DOCUMENT RESUME

SP 003 106

ED 033 877

AUTHOR Casavantes, Edward J.; Neary, Mary Dorothy

TITLE A Teacher-Centered Affective Domain. Abbreviated Edition.

INSTITUTION Southwestern Cooperative Educational Lab., Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Spons Agency Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No ER-6-2827

Pub Date Jun 69

Contract OEC-4-7-062827-3078

Note 69p.; An abbreviated edition of a monograph of the same title to be distributed later by the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc.

EDRS Price EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.55

Descriptors *Academic Achievement, *Affective Behavior, *Disadvantaged Youth, Student Teacher Relationship, *Teacher Attitudes

Abstract

Research has shown that the prophesies which teachers make about the achievement of specific students (based on their analysis of student past achievements and intelligence ratings) are often self-fulfilling; teachers usually get what they expect from students. This phenomenon becomes dangerous to learning only when the teacher's low expectations cause low achievement in a student whose past achievements and intelligence have not been correctly analyzed, when a teacher cannot adjust to a student classified as a low achiever who performs well, and when a teacher's mistakenly pessimistic judgment colors the student's own self-evaluation. This problem is especially prevalent when teachers deal with students from different cultural backgrounds (such as Mexican-Americans); the information on which teachers base their prophesies is often misleading (as in the case of most intelligence tests which test knowledge of American culture and not learning ability), and the factors which motivate these students are not understood by most teachers. To break this cycle of low expectation-low achievement, teachers must become more sensitive to the needs of the disadvantaged student and to their own interactional verbal and nonverbal defense mechanisms which communicate harmful expectations to the student. (SF)

A TEACHER-CENTERED AFFECTIVE DOMAIN

by

Edward J. Casavantes

and

Mary Dorothy Neary

Abbreviated Edition

Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc.
117 Richmond Drive, N.E.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

June, 1969

This publication is issued pursuant to terms of Contract No. OEC-4-7-062827-3078 with the Bureau of Research, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The views and findings stated herein are not necessarily those of the U.S. Office of Education, and no endorsement is stated or implied.

INTRODUCTION

This booklet is an abbreviated form of a monograph which will be distributed later by the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory. The booklet and the proposed monograph are entitled "A Teacher-Centered Affective Domain," and are concerned with essentially the same material. When we speak of a teacher-centered affective domain, we are referring to the teacher's self-image, her emotional make-up, and her expectations both of herself and of her students. We are concerned with how these several factors interact to influence the teacher's pupils and how they affect her relationship with them in the classroom. In simpler terms, we are interested in how the teacher herself, as a person, affects the learning process in her classroom.

This booklet will be divided into four sections. The first two are concerned with "the self-fulfilling prophecy"--a concept which has been receiving increased attention among researchers, practioners, and commentators in education and especially among people concerned with education for the poor. We hope to define the phenomenon, and to state both what is and what is not meant by the term.

Since prophecies in general are based on assumptions and evaluations of past behaviors (and the self-fulfilling prophecy is no exception), we will examine many of the more common assumptions about the abilities of disadvantaged children and the more popularly accepted evaluations of their potential capabilities. We begin on the premise that if prophecies are made concerning the probable accomplishments of these children and if these prophecies are likely to fulfill themselves,

then they must certainly be based upon the most accurate evaluation possible of the individual capabilities of every child. If this is not the case, then obviously his experience in school may actually be detrimental to the child's learning! We hope to persuade the reader to accept the concept that expectations which are reasonably high for economically and socially deprived children are likely to lead to higher achievement.

Since poor children's own low self-evaluations contribute to the self-fulfilling powers of pessimistic prophecies concerning their futures, we also will need to discuss the notion of failure-expectation in disadvantaged children. We will present a quick profile of the deprived child's self-concept, self-expectations and subsequent motivation to succeed (or lack thereof).

We do not believe children are born believing they are failures, but we do think there must be a number of factors which teach the poor child from infancy to expect little of himself and of life. Sometimes it is school and the teachers that teach the deprived youngster how little to expect. Thus, in Chapter Two, we will examine how teachers communicate their expectations and their feelings about the child's capabilities to the child. This chapter, entitled "The Interactional Mechanisms of Defense," will apply basic principles of human interaction specifically to the parent/child and teacher/student relationship.

The third and final chapter, "Games Teachers Play," will take its lead from Eric Berne's famous Games People Play. Selected

"games" will be analyzed for appropriateness to classroom situations. We will offer some suggestions as to how to "break up" these games which are so destructive to a positive and hygienic atmosphere.

We do not mean or want to attribute failure in the schools wholly to the teacher, although a superficial perusal of this booklet might suggest that. What we are attempting to do is to spot trouble areas for the teacher so she may be more aware of her impact upon her students. Our purpose is to focus on the teacher, to call her attention to herself as a person in interaction.

Throughout this booklet we will call attention to danger signs, and we will offer some recommendations for raising the expectations of poor children and their teachers. We firmly believe that it is the teachers' interest and enthusiasm and good will that represent our primary hopes in this country for moving large numbers of our children out of the despair of poverty. We hope to stress the great potential value of the self-fulfilling prophecy effect and to emphasize our optimism concerning the future of compensatory education. In sum, we are putting the self-fulfilling prophecy to work ourselves, hoping to direct higher achievement in the education of poor children by expecting it.

CHAPTER I

THE SELF-FULFILLING PROPHECY

Definition

The "self-fulfilling prophecy," like many terms in the popularized vocabulary of scientific research, was coined to label a phenomenon which has been observed in the classroom (and laboratory), but about which little concrete and definitive knowledge has been gathered. The term makes clearer the identification of and reference to the phenomenon which occurs when the teacher's expectations (or prophecy) of her students' performances unconsciously direct and control their performances, thereby "fulfilling" her original prophecies.

We can say that when the self-fulfilling prophecy holds in an average classroom, the teacher gets in terms of performance what she expects from her students. She gets less from certain pupils because she expects less; more from others because she expects more.

It is important to note that the self-fulfilling prophecy is not always controlled only by the teacher. Students may evaluate their own potential, predict their own performances, and their prophecies, too, may be fulfilled with the same accuracy. In other words, pupils may do less because they expect less of themselves and their abilities; more because they think they are capable of more.

We also must be careful to avoid creating a sense of total rejection of all agreement between prophecies and prophesied behaviors. Without question, a teacher's expectation (or a student's) may be a very accurate prediction of performance based on an intimate and

detailed knowledge of the individual. When that knowledge represents a sensitive analysis of the individual's past performances, of reasons for past behaviors, and of the individual's real abilities (which may have been masked for one reason or another in the past), then the prophecy based on that knowledge cannot be interpreted, in either a good or bad sense, as a "cause" of the actual behavior in the future. Instead it is a qualified prediction of performance which may, and probably will, prove accurate.

But we are dealing with an entirely different matter when the prophecy does indeed <u>cause</u> the predicted behavior, or in other words, fulfill itself. There is a difference, of course, between a doctor's qualified prognosis of death in three months due to cancer and a decision to discontinue the patient's oxygen supply during what appears to be a hopeless operation. In both cases, the patient's death can be prophesied, and in both cases the prophecies will in all likelihood be fulfilled, but we can accurately say that only the second actually fulfills itself--by directly <u>causing</u> the patient's death.

So far we have discussed the negative possibilities of the self-fulfilling prophecy. But let us stress that even when a prophecy does cause the predicted behavior, the phenomenon certainly <u>need not</u> be viewed as hazardous. This is so because when high teacher expectations produce high student achievements, then the self-fulfilling prophecy must surely be regarded as a tremendous asset in student-teacher relationships. Most of us can remember a favorite teacher who earned our respect by letting us know she expected "great" things from us, believed we were capable of doing much, and then helped us meet her expectations.

That sense of accomplishment and self-fulfillment may well be the single most important goal in the educational process. Ideally, we like to think that teachers and school administrators everywhere set standards which are reasonably high for each student, so that in meeting these expectations, each child may enjoy the many benefits which come in knowing that he is fulfilling his own potential as an individual. We want each child in our country to become all that he is capable of being. And many educators suspect that higher expectations, based on a better understanding of their abilities, may help large numbers of our children, especially the economically and socially deprived, to come closer to meeting that goal. But when low expectations consistently produce low performances, then obviously the self-fulfilling prophecy does represent a serious threat to education.

Perhaps an anecdotal example or two are in order to help clarify the "self-fulfilling prophecy:" In order to see how a student may prophesy his own performance, let's look at the following example: In an ordinary middle-class high school, Joseph G., an honors student, decides to skip studying for his American History exam on Monday. Perhaps astute enough to sense his teacher's uncertainty about the achievement standards she sets for her class, Joseph reasons that he has consistently received A's in the past from Miss Smith, and thus is likely to be graded favorably again, even if he temporarily slips in his performance. And sure enough, Monday evening when Miss Smith discovers the weak performance of her "A" student, Joseph G., she may doubt the validity of her grading scale, question the value of her exam, and may finally adjust her criteria to assure that the

student she expected to do well does indeed receive an appropriately high grade.

This example is complex because it illustrates both the effects of pupil and teacher expectations at work together. Both Joseph G. and Miss Smith expected more. But what happens when the teacher's prophecy governs alone? Let's look now at the results of recent experimentation conducted by Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson to test more precisely the possibility that children "become brighter" when their teachers expect them to be "brighter."

We ought to comment, however, on the notion of one child being "bright" as contrasted with another being "dull." Both terms are obviously imprecise, open to many definitions, and are thus weak to use in reference to a child's potential for achievement. We will discuss this issue later because too often serious damage is done to children through the inaccurate assignment of terms such as "bright" and "dull," or "high I.Q." and "low I.Q." These are handy labels, usually used to rank children's potential as well as their abilities, but they may measure inaccurately, and yet irrevocably, and thus hinder the child's chances for achievement. Nevertheless, perhaps for reason of convenience and possibly to emphasize the possibilities for their misapplication, Rosenthal and Jacobson chose to employ the terms "bright" and "dull," and we shall report their findings in their own vocabulary.

In their experiment, every child in an elementary school in a lower socioeconomic neighborhood on the West Coast was given an intelligence test "billed" to the teachers as one that would predict "intellectual blooming." In this school there were three classrooms for each grade--one for children of above average ability, one for average ability, and

one for below average ability. About 20 percent of the children in each classroom were chosen at random to form the experimental group. The teachers were given the names of this group and told that these children had scored high on the test for intellectual blooming and would show remarkable gains in intellectual development during the next eight months. In reality, the only difference between these children and their classmates was in the minds of their teachers.

At the end of the school year, the children were tested again with the same I.Q. measurement. The children who has been designated as "bloomers" gained four points more in total I.Q. than did the other children in the school, and in reasoning I.Q., their average gain was seven points more!

