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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF
THE STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

There is much talk about emotional problems and maladjustment in our schools. To what do people refer when they speak of emotional problems and maladjustment? Let's look at some of the causes. Look at the youngsters that have lost a parent or those whose homes have been shattered by divorce or separation. Then consider the boys or girls whose parents are in the family but too busy to pay much attention to their children. Mother works, father travels, and his business is his life. These children have all been subjected to conditions which lead to problems.

Ideally every child should come from a complete family, one with happy parents, secure in each other, and providing security for their children. A child may be reared in poverty in a deteriorated neighborhood with severe handicaps, but if there is love and affection between parents, between the parents and the children, and among the children themselves, these children may escape emotional problems. Such a home provides a sense of security and companionship which is indispensable. Contrast this home with one where quarreling, bickering, and even fighting
between parents takes place. The latter home is a likely place for emotional problems to start. From these environments the child is developing personality; will it be a well adjusted personality or a personality with emotional problems?

Joel Davitz states:

The relationship between a child's early experiences with key figures in his environment and his subsequent personality development has been the focus of an impressive amount of research in child psychology. Fearful responses acquired in the parent child relationship tend to generalize to the school situation. The answer, therefore, to the question of why the maladjusted child's fear doesn't extinguish is simply that the fear continues to be reinforced. For instance if he becomes severely withdrawn he tends to elicit withdrawing or rejecting reactions in others. Thus other persons continue to punish the maladjusted child and his fears of others persist. The child lives in an interpersonal world of constant threat. The consequence is unhappiness and fear (13:4).

No child grows up in a perfect world because no parents, homes, or teachers are perfect. Almost all youngsters have been subjected to problems. The largest number have managed to go through without any ill effect. Then there are those that have become juvenile delinquents, or those whose problems are not apparent to other people but who have built up feelings even more difficult to diagnose and help.

Lowell Carr states that a public school is the one agency that deals with 90 per cent of the children of the United States. He further states that a school program unsuited to a child's capacity or a teacher not qualified may contribute definitely to delinquency (9:360).
William Kvaraceus says:

Gleuck's report on juvenile delinquents states that 85 per cent of 935 cases had repeated at least one year in their school history. In Fenton's report 47.5 per cent of the delinquent boys in his group were retarded and only 2.5 per cent had been accelerated. The New Jersey Juvenile Delinquency Commission figures showed 55 per cent retarded one year or more and 33 per cent two or more years. . . . Habits of failure and inferiority characterize the delinquent. Perhaps truancy is an escape from conflict and failure (14:138).

A child that feels secure has a feeling of belongingness. Accepted by others, respected by others, he has a feeling of self respect. He feels secure in his home and accepted by his parents and other members of his family. He may be timid when entering school, but has anticipations of being welcomed. He will belong and can satisfy his own needs through his own efforts.

Teachers don't know all of the answers. There is a need for discovering the inner feelings of the pupils: what methods are available to assist the teacher? This research study deals with the use of the California Test of Personality and its validity as an instrument for helping the teacher discover children with severe personality problems. Equipped with this information, the teacher would then be in a better position to help the child with his problems.

The writer has taught fifth grade in the Cle Elum, Washington, Elementary School for the past three years. Problems arising in the school room created interest in this study: an over-aggressive boy capable of doing his school work but not doing it and always in trouble; a shy little
girl behind in her school work, very polite, but a dreamer; a boy with a physical defect, defiant and hard to reach, doing very little school work and capable of doing much more. These and other problems not so severe were present in the school room.

Could some means be found to help these children make a better adjustment? How can the classroom teacher proceed to better appraise the adequacy of adjustment of every child? This was the central problem of the study.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Maladjustment. This term is used to denote failure of an individual, through inherent weaknesses or faulty development, to adapt his behavior to the demands of the environment.

Tests. Tests, a means of evaluating the scope of the problem, are not an evaluative measure of intelligence.

Personality. This means the manner and effectiveness with which the whole individual meets his personal and social problems, and indirectly the manner in which he impresses his associates.

Percentile Rank. This term refers to the rank of the individual in comparison to the complete sampling on a scale from 0 to 100.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

I. RELATED RESEARCH

Many professional persons have known there was a relationship between a child's personality adjustment and his attitudes and achievement. Research over the past years has brought forth much more understanding.

