capacity for relational constructive thinking, directed to the attainment of some end?'

Alexander emphasized the importance of determining whether the child has mainly an abstract or a practical intelligence, and developed tests suitable for persons with language defects or other cultural limitations. He believed that teaching should be geared to the particular type of intelligence the pupil had. For example, he divided his tests into 'practical groups' and 'verbal groups', then further subdivided them into groups according to their
performance on specific tests within these groupings. Vernon stressed the importance of schooling upon specialized abilities - 'it can integrate them or further separate them.'

C. Factors Affecting the Use of Intelligence.

In the presentation of the problem, we have implied that the investigator must go far beyond the classroom to assess reasons for failure to make progress in school subjects. Numerous factors have been mentioned: environmental influences in the pupil's immediate situation, such as disturbing parents (Case I); personality factors such as physical disabilities (Case 3), psychological difficulties (Case 4). All of these were thought by parents, teachers and clinical psychologists to play a part in intellectual functioning. Similar influences have also been noted in theories regarding the nature of intelligence, e.g. Galton's stress of social class, Spencer's emphasis on the relationship between body and mind, Freud's focus on the early emotional climate of the child.

1. Environmental.

Lewin, who was also interested in the tensions which frustrate the individual's goals, focused more definitely on the environmental setting, which he called "the field." But, in contrast to other Freudians, who looked more largely to past relationships for the source of contemporary disturb-
ances in learning, Lewin laid greater stress on a cross section of present behaviour and contemporary influences. For example, in the subject under discussion, he would inquire into the pupil's relationships with classmates and teachers; the physical setting of the schoolroom and the home. Any of these, he believed, may serve as blockage in reaching the desired goal, or may even change the primary goal and necessitate the pursuit of substitute goals. (33)

Vernon underlined the importance of environmental factors:

"I would emphasize as strongly as any psychologist the importance to the teacher, parent or clinician of a knowledge of a child's main drives...but I would much prefer to regard such drive as interests, attitudes, sentiments and complexes, which may differ greatly in different cultures, which could readily be altered by change of methods of upbringing in early years, and which are susceptible to modification during later childhood, adolescence, and even adulthood, by skilful psychological treatment." (34)

2. Personality.

As in the case of environmental influences, a discussion of personality factors involves a complicated question: What is personality? Here, we encounter a literature as immense as that which attempts to define the nature of intelligence. From this literature, we have chosen the definition of Gordon Allport, not only because 'he has probably done more than anyone in recent years to bring personality to the forefront of psychology,' (38) but also because his definition best suits the require-
ments of this investigation. Yet we are aware of the
tremendous loading of each word in his definition and the
controversy which exists regarding them:

"Personality is the dynamic organisation within
the individual of those psychophysical systems which
determine his unique adjustments to his environment."  (39)

In his amplification of terms, Allport pointed out that:

"...this organisation must be regarded as constantly
evolving and changing, as motivational and as self-regulating; hence the qualification 'dynamic.' Organisation
must also imply at times the correlative process of
disorganisation, especially on those personalities that
we are wont to regard as 'abnormal!'"  (40)

By "psychophysical systems", he refers to habits,
specific and general attitudes, sentiments and dispositions.
"Systems" refers to 'traits or groups of traits in a latent
or active condition.'

While Eysenck, in his discussion of Allport's
definition, agrees with this description of the nature of
psychophysical systems which 'underlie the behavioral acts',
he points to the difficulty in speaking about the 'organisation
of behavioral acts', and prefers to postulate 'certain
psychophysical systems which are believed to underlie the
behavioral acts', and to apply the concept of organisation
to the abstractions. This, he finds, 'quite essential to
any scientific discussion, provided the connection between
observed behaviour and hypothesized abstract concept is
operationally defined and experimentally verifiable.'  (41)
Thus, Eysenck presents a "hierarchial model of personality organisation" which he believes is "capable of representing the majority of experimentally determined facts regarding personality structure."

It is evident in Eysenck's factorial analyses that he is concerned with prediction of human behaviour, and in this respect he is in agreement with Cattell, who states:

"the personality of an individual is that which enables us to predict what he will do in a given situation". (43)

While Allport implies this in his amplification of the word "determine", which he considers "a natural consequence of the biophysical view", he stresses that

"personality is something, and does something. It is not synonymous with behaviour or activity...it is what lies behind specific acts and within the individual. The systems that constitute personality are in every sense determining tendencies, and when aroused by suitable stimuli provoke those adjustments and expressive acts by which the personality comes to be known." (44)

Of "determine", Eysenck explains:

"personality is conceived of as an enduring (though not necessarily unchanging) organisation which enables us to make predictions regarding future behaviour." (45)

In the present study, we are not concerned with the 'organisation of behavioral items into a hierarchy', nor with 'predictions regarding future behaviour,' but rather with the individual's present adjustment to his environment, particularly that of the school situation. Thus, Allport's definition appears to cover our focus of interest:
"...adjustments...must be interpreted broadly enough to include maladjustments, and 'environment' to include the behavioral environment (meaningful to the individual) as well as the surrounding geographical environment. Above all, adjustment must not be considered as merely reactive adaptation such as plants and animals are capable of. The adjustments of men contain a great amount of spontaneous, creative behaviour toward the environment. Adjustment to the physical world as well as to the imagined or ideal world - both being factors in the 'behavioral environment' - involves mastery as well as passive adaptation." (46)

Eysenck would include "all objectively recordable modifications of the environment." (47)

Where do we find evidence of adjustments and maladjustments? Allport finds in attitudes and traits 'virtually every type of disposition with which the psychology of personality concerns itself.' (48) In his view, attitudes and traits have common qualities:

"A trait is a form of readiness for response; so too is an attitude. A trait is individualized, distinctive of its possessor; so too may be an attitude. A trait guides the course of behaviour, and may often become dynamic and compulsive as well; so may the attitude. Both may be regarded as biophysical in nature combining, in any proportions, the fruits of heredity and the fruits of learning." (48)

The distinction he makes between attitude and trait is highly controversial:

"an attitude has a well-defined object of reference, either material or conceptual; whereas traits have no such definite reference to objects. The more numerous the objects that arouse an attitude, the more closely does the attitude resemble a trait...The term attitude usually signifies the acceptance or rejection of the object or concept of value to which it is related...Ordinarily attitudes are favourable or unfavourable, well disposed or ill disposed. Traits as a rule have no such clear-cut direction. They are often merely stylistic, and their significance is often adverbial rather than propositional."(49)
Cantril objects to these definitions:

"The various definitions and classifications he (Allport) presents in order to make his meaning clear seem not only to be unsuccessful, but further to confound the conceptual problems...To lump together what we would call ego-involved attitudes and biologically determined abilities or temperamental characteristics only makes for confusion and disregards the genesis, the function and the real relationship between socially derived attitudes and biologically determined individual differences." (50)

This distinction is worth maintaining, though it has been recognized that biological factors influence the formation of 'ego-involved attitudes.'

(a) **The Physical Aspects of Personality.**

We agree with Allport that "personality is neither exclusively mental nor exclusively neural...the organisation entails the operation of both body and mind, intricably fused into a personal unity." (52) Yet, in the present investigation, it has not been necessary to explore physical aspects, since neither Subjects nor Controls gave evidence of physical disease or deformity, and it was safe to assume that matters pertaining to physical health had been adequately covered by either National Health Doctors or School Medical Services.

(b) **Psychological.**

The Freudian theory that all learning is liable to become libidinal, and therefore subject to the laws that govern the organism as a whole, does not appear to be borne out in some of the cases brought to Child Guidance Clinics. For example, it has been observed that a few
children with superior I.Q. who suffer from various emotional disturbances, which interfere with their adjustment at home and in other social situations, are able to make a satisfactory adjustment at school, and even to excel in their school subjects. One gets the impression in some of their records that the school represents the only place where they feel safe, and the teacher becomes the one person of authority to whom they can relate in a positive way. Why is it, then, that others are unable to use their intelligence at school? Many answers have been suggested in psychoanalytic literature. Some authorities say the children who fail transfer their family problems onto the school situation and there continue to fight out the jealousies, hatred, competition, etc., which they have failed to resolve at an early age. The ones who learn, they explain, may escape such unsolved problems by identifying with the good parent which they find in the person of the teacher. The question of what combination of personality qualities enables some children to do this and prevents others is one of tremendous complexity. It involves the whole question of innate ego strengths, mechanisms of defence and environmental influences.

Edward Glover has made a lucid interpretation of the most important metapsychological factors that bear on intellectual development, and has sought to bridge the
gap that is believed to exist between the clinical psychologists and the psychoanalyst:

"The tradition that intellectual processes are the appropriate preserve of the 'conscious' psychologist, that they can be adequately examined by methods of descriptive classification, by mensurational procedures, or by factor analysis, and that the authority of the clinical psychologist extends only to gross interferences, such as amnesia, hallucination or delusion formation, is one that dies hard. Yet a moment's consideration will shew that although the intellectual processes are, more than any other form of mental activity, amenable to conscious and logical forms of controlled investigation, the results obtained cannot possibly satisfy the requirements of the 'unconscious' psychologist." (35)

While he concedes that constitutional factors play a large part, he maintains that:

"It is impossible to understand either normal or abnormal function of the intellect without examining the unconscious and pre-conscious elements that originally contribute to its development and later advance or retard its function." (36)

Glover divides the metapsychological factors into three parts: dynamic, structural and economic. Dynamically, he states that the most important factor is "mobility of cathexis", that is, 'whatever interferes with the cathexis of psychic presentations must interfere with the efficiency of the intellectual faculties.' He shows that the basic instinctual tendencies (such as sexual and aggressive impulses) are reflected in intellectual development. He points to the success of sublimation as the deciding factor:
"Should this mechanism fail to provide an adequate outlet for frustrated energies, thinking tends to become libidoized and so to function as an instrument of unconscious expression." (35)

He further emphasizes the influence of fantasy formation on intellectual development, which latter depends largely on the 'smooth functioning of repression.'

"When these (repression) mechanisms operate without friction, the creative powers of the intellect are enormously enhanced... When however their function is faulty, fantasy formation has a detrimental effect..." (36)

D. The Measurement of Intelligence.

We have presented some of the important theories of intelligence and some of the attempts to define the word, as well as the various methods which have been used to verify these definitions. Yet, we are no wiser than the psychological experts who assembled in the U.S.A. in 1921. The Symposium (37) had been asked: Does intelligence exist? How precisely can it be defined? How does intelligence operate? What materials may be most profitably used in constructing tests? The twelve experts gave twelve different answers. For example, Calvin, Piétrema and Peterson were in fundamental agreement with Binet, but gave different interpretations of his theories. Thorndike defined intelligence as 'the ability to act effectively under given conditions;' Woodrow, 'the capacity to acquire capacity;' Terman, 'the power of abstract thinking;' Dearborn, 'capacity to profit from
experience.' Ruml doubted whether the nature of intelligence could be discussed at all.

Has all this activity brought us to a better position to evaluate the intellectual functioning of the school child than his teachers' opinions? Perhaps the answer can be found in the history of intelligence tests. The mass testing movement arose to meet problems involved in mass education. While schools were small and catered to a highly homogeneous and limited number of pupils, it is conceivable that teachers were able to know a great deal about the individual pupil's abilities and the factors that influenced them. With the rise of cities and the development of compulsory education, the school took on broader functions, many of which had formerly belonged to home and church. School attendance grew rapidly in urban centres, and often the teacher's job became that of merely maintaining order by coping with behaviour problems which arose in the classroom. It is, therefore, not surprising that she welcomed any measure that would rid her of pupils who grossly interfered with instruction and learning. It is difficult to imagine that under such circumstances she could gain enough information about individual pupils to enable her to evaluate latent abilities and capacities. Psychological tests enabled her to organise the classroom into smaller units. Yet, it should not be overlooked that the same goals might have
been achieved on the basis of other groupings. But the psychological testing method was generally successful, and continues to be so, in spite of the many limitations in this technique. It is best achieved when teachers' estimates and other environmental factors are taken into account. Yet it is evident in this discussion that Spearman's original postulate of a "g" factor had little relevance to Binet's tests which, being designed for school children, bring to bear such a composite of specific factors that any general one tends to become lost. But the fact that Binet's tests were designed for school children and for the scholastic grading of them is the chief reason for their use in the present thesis. Over a long period of years, they have been used by numerous educational authorities and proved satisfactory in estimating the potential of children. While this fact has very limited relevance, it does mean that children who produce good results on Binet tests should produce comparably good results at school. And it is into the discrepancies between these two sets of results that the present work aims to look.

E. Summary.

There has never been a satisfactory definition of intelligence. This is hardly surprising since the factors that condition it are so fluid and varied. All sorts of
things, like environment, heredity and personality — each of which is in itself at present incommensurate — enter into any real assessment of intelligence. Nevertheless, numerous observations and measurements have been made and these are not without a certain value, provided we do not regard them as definitive.

When we come to study children who, according to these measurements, possess high intelligence and who are yet failing in the social business of succeeding at school, we may very well be thought to be calling into question the validity of all these measurements. This, however, is not so. What we are trying to do is to discover another factor which can be added to those already prepared by our predecessors in this process of measurement. This additional factor would be the opinion of the children themselves about what causes their failure and, ideally, about how the discrepancy between success and failure can be overcome.
II. AIM, SCOPE AND METHOD OF RESEARCH.

The research was designed to investigate boys of superior intelligence who failed in their school subjects. The study aimed to help parents, teachers and others responsible for them to recognise causes of school failure and to remedy these deficiencies.

A. Preliminary Inquiry.

Initially, it was decided to select children as young as possible, since the earlier these causes could be detected, the better the chance of helping the child. However, the study required an objective assessment of the children's intelligence and of apparent failure to live up to promise. And this could not reliably be made until they entered school and established some kind of record there. Thus, the question of how early such assessment could be made was raised.

1. Method of Procedure.

With this in mind, the London County Council, Education Department, was approached and asked to suggest the youngest boys on their files who had I.Q's of 135 and above* and who were failing at school. (The inquiry was restricted to boys in order to keep the group as homogeneous as possible.)

* These limits were suggested by Terman's classification of children on the basis of I.Q. 120-140, very superior: above 140, genius or near genius.
Thus, the preliminary investigation included the cases referred by the L.C.C. which met the above requirements. A total of three boys were referred. Their ages were: 8 years, 11 months; 11 years, 9 months; 8 years, 1 month. All of them were residents of London County, but one had been placed in a boarding school outside the London area before the investigation was made.

In two cases, the school had recognised the child's superior ability and had sought help from the L.C.C. in helping him to make a better school adjustment; in one case the child was considered by the school to be mentally retarded, and the Headmistress had applied for placement in a special school that might cope with his intellectual deficiency.

2. **Aim.**

Since the aim of the preliminary survey was to obtain a broad picture of the child's social situation, as well as his particular school handicaps, interviews were held with the following sources: the psychologists who tested them, school teachers, parents and subjects. The aim was therefore to explore —

(a) the scope of the child's intelligence;
(b) reasons for his school failure.

(a) **Scope of Intelligence.**

(i) **Interview with Psychologists.**

In two cases, the psychologists indicated that the child suffered from gross emotional insecurities which were
evident during the testing procedure. Michael (8 years, 11 months) had a mental age of 12 years when he was tested at the age of 8 years, 9 months, and an I.Q. of 137 on the Revised Stanford Binet, Form L. He had been unsure of himself and had approached the test in a very apologetic manner: "I hope you won't think I'm silly but..." or "Is it my fault?:...they say it is my fault." Similarly, he was in a muddle about his relationships with people, although his intellectual integrity was marked and his loyalties deep. The psychologist had noted his tension, fears and infantile attitudes which she felt handicapped him intellectually. There was no question in her mind that he would achieve a much higher score (at least 150) if these emotional difficulties were remedied.

In the case of Joseph (11 years, 9 months) who had been tested when he was 11 years, mental age 18.2 and I.Q. of 165, it was observed that his failures even at the top of the scale were due to an inadequate vocabulary, rather than to failure in reasoning. The psychologist commented: 'he simply did not know words like "liability" and "deciduous"'. Yet his verbal definitions were generally accurate, brief and stylish, his reasoning powers acute. The Headmistress of the school which he attended had told the psychologist that he was "the most intelligent boy in school", though his performance was inferior. The Educational Psychologist (L.C.C.) stated that Joseph was not
only remarkably intelligent, but very suitable for grammar school and university education, and she recommended that every effort should be made to obtain a place for him in grammar school, although he had failed the examinations for grammar school entrance.

Alan, who was 8 years, 1 month old, had been tested at the age of 7 years, 9 months, by a clinical psychologist in the psychiatric department of a hospital to which he had been referred a few months before he was brought to the attention of the investigator. On the Revised Stanford-Binet Form L test, he had a M.A. of 14 years, 5 months, and an I.Q. of 186. The psychologist stated this was a "satisfactory and reliable estimate of his ability", and that the score indicated that "Alan's level is such that it occurs only once in 10,000 cases."

During the testing, the psychologist had noted there was not a great deal of scatter, though the test was not quite completed. Alan had failed one test at the 13th year; the highest success being at the superior Adult II level. Alan had impressed the psychologist as "a crisp, friendly boy who thoroughly enjoyed the test." He suggested that the backwardness at school must be only relative, since his reading was very good.
(b) **Reasons for Failure.**

(i) **Interviews with teachers:**

Since Michael had been placed by the L.C.C. at a boarding school for maladjusted children in Somerset a few weeks before he was referred to the investigator, the assessment of his school performance was obtained from the Headmaster during a visit to the school. The Head agreed with the psychologist that Michael's intelligence was far beyond the test results. He thought the boy was too frightened to use very much of his intelligence. When he had entered boarding school he had been exceedingly frightened. His whole behaviour seemed to be governed by the fear that he would be blamed - "they will say it's my fault." The Head stated that Michael's condition had improved to some extent, but he was still over anxious to please, and became quite worked up when he did something wrong, such as arriving for meals a few minutes late. Neither the Head's nor the teachers' reassurance, nor the permissive atmosphere of the school convinced him that he would not be treated harshly. It was soon evident to the staff that "this was a child desperately in need of love." Gradually, he was able to respond to the Head, who took an affectionate interest in him. For example, one night the Head had tucked Michael in bed and given him a sweet and the boy's arms went around his neck and clung desperately as he kissed goodnight. He had found the child extremely backward in caring.
for himself. Michael explained: "My mother never taught me to do these things." Although the larger boys had helped him in an indulgent manner, Michael had been unable to respond to their friendliness. In the woods and during games, he had clung to the Head.

Michael's chief symptoms were soiling and feeding difficulties. He was very clumsy with the fork, and held food in his mouth for a considerable time. Yet he showed great anxiety about finishing the meal, and would say: "Wouldn't it be awful to be the only person on the first bell." The Head thought that Michael's mother was largely responsible for his difficulties, including the learning disabilities at school. When she had committed the boy as being "beyond control", she had impressed him as a demanding, exacting, nervous woman. Her attitude toward the boy's intelligence was: "if he can speak so well, why does he soil?" She thought he soiled because he was "hateful", and failed at school because he was lazy. She was puzzled because some of the boy's behaviour resembled that of a two-year old, and some that of an old man. The Head commented: "His mother makes it difficult for the child to control himself...she is over-anxious." Her attitude toward the school authorities was one of apprehension and lack of co-operation. The father, who is fifteen years older than the mother, is sixty. He is a rough, good-
hearted, cordial man, but has very little jurisdiction over the boy, except to threaten him. Later, when the investigator sought an interview with the parents, they broke several appointments, and finally stated they were too busy to allow time for a visit.

Regarding Michael's school performance, the Head mentioned his unusual vocabulary and grown-up talk. At the school, he amazed everyone with his long words. Yet, he was slow and backward in his school work, constantly sought reassurance and direction. When the investigator observed him in the painting class, which was very relaxed and informal, he seemed frightened of the brush, and moved it slowly and timidly along the outline of a boat he had drawn, in a very childish manner. His hands trembled and he made many trips to the teacher to ask how he was getting on.

It is evident from this account that the Head saw Michael's inability to learn at school as a part of total underdevelopment and insecurity in the personality of the boy. It is also clear that he held the home responsible for this condition. He felt that this was borne out by the boy's improvement several years later, when the investigator made a follow-up contact. At that time, Michael was doing an above-average grade of work and had become more social. The Head thought this the result of relaxed and intelligent handling. On this occasion, he
mentioned that the mother had exerted a great deal of pressure upon Michael to "pass the 11-plus." She had pushed him with threats and scolding several years before he had reached his 11th year.

In the case of Joseph, again the school was in agreement with the psychologist in her assessment of the boy's intelligence. Again home conditions, particularly the mother's attitude, were blamed for the failure at school. The Headmistress, who was keenly interested in Joseph and proud of his superior ability, was deeply disappointed that he had to be pushed, instead of making his way as she had hoped. She said he lacked stamina, concentration and ambition. She had found him an "unstable" boy, and she traced this instability to his mother, whom she considered "doubtful". This impression was vague, and the results of infrequent contacts, but it seemed to the Head worthy of investigation. In contrast to this impression of the mother, who she stated was Greek, she had been favourably impressed by the father's interest in this boy and his performance at school. The father, who is an Englishman, had told her that Joseph did better work in his studies at home, particularly in languages, and he found it difficult to understand why it was he failed at school. The father had been greatly disappointed at Joseph's failure in the "11-plus" and told of the tremendous help he had given the boy in coaching over a period of several years in order to prepare him adequately for the examinations.
When Joseph failed the examinations, the Headmistress asked if he realised this would disqualify him for grammar school. The boy said he did not mind, because he had not planned to go to grammar school anyway, his father could not afford to send him. She had, therefore, been surprised when his father came to school and told her he not only was counting on Joseph's going to grammar school, but had taken another job that would enable him to meet the necessary expenses. The Head thought this attitude was unusual among parents in the district, which is not a grammar school population. Most of the parents take the children out at 15 years.

The "streak of laziness" which was so evident in his school subjects extended to athletics as well. Joseph had never joined in sports, he could not be bothered to exert himself. The Head spoke of her efforts, in co-operation with the Educational Psychologist, to find a non-scholarship place for Joseph in grammar school, and was delighted that this attempt had been successful.

In contrast to the teachers' attitudes in the cases of Michael and Joseph, Alan's Headmistress took a very dim view of the psychological assessment of his intelligence. And she was furious with the Clinic for telling Alan and his mother about the I.Q. When his mother informed her that the boy had the intelligence of a
fourteen year old boy, she had replied: "Well he may be fourteen in intelligence, but to me he is a silly boy of eight." She had found no evidence of "genius" in his school work. He had always done very poorly, and she had considered placing him in a slower moving class. The mother had suggested a higher form, claiming he was "bored" but the Head's reply to this request was that if he did his work, he would be placed in a higher form, but not unless he did.

Alan's best work was in Arithmetic, where he came 21st in a form of 34 pupils, but he failed in the remainder of his subjects. The Head blamed his parents for Alan's learning difficulties. She was particularly critical of their inconsistencies in dealing with him. "They smack him and say no T.V., but in the end he always gets his way."

In contrast to her mood of annoyance when she talked with the investigator alone, the Head was very warm and understanding in her personal contact with the boy when he joined us. She examined his work books and was careful to praise merits such as neatness. She spoke later of his poor attendance and lateness in coming to school. Since his father always brought him by car, she considered him responsible for this. Other reasons for his poor performances were: inability to concentrate, fidgety and silly mannerisms, thumb sucking, extremely poor
relationship with his classmates. In her mind, there had always been a question of mental retardation.

(ii) Interviews with Subjects.

Investigator's Impressions.

Michael, a stocky, square little boy, who gives the impression of a middle-aged man, was in a great hurry to have the interview over. When I produced a box of sweets, he settled somewhat, but it was evident throughout that he considered it a chore to sit and talk. He gave few evidences of a superior intellect, and it was necessary to repeat questions many times, constantly to bring him back to the subject and to support him when he seemed uncertain. It was obvious that he was preoccupied with fantasies, and this was evidenced in absent-mindedness and incoherence in answering questions. He was repetitive and, like a senile person, he tended to confuse present with past events. For example, it was never clear whether he referred to the old schools or to his present one.

Joseph: A very handsome latency boy, with dark features and a relaxed, casual manner. He reacted to the investigator in a positive manner and seemed in possession of the situation. His keen intellect was evident throughout the interview, and he also gave evidence of a keen sense of humour. However, he seemed to be well defended, and this was shown primarily in a desire to please. At times he was able to take on the role of host, and to advise the investigator about the questionnaire. He thought certain questions might be better phrased in a different way for example.

Alan made no pretence about not being bored with the whole procedure. He had been excited about my visit, and was waiting in full cowboy regalia when I arrived. He spent the first hour of the interview showing his guns and electric train, and it was soon evident that his chief interest in the investigator was centered in the knowledge that she was American. At school, he had asked if she had Indian connections, and when told that her grandmother was American Indian, he had become quite enthusiastic about this. To him, the interview was a bore and he interspersed questions about cowboys and Indians, in a "stick-'em-up" atmosphere, which indicated this was his chief interest. In contrast to the stories he told of knocking out bullies, Alan is a pale, delicate lad, who seemed thoroughly frightened and helpless.
All of these interviews lasted 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) hours and it appeared that this was too long a period to maintain the subjects' interest. Also, the subjects indicated that they would have preferred more specific questions.

In the interviews with subjects, verbatim answers to some of the questions have been included in order to give the reader some idea of the basic confusion found in children about the points at issue. It is also hoped that they will be seen to lead into the final wording of the questionnaire given to later samples. Apart from this, it is hoped the reader will gain some impression of the incoherence with which children, however articulate, think of their environment.

To the question: "How do you judge your intelligence?" the boys gave the following replies:

**Michael:** "My teacher said I was doing very well, and if I carried on, I'd be very clever when I get older."

When asked what he thought, Michael replied:

"I think it must have been if the teacher said so."

**Joseph:** "In between fair and good," "Medium."

**Alan:** "I judge by how many marks I get on the list - so far, I got 2 or 3. That's not very good, because there's one person's got 10. Every term we do some things. The teacher writes in a book how many marks we deserve. The first two she gives prizes, including the exam prizes. I got 4th prize."

**How do you get on in school?**

**Michael:** "Mother said I might get on well if I learn from the beginning of everything. Like learning English is much easier than Arithmetic. Not much, a little. Mother meant learn English before I learn Arithmetic - the easier before the harder. Once she said the teacher said I was doing very
good at school. I thought it was a very nice thing to say about me. She didn't only have good reports, she sometimes had bad ones too. When she had bad reports, she said: 'if you keep being a nuisance, I wouldn't get on'".

If you could pick any occupation you liked, what would you be when you grow up? Why?

Michael: "Mother said I should be a school teacher, but I would have to pass my 11-plus and go to grammar school.

Joseph: "I'd like to be quite a few things: a millionaire, to have a little money so as not to have to worry about will I be able to afford this or that. A test pilot or pilot in the Fleet Air Arm, because I am keen on planes" (His father was in the R.A.F.) "Surgeon - it would be rather interesting to see how people's bodies work and things like that. Solicitor, because it's a very interesting job." (Five years later Joseph left school because he was "bored" and was recommended for a job as apprentice in a solicitor's firm, which he entered at the age of 16½.)

Alan: "I'd like to be King of the Cowboys, like Roy Rogers, and lead a wild life, a free life, fighting the Indians." Here he drew a gun from his hip pocket and went "Bang-bang".

As you are now, what would you like to be?

Michael: "I don't know."

Joseph: "A footballer. I like football. I'm not too good at it, only fair."

Alan: "I'd prefer to be a train driver, because there is not much danger, except crashes and things like that."

If things were different at home, would you do better work at school?

Michael: "Sometimes father smacked me for not doing well. Once he talked with me, but he said so much I forgot what he said. When I got bad reports my mother scolded me. Sometimes she smacked me, not a cane like the teacher who used one in the old school. I was very young when the teacher used the cane. One night when father came home from work and Ma told him about my report he said, 'Oh dear, not getting on very well, indeed we can't have that...he will never pass the 11-plus.' I didn't think it was very nice but I had to put up with it. You can't always get good
reports, sometimes you must have bad ones. All fathers are kind. When they are cross, they're usually a bit rough. My father is 60, he sometimes gets cross, then he usually smacks me. My mother and father quarrel at times, but it never ended up anything serious. My mother says I've got bad nerves." This was a near as he came to answering the question.

Joseph: Both of his parents kept after him about his school work, they called him "lazy", but he had no fault to find with home conditions except that his parents did not allow him to play with the children on the estate. Here he mentioned how "bored" he was with his school work. "Teachers keep on the same subject for a month. I despise English, it takes me much longer than Arithmetic, which is my best subject. I get verbs and nouns muddled up. I write what I think, and it is usually wrong."

Alan complained of his parents threats. They say: "Now listen here, if you don't get on with your work I'll take your pocket money..." or they threaten to send him to bed. "They want me to go to Oxford or Cambridge, they always talk about things like the examinations (11 plus) and University. I don't like that."

(iii) Interviews with Parents were held for the purpose of obtaining their views regarding reasons for the child's failure at school, and assessment of the home situation.

Michael: parents refused interview.

Joseph: Father very ambitions for the boy, primarily because he had been unable to achieve his goals in the academic world. He had been top of his form at school and won scholarships to Grammar School, but was unable to attend because he had to leave school and go to work. He had always said that if he had a son he would give him every advantage. He planned to send the boy to Oxford, but Joseph had said "Cambridge for me." He concurred with Joseph in his ambition to be a Nuclear Physicist. Thus he was saddened by Joseph's failure to achieve a place in Grammar School, but had regained enthusiasm when a place had been found for his son. He then planned to push and to help him through. He told of the anxiety he and his wife had experienced before the "11-plus"... they had grilled Joseph in all his weak subjects, pressed him to do his prep., even during the weekends. To this end they had limited his contacts with boys in the neighbourhood, whom they considered to be lacking in ambition. He considered his family far superior to the neighbours. He had reacted so strongly to Joseph's failure that he had not told his wife about it. In general,
he gave the impression of over-protection of both - of Joseph because he lacked "push"; of his wife because she was "foreign" and did not understand the subtleties of the language.