The most difficult questions concerning the self-fulfilling prophecy--how the phenomenon works and why it does--have not yet been fully answered by research. Teacher expectancy is potentially a powerful asset, but much sound research is still needed if it is to be fully understood and if its value is ever to be fully utilized in education. Nevertheless, the fact that the phenomenon occurs in many kinds of interaction between teachers and students has been suggested by a number of researchers and has been greatly popularized by the work of Rosenthal and Jacobson. Their studies have been met by serious criticism (from Richard Snow and Robert Thorndike) especially in the areas of measurement and data analysis. But the general reasonableness of the self-fulfilling prophecy effect is not questioned in the critics' work. This chapter will lean in part on the work of Rosenthal and Jacobson to explain what is known about the self-fulfilling prophecy. We will be especially concerned with their implications concerning its impact upon the education of poor children.

We have seen that when the self-fulfilling prophecy works in the classroom, the teacher's expectations unintentionally, even unconsciously, determine her pupils' intellectual achievement and competency. When the phenomenon works to the advantage of students, as in the case of the honors student, Joseph G., or the "intellectual bloomers" in Rosenthal and Jacobson's experiment, it may be difficult to assess precisely its detrimental effects on the educational process. One senses that both the students and the teacher may be missing the heights both may have reached in the process of learning and pupil-teacher exchange, but the level they accept in place of those heights seems at least adequate.

The self-fulfilling prophecy can have more harmful repercussions however. For example, Rosenthal and Jacobson reported that the teachers involved in their experiment described the "bloomers" as "more interesting, more curious, and happier." These children were slightly "more appealing, better adjusted, and more affectionate and with less need for social approval," according to the teachers. But when asked to describe the children who were undesignated for improvement but nevertheless did actually gain in I.Q. during the year, the teachers expressed a <u>negative</u> reaction to such unexpected achievement.

Rosenthal reported: "The more the undesignated children gained in I.Q. points, the more they were regarded as <u>less</u> well-adjusted, <u>less</u> interesting, and <u>less</u> affectionate. It appears that there may be hazards to unpredicted intellectual growth--at least in the eyes of the teacher. This is particularly true of children in the low-ability groups." Jacobson and Rosenthal summarized that classroom teachers simply may not

be prepared to accept, or adjust to the unexpected good classroom behavior of the intellectually upwardly mobile child.

In a more detailed report on this experimentation, the researchers wrote:

> If the hypothesis were tenable that there are hazards to unexpected intellectual development, we would expect to find that among the children of the slow track there is the greatest negative relationship between intellec ·al growth and favorable evaluation by the classroom teacher. It is from the slow-track children, almost by definition, that the least intellectual gain is expected. The results of this experiment support the tenability of the hypothesis. It was among the slow-track children of the control group from whom no particular intellectual growth had been expected by virtue of both the experimental condition and their slow-track status that the effects of intellectual gains were most adverse in terms of teachers' perceptions of their behavior. (Emphasis ours)

The implications of these findings are obviously grave, for the teachers' expectations not only hindered the slow-track children's achievement, but resisted it. Even within the experimental group itself, the children of the slow track (who had been designated as "bloomers") did not show the same advantages (in terms of teachers' perceptions) as those shown by the "bloomers" from the fast and medium tracks, even though they showed as great a gain in I.Q. relative to the control-group children as did the experimental-group students in the fast track.

The theory that lower teacher expectations may resist and hinder improvement among children from whom little achievement is expected seems

to have been further supported by a long-term study of the progress of children who had completed three different preschool intervention programs and who had entered regular academic programs in elementary schools.

Some back-sliding has come to be expected in the academic experience of children who have participated in preschool intervention programs such as Head Start. A number of studies have reported a gradual loss or leveling of the students' initial "head-start" advantage with which they entered first grade. Often by the second or third grade, the students who have participated in such programs are indistinguishable from those who have not, despite the fact that they may have entered school with an advantage in I.Q. scores, language skills, and in other areas.

A number of explanations for the back sliding have been put forth, and some researchers have held the self-fulfilling prophecy to be at least partially responsible.

In this respect the distribution of I.Q. score gains and the subsequent losses of those gains among children of different levels of I.Q., which were pointed out in the long-term study of the three pre-school programs, merit some close attention.

The study addressed itself to the evaluation of the effectiveness of the preschool interventions in preparing disadvantaged children to function successfully in school. The first program, traditional in its point of view, provided a nursery school experience which worked in conventional ways to improve the personal, social, motor, and general language development of the children, followed by a traditional kinder-garten under the auspices of the public school. The second program saw the traditional preschool and kindergarten as inadequate and inappropriate

to the task of insuring academic competence in the disadvantaged child, and thus it provided an experimental preschool and kindergarten, referred to by the researchers as "Direct Verbal" in its approach. The third program (called "Ameliorative") was aimed at improving deficits or handicaps related to school readiness; it provided a preschool program. It was assumed that the traditional kindergarten would then be an appropriate prelude to first grade, and only a one-hour supplementary program was offered to the children in the second year.

At the end of the first year of the study, the researchers concluded that the magnitude and consistency of I.Q. gains reflected a more positive effect of the "Ameliorative" and "Direct Verbal" programs upon the children. At the end of the kindergarten year, the performance of the "Direct Verbal" group children on the Stanford Binet Intelligence Scale was significantly superior to that of the children in the other two groups. At the end of the third year, when all the children were finishing the first grade, there were no longer any significant differences among the three groups. The magnitude of the loss (11 points) in the "Direct Verbal" group was the major factor in the leveling effect; however, the "Ameliorative" group lost an additional four points (a six point loss over the two year period).

At the beginning of the experiment, the researchers had ranked the children in three I.Q. levels: high, medium, and low. Losses in I.Q. scores over the three-year period were sustained by children from all levels. But, in the words of the researchers, those losses experienced only by the high level children in both the Traditional and Ameliorative groups during the first grade are of "real concern" and "resulted in an I.Q. change in a negative direction over the three year period":

The modest gain (6 points) of the Traditional high strata and the more substantial gain (10 points) of the Ameliorative high strata during the preschool year remained constant during the kindergarten year but were lost during the first grade. It is untenable to presume that there was a factor common to both the Traditional and Ameliorative two-year interventions which could explain such losses the third year. Rather, it seems reasonable to suppose that in important ways the public school failed these high strata children during the first grade. These children may have been judged by criteria based on preconceptions of what disadvantaged children are like and how they will perform in school, and instructional provisions may have been more inadequate for the high strata children with their demonstrated potential than for the children in the other two strata. (Emphasis ours)

The profound implications of these findings simply cannot be ignored. When teachers' prophecies of poor achievement work consistently to hold back disadvantaged students, the "self-fulfilling prophecy" becomes a very dangerous phenomenon indeed, and its distortion and perversion of their educational experience cannot be tolerated.

When, for example, a black child in the first grade strongly suspects he will never complete school; or a Mexican American child calls herself "stupid" in the third grade and announces that she expects to fail arithmetic; or an American Indian replies routinely to a questionnaire, "I can't do it," "I'm not important," "I'm not smart," then the dangers inherent in the self-fulfilling prophecy become too apparent and too powerful for educators to ignore.

Since children are obviously not born believing they are failures in society, there must be elements in our social system that help to build into the poor child the sense of his own inadequacy and low value which then hinder his chances for success. The attitudes of his parents and of the other adults and the other children in his home and neighborhood strongly influence the poor child and may dissuade and discourage him from "trying too hard" in a middle-class school. But sometimes it is the school itself and the teachers in it that help the child to learn how little to expect of himself.

And when poor children's low self-expectations and poor self-concepts not only are not countered but <u>are supported</u> by the very teachers who are supposed to lead them out of such despair, then the whole educational system in this country must turn to critical self-examination. For then the question becomes whether our schools and our teachers do not actually create, contribute to, aggravate and continue the lower expectations and thus the lower levels of achievement among the poor.

If the low-expectations/low-achievement cycle is to be broken in the poor children's classroom--and we believe it can and must be--more and more teachers will need increased knowledge and skills in the area of raising the level of motivation in poor children. We believe that before learning can take place, the child must <u>want</u> to learn. Often the poor child's desire to learn--in the academic sense--has been dulled and sometimes deadened even before he reaches school. Once he reaches school, there may be many emotional, psychological, and social factors working <u>against</u> the teacher to interfere with learning. For example, the child may simply be too afraid of the teacher--because she is an adult stranger and poor children are very often afraid of adult strangers--to allow for

much learning to take place.

We will discuss some of these motivational factors which hinder learning in the next section because we believe that increasing teacher sensitivity to the reasons behind the deprived child's low motivation is necessarily one of the first steps toward increasing it. We believe increased teacher sensitivity to motivational handicaps in learning, increased motivation in the students, and the resultant higher expectations in both teachers and students all contribute to a basic formula for higher achievement in learning. We will cite some of the research conducted at the Laboratory in the area of increasing student motivation and achievement.

Foundations for Prophecies

At the beginning of this chapter we stated that prophecies are almost always based upon evaluations of past behaviors and events and upon assumptions about future behaviors. In education, prophecies about a student's achievement are usually based on the teacher's knowledge of the student's school record and her assumptions about how he is likely to behave in the future. And, as we have pointed out, sometimes such prophecies fulfill themselves.

But what happens when the bases of the prophecies are false? What happens if the evaluations of the student's past behavior were incorrect, if his grades and test scores were misleading, and if the assumptions about his future action are founded on inaccurate or insufficient information about the culture in which he lives? If the prophecies are based upon inaccurate data and yet fulfill themselves, what happens to the student and to his education in the process? Those are the questions with which we must now deal.

At this stage of educational research we have learned that some of our past assumptions about poor children and our past evaluations of their experience in school were incorrect, or at least misleading. We have recognized some of the defects in our use of educational and psychological tests, for example, with socially and economically deprived children; and we have seen how those defects can contribute to inaccurate prophecies about the children's future. We have also learned to be suspicious of terms like "bright" and "dull" and to question the relevancy of terms like "high I.Q." and "low I.Q." We have learned that very often these terms, which seemed to be universally understood and applicable to middle-class school children, have diverse meaning and little, if any, of the same applicability for disadvantaged children. We have discovered that social class, and especially the social deprivation that goes along with poverty, are much stronger determining factors in regard to a child's experience in school than we ever suspected them to be. And thus, when we deal with the concept of the self-fulfilling prophecy in compensatory education, we must examine with special care the data and knowledge upon which prophecies concerning poor children in school are based. We will attempt to summarize much of what we consider to be the most significant new information concerning testing, and the effects of social deprivation and social class upon school children, so that the reader may apply this new knowledge in his relations with disadvantaged children.

One of the most interesting and important studies related to the question of testing as an accurate measurement of the learning abilities of children from non-Anglo cultures was conducted in 1961 by Arthur Jensen.