Ernest Ligon states:

The modern public school teacher is rapidly out-growing the idea that all she needs to teach is arithmetic. She knows that character and personality are even more important. One of the most hopeful signs of the times is the great interest shown by school teachers in genuine efforts at character education (24:12).

Perhaps in the back of her mind the teacher has always considered the personality needs of the pupils along with academic needs. In this day of growing urban population and with it the complex society causing frustrations in the lives of parents as well as children, the teacher's understanding of the emotional problems in developing personality is even greater.

Katherine D'Evelyn states:

The teacher who meets the emotional needs of his pupils is aware of the relationship between emotions and learning, between emotions and mental health. Conscious of these facts this teacher tries to preserve an attitude toward the children coming to him that will enable those with good mental health to maintain it and those with poor mental health to be benefited (14:3-4).
Many times the pupil does not realize he has personality problems. The child needs to feel he belongs to the school and is a part of it. He needs to be happy in the things he is doing and in what he is able to accomplish.

Daniel Prescott explains:

A person cannot be adjusted even reasonably well unless he feels that he has attained a worthy and effective selfhood. . . . The first step toward helping maladjusted children is the recognition of genuine maladjustment and the diagnosis of its causes. The problem case is acutely apparent whose emotions lead him to aggressiveness and rebellion. The problem child is much less apparent whose behavior is characterized by withdrawal and self condemnation (29:135).

The great concern to all professional workers is the increased number of juvenile cases coming to court or being studied and analyzed by social workers. The need to know something about factors in the child's life that cause this behavior is ever present.

Nora Cutts states:

The same forces that account for crime, divorce, and mental illness are operating in the classroom. Indeed adult maladjustment are foreshadowed in childhood and their causes are often found.

The boy who pushes and fights, talks out of turn, is rude to you and his classmates, and plays truant at every opportunity may become a delinquent and a hoodlum. The shy girl who never takes part in discussions may become hospitalized in fifteen years. But if you can find out why the overaggressive child defies your efforts to win his cooperation and why the day dreamer escapes into fantasies you may be the means of saving him. . . . Your efforts show the child that someone is interested in him, and this alone may make him want to help you by behaving better (11:56).
These articles and many others of similar nature point out the classroom teacher's need to realize how important it is to understand the emotional problems of children. Several studies can be cited which relate to the use of tests and other measurements in the study of classroom adjustment problems.

Alice Lund incorporated a program in the fifth grade to help children understand themselves. She had an experimental group of twenty-six pupils. She used the Otis Intelligence Test, The California Test of Personality, Forms A & B, and free responses of the children to questions such as "What I Like About Myself?" and "What I Don't Like About Myself?" The California Test of Personality was given before the study began and after the study was completed. The results of the second testing showed a marked gain over the first (31:373,375).

Glen Jacobsen studied juvenile delinquency in the Seattle, Washington, Schools. He found that in 1948 there were 1,550 referrals to the King County Juvenile Court; in 1949, 1,656; and in 1950, 1,557 cases. The reasons for the referrals, listed in order of frequency, were runaways, stealing, auto theft, burglary, careless mischief, and many minor offenses. Ages ranged from seven to seventeen, with most cases listed as fifteen and sixteen.

In 1948, forty eight per cent of the cases were from homes where the parents were married and living together, while twenty eight per cent were from homes broken by divorce.

Jacobsen concluded that some children needed more help in growing up than others, and that unless they get
the help they need, they may become delinquents (20:62, 67, 103).

In her study "Relationship between Reading Problems and Emotional Problems," Ruth Woods came to this conclusion:

Of the 243 children's case studies analyzed in this study, 145 were reading below capacity. Of these 145 students 113 showed evidence of emotional problems. The other thirty-three children evidenced no emotional problems. The analysis showed sixty-eight were reading at capacity. Thirty students were reading above capacity. Even though ninety-eight students were reading at or above capacity, fifty per cent of these possessed emotional problems. These problems seem to be caused not by a lack of reading difficulties but by other sources. These children were undergoing tension and anxiety from pressure placed upon them by the classroom teacher and parents. ... When emotional blockings are primary, the emotion may block success in reading and learning in general. When reading difficulties are primary, emotional problems may follow in parallel (37:72).

II. THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY

The California Test of Personality was used by Frances Oechsner in "A Study of Relationship Between Defects of Articulation in Speech and Emotional Stability of Children in the Primary Grade."

Two groups were used, the experimental--those having defective speech--and the control--those with no speech defects. There were twelve pupils from each of grades one, two, and three for the control group and the same number from each grade for the experimental group. She found a significant difference in the test scores, those in the control group scoring considerably higher. Therefore, she concluded that the experimental group, those having speech
defects, were not as emotionally stable as those not having defects (3:57).

Teachers oftentimes have not had the background needed to diagnose the emotional problems of children. They need more specialization than that generally given in the teaching profession in order to enable them to properly understand emotional problems.

William Burton, in his review of the Wickman Study, found that the teachers did not rate the pupils as they were rated by the mental hygienists. The teacher rated immoralities, dishonesties, and transgressions against authority as the most serious and withdrawing recessive personality, and behavior traits as the least serious. The mental hygienist considered withdrawing recessive personality, and behavior traits as the most serious and transgressions against authority and violations of orderliness in class as least serious.(7:570-571).

Since it was decided to try out the California Test of Personality as a testing device to help the teacher locate the children with personality problems, an evaluation of the test is included.

The California Test Bureau Staff states:

Parents as well as teachers in large numbers are coming to realize the desirability as well as the necessity of striving to improve their ability to guide children to better personality development. Accumulating evidence reveals the fact that beneath the relatively calm exterior of children are problems, frustrations, and conflicts just as difficult for them to face as are the problems with which adults wrestle from day to day. We cannot continue the old fashioned waste of allowing large numbers to develop serious nervous and mental difficulties until none but highly trained psychologists and psychiatrists can help them.
It would be gratifying to all concerned were it possible to certify that in every research to be reported and in every use of the California Test of Personality, all necessary information and suggestions for treatment proved to be entirely adequate. However, such is not the case; and the author of this test would be the first to disavow any such claim.

The California Test of Personality is much more than a mere test. It is proving to be an excellent pre-service as well as in-service training device for orienting potential as well as experienced teachers. It is providing them, not only with a frame of reference or base of operation, but also a tool for efficient guidance to better personality. Were we to forget entirely the technical validation to which the California Test of Personality has been subjected, it would still be a most valuable instrument for aiding teachers in identifying the causes of various forms of maladjustment and in contributing to their elimination (8:3).

One of the features of the test is the profile (Appendix, page 46) which makes it possible to see wherein the child deviates from the majority of the pupils. The manual contains suggestions by which the teacher can guide the child's personal and social development more effectively. Many of the items touching sensitive personal and social problems are disguised to facilitate honest pupil answers. The following are examples from the test:

Are your tests so hard or unfair that it is all right to cheat?

Do your classmates quarrel with you a great deal?

Do you suffer more than most people when they are ill (8:5)?

The California Test Bureau Staff is confident that . . . the total score, the self-adjustment score, and
the social adjustment score are highly reliable and should be used for research purposes and for individual guidance where significant decisions are to be made (8:5).

The California Test of Personality is divided into two major divisions, Personal Adjustment and Social Adjustment. The subdivisions of the Personal Adjustment are Self Reliance, Sense of Personal Worth, Sense of Personal Freedom, Feeling of Belonging, Withdrawing Tendencies, and Nervous Symptoms. The subdivisions in Social Adjustment are Social Standards, Social Skills, Anti-Social Tendencies, Family Relations, School Relations, and Community Relations.

Each subdivision of the test has twelve questions to be answered "Yes" or "No" by the pupils. A Total Adjustment score is also provided for.
CHAPTER III

THE RESEARCH SETTING

I. REVIEW OF TEST MATERIALS

The problem, to find if the California Test of Personality could be of any benefit to the teacher as a testing device to help discover personality adjustment disorders, was talked over with the superintendent and the principal. A great deal of interest was shown. It was arranged, with the permission of the teachers, to use the two sixth grade rooms and the two fifth grade rooms for the study. The teachers, all interested, agreed to help in any way they could. It was also decided to do the testing in the morning as children could do a better job of answering the test questions then.

The superintendent and principal felt that as long as the tests were to be used for school purposes (i.e., used by the teachers and kept on file at the school) the school should defray the expenses of the tests. It was also arranged with the principal to use the tests given by the school. The California Test of Mental Maturity is given to the fifth grade at the school every year. The Stanford Achievement Test is given to all of the students every spring.