The only reason he could give for Joseph's failure at school was his fondness for a teacher who died. After this event, Joseph had gone down to the bottom of the form. He also thought that Joseph's "stubbornness and untidiness" affected his school work: "He refuses to wash or to keep his clothes and room tidy." At home, he found Joseph clever, he could not understand why he did not show this ability at school. The father had been in the R.A.F. for ten years and had married the mother in Egypt during the war. He was currently engaged in business as a salesman, and tended to identify with his West End customers.

Joseph's mother was very retiring and gave the impression of being either dull, or ill-acquainted with English when the investigator saw her in the presence of her husband. However when seen several days later alone, she became articulate and confident. She felt isolated by the suspicion of foreigners which was endemic in the district where she lived, and recounted laughingly how she had been reported to The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children because she had refused to permit Joseph to play with neighbouring Teddy Boys. She focussed blame on the teachers, accusing them of being negative in their attitude towards Joseph's laziness. She felt that it was the job of the teacher to get out of the pupil all that was in him, and that they should have been able to persuade Joseph to work harder.

Alan: The parents were too involved in a family business, which they conducted from their home, to give much attention to either of their children. The father was annoyed at Alan's teachers, the Clinic Authorities and the investigator for what he considered excessive concern about the boy: "He will grow out of his difficulties," and he told of what a troublesome lad he had been - now look how successful he was. As for the mother, she was an intelligent, tense, high-pressure business woman, who professed to be greatly worried about Alan's learning difficulties, but it was evident that she was not willing to go out of her way to do anything about them. Thus, during his attendance at the Child Guidance Clinic she found it inconvenient to get time away from the business to take him there, and it was only after the importance of her presence had been impressed upon her forcibly that she would turn up at all, and then she was usually late.
She, too, blamed the teachers for her boy's failure. They should have made the boy's work more interesting for him, even if it meant pushing him into a more advanced class. Also, she was suspicious of anti-Semitic feelings on the part of his teachers.

(iv) Use of Intellectual Abilities.

Thus far, evidence from teachers, parents and the subjects indicated that these children failed to use their superior intellectual gifts at school. The question, therefore, arises, in what areas of their activities were these abilities used? To this end, the parents and subjects were asked about their hobbies and other outside activities. Since there was general agreement on information given by parent and child, only the child's answers will be given.

Michael was vague about his interests. In parrot-like fashion he referred to his parents and teachers who thought that he could paint, draw and build sheds, like his father. He was clearly not involved in any special activity after school hours.

Joseph's favourite hobby was reading: "books like 'Tom Brown's School Days, Robinson Crusoe and Comics.'" He was "pretty good" in football, "all right" in cricket, but did not know how to swim. He said he could not enter any sport after school because of his dinner hour. His mother returned from work at 5 p.m., and his father at 6. They had dinner at 6.30 and he had to be home before that hour. He spoke of having "plenty of friends", but they only went to museums together occasionally. His best friend had never visited him. "I tell him my address, but he gets it muddled up." He would like to join the Cubs but again the dinner hour interfered."You don't know how I eat...I eat like a horse. I get used to having a hot dinner." He found most boys his age "silly". They go in for games like collecting dates of Kings and Queens of England. "I don't see much in it, I prefer football." Besides, his mother did not like children coming to the house.
Alan's hobbies were evident in the first interview: Cowboy games, guns, picture books about cowboys. He said his one ambition was to be a cowboy. His father wanted him to be a medical doctor and this amused Alan: "Surely he doesn't expect me to be a doctor with all my cowboy ways...I'd do more harm than good. I'd be running wild like Buffalo Bill." Apart from his cowboy reading, he liked books on astrology, scientific explorations and encyclopedias.

(v) **Pointers from Preliminary Investigation.**

**Psychologists' reports:** In the one case, where the psychologist believed there to be a real discrepancy between the results of the test and the true mental age, she also noticed that the performance of the test was accompanied by considerable anxiety and an apologetic manner. In the remaining two cases, the results would lead one to expect that the children in question would be capable of performing brilliantly at school. Yet the fact remained that they were not, and we look in vain through the psychologists' reports for some hint of a reason as to their failure. It would, therefore, appear that we must search outside the simple measurements of intelligence and the observations of clinical psychologists in the test situation to the larger, less sharply defined areas of the environment, like behaviour in class and in the home, and to other less disciplined observers, like the teachers and parents, for some clue as to the reasons for failure.

**Teachers' reports** were more suggestive. They focussed on causes within the pupil and in his home environment: pupils were said to be excessively anxious,
fearful of failure, lazy, bored, lacking in ambition. Two
of the boys were observed to have very poor relationships
with their schoolmates. Parents were said to be unstable,
nervous, tense and exacting. Some had shown lack of
understanding and sympathy. Parental anxiety had been
evident in nagging, criticism, pushing and threatening
the child in some instances; in others, intensive coaching
at home.

The subjects blamed both parents and school
for their failures: parents worried, nagged, smacked,
lectured, scolded, belittled intelligence, predicted future
failure. Teachers were inefficient, "rushed" the pupil,
were careless, strict, critical, and stingy with their time.
Systems of punishment and assessing ability (particularly
exams.) were unfair. Schoolmates bullied, hit, stole, or
were unfriendly. Classmates were "silly", or distracting.
More subjectively still, introspectively in fact, the boys'
personal ambitions did not coincide with academic brilliance:
one wanted to be a cowboy, another an engine driver, neither
of them felt they needed to be particularly good at school
work in order to achieve their ambitions.

The first thing that strikes one about these
answers is the extreme degree to which two of the subjects
were dependent upon their teachers for an assessment of
their intelligence. In contrast to this, they clearly
felt their teachers were inadequate and to blame for their
school failure. Not only this, but they felt their parents
to be in part responsible for this failure. Only Joseph, the oldest of the three, was willing to accept any part of the responsibility himself. And here we come to the question of how far the age of the child determines its degree of dependence on the outside world. We know that as the child grows older, his dependency needs usually become less. Does it follow that older children would accept more responsibility for their failures and would be less likely to palm off the blame on teachers or parents? On the other hand, is it equally possible that the degree to which a child blames the outside world for its own failures depends upon the intensity of its own emotional conflicts? This would lead one to expect that Michael and Alan would be more neurotic than Joseph. And such expectations are amply confirmed both by the present material and by the future behaviour and therapeutic treatment of the children in question. Michael was referred to a Psychiatric Clinic, on account of suicide threats and other severe symptoms of disturbance: Alan was treated psychoanalytically. With these ideas in mind, the investigator resolved to study a larger sample of children in this age group and some who were older, children who were undoubted neurotics and who had been studied sufficiently closely to gain some idea of the intensity of the disturbances, and some of whom were normal children taken at random from the school population.
B. Review of Case Files at a Children's Clinic.

The case records of ten boys who had been referred to a children's psychotherapeutic Clinic were examined. The boys' ages ranged from 8 to 12. The age scope was broadened in order to test the first hypothesis, i.e. that older children are more apt to accept responsibility for failure than younger ones. The boys' I.Q's ranged from 137-150. Nine of them were in daily psychotherapy for neurotic disorders, and one for borderline psychotic disturbances. Four of them were in treatment with the investigator and the remainder with other psychotherapists.

1. Reasons Given for Failure.

The majority of these patients (regardless of age) blamed the school and/or their parents for their poor performance in school subjects. Teachers were said to be over-strict, "ready to use the cane", or they played favourites, and the patients were never the favoured ones. Some of them complained that teachers were unfair in examinations: sometimes they asked questions on material that had not been covered in class, or they gave too many examinations, or were unfair in grading their papers. Five of the children had acute anxiety before and during exams., and in all these cases they blamed parents for anxiety over their success. By far the greater anxiety on the part of the patients was over the cane. Eight of them complained of this. Six gave details of methods of punishment and were
alert to any misdemeanour on the part of their classmates and methods used by teachers to correct them. While three of them said they had never been caned, they lived in daily fear of being beaten. The boys who had been caned gave elaborate details of the procedure. Eleven-year old Terry, for example, gave the following description of punishment at school:

"The boys get 'stars and stripes' for good and bad behaviour. One can get stripes for either bad behaviour or bad work. Stripes are given, not only by the masters but also by the captain of the house, the vice-captain and the staff captain. If one gets 4 stripes a day, or 7 stripes a week, one gets sent to the Headmaster for whacking - only the Headmaster. He has a thing shaped like a cricket bat, made of rubber, which he uses for those boys who don't have stripes often. The leather one is used on the boys who get stripes frequently."

Terry had not been given many stripes. He continued:

"Sometimes the whole class is sent to the Headmaster and then the Head gives them one whacking instead of three."

Terry thought the Head would get too tired if he had to give them three whackings each, and he calculated how many that would be. Other details follows:

"There is also a system whereby one can go to the person who has given the stripe, if one thinks it was not fair, and the stripe can be cancelled. If the boy goes to the vice-captain and asks for a stripe to be cancelled, he will do it; but the present vice-captain does not cancel stripes, but the vice we had last year did. I went often to him. He gave me a stripe when I only turned round and he thought I was speaking to another boy, but I was not, so he cancelled it."

Terry also talked of the 'awful strict' Latin teacher who died while playing the piano. He was sure the
next one would be nicer - not so bad-tempered. This boy, who was frequently absent from school due to stomachaches, disliked all but one of his teachers.

Gerald, 12 years of age, I.Q. 146, complained about examinations and always feared he would fail them. He described himself as a 'slow worker'. He could never finish an exam. If the teachers gave more time, he thought he could move up from the bottom to somewhere near the middle.

Bob, 10 years, I.Q. 150, complained that school work was too dull. He saw no sense in learning Arithmetic, he would never use it. His teachers gave too much homework, his mother nagged him constantly about it. She would never help him. He disliked going to school: 'I'm a home bird.' He missed an average of two days weekly from school because of colds, headaches, tired feelings, and finally dropped out completely, and had to be taught at home.

2. Assessment of Intelligence.

Seven of the boys declared they were too stupid, or did not have enough intelligence to do better work. Five of them complained of the bright boys who were always at the top, three of them thought the bright boys were favourites of the teachers. The majority were dubious about intelligence tests: how could anyone find out how much they knew in such a short time? Perhaps the tester did not understand them, she was a foreigner; maybe she got the test paper mixed up with that of another child. Most of them based lack of faith on the fact that they failed at school: "a boy all that bright would not be at the bottom," one of them said. How, then, did they assess their intelligence? Four said that they had "fair" intelligence, two believed
themselves to be "slow", "dim", one stated he was medium, three of them gave no specific estimate of their intelligence, but complained that they could not learn certain subjects because of poor memory, lack of interest, dislike of the teacher, etc.

3. Relationships with Schoolmates.

Six of the patients disliked their schoolmates and were terrified of "bullies", "bigger boys", or "Teddy Boys". Three of these children had to be accompanied to school by their mother. Two found classmates boring and unable to share their interests, two said they had one friend. On the whole, these patients adjusted poorly to children of their own age and there were several instances of provocative behaviour. For example, one of them cringed against the school building in obvious fear of other children, and complained they 'pounced' on him during breaks. The accounts of these beatings were greatly exaggerated. Another bullied younger children, whom he preferred as companions to children of his own age.


Of the four boys who had reached their 11th year, two of them had passed the "11-plus", Three of them mentioned anxiety on their parents' part which came in the form of outside and home coaching, gifts, bribes, threats, nagging, "cram" courses.
C. Pilot Survey of Normal Children.

Since there were no convenient files to be consulted in the case of normal children, it was necessary to devise a questionnaire which would allow them to express as honestly and objectively as possible their feelings about school and school life.

In the framing of this questionnaire, attention was paid to the fact already suggested in the preliminary investigation that, given the opportunity, some children would be content to repeat the judgment of their parents or teachers about themselves, as though it were their own opinion. In order to minimise the effect of this, as well as to be able to diagnose it accurately when it occurred, questions were asked on four different subjects:

1. The child's relationship with his school fellows;
2. His relationship with his teachers.
3. His own and his teachers' relationships with his parents.
4. His own opinion of himself, school subjects, school discipline.

Unlike, too, the original questions those in the Pilot Questionnaire were framed with varying degrees of directness, so that some of the less communicative children might be surprised into honesty by an apparently irrelevant question. The resulting Pilot Questionnaire, has been
included in the Appendix, page I.

1. **Method of Procedure in Pilot Study.**

Ten subjects were selected from cases referred by the L.C.C. Senior Educational Psychologist, according to the plan discussed in the Preliminary Investigation, i.e. boys whose ages ranged from 8 to 12 years with I.Q's over 130. However, there was one exception to this earlier plan: no children were selected who had been known to Child Guidance Clinics or other therapeutic sources. All of the boys had been referred for educational reasons, rather than psychological difficulties. In this respect they differed from Michael and Alan among the Preliminary subjects, as well as the Clinic patients.

Subjects were visited at schools, according to the plan discussed in detail in the Main Inquiry. The following Schools were visited:

1. St. Marylebone Secondary School;
2. Deansbrook Junior School;
3. Avignor Primary School (2 boys);
4. St. Mary's Junior School;
5. Byron House School (3 boys);
6. Edith Neville Junior Mixed School;

The subjects' I.Q's ranged from 135-147.

2. **Useful Tendencies Observed During the Pilot Study.**

Since considerable space would be required to
discuss answers to all the questions, we have focussed on responses which were most useful in planning the main questionnaire. At the same time, we have kept in mind trends that were observed during the earlier inquiries.

(a) Reasons for Failure in School Subjects.

When asked: "What are the most important reasons for boys not doing well?" the majority of the subjects held the individual pupil responsible for failure:

"because they have no interest in the work"
"they don't grow to tolerate work"
"too damned lazy"
"slack about homework
"no ambition, they clear out at 15"
"haven't got a will to work"
"not much revising", etc.

Several included such impersonal reasons as "the work is too hard", or "the school is too large."

All of the boys stated they could get on better than they did, but the reasons were similar to those given above. Only one of the subjects had mentioned a factor outside his personal responsibility. He stated that examinations were too hard. Although the subjects did not list "other" reasons in the space allowed for this purpose, their answers to related questions suggested a broader range of factors than those they had given. For example, when asked: "If
you were a school teacher, How would you test your pupils' abilities? the majority stated they would rely upon their own judgment, or the pupil's everyday work. Some of these made comments which indicated a strong feeling against examinations: "not by written exams, the most unfair method." Another stated that a clever boy might not be good at exams, and it would be unfair to judge him on the basis of exam results, etc.

The boys were in favour of some homework, the average amount being 1 hour daily, and all but two stated their teachers gave too much homework. Some mentioned they did not have enough time for other activities, others blamed teachers who gave too much homework for their parents' nagging about it. Yet all of the subjects had stated that the teachers were fair and none had mentioned nagging parents. Criticism of parents came in indirect forms in most cases. For example, during the investigator's visit to the homes, one of the subject mentioned his father was keen about TV, and kept it blasting all night, and there was only one room with heat. Yet, earlier, he had given "laziness" as the only reason for failure at school. Another called attention to the budgie, who had flitted between us several times during the interview and had finally landed on my shoulder. He commented: "That's what happens to me." He said the budgie was noisy and no one had control over it.
Another boy complained of distractions from younger brothers and a sister. One of the subjects complained that he did not have a room of his own and thought he could concentrate better if he did. The reason he had given for failure at school was "Lack of ambition."

Similarly, the boys who had not passed the Common Entrance Examination gave indirect criticisms of their parents: one of them mentioned that his mother had promised a "bike" if he passed. She was very "keen" on it, and had been to see the teacher. Another spoke of the help his mother had given with homework; still another mentioned his parents' disappointment that he had not measured up to the family's standards - two of his brothers had passed the "11-plus" and were already in grammar school.

In several cases the mothers had expressed concern, to the investigator, about their sons' failure. One of them assumed we were interested in helping the boy to qualify, another asked advice about coaching; another asked, after the interview with her son, whether the investigator thought he was likely to pass the "11-plus". While assurance was given to parents and subjects that the visits had no connection with the Common Entrance requirements, it did appear that visits to the homes during this period might accentuate concern about the boys' intellectual capacities.
(b) **Attitudes Towards Teachers.**

More than half of the subjects stated they would like to be school teachers, some of them saw the teacher's job in terms of social services to children: "I think teaching is a very good job, because a teacher is in a position to help young children and to give them a good start in the world." Others were not sure they wanted to be teachers, but it was apparent in some of the remarks that they identified with the teacher: "Knowing the way some of my classmates carry on, I don't know", or "Some of the boys take advantage of teachers." One of them was not in favour of being a teacher for the following reason: "I don't think I would like ordering people around a lot. I'd like to be friendly with people."

What kind of teachers did they like? Most of the subjects liked the kind of teachers they said they had:

"I like teachers who are strict and don't let the boys play around in class."

"I like the ones not too soft, but can keep the class in order."

"....teachers who keep strict discipline."

"I like someone who gives a lecture beforehand and who has an exciting character. Someone who understands you fully. I've got a teacher like that."

Do these boys identify with the strict teacher? Are criticisms of teachers implied in these statements? Answers to the question "What type of teacher to you dislike?" point in the direction of criticism:
"I like teachers with a sense of humour. I don't like women teachers. If there's a woman teacher, I just don't do any work."

"I dislike the ones who can't stand up for themselves and who always send you to somebody else for punishment."

"I don't like the ones who always seem to be in a bad temper, those who give you punishment at the slightest thing."

"I dislike the ones you have to treat like demi-gods."

"The ones one must be careful not to undermine."

None of the subjects indicated that their teachers fitted into any of these categories, yet the responses would not add up to "all teachers being fair", as they had stated. When asked what they would do with a slow pupil, if they were teacher, the answers were less subtle:

"...teachers should take more interest in the ones who are slow. I'd divide the class into groups: bright, average, elementary people. The average one, I'd give him work according to what he was good at. If he was slow, I'd give him extra work during break and try to make him catch up with the bright ones."

"Some teachers don't explain properly. The best thing to do in explaining is to make sure they know it."

"Some teachers can't keep control in class, and this makes it hard for some people to learn."

"The main thing is not to become a teacher but a friend as well. I'd try to establish myself as a friend. If some people went badly, I'd talk to them and try to get them to improve."

"If boys don't do well, I think threat works better. Most masters cope in this way. It makes the boys feel ashamed if they do anything wrong."

Yet, identification with strict teachers was evident in most of the answers to the question "Do you think some types of punishment shouldn't be allowed?" One of the
subjects commented:

"Yes, cane, but some children ask for it."

"No, every kind is perfectly fair. If a boy deserves a cane, definitely he should get it."

"I dislike punishment by prefects - this should be the master's job."

One objected to 'lines' because it interfered with games and after-school activities, another thought detention of the whole form was unfair to the boys who were innocent. Only one of the subjects was against corporal punishment:

"I don't agree with corporal punishment. I think it is bad because it makes a child an enemy to the teacher. It doesn't hurt me, or make me do better work, I think it is bad."

What would you do to keep discipline? This question brought additional evidence of identification with the strict and controlling teacher:

"I would be strict with them and firm, wouldn't let them play around in class."

"I'd tell them I didn't want any tricks or monkeying around. I wouldn't give them lines, cane or anything. Caning makes you want to do it again."

"I wouldn't let the boys get too familiar with me if I was a teacher. On my first appearance to the class, I'd lay down the law with a firm hand, so they wouldn't try to take advantage the next time."

"I think detention after school of the whole form is best."

The suggested link between punishment and school failure made by one of the subjects seemed an important point to incorporate into the Main Questionnaire. The
volume of responses in favour of "strictness" suggested that additional scope should be given for pupils' reactions in this area. Similarly, the suggestions that certain forms of punishment interfered with outside activities seemed worthy of further exploration. This was underlined by the considerable number of activities in which the subjects stated they engaged: reading seemed to be broad and intense—novels, "stories about the lives of people who have done big, good or hectic things," science fiction, war novels, romances, detective stories, adventure books, classical novels, "escape stories", history, books on astronomy, electricity, "practical books", encyclopaedias. One of the subjects stated that he read three daily newspapers.

Yet, the group appeared to favour more active hobbies: building things, like model planes, engines and boats; sports; running, cricket, football, rugger, swimming, cycling, sailing archery. Several of them played musical instruments: violin, piano, 'cello, recorder, guitar. They were active in clubs of all sorts—Scouts, sailing club, church groups, football clubs, etc. It was therefore not surprising that the majority of them stated that their outside activities were more interesting than school work. Only one said "sometimes" his hobbies were more interesting.
It was evident in the majority of cases that contacts with boys their own age were as important as the activities in which the boys engaged. The subjects showed pride in the number of friends they had and in the closeness of the relationship with a 'best friend', 'mate', or 'pal'. As a group, they seemed to have a positive relationship with adult leaders of various group activities. Answers to this group of questions showed them to be essential to the Main Questionnaire.

(c) **Summary.**

1. Uniformity in responses to questions about parents might suggest that the framing of the questions was at fault. More provocative questions seemed to be needed.

2. We have noted the tendency of the subjects to focus on personal reasons for failure in school subjects, and this called attention to the greater number of choices offered in this category. For example, 4 of the 6 choices suggested causes within themselves. It seemed that additional categories - including a wider range of environmental influences - was indicated.

3. We have noted the discrepancy between the boys' replies to objective and subjective questions, e.g. to questions where direct, subjective responses to teachers
and their methods was asked for, they showed a surprising 
unanimity of faith. But when more indirect, more objectively 
valid terms were set to the questions, their opinions tended 
to disperse into a variety of unconnected complaints. The 
ambiguity of the responses aroused a similar ambiguity in 
the mind of the investigator, so that she decided it would 
be advisable to establish what might be called a coefficient 
of honesty, and a questionnaire which was meant to accomplish 
this purpose is here outlined.

4. Revision of Questionnaire.

The revised questionnaire was divided into three 
groups of questions:

**Group 1** included questions about conditions in 
school. The interest of the answers lay, of course, in 
what they revealed of the boy's state of mind and in their 
relation to the account he gave of personal observations 
and experience. It was also hoped that the questions in 
this group would persuade the boys to be candid and perhaps 
objectively illuminating.

**Group 2** presented questions in which the child 
was asked to comment upon his immediate surroundings: his 
teachers, school fellows, parents, with emphasis on his 
observation of what went on around him rather than what he 
personally experienced.

**Group 3.** Only after the two opening barrages 
would the investigator tackle the child about what he himself 
thought and felt as an individual. These would be direct 
and difficult questions, like "Why are you where you are in 
the class?" It is essential for the whole operation that 
these last questions should be as personal and provocative 
as possible, in order to uncover the inconsistencies between 
what would be described (in Freudian terminology) as ego 
and superego reactions. (However, the questionnaire makes 
no attempt to come to terms with such Freudian concepts as 
that of the id.)
The point of dividing the questionnaire into three sections in this manner can be summarized in the statement that nobody can tell the truth (or, if he could, would want to) about his own social relationships. That children are no exception to this generalisation - not even gifted children, or least of all, gifted children - had already been revealed by this attempt at a systematic questionnaire.

5. Reasons for Change of Age.

We have noted the reactions of some of the children in the Preliminary Inquiry, Clinic Records and in the Pilot Study toward the Common Entrance Examinations. In some cases, considerable anxiety was evident on the part of subjects or their parents. In my talks with Headmasters and members of the L.C.C. staff, these impressions were reinforced. There was general agreement that the period between 8-11 was not a suitable one for the investigation because the subjects were already under a certain amount of strain. The next age group - 12 - usually coincided with the first year in grammar school, where adjustments to a new situation had to be taken into account in the assessment of performance. As one Headmaster put it, "It takes them at least a year to settle in." Most of the teachers favoured the 3rd, 4th and 5th forms. Thus the boys' ages would range from approximately 14-17. There were obvious disadvantages in studying this group, the most important of them being that the boys
would be deep enough into adolescence for the problems attendant on that stage of development to have affected their school performance. Also, the chances of helping children of this age would be less than with younger children. While the latter obstacle could not be overcome in the present investigation, the former could be taken into account by further revising the questionnaire to meet some of the characteristics of the adolescent group. Already the aspect of inconsistency in responses had been called to our attention with the younger boys. Since this trait is even more symptomatic of the adolescent, greater subtlety would be required in phrasing the various groups of questions. The delicate task of framing the questions required considerable thought and time. Suggestions from grammar school boys, teachers and headmasters were most helpful. I had to be particularly careful that my American English was translated into terms familiar to the English schoolboy. Yet it was interesting to note that some expressions, such as "regular guy", "take it easy" had already become a part of the subjects' vocabulary. The final questionnaire has been placed in the Appendix Section, page 6.

6. Observations pertaining to Study of Clinic and Preliminary Groups.

In contrast to the earlier groups, the pilot subjects gave no evidence of fear of punishment. In fact, they advocated strict punishment and some of them were critical of
the teacher who sent pupils to other people for punishment. The methods they would use, if they were teacher, were often more severe than those which they stated were used by their own teachers. This identification with strict authoritative figures is usual with this age group, but the approval of caning on the part of at least half of the pilot subjects did seem surprising. We do not know whether this approval of beating represents the wish to be beaten which always accompanies the fear of being beaten with neurotic children. Although a certain amount of criticism of teachers may be implied in statements regarding strict punishment, it seemed fairly evident that the pilot subjects were strongly identified with persons of authority, and this was not the case with the majority of the other groups.

The pilot subjects appeared to gain more satisfaction from other children and to enjoy a wider range of hobbies and other interests than the earlier groups. The most important tendency in this inquiry is the attitude shown about school failure: the pilot boys tended to assume responsibility for their own learning difficulties, in contrast to the earlier groups who more freely projected blame upon outside conditions and persons. Observations of these two groups (for the preliminary boys were mostly Clinic patients) would suggest that a controlled investigation of this type would be rewarding.
III. MAIN INQUIRY - METHOD OF INVESTIGATION.

A. Selection of Subjects and Controls.

Thanks to the cooperation of the LCC, several headmasters were approached. Of the first three, two agreed to cooperate, while one disclaimed any knowledge of pupils of high intelligence who were failing. At a later date, this school was approached and granted facilities for the questioning of Controls. Further contacts produced similar degrees of cooperation. Pupils were classified on the basis of the results they achieved in the Moray House Group tests, used for Common Entrance. This was regarded as satisfactory since the Senior Educational Psychologist of the LCC assured me that Moray House results were usually some 10 points below the results achieved in such individual psychological tests as the Stanford Binet. This in turn was confirmed by testing a sample of 17 subjects and controls. All boys with intelligence scores (as judged by Common Entrance Examination) of 130 upwards were listed in each school.

B. Length of Time Required for Investigation.

Interviewing took place over a period of three years, from 1955 to 1958. The total investigation required five years, since the Investigator was employed and could devote only a part of her time to the project.
C. The Investigator's Role.

In introducing myself to the Headmasters, teachers and pupils, I told them that while the research was connected with my training at the University of London, I also worked at a Children's Clinic attended by many bright children who were consistently failing in school. With the Headmasters and teachers, I assumed this must be a matter of concern to them as well, and with the boys I appealed for help in getting to the bottom of the situation. I assured the boys that their marks on the Common Entrance Examinations showed them to be children of superior intelligence, and that a study of their attitudes regarding school life and methods of work might help me to better understand the sick children who were incapacitated for various reasons. The boys gave a hearty response, and I had the impression they were proud to do whatever they could to help me. All but three readily agreed to the psychological test, and these boys preferred to first discuss the request with their parents. Once their parents had agreed, they showed similar eagerness to that of pupils who had been keen during the first interview at the school.

D. Schools from which boys were selected.

In addition to the grammar schools listed on pages 64 and 65, the following were included in the investigation:
Thus, a total of eleven grammar schools (from a total of 18 referred) were included in the investigation. Schools were visited in consecutive years. Since the 3rd, 4th and 5th forms were interviewed on the occasion of the first visit, subsequent visits dealt with pupils in the 3rd form. A total of 23 Subjects were selected in this manner. They were drawn from a total of 64 forms.
IV. MAIN INQUIRY - RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE.

A. What prevents some highly intelligent boys from succeeding in school work?

1. Theoretical views.

Every boy with a good intelligence should succeed in his school work. Do you agree or disagree?

By establishing that the majority of boys interviewed believed there to be positive correlation between high intelligence and scholastic achievement, we are thus put in a position of being confronted with a genuine rather than an artificial problem, i.e., what prevents some highly intelligent boys from succeeding in school?

It was with the idea of dismissing the negative of this that the first question was asked, and it led to a validation of the reality of the problem, though just what boys meant by intelligence remained in doubt, since many of them are found to rely on some private estimate of their own. The difficulties in this assessment are increased rather than diminished by the expansive answers which many boys gave to the first question. Thus, for example, some spoke of the need of will power, others the need for industry, still others the ability to overcome blocking factors. Whether they would have included these specific factors in their estimate of
intelligence or not remains doubtful. Thus, the answers to the first question indicated that the majority of Subjects and Controls agreed that every boy with a good intelligence should succeed in his school work. (See Table I)

Table I.

Every boy with a good intelligence should succeed in his school work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGREE

Subjects

To some of the Subjects who agreed, the formula was simple:

"If he's got a good intelligence, no matter what he's taught, he should be able to get along."

Or:

"If he has intelligence, he would be bound to expand his intelligence and succeed in school."

Or:

"He should be able to reason."
To others, it was a matter of good intelligence plus industry:

"If he's got intelligence, he should succeed. If he doesn't, then he just hasn't tried."

"If they've got intelligence and use it, then I don't see any reason why they shouldn't succeed."

Or:

"I agree, theoretically, but some of them are lazy."

One of the subjects, though agreeing that "if he's got the intelligence, he's got the capacity to do well", broadened the scope of interfering factors:

"...there must be something blocking it if he doesn't."

Controls

Among the Controls who agreed, some of the boys brought new factors, ambition:

"...if he is intelligent, you usually find he is keen to get on. The Master will notice he is intelligent and will do all he can to help."

Will power is mentioned:

"If he has got intelligence, all he needs after that is the will to do it. If he doesn't do it, he's just mentally lazy."