Jensen noted that in a number of California school districts many of the Mexican American children were being classified as "slow learners" or as "mentally retarded" on the basis of popular standard intelligence tests. But despite their low scores, the Mexican American children often appeared on the playground to be normally "bright" as compared to the Anglo-American retarded children. Thus Jensen decided to look for a method to test the educational potentialities of Mexican American children, as well as those of other national sub-cultures and ethnic groups, by using tests which provided direct measures of the children's learning ability at the time of the testing.

The standard I.Q. tests, he felt, were "static" measurements of achievement which sampled only the knowledge and skills the child had acquired in the past. Jensen felt that that sampling often was inappropriate for children who had not had much exposure to the Anglo-American culture. Thus he felt a better way to measure learning potential would be to give the child a standard learning task and observe how fast he learned it.

In order to test his hypothesis, groups of Mexican American and Anglo-American fourth and sixth grade school children of different I.Q. levels, ranging from 60 to 120 or above, were compared on a number of learning tasks consisting of immediate recall, serial learning, and paired-associates learning of familiar and abstract objects. The most important finding of Jensen's experiments was that on the particular learning tasks used, Mexican American children with low I.Q.'s performed significantly better than Anglo-American children with low I.Q.'s.

> The fact that high I.Q. Mexican Americans are so rare in the population from which our samples were

drawn, along with the fact that they performed no differently on the learning tests than did the low Mexican Americans, suggests that the I.Q. test is discriminating in the Mexican American group on some other basis than that on which it discriminates in the Anglo-American group. The I.Q. in the Anglo-American group is a valid index of learning potential; the low I.Q.'s among the Anglo-Americans were indeed the slow learners. But this is not necessarily so in the Mexican American group. (Emphasis ours)

Jensen found that Mexican Americans with I.Q.'s in the 60's, for example, are very fast learners as compared with Anglo-Americans in this I.Q. range.

Jensen's study also examined these questions: Why do the low I.Q. Mexican Americans, if they are not all really slow learners, appear to their teachers to be retarded in the average classroom? And why is the I.Q. able to predict their poor scholastic achievement? Jensen suggests that the answer lies in the fact that the low I.Q. Mexican American children have not acquired in their home environment the kinds of knowledge, habits, and skills that provide the basis for school learning and which are tapped by I.Q. tests. Thus when they are placed in regular school situations, designed for the average Anglo-American child, they may appear slow, or even retarded, as they struggle with tasks for which they are not culturally equipped. Obviously, the odds are high against the Mexican American children's scholastic success under such circumstances.

Jensen's study did not offer any proposals for revised curriculum for Mexican American children in California, but it did make one

deceptively simple recommendation concerning the use and interpretation of standard I.Q. tests: that most of the low I.Q. Mexican Americans, not being basically slow learners, should not be placed in classes with the Anglo-Americans of low I:Q., who are basically slow learners and therefore require different methods of teaching. Jensen was not prepared at the time of his study to say what the nature of remedial instruction for low I.Q. Mexican American children ought to be, but he concluded that it "was safe to say" that at the very least, they ought to be treated differently from mentally retarded children because they were not mentally retarded.

It seems simple to state that children who are not mentally retarded, but who are culturally retarded in an average classroom learning situation ought not to be treated the same as mentally retarded children. And yet it was precisely Jensen's observation that non-mentally retarded Mexican American children were being treated as if they were that prompted his investigation in the first place! His discovery of the inadequacy of standard I.Q. measurements for use with these children represents one of the most important break-throughs in educational research. And its implications for reform both in the testing and teaching of culturally different children are strong.

A truly definitive study on testing minority group children was prepared in 1961 by a work group of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, a division of the American Psychological Association. The researchers introduced their guidelines for testing with the following statements:

> American educators have long recognized that they can best guide the development of intellect and character of the

children in their charge if they take the time to understand these children thoroughly and sympathetically. This is particularly true with respect to the socially and culturally disadvantaged child.

Educators must realize that they hold positions of considerable responsibility and power. If they apply their services and skills wisely they can help minority group children to overcome their early disadvantages, to live more constructively, and to contribute more fully to American society.

Educational and psychological tests may help in the attainment of these goals if they are used carefully and intelligently. Persons who have a genuine commitment to democratic processes and who have a deep respect for the individual, will certainly seek to use educational and psychological tests with minority group children in ways that will enable these children to attain the full promise that America holds out to all its children.

This study team was charged with the responsibility to provide an introduction to the many considerations relevant to the selection, use and interpretation of educational and psychological tests with children from minority groups. The paper they wrote cited three principal difficulties in the standardized tests most generally used with disadvantaged school children:

1.) They do not provide a reliable measure of the differences in the range of the minority group children's scores.

2.) What they can validly predict for the minority school children's performances may be quite <u>different</u> from what they usually can predict for middle-class-majority-culture children.

3.) The validity of their interpretation strongly depends upon an understanding of the social and cultural background of the children being tested.

The importance of these criticisms must not be ignored, because as the research team points out, educational and psychological tests are among the most widely used and most useful tools available to teachers, to educational supervisors, school administrators, guidance workers, and counselors. The tests are used to measure learning abilities and individual potential, as well as past achievement, and most often they are the primary bases for a teacher's or a school's prophecy concerning the future of an individual child. But without a knowledgable understanding of the tests' applicability to minority group children, test scores may easily be misinterpreted and then the prophecy is founded on "data" which is itself incorrect.

As Jensen's study made clear, sometimes even the same test scores do not mean the same thing about different students when those students come from different cultures. That means when any standard test is given to children from a minority culture, the <u>tester cannot and must not assume that his test will measure the same things in these children and in the same way as it would for children from the majority culture</u> for whom the test was originally designed. The American Psychological Association's research team also warns against a careless or irresponsible use of standard tests with minority group children, pointing out again that

these children's scores may not mean at all what they appear to mean when compared only to scores from children of the majority culture.

The team was concerned not only with the tests, but with factors which affect the children taking them. After a long and careful survey of many studies in this area, the team was able to give the following information about characteristics of minority group children which affect their performances on tests, and thereby affect their scores.

In contrast to the middle-class child the lower-class child will tend to be:

1. Less verbal.
2. More fearful of strangers.
3. Less self-confident.
4. Less motivated toward scholastic and academic achievement.
5. Less competitive in the intellectual realm.
6. More "irritable."
7. Less conforming to middle-class norms of behavior and conduct.
8. More apt to be bilingual.
9. Less exposed to intellectually stimulating materials in the home.
10. Less varied in recreational outlets.
11. Less knowledgeable about the world outside his immediate neighborhood.
12. More likely to attend inferior schools.

The researchers were certain that such characteristics would be reflected not only in the way minority group children took tests, but in their scores as well.

One example which the team noted of this relationship between minority group status and test-taking is especially relevant to our discussion of

the self-fulfilling prophecy:

Example: A Negro child has had little contact with white adults other than as distant and punitive authority figures. Probable result: Such a child might have difficulty in gaining rapport with a white examiner or reacting without emotional upset to his close presence. Even in an individual testing situation, he might not respond other than with monosyllables, failing to give adequate answers even when he knows them. The examiner, reacting in terms of his own stereotypes, might also lower the reliability and validity of the test results by assuming that the child's performance will naturally be inferior, and by revealing this attitude to the child.

What the team suggests is the possibility that the examiner may indeed "prophesy" the child's test performance "in terms of his own stereotypes," assume that the child will do poorly, communicate to the child the sense that little is expected of him, thereby contribute to the child's low score, and thus fulfill his original prophecy concerning the child's performance! If this is the case, imagine the consequences when the "low" test scores are forwarded to the child's teacher, who in turn bases her own prophecy concerning his future upon them, and then subtly and even unintentionally manages to bring about its fulfillment. We must begin to wonder, at least, what becomes of the real abilities of the child which were never really tested, measured, or acknowledged in this whole process. If, for example, a child with real learning potential is consistently treated as if he were retarded, what can we expect of his performances in school? How can we measure his frustration and the effects it will have upon his whole life?

Educational and psychological tests can help sensitive and well-trained educators deeply committed to understanding the individual work with disadvantaged children to help overcome their early deprivations, to utilize their innate abilities, and to realize their own potential. But when tests and scores are used without caution, they can unfairly relegate the disadvantaged child to a rank of low intelligence and poor performance, and they can lock the child in poverty by severely limiting his chances for achievement. It is the task of the conscientious educator to study, to learn, and to understand what test scores for each minority group child <u>mean</u>, and to plan remedial programs to help the child overcome his learning handicaps.

The American Psychological Association's researchers concluded their paper with the following comment:

> Utilizing the individual child as his own control and using the test norms principally as "bench marks," we are best able to gauge the success of our efforts to move the minority group child forward on the long, hard road of overcoming the deficiencies which have been forced upon him. Many comparisons depend upon tests, but they also depend upon <u>our</u> intelligence, our good will, and our sense of responsibility to make the proper comparison at the proper time and to undertake proper remedial and compensatory action as a result. The misuse of tests with minority group children, or in any situation, is a serious breach of professional ethics. Their proper use is a sign of professional and personal maturity.

We emphasized the misuse and misinterpretation of standard I.Q. tests and scores in measuring the learning capabilities of children from minority cultures as definite hazards, but recent criticism has been aimed directly at the great significance which usually is granted to I.Q. scores themselves. The relevancy of those scores to an individual's experience as a student has been seriously called into question. I.Q. scores, be they the scores of middle-class children or those of poor minority group children, say these critics, receive far too much attention at the expense of an individual understanding of each child.

Among the most vocal critics of the indiscriminate amount of emphasis placed upon I.Q. scores is Edward Zigler, a psychologist at Yale University. Zigler's research has been conducted over many years in the area of mental retardation. But recently he has published the results of his work with culturally disadvantaged children. Zigler has worked extensively with "social deprivation," which he says is a phenomenon that, once experienced, becomes built into the personality structure of the child and there interferes with and influences the child's interactions with his environment. He has noted a parallel between the social deprivation of lower-class, minority group children due to their cultural isolation from the mainstream of American society and that of mentally retarded children who are either institutionalized or set apart in other ways from the majority of normal children and adults. According to Zigler, there are important similarities in the effects that social deprivation has upon both groups of children. He has found that they may react in certain social situations, such as school or other learning situations, in ways which are very alike. He has found their reactions in such situations may be governed or influenced not so much by

intelligence as by motivational factors such as being afraid of the teacher or being intimidated by other children who seem "smarter" or "brighter" and with whom they do not want to compete.

Zigler and others have studied the question of different children's expectancy of success in certain learning situations and learned that it is more common for lower-class children to expect to fail at learning tasks than it is for middle-class children. This finding was similar to the results of research he conducted with mentally retarded children and normal children. The mentally retarded child, too, expected more often to fail than did the child of normal intelligence. Once pointed out, these findings seem obvious--we might expect that lower-class children and mentally retarded children who probably have experienced failure often in a classroom where they were asked to compete with middle-class children or those of normal intelligence, would learn to expect to fail.