The following test batteries were reviewed and rejected: The Detroit Adjustment Inventory, The Printer Aspects of Personality, The Bell Adjustment Inventory, The Amatora Child Personality Scale, and the Brown
Personality Inventory for Children. There were several reasons for rejecting tests: (1) the answer categories agree or disagree, were hard for the children to understand; (2) there were too few questions to give a good testing; (3) the questions were hard for the children to understand; and (4) complicated gradations were required for the answers.

The California Test of Personality was reviewed and chosen. It was felt that the children could understand the questions and apply them to their own behavior. It covered a wide range of adjustment situations, and all of the questions could be answered "Yes" or "No."

II. TEACHER'S EVALUATION TEST

Questions were taken from the California Test of Personality and reworded so that the teacher could answer the questions "Yes" or "No" in her evaluation of each pupil. This made it possible to make a comparison between the pupil's responses on the California Test of Personality and the teacher's evaluation of the pupil. (This test can be found in the Appendix.)

The California Test of Personality was given in November, 1958, and again in March, 1959. All of the raw scores were changed into percentile ranks, and test profiles for each child were drawn.

Teachers' evaluations were made at mid-term; all the specific responses on these evaluations were converted to percentile ranks using the same key used in the California Test of Personality. The percentile rank on the teachers' evaluation were compared with the pupil's percentile rank on
his test taken in November.

III. COMPARISON BETWEEN CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY AND OTHER SCHOOL TESTS

The pupil's I.Q.'s, obtained from the California Test of Mental Maturity, were on file at the school. These were compared with the pupil's percentile ranks on the California Test of Personality in November, 1958.

The Stanford Achievement Test scores, (i.e., grade placement), on file at the school were compared with the pupil's percentile ranks on the California Test of Personality.

IV. TEACHER INTERVIEWS

In May an interview was arranged with each teacher to discuss discrepancies in the teacher's evaluation of the pupil's personality adjustment and the pupil's responses on the California Test of Personality. The teachers were questioned only on those responses where there was a difference of thirty percentile ranks or more in the teacher's evaluation of the pupil and the pupil's test scores. Four months had elapsed since the first evaluation, and the teacher found it necessary to re-evaluate the pupils. In instances where her evaluation was unchanged, she told the reason why she had evaluated the pupils as she did.

In many instances, however, the teacher indicated that she had changed her mind, most often in the direction indicated by the pupil's test scores.
CHAPTER IV

THE RESEARCH DATA

I. COMPARISON OF THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY IN NOVEMBER, 1958, AND MARCH, 1959

As already stated the California Test of Personality was given to the pupils in the four rooms used for the study in November, 1958. Each student's scores were converted into percentile ranks, and all percentile ranks were recorded on record sheets for future use. In March, 1959, the same test was given the second time. These scores were also converted into percentile rank in order to compare the results with the results of the test taken in November, 1958.

For comparison the following divisions were used: (1) percentile rank from the same to five percentile difference, (2) score differences of 6 to 10 percentile ranks, (3) score differences of 11 to 20 percentile ranks, and (4) score differences of 20 percentile ranks or more. It was thought that rank differences of twenty percentiles or less were sufficiently close to be noteworthy and fairly reliable and valid. Rank differences of more than twenty percentiles were obviously dissimilar and, therefore, unreliable.

Table I on page 16 presents a summary analysis of the consistency of pupils' scores on the two tests of November, 1958, and March, 1959. It will be noted that 27.5 per cent of the pupils' responses were within five percentile ranks on both tests, while 18 per cent of the responses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores differences within</th>
<th>Percent of Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 percentile rank</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 percentile rank</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 percentile rank</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difference 20 percentile or less</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores differed more than 20 percentile rank</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
showed score differences from 6 to 10 percentile ranks, and 24 per cent showed score differences from 11 to 20 percentile ranks. It is apparent, therefore, that 69.5 per cent of the responses, or about 7 out of 10, were within 20 percentile ranks on both of the tests. Those that varied more than 20 percentile ranks on both tests comprised 30.5 per cent of the responses. It would seem, therefore, that the pupils were fairly consistent in their answers to the questions on both of the tests.