A more sophisticated Control, though agreeing that the pupil should succeed, added:

"...it depends on his personality and what the Masters think of him themselves. He should do, if he is intelligent."
Obviously, this Control is not in agreement, since he is careful to point out that factors outside the pupil's personality as well as internal ones might influence performance. Another Control distinguished between normal and abnormal use of intelligence:

"I think he would, normally, because he learns faster than the rest."

To this question, we observe that the most comprehensive and enlightened answer was given by the Subject who mentioned 'things that might block the use of intelligence', presumably personality and environmental factors beyond 'what the Masters think' would influence the use of abilities. Yet, on the whole, Controls show a broader degree of awareness in their replies than the Subjects.

**DISAGREE**

**Subjects**

Subjects who disagree show greater insight than the Subjects who agree. One of the former distinguishes between alertness and intelligence:

"Boys with good intelligence are not always able to pick up things as quickly as the others."

Another Subject mentions special abilities:

"...a boy can be intelligent, but be bad at Maths and Physics."
Still another calls attention to the limitation of carrying-over abilities:

"He might be intelligent, but not particularly good at school subjects."

Controls

Again, the Controls broaden the scope of factors which influence the use of intelligence. One mentions interest:

"Sometimes the most intelligent boys fail in subjects that do not interest them."

Another distinguishes between having intelligence and imparting knowledge:

"Lots of boys with intelligence are not good at written work. If they fail, it is quite unfair."

Here, again, an external limiting factor is implied: method of judging ability.

One of the Controls stated more directly:

"It isn't necessarily so. It depends a lot on the Masters and the method of teaching."

Specific personality factors are mentioned by several of the Controls:

"I know two or three boys who are nervous in exams, nervous in answering questions."

Another states:

"If he's clever, he thinks too much of himself, thinks he's learned everything, and gets nothing right."
Still another Control shows a connection between a limiting personality factor and home environment:

"We had a boy with an I.Q. of 150. He came from a bad home - terrible inferiority complex - didn't get on well, and antagonized people. He left."

2. Actual Observations.

Whereas in Section I only two choices had been given and the elaboration came voluntarily, a variety of choices was given for answering the following question:

Why do boys fail in your school?

(a) home conditions
(b) unsympathetic parents
(c) bad teaching
(d) something in themselves:
   1. laziness
   2. slowness
   3. day dreaming
   4. lack of ambition
   5. stubborness
(e) because exams are not fair
(f) too many hobbies
(g) girl friends

Yet the responses to this question were surprisingly concentrated.
## Table II.

### Why do Boys fail?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) Home Conditions</th>
<th>(b) Unsympathetic parents</th>
<th>(c) Bad teaching</th>
<th>(d) Something in themselves (including (f) too many hobbies (g) girl friends)</th>
<th>(e) Exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table II, the majority of the answers given by the Subjects and Controls fell into the category of personal responsibility. Boys in their school failed primarily because of laziness, slowness, day dreaming, lack of ambition, stubbornness, too many hobbies, girls. A detailed analysis of these answers will be made in another section of this discussion. At this time, attention will be focused on the reasons, other than personal ones, for failure:

**Exams are not fair:** Only two Subjects and one Control gave this, among other reasons, for school failure. None of the boys stated that exams were the only reason.

**Unsympathetic parents:** Three in each group included this factor among others.

**Bad teaching:** Two in each group.

**Home conditions:** 2 Subjects, 6 Controls.
Contradictory Responses.

In view of inconsistencies noted in the answers to questions in Section II and the unexpectedly small number of boys who blamed conditions outside themselves for failure in school subjects, a comparison was made between answers in Section I and Section II. The following contradictions are typical:

Subjects

4S: To Section I, he stated: 'every boy with a good intelligence should succeed in his school work.' "If they've got the intelligence and use it, then I don't see any reason why they shouldn't succeed."

To Section II, he stated: 'bad teaching' as well as personality factors was responsible for school failure.

12S: agreed to Section III and added: "not really, because most masters grade you on things like neatness and things like that".

In Section II, he placed all the blame for failure within the individual boy: lack of ambition.

14S: To Section I, he declared: "If he's got the intelligence he should succeed. If he doesn't, then he just hasn't tried."

To Section II, he blamed home conditions and unsympathetic parents entirely.

2S: whose answer to Section III was "agreed, theoretically, but some of them are lazy",

in Section II, includes unsympathetic parents and because exams are not fair.
We would not say this is a contradiction. What is important here is that spontaneously he had mentioned only laziness, which, as we have seen in his second answer, was only one of the factors involved. Whether this was due to the fact that he gave more weighting to the personal factor, laziness, or whether the choices offered to him in Section III permitted him to include all the factors he had in mind, we do not know at this time. His answers to other questions may throw light on this omission.

Controls

16C Section I "...depends on his personality and what the Masters think of him themselves. He should do, if he is intelligent."

Section II finds the reason for failure entirely in lack of ambition.

14C Section I "It's not necessarily so. It depends a lot upon the masters and the methods of teaching."

Section II he blames lack of ambition, laziness, slowness, daydreaming, stubbornness. References to masters and methods of teaching were omitted.

8C Section I makes a definite stand: "lots of boys with intelligence are not good at written work. If they fail, it is quite unfair."

Section II "boys fail only because lack of ambition."
Section I failure due to **lack of interest.** Section II adds **home conditions**, unsympathetic parents, as well as personal factors.

**Factors Concealed**

What, then, are the factors contributing to failure which are concealed by these contradictory statements and omissions?

In the case of Subjects, the following factors emerge from these comparisons:

- masters' pettiness, unfairness, bad teaching,
- home conditions, unsympathetic parents, unfair examinations, lack of ambition.

In the case of Controls: lack of ambition, laziness, slowness, day dreaming, stubbornness. While one of them mentions home conditions and unsympathetic parents, he makes it clear that these are secondary to personality factors.

Thus, in the case of Subjects, we observe a wider range of environmental factors concealed or omitted and few personal inadequacies; with the Controls, the tendency is to take the blame upon themselves upon second thought. That is, when faced with a number of choices, they accepted responsibility, whereas the opposite was the tendency with the Subjects.
In the foregoing questions, differences between the responses of the two groups are slight. When one compares the answers to related questions, one observes that the number of contradictions are similar. It is only when one examines the nature of these contradictions that one can separate the trends in the two groups. The Subjects tended to focus their difficulties on circumstances outwith their own control, whereas the Controls tended to blame themselves for their difficulties.

In their responses to this group of questions, the boys are in agreement with many of the experts: e.g. Burt presented evidence of numerical, verbal and practical group factors in school subjects in addition to Spearman's general factor: 'for the average school subject the variance attributable to the general factor was 27.9 per cent, and the general factor correlated highly with an intelligence test. This suggested that general scholastic ability is largely made up of G, but involves in addition such qualities as interest and industry.' (53)

Alexander's extensive investigations of school children in Scotland and America (in which he applied Thurstone's methods) confirmed Burt's observations that the measurement of school attainment showed a separate group factor. This he called the X factor, and identified it with the influence of personality, interests, industry. (54)

Vernon calls attention to some of the complex problems in assessing educational attainments, especially when measured by
school or other examinations. He points to the 'somewhat ill-defined factor of industriousness plus interest, which plays a prominent part.' Regarding success in school work, he states:

"At one time some psychologists did propose that children most likely to benefit from advanced schooling would be those with the highest innate intelligence, rather than with the best attainments, but we realize now that this was shortsighted." (55)

He stressed the importance of 'home background', 'the tone of the pupil's school, stimulatingness, or good teaching by his teacher; the pupil's interest, his temperamental characteristics' and the need for researches into these factors.

3. Personal Experiences.

In order to find out what they thought of their own performance, the boys were asked: Are You Good At School Work? Most of the Subjects replies fell into the category of average and no, while the majority of the Controls said they were good. (Table III).

Table III.
Are you good at school work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECTS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 12.7 \]
An apparent contradiction was observed in the answers of approximately one-third of the Subjects who stated they were good at school work (in spite of the fact that they were failing). When asked, why they were not at the top (Table IV), more than half of them mentioned competition with other classmates: "others better than me, better abilities", "the other boys are more clever", "not as clever as other boys, they are better than I am at school work", "other boys cleverer than me". The remainder stated they did not work hard enough: "lack of revision", "lack of work, I don't concentrate enough", "don't work hard enough". When compared with the Subjects who considered themselves average, it was observed that the latter group focused more largely on hard work. Nine of them gave this reason, while two of them mentioned competition. This was less surprising than the answers given by the Subjects who said they were good. From this group, one would expect a variety of reasons outside their own control - methods of assessing ability, day to day procedure, limiting factors in the home, etc. To some extent, this might apply to Subjects who stated they were average, but there were no references to such factors in either group. This point will be kept in mind in the discussion of answers to other questions.
**Table IV.**

Why do you think you are not at the top?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At top or near</th>
<th>Not clever enough</th>
<th>Do not work - too many distractions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 11.3 \]
B. The assessment of Ability.

1. Theoretical Views.

As we have seen, the majority of both subjects and controls put the blame squarely on themselves for whatever failures they suffered at school. This would lead us to imagine that broadly they accept the values and conclusions of their teachers and the other authorities with which they are surrounded. In order to confirm or deny this thesis, it was considered necessary to make a number of detailed inquiries into their attitudes towards various aspects of school life. The first of these chosen was the system by which their abilities were judged and, as in the other parts of this questionnaire, the questions fall into three groups: their Theoretical Views, Actual Observations and Personal Judgment. Thus, they were first asked:

How should the ability of pupils be judged? The answers to this (Table V a) showed both Subjects and Controls to be united in the agreement that written examinations were essential to the judging of ability. On the other hand, to the second question in this list: Do examination results adequately show up the differences in boys? the majority of both Subjects and Controls answered "No", (Table V f). Thus while they had no doubt about the deficiencies of written examinations, some were
### Table V

**Assessment of Ability. Comparison of Theoretical Views with Actual Experience and Personal Judgment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>(a) How should ability be judged?</th>
<th>(b) How is ability judged by teachers in your school?</th>
<th>(c) How do you judge your own ability?</th>
<th>(d) Is it fair?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. term's work</td>
<td>Homework, class work</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. class work (oral)</td>
<td>exams.</td>
<td>private est.</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. tested on homework</td>
<td>exams &amp; home</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. test every month or no exams &amp; questions</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>private est.</td>
<td>sat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. exams &amp; questions on schoolwork</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>private est.</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. small, oral tests</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>private est.</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. homework &amp; exams</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>exam results</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. performance</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>sat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. all round (exams, daily work)</td>
<td>all round work</td>
<td>private est.</td>
<td>sat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. term's work end of term exams.</td>
<td>exam</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. homework</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>ideal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. yearly work</td>
<td>daily performance</td>
<td>exam.</td>
<td>sat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. exams</td>
<td>exam</td>
<td>exam and term's work</td>
<td>sat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. exams</td>
<td>homework, guest. on form work</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. teacher's knowledge, exams, char.</td>
<td>teacher's opinions</td>
<td>exam &amp; priv.</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. class work</td>
<td>degree of interest, how work</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>ideal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. exams</td>
<td>ind. basis &amp; exams</td>
<td>comp. and priv.</td>
<td>sat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. pupil's interests</td>
<td>exam</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>sat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. exams &amp; teacher's judgment</td>
<td>homework and tests</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>sat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. other methods</td>
<td>Exams only</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ideal, Fair</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Methods other than exams</td>
<td>Exams plus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. other methods</td>
<td>other methods</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. other than exams</td>
<td>other than exams</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE V.
**ASSESSMENT OF ABILITY.** Comparison of Theoretical Views with Actual Experiences and Personal Judgments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>How should ability be judged?</th>
<th>How is ability judged by teachers in your School?</th>
<th>How do you judge your own ability?</th>
<th>Is it fair?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>homework</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>exams and priv.</td>
<td>unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>standard of work</td>
<td>ac. and nat. aptitude</td>
<td>all 3</td>
<td>unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>exams, day-to-day work</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>exams and term's work</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>personal interview</td>
<td>long-term policy</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 exam a year</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>exam and homework</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>comp. and priv.</td>
<td>sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>exam and term marks</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>the way he uses help and yrl exam.</td>
<td>way of work and exams</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>class and home work</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>comp. and priv.</td>
<td>unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>long-termed exams</td>
<td>marks, exams, gen. appearance</td>
<td>comp. and priv.</td>
<td>sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>exams &amp; master's opinion</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>term's work</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>homework</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>daily work</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>exams &amp; priv.</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>exams &amp; interview</td>
<td>gen. work and behaviour</td>
<td>exams &amp; priv.</td>
<td>unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>daily work</td>
<td>exams &amp; homework</td>
<td>exam. &amp; priv.</td>
<td>unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>exam and daily work</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ind. oral tests</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>year's work and exams</td>
<td>questions, homework &amp; exams.</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>form and home work</td>
<td>homework &amp; ability to express</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>sat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exams only 5                      13 Exams only 10  Fair 3  
Exams + other methods 9  Exams plus other methods 4  
Methods other than exam 9  Methods plus 10  Sat. 10  
Total 23  Total 23  

Fair 3  
Sat. 10  
Unfair 7  
Other 3  
Exams 16  Other 3  
Exams 23  Other 3.
## ASSESSMENT OF ABILITY

### Comparison of Theoretical Views with actual experiences.

#### (e)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>How should the ability of pupils be judged?</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>Do exam results adequately show the differences in boys?</th>
<th>(g)</th>
<th>How do teachers judge?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>term's work, not from exams</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>def. not</td>
<td></td>
<td>Homework exams. Some shd. do better in oral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>class work, speaking not writing</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tested on homework</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>test every month or so</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>exams and questions on school work.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>small oral tests. No written tests.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>homework and exams</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>performance</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>all round (exams, daily work)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>on term's work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>end of term tests</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>not by exam. Homework</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yearly work. No exams.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Exams at end of each term</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher's knowledge, exam, character.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>class work</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pupil's interests. More practical</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Exams at term end. Partly on h. work</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams and teacher's judgment all round work</td>
<td></td>
<td>exams exams and teacher's judgment term marks, home and exams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yes....10**

**No ....13**

**Total: 23**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>(g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How should the ability of pupils be judged</td>
<td>Do exam results adequately show the differences in boys?</td>
<td>How do teachers judge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Homework. No exams.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On standard of work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>academic and exams daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exams. Nobody's thought of a better system.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>exams and term's work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>personal interview</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 exam a year</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>long-term policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>exam and home work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>exam and term work, way of work &amp; exams, yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>should be judged on way he uses help.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams once a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>class work mainly, and home work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>long-termed exams</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>marks, exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>exams and master's opinion</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>term's work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>day-to-day work</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>exams</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>exams and interview</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>general work &amp; behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>everyday work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams and home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>exams and everyday work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>individual oral tests</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>year's work and exams</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>form and home work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>questions, homework &amp; exams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes : 7
No : 16
Total: 23
**TABLE VI.**

**DO EXAMS. MAKE BOYS WORK HARDER?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>It makes them do Special Swotting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VII.

ARE THERE TOO MANY EXAMINATIONS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VIII.
HOW MANY EXAMS DO YOU THINK THERE SHOULD BE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NONE</th>
<th>AS NOW</th>
<th>ONE OR TWO YEARLY</th>
<th>THREE YEARLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
inconsistent even to the extent of holding that ability should be judged exclusively by exams. Therefore, we can hardly be surprised when we find that to the question — Do you think that the examination system is fair? — approximately one-third of each group stated that it was definitely unfair, while the majority were fairly equally distributed between satisfactory, ideal and fair. (Table V d)

In spite of some omissions and plain contradictions that have been noted, a significant majority of both Subjects and Controls were able to say that exams make boys work harder (Table VI), though a few boys in each group limited this hard work to special swotting immediately before exams.

Yet, the majority of Subjects stated that there were too many exams, and the majority of the Controls that there were not too many exams (Table VII). Of those who objected to the current practice of end-of-term exams, the largest number in each group said they would prefer one or two yearly (Table VIII).

2. Actual Observations.

In order to appreciate the importance of the conclusions over the efficacy of examinations, it is only necessary to note the response to the first question in the second section: How is the Ability of Pupils Judged by Teachers in your School? The majority of both Subjects and
Controls agreed that it was solely on the results of written examinations, while a few of them coupled examinations with other types of assessment, and a small minority denied that examinations had any place whatever, (Table V b).

3. Personal Judgement.

When it came to the question: How do you judge your own ability? three alternative answers were suggested in order to lessen the effects of their tendency toward conformity:

1. by comparison with other boys;
2. by exam results;
3. some private estimate of your own.

While the majority of the boys in both groups stated they relied upon methods other than exams, twice as many Controls as Subjects (14, 7) included their own private estimates. Only one Controls and 6 Subjects stated they judged their own ability by exams only. Yet, the majority in both groups claimed that methods of assessing ability in their school (largely by exams only - Table V (b)) were either ideal, fair or satisfactory (Table V (d). To find out how far these inconsistencies were reflected in other answers, comparisons were made of both group and individual replies.
4. Apparent Inconsistencies.

Group Responses.

(a) Comparison of Theoretical Views with Actual Experiences.

As shown in Table Va, six Subjects and five Controls stated that pupils' abilities should be judged by written exams exclusively. In Table Vb, twelve Subjects and thirteen Controls stated that pupils' abilities were judged exclusively by written exams in the schools they attended. Thus it would follow that six Subjects and eight Controls disagreed with current practices of judging ability by written exams alone. When we add to these three Subjects and five Controls who disagree with teachers who include examinations in methods of assessment, the extent of disagreement becomes slightly larger: nine Subjects and twelve Controls imply that their ability is judged by methods which they think should not be used. Yet, in Table IV, only two Subjects and one Control mention examinations as one of the reasons for pupils' lack of success. How do we account for these omissions? An examination of individual responses was made in an effort to find some answers to this question.

(b) Comparison of Individual Responses in Tables IV and V.

Neither of the two Subjects who gave exams as a reason for failure (Table IV) thought that ability should be assessed by written examinations (Table Va), as they indicated was practised in their school (Table Vb). One of them said
ability should be judged by oral class work, the other by oral tests of homework. The Control who had stated that pupils failed (among other reasons) because examinations were not fair (Table IV), gave a contradictory response in Table Va - "ability should be judged by written examinations", and further stated that this was the method used in his school (Table Vb). Inconsistencies such as these come in the majority of answers to the four questions in Table V (a, b, c, d).

The comparison of answers shows marked disagreements between the pupils' expectations and the actual procedure used in their school to assess ability. There were 18 of these noted in the Subjects' replies, and 21 in the Controls' (Sections (a) and (b), Table V). Further disagreements are shown between the pupils' estimates of their own abilities and the methods used by their teachers - 15 in the case of Subjects', and 16 in the case of Controls' answers (Table Vc, f). An even wider gap is observed when theoretical expectations are compared with personal estimates of ability - an equal number of inconsistencies (22) were noted in each group (Sections (a) and (c), Table V). Yet, one might reasonably expect greater agreement in the answers to these two questions.

Table Vf reveals that approximately one-third of Subjects and Controls state that the method of examination used by their teachers to judge pupils' abilities did not
adequately show the differences in the boys. Yet the majority of Subjects and fewer of the Controls include examinations (in the case of Subjects, six of them would expect exams to be used exclusively) in their theoretical preferences (Table V a).

Although the majority in each group claimed that examination questions were hard (Table IX), more than half of the Controls stated they were as good as they should be in exams. And it was not surprising that less than a half of the Subjects gave this response (Table X).

5. Summary.

Thus the answers to questions about examinations so far give rise, in the majority of cases, to two contradictory propositions:

(i) that the system of examinations is a faulty one, and does not measure the ability of pupils;

(ii) the ability of pupils should be judged by examinations as, according to them, is the common practice.

In spite of the conviction with which these contrary propositions are held, one cannot help noticing that, to the Subjects, exams are basically more important than to the Controls, as six times as many Subjects as Controls assess their own ability by the results of examinations. Yet the question remains: Why are these complaints and dissatisfactions not reflected in reasons they give for failure in school work? Do these Subjects — boys who are failing in school work — argue that in spite of the inadequate system of assessing ability
### TABLE IX.

ARE QUESTIONS -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HARD</th>
<th>TOO HARD</th>
<th>NOT HARD ENOUGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE X.**

Are you as good at exams as you should be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I am as good</th>
<th>I am not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 5.66 \]

Sig. p.c. 0.05

**TABLE XI.**

Homework.

Should homework be given?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes.</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE XII(a)**

Homework.

How much daily homework should be given?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30 min. to 1 hr.45</th>
<th>2-3 hrs.</th>
<th>others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 6.15 \]

Sig. p.c. 0.05
they should still succeed in school work? Is this the reason they blame themselves? With a small number of Subjects (6) no room has been left for conjecture. These boys state they are as good as they should be. Does this imply they think they should be still better in order to overcome the faulty school system? Perhaps some answers will emerge in the discussion of their responses to other questions.

The most significant point to emerge from the answers to these questions is that while both Subjects and Controls find many shortcomings in the examination system as it stands, the Subjects do not use these shortcomings in order to account for their personal failures. Indeed, their responses are comparable to those of the Controls. This would lead us to conclude that there is a considerable degree of objectivity in their analysis of the injustices they think they suffer under the present examination system. However, any such conclusion must be balanced by a realisation of the essential inconsistency and muddleheadedness of the adolescent’s approach to any problem which arouses emotion, as all problems concerned with authority do. This inconsistency has been clearly demonstrated in the answers given by individual Subjects and Controls to this particular group of questions, and it will be further disclosed in later parts of this paper, particularly those concerned with the psychoanalytic approach to particular children.
C. Home Work.

1. Theoretical Views.

When it came to the question of home work, the first significant differences between Subjects and Controls were observed. And since in the majority of cases the Subjects were on the side of less homework, both in theory and practice, these differences lend substance to the Subjects' own theories that their failure in school is due to laziness. Already they had given evidence that homework should be taken into account in the evaluation of their performance, and it was therefore consistent that the majority in both groups agreed that some homework should be given. However, the amount of homework varied with the two groups. The Controls favoured 2–3 hours, while Subjects favoured thirty minutes to 1 hour 45 minutes maximum homework (Table XII). It was interesting to note that only the boys who stated that no homework should be given offered explanations, and all of these preferred a longer school day:

"I feel strongly that no homework should be given, but longer school hours or something kin to it."

"I would prefer them to have longer hours at school, that would assure we would do it."

"No home work, but a longer school day, about three-quarters of an hour longer. Let them do prep in that period under supervision of a master."
2. Actual Observations.

When asked: How much homework is given at your school? the majority of Subjects and Controls stated "Just enough". More than twice as many Subjects as Controls thought there was too much homework given. (Table XII)

3. Personal Experience.

Questions regarding their own homework brought out significant differences in the two groups:

Do you always do your homework? More than twice as many Controls as Subjects stated they always did their homework (Table XII). Thus the difference between Subjects and Controls, among those who answered "yes" and "no" is significant above the 5 percent level.

The majority of Controls said they did extra homework and approximately half of the Subjects made this claim (Table XII). Over twice as many Subjects as Controls stated they copied answers to homework questions from other boys. This would be consistent with the self-reliance of Controls in Table XII, who were more independent in making their own private estimates of ability than the Subjects, and the Subjects' claim that laziness, lack of interest, were responsible for their failures.

More than twice as many Subjects as Controls complained they got too much homework.
### TABLE XII.

(b) How much homework is given at your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too little or just enough</th>
<th>Too much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 5.85 \]

:: Significant \( p \leq .05 \)

(c) Do you always do your homework?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 7.26 \]

:: Significant \( p \leq .01 \)

(d) Do you ever do extra homework?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 5.84 \]

:: Significant \( p \leq .05 \)

(e) Do you ever copy answers from other children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 5.712 \]

:: Significant \( p \leq .01 \)

(f) Do you think you get too much homework?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 4.39 \]

:: Significant \( p \leq .05 \)
4. Inconsistencies.

The Subjects showed a greater number of inconsistencies in this group of questions than the Controls. A comparison of answers given to three related questions:

How much homework should be given?
How much homework is given at your school?
Do you think you get too much homework?

showed twice as many inconsistencies among the Subjects as the Controls (Table XII). The most common of these was the complaint that they got too much homework and at the same time claimed that just enough homework was given at their school. Also, in some cases, the amount they considered ideal was far less than the actual amount they stated was given. However, the answers given to questions in this group are more consistent with reasons for school failure than those previously discussed. For example, the majority of Subjects stated they did not always do their homework, and a similar number admitted to copying answers to homework questions, both of which might fall into the category of laziness, by which most of them account for school failure. Although the majority of Controls said they always did their homework, and a few of them said they copied answers to homework questions, the majority gave laziness as a reason for not doing better in their school work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>(a) How much homework should be given?</th>
<th>(b) How much homework is given at your school?</th>
<th>(c) Do you always do your homework?</th>
<th>(d) Do you ever do extra homework?</th>
<th>(e) Do you ever copy answers to homework questions from other children?</th>
<th>(f) Do you think you get too much homework?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30 mins.</td>
<td>too little</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 mins.</td>
<td>too little</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>too much</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>too much</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>indiv.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1/3 hrs.</td>
<td>too much</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 1/2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>too much</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 1/2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1/2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 1/2 hrs.</td>
<td>too much</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>too much</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30 mins.</td>
<td>too much</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 1/2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 1/2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 1/2 hrs.</td>
<td>too much</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 1/2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XII.

HOMEWORK: Comparison of Theoretical Views with Actual Observations and Personal Experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>How much homework should be given?</th>
<th>How much homework is given at your school?</th>
<th>Do you always do your homework?</th>
<th>Do you ever do extra homework?</th>
<th>Do you ever copy answers to homework questions from other children?</th>
<th>Do you think you get too much homework?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/3 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1/3 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1/2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>too little</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 hr, 40 min.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1/1 1/2 hrs.</td>
<td>too much</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 1/2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 1/2/2 1/2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>too little</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>too much</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>just enough</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This question of laziness in connection with homework and other aspects of performance at school, will be discussed in a later section of this report. At this time, we will confine our discussion to comments made by the boys who stated they did not work hard enough:

"I don't study", I don't have will power to just sit down, use all my time learning facts." "Lack of revision, lack of work." "Some boys work harder than I do." "The boys who did a lot more are there" (at the top). There are three boys above me, they seem to prefer working, I don't make the effort." "If I pushed myself, I could get my homework." "I sit and think about it (homework), plan how to do it, but never get started."

Such answers were typical of both groups. It appeared that most of them thought that harder work at home as well as at school, would bring them to the top position in the form. Conspicuously lacking were references to cultural influences, such as ambition, lack of interest on the part of their parents, inadequate teaching, etc. Do these attitudes indicate awareness of superior ability and the conviction that whatever the obstacles, they should be overcome by such ability? To a large extent, this is indicated in the answers given in Section G - The Boys' Attitudes to Themselves, where there are also suggestions that they are repeating cover-terms, labels used by their parents and teachers, especially comments made by teachers in end of term reports.
5. **Summary.**

In their answers to questions regarding homework, we find a consistent difference between Subjects and Controls. The Subjects favoured less homework, twice as many of them complained that too much was given in their school, fewer of them did extra homework, and more than twice as many copied answers to homework questions. Three times as many admitted they did not work hard enough. How do we account for these responses? Do the comparisons of answers to related questions give us any clues? How can it be that almost half of the Subjects say that they get too much homework, that they get just enough homework at school, while their theoretical preference is for far less than the actual amount given? Again, we approached the question obliquely, by examining the answers they gave to questions regarding punishment. The idea here was to determine to what extent the acceptance of blame was reflected in attitudes regarding punishment — punishment, that is, not for poor discipline but for failure to learn.
D. Punishment.

1. Theoretical Views.

Earlier questions on school organisation, judgement of ability and assignment of homework have evoked a wide range of indirect attitudes regarding authority, and this is to be expected, since all school children are subjected, to a greater or lesser extent, to the control of teachers, administrative heads, Local Education Authorities, and others in authority. It is, therefore, not surprising that questions regarding punishment should bring forth more direct attitudes regarding authority than those we have already discussed, not only because failure to co-operate brings the pupil into direct conflict with controlling persons, but also because decisions to punish and the methods used, often appear to the pupil as arbitrary use of authority. It is the teachers who must decide that a pupil has failed to comply with the rules, or other expectations. It is he who weighs the evidence for or against the need for punishment. But such a decision involves the teacher's performance as well as that of the pupil. So that, in a sense, he metes out punishment for a misdemeanour for which he is, to some extent, responsible. In matters of school failure, this relationship is greatly intensified. The good teacher must always feel that a pupil's failure represents in some degree a lack of success on his own part. With pupils of superior intelligence, the lack of success is felt more keenly. The boys' own sense of this has been evident
in the comparison of answers to questions in the foregoing sections, e.g. while the majority of the boys blamed themselves for school failure, careful scrutiny of related responses to questions showed a high degree of conflict, with some tendency to blame school methods.

Since we have no direct evidence about the ambivalence of attitudes among teachers, we can only observe that many of the punishments they devise for the children in their care involve actions which must be unpleasant to themselves and, in fact, they may be said to share the punishment they inflict on their pupils. While, for example, it may be true that there is an active minority of sadistic teachers, who take pleasure in caning children, there can be no doubt that to the vast majority the infliction of such punishment is disagreeable. But even more obvious are those punishment which require the teacher to work overtime without receiving any extra pay, as when he detains children after hours, or asks them to report back on Saturday morning. Among these can also be included those punishment exercises which require correction by the teacher. Nor can the strain of interviews with parents of pupils be discounted. And there is always the final ignominy of having to send a child to the Headmaster in a final confession of failure of his ability to cope. Yet these methods of punishment, as well as the concommitant system of rewards, are so integrally interwoven
into all areas of school life that there would seem to be the need for them. That this is so is confirmed by the opinions of pupils, both Subjects and Controls, who agreed that discipline was an aid to learning: discipline implied punishment in the context of the question. This was shown in their answers to the theoretical question: Should school discipline assist children in learning? Eighteen Subjects and nineteen controls stated that it should (Table XVII).

About half the Subjects and Controls agreed that Children should be punished for not learning (Table XVIII).