In addition, Zigler found that children whose expectancy of success is very low, settle for lower levels of success than do children whose expectancy is high. We might say that when a child has expected to fail and he achieves instead some measure of success--no matter how low by average standards--he usually will settle for that level of success rather than risk failure by trying to achieve a higher level of success. When this is the case, it is obviously very difficult to know exactly how much the child is really capable of doing for he stops trying at a level below his real capabilities. Only if we reduce the motivational factors that hold the child back can we hope to see all that he is capable of achieving.

Expanding upon the question of motivational factors in the deprived child's experience in school, Zigler and Butterfield studied the increases in I.Q. scores that so often occur when children who have been socially deprived are placed in learning situations which seem less cold, less dangerous, less threatening to them emotionally than might average school-rooms, or other learning situations they may have known in the past. They did their research with children from a low-income housing project who were attending a session of a Ford Foundation sponsored nursery school. Zigler and Butterfield again found that the culturally deprived child has more intelligence than he is often credited with, and that standard testing procedures often underestimate his intelligence. They found that they could raise the initial I.Q. test scores, before the nursery school experience began, by revising the testing conditions alone to accommodate the disadvantaged children's difficulties with standard testing situations.

More importantly, they found that the increases in I.Q. scores that occur during the nursery school experience (as measured at the end of the school session) are more the result of the reduction of poor motivational factors--such as the child's wariness towards his teacher or his expectancy to fail--which had handicapped him in the past than they are of changes in the actual rate of intellectual development. Zigler and Butterfield's study suggests that the deprived child's general level of abilities should not be equated with measured I.Q., and it calls into question the frequently stated view that the poor child's basic problem is a lack of intelligence. The findings indicate that the deprived child suffers more from an emotional and motivational handicap which decreases his usual intellectual performance to a level lower than that

which he is really capable of reaching. Therefore, Zigler and Butterfield recommended that the programs designed for preschool disadvantaged children such as Head Start and Ford Foundation nursery schools work directly at reducing those handicaps in learning, thereby allowing the children's true abilities to be utilized fully.

Thus Zigler, as well as others, urge a shift of emphasis from a child's score on an I.Q. test to the close analysis and intimate understanding of each child as an individual--an understanding of what may be hindering his performance in school and a commitment to reduce that handicap so that each child may enjoy the deepest human satisfaction of knowing he has done as well as he can. Even with middle-class children, the factors which affect academic performance such as motivation, energy level, study habits, natural aptitude for a particular subject, etc., are more important in predicting performance than a well-administered individual test of intelligence. These are motivational and personality factors, not intellectual factors. How much more serious it is for us to make judgments about future performance when we do not understand the motivations and the feelings of youngsters from various ethnic and poverty situations!

There are more and more educators who say that instead of asking, "How can we make Johnny learn to read?" we ought to ask, "Why doesn't Johnny like school?" In other words, they are urging teachers, specialists and counselors to seek to understand why a child may be consciously or unconsciously resisting school and all it represents to him, thereby severely limiting his performance in the classroom. In that situation, an I.Q. score does not have nearly the relevancy as does the teacher's

understanding of the child himself, based on a sensitive knowledge of what his past experiences in social situations may have been and the real desire to help him overcome whatever handicaps past social deprivation may have caused him.

******

We have said that before learning can take place, the child must want to learn; let us now expand that statement to include the idea that the child must want not only to learn, but he must also want to learn in his teacher's classroom, if she is to have any real success in teaching him.

There are a number of ways in which the teacher may raise her pupil's level of motivation, but perhaps most basically, she must adapt the school and specifically her classroom and her own actions to the children she is trying to teach. She may have to work very carefully to adjust her curriculum to the students she teaches, for children will want to learn only that which is relevant and important to them. This does not mean she cannot teach her traditional curriculum content, but it does mean that if she wants the material to be worthwhile, meaningful, and comprehensible to the children in her classroom, she cannot simply assume that it will be so naturally.

If the teacher is aware of the child's cultural background and sensitive to any learning handicaps he may have, she will be more apt to understand and accept her responsibility for helping him to conform gradually to the classroom setting by molding her curriculum as closely as possible to his developmental level and needs.

There are other methods that a teacher may use to overcome her pupil's poor self-concepts and lack of motivation. Another primary factor in

increasing motivation, for example, is the practice of reinforcement. Reinforcement, especially when it is tangible, provides immediate, extrinsic reward for success and thus strongly motivates the child who is not inherently motivated to learn and to perform. It gives those children with low self-esteem and high failure expectations a strong and immediate feeling of success, of having done well. And such repeated and steady success obviously helps overcome these children's expectancy to fail. In addition, if a child with a poor self-concept should isolate himself from other children, a structured program of continued reinforcement from the teacher may raise his self-esteem, making him feel better about himself as a person, and thereby reduce his self-imposed separation from other children.

The Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory has developed classroom management techniques and reinforcement strategies that increase pupil interest in the learning process and improve motivation to learn. SWCEL also has found that the use of behavioral objectives--that is, objectives which are clearly stated in terms of desired end or terminal behaviors, and which even the youngest students in the classroom can understand--is extremely helpful in improving students' self-esteem and in encouraging more enthusiasm for learning.

Other manuals, lectures, and varied materials are available to the reader which present detailed information on the research conducted by the Laboratory in these areas and the results found. These can help teachers make the transition between some of the theory presented in this booklet and its application in their classrooms. To discuss the use of behavioral objectives, classroom management techniques, and

reinforcement strategies would be beyond the scope of this booklet.

Now let us conclude by saying that we hope that in explaining the self-fulfilling prophesy, in pointing out the dangers of prophecies based upon incorrect information, and in briefly offering basic recommendations for raising the expectations of both teachers and students, we have taken a step forward. It is the teacher who can actually put the prescriptions, which are the results of the research and the theory presented here, to work in school for the benefit of the students. Thus we shall hope that we have had some success in using the self-fulfilling prophecy ourselves--that by communicating our optimism and high expectations to our readers, we shall have encouraged many teachers to aim for better understanding and higher expectations of children whose abilities they may have erroneously doubted in the past.

CHAPTER II
THE INTERACTIONAL MECHANISMS OF DEFENSE FOR PARENT-CHILD AND TEACHER-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS

Introduction

Human behavior is extraordinarily complex. To try to simplify the "workings" of man is self-defeating, for the more we try to simplify, the more we become aware of the loose ends we have omitted. Nevertheless, there are some processes that we can attempt to describe. One of them is the process that occurs in small-group interaction, especially the one-to-one interactions. As we shall see in the next few pages, this process is affected by Expectation, with which we are acquainted from the discussion of the self-fulfilling prophecy.

In describing the self-fulfilling prophecy, we were able to show that teachers can expect children to do certain things, and indeed the children will often do those things. But the exact process through which the expectation is communicated was not described by Rosenthal and Jacobson.

Psychological clinicians have accumulated an extensive knowledge of non-verbal as well as verbal behaviors which have meaning to them and which they utilize in their daily practice. Much has been written about them, but little has been done to systematize most of these individual "suggestions." It is the purpose of this chapter to systematize some of these clinical observations and to relate them to Expectation, and then to further relate them to classroom behavior. The path from theory to general behavior to classroom behavior is an arduous one, and we hope that the many examples included will serve the purpose.

History and Development

In Sigmund Freud's first writings in the 1890's, and in those of the next 40 years, scattered references to the so-called "mechanisms of defense" appear. Whenever Freud wanted to use the concepts entailed in a particular mechanism of defense, he would simply explain them as part and parcel of his analysis of a case history or of an idea. Nowhere--to this writer's knowledge--did he ever make a single "compilation" of all these mechanisms.

This job fell to his daughter, Anna. In 1937, Anna Freud put together many of these mechanisms of defense in the now classic book, The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense. Not only did she describe many of these mechanisms of defense in great detail but she also integrated the theory which attended them.

The first group of writers which stressed the cultural and social--i.e., external--components of an individual's psychic life were people like Karen Horney, with her The Neurotic Personality of Our Time, published in 1936. Preceding her were other writers such as Erich Fromm, in "Ueber Methode und Aufgabe /problems/ einer Analytischen Sozialpsychologie," written in 1932.

However, Sigmund himself was no mean social psychologist, as a great many have unjustly claimed. The great amount of data which is reviewed in The Handbook of Social Psychology, published in 1954, in Hall and Lindzey's article, "Psychoanalytic Theory and Its Applications in the Social Sciences," fully documents that Freud could and did extend his thinking "outside the individual's skin." But, for some reason, writers usually still think of Freud as an individual who dedicated himself almost exclusively to the study of the individual.

However, the point must be made that there is a basic distinction between the influence of culture on personality and the reciprocal interaction between two or more people. It is the latter which concerns us here.

Probably the first true "interactional" psychiatrist was Harry Stack Sullivan. Sullivan dedicated a major portion of his efforts to the study of the interaction itself, distinguished from the study of the individual in interaction. But Sullivan himself acknowledges that his notions were, in part, borrowed from others. His 1940 Conceptions of Modern Psychology, contained his seminal thoughts on interaction.

But, definitive statements such as those of Anna Freud on specific mechanisms of defense (displacement, regression, projection, reaction-formation, etc.) were nowhere to be found in the work of Sullivan and the new interactionists. Each piece of interactional pathology was explained in the same general manner that Sigmund Freud explained his and no "labels" were given certain characteristic interpersonal patterns. For that matter, no great number of specific interactional patterns were identified.

To our knowledge, the individual who has come closest to identifying these patterns has been a relatively neglected writer, Adelaide Johnson. She and some of her students and co-workers worked (from 1942 to 1960) out of the Section in Psychiatry, the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota. Even she did not "label" or even give formal stucture to her insights underlying the interaction dynamics she described so well. This "labeling" was begun in some work by Dr. Hubert Estes, a psychiatrist who studied (and co-authored) with A. Johnson.

In addition to Adelaide Johnson's work, other workers also have striven to understand human interaction. In general, they seem to come from the Palo Alto, San Francisco, San Jose, and Carmel area. These include Virginia Satir's Conjoint Family Therapy, 1964; Eric Berne's Games People Play, 1964; and, the volume edited by Don Jackson, The Etiology of Schizophrenia, 1960, especially the chapters by Bateson, Bowen, and Weakland. Berne's Transactional Analysis in Psychotherapy, 1961, which preceded his Games People Play, makes some attempt at identifying specific interactional processes. In Games People Play, Berne's humorous ploys actually detract from the amazing perception these "games" reveal. Frederick Perls' "Gestalt Therapy" is another.

The Classical (Freudian) Mechanisms of Defense

In general, the so-called "classical" mechanisms of defense are 1) displacement, 2) denial, 3) projection, 4) reaction-formation, 5) regression, and 6) repression. Actually, according to formal theory, the first five of these are based on the operation of the sixth, repression. And, a seventh, rationalization, is the person's intellectual attempt to explain his behavior. Of course, other names for these mechanisms of defense are described in the psychiatric literature, but generally, they are variants of the above.