Chart I on the following page shows the comparison of the pupils' scores for each division of the test. Degrees of consistency are indicated by shadings from dark to light, with differences of 20 percentile ranks or more being unshaded. It will be noted that on several sections of the test the degree of consistency from one testing to another was more than 70 per cent. In other words, 70 per cent or more of the responses showed score differences on both tests of 20 percentile ranks or less in the following: Sense of Personal Worth, Social Skills, School and Occupational Relations, and Community Relations. Those test divisions with a consistency of over 60 per cent were: Self Reliance, Sense of Personal Freedom, Feeling of Belonging, Withdrawing Tendencies, Nervous Symptoms, Personal Adjustment, Social Standards, Family Relations, Social Adjustment, and Total Adjustment. On the other hand, the test section, Anti-Social Tendencie s, was least consistent, having only 50 per cent of the responses with score differences of 20 percentile rank or less on both tests.
CHART 1

COMPARISON OF THE PUPILS' SCORES ON THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY IN NOVEMBER, 1958, AND MARCH, 1959

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per cent of pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Self-Reliance
- Personal Worth
- Freedom
- Belonging
- Withdrawing
- Nervous Symptoms
- Personal Adj. I
- Social-Stdn.
- Social Skills
- Anti-Soc. Tend.
- Family Relations
- School & Occ. Rel.
- Community Rel.
- Social Adj. II
- Total Adjustment

Legend: Percentile differences on the California Test of Personality

- same - 5 p
- 6 p - 10 p
- 11 p - 20 p
- 21 p - over
II. COMPARISON OF THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY IN NOVEMBER, 1958, AND TEACHERS' RATINGS

The pupil's percentile ranks on the California Test of Personality were compared with the percentile rank of teacher's ratings of the personality adjustment of the pupil in the same manner as was done in the previous comparison. Table II on page 20 shows the consistency of the teachers' estimates of the pupils' personality adjustment, and the pupil test scores on the November, 1958, testing. It was found that 15 per cent of the scores on both tests (pupil test and teacher evaluation) were within five percentile ranks of each other, while 21.1 per cent showed score differences of from 6 to 10 percentile ranks, and 18 per cent showed score differences of from 11 to 20 percentile ranks. Altogether 45.1 per cent of the scores on both tests (about four out of nine) were within 20 percentile ranks of each other. Those that varied 20 percentile ranks and more consisted of 54.9 per cent of the pupils. This shows, therefore, that the pupil scores and the teacher estimates were not very consistent with each other.

Chart II on page 21 shows the comparisons of the pupil scores and the teacher estimates for each division of the test. The degree of consistency is again indicated by shading from dark to light. A high degree of consistency in the pupil scores versus teacher estimates (70 per cent or more) is noted in the following divisions: School and Occupational Relations and Social Adjustment. Those
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Cent of Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores differences within 5 percentile rank</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores differences 6-10 percentile rank</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores differences 11-20 percentile rank</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total differences 20 percentile rank or less</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores differed more than 20 percentile rank</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHART 2

COMPARISON OF THE PUPILS' SCORES ON THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY IN NOVEMBER, 1958, AND TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF PUPILS BEFORE MID-TERM

Percentage of pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Worth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous Symptoms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adj. I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Stdn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Soc. Tend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School &amp; Occ. Rel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Rel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adj. II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Percentile differences on the California Test of Personality

- same - 5 p
- 6 p - 10 p
- 11 p - 20 p
- 21 p - over
sections showing a consistency of from 60 to 69 per cent were: Withdrawing Tendencies, Community Relations, and Total Adjustment. On the other hand, in several test sections a lack of consistency appeared. The following test sections all showed consistency levels of 50 per cent or less: Self Reliance, Feeling of Belonging, Nervous Symptoms, Personal Adjustment, Social Skills, Family Relations, and Sense of Personal Worth.

III. COMPARISON OF THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY AND PUPIL I.Q. SCORES

The pupil percentile ranks on the California Test of Personality were compared with the I.Q. scores from the California Test of Mental Maturity. For comparison purposes the I.Q. distribution was divided in the following categories: (1) low, 84 and below; (2) low average, 85 to 94; (3) average, 95 to 109; (4) above average, 110 to 119; (5) high, 120 to 129; and (6) superior, 130 and above.