Since half the boys subscribed to the system of punishments for not learning, and the great majority thought some form of discipline an aid to learning, it seemed important to have their views regarding specific methods of punishment. Thus, a series of questions relating to methods was asked: If you were a teacher and had a boy who would not work, what would you do?

1. See him after school?
2. talk with his parents
3. expel him?
4. send him to the Head?
5. cane him?

The majority of Controls and fewer Subjects stated they would see him after school (Table XIX). The boys understood that this method (an interview with the teacher) was not the equivalent of detention, but a private talk with the teacher to discuss difficulties in coping with school subjects. Yet, as one of the Controls explained, this
## PUNISHMENT

### TABLE XVII.

Should school discipline assist children in learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XVIII.

Should children be punished for not learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table XIX.

If you had a boy who would not work, would you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with parents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send to Head</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane him</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expel him</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
this method of discipline was sometimes felt as a punishment. He stated:

"...if you are scolded or have lines or an essay to write, or if the Master has a strong personality, it is looked upon as a punishment."

Another Control made this comment: "talks with teachers - rather interesting sometimes."

A larger number of Subjects than Controls favoured talks with parents.

2. Actual Observations.
When asked, What do most teachers do? While the majority of the Controls stated that teachers used the method of interview after school hours, twice as many Subjects as Controls (10, 5) stated that teachers either caned or sent boys to the Headmaster. (Table XX.)

3. When it came to their Personal Experiences, disagreements with teachers' methods of punishment were evident among the majority of Subjects and Controls. (Table XIX-XXV). There were numerous disagreements on relatively small issues, e.g. whether to detain the boy after school or to give him lines or an essay as well. However, some of the disagreements showed important trends and basic differences between the two groups, e.g. half
**TABLE XX.**
What do most teachers do about a boy who does not work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks with parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send to Head</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE XXI.**
What punishment do boys in your school prefer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent to Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table XXII.**
How were you punished?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention plus other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXIII.

**Do you think the punishment was fair?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not punished</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XXIV.

**How often were you punished?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not punished</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times in term</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times annually</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XXV.

**Which method seemed least fair?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane, flogging</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class detention</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent to Head</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All unfair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>(a) If you had a boy who would not work, what would you do?</td>
<td>(b) What do most teachers do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>send to Head</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>cane</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XIX-XXV.

PUNISHMENT: Comparison of Theoretical Views with Actual Observations And Personal Experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>If you had a boy who would not work, what would you do?</th>
<th>What do most teachers do</th>
<th>What do boys prefer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>cane</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>expel</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>How were you punished?</td>
<td>Did you think it fair?</td>
<td>How often punished?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>fortnightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>fortnightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>cane</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>twice weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>detention, Head</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>fortnightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>not punished</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>twice yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>detention, lines</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>once yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>detention, lines</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>detention, lines</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>cane</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>once yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>twice in term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>fortnightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>cane, det., essays</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>detention, lines</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>once in 2 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>lines, detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>fortnightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>detention, lines</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>twice in term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>detention, cane</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>once in term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>detention, essays</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XIX - XXV (Continued)

**PUNISHMENT:** Comparison of Theoretical Views with Actual Observations And Personal Experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>(d) How were you punished?</th>
<th>(e) Did you think it fair?</th>
<th>(f) How often punished?</th>
<th>(g) Which method least fair?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>seldom</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>once in term</td>
<td>all a waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>once in term</td>
<td>det.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>not often</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>detention, conduct class</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>not often</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>annually</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>lines</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>detention, extra work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>once in term</td>
<td>expel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>lines, detention</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>twice in term</td>
<td>extra wk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>cane, detention, work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>twice in term</td>
<td>extra wk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>detention, lines</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>once term</td>
<td>all fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>lines</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>3 in term</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>once term</td>
<td>form det.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>line, detention</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>once term</td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>not often</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>twice yr.</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>form detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>twice yr.</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>lines, detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 in yr.</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>annually</td>
<td>cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>detention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>detention, lines</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>don't remember</td>
<td>form det.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the subjects preferred talks with parents instead of teachers' methods of talks after school with the boy, the cane, or sending him to the Head; while the Controls showed a leaning toward talks with the teacher after school, instead of the teachers' methods of talks with parents, sending to the Headmaster, or caning (Table XXV). Does this indicate that the Controls were more willing to accept responsibility for school failure than the Subjects, who might be shifting blame for failure on to their parents? Or is it that the Subjects are suggesting that their parents simply may know more about them than their teachers? In our discussion of the relationship between child and parent, it is possible that some light may be thrown on the subject.

Which method of punishment do boys in your school prefer?

As shown in Table XXI, there was agreement between Subjects and Controls on this question. The majority of the boys preferred talks with the teacher, yet when asked How were you punished? the majority in both groups stated that the method of detention, which was less favoured by them, had been used. Several of the Subjects and one of the Controls stated they had been caned. Only one Subject and none of the controls stated they had been sent to the Head.

Thus the majority in both groups were in disagreement with the teachers' methods of punishment in the schools
they attended; only a few boys, whether Subjects or Controls, preferred detention, while the majority of them said they were punished by this method (Table XXIII). On the other hand, when asked whether they thought the punishment they received was fair, the majority of Subjects and Controls said 'Yes' (Table XXIII).

What was the reaction of those who thought some methods of punishment were unfair? The majority of Subjects and fewer Controls who gave this answer were angry (Table XXIV). Several Subjects tried to get their own back, one of them mentioned by not doing homework, another by arguing, answering back, cheeking; still another by just hating my teacher for a time. Among the Controls, only one stated he tried to retaliate, and he did not describe the method used.

Among the majority of Subjects who did not attempt retaliation, one of them gave his reason:

"...if I had tried to disrupt the class, no one would like you. If I didn't do good work, he'd punish you some more. Not worth it."

How prevalent were these various methods of punishment? Here there was considerable difference between Subjects and Controls (Table XXIV).

Subjects:

5 of them were punished once or twice weekly;
5 fortnightly;
4 monthly.

Thus a total of 14 Subjects' punishments ranged from once weekly to once monthly. Only one Control came into any of
these categories. The majority of the Controls stated they had seldom been punished. From these responses, one gets the impression that the Controls are less often punished, and this is reflected in the slightly smaller number who complained that punishment was not fair.

When asked Which method seemed least fair (Table XXV b), 14 Subjects, as compared with 2 Controls, named detention. Five of the Subjects and 10 Controls named caning. A comparison of individual answers in this category with responses to the question How were you punished? (Table XXV d) revealed that 14 of the Subjects and 6 of the Controls thought they were punished by methods which seemed to them least fair (Table XXV e). The majority of the boys in each group named detention. Several of the Subjects included Saturday morning detention, and 2 Controls stated — all unfair, all a waste of time, but none of the Subjects came to these conclusions.

Why did the boys complain so generally about detention? Some of the Subjects offered explanations:

"It interferes with outside things." "keeps you after school, worries your parents. I don't mind the cane, that's over and done with." "Some boys might have a job and lose money." "Keeps you in late, then you can't do your homework (which is why you are detained.""

About caning, Subjects made the following comments:

"When you are caned, it is for something bad. It is the thought of the thing rather than the deed. It scares them."

One of the Subjects illustrated the unfairness of this method
by a personal experience:

"I was caned for holding a cardboard horse, which they took from the class next door."

A Control expresses a popular view about caning:

"Caning should not be allowed, but I know with some children only one kind of punishment works. Most mothers should keep their control better than they do."

We will observe this boy's responses to questions relating to parents.

Another Subject made the comment:

"I have never been caned myself, but don't think it should be allowed. Boys don't like it, but expelling people from school should definitely not be allowed. It is hard for him to find a job after that. You could give him the cane but not expel him."

Perhaps the notion of expelling is theoretical. None of the boys was able to give an instance of boys expelled from their school for failure to learn.

Some of the boys made general remarks about punishment. A Control:

"In the abstract, except for talks with teachers, they are all considered good. They are naturally not liked so much, when one is a victim of them, but immediate resentment is almost inevitable."

Another Control:

"Discipline is regarded as necessary to the successful running of the school, not as tyranny on the part of the authorities."
From a Subject, we have the following evaluation of punishment:

"If they do something wrong, they expect detention. Prefects do a good job on the whole. Most of the boys expect caning or detention if they do something wrong. They resent it when the punishment interferes with something they want to do, but on the whole, they expect what they are given."

One of the Controls had this to say about authority:

"Those persons who have to teach people at some kind of school should have some kind of authority over those who are being taught. This should be – that people who are being taught are under the authority of the teacher, and should not try to contradict or bully that person, because he or she is not much older than yourself. Any person who seems to be worthy of a higher position than others concerned should be able to have authority over them."

Although this Subject disapproved of 'contradiction' with persons of authority, we noted several instances of contradiction in the answers he gave to questions regarding punishment. He had been punished on the average once fortnightly, usually by detention, which he considered the least fair method. If he were in the teacher's place he would send a boy who would not learn to the Head, instead of seeing him after school, as most teachers did. Similarly, the Subject and Control who declared that all methods of punishment were fair, had in their responses shown disagreement with the practices in the school which they attended.
4. Summary.

Explicitly, the majority of the boys in both groups appear to be on the side of school administrators: discipline should be given; it should assist children in learning; children should be punished for not learning - failing pupils should be dealt with in highly conventional ways: little talks with the teachers, conferences with parents, caning, etc. Subjects and Controls alike stuck to the formation of questions presented to them. There is no suggestion here that school teaching should be more closely adapted to the needs of individual pupils, nor that familiar methods of coping with failures, such as detention, caning, lines, etc., might contribute to repetition of failures which they seek to correct. None of the boys hinted at the teachers' part in circumstances leading to punishment for school failure, when they might have suggested that if the work had been more interesting, e.g., the difficulties which led to punishment might have been avoided. Nor did they raise here the complaints made earlier regarding methods of judging ability (e.g., written examinations) or defects in school organisation,
such as the size of classes, or the small amount of
time the teachers had for them. It would seem that
these past grievances were forgotten, and that they
approached the problem of punishment as if it were
isolated from other aspects of their school experience.

In their answers, the boys seemed
willing to be led by the investigator and the
established practices in their schools. The issues
presented by both were considered, discussed and
sometimes enlarged, but few fresh views were presented.
Only two Controls and no Subjects ventured opinions
of their own choice: one of them stated: "all a waste
of time", the other: "all unfair", but neither gave us
the thinking behind these conclusions. Few of them
stated that their school performance had been affected
unfavourably by punishment.

While some contradictions in answers
to related questions and disagreements with teachers' specific methods were observed in individual answers,
one gains the general impression of good rapport
between teachers and pupils, a rapport which enabled
the boys to take punishment more or less in their
stride, to accept it as a constructive measure, an aid to learning. Whether the minor disagreements with teachers' methods of punishment hint at more basic ones cannot be determined from the responses to these questions. All we can observe here is a general tendency to conformity, a reticence to present views widely different from those prevalent in the schools they attend.
E. TEACHERS.

1. Introduction.

Until we reach the state of schoolroom teaching by mechanical devices, which is expected by theorists such as Skinner, to "prove far superior to the usual teachers," we must still rely largely upon the face to face relationship between pupil and teacher. And this implies "schoolroom learning is a social experience as well as an opportunity to learn multiplication tables." There are those psychologists such as Hilgard, who believe that "no new machine will make the teacher superfluous." In this context he implies that the social experience cannot be divorced from formal learning in the classroom. And this is true, not only because both teacher and pupil react to one another in the present learning situation, but each brings to the new experience attitudes which have developed in earlier ones. For example, by the time the child reaches the classroom, he has already had considerable experience in learning from a variety of teachers: parents, sisters, brothers, relatives and friends. In the nursery school, it is expected that he will draw lavishly upon these past learning experiences. The alert nursery school teacher is apt to look to the home for the source of attitudes which may handicap the child in the new learning situation.
By the time the child reaches Grammar School, connections are still to be sought, and therefore interviews with parents are often illuminating to the teacher. These and other sources are available to him when he seeks to understand some of the complexities in the personality of his pupils. It has been said that "...every teacher has to diagnose causes of personality difficulty in his dealings with children and every teacher is, to some extent, a therapist." Other psychologists point out:

"The teacher is not expected to be a psychiatrist or a psychotherapist who is responsible for diagnosing and treating every problem which appears in her classroom. She can, however, recognize the child as a growing dynamic organism and adopt the clinical point of view in the study of his problems. By doing this, she sees his problems as symptomatic of some unfavourable condition in his past or present environment. His behaviour is quite often his negative way of asking for help. In the expression of this negativism may be found the child's strength which a teacher may use in guiding him into possible and acceptable forms of behaviour."  

These authorities imply that the teacher is qualified to make such assessments, and this brings us to the subject of the teacher's personality and training. Hollingworth has called attention to some of the 'necessary personal traits of the teacher: a sense of humour, patience and love of truth for its own sake.' Regarding teachers of gifted children, who she states should be selected with 'special reference to certain qualifications', she writes:
"One of the most important of these is a qualification of attitude. The teacher must be free from unconscious jealousy and from unconfessed bias against gifted children. At first thought this might seem an unnecessary stipulation, as it might appear absurd that an adult would be likely to entertain such an attitude toward a child. Nevertheless, emotional bias against the bright, identified as such by tests, does appear among teachers."

Hollingworth refers to Coy's experiences with high school teachers in special classes for gifted pupils. She quotes from Coy (of Teachers' College, Columbia University):

"...the mother of one child had visited a class in which the teacher had said to the children, 'Especially bright are you? I should say that you were especially stupid.' When the mother of No. 1 told him that he must look interested in Miss X's class he replied, 'Yes I try to. But when we raise our hands she says, 'Put your hands down. I'll call on you if I want you to talk.' But when we keep our hands down, she says, 'What, don't any of you know anything! Why aren't your hands up?'

Hollingworth comments:

"In view of these underlying attitudes, it is cruel to identify a child as gifted, and then place him or her in charge of a jealous teacher. The teacher should be chosen for impersonal interest in educational problems and for ability to maintain an unbiased attitude even toward pupils whose grasp may in some cases exceed her own. The teacher must, in short, be one who can tolerate being beaten occasionally by a child in intellectual performances...The teacher should be a person of very superior intelligence in order to gain and hold the respect of gifted pupils...Aside from the endowments of original nature, the teacher must be thoroughly well educated. An unusually wide range of information must be at command, if resources in this respect are not to be under a constant strain."

While it is doubtful that any teacher is able to maintain "impersonal interest in educational problems" and "unbiased attitudes towards pupils", there would seem to be no doubt that he should be aware of these involvements and
should aim to cope with them in ways that do not basically affect the learning situation. Professor D.W. Harding goes a step further when he calls attention to the inevitability of such differences in intellectual ability:

"It is quite evident on general grounds that most teachers will be dealing with an appreciable percentage of children who are potentially abler than themselves."63

And he refers to evidence on this point in the studies of Knight and Tozer. While he is fully aware of difficulties and dangers inherent in the situation, he focuses on the positive aspects:

"...the teacher's advantages of special training, acquired information, practised habits of work and general experience can enable him to be of the utmost service to minds better endowed than his own....I want to emphasise that I see no reason why a teacher should not win the respect of pupils far abler than himself and help them to realise their potentialities, but it may be a part of the art of teaching that involves more special difficulties than are always grasped. It seems to me an important mark of successful teaching that a pupil can look back gratefully and with appreciation to teachers whom he has far out-distanced."64

We have said that the classroom situation involves the personality of both teacher and pupil, and that the teacher's function enables him to assess personal difficulties of his pupils when a need arises, such as failure to learn at school. But this is not a mutual privilege. The pupil cannot suggest to this or that teacher that a personal interview might help him to understand unfathomable depths in his personality; and it would be unthinkable to suggest that a parent or spouse of the teacher might be inspected.
Yet, as we have suggested, the pupil is no less affected by
the complexities in the teacher's personality than the
teacher is by his own. During breaks and at the close of
the school day, the teacher's personality is widely explored
among his pupils. Seldom are these evaluations known to
the administration or explicitly to the teacher, yet they
enter into the learning process and influence it in both
positive and negative ways.

In Parkyn's New Zealand investigation of Children of
High Intelligence, he records an adolescent pupil's evaluation
of teachers and the teaching profession:

"Teachers! I used to like them, but didn't want
them to know it. And when, in primary days, one said:
'Just because you're an only child at home you're not an
only child here', how I loathed her....They treat you like
babies at primary, and at high you're expected to be grown-
up at once when really you're still just a happy lot of
kids...High School teachers are either too old to be
interested in you or too young to teach. If they are too
old, all they are interested in is subjects. They don't
know children, and don't want to. They teach abruptly – show
you one example and then say 'Do page so and so'. No explana-
tions, tell you nothing. If they are too young, they are
frightened of you, and that provokes you to play with them."65

Parkyn stated that this pupil's attitude was not
characteristic of his subjects, who numbered several thousand.
"...most of the children liked their teachers. In only one
case did it appear that hostility towards teachers was having
a bad effect on a child's work."66 Yet there are those who
would argue that the relationship between teacher and pupil
is so complex it is difficult to assess the effect. Thus we
felt that exploration of the pupils' attitudes might suggest certain trends which might be helpful in understanding school failures.

In earlier sections of this report regarding methods of assessing ability, assignment of homework, punishment, we have had some oblique glances at teachers from the answers given by their pupils. And a few of the boys have presented their views in a very direct manner. For example, one of the subjects complained that he was given a "mark" (punishment) unjustly. He had only turned around, but the master said he was talking. When members of the form grumbled, the master threatened: "If you think I've been unjust, I'll show you just how unjust I can be."

Another boy said he was a second late answering a question and the teacher had given him a "mark". Another complained that his teacher, who "looked down on all the boys", called the whole form "morons and imbeciles." This teacher, said to be a young man from Cambridge, rode in a "flashy car." Another teacher talked incessantly and went over the hour. When requests were made about the work, he never followed-up.

Yet, in only a few instances, have we been able to say that the boys blamed their teachers alone for the shortcomings in various school procedures. One might say that the administration dictates that exams. should be used to assess ability, that a certain amount of homework should be
given during the term, and that certain types of punishments should be given both as corrective and deterrent measures against those who ignored certain requirements. In other words, the most generous pupil might say that: "the teacher's not at fault, he is caught up in the same system as myself... I think he would have it otherwise, but then he must have a job." Perhaps it was this attitude that accounted for the nonchalance with which they said they "accepted" punishment. We would expect that more direct questions about teachers would evoke answers that would to some extent isolate the person of the teacher from the more general "they" - the system. Thus a series of questions were asked with this purpose in mind. They relate to the teaching profession as well as to the characteristics of individual teachers and their methods of work.
2. Theoretical Views.

The first of these questions aimed to determine the degree of respect in which the teaching profession is held by pupils:

Do you think teaching a good profession for:

(a) very clever people
(b) average people
(c) very stupid people

Here it was significant that more than twice as many Subjects as Controls stated teaching was a good profession for very clever people. Three times as many Controls as Subjects thought it a good profession for average people (Table XXVI a). Does this mean that Subjects sense a wider gap between their own ability and that of their teachers? A review of the comments made to this and related questions suggests some answers to this question:

Subjects' Comments.

Among those who viewed the teaching profession to be a good one for very clever people, the following are typical qualifications:

"...fairly clever, they get to know boys and girls early. Very clever people might be better employed elsewhere."

"It is difficult to answer this because the very clever people can get better jobs than school-teaching. The average and stupid might not have enough intelligence."

"Very clever people, scientists, would get a job in a research station or something like that."
TABLE XXVI (a)

DO YOU THINK TEACHING A GOOD PROFESSION FOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Clever People</th>
<th>Average People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 > 6.62 \quad \therefore \text{Significant } p < 0.01
\]

\[
\chi^2 = 9.212
\]
"Naturally, you have to be to teach in a grammar school"

While in a few cases the teacher's intelligence appears to be evaluated on the basis of his choice of profession, to most of the boys in this category the choice of teaching as a profession led them to beg the question: "how can they be very clever if they teach in a school?"

Controls' Comments.

"If they are very clever, school teaching is a good job for them, but there are other jobs like scientists."

"You must have clever people to train clever people. While many average people are in the field, it would be better if they were not."

"Some clever people might prefer to get a better job to help the country, unless they are going to lecture in some University."

"You usually find the very clever people go to the higher jobs, yet some just haven't got the right idea about teaching - how to go about it."

Thus, the comments made by Controls tended to be more consistent with the answers they gave than those of the Subjects, whose ambivalence towards the teaching profession was more evident. This tendency was also shown in the comments made by Controls who considered teaching a good job for average people: "clever people could get better jobs" or jobs that paid more. In general, Controls' answers to this question were similar to those given by Subjects in the very clever category.
3. Actual Observations.

Do the boys at your school think teachers are clever?

The majority in both groups replied "Yes" (Table XXVI d.) Thus Subjects tend to be more in agreement with the attitudes they observe among schoolmates than Controls.

Do the boys at your school think much of teaching?

This question was aimed at separating views regarding teachers from those regarding the teaching profession; 9 Subjects and 13 Controls answered "yes" (Table XXVI b). These boys' comments suggested that further exploration was needed, thus a series of more specific questions pertaining to conditions of work and the teachers' own personal qualifications were asked.

How many hours a day do the boys think teachers work?

The vast majority in both groups saw the teacher's job in terms of long hours, 7-12 daily (Table XXVI c). Similarly they thought that teachers were poorly paid (Table XXVI g). Half as many Subjects as Controls considered them nice people (Table XXVI f): less than half as many Subjects as Controls answered "no" when asked if teachers were regarded as bossy (Table XXVI e). The vast majority in both groups agreed that their teachers liked children (Table XXVI s). But these were attitudes which they believed their fellows had. The extent to which these boys agreed with their schoolmates was estimated from the following series of questions:
### Table XXVI (b)

**Do boys at your school think much of teaching?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/Some</th>
<th>Fair/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/12 Hours</td>
<td>Less than 7 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Totals:          | 40         | 6                 | 46

TABLE XXVI (c)

HOW MANY HOURS A DAY DO THE BOYS THINK TEACHERS WORK?
TABLE XXVI (d)

DO BOYS AT YOUR SCHOOL THINK TEACHERS ARE BOSSY?
 ARE CLEVER?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/Most</th>
<th>Some/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXVI (e)

DO THE BOYS IN YOUR SCHOOL THINK TEACHERS BOSSY?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/most</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 \leq 3.8 \text{ (a)} \]

\[ x^2 = 3.577 \]
TABLE XXVI (f)

DO THE BOYS AT YOUR SCHOOL THINK TEACHERS ARE NICE PEOPLE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/Most</th>
<th></th>
<th>Some/No</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 < 3.84
\]

\[
X^2 = 3.577
\]
Table XXVI (a)

Do boys at your school think teachers are well paid?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total subjects = 46
**TABLE XXVI (h)**

DO YOUR TEACHERS LIKE THE OTHER BOYS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/most</th>
<th>Some</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>14 23 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>17 22 6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>31 45 15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXVI

DO YOU THINK TEACHERS SNOBBISH?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE XXVI (k)**

**DO YOU THINK TEACHERS SELF-IMPORTANT?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE XXVI (1)**

**DO YOU THINK TEACHERS STUCK-UP?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subjects | 19  |
| Controls | 3   |
| Totals:  | 22  |

| Totals: | 41  | 46    |

| Totals: | 5   | 46    |
TABLE XXVI (m)

DO YOU THINK TEACHERS ARE LIKE OTHER PEOPLE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXVI (a)

**DO YOU LIKE YOUR TEACHERS?**

**WOULD YOU LIKE TO BE A TEACHER?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 > 5.62, \text{ not significant for } \alpha = 0.10
\]

\[
\chi^2 = 7.56
\]
**TABLE XXVI (o)**

**DO YOU LIKE YOUR TEACHERS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/most</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>10 13 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>19 4 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29 17 46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 > 6.63 \quad : \quad \text{Significant } P < 0.101 \]

\[ x^2 = 7.56 \]
**DO YOU THINK YOUR TEACHERS HAPPY?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/most</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DO YOU THINK TEACHERS ARE WELL PAID?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:**

|        | 155     | 50      | 205     |
TABLE XXVI (r)

**DO YOU THINK TEACHERS ARE WELL PAID?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:**

|                      | 11  | 31      | 46     |
TABLE XXVI (s)

DO THE BOYS THINK TEACHERS LIKE CHILDREN?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/most</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 36, 10, 46

\[ x^2 = 4.17 \]

\[ x^2 < 3.84, \text{ Significant at } p < 0.05 \]
**TABLE XXVI (t)**

**DO YOUR TEACHERS LIKE YOU?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
x^2 > 3.84 \quad \text{Significant } p < 0.05
\]

\[
x^2 = 4.174
\]
**TABLE XXVI (u)**

DO YOU THINK TEACHERS LIKE THEIR PROFESSION?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/most</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>Totals:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**TABLE XXVI (s)**

**DO THE BOYS THINK TEACHERS LIKE CHILDREN?**

"no" (Table XXVI n)

**Subjects' Comments.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/most</th>
<th>Some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tots: 36 10 46

"Not really an interesting job to come to school every morning and teach."

"No, very hard work. I don't think I really really like this work."

"No, don't think I would manage with a certain amount of freedom. I can't manage a good teacher."

"I did have the idea once... Interesting to teach others, but if you do something wrong, you get laughed at and upset..."

"Work too hard, pay isn't that good."

...because I don't think I would be able to get by order. The Headmaster at our school got upset..."

"I wouldn't like to be a teacher. It's a hard life, if you've got some of those boys who won't work. Not a very good pay. On the other hand, it requires you to mix with children and to like them, makes you good at certain subjects."

"...not well enough paid. That's what puts a lot of people off being a school teacher."

**Controls' Comments.**

"...not lucrative enough."

"...there is more scope in scientific work."

"...They're always working at home."

"Can't see any future in it."

"Boring, telling children the same thing over again."
4. Personal Experiences.

Would you like to be a teacher?

The vast majority of Subjects and Controls replied "no" (Table XXVI n)

Subjects' Comments.

"Not really an interesting job to come to school every morning and teach."

"No, very hard work. I don't think I would really like this work."

"No, don't think I would enjoy it. I like a certain amount of freedom. I don't think I'd make a good teacher."

"I did have the idea once. Not so much now. Interesting to teach others, but if you happen to do something wrong, you get laughed and jeered at."

"Work too hard, pay isn't that good."

"...because I don't think I would be able to get order. The Headmaster at our school got grey."

"I wouldn't like to be a teacher. It's a hard life, if you've got some of these boys who won't work. Not a very good pay. On the other hand, it teaches you to mix with children and to like them, makes you good at certain subjects."

"...not well enough paid. That's what puts a lot of people off being a school teacher."

Controls' Comments.

"...not lucrative enough."

"...there is more scope in scientific work."

"...They're always working at home."

"Can't see any future in it."

"Boring, telling children the same thing over again."
"I like dealing with people, but I don't know that I'd like to be one all my life. I'd like to try it for a while. It is a rather hard job. Lots of responsibility. There is also a lot of routine, you have to do the same thing over and over again."

"...too much worry."

While both groups focus on the hard work, long hours, boredom and other limitations which they consider teachers are ill paid for, the Subjects appear to be more negative towards professional work, and some of them base this attitude on their own shortcomings. By contrast, none of the Controls indicated they did not feel equal to the requirements of the teaching profession. This is in keeping with the answers to question (XXVI a) in which the majority of Subjects stated that the teaching profession was a good one for very clever people; while three times as many Controls saw it as a profession for average people. The apparent ambivalence in the Subjects' comments to this earlier question might well be based on feelings of incompetence in themselves in some cases.

Yet, in commenting on their Personal Experiences, the boys in both groups mention factors which may be said to be outside the teacher's personal control. They would not like to be a teacher because of the hard work, boredom, lack of freedom, unpleasantness on the part of pupils, limited scope, poor pay. There is no statement among these regarding either the teacher's personal or professional shortcomings, which might account for the lack of ambition
to be a teacher. More specific questions aimed to obtain attitudes in these areas:

Do you like your teachers? One-half as many Subjects as Controls stated they liked most of them (Table XXVI, o)

Do you think they are happy? The majority in both groups said they did think their teachers were happy (Table XXVI q). Why, then, would teachers be happy in a profession which had so many unfavourable features, and to which they themselves would not aspire? Was it for money? The vast majority stated their teachers were not well paid (Table XXVI r). Yet the majority stated that their teachers liked the teaching profession (Table XXVI u); they liked the other boys (Table XXVI h), and were neither snobbish (Table XXVI j), self-important (Table XXVI k), stuck-up (Table XXVI l). One-half as many Subjects as Controls (7, 15) thought their teachers liked them personally (Table XXVI t). The majority in both groups thought they were pretty much like other people (Table XXVI m)

The most significant observations in these groups of questions were: agreement between Subjects and Controls, the majority giving responses favourable to teachers; relatively few spontaneous comments accompanied their answers and the tendency for these to be unfavourable to teachers. For example:
Do you like your teachers? "I like the young ones - athletic types. The ones I don't like are those that can't stand up for themselves - always sending you to somebody else for punishment."

"I like those who are cheerful, say what they think. I don't like those who are short. I don't respect them."

Do you think them happy? "Majority are disillusioned."

"Some of them have been at school so long, they must be."

"The old established masters seem happy, but the younger ones are not so happy."

"I don't see how they can be so happy, it's a hard job."

"...sometimes you wonder - you see the bloke struggling away at it."

Well paid: "I don't think they're paid what they would like to."

"They say not, but don't seem badly off - look at the cars outside."

Do they like you? "I think they think I'm lazy."

Do they like the other boys? "The ones who are clever."

Do they like teaching? "If they could be always obeyed."

Are they self-important? "An occupational disease."

Since these comments did not reflect differences in the attitudes of Subjects and Controls, we have no means of estimating trends in the attitudes of the two groups. We can only mention that the comments made by a few of the boys stood out in contrast to the positive answers given to the various questions.
5. Discussion.