In these classical mechanisms, the "actor" is the ego, the self. This implies that almost all of these mental machinations go on almost independently of external circumstances. When circumstances do intrude, they are only triggers--not much more than a vehicle--through which the individual personality needs find expression. They are essentially personal; they operate almost exclusively within the individual himself, since they are a function of an individual's personality.

A brief review of the classical Mechanisms of Defense follows. The Mechanisms of Defense, like the Interactional Mechanisms of Defense (IMD), serve to reduce the amount of anxiety from emerging impulses. In general, they operate to give basic impulses a socially-approved manner of expression. For example, a hungry man does not just walk into a grocery store, steal an apple, and right then and there devour the stolen fruit. Instead, he would purchase the fruit, take it home, and then serve himself some of it on a plate. Generally, however, the Mechanisms of Defense are associated with less-than-desirable behavior because it is with abnormal or dysfunctional behavior that they can most easily be explained. However, not all behavior is "bad" just because it is a defense. Also, when a person is said to be "defensive," this refers to an excessive degree of defense utilization, for use of defenses is quite normal.

The brief definitions which follow, coupled with a single example in each case (how aggression is handled) will allow you to make a comparison between the types of Mechanisms of Defense. (Examples will be given as if the person were thinking out his feelings consciously, which is not often the case):

Displacement. When an individual is unable for any reason to express his anger or other emotion directly at the source of the frustration, he then turns his anger onto a "safer" object. Often, it is another person such as a child or a spouse, but individuals can also displace onto themselves, and punish themselves as in a psychosomatic disease, masochism, depression or very self-destructive behavior.

Example: "I am angry with you because you rejected me, but if I hit you, you will reject me even more. Therefore, I will take my anger out on my siblings and be angry with them for whatever small annoyance they cause me."

Sublimation. Sublimation is a special case of Displacement, a socially-acceptable Displacement. When anger needs are converted

into tough, body-contact sports, then the anger has been sublimated. Or, a deep-seated need to be taken care of is converted by the mechanism of Reaction-Formation into helping others. Both of these actions (playing rough ball and helping others) are considered to be a "higher order" or more socially-approved expression of the more basic and less socially-desirable impulses.

Projection. Often, an impulse cannot be directly expressed at the person with whom one has such-and-such a dealing. Perhaps the amount of repression (holding back of the impulse) is so intense and frightening that the individual is totally unable to even think of it. However, this impulse can be converted into a feeling that the other individual is the one who feels the anger.

Example: "I am very angry with her for rejecting me, but I cannot express my hostility However, I feel she is angry with me. She must be angry with me or else she wouldn't have rejected me. It is not I who is angry; it is she."

Reaction-Formation. Sometimes an impulse or need is so totally repressed that the individual not only has to deny it, but to assert its very opposite. Love becomes hate; hate becomes love. Or dependency becomes excessive need for independence.

Example: "I hate cats so much I would like to kill every one of them. However, this is such a terrible idea that I had better totally curb it. One effective and socially approved way is to start the Coronado Chapter of Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. That not only keeps me safe, but also, by displacement, it allows me to be very angry with others who are as hostile toward cats as I once felt."

Regression. Regression is the opposite of "Progression." When an individual becomes severely frustrated, rather than try and solve the problem in a mature and adult manner, he will "regress" and begin acting like a child yelling, screaming, pouting, crying.

Example. "I have been hurt by what happened. I don't know what to do that will help, but I remember that, sometimes, when I had a temper tantrum, my mother would come to my rescue. Perhaps if I do this now, someone will help."

Repression. When an individual has been socially conditioned to control his impulses so they are never exhibited in "raw" form, the individual may not even be aware they exist.

Example. "I am angry at that fellow over there, but, while we are here at this party, I better act politely and not even show that I harbor such bad feelings toward him. I'll act so casually that even I won't be able to feel my anger."

Rationalization. A rationalization is an intellectual "explanation" of why we acted in the way that we did. If asked to explain why he became very angry at a surly clerk, one person would say "Because he was surly;" another person may deal with the surly clerk and think "I won't give him the satisfaction of seeing I was annoyed;" a third

may say, "It didn't bother me at all; I'm used to such help nowadays." None of these people knows why he was annoyed at certain levels, much less is able to explain exactly why he did what he did. So, each gives a relatively simple and "reasonable" explanation, which is called a rationalization.

Remember that these Mechanisms of Defense are normal, and that without them we would be savage, unsocialized animals. It is only when we use one defense only, like reaction-formation only, or when we use one defense to excess, that they are seen as abnormal or dysfunctional.

The Interactional Mechanisms of Defense

The mechanisms we have chosen to call "Interactional Mechanisms of Defense" go beyond the original classic mechanisms. Thus, they acquire a somewhat different quality. Some of these were "labeled" by Dr. Hubert Estes, and others we have "labeled" ourselves. (For formal credit purposes, this may not be important since there is no publication wherein these are to be found and credited.) These mechanisms include 1) Expectation, 2) The Specific Poor Example, 3) Excessive Concern or Eagerness, 4) Lack of Genuine Prohibitions, 5) Unreasonable Blaming, 6) Assigned Identification, 7) Indirect Suggestion, 8) Unhealthy Predictions.

In general, these mechanisms do not operate only through the ego of the person principally involved. Often, they include a specific other person. These interactional mechanisms, then, do not operate just within one individual, but within the person and within another person, usually a very particular person who is emotionally close. For example, the writers in marriage interaction or in family psychodynamics (i.e., Nathan Ackerman in his The Psychodynamics of Family Life) have often spoken of how the interaction between man and wife make different people out of each of them. In effect, they are saying that if John is married

to Lucy, he would have one particular type of personality in his interaction with Lucy. But, if he were married to Joan, he would have a different type of personality implying that the interaction is a reciprocal entity. Each of the participants, then, elicits behavior which is at the same time both cause and effect. Ergo, different cause (i.e., Joan) and different effect (i.e., reaction to Joan) which yields a different personality both for John and for Joan.

Before we get into the Interactional Mechanisms themselves, it is necessary to get into a bit of background as to the nature of some forms of motivation. We know that differing personality characteristics are present in all individuals, and that these characteristics affect all subsequent behavior. Whether this is "good" behavior, or "bad" behavior, it makes no difference. Motivation must be seen as being an objective thing which affects behavior, being neither good nor bad in the scientific sense. We are going to consider certain characteristics of all people, and how these characteristics operate as important factors in the behaviors which will be outlined in the rest of this discussion.

1. By now, we must be aware that every individual has unconscious feelings and unconscious thoughts. These unconscious feelings exist in all of us and affect almost everything that we do, think, or say. We also, of course, have conscious feelings and thoughts, which combine with the unconscious.

2. All children want to please their parents and their teachers, and they want to conform to their parents' and their teachers' wishes. Note the emphasis on the word "want" other than "do." Children, because their

intelligence and emotional controls are not sufficiently well developed, need and require from their elders guidance and instructions. It is not important for our present purposes whether children "mind" us all the time. They do, however, want to please us and do what we think is right. That is, they may not mind us, but they want to mind us.

Children, in general, do not know what is right and what is wrong, or what is expected of them until we very clearly establish this for them. So, then, we can make the assumption that children do want to please teachers and parents because this is one of the most important processes through which they can receive the approval and the affection they need.

3. Children are knownto react both to the conscious and to the unconscious desires, wants, and needs of their parents and of their teachers. By this we mean that children very often--if not always--"sense" the every-day parental messages, which may come either in obvious verbal communications such as ordinary speech, or via what is known as "sub-verbal cues," such as gestures, tone inflection, mood, body posture, paying attention, etc.

It is these more unconscious desires that will attract our attention in the next few pages. These sub-verbal cues that are intuitively sensed by the child are not often sensed to in a completely conscious manner. But they do affect the child in an intuitive or unconscious way, and from this we get overt and conscious behavior. For example, if we were to ask a youngster whether he felt a teacher was slighting him or ignoring him, the chances are that the child would say that the teacher was not. In effect, adults do identically the same thing, but we too deny it because it sometimes is embarrassing to have to admit that someone is not paying attention to us, or dislikes us, etc.

We would now like to discuss how teachers, as well as parents, can generate undesirable or delinquent type of behavior by certain difficulties which they may have. In this regard, they represent nothing less than surrogate parents, and the psychodynamics of the relationships between parent and child are used as a model here and converted into teacher-child behavior in the classroom.

The following are some of the characteristics which are known to often result in dysfunctional, neuratic or delinquent behavior.

1. It is known that very often a conflict or a series of conflicts, exist in either parents or teachers. These conflicts need not always be very profound or very disturbing or very distressing to the adult. Nevertheless, they will almost inevitably be manifested in certain subtle, and sometimes not so subtle, behavior on the part of the adult. These conflicts may be either fully conscious, semiconscious, or be completely unconscious. The important thing is that the conflict is communicated to the child via some subtle mechanism, such as we will be discussing in the following pages.

2. Adults communicate (often by sub-verbal cues) their conflicts to their children and students. With this "double communication," which can say both "Do what I tell you" and also "Don't do what I tell you," adults often grant unwitting permission to a child for undesirable behavior. This is the so-called "Double-Bird" that many recent authors have written about. An adult's mixed emotions (technically called "ambivalences") are communicated, and the child senses both emotions. However, for practical reasons--the reasons being that a child cannot do antagonistic things both at the same time--the child can only react to

one of them, usually the surface-directed one. At certain times the child also reacts to the submerged or unconscious desire of the adult, to the "directive" which was communicated by the adult by gestures, by voice tone, by inflection, etc.

3. It is very difficult for us to accept that a parent could actually receive satisfaction from what a child does when that behavior is undesirable or even delinquent. Nevertheless, the clinical evidence on this point is quite clear and we must accept the fact that at times both teacher and parent derive unconscious satisfaction from misbehavior or other anti-social acting-out of the child. This kind of satisfaction is called "vicarious," meaning that the parent receives satisfaction indirectly from the act of the child, or the teacher receives satisfaction from the act of the child.

The notion of vicarious satisfaction is less difficult to accept if we keep in mind that we receive a great deal of satisfaction when our children do good things. For example, when a young boy runs a touchdown pass and wins the game for the home team, the parents of that child are tremendously pleased because the youngster has done something with which they themselves identify. After the game they will say, "We won the game," when of course they had very little to do with the actual winning. We'll see how this vicarious satisfaction operates in the many examples which are to follow. At any rate, it is important to keep in mind that a certain amount of unconscious satisfaction--vicarious satisfaction--is present in the acting out of a child when it is fostered by the adult.