Table III on page 23 gives a summary analysis of the scholastic ability as compared with the personality adjustment scores.

Thirty-three pupils had an I.Q. of 104 and below; of this number eleven, or 33.3 per cent, had an adjustment score on the fiftieth percentile rank or above, and twenty-two, or 66.6 per cent, had an adjustment score below the fiftieth percentile rank. Fifty-six pupils had an I.Q. of 105 and above; of this number, 47, or 83.9 per cent, had an adjustment score on the fiftieth percentile rank or above while 9, or 16.1 per cent, had scores below the fiftieth
TABLE III

COMPARISON OF PUPILS' SCORES ON THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY AND PUPIL I.Q. FROM THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF MENTAL MATURITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment Percentile Rank</th>
<th>I. Q. below 104</th>
<th>I. Q. above 105</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Pupils</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment Score of 50 or above</td>
<td>11 (33.3%)</td>
<td>47 (83.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment Score of below 50</td>
<td>22 (66.6%)</td>
<td>9 (16.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percentile rank. It can be seen, therefore, that of the pupils with high I.Q. (i.e., 105 or above) about five out of six were average or above in adjustment scores, but of those whose I.Q. was low (i.e., below 105) only one out of three was average (fiftieth percentile) or above in adjustment score.

Chart III, page 25, gives the comparison of the pupil's percentile scores on the California Test of Personality given in November, 1958, and pupil's I.Q.

The degree of personality adjustment is indicated by shading; the lowest grouping below the twenty-fifth percentile rank is indicated by dark shading, and as the adjustment scores go up the shading is lighter, with the group seventy-fifth percentile rank or higher unshaded. In the low and low average I.Q. group almost all of the pupils' personality adjustment scores are below the fiftieth percentile rank. In the higher I.Q. group the number of pupils who have adjustment scores below the fiftieth percentile rank are much fewer, with the exception of the I.Q. group 110-119, in which 11 out of 26 pupils (42.2 per cent) have individual scores that fall below the fiftieth percentile rank. It would seem, therefore, that the personality adjustment score is positively related to the pupil's I.Q. In other words, in general, pupils with a high I.Q. have a high personality adjustment score and pupils with a low I.Q. have a low personality adjustment score.

IV. COMPARISON OF THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY AND PUPIL GRADE PLACEMENT SCORES

Table IV on page 27 gives the comparison of the
Legend: Percentiles on C. T. P.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile Range</th>
<th>Legend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 24</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I. Q. LEVELS**

**CHART 3**

COMPARISON OF PUPILS' SCORES ON THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY AND PUPILS' SCORES ON THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF MENTAL MATURITY
pupils' personality adjustment scores on the November testing of the California Test of Personality with the pupil's grade placement scores.

Of the twenty-two pupils below grade level, only one, or 4.6 per cent of the children, had a personality adjustment score above the fiftieth percentile rank, while 21, or 95.4 per cent, had adjustment scores below the fiftieth percentile rank. In those instances where the pupil is at grade level or above, 69 pupils, 47 or 68.1 per cent, had adjustment scores above the fiftieth percentile rank. It can be noted that pupils at grade level or above, almost 7 out of 10, were average or above in personality adjustment scores; and of those below grade level only one out of 22 had a personality adjustment score of average or above. To a great extent those pupils with high achievement have high personality adjustment scores, and those with low achievement have low personality adjustment scores.

Chart IV page 28 gives the results obtained in comparing the achievement scores (i.e., grade placement) with the personality adjustment scores of the pupils. The shading from dark to light is the same as in the previous comparisons. In the low achievement group all of the pupils have low personality adjustment scores and almost all of those in the low average and average groups have low personality adjustment scores. As the personality adjustment scores go up, the achievement scores go up also. This suggests that personality adjustment is positively correlated with achievement. Those pupils who have achieved well are relatively well adjusted persons, while those pupils who
TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF PUPILS' SCORES ON THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY AND GRADE PLACEMENT RATING FROM THE STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment Percentile Rank</th>
<th>Achievement Test Scores</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Grade Level</td>
<td>Grade Level or Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment Score of 50 or more</td>
<td>1 (4.6%)</td>
<td>47 (63.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment Score below 50</td>
<td>21 (95.4%)</td>
<td>22 (31.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend: Percentiles on C. T. P.