Louttit weighs personal and professional attitudes which he considers essential on the part of the teacher:

"Children must be accepted as they are - poor or rich, bright or dull, healthy or ill, clean or dirty. Whatever they may be, they are all growing human beings who must be trained, must be respected, must be given every opportunity to find profit in the class. Corollary to this is the principle of the equality of the children. Every child should be made to feel that he is an important member of the group. If the teacher does not accept all the children, she will show favouritism toward one and neglect another....The teacher's attitudes toward the job will significantly affect her influence on the children. If teaching is a stepping-stone to something else, or if it represents mere economic security, the children will suffer. If the subtle influence of teachers' attitudes is to have the most favourable effect on the children, that attitude must be one of vital interest in the task and enthusiasm in meeting the myriad adjustment problems a group of children present." (67)

Vernon calls attention to the effects of subjectivity on the part of teachers:

"Not only the teacher's general impression of a child's suitability, but also the marks he or she gives to his school work, may be prejudiced by his personal reactions to the child." (68)

More generally, Freud emphasized the importance of identification in the process of school learning and other forms of sublimation. He showed that disturbances of identification often led to disturbances of learning. Although these influences are more deeply rooted in earlier childhood experiences, it is known that grammar school teachers can (consciously or unconsciously) make use of
these earlier relationships in either a positive or a negative way. Liss discusses interaction between pupil and teacher:

"...a projection of parental concepts by the child upon the educator influences acceptance or rejection of subject material. The response of the educator in this role to the learner is determined by the motivations which have conditioned his or her choice of profession. Her own resolved or unresolved tensions will likewise affect the receptivity or rejection of the subject matter which she conveys to and induces the learner to accept. The acceptance can be based upon fear, which is hardly a healthful one, or can be founded on love or empathy, which is ideal for both participants. One sees that the potentials for constructive influence are inter-dependent and that the whole life pattern of the educator is drawn into close relationship to the student." (69)

In their attitudes towards teachers, the majority of the boys in both groups appear to be in agreement with these authorities. And there have been few apparent contradictions. Most of them have a high regard for the profession as well as for their teachers, whom they consider conscientious, fond of their charges, happily adjusted in their own lives. While the vast majority in both groups stated that teachers were poorly paid, there is no indication here that this factor influenced either the quality of their performance or attitudes towards their pupils. This would suggest that the boys saw the teachers as truly dedicated people, whose regards were measured by values that were independent of the things that money could buy. Yet, they were not set apart (like missionaries) from ordinary people, they might make good personal friends outside the classroom.
But why, we ask ourselves, do so few of the boys aspire to the profession of teaching? Do we take the majority (in both groups) at their word - that the pay is too little and the job is too big? Or do the answers and comments to this question cover negative attitudes which have not been expressed? Or is the answer to be found in full employment and a wider range of job opportunities? Do these boys come from homes where salaries are much higher than those of school teachers? Or is the popular notion true, that teenagers are money-mad, and that their personal standards and values are unduly influenced by cash considerations? Most of these questions involve subjects outside the field of this inquiry. However, in the last section of this paper we will have an opportunity to learn more about the boys' own professional aspirations. If the jobs they hope to find are not appreciably more lucrative than school work, if they are not less arduous and time consuming, then we shall have to review the answers to this question in a different light. Yet it is clear from the answers to this group of questions that the Subjects do not blame their teachers for lack of success in school work - there is no evidence in most of their answers that either personal or professional qualifications of the teacher might constitute obstacles to learning in the classroom. And this tendency is in keeping with their focusing on factors within their own personalities when they try to account for failure to learn.
We are thus left with the significant differences between the two groups: one-half as many Subjects as Controls did not like their teachers, nor did they feel themselves to be liked by the teachers. It would be tempting to say that these boys blame their lack of success on the subjective factor - "teacher does not like me." And this assumption could easily lead to the conclusion that they retaliated by not liking their teachers, and it was impossible to learn from teachers whom they did not like. Then why do the majority of the Subjects recommend the teachers so highly? Surely they are not suggesting that the teacher's attitude toward themselves is the only defect in otherwise near-perfect qualifications? When one weighs the various answers to questions in this section, it seems more likely that a general dissatisfaction and malaise over their own school performance is most easily and immediately focussed on the figure of the teacher, not as a person or as a professional worker, but merely as a symbol of the hated drudgery of school.
F. PARENTS.

1. Introduction.

The parent's role in the education of his child has grown from relatively simple beginnings to a more complicated, subtle and less assured one. "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it." So wrote King Solomon. And while we are a little wiser today, the problems we encounter are more difficult than those to be met with in the strictly organised and morally authoritarian society of ancient Israel. It was easier then to know how a child should be oriented; it was taken for granted that the parent knew what was best for the child.

Plato believed it was mostly by example that the parent taught:

"The best way of training the youth is to train yourself at the same time; not to admonish them, but to be always carrying out your own principles in practice."

But Rousseau thought that the parent was hindered in "carrying out his own principles" by society. Thus, he sought to eliminate the bad influences of society by removing both parent and child from it - back to the more elemental influences of nature. His belief in the natural powers and capabilities of the parent, particularly that of
the mother, was evident:

"The earliest education is most important and it undoubtedly is woman's work. If the author of nature had meant to assign it to men, he would have given them milk to feed the child... the laws give too little authority to the mother. Yet her position is more certain than that of the father; her duties are less trying. There are occasions when a son may be excused for lack of respect for his father, but if a child could be so unnatural as to fail in respect for his mother who bore him and nursed him at her breast, who for so many years devoted herself to his care, such a monstrous wretch should be smothered at once as unworthy to live. Tender, anxious mother, I appeal to you. You can remove this young tree from the highway and shield it from the crushing force of social convention. Tend and water it ere it dies. ... From the outset raise a wall round your child's soul; another may sketch the plan, you alone should carry it into execution." (70)

No other educational philosopher has affected parents so widely and deeply as did Rousseau. He not only elevated the parent's role in education beyond that of any other influence, but he raised the total prestige of the parent. As a result,

"Education slowly came to be thought of in connection with the family. The improvement of ideas upon education was only one phase of the great general movement towards the restoration of the family, which was so striking a spectacle in France after the middle of the century. Education now came to comprehend the whole system of the relations between parents and their children, from earliest infancy to maturity." (71).

After Rousseau, the Romantics tried to give childhood a metaphysical or mystic status which corresponded to their new-found sociological position, but the conditions of children were not noticeably improved by it. During the Industrial Revolution, when the conditions under which children laboured grew a good deal worse before they
got better, malnutrition, lack of education and overwork excited the sympathy of an ever-increasing body of social observers and reformers. It was thanks to these, rather than to the English poets or the French philosophers, that legislation began to be enacted during the second quarter of the nineteenth century and that some slight protection was afforded to children against the more devoted exponents of enterprise and progress. And the past one hundred years has brought about revolutionary changes in the parent-child relationship. Although the seeds of this revolution were planted hundreds of years ago, the past one hundred years have done more for the cause of children in Western society than all the centuries put together. Without politicians like Lord Shaftesbury, writers like Dickens, religious men like St. Vincent de Paul, little use would have been made of the findings of Sigmund Freud, who has done more than any single individual to bring about emotional harmony between parent and child.

Yet the Child Welfare Movement has placed an ever-growing number of society's representatives between parent and child: The Public Health Doctor and Nurse, Inspectors of Sanitation, Child Care Officers, Attendance Officers, Mental Health Officers, Sociologists, Psychiatrists, Psychologists, and so on. Each of these intruders has diminished the authority and confidence of the parent, while aiming to build them up. And finally, there is the Children's
Court, the Foster Home and the Approved School or Borstal ready to replace the parent if he is "deemed" basically inadequate. But none has intruded more into the relationship between parent and child than the school teacher, with whom he spends a good part of his waking hours. It is not only the child's physical presence that the teacher tends to command, but many of the emotional allegiances usually given to the parents are transferred to the teacher. This is particularly evident in the case of the grammar school child and, indeed, is to be expected at this stage of development. What, then, is the new role of the parent in the education of his child? It should, in our opinion, consist largely in the creation of an environment in which the child can mature emotionally and study profitably. All of this applies at least to the average child. But does the child who is gifted intellectually and is still failing at school require more from his home? Psychologists are divided about what precisely is the answer to this question. So let us hear, for a change, from the subjects of it - the children themselves.

2. Theoretical Expectation.

To what degree should parents concern themselves with their children's school work?

All of the boys stated that parents should concern themselves with school work, but the extent of
concern varied with the two groups. Responses fell into three categories: great concern, considerable and less.

Great Concern. Three times as many Subjects' answers as those of Controls' (12-4) were in favour of great concern (Table XXVII(a)). In most cases the concern included active help with school work: "they should help him;" "they should help when he's got homework and doesn't understand, if they can explain it a bit more better than the teachers do. Also they (the parents) can give you a bit of encouragement. When you feel you are not up to the exams, they can give you a bit of encouragement. He'll try a bit more harder."

Other Subjects saw the parents' concern in terms of executive functions: "They should concern themselves very much. If a boy continues to come low, they should do something. They should take strong measures, but not too strong." Still another reminded parents of their legal responsibility: "They should know the child is getting on well. If he doesn't work then parents get into trouble, so they should see that he does work." Still another emphasised the importance of being informed about both performance and behaviour. "They should be very much concerned. They shouldn't take it for granted that he is learning, they should find out what he is actually doing at school - whether he is behaving himself and learning."

Several of the Subjects saw parental interest in terms of the boys' future careers: "to the extent of concern about preparation for a job;" or "to a degree from where
TABLE XXVII (a)

To what degree should parents concern themselves with their children's school work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 10.4$
they can see his ability in certain subjects and decide his better points." Or "most interested, because that is what his career depends upon."

Controls. It was interesting to note that among the four Controls whose answers fell into the great concern category, none of them mentioned these aspects of parental concern: three of them simply stated that parents should show a maximum of concern: "100%", "great interest", "keen interest"; and one of them brought forth the broader function of parents' participation: "they should take a very active interest. In extreme cases they may not like the form of education their children are getting. They should keep in touch and try to help him."

Considerable Concern. Although there was little difference between the number of Subjects and Controls whose answers came into this category, the Subjects were far less illuminating and enlightened in their responses. They gave such answers as the following: "should have interest, but not try to boss," "they should take an interest," "quite a lot", "should be interested but not too helpful." On the other hand, some of the Controls saw parental concern in terms of the kind of people parents were, the quality of home atmosphere they provided, and the more subtle aspects of their relationship to children. For example, one of the Controls stated:
"Quite a large degree of concern. If the child's environment at home is unhappy or disturbed, I think they will be less capable of learning than if their parents are happy and send them off in the world happy to learn. Parents should offer encouragement but not gifts."

Another stated:

"I think they should have a real interest. They should not threaten him. Some parents say: 'If you don't pass that exam I'll be really annoyed with you, hit you.' I don't think it is fair that some parents try during the holidays to pawn their children off on other people. I think they should take a real interest."

Still another:

"Quite a lot. Parents should be interested, but should not push him on. Should let him work at his own speed. Some parents think they are working badly when they're not working badly. This attitude stops them. Shouldn't worry him. Because I think if they worry him a lot, he'd be a bit frightened and tell them a lot of things that are not true, probably. They should take a steady interest, not just at exam time."

Little Concern. More than twice as many Controls' as Subjects' answers indicated that parental concern should be limited. One of the Subjects stated: "Not a great degree. If a boy wants to learn, he will learn."

Two Subjects cautioned against worry and nagging. For example:

"They should be interested, but not be always telling them they should work harder at school. 'do this and that'. I think it is a lot of harm instead of good. Some parents worry too much."

Another: "...should take an interest, but shouldn't worry the boy too much."

Controls tended to prefer moderate concern, little interference, no help:

"...should concern themselves as long as they don't become a nuisance."

"encourage them, but no more."
"should have an interest, but should not interfere too much with the way he does his homework."

"not too much. Just be concerned but not overdo it."

**SUMMARY.**

The highly significant differences between the two groups is underlined by the Subjects' greater stress on direct help with school work and supervision of it; whereas the Controls place less direct responsibility upon parents, they tend to stress the more indirect influences that parents exert upon their children's school performance; the more general quality of relationship between parent and child. It seems likely that the distribution of the Controls' answers on something like the normal curve (4-12-7) reflects the fact that they were being questioned about a relationship with which they were fairly satisfied and which they took for granted, whereas the highly uneven distribution of the Subjects' answers (12-8-3) points to their awareness of some lack or failure in their relation with their parents. Perhaps this would suggest that the Controls felt a more basic need for their parents' interest and concern than the Subjects, who seemed more dependent upon immediate participation from them. This suggestion is supported by answers to the next group of questions. In this group, the boys were given five choices of answers in each category:
3. Actual Observations.

Do the boys in your school whose parents—push, help with school work, worry a lot, simply encourage and leave it to the boy, discourage, show indifference—do:

1. better at school than others?
2. less well " " "
3. about the same " "
4. fail
5. worse " " "

The answers to these questions were generally uniform except to questions involving encouragement and indifference (Table XXVII b). A small number of Subjects and Controls stated that pupils whose parents push do better, whilst almost twice as many Controls as Subjects (19, 11) stated that pupils did worse, or failed, if parents showed indifference. Nine subjects thought encouragement from parents produced better results, and 19 stated that discouragement made them do worse or fail. 20 Controls stated that simple encouragement brought better results and 19 that indifference caused pupils to do worse or to fail.

In spite of the Controls' significant stress on the importance of encouragement, fewer of them thought failure was due to discouragement. The Controls' attitudes suggest that they accept full responsibility for doing their job—learning at school; that they neither require direct assistance nor supervision from their parents; that they have already become identified with their parents' goals and attitudes toward work; but that they cannot go it alone.
Table XXVII (b)

Do boys whose parents:

1. **Push**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do better</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Fail/Worse</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Help with School Work**

| Subjects  | 12   | 8          | 3     | 23    |
| Controls  | 12   | 8          | 2     | 22    |
|           | 24   | 16         | 5     | 45    |

3. **Worry**

| Subjects  | 4    | 8          | 10    | 22    |
| Controls  | 4    | 2          | 16    | 22    |
|           | 8    | 10         | 26    | 44    |

4. **Simply Encourage**

| Subjects  | 9    | -          | 14    | 23    |
| Controls  | 20   | -          | 3     | 23    |
|           | 29   | 17         |       | 46    |

\[ x^2 = 11.29 \]

5. **Discourage**

| Subjects  | -    | 4          | 19    | 23    |
| Controls  | -    | 1          | 22    | 23    |
|           | 5    | 41         |       | 46    |

6. **Show Indifference**

| Subjects  | -    | 10         | 11    | 21    |
| Controls  | -    | 3          | 19    | 22    |
|           | 13   | 30         |       | 43    |

\[ x^2 = 5.88 \]
They need the solid assurance that their parents care and are proud of their industry, perseverance and achievement. Whereas with the Subjects, who may not have so successfully aligned themselves with their parents' attitudes toward work and goals, constant reminders were needed in the form of supervision or more direct help.

More than half of both Subjects and Controls (12) agreed that help with school work brought better results. And this would seem to be contradictory to the majority of replies made by Controls in Section 1, where the stress was against parental help or interference. Yet it seems likely that the majority at least of the Controls were interpreting the word help in its broadest sense, i.e. sympathy, understanding, peaceful environment, though others probably had more definite ideas of precise kinds of assistance, with homework, etc., in mind.

The following statement from one of the Controls is typical:

"Some mothers don't give their children any encouragement at all, whereas a good mother will encourage her child in every possible way, and leave it to him to get on with his school work."

While fewer Subjects than Controls (10, 16) said that parental worry caused pupils to do worse, a strong reaction against worrying and pushing was noted in the comments made by boys in each group, as shown in Section 3.
4. Personal Experiences.

Since examination results are often considered by parents to be the best barometer of their child's productivity at school, the results of this method of gauging ability often bring forth strong reactions, of one type or another, from parents. These reactions not only reveal attitudes regarding their children's abilities and methods of work, but also hint at more basic relationships between parents and their children. Boys' answers to the question: What do your parents do when you get bad marks in exams? focused these attitudes and relations in a manner which allowed them to be classified, according to their probably constructive or destructive effects upon the boys' learning. There were three categories - Simple reproof, constructive, neutral, which included boys who stated they did not make bad marks.

A small, but equal number of Subjects' and Controls' answered were included in the Simple Reproof category (Table XXVIIc). Most of these stated that parents reacted with vituperation: "tick off", "tell me off", "lecture", "scold", "nag", "worry", "give me a good talking to", "say it's my fault". Some listed less harsh reactions: "tell me to do better", "tell me to try harder", "tell me I must do better."

14 Subjects and 9 Controls gave answers which indicated a more constructive view on the part of parents:
### Table XXVII (c)

**What do your parents do about bad exam. marks?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructive</th>
<th>Simple Reproof</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table XXVII (d)

**Are you appreciated or pushed?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciated</th>
<th>Pushed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table XXVII (f)

**Do you resent parents interfering in school work?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table XXVII (e)

**Has pushing from home caused you to do less well?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE XXVII (g)**

When you grow up do you think you will be as clever as your parents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More clever</th>
<th>As clever or less</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table XXVII (i)**

Would your parents like you to go to University?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 7.51 \]

**Table XXVII (j)**

If you had a son and his teacher recommended University, what would you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ask him</th>
<th>Tell him to go</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"they ask the reasons why", "talk it over", "father helped me a lot with geometry and maths", "they ask if I have done my best."

One half as many Subjects as Controls (4, 9) gave replies which appear to indicate that their parents' reactions were neutral, "don't worry", "they say nothing", "they say it doesn't matter", "they take it as normal ups and downs", "better luck next time."

The vast majority of the Subjects and all of the Controls stated that pushing had not caused them to do less well (Table XXVIIa) and a similar number said they were appreciative (Table XXVIIb). However, some of the boys in each group stressed the damaging effects of pushing:

"When parents push, boys get worried about what their parents want. They get disappointed if they don't do as well as their parents think they should. If a boy's a genius, he won't mind."

Another boy stated: "Not really, I don't like school. Could we put it this way - pushing didn't help. Definitely not."

Another minimized the effect of pushing:

"Boys don't take it seriously. Boys don't worry too much."

The answers to this question would seem to indicate that most of the boys in both groups were, in fact, pushed, but they did not blame parental pushing for doing less well. Yet, as we noted in Table XXVIIb, 10 Subjects and 7 Controls stated that pushing made boys do less well. It is this type of discrepancy, less flagrant than those emerging from
questions regarding school organisation and assessment of ability, that is so characteristic of answers regarding parents. Yet we realised that it would not follow that an individual boy would necessarily agree with a broad, theoretical statement, such as *pushing from home makes boys do less well*.

Although the Subjects have indicated greater need for parental help and supervision than Controls, more of them resented parents interfering in school work, yet the majority in both groups said they did not. (Table XXVIIIf) A typical comment from Subjects who resented interference was:

"If I were a parent I'd like my son to do well, but I wouldn't always sort of ask questions - how he is getting on - all the time. It is his life. I'd send him to the type of school where he wanted to go."

The fact that the majority of the Subjects did not resent parental interference, although they were justifiably worried about their son's lack of progress, speaks for good rapport between parent and child. Under the most favourable circumstances it is difficult for parents to cope constructively with a child who fails to live up to the standards they expect. The greater the expectations, the more disappointed the parents are likely to feel at the failure. In the case of boys under investigation, there was no objective measure of parents' cultural levels. Although some indications were given in talks with teachers and Headmasters,
these impressions have not been included in our inquiry, since the purpose was to obtain the boys' attitudes and assessments. For example, it was pertinent to the subject under discussion to know from them whether or not they considered themselves as clever as their parents, or more or less clever. To have asked this question directly might have proved embarrassing to the boys, and because of this possibility the question was framed:

When you grow up, do you think you will be:

i. as clever as your parents?
ii. more clever than your parents?
iii. less clever than your parents?

The answers indicated that there was no significant difference in the two groups. A bare majority of the Subjects thought they would be more clever, and the majority of the Controls thought they would be less clever, or as clever as their parents. (Table XXVIIg) Taken alone, the responses to this question are not very illuminating. In the questions that follow, we hoped to obtain the boys' assessment of their parents' attitudes as well as their own attitudes and goals for themselves. For purposes of comparison, the same choices of answers were given in each of the following categories:

What would you like to be?
What would your father think most worthwhile?
What would your mother think most worthwhile?

i. top of the form
ii. all-round athlete
iii. have special knowledge
iv. be a regular guy and good sport
v. be well liked.

As indicated in Table XXVII, one-half as many Subjects as Controls (6, 11) chose intellectual goals. These included top of the form and special knowledge. Of this group, 5 Subjects and 10 Controls preferred to be top of the form. When we bear in mind that 8 additional Controls were already top (1st place), and it is unlikely that they would have reached that level of attainment without ambition to be there, it is evident that the Controls’ responses were misleading. It would, therefore, be more accurate to estimate that one-third as many Subjects as Controls had this ambition. Since the Subjects did not comment on the reasons for their choices, we are left with the question why so few of them aspired to this goal of excellence.

Child and Whiting investigated the effects of failure on level of aspiration among college students and arrived at the following generalisations:

1. "Success generally leads to a raising of the level of aspiration, and failure to a lowering.

* It was interesting to note that the conception of a 'regular guy' was fairly uniform with both groups. However, since it is a slang expression, a definition, which had been given by a boy in the pilot study, was suggested by the investigator:

"A boy who is in general sophisticated and at ease with his contemporaries, who is interested in jazz, dancing, girls: who is popular at parties, knowledgeable about films, good at games, one who is socially confident and lacking in shyness and timidity."
2. The stronger the success, the greater is the probability of a rise in level of aspiration; the stronger the failure, the greater is the probability of a lowering.

3. Failure is more likely than success to lead to withdrawal in the form of avoidance of setting a level of aspiration."

These fairly evident conclusions may, in fact, apply to the Subjects, who were failing in their school work. But should they be applied to other areas of interest? The majority of them might have aimed to be top in something other than school work. This possibility was suggested in their non-intellectual goals, which included being well liked, a regular guy, all-round athlete. 17 Subjects and 12 Controls were included in this category. Of the 17 Subjects, 6 of them (as compared with 1 Control) aimed to be a regular guy and, as the definition implies, this would place them at the top of the social ladder. When it came to being an all-round athlete, 4 Subjects and 1 Control had this ambition. In both instances the Subjects have greater ambition than the Controls, who merely wished to be well liked. But in the majority of this group, the Controls had already achieved one of the goals (to be top) so that the desire to obtain esteem may be considered a secondary goal.

While it is undoubtedly true that failure is likely to result in a 'lowering of aspiration' and to shifts in ambition, it seemed worthwhile to examine other causes. The literature on this subject is rapidly growing and
suggests other areas of consideration. For example, in Rowland's investigation of grammar school boys' aspirations, he attempted to answer the question:

"What sort of boys are most likely to have both a high level of educational aspiration and a preference for scientific studies?"

He sought their attitudes towards school subjects and school life, spare time interests and vocational ambitions. "The results suggested that it was the educational and cultural status of the home...which had the most important influence on the level of aspiration of the boys. The father's occupation, parents' education, economic status and cultural level of the home were found to be linked with level of aspiration." In Meyer's investigation of pupils in a co-educational school in London, he found:

"By a process of elimination, the most likely sphere of influence...would seem to be the home, and this conjecture was supported by the evidence of a small number of case studies where homes were visited and parents interviewed at length, suggesting that a pupil whose home was secure and democratic, and whose parents had a genuine interest in schooling, would be more likely to acquire an interest in science than one who had not such a background."

While these studies were concerned with particular aspirations, it is generally agreed that a child is more likely to succeed if the relationship between his parents is such that they agree about fundamental issues, particularly those concerning the child and his education. On the other hand, the child is handicapped if his parents disagree, because he is usually unable to decide with which of them to
identify his own aspirations. It has been noted in an earlier section of this paper that the Subjects were more dependent upon their parents for supervision and direct help than the Controls. This might suggest that the Subjects were less well identified with their parents - that they had not been so successful in incorporating their parents' standards and values as the Controls. We might say that the Subjects needed reinforcement, constant reminding of these values and goals; while the Controls required mostly support of values and goals which had already become a part of themselves. This finding suggests another question: To what extent are the boys under investigation identified with their parents' goals? And here it is not a limiting fact that we have only the boys' attitudes to go on, since it is more important to assess whether or not they feel this identity, than whether it is accurate in detail. A series of comparisons between the boys' attitudes and those they attribute to their parents were made to assess this.

(a) **Intellectual Goals.**

Did the boys identify with their parents goals, or was there a clash in goals? A comparison of intellectual goals (Table XXVIIh(4)) shows that in the case of Subjects, both parents had aspirations which by far exceed that of their sons (boys 6, father 13, mother 16). The Controls'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>What would you like to be</th>
<th>What would your father like you to be</th>
<th>What would your mother like you to be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>top of the form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>regular guy</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
<td>top of the form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>regular guy</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>regular guy</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>regular guy</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>regular guy</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>all round athlete</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>good athlete</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>all round athlete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>all round athlete</td>
<td>all round athlete</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>all round athlete</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>regular guy</td>
<td>all round athlete</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>no father</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>all round athlete</td>
<td>no father</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>all round athlete</td>
<td>no father</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table XXVII (h) 4.

Parents' Intellectual Goals Compared With Those of Boys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>What would you like to be</th>
<th>What would your father like you to be</th>
<th>What would your mother like you to be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>all round athlete</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>regular guy</td>
<td>regular guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>all round athlete</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
<td>special knowledge</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>well liked</td>
<td>well liked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intelectual Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Intellectual goals</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intellectual goals</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intellectual goals</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXVII (h) 5.

Top of Form.

Boys' Ambition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXVII (h) 6.

Top of Form

Boys' goals compared with Parents':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boy-Father</th>
<th>Boy-Mother</th>
<th>Boy - Both Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Different</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 7.22 \]

Significant p.c. .01

Table XXVII (h) 7.

Top of Form

Comparison of Mother's and Father's goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXVII (h) 8.

Non-intellectual goals.

Comparison of Boy with Father and Mother

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Boy</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Boy with Both Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Different</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXVII (h) 9.

Boys' ambition compared with parents'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boy - father</th>
<th>Boys - mother</th>
<th>Boy - Both parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Different</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 4.37 \]

Significant p.c. .05

\[ X^2 = 7.26 \]

Significant p.c. .01

Comparison of Mothers' and Fathers' goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Different</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Controls | | |
| 17 | 6 | 23 |

| | |
| 27 | 16 | 43 |
parents, although higher than that of the boys (boys 11, father 17, mother 17) again does not represent a true picture since, as we have noted, 8 of those who listed non-intellectual goals were, in fact, at the top of the form. Thus an almost equal number of Controls and their parents were in agreement regarding intellectual aspirations. The negligible difference in intellectual goals between the attitudes of parents in the two groups suggests that parental aspiration was not a factor that contributed to the Subjects' lack of intellectual ambition. Nor did a comparison between the boys' intellectual ambitions and those of their fathers and mothers indicate that this was a factor which might have affected the Subjects' goals for themselves.

1. Top of the Form. As shown in Table XXVII(5), twice as many Controls as Subjects aspired to be at the top of the form. When compared with their father's, mother's and then both parents' goals, important results were obtained: when the boy and both his parents had the same goals, there was a significant difference in the two groups (Table XXVII(6)). These results outweighed those obtained from a comparison of the mother's and father's goals (Table XXVII(7)). This raised the question of the importance of common goals between child and parent in general. Is agreement more important than the nature of the goals?
(b) **Non-intellectual Goals.** Answers were sought in a comparison of the boy's non-intellectual ambitions with those of father and mother and with both parents, which showed practically no difference between the two groups (Table XXVIIh 8).

(c) **General Goals.** Comparison of the boy's goals with those of his father showed a significant difference between the two groups (Subjects 5, Controls 13) - See Table XXVIIh(9). Differences between the boy and his mother were less pronounced. The most significant fact emerging from these comparisons was that more than 5 times as many of the Controls as Subjects had the same general goals as both their parents. When the parents were compared with each other, the difference between the Subjects and Controls was less.

As noted in all of the tables in this section, the Controls showed greater agreement with their parents than the Subjects, but the differences were statistically significant only when the boys had the same general goals as their fathers and as both parents. No doubt the Controls feel a rapport with their parents which gives them assurance of interest and support, which is what they state they need for success, whereas the Subjects, who are less in agreement with their parents, may feel this lack of identification in a way that affects their performance. Or is it the other way round? We know that the Subjects' parents are said to
to be more ambitions intellectually for them than the boys themselves. But so are the Controls' parents. Is it the Subjects' lack of success which makes them feel the lack of common goals more keenly? In other words: "I fail, therefore I have no identification with my parents' ambitions for me."

Certainly there is no suggestion here that the Subjects are blaming their parents for lack of intellectual ambitions. On the other hand, they may attach some blame for their own lack of success to the parents, by arguing that if their parents were a little less ambitious and did not nag so much, they might be able to do better.

Further evidence of the parents' ambitions for their sons was found in answers to the question: Would your parents like you to go to University? Almost twice as many Controls as Subjects stated their parents would like them to go to University (Table XXVII). The reasons given by both groups related to jobs:

"Yes, so I could get a better job."
"Yes, very much, so I could get a good job."

A few of them saw it in terms of social gains: "Yes, prestige as well as for my own sake." Several saw it in terms of their parents' desire to give them better opportunities than they had had: "Yes, to give me something they never had." Still others stressed educational gains:
"No reason, except to have a good education."

When we combined the 8 fathers and 15 mothers of Subjects who were ambitious to have them at the top of the form, with the 11 whom the boys stated wished them to have university education, we get some hint at the disappointment these parents, as well as their sons, must feel about the failure in school subjects. That the majority of these boys should still feel themselves "appreciated" at home might speak for deeper sympathy and understanding than the boys indicated in answers to specific questions regarding their parents' attitudes towards bad examination results. This impression is supported by answers given to the question: "If you had a son and his teachers said he was very clever and should go to the University, what would you do?"

1. Ask him what he wanted to do and try to reach an agreement?

ii. Ask one of his friends to persuade him, if he didn't want to go?

iii. Tell him you and the teacher had decided, and make plans for him to go?