These general principles can apply to both appropriate behavior and to dysfunctional behavior. They are general principles of behavior and

may not, necessarily, have anything to do with behavior which is inevitably undesirable or abnormal. However, as is the usual procedure in this type of writing, use of examples of a clinical or extraordinary nature are given in order to make a point. This is once again a case of not pointing to the very obvious and to the very well-ordered things as being exciting reading. A perfectly legitimate chapter could be written using only those elements which are "good" or "desirable" or "charming" or "pleasant" or "functional." These things imply usually well-ordered parents and children, consequently do not call attention to the problems that never arise. For our purposes, however, we want to call attention not to the "goodie-goodie" elements, but to those which may become dysfunctional not only in home but in the classroom.

III Games Teachers Play

Expectation. Expectation represents an "extension" of the person's own needs onto another person, rather than a projection of them. It is not identical to a conscious "wish" or a "hope," but rather a deep seated expectation of people we have come to know. It is central to all other concepts. In general, the emotionally healthy teacher or parent expects good things from a child, both consciously and unconsciously. He expects the child to behave well and productively in school, with friends, at home, and even when he is away from school and home and no one is supervising him. The well-adjusted parent or teacher, then, has faith in a child. This healthy, trusting expectation is sensed by the child, and make him feel secure in and good about his behavior. Consequently, the child will usually act in accordance with this feeling of trust and good will.

In its less constructive form, expectation can seriously damage a child. For example, because of some poorly repressed, unacceptable need; teacher or parental conflict of emotions; or conscious needs which are extremely troublesome to the teacher or parent begins to endow the child with expectations which are not healthy. We say that the teacher or the parents' problems are being displaced onto the child. The child is thus

being burdened with the conflicts and ambivalences which reside in the adult, and are emotional problems only of the adult. Rather, they are problems which should be only of the adult.

The result of this displacement is that the child feels excessive internal emotional conflict and frustration. This frustration is converted into anger, and in turn has to be "unloaded" in some manner. Everyone knows of this "unloading" (technically called "displacement") in the examples seen every day. A husband takes his anger toward his boss out on his wife; a teacher angry at her principal or her husband, scolds her class, or the little boy kicks the dog when his mother scolds him.

In a similar manner, conflicts of long-standing or aggression which is chronic has to be spent. If the person cannot unload this anger, he can turn it inward and become depressed or ill. Or, he can "deposit" this anger in one of his children who will then act out the adult's hostility. This hostility can quickly form the basis for destructive behavior. As the adult feels his own aggression, he can project his feelings of aggression onto others and expect them to be aggressive. Specifically, however, he can project his anger unconsciously onto a single child or an entire class and expect the child or the class to be aggressive.

Expectation, then, can refer to both conscious and unconscious feelings. It is wise to point out that Expectation is less of a specific mechanism than are the others which are to be outlined below. It is a generalized mechanism which manifests itself throughout the other mechanisms. In summary, then, the adult's expectation is communicated in one

way or another to the child, who, after having absorbed it, either consciously or unconsciously, reacts to it, again either consciously or unconsciously.

The Very Specific Poor Example. The second of these mechanisms is the Poor Example, or as it will come to be called here, The Very Specific Poor Example. This mechanism is well-known to everybody, not only to the psychologically-minded or to probation, parole and social workers. The idea is usually simple enough: teachers or parents set a poor example for their children in the things they (teachers or parents) do.

However, in our way of looking at adult-fostered behavior, a poor example connotes much more than just this. A moment's reflection must surely reveal that no single adult can set a poor example in all areas of life--although at times it surely seems this way. If one considers the vast number of "bad" things that a teacher or a parent can do, then it is easier to see that the adult can set a bad example in only a limited number of areas of life. For the most part, an adult's "bad" behavior is confined to two or at most, three immoral, dysfunctional, or illegal activity patterns. While it may be said that this is enough, it is important to keep in mind that there are literally thousands of immoral, illegal and dysfunctional activities in which people can engage. The great diversity of potential behavior--both good and bad, legal and illegal, moral and immoral, passive or active, normal and abnormal--calls to mind the joke about the minister who walks into a lawyer's office, sees the walls lined with hundreds of law books and remarks, "Look at all the laws necessary to enforce the ten commandments!"

Fully aware that a person can act inadequately in only a limited manner, Adelaide Johnson was able to formulate her concept of the "Super-ego Lacuna." She uses this term to designate a break, a gap, in our conscience or moral structure. The psychoanalytic thinkers use the term Super-ego for that portion of the psychic apparatus which has to do with controlling impulses, our moral conscience, as it were. Johnson feels that it is almost literally impossible for a person's <u>entire</u> repressive barrier to break down, and thus to behave inadequately in <u>all</u> areas of life. I used to be fond of pointing out to delinquent children, regardless of how many delinquencies they had committed, that the actual amount of waking time they had spent "getting into trouble" was less than five percent! Nevertheless, these youngsters had been "talked to" (reinforced) so much about their five percent of "bad behavior" that often both they and their parents forgot the adequacy of the other ninety-five percent.

Police departments all over the nations, as well as the F.B.I., have recognized the phenomenon of a Super-ego Lacuna, but it is reasonable to assume that these people were not always able to explain completely what this phenomenon really meant or how it came to be. They did assign it a name, the "modus operandi" or M.O. of criminals, which is the criminologist's way of saying, "Certain criminals behave illegally in certain ways only."

The bad example that a parent can set, therefore, is not a generalized bad example, but a <u>Very Specific Poor Example</u>, a label which fits our present concepts of misbehavior much more accurately. By extension, of course, we all have an M.O., but it is not always "bad." This M.O. simply attests to our individuality. And, of course, when a teacher says she

"knows that child," what she is saying is that she knows his "M.O." Of course, she also may be contributing to the M.O. being perpetuated by expecting it!

In somewhat broader manner, one of our psychological tests, the Thematic Apperception Test, usually call the TAT, is designed to identify this type of individuality. In the TAT, the individual being tested is shown a series of 10-20 drawings, and asked to tell a story about each one. Although the pictures are the same for all individuals, the stories told to them are <u>always</u> different. Each individual's stories seem to have an underlying "theme," related to <u>that</u> individual's manner of perceiving the world. This theme is unique for each individual, and reflects both his deep-seated predispositions, and his manner of acting them out. When the psychological examiner carefully goes over the stories, he will note that the stories have a certain unique pattern, or a certain unique feeling-tone, or a certain unique type of ending. For instance, the individual may have all his stories end in a sad or tragic manner. Another individual will have them all end in murders and violence, but they won't have a "sad" flavor, and so on.

When I was first starting my training in the TAT, I had administered the test to an individual and examined his stories. I could find no pattern or theme, so I went to my clinical professor and told him that this individual had no themes. He did not even look up from his desk, but told me five words I have never forgotten: "Keep looking. He has themes." I looked harder; and he had themes.

<u>Over-Concern</u>, <u>Excessive Curiosity</u>, <u>Excessive Eagerness</u>. The third is actually a group of mechanisms, but they are "birds of a feather."

They are Over-Concern, Over Preoccupation, Excessive Curiosity, and Excessive Eagerness. In effect, these mechanisms are used by the people who are maladjusted in certain areas to become over-concerned with behavior and ideas related to those same areas.

For example, the teacher who is a hypochondriac is forever over-concerned with the vague aches and pains of his body, with doctors, with medications, and with related health matters. It is often quite difficult--at times almost impossible--for his class to have a discussion with him without him making reference to his body's health. The concern with his health is so intense in his mind that he is unable to prevent this concern from intruding into the various areas of class discussion. For example, if the class (or a student) should want to talk about the trip it recently took to the mountains, the teacher will listen for a while and then begin telling how his family had also wanted to go to the mountains, but that his arthritis seemed to be worse that week.

Or a fellow teacher wants to talk about his children; he will soon find himself hearing about the first teacher's sickly week. If he will listen very closely, he will hear "between the lines," that the teacher is expressing exaggerated concern with the state of his children's probably minor illness.

Should you come to talk about your work, the hypochondriac will eventually come to mention how he "has not been feeling well at all" lately, and this, as a consequence, he has not been working effectively at school. Listen long enough and you will probably hear how "the pressure with the kids at school" has had to do with how he feels, although he may say it backwards: how he had felt so bad this week,

"just when there has been so much misbehavior at school." It hardly needs to be emphasized that such constant concern with health and with the body will eventually be interiorized by the students. Of course, the example of the hypochondriac is but one single way of expressing over-concern, or Over-Preoccupation.

Likewise, when a parent is over-concerned with sexuality, he will be transmitting to the child an unhealthy preoccupation with matters dealing with sex. Because of the constant reference to matters of sex, the child will begin to feel that perhaps sex is something to be concerned about, something to become acquainted with, something which should be investigated further. Just like the healthy parent's constant legitimate admonitions to the young child to "never cross the street alone" are eventually absorbed, so too are the constant references to sex by the sexually maladjusted parent regarding its dangers, other people's attitudes toward it, or other's actual sexual misconduct. Eventually, the child internalizes a morbid concern for matters dealing with sex. This over-concern with sexuality can take several paths, but we can get a good taste of what it can do by examining two aspects of it, excessive restrictiveness and excessive permissiveness, the two extremes of a continuum of sexual attitudes.

Let us say that a parent (or a teacher) is excessively concerned with the idea that sex and all things pertaining to sex are bad, immoral, and dirty. When the parent or teacher talks about sex, beyond the mere content of this talk, there is a "feeling-tone," an emotion, which is also conveyed, and this feeling-tone must surely also reveal the fear, disgust, repulsion, or other neurotic inhibitions. At the same time the

teacher or the parent is admonishing the child regarding the "proper place" of sex, the child is intuitively picking up more; he is also picking up the sub-verbal cues of excessive preoccupation with sex. And so, because of "communication at two different levels," the child has now been taught two things: sex is dirty, shameful, and evil, and to be terribly concerned about it all.

Another parent may be excessively permissive with regard to sex. He will reveal his feelings by such behavior as running around the house nude or semi-nude, by constantly asserting that sex is a natural and beautiful thing and nothing to be ashamed of, by claiming that there is no reason why people should shy away from it, or by proclaiming that no one ever need deny "sexuality in all its aspects, for it exists for one and all to acknowledge." Often, these people will carry on highly intellectualized conversations regarding sex. Accompanying the intellectualizations will be casual jokes about sex, or a smattering of subtle double entendres related to sex. The effect of this "liberal" view about sex is approximately the same as the "conservative" view. The child absorbs not only the intellectual view, but also the emotional feeling-tone behind it. Ultimately, as a function of all these subtle and not-so-subtle cues, the child becomes ensnared in a web of sexual maladjustment.

While the above two examples dealt with sexuality, the concepts of Excessive Concern, Over-Preoccupation, etc., are obviously not limited to this area of functioning. To show how these mechanisms combine with others, let us take the pair of Expectation and Excessive Concern to demonstrate how they operate to generate a delinquent act.