0 - 24
25 - 49
50 - 74
75 - up

Categories of Grade Placement Scores

CHART 4

COMPARISON OF PUPILS' SCORES ON THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY AND PUPILS' SCORES ON THE STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
have low achievement are often rather poorly adjusted.

V. RESULTS OF TEACHER INTERVIEWS

An interview was arranged with each teacher to discuss the wide variation of answers between the pupil's personality adjustment scores and the teacher's evaluation of the pupil's personality adjustment. Only those differences of 30 percentile rank or more were discussed. It was indicated to the teacher whether she had rated the pupil higher or lower than the pupil had been ranked on the test. The teacher re-evaluated the pupil and stated her judgment concerning her first evaluation. Answers were then compiled according to the teacher's opinion.

Table V page 30 gives the effect of knowledge of differences between children's personality adjustment scores and teacher's rating, or teacher's judgment.

In 37 cases, or 44.6 per cent, the teacher had either changed her mind about her judgment of the pupil's personality or was not certain about her judgment while in 46 cases, or 55.4 per cent, she felt that her judgment the first time was correct. In almost half of the cases, that is, the teacher had either changed her mind or was uncertain about her judgment.

Following are some statements made by the teachers because of reactions after studying the pupil's test papers and individual profiles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Opinion</th>
<th>Judged Higher</th>
<th>Judged Lower</th>
<th>Total Pupil Cases</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE V

THE EFFECT OF KNOWLEDGE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PUPIL PERSONALITY SCORES AND TEACHER RATING ON TEACHER JUDGMENT
1. By studying the child's answers to the California Test of Personality, I will be aided to better understand the child.

2. Now I can see some reasons for his actions.

3. The California Test of Personality answers are fascinating to study.

4. I would hardly have believed the child felt that way.

5. It is interesting to see how the child rated himself.

6. The child doesn't have confidence in himself, and it certainly shows in his answers.

In reviewing the information obtained from the teachers' interviews, the following points were brought out:

1. Often the teacher was uncertain about her judgment; in 37 instances she had either changed her mind or was uncertain about her judgment.

2. The teachers revealed their inadequacy in judging the children; for instance, one of the teachers said, "Now I can see some reasons for his actions." Another teacher said, "I would hardly have believed that the child felt that way."

3. The teacher welcomed and was willing to use information to help detect personality problems the children might have. This is noted by one teacher's remark: "By studying the child's answers to the California Test of Personality I will be aided to better understand the child."
4. The added help given by the responses on the California Test of Personality will enable the teacher to better understand the personality problems of the children. This is clearly pointed out by the teacher's remark (after studying the pupil's test responses) that the pupil certainly shows he doesn't have confidence in himself.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the California Test of Personality was of any benefit to the teacher as a testing device to help detect personality adjustment problems of the children.

The data for this thesis were limited because it was given but one year to the fifth and sixth grades in the Cle Elum, Washington, Elementary School. This constituted only a small sampling of 115 pupils.

The data were collected in the following way: The California Test of Personality was given to the pupils in November, 1958, and again in March, 1959. A comparison was made between the pupils' percentile ranks on each test to determine how consistent the pupils were in answering the test questions. The same questions were then given to the teacher for her evaluation of each pupil; these test scores and the pupils' percentile ranks on the November test were compared. In order to determine the relationship between scholastic ability and personality adjustment, the pupils' percentile ranks on the November test were compared with the I.Q. scores. In the same manner the pupils' percentile ranks were compared with the pupils' grade placement scores.

Interviews with each teacher were arranged to reveal reactions to the discrepancy between her evaluation of the pupils and the pupils' answers to the test questions. The following brief summary of the data involved:

1. Pupils in the rooms used in this study show a
fair amount of consistency in their responses to the questions on the California Test of Personality on two testings. Sixty-nine and five-tenths per cent of the responses on both tests (almost seven out of ten) were within 20 percentile ranks of one another.

2. Teacher's estimates of pupil behavior in specific test items do not agree to a large extent with pupil test responses. Only forty-five and one-tenth per cent of the items compared show teacher estimates and pupil responses within twenty percentile ranks of one another.