The vast majority in both groups stated they would consult the boy. It cannot, however, be assumed that the responses indicated this was the way they had been treated by their parents. It might well be that the boys were stating this was the way they would like to be treated.
(d) **Summary.**

In general, the answers to questions regarding parents support the claims given by the majority of Subjects and Controls that reasons for failure cannot be attributed to their parents. They did not yield to the temptation which is encouraged by the press, sociologists, psychologists, Children's Court judges and others who place the blame for children's problems squarely upon the shoulders of their parents. Nor do they appear to be blinded to parental shortcomings. These boys seem well aware that parents do nag, and that their pushing and other signs of worry do not help. But few of them use these facts to account for their own failures at school. While the Subjects indicate a need for more **direct assistance** with home work, the Controls make it clear that they must be able to count on parents for **encouragement** - that **indifference** is damaging. When we remember that these are boys of superior intelligence, and in the case of Controls superior accomplishment, we might wonder why the need for parental encouragement is felt so strongly. Here it is important to remember that adolescents are at the cross-roads between childhood and adulthood, and this means they are still more or less dependent upon their parents for support. That they should, under these circumstances, still state that they hold themselves responsible for failures at school would indicate
considerable personal integrity, more in keeping with the tradition of primitive Christians than with that of the Child Welfare Movement.

The important differences between the attitudes Subjects and Controls attribute to their parents regarding ambition in this section are in general agreement with the findings of other investigators who stress the importance of socio-economic factors in school performance, e.g. Douglas and Campbell's study of Junior High School children in Minnesota showed this factor to be the most important one in accounting for school failures (72). Campbell, who was concerned with the effects of environmental conditions upon suitability for secondary school courses, found that "children who are not doing as well as expected at the central and grammar schools tend to come from environments that are inferior to those of their control groups in respect to social activities, cultural objects and cultural values." (73)

He concludes:

"It seems clear that a particularly good socio-cultural environment may, to some extent, compensate for lack of innate ability and attainment in the primary schools, and on the other hand, a very poor environment may result in the secondary school achievement being considerably lower than might otherwise have been the case." (74)

More specific influences have been noted by Russell Davis and Kent, who showed that children of over-anxious mothers were above average in verbal ability, whereas children of mothers who were sympathetic and encouraging tended to be average. (75)
Campbell goes one step further by pointing to the prognostic value of such influences. He suggests that:

"the introduction of a sociocultural assessment into the selection procedures would have reduced the number of children allocated to secondary schools for which they later appear to be unsuited." (76)

From the evidence in this section of our investigation, we are not in a position to confirm or deny these claims, since no direct assessments of family influences were made. All we can reliably say is that according to the boys under investigation, those who live up to promise consider themselves to be more closely identified with what they believe to be the attitudes of their parents toward ambition than the boys who fail in school subjects; that these goals are more intellectual in the case of Controls than that of the Subjects.

While there is no question that university studies represent high intellectual goals, it does not follow that the reason a particular parent aspires to higher learning for his or her son is because of a primary interest in learning. The reasons may be primarily social or economic. When we examine the comments given by boys whose parents wished them to attend university, there was little qualitative difference between Subjects and Controls.

Thus, an attempt to assess the motives of parents whose goals for their children coincide with that of the boys would be futile. Perhaps it would be more rewarding
to speculate about the basic relationships behind these agreements. The fact that the majority of Controls consider themselves to have common goals with one or both of their parents (to a greater extent than the Subjects) might suggest that the Controls feel greater sympathy and support from their parents. And at their stage of development this underlying understanding and confidence may, indeed, be a crucial factor in determining success or failure. Or it may not be so important that the boy’s goals and those of his parents are the same as it is that the child should be able to harmonize the values of the two parents.

But this speculation may over-emphasize the infantile qualities of the adolescent. Obviously the adolescent of superior intelligence (like his less gifted contemporaries) has goals for himself which are, to some extent, independent of his parents. In the next section these will be assessed and compared with those in the present one, which may have been unduly linked with parental attitudes by the phrasing of the questionnaire.

It should be noted here that lofty parental ambitions do not necessarily make for scholastic success in their children. On the contrary, many notable instances of the opposite have been observed. In this investigator’s experience, an interesting situation of this sort was brought to a Child Guidance Clinic. A grammar school boy, with an
I.Q. of 150 at the age of 14, was failing at school. He longed to leave at the age of 15 to enter his father's vegetable stall in a City market. The father, who had saved over a period of years to send his boy to university, pleaded with him to make the most of his schooling. Equally as persistent, the boy maintained he had but one ambition - to enter the father's greengrocery business. At the Clinic the boy, who showed no evidence of marked emotional disturbance during the short contact, stuck to his choice of occupation, declared there was nothing the matter with him and suggested his father might need help. He left school a year later and took a job with his father. It was the investigator's impression that the parent's attempt to force his son into a professional career might have increased the resistance of the child to school work.

As in the case of this father, often such ambitions spring from anxiety on the part of the parents, which may be expressed in pushing. But there is little evidence in this section that the Subjects were unduly pushed by their parents, nor that most of them blamed parental interference for the fact that they were doing less well than they should have. We are, therefore, left with the need for encouragement. Perhaps this factor included help of a stronger sort - a conviction that their son was capable of reaching top place.
in his school work, of entering university, and the ambition that he should do so. That these elements might have been less prevalent in the case of the Subjects would not necessarily account for failure, but it is possible that (other factors being equal) it might have contributed to lack of success in school subjects.
G. THE BOYS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS THEMSELVES.

1. Introduction.

In earlier sections of this report it has either been stated specifically, or implied, that children of high intelligence should be expected to succeed in their school subjects. Other investigators have gone further by using the terms "bright" and "fast learner" synonymously. And one of these has characterised the "fast learner" as follows:

(a) He is able to absorb the same body of knowledge in a fraction of the time required by the average or slow learner; he is characterized by quick reaction time, as a rule, and by superior ease of assimilation.

(b) The superior pupil, as a rule, has greater powers of concentration and sustained attention. Given reasonable degree of interest, the bright pupil can, if he will, concentrate on an intellectual task for considerable lengths of time without apparent fatigue.

(c) He tends to be superior in originality, initiative and intellectual curiosity. He is comparatively self-directing, when given half a chance.

(d) He tends to have superior powers of generalisation. He is much quicker to see underlying principles, to relate similar elements in a situation.

(e) He tends to be superior in his ability to deal with abstractions. He has superior reasoning abilities.

(f) He tends to have superior powers of self-criticism - to know when he does not know.

(g) He tends to have greater versatility and vitality of interest, wide range of interests and greater special talents. (77)

Hill seems to imply here that general intelligence is a single capacity equally important in all branches of
learning. While Parkyn considered the multi-factor view more valid, in his study of 50 children (IQ's 130-160) in New Zealand primary and intermediate schools, he attempted to answer the question whether the highly intelligent children were making the progress that they should be expected to make, relative to the work of the children of lower general ability. Yet he realised that the question of overlapping of abilities was pertinent to the problem. He found that nearly a quarter of his subjects of high intelligence did work that fell below "reasonable expectations." He discovered no influence which showed significant correlations with success or with failure, excepting general intelligence. Social, emotional and physical factors, he concludes 'seldom act consistently in one direction, and when they do, they are usually found to be either small in their effect or limited in their incidence.' Of the 12 children whom he regarded as not doing satisfactory school work (those who failed to reach the median of the class), he found there were usually several causes in each case. The major ones were:

"Ill-health, adolescent instability, conflict of interests, maladjustment of personality, unevenness of intellectual development, unsatisfactory home environment."(78)

Parkyn does not appear to probe beneath these factors to investigate the individual child's attitudes regarding the various stresses, nor the extent to which such "causes"
as "unevenness of intellectual development" might be traced to more basic personality difficulties. As Glover points out:

"Not all precipitating stresses should be taken at face value. An apparently economic factor, for example, may operate because of the psychological deficiencies associated with poor economic background." (79)

Other characteristics of the mentally gifted have been noted: Hollingsworth quotes from G. F. Yoder's study of The Boyhood of Great Men. He found that his subjects - 50 great men - had been interested in play during childhood, 'though often the play was of a solitary kind or otherwise extraordinary.' Hollingsworth's own investigations showed that 'children very gifted intellectually (those above 170 I.Q.) often show play interests which are uncommon for their years. Gifted children rating far below this very exceptional level (130-145 I.Q.) are reported by parents and teachers to show the usual play interests, and the reports made by such children themselves reveal no deviation in play so wide as to be very noticeable to an untrained observer.' (80) She concludes that:

"The gifted are omnivorous readers, but certain preferences are nevertheless characteristic of them as a group. For example, they like dictionaries, encyclopedias and atlases much more than average children ever do. Detective stories are also greatly liked and are ranked above crude adventure stories in the preference of gifted children. Books dealing with astronomy occupy a unique place in their interests, and they like books about natural phenomena of any kind." (81)

Regarding ambitions for careers, Hollingworth noted that 'on the whole, gifted children record ambition
for literary, scientific, artistic or professional careers, but by no means all do so.'

Thus, we note among the learning characteristics of highly intelligent children industry, alertness, curiosity, perseverance and ability to concentrate. We will first deal with the boys' attitudes on learning characteristics, secondly to discuss attitudes regarding ambition, and thirdly group and solitary activities outside school, which may provide expression for many of their intellectual abilities.

2. Factors Contributing to School Failure.

(a) Actual Observations.

We have noted in the first section of the Main Inquiry that the vast majority of Subjects and Controls listed reasons within themselves (S - 38, C - 50) to account for failure of boys in their school (Table 1). In addition to this category, they had been given the following choices: Home, Parents, Teachers, Exams. As shown in Table 2, a much smaller number of both Subjects and Controls (9, 13) listed factors in these four categories. And this tendency is consistent with responses given to questions relating to the influences of home, parents, teachers and school procedures, which have been discussed in earlier Sections of this report.

(b) Factors Within the Boy and in their School.

The Subjects listed 25 factors and the Controls 40 (Table 3). Approximately half of these fell into the category of laziness (S-13, C-18). Since the responses in
Table 1.
When the boys in your school fail, is it because of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons within themselves</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.
Factors responsible for failure in school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors responsible for failure in school</th>
<th>Something within the boy</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.
Factors within the boys in your school contributing to School Failure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laziness</th>
<th>Slowness</th>
<th>Day-Dreaming</th>
<th>Lack of Ambition</th>
<th>Stubbornness</th>
<th>Hobbies</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.
Why are you not at the top?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boys at the top or near it</th>
<th>Factors within the boy's control</th>
<th>Factors outside the boy's control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 8.964 \]

Significant p.c. .05
Table 5.
Do you want to go to University? Why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjects</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better job</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Reasons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer other career</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clever</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haven't decided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work too hard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 7.097 \]
Significant p.c. .01
### Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you want to be?</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 7.97 \quad \text{P.C.} \quad .005 \]
this group of questions are similar to those in the next section, they will be considered together.

3. Personal Experiences.

The boys were asked: Why do you think you are not at the top? They provided a more widely scattered range of responses than they had given in part 2. For the purpose of discussion, these factors have been grouped into three general categories: Boys at the top or near it; Factors within the boy's control; Factors outside the boy's control. 

(i) Boys at the top or near it.

None of the Subjects and 10 Controls stated they were already at or near the top (Table 4). Here it was noted that none of the boys who fell below third place checked this category, thus indicating some dissatisfaction with their progress, in spite of their relatively high position in the form.

(ii) Factors within the boy's control.

This category includes laziness, too many outside activities, carelessness, boredom, lack of ambition, lack of will power, untidiness, slowness, lack of concentration. It is not suggested that the boy could remedy any of these conditions without outside help, but rather that subjectively he believes he could control them. 19 Subjects and 9 Controls listed factors in this category (Table 4). The majority of Subjects stated that their failures were due to laziness.
whereas only 3 Controls gave this reason. Subjects described **laziness** in the following terms: "don't try hard enough", "don't work", "Don't study", "don't work hard enough", while the Controls mentioned "lack of revision", "don't revise enough." Although the impression given by most of the Subject was a more general lack of industry, the few Controls in this section stress inadequate preparation for examinations, or a falling off in performance. This might suggest that the relied upon steady hard work during the term, rather than last minute swotting. This possibility is supported by the significant differences between Controls and Subjects in response to questions about homework. The Controls were by far more positive in their attitudes, and accomplishments were greater. A negligible number of them copied homework from school mates.

What is the meaning of this aversion to labour? The boys are not very enlightening. Some of them mention several factors in addition to laziness: **lack of attention, boredom, lack of concentration, slowness, lack of will power**, but they do not tell us what is behind these inadequacies. Are they lacking in imagination? That is, are they unable to look ahead and to visualise the results of this lack of effort? Do they have a low toleration for frustration - which is inherent in perseverance? Do they think only of the present pleasure which they derive from idleness? Or is it more simply that they are interested in something other than school work?
1. Those in favour of University.

Answers to questions regarding ambition are pertinent to these questions. When asked whether they wished to go to University, more than twice as many Controls as Subjects replied "Yes" (17, 8). (Table 5). The reasons for choosing University have been grouped under three headings: To increase knowledge, to get a good job, for social reasons.

(a) To increase knowledge. Two Subjects and 16 Controls wished to increase their knowledge. The 2 Subjects stated: "Because I want to further my studies, try to get a degree." "I want to study science."

Controls were also interested in study for specific careers: chemistry, physics, scientific research and "professions", but a third of them expressed an interest in further schooling, mainly for the sake of learning: "Further education can use your ability", "It's a good rounding off to an education," "Increases your intellectual standing and you learn about the world", "To learn a great deal, it sets you up far ahead of a boy who has to leave school at 15", "Because I am interested in studies and research. I like it." "A person who has ability should go. Silly not to."

(b) To obtain a better job. Four Subjects and one Control stressed occupational advantages: "Much better chance of getting a good job", "I want to go into science." "Everyone tells me I would have to get a degree. I've got the ability", are typical responses.
(c) **Social Reasons.** None of the Controls and two Subjects gave social reasons for wishing to enter University. "It would make mother and father prouder", or "It raises your social standing."

2. **Those not in favour of University.**
Reasons given included: "Prefer other career, prefer to go to work, not clever enough, haven't decided, work too hard. In these categories, 15 Subjects and 5 Controls gave responses. A discussion of these will be included elsewhere in this section.

3. **What do you want to be?**
The boys' answers to this question underline the necessity of allowing for fantasy, ignorance and inconsistency in this age group.

(a) **Trades.** Five times as many subjects as Controls wished to enter trades (11, 2) (Table 6). Five of them named **printing**, a trade which offers security and good pay. Other trades included toolmaker, purser, electrical worker, "Technician in the Royal Air Force", building surveyor. No doubt most of these trades require a minimum of intellectual effort, but none of them would appear to be ideal work for a thoroughly **lazy** person. It was interesting to note that their **ideal** professions also tended to be those in which high intellectual capacities were not required: footballer, shopkeeper, grown-up, and so on.
(b) Professions. Ten Subjects and 17 Controls chose professions. The Subjects wished to be: accountant, commercial artist, officer in Navy, bank teller, in the Foreign Office - no details were mentioned - engineer, scientist, interior decorate, play in an orchestra. These ambitions, exalted though some of them may be, do not give the same scope or the display of purely intellectual abilities as those of the Controls, who tend to choose professions which require at least a University degree. For example, approximately a third of the Controls wished to be medical doctors; more than half of them listed academic professions such as Professor of History at University, Professor of Languages at University, Professor of Physics, etc. Another third were ambitious to be chemists (most of them in the field of research). It was noted that all but one of the Controls would have ideally chosen the same profession.

4. Summary.

The most remarkable feature in these choices of occupation is the narrow gap between the boys' actual choice and their fantasied choice. Does this mean that most of them are unimaginative - that they do not stray too far from reality? One might have expected highly intelligent boys to have a far wider and more lofty range of imaginative professions. Remembering that all of these boys were born under wartime conditions, when they and their families...
experienced tremendous insecurities of all sorts and their everyday lives were brought close to adventures beyond their greatest fantasies, it may be that they crave most of all a certain ordinariness of existence—hard work, routine, adequate economic security. Yet these were aspects of the teaching profession which they had earlier objected to. In the case of the Subjects, indeed their choices of professions and trades do represent a departure from the teacher's job. None of them, for example, dealt with children or with teaching, whereas this was not true in the case of Controls, half of whom either aspired to be teachers or to enter careers where instruction would constitute a part of the professional services to young people as well as to adults. This would suggest that the Controls who stated they did not wish to be teachers in schools may have had other considerations in mind than the Subjects. Further, the pay in trades and professions chosen by boys in both groups would not seem to be appreciably higher than that of school teachers, whom they considered poorly paid. We would suggest, bearing in mind comments from both groups to questions regarding teachers, homework, school administration, that the Subjects may have objected to teaching in a grammar school because the profession represented their own failure to live up to promise; whereas with the Controls, the underlying reasons might include limited opportunities for advancement to, say, the University level
in the teaching profession, or that it did not carry as much social prestige as careers in professions such as medicine, law, research scientist.

4. Spare-time Activities.

In modern society, where one must earn money in exchange for the necessities of life such as food, shelter and other means of subsistence, it is often necessary to make a compromise between available jobs and one's preferences in employment. The individual who would ideally prefer to work alone, for example, may find himself employed in a group situation where he must depend upon the co-operation of numerous people to achieve his basic goals. He may be forced to enter into various types of relationships with people, while at the same time yearning for solitude or a limited number of contacts with his fellows. Sometimes there may be a choice; more often there is none. In situations where there is no choice, he may console himself with the thought that after work hours he can do what he likes: he may sit at home alone and read a book, he may engage in solitary creative activities such as painting, writing, making things, or he may simply sit and dream. Or, if his work-mates do not meet his specific needs for group expression, he may (especially in urban life) choose after work hours the particular group which gives him most satisfaction and stimulation. All of this applies equally
to the school child, whose job involves the accomplishment of various tasks in a group setting, so that his choice of spare time activities may, in fact, be a better indication of his natural inclinations than the situation in which he is legally forced to participate. It was with these ideas in mind that questions were framed in a way that would assess the boys' preferences. When it was asked: What do you do when you are not in school? it was assumed that they were able to follow their own inclinations and, to some extent, this was a reasonable assumption. In Table XXVIII(a) we note that the Subjects lean toward group activities to a much greater extent than the Controls. They participated in clubs, church activities, sports which required group participation, orchestras and other social interests to a far greater extent than they engaged in solitary activities such as fishing, running, cycling, modelling, musical instruments and reading. It was the Controls who preferred these hobbies, Table XXVIII(b) And of the boys in this category, more than twice as many Controls as Subjects (18, 8) listed reading. If we were concerned here with aspects of normality, it would be tempting to postulate that the more social group (who had a greater dependency upon their associates for enjoyment and co-operation in group activities) constituted the more gregarious and normal person, that their ability to complete and co-operate more fully with their
Table XXVIII (a)

Group activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 8.69 \quad \text{Significant p.c. } .01 \]

Table XXVIII (b)

Solitary activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solitary</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 10.25 \quad \text{Significant p.c. } .005 \]

Table XXVIII (c)

Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table XXVIII (d)
The arts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table XXVIII (f)
Sports and Games.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports &amp; Games</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table XXVIII (g)
Are you good at sports?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXVIII (h)

Do you find hobbies more interesting than school or home work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 14.694$

Highly significant p.c. .005

Table XXVIII (i)

Do hobbies interfere with school work or home work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 11.189$

Highly significant p.c. .005
Table XXVIII (j)

Imaginative Hobbies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imaginative Hobbies</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXVIII (k)

Are there a lot of stupid boys who hold up the work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 4.26 \] Significant p.c. .05

Table XXVIII (l)

Intellectual Activities (other than Arts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intellectual</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 4.01 \] Significant p.c. .05
contemporaries was a necessary preparation for communal life. Yet it is generally recognized that group life has its limitations; it requires a certain conformity, a certain surrender of individual initiative which may limit the more productive individual in his ability to express himself. Thus it might have been expected that the Controls did, in fact, list more activities which came under the heading of the arts than the Subjects. Table XXVIII(d) Here we included music, poetry, painting, modelling. And from this it would almost follow that the Controls engaged in a greater number of intellectual activities other than the arts, Table XXVIII(l). In this connection, intellectual was defined in its broadest sense - activities which required considerable mental effort as opposed to physical (reading, chess, printing, etc.)

When it came to the more physical activities, the Subjects (whom we have noted preferred group activities) naturally showed interest in sports. But an almost equal number of Controls listed such activities as cricket, football, Rugby, games, boxing, etc. Table XXVIII(f). Twice as many Subjects as Controls stated they were good at sports, Table XXVIII(g). It was noted that the Subjects were consistent in their choices, as in the preferences for non-intellectual careers they showed a penchant for hobbies and other spare time activities which do not require considerable expenditure of mental effort. This trend is further underlined by their
answers to the question: **Do you find your hobbies more interesting than your school or home work?** More than three times as many Subjects as Controls (18, 5) stated that they did. Table XXVIII(h) When asked: **Do your hobbies interfere with your school and home work?** nine times as many Subjects as Controls replied "Yes" Table XXVIII(i). These differences (which are statistically highly significant) leave us with the questions: Do the Subjects fail at school because they are more absorbed in extra-curricular activities? (which require less intellectual energy than school subjects), or do they seek refuge from school in outside activities because they get so little satisfaction from school? Would this imply that the teachers do not make school subjects interesting and exciting, or should we take the Subjects at their word - that they are lazy, lacking in ambition, etc., because of reasons within themselves? Or is it, as we have suggested, a more basic lack of imagination? In this connection, assessment was made of the various activities which might be classified as imaginative - modelling (planes, railway, boats, etc), chess, musical instruments (piano, violin, clarinet), construction, etc. Twice as many Controls as Subjects named interests which fell into this category, Table XXVIII(j). It was unfortunate that the questionnaire did not allow for more questions aimed to assess this particular function. Yet it is evident that the two trends
are consistent ones: the Controls, who are highly success­ful at school, prefer a climate (during their spare time) in which they can develop intellectual functions - solitude for reading, the arts, and other creative pursuits. The Subjects, who clearly show that they wish to avoid tasks which require considerable intellectual activity, choose social groups and largely non-intellectual, solitary pursuits.

5. Factors Contributing to Failure.

A final, direct assessment of various aspects which might have contributed to failure, was not fruitful. Categorically, Subjects pleaded that it was not a matter of the teachers not giving them sufficient time, nor administra­tive problems such as the size of the class. Yet the Controls expressed dissatisfaction with factors in the classroom. Twice as many of them as of the Subjects felt that the presence of stupid boys in the classroom had handicapped them. (Table XXVIII(k)).


The Subjects have stood up to the comparative assessments of their answers remarkably well. In answers to questions regarding school procedures (homework, punish­ment); teachers, parents and attitudes more confined to themselves personally, the majority of them have shown that
the discipline required of them in pursuing school subjects and other intellectual goals, went against their own inclinations. Equally they have either stated or indicated otherwise, that they do not blame forces outside themselves for this. And if this type of comparative assessment of attitudes has validity, we must take them (as we do the Controls) at their word. To dilute their statements by assuming that beneath these responses one is liable to find gross ambivalences or even opposite attitudes, would only lead us to hypotheses which cannot be proven in a study of this type. Further, it would show a subjective need on the part of the investigator to fit them into well-known categories which have resulted from other researches regarding the adolescent, e.g. that no adult should expect the adolescent to be honest in discussing matters pertaining to their feelings and other attitudes; that adolescents are so fraught with contradictions that even they do not know what their real attitudes and feelings are, and so on. The best we can do to allow for these arguments is to frame questions in a way that would enable us to detect such observations. A comparison of answers to the various questions does not lead us to assume that the subtleties in the adolescent's character have distorted the answers in a manner that would render them especially unreliable.
6. **PSYCHOANALYTIC SECTION.**

A. **Introduction.**

In the foregoing sections of this paper, we have noted that the significant differences between the attitudes of Subjects and Controls related to intellectual goals and methods of achieving them. For example, the majority of the Subjects stated that their failure at school was due to laziness, lack of ambition in intellectual accomplishments, and that their parents' intellectual goals and standards of work by far exceeded their own. A certain antagonism toward mental effort has been noted in their performance at school and in the choice of hobbies and careers. The majority of the Controls showed the opposite trend. The reasons for these differences have not been accounted for by the Subjects who, nevertheless, give the impression that they thought it was within their power to remedy these shortcomings - if they "worked harder," had fewer or less stimulating outside activities, and so on. While none of them mentioned changes associated with the phase of development which they were living through, we know that the adolescent years make strong and exacting demands upon both physical and mental energies. Many teachers have come to view philosophically sudden drops in performance, and at best they expect that some fluctuations will occur, without lasting effects upon scholarship. From
this point of view, one might suggest that the Controls, who showed far less disturbance in performance, were more unusual than the Subjects. But it would seem that the crucial fact here is not failure at school, but a sum total of attitudes that accompanied it. Sometimes the bases of these attitudes are fundamental to the character of the child. This would suggest that fundamental approaches of correction are required. Short therapies, such as those available at Child Guidance Clinics, have been useful in dealing with learning disturbances which are primarily developmental in nature. The child is given support through the difficult phase and brought safely into the next. In other cases, longer periods of re-education are indicated. But there are those children, and they are a minority group, with whom nothing less than intensive therapy is effective. One of the most effective of these is psychoanalysis. During the past forty years, this technique has not only proven itself to be valuable in the treatment of sick children, but the researches in this field have confirmed theoretical principles which have been useful to educators in their work with normal children.

In no single phase of the child's life has it become more helpful than that of the first five years. These have been shown to be fundamental to the future
character of the individual. The path from infantile
dependency, which the child attempts to deny through
fantasies of omnipotence, through the various levels of
the pleasure principle toward a firmer rooting in reality
has been greatly illuminated by psychoanalysts. There
are those who claim that:

"Learning is a libidinal phenomenon, erotically
coloured and subject to the laws which govern dynamic
personality development." (82)

Others argue:

"Learning is not primarily a matter of the
Oedipus Complex. School adaptation is not a resultant of
libido, save in the generic sense that all energy is
libido. Mental deficiency, myopic handicap, a broken
home, inebriety, the lure of the movies, a dull teacher,
corporal punishment, malnutrition, or inadequate sleep,
is of more importance to education than libidinal
fixations." (83)

Fenichel has placed such factors as these and
those of psychological origin in perspective:

"In considering any educational influence, it
is necessary to distinguish three factors:

(1) that which is being influenced, i.e. the
mental structure of the child;

(2) the influencing stimuli, which converge
upon this structure;

(3) the influencing process, i.e. the alterations
that occur in the child's mind in response to these
stimuli.

The first of these factors is, in the final analysis,
determined by human biology, the second by the cultural
environment in which the child is reared. Hence it is
appropriate to assume that the first factor is a subject
for study by biologists, the second for sociologists,
whereas the third would be in the realm of psychoanalytic
research. In a science of education, all three disciplines
would have to be employed." (84)
Fenichel realises that this division is schematic, and he goes to some length to demonstrate the overlapping of the various factors. Here, we are primarily concerned with the three basic means of education which he identifies: "direct threat, mobilisation of the fear of losing love, and the promise of special rewards."

Freud has shown that the child's first concepts of reality are formed in connection with states of need and satisfaction. It is through the alteration of these states that the child becomes aware that objects can either give or withhold satisfaction, and that, in relation to himself, they are therefore omnipotent. The child's self-esteem is dependent upon the flow of external supplies. Without them, he ceases to exist. Freud showed that it was this emotional dependence upon objects for maintenance and self-esteem that became the basis of all education. To maintain this state of well-being, the child was willing to make an increasing number of sacrifices to the object. For example, fear of losing the mother's love and protection, fears connected with displeasing her - with all the real and fantasied punishments and threats - prompted the child to give up many of his instinctual pleasures or to modify them or to change their goals. The child's identification with the parents' goals, and other activities, not only spared him loss of love, but gave him a share in this fantasied
omnipotence. Thus, the striving to be like his parents enabled the child more or less to accept their prohibitions as well as their positive ideals. As Anna Freud has stated:

"...since identification is one of the factors in the development of the super-ego, it contributes to the mastery of instincts. ...there are occasions when it combines with other mechanisms to form one of the ego's most potent weapons in its dealings with external objects which arouse its anxiety." (85)

The steps from the internalized parental prohibitions to the establishment of the super-ego is a complicated one. At no point does the young super-ego exert itself more forcibly than it does in the Oedipal dilemma, where the child strives to express his instinctual sexual and aggressive impulses in the relationship with his parents. It is the super-ego which demands, in the case of the little boy for example, that he should inhibit his longings to possess his mother, his desires to replace the father in her affection. And it is the super-ego which points the way out of these conflicts by allowing him to forego these unrealistic ambitions and instead to take on to himself many of the father's traits - to wish to be essentially like him in the masculine qualities which attract the mother. Thus the implied threat of loss of love of both parents paves the way to his relationship to objects other than the incestuous ones.

In the present discussion, we are primarily concerned with the delicate interplay between threats of
punishment and reward, which are so effectively and subtly balanced in the education of the child. Fenichel sums up the situation:

"Life governed by the impulse of the moment is gradually (although never completely) transformed into life governed by the reality principle, a situation wherein reality and the probable consequence of intended actions is subjected to judgment. Pleasure is renounced in order to avoid subsequent pain, or to attain subsequent, more intense pleasure. As the ego of the child gains in strength, it learns to bear tensions by postponing the reaction, and to interpolate between stimulus and reaction a kind of 'trial action' in fantasy, which affords insight into the prospective consequences. Education certainly can and should help in this development. It is not necessary for every child to burn himself; education can anticipate the pain of burning through warning or threatening...We do not know how a child would behave without any education. We do not know to what extent the natural encounters with reality would suffice in the development of reasonableness. But we do know that in actual practice more is demanded of every child than pure reasonableness, that educational procedure everywhere is not merely help in the development of the 'reality principle', but frankly of an emphasized and exaggerated reality principle. How the parents react to instinctual acts becomes the child's main encounter with reality, and serves as the motivating force for the child to change instinctual behaviour." (86)

The nursery school teacher has ample opportunities to observe the child's early reactions to this process of instinctual control. From the child's behaviour in his relationship to her and to other children, she is able to make a fair guess regarding the parents' attitudes toward instinctual manifestations. At 15, it is more difficult. The parents' methods of dealing with instinctual behaviour is more far-fetched; it may be hidden or transformed under a welter of complicated defences. What the grammar school teacher finds is a more subtle reaction to the various demands
made upon his pupil. He can be less sure of the "causes" of them. It is not his function to lead the child back to these early years and to see the various influences in perspective. Here, the therapist has a unique position. Through the patient's memories, fantasies, dreams as well as his relationship to her and reaction to current experiences, she is able to reconstruct, to some extent, the various influences which may account for his attitudes and behaviour. This way of looking backward as well as at the present may also provide insights which may become useful to the child who is handicapped in learning because of emotional disturbances. It is with this in mind that the following reports are included. They are based on the daily psychoanalysis of two adolescent boys who were failing at school, in spite of high intelligence (I.Q's 146, 150).