Donnie D. was a sixteen-year-old youngster who was shy and pleasant, but not too attractive in appearance. His father was a fireman in a small private fire station. They lived in a house trailer not far from the fire station, and thus it was easy for them to walk the distance from their trailer to work. Donnie's mother had died a few years before, so the father and Donnie lived alone. Often Donnie would go to the fire station to help his father with the station chores. On their walks to the fire station, the father often called attention to the broken-down shack which sat in an empty lot along their path. The father, now in one manner, now in another, would remark that the shack was a perfect example of a target for a fire-setter. It must be understood that fire-setting was not all they talked about. One can surmise that they also talked about such legitimate concerns as Donnie's shoes which were beginning to show signs of wear, of the fire truck's leaky water valve, of Donnie's drop from a B to a C in algebra, and so on. But, also, they talked about a very unique and singular preoccupation, the concern of the father that someone, sometime, somehow, was going to set fire to that old shack. As the boy heard this preoccupation verbalized, he also heard something else: a plea, a suggestion, a "hint," as it were, that the shack be burned down. It will come as no surprise to the reader that the boy eventually set fire to the shack, and was subsequently arrested for it. Of course, when the father was told, he was astonished!

Looking back, it can easily be seen that the father's excessive concern with people setting fires to anything in general had been focused on the shack, and that he had verbalized enough of his poorly-controlled impulses to set fires in a sufficiently precise--if devious--manner that

the boy had caught the essence of these impulses rather than the admonitions to not do these. It is significant, of course, that the father was a fireman. It has been found, more often than chance would allow, that firemen have an over-preoccupation with fires. Their need to become firemen represents a socially-approved manner of curbing these impulses. Can anyone conceive of a better way of both being able to be involved with fires, and yet to cleanse one's conscience of the unconscious guild regarding the setting of fires, than to become a fireman and help put out fires started by someone else? Of course, not all firemen are "fire bugs" with partially-controlled impulses, but, as a group, firemen probably contain more such people than, say, a group of shoe salesmen. Of course, we all choose our vocation for both conscious and unconscious reasons, so that our choice of the fireman in this paragraph is only one example of socially-acceptable means people use to curb their impulses. Another such example might be a youngster who had some difficulty controlling his impulses to fight. If he liked fighting well enough, he could choose the socially-approved profession of boxing, and thus be rewarded for fighting. But, if his impulse to fight is something he really did not like, he could help control it by helping others control theirs.

But, let us return to the story of Donnie D. which is not yet at an end. Recall that the basic defect in the Super-ego of the father, and thus presumably in the child, was a gap in the area of fires and fire-setting. Is it possible that this defect could be manifested in other ways than mere "fire-setting to an old shack along the road"?

As was mentioned, Donnie and his father lived in a trailer court. Into this court there moved a pretty divorcee who was only in her late teens. When Donnie would visit this young girl in her trailer home, she would sexually tease him, which naturally frustrated him. After a time, Donnie became infatuated with her, and held some proprietary feelings about her. However, the feeling was evidently not mutual, for the young lady began to entertain other young men in the trailer home. When Donnie found this out, he was enraged. In what <u>one</u> way might we surmise that Donnie would express his anger? That's right! You've guessed it! He set fire to the girl's trailer. Although no one was hurt, Donnie was placed in custody of juvenile officials.

After Donnie was released from the custody of the Juvenile Court, having spent several months in the State Institution for Juveniles, he was able to join the Navy. One day, an official from the Navy came to the Juvenile Court Building to check with juvenile authorities about a series of fires which had occured in the South Pacific. After having described the fires to the juvenile official, the Navy official was startled to hear the juvenile offical come up, spontaneously, with Donnie D.'s name. The Navy official may have been startled, but the juvenile official was not. The juvenile official's task was easy; he knew Donnie's M.O.

<u>Lack of Genuine Prohibitions</u>. Lack of Genuine Prohibitions is our fourth mechanism. It is the easiest of the mechanisms to outline. Whenever a teacher (or parent) <u>verbalizes</u>, <u>but does not legitimately enforce</u>, <u>a command</u>, we have an example of Lack of Genuine Prohibitions. Actually, this is but a variant of the Expectation factor. The student senses that

the teacher is not <u>really</u> going to enforce the command and that he is not <u>really</u> going to expect the child to obey. The youngster therefore sees no good reason why he <u>should</u> obey. For example, the teacher may say that he wants the student to sit down. However, the boy knows from past experience that if he does not sit down, all he <u>may</u> get is a mild scolding. In the boy's mind, these scoldings are less to be feared than is the pleasure he derives from being able to run about the classroom. The choice for the boy is quite easy.

The reader must always bear in mind that any and all psychological traits or characteristics must bear the stamp of the person's deeper personality structure. The pattern of behavior or set of attitudes the parent demonstrates have to be tied to his deeper character organization. For example, if the parent should be a fairly passive individual, one whose behavior and actions do not demonstrate much vigor or assertiveness, then the child senses this lack of vigor or assertiveness. A parent so disposed, when confronted with an unruly boy, may simply state that "I can't do a thing with that boy." He is absolutely correct, but the primary blame is not to be found in the boy's behavior, but in the passivity of the parent. For years, he has "been unable to do anything with that boy." If the boy's childhood history could be investigated carefully, it would reveal that the parents had passively allowed a multitude of little mischievous and disobedient acts to slide by as "harmless." Now, when the matter of the boy's staying out late has become an important issue, the parents are unable to understand that the boy is simply following a pattern of behavior which has been set throughout his entire life. The pattern throughout his life had been permeated with a Lack of Genuine Prohibitions.

Teachers often do essentially the same thing. They see a child misbehaving in class, and after two or three half-hearted attempts at correction, simply give up and passively proclaim to the world that they "have tried and tried, but can't do a thing with that child." They then rationalize their behavior on the basis--true or not--that the child's parents are "very difficult people." After all, haven't most teachers learned that pupils' troubles are generated by poor parents? Well, then, this must be a case of just that, poor parents. This passive attitude or feeling is communicated to the child, and the child increasingly acts out his conflicts. Little does the teacher realize that the child desperately needs and wants to be directed into appropriate and functional behavior. When the teacher does not guide him firmly, the student begins to dislike him for his lack of firmness, and an increased amount of misbehavior ensues.

There is another way that parents demonstrate the Lack of Genuine Prohibitions pattern. If a man and his wife have come to something like an "Oh, what the heck," attitude toward each other (probably because this prevents unending arguments), the child will sense this and take advantage of it. For example, a young girl wants to go to the movies and it is getting too late. The youngster will approach her mother and ask for permission. The mother will say, "No." The girl will then be upset and tell the mother that she is going to ask her father. The father sees what he is going to have to face: either he will have to make a decision against his wife or a decision against his daughter. Since the daughter has learned from the parents that it is easier for them to say, "Oh, what the heck," she will nag the father until he says "Yes." No real damage

done? The daughter goes off to the movies, and the couple glare at each other and shrug their shoulders, and think, "Oh, what the heck," once again. Neither of the parents was able to set limits firmly or to back each other in his decision. Notice that in Lack of Genuine Prohibitions, the parents' behavior constitutes a "sin of omission" rather than a "sin of commission."

Just as often, conflict and ambivalence may cause the parent to be wishy-washy in his prohibitions. The point is the same, however. The child senses that the parent is not going to "stick to his guns" in his decision, and so he (the child) does whatever he feels like doing.

An "Oh, what the heck," attitude is frequently found in the schools. Usually something has frustrated the needs or desires of the teacher. His principal seems uninterested in his work; his spouse is doing something he doesn't like; his neighbors happen to be two relatively passive teachers also; etc., etc. These situations serve to activate the passive component of his own personality, and he is no longer willing to try that extra ounce to get things done, to try and remedy Johnny's behavior problem, by giving him Genuine Prohibitions and make them stick.

Unreasonable Blaming. The fifth mechanism may be call Unreasonable Blaming. There is probably no teacher or parent alive who has not, at one time or another, wrongfully blamed a child for something the child has not done. This is almost natural, for children are frequently into some mischief or other. Usually, it is not serious, and, with continued supervision, the child will eventually stop his wrongdoing. However, when a teacher or parent blames a child repeatedly for something the child has not done, the adult is probably expressing some negative aspect of his own personality.

This is especially true when the child is blamed for behavior in only one area of his conduct. For example, the child may be constantly blamed for not telling the truth, but not for doing any one of a multitude of things children usually do, and for which they are generally scolded. Why should it be that the teacher unjustly blames the child for being dishonest if the idea of dishonesty was not foremost in the teacher's mind? Why not fighting? Or, why not fearfulness? Because it was not aggression, as such, or fears, as such, that was occupying a greater and greater amount of time in the teacher's thoughts, be these conscious or unconscious thoughts. It was dishonesty. Whenever a teacher--or anyone else for that matter--becomes overly concerned or preoccupied with a single idea, that one idea intrudes into much of that individual's thinking. Inevitably, this thought is then attributed to other people, and the person believes that these other people are, likewise, preoccupied with the same ideas or thoughts. The usual name of this is projection. People project onto others the ideas or feelings which they, themselves, have.

But, parents have much less influence on the people who are not in their immediate family than they have on their family. And they have most influence on their children. So, it is not hard to see why a parent, obsessed with the "wrongfulness" of dishonesty to be also obsessed with the idea of wrongfulness in his child. Then, to carry this idea to its logical conclusion, we can ask, "In what kind of parental behavior would such excessive preoccupation as this overconcern with dishonesty likely to be manifested?" By saying that the child is dishonest.

Teachers behave in much the same way as parents. Their influence is both somewhat less intense and more widespread--more "watered-down."

Nevertheless, the identical mechanism operates. A teacher who expects her children to cheat will somehow beget cheating children (the old Hartshorne and May studies showed this as early as the late 1920's).

A child can be blamed, then, either by parent or by teacher, for something he did not do. However, the expectation of the wrongdoing will have been sensed by the child, and, sooner or later, the child will begin to do "what is being asked of him." He will begin to do what he is being blamed for.

While all of the examples in these paragraphs have been negative (undesirable or abnormal or unusual), the same mechanism does operate in a completely opposite way toward the healthy expectation. Let us take the case of a young man who is very much is love with his fiancee. He loves her and he feels that he can respect her, because he feels she is sincere, trustworthy, and loyal. Feeling this way, he has complete faith in her. Now, suppose someone tells this man that the girl is seeing another man. The natural reaction of the young man will be to refuse to believe the idea that his girl has been unfaithful. This is psychologically so because the idea of the girl's being unfaithful does not fit the picture in his mind of her. He does not expect this kind of behavior from her. His love is based on respect and mutual faith, and, since he is still in love with her, he cannot accept anything about the girl which violates the reasons that cause him to be in love with her. In his state of mind--in love--he cannot expect anything from her except what is in his mind.