3. Pupil adjustment scores are closely related to pupil I.Q.'s. Only one pupil out of three with I.Q.'s below 104 had above average adjustment scores, while five out of six pupils with I.Q.'s above 105 had above average adjustment scores.

4. The pupil's adjustment scores are also closely related to the pupil's grade placement scores. Only one pupil out of twenty-two below average in achievement had above average adjustment scores, while 68.1 per cent (almost seven out of ten) from average to high in achievement had personality scores above average.

5. The teachers are not always sure about their judgments; in almost half of the instances showing large discrepancies between pupil scores and teacher estimates the teachers were either uncertain about their judgment or had changed their minds since they first rated the pupils.

6. The California Test of Personality proved to be helpful to the teachers in locating many pupil personality problems. As the teachers reviewed pupil responses on the test they indicated that they had gained in understanding the pupils.
This study was concerned with the value of the California Test of Personality as an aid to teachers in helping to detect personality adjustment problems in children. On the basis of the data contained in this study it can be concluded that the California Test of Personality has considerable value as an aid to the teacher. Pupils in the fifth and sixth grades tend to give consistent responses to the test items and the teachers indicate that the California Test of Personality has helped them to understand individual pupil behavior. While the test is not perfect in every respect (and should not supplant teacher judgment) it can serve as a valuable tool in the diagnosis of pupil personality problems.

Much work remains to be done in the field of research on personality problems. However, the teachers in this study indicate that they are in need of help. It is recommended, therefore, that the use of the California Test of Personality be continued in the Cle Elum School. Its use in elementary schools elsewhere is also suggested.
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APPENDIX
TEACHER'S TEST

Name_________________  Grade_________________

School_______________  City_________________

Date_______________  Age_________________

Personal Adjustment

Yes  No

Self Reliance

1. Do you usually need to tell him to do his work?
2. Can you depend on him to do a job?
3. Is it easy for him to recite in class?
4. Is he patient and good natured?

Sense of Personal Worth

1. Do his friends think his ideas are good?
2. Do his classmates want to help him?
3. Can he do most of the things he tries?
4. Do his classmates think he isn't a good friend?

Sense of Personal Freedom

1. Is he peppy and full of life?
2. Is he allowed to volunteer for things in school?
3. Does he like it when severely corrected?
4. Is he given spending money to use?
Feeling of Belonging

1. Is he good about sharing with others?
2. Is he proud of his school?
3. Is he well liked by other boys and girls?
4. Is he usually included in activities of his classmates?

Withdrawing Tendencies

1. Do his friends often say things to hurt him?
2. Is he easily discouraged about things?
3. Would he rather dream than do his work?
4. Is he usually happy?

Nervous Symptoms

1. Is he restless or nervous?
2. Is he generally quiet?
3. Does he bite his nails or other symptoms?
4. Does he often seem tired before noon?

Total Personal Adjustment

Social Adjustment

Yes No

Social Standards

1. Is he friendly and sociable?
2. Does he feel it's right to cheat if the teacher isn't looking?
3. If he finds something does he feel he should keep it?
4. Does he thank those that help him or show appreciation?
Social Skills

1. Does he work well with others?
2. Does he get angry when he loses a game?
3. Does he help new children get acquainted?
4. Do other boys and girls think he is nice?

Anti Social Tendencies

1. Is he usually a good sport?
2. Does he quarrel with his classmates?
3. Does he make a fuss to get what he wants?
4. Does he like to push or scare smaller children?

Family Relations

1. Does he have an over anxious parent?
2. Is he polite and well mannered?
3. Does he come to school neat and clean?
4. Does he show respect for his family and home?

School and Occupational Relations

1. Is he bright and intelligent?
2. Does he show interest in few things?
3. Is his work so hard he is afraid he will fail?
4. Does he think others aren't as fair in games as he is?

Community Relations

1. Does he accept school responsibilities and do them?
2. Does he seem to dislike other people?
3. Does he take pride in the way the room looks?
4. Does he do and help others do what is right at all times?

Total Social Adjustment

Total Personal Adjustment

Overall Total
SAMPLE PROFILE WITH I.Q. 81
SAMPLE PROFILE WITH I.Q. 103
Legend:  
+Fall 1958  
+Teacher's Evaluation  
+March, 1959

SAMPLE PROFILE WITH I.Q. 149