B. Learning disturbances in a borderline psychotic boy.

Jerry. The first case is that of Jerry, who was 10 when he was referred to the Clinic because of tantrums - quite dangerous tantrums, including kicking and hitting his mother, throwing books at members of his family, bashing doors and screaming murder late at night. When he talked to you, his mind was taken up with gales blowing the house down, tall trees overwhelming him and their roots undermining the house; and fungi growing on dead trees. These seemed to be the most striking symptoms and to contain the root of the trouble. Apart from his being abnormally concerned about these matters, the thing that struck one was that they were very complicated things to have thought about. This all spoke of very deep reflection. This kind of pre-occupation which was the result of very intensive reasoning, seemed to match his ability to build electric circuits and draw elaborate pictures of plants. The fact that his school
work was bad seemed to be the result of the fact that his tasks there took second place to all his other preoccupations. His other symptoms, fears of all sorts, clinging to his mother and refusing to be separated from her after school hours, not getting on with other children, excessive food fads (which resulted in systematic starvation of himself), talking to himself, seemed to be subsidiary with regard to the key symptoms.

The referring hospital had mentioned his unusual ability at drawing and his high intelligence (I.Q. 150). The doctor at the other Clinic had commented:

'I am sure he does require very thorough going, patient, careful work, and it is almost as if one were being given the chance of treating Van Gogh in childhood, for he seems to be completely at the mercy of what is going on inside him.'

Jerry comes from a lower middle class background. His father, who has progressed from precarious artistic work to a solid position in the film industry, had not gone beyond the required schooling. In his view 'if a child had it in himself he would succeed, if he didn't, further schooling was a waste of time.' And he had already concluded that Jerry did not have it in him. The father had spent a lot of time abroad and this gave him relief from a highly unsatisfactory home life - a depressive wife and children who sided with her against him. Yet the family was unusually closely knit, especially in keeping its secrets. Neither Jerry nor his parents disclosed such distressing facts as the parents' virtual separation from each other. Near the end of the therapy, the child eventually admitted that his father had frequently beaten his mother; while the father, a handsome man of over 6 ft. and younger than the mother, himself admitted recurring episodes of unfaithfulness and revealed that he was bound to the mother only by her claim that she depended upon him for protection against the son's violence. It was not possible, in the absence of intimate family facts, to assess the extent of parental and other family influences. The therapist herself observed paranoid trends in the man; and the mother's depressive tendencies led her on the one hand to dismiss Jerry as physically weak, incompetent, clinging and unnecessary, and on the other to build up his few positive qualities into merits which far exceeded those of the father. Thus at times Jerry was used as a tool with which to separate mother and father, chiefly by the process of hammering on him as though he were a wedge. At
other times he was used to cement their tortuous relationship. There are two daughters; one eight years older, the other 3. In the case of all the children, the mother's goals were very high. She prided herself on superior background having come from a professional family. She visualied all of her children in Oxford or Cambridge, and blamed the father's lack of interest and poor pay for their failure to reach these goals.

1. Early identification.

Jerry's major disturbances were said to have begun when he was placed in nursery school, at the age of 3. The family doctor had advised this because of his uncontrollable tempers and the mother's inability to cope with them. In school he went on a hunger strike and refused to eat until his mother took him away; this coincided with the return of the father from service in the Air Force abroad. At Junior school, he failed to learn, sat daydreaming and gave the impression of being dull. In primary school these symptoms persisted and in addition to these his cringing, almost sluttish behaviour, provoked his schoolmates to attack him, thus acting out what was later found to be fantasies of his mother having been attacked by his father, at whose mercy she was held. This Oedipal sounding acting was misleading. It was later observed that Jerry never entered the Oedipal phase of development, and that his reaction to his father was one of pure fright. This fear of his father implied an identification, almost totally, with his mother who did, in fact, consider sexual intercourse an unpleasant aspect of her marriage and some years later actually discontinued this function.

This identification with his mother offered diagnosis clues. When it was observed that he identified with parts of her (usually the frightening or anxiety-provoking parts), coupled with other symptoms such as the use of words as objects and things, certain paranoid defences, inability to form object relationships other than primary ones, and the severity of his depressions, he was easily placed in the category of borderline-psychotic. The fact that Jerry had given full expression to all of these traits, e.g. he had no friends, was unable to use his good intelligence except in the service of his instinctual life, he was unable to control himself and actually believe that his parents were trying to murder him, following his attacks with knives upon their bodies, all meant that the treatment goals must be modest. A further, negative aspect of the treatment situation was the
mother's precarious health and the exceedingly poor marital relationship. Thus the treatment aims were to assist him in sublimating some of his impulses, sexual and aggressive, and to be able to cultivate objective interests (now in school) and friendships with children his own age. This implied loosening the tie with the mother. Ideally, the mother would have been influenced to accept therapy in her own right. But her illness had advanced far beyond her awareness of the consequences of her prophecy for either herself or Jerry. Thus we settled on a makeshift arrangement, whereby contacts were maintained whenever she agreed. Toward the end of the 6 years' therapy, when Jerry improved and showed signs of movements away from his mother, she became hostile to the therapy, discontinued contacts, and finally withdrew him from it.

2. Why did this patient fail to learn at school?

Already we have mentioned several factors:

(a) Failure to identify with his father, or with the healthy parts of his mother which, in our culture, represent the road to sublimation. This trait was brought immediately into the treatment situation, where he consistently denied there was anything the matter with him and thus failed to identify with the therapist. Instead he maintained a mood of circus-like hilarity, teasing, joking, entertaining. He further warded off analytic 'teaching' by monopolising the treatment hour in a never-ending flow of talk about his own fantasies. These involved botany, astronomy, zoology. For example:

He connected the gales with noises of trees bent by the gales and told me he sawed off a branch of a tree so that it would not make such a noise during the gale. Or, about deadly fungi that lived on wood: 'Fungi live only three days and then they die. They just shoot up and die.' He went into great details about the length of roots in comparison with the tree: 'there are trees which have as much underneath the ground as above it, so that if there is a gale their roots cannot come out, but the tree could be broken off just above the ground,' etc. Here it was evident that his knowledge of plants had become sexualised. His concern about gales (which symbolized sexual intercourse between his parents), his fears regarding castration (the limbs of trees which were cut off), were in the foreground. And although he read extensively from scientific books, the facts he used were mostly in the service of supporting his infantile fantasies. Initially he was immune to different views of his 'facts'. He could take nothing from his therapist.
He became the teacher and controlled the channels into which he would accept objective facts. At school, this same tendency was shown by withdrawal from the influence of his teachers. His fantasies, which were far more interesting and exciting to him than his school work, drowned out the total learning situation. What appeared to be 'dullness' or 'laziness' was an abdication into a more exciting world which had more meaning to him than anything the teacher or his classmates talked about. He could no more identify with his teachers than he could with his therapist. He could not be taught and he remained at the bottom of his form for several years, and blamed his teachers for his failure at school. They had given him a poor foundation; had not, e.g., taught him to spell and this crippled him in all his subjects. His mother was at fault because she sent him to the wrong schools or had started him too early; his therapist had failed to correct these early influences.

(b) The second observation pertains to the oral aspect of the learning situation. Jerry had become the feeding mother. And he fed me bad food. Not the analytic food of facts about his daily activities, memories of his childhood, or dreams, all of which he understood were necessary to help him to overcome his difficulties, but massive quantities of a highly selected diet of fantasies. Later, he equated this with 'poisoned' food his mother had given him. And this, in fact, had a reality basis since she had neglected cooking and cleaning during her depressive moods. Thus his oral impulses had not undergone transformation into curiosity about the world about him, a thirst for knowledge, but a need to defend himself against wishes to incorporate the mother by turning his former passive position into an active one. When confronted with the learning situation at school, where he was required to sit passively while he was taught, he could only regress to infantile positions where he withdrew into a state of omnipotence where he became both the feeding mother and the fed child. Thus, instruction was unnecessary, was ignored. This position was rationalised by Jerry by pointing out the defects in the teaching. According to him, his teachers were stupid, they were comical, he drew pictures depicting them in ridiculous positions; they were cruel, he collected details about the beatings and other punishments which they administered. They made mistakes and he offered abundant examples of the bad food which they served, e.g. his science teacher had said 'In a normal, neutral uncharged atom there exists numerical equality between electrons and protons. When electrons are in excess the atom is positively charged. When
the protons are in excess it is negatively charged.' Jerry roared with laughter: 'he had it the wrong way round.'

This focussing on mistakes had many associations: he considered his birth a mistake, and this was supported by his mother's saying that she had not wanted an addition to the family at the time he was conceived. It was a mistake. Jerry further concluded that it was a mistake that he was a boy, since his mother obviously preferred girls. Much of his analytical material supported this view: the man was at the mercy of the woman. There was his fantasy story of the female genital: 'the walls of the vagina are jagged and have sharp edges that cut the penis.' Thus the vagina had teeth. In his drawings it was observed that the vagina of the woman was similar to that of the 'cat's vagina' which he had shown me in one of his animal books. Now we were able to understand some of Jerry's most disturbing symptoms; that of brushing his teeth a dozen times daily with different brands of paste, with the excuse that bits of food would get in between them and that the 'germs would collect overnight' and decay his teeth within a matter of hours; his inability to eat meat. And here we are able to observe some of his problems of identification: to identify with his father, Jerry ran the risk of having his genital bitten off. To identify with his mother (and here we find him identifying primary with the frightening parts of the object) he must be prepared to defend himself against the attack by
the penis, i.e. to be able to bite it off. He could only be safe from the dreaded paternal organ by keeping his teeth in good shape. But the identification with the mother, a mechanism which aimed to free him from the anxiety of being a male, broke through and Jerry had to defend himself through another mechanism: that of restricting the ego — he could eat no meat. This, too, failed and Jerry had to resort to denial in fantasy — his penis did not exist, he removed all cathexis from it so that all his erotic fantasies arose at the oral and anal levels. From this, it may be seen that the psychological structure of Jerry is a very primitive one, since the phallic element is altogether absent, and the vagina is identified almost completely with oral manifestations. In a stupid child this would lead to a view of the world so obviously psychotic that he would long ago have been confined to a mental hospital. But Jerry was not stupid. He had been able to construct a fantasy world (partially based on infantile observations) that was large and complex enough to bear comparison with reality perception of the average individual, and he was therefore always in a position to produce facts which at first glance justified his wildest fantasies. The father's coming late into the family may partially account for this preoccupation with his parent's sexual activities — sexual observations were perhaps made at a much later age than is usual and these might have acted as a trauma. Often in young children, the onrush of
Oedipal material dates to the sudden appearance of the father. However, it is evident in these accounts that by exaggerating the apparent positive transference with the analyst, Jerry was attempting to delude her into receiving his own prefabricated phallic interpretations of his predominantly oral and anal fantasy life as though they were her own interpretations. At home, he managed to canalize his fantasy into apparently innocent activities in the garden and the wireless room while at school, this child, whom I must emphasize is most certainly brilliant, was able to pass for a harmless mental defective.

Why had he regressed from the early phallic phase to these earlier positions? The social situation offers a clue: shortly after his father's return from the Service, Jerry caught hold of a soldering iron and was badly burned. It seems that this experience proved traumatic. All phallic symbols became suspect. From then on he did not masturbate, as children his age normally did. He did not touch his penis. It was too hot. This event, combined with earlier separation trauma, identification with the more unhealthy parts of his parents and constitutional factors, all contributed to his bisexuality, which is said to be fundamental to pre-psychotic states. This factor is best illustrated in one of his fantasies about frogs. These fantasies came into his treatment sessions initially through
motility. He spent most of the hour lying on the floor, holding his legs close together and making wiggly movements of his body. He finally revealed that he was acting like a tadpole. But he offered no additional clues. When I approached him through a poem about a tadpole he responded. The poem went:

Little Tommy Tadpole
He lived within a pool
He didn't have to wash his face
He didn't go to school.
His life was all a holiday
No wonder he was gay
As he wagged his little tad tail
Throughout the live long day.
Little Tommy Tadpole
Began to weep and wail
For little Tommy Tadpole
Began to lose his tail.
And his mother didn't know him
As he sat upon a log
For he wasn't Tommy Tadpole
But Mr. Thomas Frog.

Jerry bounded to his feet laughing, but soon he was challenging the facts in this rhyme with all of his scientific resourcefulness. He declared it was not true that tadpoles lost their tails. He knew all about frogs and tadpoles, he had read books on the subject, and he made a series of scientific drawings to show me the various stages in the development of a frog. In the last stage, he had left the tail on. When I inquired about a later stage, where there was not a tail, he challenged this point. He was certain that some frogs did keep their tails, but he could not give evidence for this. When I offered to do some
researches on this point Jerry was enthusiastic and entered more fully than ever before into the treatment situation. He became even more positive when I reported a few days later that he was quite right. I had learned that during the early stages of the frog's development (say up to 3 months) it may still have a stumpy tail, but it gradually disappeared as the frog matured. By the time it was a mature frog, the tail was lost completely. However two rare (and almost extinct) species had been found who kept their tails permanently. I gave him the scientific names of these species; Liopelma in New Zealand, and Ascaplus in British Columbia. He was very pleased and only then did he become receptive to my explanations. He later revealed that he had read these facts in his encyclopaedia. In discussing this with Jerry, it became evident that this was no isolated fluke of knowledge. He knew perfectly well that most frogs did lose their tails. Unconsciously, he was trying to assure himself that he would lose his penis in exactly the same way as these very obscure frogs did not lose their tails. In other words, he was not comparing himself with these rare frogs, as being possessed of an extraordinary organ, but merely in being extraordinary. If some frogs could keep their tails, then some little boys could lose their penis. He was showing himself to be as extraordinary and obscure as a frog with a tail - he was a boy without a penis. This discovery
indicated that we were not dealing with phallic manifestations. It was not the penis (which he wanted to get rid of) that was highly cathected with him: it was the mouth and the anus, as shown in earlier fantasies.

The details of these fantasies have been given for several reasons:

1) To show the problems which he encountered as a small boy in identifying with either of his parents: sexual identification with his mother spelt aggressive, female sexuality (on the oral level), he would have to bite off the male organ. Thus he inhibited biting and could eat no meat. Further, oral manifestations of all kinds were especially cathected: the flow of words from his teachers, for example, placed him in a passive and dangerous position, from which he had to withdraw. By projecting his own oral aggression upon his schoolmates, he experienced them as hostile and carnivorous. He must avoid them.

2) Identification with the masculinity in his father (which spelt strength, maturity, learning, success) had to be guarded against, since these qualities were associated with the male organ, which was in danger of being bitten off.

3) Thus he sought a compromise identification, that of regression to an infantile omnipotent state, where he was able to circumvent the problems of sexuality. There
he could be all powerful, and by magic assume a multiplicity of roles at the same time: he could be a boy without a penis, he could be his mother (so long as he kept his teeth in good working order), he could avoid identification with the parts of the father which he considered in danger. What he could identify with was the attacking, cruel father (for, as we have noted, his father was physically cruel to his mother). In this role he could match his mother's oral aggressive traits and subdue her, as shown in the physical attacks which overlay these fantasies.

(4) The implications for learning are evident; what teacher could hope to cope with such a rare creature? What teacher could spare the time to reach him through the labyrinth of his fantasies and to meet him on this level of using objective facts to support an infantile fantasy system? Besides, these teachers had already become identified with the orally aggressive mother, who talked, 'nagged', and threatened him in the very act of moving the moth. In addition to these associations, there was the fight against passivity which the school situation did not help. Thus, it was not surprising that eventually he left school, (He saw no reason to attend school, since he wanted to be a gardener), retired to his home where he clung even more tenaciously to his mother. While the mother's relapse into depression initiated the school phobia,
these underlying factors weighed even more heavily in its development.

Here we find that neither the 'laziness' nor failure to identify with the parents, nor lack of ambition were simple phenomena, but a complexity of structures (some of them rooted in the patient's environment, many of them internal), which accounted for Jerry's bizarre reactions to any learning situation. The teacher who slipped and fell or made an explosion in the science laboratory was an object of ridicule. The treatment room became a stage upon which he re-enacted their pranks. He placed his therapist in the passive position of onlooker in which he felt himself to be in the classroom. It was evident that he exaggerated the teacher's activity in order to rationalize his own hostility at watching a performance passively. Also, as Freud has pointed out:

"Caricature...bring about degredation by emphasizing in the general impression given by the exalted object a single trait which is comic in itself but was bound to be overlooked so long as it was only perceivable in the general picture. By isolating this, a comic effect can be attained which extends in our memory over the whole object." (87)

How could he learn from such inferior people?

3. The uses of intelligence.

This leaves us with the question: how did this boy of superior intelligence use his abilities? One answer
to this question is evident in the frog, cat and gale fantasies. There was no lacking of curiosity, or industry. Jerry kept busy with his books of knowledge, his botanical researches. He drew freely upon his animal and fish worlds to describe the various infantile theories which he persistently adhered to. For example, he had a large number of fish, tadpoles, birds, beetles, slugs, which he used for his "experiments". For some months the focus of these activities was destruction (usually orally): "I make my stickleback eat up my Razor Bill." This twisting of reality (since it is the Razor Bill which can eat the Stickleback) was used to show Jerry how he distorted facts whenever they corresponded with his frightening fantasies. On such occasions he attempted to deal with anxiety by denying facts.

It has been hinted throughout this discussion that words were highly cathexed with Jerry. A seemingly innocent remark might consolidate a system of fantasy associations. For example, his jokingly naming the therapist (whose name was then Wills), "Willsey Gillsey" was traced to facts about amphibians who start life in water and finish on land. Jerry pointed out that 'they breathe by gills in the larval (tadpole) state; by lungs in the adult state.' Thus I became an inferior creature - a tadpole with a tail, while he had now become a frog without a tail, thus changing his earlier identification with the frogs who
were fantasied to have kept their tails. Such manipulations as these could rationalise his failure to co-operate and to identify with the analyst who, like his teachers, was not so advanced in development as himself. But there is a further clue to his learning disturbances: Jerry felt 'he could reverse an actual situation by verbal play. This symptom alone would put him in the borderline category. For, as Freud pointed out, psychotics treat words as things and they are subjected to the primary process ( ). Examples of this behaviour as shown in the accounts of both the stickleback and the frog. In both of these instances the facts were twisted to fortify his own preconceived ideas. Thus objective facts (such as those taught in the classroom) which might run counter to his rigid systems, were ignored or dismissed. And since one could not anticipate when such facts might appear, it was far better to hang out a deaf ear to them all.

4. Reasons for Failure.

The reasons for failure at school are evident in this discussion: no objective facts could match those of his fantasy systems; no teacher could be so knowledgeable as to cope with the storehouse of facts Jerry had accumulated from his researches in particular fields of knowledge; no teacher could avoid making mistakes or avoid weaving some objective scrap of information into a highly charged area;
no teacher could hope to escape from the hostile and
dangerous projections (carried over from the various
fantasied and real identifications with parts of his
infantile objects). Jerry returned to school and started
to learn only when these fantastic images had been dealt
with by working systematically through the various phases
of development in which he had become fixated. But his
state was a precarious one, highly sensitized to the winds
of family activities; his mother's periodic depressions,
father's frequent absences, and finally separation from the
family; the comings and goings of an elder sister, whom he
resented; and similarly to any social situation in which
he found himself in a passive position. Boarding school,
where he later functioned well, became a dangerous place
when his schoolmates used "bad" words or talked of Lady
Chatterley's Lover. He could not resist the temptation to
play the passive role to boys who needed to bully him; he
could not help but torture girls, always with the fantasy
of the father who inflicted cruelty on the mother. While
he was finally able to sublimate some of his instinctual
life, both in the classroom and outside, his greatest
achievements came during his free time in the use of hobbies,
such as photography, electricity, gardening, and these paved
the way for a future career. In this sense, he resembled
the picture given by the Controls - of mainly solitary
activity. Yet he had earlier resembled the Subjects in remain-
ing at the bottom of his form (except in science), showing
great resistance to homework and in limiting his aspirations
to a non-intellectual career. He finally identified with
his father's interests and goals when he later entered
technical school, where he excelled in scientific subjects
and looked forward to a career as an electrical engineer.

C. Learning disturbances in an obsessional-neurotic boy.

ANDREW.

1. Learning Symptoms. At the age of 12 years, 10
months, Andrew was referred to the Clinic because he wet his
bed and had uncontrollable tempers. On the Revised Stanford
Binet, Form L, he had an I.Q. of 146 (M*A. 15.9). During the
test he made comments which proved to be significant in his
therapy.

(i) He told the psychologist that his father, a building
superintendent, who had accompanied him to the Clinic, could
"slip away" from work on such occasions. That he (Andrew)
too "got away" by telling the boys he was going to hospital.

(ii) He defined both "shrewd" and "repose" as "keeps things
to himself." "Laziness" was defined as "can't do a thing."
Andrew was near the bottom of his form, although he
had passed the Common Entrance Examination, and had made a
"good start" in Grammar School. Both he and his parents agreed
that the reason for his failure at school was laziness and this had also applied to the wetting. His mother had linked the two symptoms in her talks with Andrew: 'If you didn't wet, you would be brilliant.'

His mother, of course, was unaware that in using these words she had pinpointed the essence of Andrew's problem, i.e. that his school failure was but a repetition of his failure to learn from her the basic principles of hygiene and control.

Andrew's references to his father's shirking of responsibility proved significant at a later stage, when it was realised that it was this facet of his father's behaviour with which he identified himself.

His definition of two words as difference as "shrewd" and "repose" gave us an inkling of his obsession with keeping things to himself, which also turned out to be one of his major learning difficulties.

(a) Laziness. Andrew's "laziness" was brought immediately into the treatment situation. Following an ambitious and energetic "good start", he lapsed into long silences. He wanted me to ask him questions, "start me off." He longed for an easier and quicker method of treatment; to press a button, and "presto, my problems will be solved!" Or he would like to record what he had to say on a tape and send it to me. How he envied his dog, Ferdie, "I wouldn't mind having a dog's life - sleeping, eating, going for walks."
This expression came near examinations, when he had fantasies of escape from them.

Apart from the magical wishes inherent in these statements, it is evident that Andrew wished to avoid responsibility. His initial statement about the wetting was that his mother was responsible; overcrowding in living arrangements at home, too strict training, were the reasons. He had thought it a better idea to treat her. An article in a journal about the effects of surgery upon wetting stimulated a fantasy in which he would be spared laborious insights and re-education: "following the operation on my cock I got on famously, became dry immediately, passed all my school subjects, including Greek and Latin. When I got my report card (I came top in everything), I tried to fool my mother and father by indicating I had failed...came home looking glum and disappointed. When I showed them the card, they were surprised."

This need to avoid responsibility was also shown in his persistent latenesses for treatment. Always forces outside himself were responsible; the alarm did not go off, his father or mother had failed to call him, the bus was late, the therapist's watch was fast. At school it was the same: teachers either did not know much or were unable to present material in an interesting way, or they gave material that had not been assigned during the term, or did not allow enough time in exams. He had been placed in the wrong Course
had not been admitted to modern science because of the stiff competition - only the 5 top boys were given places), he could not borrow a study book because all the boys were using it; there was favouritism - the teacher's pets always got the best marks, and he fantasied that a girl patient before him got special favours from me. The admixture of fantasy and reality in the school situation limited its usefulness in pointing out to Andrew the part he played, but I could point out (a) his denial of responsibility for his problems in the therapy - through silences, latenesses and projection of the blame on to other people; (b) his readiness to believe that preference was given to another patient. These explanations brought from Andrew expressions of jealousy of his older sister, whom he believed to be better loved by his mother than himself. And he linked the mother's neglect of him with his problems - his sister had been dry at the age of 10 months. More directly, Andrew admitted he disliked taking responsibility because whenever he did, and anything went wrong, he was blamed for it. For example, when he was a patrol leader in the Cubs, he found that he was held responsible for the failures of his group, and that the boys responded only to brute force, and he disliked using it. Thus Andrew has told us that through laziness, he can avoid responsibility, and that responsibility had become linked with aggression. This formula gives us a clue to the major symptom - wetting; since it occurred during the
night, when he was asleep, one might say that he could not be held responsible for it; but even if he was held responsible for the wetting (his mother blamed him for being too lazy to go to the toilet), she could not blame him for the aggression, which he implies is inherent in the assumption of responsibility.

(b) The link between responsibility and aggression was found in Andrew's fantasies, which came much later in the therapy: these were mainly of Indians blowing up a dam to let the water come out to cut off a train. He figured that instead of this crude tactic of flooding the valley and killing things, they could use dynamite on the roof of the tunnel. The train engineer would be unable to stop before rushing in the tunnel. Several of the Indians could creep along the side of the tunnel, through the narrow passage, plant the dynamite and then escape. They could not be held responsible for the damage. The Indians had muzzled revolvers and they used cartridges made of "crude elements" in contrast to the white settlers who used gun powder. Here the emphasis was on avoiding detection and doing damage that would cut off a train, which symbolized his father's penis. In another fantasy he pictured a small Indian army, "half starved, full of malaria, discouraged as they were driven by the U.S. army of thousands. They could not find the Indians because they had dug trenches and were in hiding." Fantasy after fantasy poured in about unfortunate, inferior people who had to exploit
their wit and other resources to avoid detection and escape from the enemy. Andrew's identification with these weak people had to be explained in terms of his feelings of inferiority and subterfuges in the analytic situation, where he employed devices such as denial in fantasy, projection and intellectualisation to avoid facing up to his problems, and to avoid responsibility for them. He then rationalised this tendency by reminding me I had asked him to free associate. This meant he should tell me whatever he was thinking. And Andrew insisted that these were the essence of his thoughts. Much later, when this defence was explained to him, he brought memories of his father's return home from wartime service in another town, of his having to be moved from his mother's bed and of the resentment he felt. The four-year old boy was helpless and could only resort to fantasies to express the aggression he felt towards both his parents: how he could intercept their activities and not be detected. He could in fantasy blow up the dam, which represented his mother's genital, and cut off the train, which symbolized his father's penis. He could engage in these secret activities in a way that enabled him to avoid responsibility for them - thus the wetting (flooding of the dam) became a device which could express all these aggressive and sexual wishes, it could also embarrass his mother and show her to be inefficient. He could also keep her busy with him - she
had to wake him during the night and lead him to the toilet, change his sheets, limit the intake of liquids, and so on. The connection between the wetting and school failure emerged in one of Andrew's fantasies in which he gave his mother's reaction to a report of failure in all his examinations: "She blew up that night and said I should have done better in this or that subject. Then she called Dad and they were at it all night over my report." This fantasy of keeping his parents busy over his intellectual failures was shown to represent an infantile desire to diminish the parents' enjoyment together. Now Andrew could bring memories and facts from his daily life at home: his parents had quarrelled constantly — mostly over his father's drinking; they had not slept together for several years. Undoubtedly this actual separation of his parents increased his infantile sexual wishes, which were revived during the adolescent years. And Andrew was attempting to deal with his oedipal competitive wishes by out-wetting the father who drank. The same tendency was shown in his relation to me: instead of using insights, he kept charts of the wetting, made vows not to wet and eliminated the intake of liquids at certain times during the day. These negative aspects of his relationship with his parents could be demonstrated by linking them with his relationship with the therapist, whom he had to keep busy trying to interpret his silences, to get him to talk, to get him to come on time. All of these infantile ways of
coping with his conflicts were shown to be incongruous with his present situation: he was no longer a child, he could express his feelings in words, he had objects other than his parents with whom he could identify - teachers, group leaders, contemporaries. He was no longer limited by the immediate influence of his family life. The responsibility of his own choices, which was implied in these explanations, brought from Andrew even more fantastic reasons for clinging to infantile methods of solving his problems. He told of the fears that were associated with ambition.

(c) Ambition. The father considered school a luxury and nagged Andrew to leave or to justify his remaining there. The mother was ambitions for Andrew to enter University. While her own schooling was limited, she had a great fondness for poetry and used to read to her son. Andrew wanted to be a sea pilot. He showed little interest in his school work. For the most part he sat passively, unimpressed by his teachers, of whom he lived in daily fear of punishment. Whenever he could provoke other boys to break rules, he did this, and had "developed a system" to avoid getting caught. He seldom got around to his home work, preferred radio, jazz records and TV. At times he engaged in modelling planes and ships, which he later smashed. He spent much of his after school hours lying in bed daydreaming.
In his fantasies, he was either commander of armies, battleships, submarines or guided missiles. In one of these, the Germans had invaded England. Andrew was head of the resistance movement: "I used my submarine gun as a rifle. I hid in doorways. I could jump from roof top to roof top. I was an ace shark, I could pick them off with my gun." Here it was pointed out to him the contrast between his heroism in battle and the lack of responsibility he showed in mastering his school subjects. Further, it was explained that he had equated masculinity with quite extraordinary feats - far beyond the achievement of most men. Thus he could rationalise his shortcomings. As if to explain the anxieties which underly these defences Andrew brought a fantasy of his own inferiority. He and another chap were in an old English castle. They were surprised by a Dane who held them at bay with a long sword. Andrew attacked, but his weapon bounced off the shoulder of the Dane because it was only a little plastic knife - "it was green, it had not been moulded very well, the edges were rough." Thus, he was at the mercy of the Dane, who attacked and killed him. Here the fantasy, which aimed to give him feelings of grandeur, had failed, and we find a break-through to the original anxiety of impotence. It was necessary to show the unconscious equation of penis with brain, the use of which became threatening. The appropriateness of this interpretation was confirmed by a
factual report which Andrew brought. He had been ambitious to become a "Sir Lawrence Olivier in the school play," but his aspirations were "cut short" and shattered at the try-outs, when it was discovered that his voice was too feminine to qualify for a boy's part, and too masculine for a girl's part. Andrew had fainted when this decision had been given to him. Thus ambition, which had been highly exaggerated in his fantasies, spelt extermination, failure, or humiliation. And now Andrew led me into his own therapy for avoiding such failures:

(a) he could escape in fantasy where he could always win. He recalled the poem of Abu Ben Adhem. To Andrew, the moral of this poem was that by limiting ambition (restricting the ego, as he had done in school), he could achieve spectacular success. When it was pointed out to him that the goal of "loving one's fellow men" was not a simple one, he began to consider the ineffectiveness of this defence.