Further proof of this can be seen in every classroom. How many times has a "good" child been accused for something gone wrong in the

classroom, and for which, in effect, that "good" child actually was responsible. If you can recall your own hesitancy to believe that child could have done that particular act, you have the principle of Unreasonable Blaming in its reverse form, "Unreasonable Non-Blaming," if you will!

As you can easily see, these subtle things are two-edged. If you refuse to blame a (misbehaving) child, you are doing something harmful; if you unreasonably blame a innocent child, you are doing something harmful. The correct path is not easy to follow, but we must at least try.

Assigned Identification. Assigned Identification is the sixth interpersonal mechanism of defense. Take the case of "Uncle Louie." The second boy in a family of three boys bears a striking resemblance to good old Uncle Louie. He has the same mouth and the same eyes as Uncle Louie. The body build is the same, and he even walks like Uncle Louie. People are always saying how the boy reminds them of Uncle Louie. Now, if you live with this idea being tossed at you for a dozen or more years, it begins to "make a dent."

However, the boy also hears about how Uncle Louie drinks too much. So, one day he will be reminded of how much he looks like Uncle Louie; and the next day he will be reminded of how much Uncle Louie drinks. Thus, the boy has grown up with what I have come to call an "Assigned Identification." This means that the child did not really choose to identify with whatever figure he normally chooses, i.e., his father. Instead, others "suggested" a specific alternate person to him. After a while, then, the boy somehow gets the feeling that he is, in fact, like Uncle Louie.

But, unless Uncle Louie is unusually close to the boy, one would not expect the child to interiorize the frequent libations which are also part of Uncle Louie. However, should the parents of this now teenage child also begin to evidence poorly-controlled impulses against drinking--that is, if they would like to drink but have somehow only partially controlled this impulse--it may be that they will expect the boy to also act like Uncle Louie. Naturally, they do not realize what they are doing, for the impulse is almost completely repressed.

So, a subtle but insidious campaign is begun, in which an increased number of admonitions not to act like Uncle Louie begin to appear. Also, more and more talk referring to Uncle Louie's drinking is to be heard around the house. Inevitably, the remark is submitted to the boy, "I better never see you come staggering in like Uncle Louie did last Saturday night." How do you think the boy feels? He senses that the parents really don't want him to drink, . . . but, ... But, they really must want him to drink, somehow. Eventually, the boy begins to drink. The parents' own poorly-controlled need to drink has chosen the best scapegoat they can find, the drinking Uncle's closest replica, their son. They have actually achieved unconscious vicarious satisfaction through the boy's drinking. Of course, when the boy is found drinking, one can just imagine the uproar: "I was afraid something like this would happen;" "We tried to warn him about being like Uncle Louie;" and, of course, the old tried-and-true, "He probably got some of the same bad blood that got into Uncle Louie." That they actually and activally encourage the boy to start drinking probably never would occur to them.

Assigned Identification occurs in the schools all the time. I recall an instance in my own case: My sister was exceptionally good in math, and I was not. Mrs. R. simply insisted that I be good in math. "You're Vicky's brother aren't you?" she would ask. My affirmative answer also automatically--to her--identified me as someone who "must" be good in math.

Physical appearance is often another good "starter." A teacher who had an oversized and troublesome youngster one year will instantly eye the biggest boy in her next class and begin to "hope against hope" that he will not also be troublesome. Assigned Identification can, of course, also work in a positive manner. Should a teacher somehow stereotype a youngster as "smart" because, for example, he or she wears glasses, the expectation of that child as a good student can actually produce an increasingly effective student!

Indirect Suggestion. Number seven in our list of mechanisms is Indirect Suggestion. With a phrase that is half-finished, or with a sentence that has a particular flavor, the child senses that indeed it "wasn't what you said, it was the way you said it." Suppose the family was passing through a slum section of the city. As the mother surveyed the run-down housing and the children playing in the street, she may have remarked to her own child, "We mustn't look down on these poor folks--they are nice people--they are poor, of course, but most of them are well-behaved; yes, only some are ill-mannered," and so forth. It may never have occurred to her young child that these poor (economically) folks were also "poor" in morality. The thought that erupted spontaneously from the mother causes the identical possibility to occur in the child's mind that perhaps their "poor" morality may indeed be a fact.

Who has not felt the uneasy tension when a person is talking about a third party, and then adds that he, the third person, is a Jew. Someone is bound to add, "Why, that's all right. I know some fine Jews." Why did the question of whether Jews are fine or not arise? If the man has said the third person was a Swede, would the party have made remarks concerning the Swedish population's morality. Would he have been more likely to ask whether this Swede had blond hair? It is a subtle difference, but the implication is clear.

Or suppose a youngster comes home and tells his parents that some of the boys at school were throwing rocks at passing cars. The father may quickly ask the boy if he (the boy) was throwing rocks. The instant the father does this, he is communicating, in the most subtle manner possible, that he (the father) believes his son capable of throwing rocks at cars. If he thought his boy never really could throw a rock, the question would never have been asked.

There is a subtle but significant difference between encouraging a child to do something and believing a child capable of doing something. Let us examine another of these examples, one not so marginal. Say the same boy came home and told his father that one of the boys up the street had called him "a dirty name." The father, then, immediately will ask if the boy (his son) hit the other boy. Although the youngster will honestly answer that he did not, the suggestion was nevertheless planted in the boy that the father believed him capable of doing this sort of thing, hitting back. Now, the next time a boy calls the son a "dirty name," the boy will half-remember how the father asked him if he had struck the name-caller. And, he reasons--probably completely unconsciously--

that if he hits the boy this time, and then tells the father that he did, the father will probably not be surprised, and thus he probably will be neither admonished nor punished severely.

Perhaps the idea of a parent's believing his youngster capable of doing something bad--or good-- is a little less obvious, or perhaps it does not communicate as readily, but it is in the same family as Expectation, and is a variant of Expectation. These two travel hand-in-hand. When a parent expects a child to do something, whether consciously or unconsciously--whether good or bad--that parent actually believes the child capable of doing that particular act. The projected belief motivates the youngster--at least in part--and the parents' or the teacher's expectation becomes a Self-Fulfilling Prophecy.

When an anxious mother waits up for her daughter after a date and questions her about any possible sexual behavior or drinking, she is actually saying that she (the mother) believes the daughter capable of going out and doing these things. That the mother loudly decries these actions is of relatively little consequence. The youngster, upon seeing what the mother is doing, senses that the mother might actually want to hear that something had gone on. Now, if the youngster has this expectation pounded into her a sufficient number of times, such as if the mother always stays up to ask the daughter if she has been drinking, then the youngster will eventually commit the offense, because it is in this manner only that she can satisfy the parent's unspoken but unwittingly clearly communicated need for the act. In a word, the child will perform the act expected by the parent.

Lives there a teacher who, having left the classroom for a few minutes upon coming back into the classroom has never asked "Did you all behave all right?" As innocent as this may sound, in this statement was the teacher's unspoken implication that he believed the class capable of misbehavior. Actually, to turn the tables around, it is actually possible for a teacher to say the exact thing--"Did you all behave all right?"-- and have the class sense that the expected reply would be a resounding, "Yes, we behaved very well." It has to do with the teacher's own fears, his insecurities, his lack of confidence; or, by the identical but reverse token, his self-assuredness, his total confidence.

A good example of Indirect Suggestion may be seen in a story of a boy who committed vadalism. The father of the boy had stated that he did not like the fact that a Jew had just moved into their neighborhood. Further, the father added, since he had been "cheated" by Jews in the past, then, obviously, this man was also a cheat, and that he would not have a dishonest person living in the same neighborhood. The father was actually going to try and take legal steps to have the Jewish man move from the house. The boy, of course, heard all of this conversation and took it all in. When the boy was arrested by the police for having committed a considerable amount of damage to the Jewish man's house, the boy stated, much to everyone's surprise, that every thing was alright, and that "Father would understand." However, when the father arrived at the police station and found out what the boy had done, he was shocked. It was true, the father was forced to admit, that he did not like having Jews in the neighborhood, but he had never told the boy to cause damage to the Jewish man's property. And, in truth, the man consciously did <u>not</u>

condone the actions of the boy. The boy, not trained in the subtleties of whatever legal maneuvers the father might take to make the Jewish man move, listened only to the father's anger, and, using the most direct and effective manner he knew, took action. It was obvious that the boy was following the father's wishes, if not his actual commands.

Unhealthy Predictions. The eighth of our arbitrarily-labeled mechanism is called Unhealthy Predictions. Imagine yourself visiting some friends who have just had a new baby boy. Typically, the father and mother will take the child and begin to talk about how he looks "more like grandmother than mother," or they'll allow how "with those little, chubby fingers, another Van Cliburn he won't be." In the same jovial tone, they'll talk about how he is going to become a great engineer, an astronaut, a big businessman, or a big-name writer for Hollywood. Then, mother will surely bring into the conversation whether or not the baby had had the colic, and no sooner has this been heard, when the conversation will turn to the controvery of whether the baby's bottles should be warm or cold, as the magazine article said last week.

Most people have gone through this kind of new-baby-visitation many times. At worst, if the conversation takes a somewhat morbid turn, the parents will remark that they hope nothing happens to the youngster, like an accident, or a serious disease, and wind it up making vague statements of how he'll grow up to be a solid citizen. Nothing terribly abnormal about the tone of this conversation, is there?

Imagine, then, a social worker's surprise, when, in a true incident, whe heard a parent express the notion that she (the mother) hoped her new-born youngster would not grow up to be a murderer! If you are somewhat

surprised, then you will be even more surprised to know that, by the age of fourteen, that boy had actually murdered a man! Was this just a coincidence? You may say, "Of course, it must be a coincidence." But, ask yourself, "How many times have I heard a mother state she would not like her boy to become a murderer." Not very many, I trust. It may be assumed that the same preoccupation verbalized to the social worker was verbalized to the boy many other times, and that the boy, for some fourteen years, was plagued on and off, with ominous warning about being careful not to murder someone! Or, in a different case history, was it just another coincidence that a father would repeatedly warn his boy not to go out and hold up a store. You get one guess what the boy's offense was.

Are we to conceive of all of these "subtle suggestions" as mere coincidence? The Mayo Group feels that these "coincidences" are always to be found. Because they seem to "fit" so well, we may tend to pass them up and say, "It's just a coincidence, nothing else." Hard-core scientific evidence is, of course, almost impossible to gather in cases such as these, since for each case there is 99 percent of general-behavior fact-finding, and only 1 percent of "coincidental data." One can only appeal to the reader to keep in mind the remarkable consistent manner with which these "coincidences" keep recurring throughout the many case histories given here. Or, to put it another way, "Is it just a coincidence that every single one of these case histories is permeated with such specific coincidences?"

With these Interactional Mechanisms of Defense, it is increasingly possible to be aware of just exactly how it is that children are influenced. Also with these IMD's in mind, the teacher can prevent certain behaviors from being exhibited, thus reducing the chance of unwittingly encouraging a youngster to commit an undesirable action.