(b) he could annihilate himself. Now he brought the fantasy of dying at the age of 18 from bullet wounds. His therapist would attend the funeral with a wreath and make a speech about the great genius he had been "he was a young Einstein". His parents would weep sorrowfully about the injustices they had done to him. Here, the punishing aspect of his failures (he could produce guilt in his therapist and his parents), his fantasied omnipotence
(he could watch and enjoy happenings after his death), were evident. Explanations along these lines brought from the patient great concern about his father, who had to leave school at the age of 11 (having achieved a brilliant school record) because of illness. When he recovered several years later, he had to go to work. Thus his career had been "cut short" and he had to take menial, labourer's jobs. To surpass his father intellectually meant lack of sympathy. Further, it represented an ambition which might bring him into conflict with his father. Andrew himself was aware of this when he reported that he came "top in Maths", a subject in which his father had excelled. In other subjects, such as Latin, French, Greek, which his father had been 'denied the opportunity to learn', Andrew came "bottom". This fear of competing with his father was brought out more clearly in his inability to win social games which he played with his father. In chess, Andrew told of making "silly mistakes", or of having his "mind wander" during the game. Similarly, he allowed his father, who was much smaller than himself, to beat him in physical contests, such as wrestling. All of these methods of avoiding competition, which were so evident at school, had to be related to the treatment situation, where he could not allow himself to discuss any of the interpretations which were made by the therapist.
Passively, he accepted them without comment. When this was pointed out to him he stated: "You know all about Freud, if I say anything you will cancel it out, what me down." Thus to compete, to challenge, placed him in the feared position of being castrated.

It is evident in all the patient's remarks that his retreat into infantile methods of dealing with his conflicts enabled him to avoid responsibility for his actions, and to avoid castration, which he fantasied would result. And this brings us to the consideration of the patient's super-ego structure. The infant boy had been overly ambitious (we learn that he had been clean at a very early age, that he was precocious in other aspects as well), thus indicating that he had been eager to please the mother, who had very high standards for him. With the return of the father, a deterioration had been observed. It would appear that this was occasioned not only by Oedipal rivalry, envy and so on, but also by the mother's attitude toward the father. She had bullied him, and his weaknesses (which also included drinking-wetting) had provided rationalisation of her criticisms of him. But these were infantile experiences which were not unlike those of many small boys. They do not explain Andrew's fascination for these early events, nor his identification with the weaknesses of a father who was, in many respects, an adequate man. We know that many boys choose the
opposite path: they may rise above both parent's deficiencies, become adequate in precisely the areas in which their parents have shown deficiencies. Yet parental and other environmental influences during the formative years cannot be discounted.

No single event in the patient's history accounted for his character disturbances. However, there were a number of trauma which, taken together, might have contributed to his condition: there was the visit to Wales at the age of four years, when his mother nursed an aunt and her new baby. In fact there were two babies in the flat and Andrew had not been prepared for these events. His daily routine, which had been very strictly adhered to, was necessarily changed. His wetting began during this visit. The mother's fears of the dark, rats, burglars, and any other noise she may have heard or imagined in the farm house had been upsetting. She had always suffered from anxiety about accidents, and was preoccupied with stories about them. At her home in Wales she had lived near the sea, where there had been numerous disasters, several of them involving members of her own family. She did not allow her children to swim, ride bicycles, nor to engage in many ordinary activities which their friends enjoyed. Her favouritism towards the daughter was marked and Andrew did, in fact, have many reasons for resenting this. Following drinking periods, the father had been
violent in his handling of Andrew, and there were evidences that the mother deserted the father on several occasions. Conflicts between the parents had become chronic, and Andrew was well aware of the means of exploiting them.

As shown in the Grammar School boys' answers to questions relating to parents, it was the agreement between parents which proved to be the crucial factor. And in this respect Andrew was unfortunate: his mother had excessive goals for him (which he could realise only in fantasy), his father had less ambitious goals, and he had his father's example of resorting to magical means (through alcohol) for achieving ambition (the drunken father made Napoleonic speeches of grandeur after closing time at the public house). And these contrary methods were duly reflected in the treatment situation. The school medical officer promised Andrew a more efficient and quicker cure for his wetting through a magical pill. While the patient did not accept his method of therapy, he made elaborate use of it to threaten his analytic therapist and to show up her technique as inferior. The pleasure derived from this flirtation was evident and exceeded, (for some months), any satisfaction he might have derived from aligning himself with either technique. Thus he could avoid responsibility by feeling himself caught between two opposing forces; and the secondary gain which he derived obviously outweighed the pride and satisfaction he could
gain from success in becoming dry, or competent in his school performance. This form of "acting out" enabled me to isolate environmental influences from the particular reaction he made to them. When this fact was brought home to him by pointing out the separateness of his own fate from that of his parents, Andrew was able to think of his school performance in a different light. He summed up his insights in the following manner: "Of course, I can make you and my parents look silly and a failure by remaining at the bottom, but it also makes me look very silly and stupid at school." From this point he showed signs of genuinely wishing to fight for his own health and to diminish the infantile link with his parents. Minor successes were encouraging and a diminishing fantasy life (which resulted from interpretation of his omnipotent wishes, denial of weaknesses, persistence in magical thought, etc.) enabled him gradually to substitute industry for escape; to narrow the gap between fantasy and reality. But the path to reality was a difficult one; the boy who had achieved a special place through pseudo-stupidity had now to bear frustration until he could achieve a special place along other lines, and the analysis had to lend strong support through this period of transition. The periods of laziness were now seen to represent regression to earlier states of infantile omnipotence, in which he could be all-powerful in fantasy, which defended him from
the hard work and frustration of coming to terms with the relatively unexciting reality of home work, lessons, exams. During the final year of the therapy, the patient made use of the treatment situation to obtain gratification of the infantile regression - he could be a baby in the sessions, he could give vent to his abundant fantasy life, and this enabled him to cathect more fully with reality in his everyday experiences at school and at home. Andrew completed both his school years and his therapy successfully and entered the Naval career to which he aspired.

As we have indicated in the discussion of these two cases, the process of shifting the focus from blaming environmental influences for failure at school to that of personal responsibility is a tedious and painful one. In the case of Andrew, it was achieved after four years of daily analysis. In the case of Jerry, where the goals were necessarily more limited, considerable progress was observed. We are not in a position to say that the subjects fall into either category. We do, however, suggest that further exploration is needed, that the boys may not be so satisfied with their failures as they appear to be, and that the cavalier assumption of responsibility for failure at school may, in fact, cover many problems of which they may be unaware. Early diagnosis of such learning deficiencies may be useful in sorting out
children who are handicapped by unconscious conflicts from those whose specific interests may lead them to choose careers, hobbies and other interests which have not been traditionally associated with high intelligence.

2. **Summary.**

In the presentation of these cases, we have not attempted to discuss all of the factors relating to learning at school, e.g. both these patients have shown extraordinary concern about methods of beating and other forms of punishment; nor have we enlarged upon the devious means they used to provoke punishment; nor the various ways in which they depicted their teachers as cruel, inefficient, inferior and unfair. We have concentrated on the points in which there was marked disagreement between Subjects and Controls. These have been shown to involve such reasons for school failure as laziness, lack of ambition and differences between the boys' goals and those of their parents.

Laziness, which appears to be a cover-term which the boys have adopted from parents and teachers, has been seen to include a variety of active as well as passive qualities, e.g. in their fantasies, the patients engaged in strenuous, violent, adventurous activities; they took part in warfare or described the most vigorous activities of plants and
and animals or atmospheric conditions such as gales. These stood out in contrast to their passive, sometimes withdrawn observable behaviour at school. This has been accounted for by the patients in terms of many fears, e.g. fear of competition with their fellows - by whom they felt out-distanced. And this fear of competition in both instances has been shown to spring from acute jealousy of sisters by whom they felt out-distances by the fact of their mothers' preference. To compete meant a repetition of these family relationships, with all their infantile colouring and exaggerations. On another infantile level, competition placed the patients in dangerous positions with their teachers, who now represented the threatening father by whom they expected to be castrated if they became sexually potent. The equation of penis-brain (imagining themselves as always hopelessly inferior sexually) has been seen to result in fantasies of intellectual inferiority, which they freely acted upon in the classroom. While the fear of competing with the father is inherent in these fantasies, the wish to do so comes in parallel fantasies of grandeur, which have been described.

Thus it has also been shown that laziness, which carried associations with remoteness from school work, included feelings of superiority. For example, while the teachers adhered to certain established facts, our patients transcended these, wrote their own text books -
one was able to rearrange zoological data as he wished; young Einstein, too, wrote his own book. These feelings of superiority have been found to represent defensive measures against infantile helplessness and fears connected with inferiority. Further, the appearances of laziness in connection with homework and classroom performance, has been shown not to extend to solitary leisure time activities, where again ferocity and sometimes perpetual motion (digging in garden, wiring, smashing, kicking, throwing, modelling, etc.) were in evidence. Thus, both in body and in mind these patients have shown themselves to by far exceed the ordinary boy in activity of all sorts. And their inhibition of activity in the classroom represented a defensive restriction of body and mind to avoid fears of all kinds.

Similarly, lack of ambition. The patients were modest in their goals: one aspired to be a gardener, the other a sea pilot. Neither represented great expenditure of intellectual energy. But this restriction of ambition was as misleading as the picture they gave of being lazy. In fantasy, they became both intellectual and physical giants (an Einstein, or commander of armies); or they became quite extraordinary specimens of humanity; a boy without a penis, or a corpse who could still observe, punish and revenge. Thus they were omnipotent, and in this role not only exceeded the position of all their
classmates, but that of the teachers as well. No one could teach them. From this height, the Lilliputian teachers could be viewed as inferior, comical, ineffective. And who would wish to learn from such people as these?

Besides, the intellectual giant was better informed and was ever ready to catch the teacher out. The gap between these fantasied ambitions and the real ones was indeed wide. To a gardener, the successive route to the genius of Einstein (involving all the painstaking steps of classroom learning) would indeed be discouraging. It is no wonder that these patients felt that it was not worth their effort to attempt learning at school. The great distance between them and school work could also rationalize their laziness which, as we have seen, represented an excuse for indulging in activities of their own choice. As in the case of their teachers, fathers and mothers became pigmy people. Constantly under the critical scrutiny of the god they imagined themselves to be, these authorities were not worthy of emulation. Thus envy, jealousy, resentment could be rationalized in a manner that decreased the guilt they felt in their relation to parents, whom they also loved and respected. But all of this speaks for tremendous activity, layer upon layer of dynamic unconscious, defensive measures to subdue equally surging instinctive
impulses - impulses which could not be adequately contained on psychic levels and which spilled over into random motility and other forms of expression.

VI. Teachers' Forecasts

In recording the results of the questionnaire it was valuable to know what the ordinary experienced teacher would expect the answers to be, so that we could see where the results only confirmed common sense anticipations and where they were perhaps more challenging. With this aim in mind, a number of grammar school teachers were approached and asked to fill out the same questionnaire which had been given to Subjects and Controls. In order to maintain uniformity, the same number (23) seemed desirable.

Since the teachers were asked to give their forecasts of Subjects' responses, we have included only those answers which showed considerable differences between the attitudes of Subjects and teachers. However, the Controls' responses have also been noted for the purpose of observing areas of agreement as well as disagreement between teachers and Controls.
Table I.
Every boy with a good intelligence should succeed in his school work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II.
Why do boys fail?
(a) Home conditions (b) parents (c) teaching (d) internal reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III.
Are you good at school work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV.
Why do you think you are not at the top?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>At top or near</th>
<th>Not clever enough</th>
<th>Do not work, distractions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table V. (a)

How should ability be judged?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exams only</th>
<th>Exams plus other methods</th>
<th>Methods other than exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V (b).

How is ability judged by teachers in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exams only</th>
<th>Exams plus other methods</th>
<th>Methods other than exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V (f)

Do exam results adequately show the differences in boys?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XII. (b)

How Much homework is given at your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too little or just enough</th>
<th>Too much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XII (d)

Do you ever do extra homework?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XII (\(e\))

Do you ever copy answers from other children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XIX.

If you had a boy who would not work, would you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interview</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XX.

What do consider the least fair method?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane, flogging</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class detention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXVI (a)

Do you think teaching a good profession for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Clever people</th>
<th>Average people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXVI (b)

Do you like your teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes/most</th>
<th>some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXVI (t)

Do they like you?
Table XXVI (t)

Do your teachers like you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXVI (m)

Do you think teachers are like other people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>some/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXVII (c)

What do your parents do about bad exam. marks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructive</th>
<th>Simple Reproof</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXVII (d)

Are you appreciated or pushed by parents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciated</th>
<th>Pushed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXVII (e)

Has pushing from home caused you to do less well?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXVII (g)

When you grow up do you think you will be as clever as your parents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More clever</th>
<th>As clever or less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXVII (i)

Would your parents like you to go to University?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXVII (ii)

Parents' Intellectual Goals Compared with Those of Boys

What would you like to be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intellectual</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What would your father like you to be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intellectual</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What would your mother like you to be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intellectual</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. CONCLUSIONS

The Subjects' responses showed that, contrary to theoretical expectations, these adolescent boys showed few feelings of resentment against authority, and that they were almost unanimous in blaming factors within themselves, such as lack of intellectual ambition, or plain laziness, for their failure at school. The Controls, too, showed little sign of rebelliousness usually associated with adolescence, although the teachers had anticipated that this problem would be paramount. Questions regarding punishment were asked with the idea of determining to what extent the acceptance of blame was reflected in attitudes regarding punishment - punishment, that is, not for poor discipline but failure to learn. Explicitly, and quite unexpectedly, the majority in both groups appeared to be on the side of school administrators: discipline should assist children in learning; students should be punished for not learning; failing pupils should be dealt with in highly conventional ways - little talks with the teacher, conferences with parents, detention, caning, etc. While some contradictions came to light in the comparison of individual responses, one gained the impression of
of good rapport between teachers and pupils, a rapport which enabled the boys to take punishment more or less in their stride, to accept it as a constructive measure.

This good rapport was further indicated in answers to direct questions about teachers, in which the person of the teacher was separated from that of the more general "they" - the system. The majority of the boys in both groups had a high regard for their teachers, as well as for the profession. They considered their teachers conscientious, fond of their charges, happily adjusted in their own lives. While the vast majority in both groups stated that teachers were poorly paid, there was no indication here that this factor influenced either the quality of their performance or attitudes towards their pupils. This would suggest that the boys saw the teachers as truly dedicated people. It was clear from the answers to this group of questions that the Subjects did not blame their teachers for lack of success in school work. Yet, twice as many Controls as Subjects liked their teachers and felt themselves to be liked by them. However, when the Subjects's various answers to questions in this section were weighed, it seemed that a general dissatisfaction and malaise over their own school performance was more easily and immediately focussed on the figure of the teacher, not as a person or
as a professional worker, but merely as a symbol of the hated drudgery of school.

In general, the answers to questions regarding parents support the claims given by the Subjects that reasons for failure cannot be attributed to their parents. While the Subjects indicated a need for more direct assistance with homework, the Controls make it clear that they must be able to count on parents for encouragement - that indifference is damaging.

The important differences between the attitudes of Subjects and Controls related to ambition. Those who lived up to promise considered themselves to be more closely identified with their parents' ambitions for them than the boys who failed at school; and these goals were more intellectual in the case of Controls than that of the Subjects, who expressed a certain antagonism toward mental effort. And this was noted in their choice of careers as well as hobbies and performance at school. It was noticeable that the occupational ambitions of the Subjects were very firmly rooted in possibility. Whether they chose such trades as printing because they were failing at school or whether they failed because school success was relatively unnecessary to their occupational aims, might prove a fruitful subject for investigation by future workers. It must, too, be remembered that all the children in this age group were born during the war, and their infancy was subject to all the consequent excitements. It may well be
that their somewhat drab choice of occupations was to some extent conditioned by this surfeit of excitement in their early years.

Neither Subjects nor Controls showed much interest in making large sums of money, and even when asked to give their supreme ambition, unimpeded by any factors in reality, only a very few thought riches in itself desirable. Thus we find that what they called "lack of ambition" was in reality a cover term for a very different kind, and much less spectacular form of ambition than that which was expected of them by their masters and parents. The same also applies to the term "laziness", a term both vague and derogatory, with which teachers and parents belabour them. It was impossible in the case of the questionnaire to work out what was involved by this term, but the psychotherapy of a few Subjects gives us some clue to its nature. It would appear that it consists largely in the leading of such an exciting, vigorous, and even violent life in fantasy that there is very little energy left over for coping with the problems of the real world.
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I. APPENDIX

Questionnaire to Determine Areas of Difficulty in Learning

GROUP 1.

Boy and Schoolfellows

1. What do the other boys think of boys at the top of the form?
   a. deserve it
   b. only because they swot so much
   c. teachers' favourites
   d. sissies
   e. other

2. What do you think about them?
   a. Why?

3. Do you think the clever ones have any effect on the others?
   a. make them feel they aren't much good?
   b. make them try harder?
   c. other

4. How do you get on with your schoolfellows?
   a. well? all right? not very well?
   b. what do they think of you?
   c. what do you think of them?

5. What are the most important reasons for boys not doing well?

6. Could a clever boy do badly? How could this come about?

7. Can boys sometimes be so clever that they don't fit in, almost as though they were a bit dull? How is this?

8. Should there be boys and girls together in schools? Why?

GROUP 2.

Boy and Teachers

1. How do you get on with your studies?
   a. very bad, b. bad, c. fair, d. good,
   e. very good, f. brilliant.
2. Supposing you were a teacher -

i. How would you test your pupils' ability?
   a. by exams only?
   b. by your judgement only?
   c. by their every-day work?
   d. by a combination?
   e. other

ii. Would you give homework?
   a. how much?
   b. do teachers mostly give too much?
      too little? about enough?

iii. If you had a boy in your class who didn't work, what would you do?
   a. see him after school to find out what the trouble was?
   b. talk with his parents?
   c. punish him yourself?
   d. send him to the Headmaster?
   e. cane him?
   f. what do you think most teachers do?

iv. If you had a clever boy in your class who knew all the answers, what would you do -
   a. let him go on with the class?
   b. let him take it easy?
   c. ask him to help the other boys?
   d. give him jobs like collecting dinner money and filling inkwells?
   e. think up questions he couldn't answer to keep him in his place?
   f. be more firm with him than with the other boys?
   g. what do you think most teachers do?

v. What would you do with the average boys to get them to do their best?

vi. What would you do with the dull boys?
   a. spend more time with them?
   b. make the whole class go slow so they could keep up?
   c. leave them alone and teach the others?
   d. what do most teachers do?
Group 2 (continued)

vii. What would you do to keep discipline?

viii. Is there any kind of teacher you especially like?

ix. Is there any kind you especially dislike?

x. Do you think some types of punishment shouldn't be allowed? Which? List.

xi. Do you think that teachers are mostly fair?

  a. are they as fair with clever boys? More? Less?
  b. are they sometimes a bit jealous or afraid of boys who are very clever?
  c. do you think many teachers are bossy and like being called "Sir" and that sort of thing?

Group 3

Boy and Parents

1. Do you think parents sometimes affect how their children get on at school? How?

   a. encouragement?
   b. worrying?
   c. promising presents?
   d. other.

2. When they worry does it stop boys doing their best? or does it encourage them? Why?

3. If you were grown up and had a son, would you be very keen for him to do well in school or wouldn't you mind? Why?

4. If his teachers said he was very clever and should go to University would you think anything special about that? What? What would you do?

   a. ask him what he wants and try to reach agreement?
   b. ask one of his friends to persuade him, if he didn't want to go?
   c. tell him you and the teacher have decided, and make plans for him to go?

5. Do you think some parents push their children too much about their school work? Why do they do it? List in order of importance:
Group 3 (continued)

a. because they think education and knowledge are good things to have,
b. well educated people get better jobs,
c. they want them to associate with a better class of people,
d. want them to succeed in life.

Group 4.

Boy and Himself

1. What do you think about your own intelligence?
   a. very low   d. good
   b. low        e. very good
   c. fair       f. excellent

2. Could you get on better than you do? Yes? No? How?
   a. are you lazy?
   b. are you ambitious enough?
   c. are you slow?
   d. have you got too many interests outside?
   e. does competition from clever boys discourage?
   f. are you bored in school?
   g. other

3. What are your hobbies and interests?
   a. sports       e. T. V.
   b. clubs        f. music (making or listening)
   c. films
   d. wireless

4. Do you like your hobbies better than school work? Why?
   a. can you concentrate more on your hobbies?
   b. do them better than school work? Why is this?

5. If a fairy godmother said you could be anything you wanted what would you choose?

6. Would you like to be a teacher?

7. What do you really want to be?

8. If the teacher told your parents you were the cleverest boy in the form, would you think anything special about it? What would you do?
   a. take things easy?
   b. swot just before exams?
   c. work hard to get better still and come top?
   d. other.
Group 4 (continued)

9. Is there anything you like to do better than anything else? What? Why?

10. Is there anything about school you dislike? What?

11. Do you like reading?
   a. what do you like to read most:
      List: (adventure stories, biographies, scientific books etc.)

12. Do you think you spend a lot of time daydreaming, imagining things that might happen?

Epilogue:

Is there anything special you want to say that is not in the questions about:

   a. you and the boys at school?
   b. you and the teachers?
   c. you and your mother and father?
   d. yourself?
APPENDIX II.

Questionnaire, Main Inquiry

GROUP I.

1. How many boys should be included in a grammar school form?
2. How should the ability of pupils be judged?
3. How much home-work should be given?
4. How should clever boys (top of form) be treated by-
   a. teachers? b. the other boys?
5. Do you think the exam. system is:
   a. satisfactory  c. fair
   b. ideal       d. unfair.
6. Should school children have a full programme of spare time activities? Why?
7. (a) Should school discipline assist children in learning?
     (b) Should children be punished for not learning?
     (c) If you had a boy in your class who would not work, what would you do?
        i. see him after school (interview) ?
        ii. talk with his parents?
        iii. expel him?
        iv. send him to the Headmaster?
        v. cane him?
     (d) What do most teachers do?
8. To what degree should parents concern themselves with their children's school work?
9. (a) Every boy with a good intelligence should succeed in his school work. Do you: agree? disagree?
9. (b) If you had a clever boy in your class who knew all the answers, what would you do?

1. let him take it easy
2. help the other boys
3. collect the dinner money etc.
4. keep him in his place
5. be more firm with him
6. give him extra homework.

(c) What do most teachers do? Let him -

1. let him take it easy
2. help the other boys
3. collect dinner money, etc.
4. keep him in his place.
5. would you be more firm with him
6. give him extra homework.

10. Do you think it should be every boy’s ambition to be:

a. at the top of the form
b. do the best he can
c. be the cleverest boy in his class
d. be extra good at one thing only
e. be well liked
f. good in sports and games.

11. It should be possible for everyone who is clever enough to attend a University. Do you -

a. Agree
b. Disagree
c. Why.

12. Do you think school teaching is a good profession for:

a. very clever people.
b. average people.
c. very stupid people.
GROUP 2.

1. How many boys are there in your form:
   a. too many
   b. too few
   c. just enough

2. How is the ability of the students judged by:
   a. teachers?
   b. the boys?

3. How much homework is given at your school?
   a. too much
   b. too little
   c. just about enough

4. How are the boys at the top of your form treated by:
   a. teachers
   b. the other boys.

5. (a) Do exams make the boys in your class work harder?
   (b) Are the questions:
      i. hard?
      ii. too hard?
      iii. not hard enough?
   (c) Do the results adequately show up the differences in the boys?

6. Do the boys in your school have many spare time activities?
   (a) Do the boys at the top:
      i. read a lot?
      ii. have hobbies?
      iii. engage in sports?
      iv. have employment after school hours?
   (b) Do the boys at the bottom:
      i. read a lot?
      ii. have hobbies?
      iii. engage in sports?
      iv. have employment after school hours?
GROUP 2. (Contd.)

7. What do the boys in your school think of discipline such as?
(a) detention
(b) being sent to the Headmaster
(c) caning
(d) having individual talks with teachers.

8. Do the boys at your school whose parents:

(a) push: 1. do better at school than the others
           2. less well at school
           3. about the same
           4. fail
           5. worse than the others

(b) help them with school work:
           1. do better at school than the others
           2. less well at school
           3. about the same
           4. fail
           5. worse than the others

(c) worry a lot:
           1. do better at school than the others
           2. less well at school
           3. about the same
           4. fail
           5. worse than the others

(d) simply encourage and leave it to the boy:
           1. do better at school than the others
           2. less well at school
           3. about the same
           4. fail
           5. worse than the others

(e) discourage them:
           1. do better at school than the others
           2. less well at school
           3. about the same
           4. fail
           5. worse than the others

(f) show indifference
           1. do better at school than the others
           2. less well at school
           3. about the same
           4. fail
           5. worse than the others
GROUP 3.

1. a) Do you think the teacher does not have enough time for you? (If not, why?)
   b) Does the size of the class make progress of the work too slow?
   c) Are there a lot of stupid boys who hold up the work?
   d) Are there a lot of clever boys who make it go too quickly?

2. a) How clever do you think you are –
   i. as clever as the teacher
   ii. cleverer than the teacher
   iii. not so clever as the teacher
   iv. almost as clever as the teacher
   b) How do you judge your own ability?
      i. by comparison with the other boys
      ii. by exam results
      iii. by some private estimate of your own.

3. a) Do you always do your home-work?
   b) Do you ever do extra home-work?
   c) Do you ever copy answers to home-work questions from other children?
   d) Do you think you get too much home-work?

4. a) How do you treat the boys at the top? Are you:
   i. friendly
   ii. less friendly than with boys lower down
   iii. do you dislike them?
   b) If you are at the top, how do they treat you?

5. a) Are you as good at exams as you should be (from your own estimate of your intelligence?). Do you think:
   i. I am not as good as I should be
   ii. I am as good as I should be
   iii. I am better.
   b) Is there any boy in your class who appears to be more clever in exams than you think he should be?
      i. Does this discourage you?
   c) Does anybody cheat at exams?
      i. What do you think of this?
      ii. Would you like to cheat yourself?
GROUP 3 (contd.)

5. d) Would you be better at exams if there were no other children sitting them?
   e) Are there too many exams? How many do you think there should be?

6. a) What do you do when you are not at school?
   b) What do you do in school, other than your lessons?
   c) Do you find your hobbies more interesting than your schoolwork?
   d) Do your hobbies distract your attention from your schoolwork?
   e) Are you good at sports?

7. a) When were you last punished?
   b) How often have you been punished?
   c) How were you punished?
   d) Do you think it was quite right that you should have been punished?
   e) Which method of punishment seemed least fair?
   f) Did you ever get angry at being punished?
   g) Did you act badly in order to get your own back, i.e. did you punish the teacher?
      i. By not learning your lessons?
      ii. By not doing your homework?
      iii. By coming in late (trying to disrupt the class)?
      iv. By other methods?

8. a) What do your parents do when you get a bad mark in exams?
   b) Are you appreciated or pushed at home?
   c) Do you resent their interfering in your school-work?
   d) Do you think that pushing from home has caused you to do less well than you should?
   e) When you grow up do you think you will be:
      i. As clever as your parents?
      ii. More clever than your parents?
      iii. Less clever than your parents?

9. a) Are you good at school work?
   b) What is your position in class?
   c) Why do you think you aren't at the top?
   d) Is there a boy in your class who should be at the top?
GROUP 3 (contd.)

10. a) What would you like to be? -

   i. top of the form
   ii. all 'round athlete
   iii. have special knowledge
   iv. be a regular guy and good sport.
   v. be well liked.

b) How far have you achieved these things?
c) What would your father think most worth while?
d) What would your mother

e) Would your sisters and brothers be jealous of you, or
   would they be glad for your sake?
f) If the teacher told your mother and father that you were
   the cleverest boy in the form, would you:

   i. take it easy?
   ii. take it easy, but not just before the exams?
   iii. Work hard to stay on top?

11. a) Do you want to go to a University? Why?

   i. Do you agree that you are clever enough to go?
   ii. If you could get a scholarship and were clever
       enough, would you go?
   iii. How much does it cost?

b) Would your parents like you to go to a University? Why?
c) What do you want to be? Why?
d) If you had your wish, what would you want to be?

e) If you had a son and his teachers said he was very clever
   and should go to a University, what would you do:

   i. ask him what he wanted to do and try to reach
      an agreement?
   ii. ask one of his friends to persuade him, if he
       didn't want to do?
   iii. tell him you and the teacher had decided, and
       make plans for him to go?
GROUP 3 (contd.)

12. a) Would you like to be a school teacher? Why?
   b) Do you like your school teachers? Dislike them?
   c) Do you think they are happy?
   d) Do you think they are well paid?
   e) Do you think they like you?
   f) " " " " the other boys?
   g) Do you think they like teaching?
   h) Do you think they like children?
   i) Do you think they would be nice people to have as friends outside school?
   j) Do you think they are: 1. snobbish?
      2. self-important?
      3. stuck up?
      4. like other people?