

FACULTY RESEARCH EDITION
of
The Savannah State College Bulletin

Published by

The Savannah State College

Volume 21, No. 2

Savannah, Georgia

December, 1967

HOWARD JORDAN, JR., *President*

Editorial Committee

Mildred W. Glover

Andrew J. McLemore

Joan L. Gordon

Charles Pratt

Calvin L. Kiah

Forrest O. Wiggins

JOHN L. WILSON, *Chairman*

Articles are presented on the authority of their writers, and neither the Editorial Committee nor Savannah State College assumes responsibility for the views expressed by contributors.

Table of Contents

The Pedagogical Interrelationship Between Mathematics and Science Prince A. Jackson, Jr.	7
Educating Parents and Teachers for Intelligent Use and Support of Good Preschools Sadye A. Young	17
On Strengths of Shock Waves with Respect to Thermodynamic Parameters Nazir A. Warsi	35
Efforts to Prevent Negro Revolts in Early Savannah Austin D. Washington	39
White Professors and their Students in Southern Negro Colleges Carroll Atkinson	43
The Feasibility of Establishing a Library-College in Predominantly Negro Colleges Elonnie J. Josey	45
An Enrichment Program: Industrial Arts and Elementary Education Richard M. Coger	55
Far Infrared and Raman Studies on The O-H---O Bond Stretching Vibrations in Crystals Venkataraman Ananthanarayanan	60
The Distribution of Income in a Highly Industrialized Society Sarvan K. Bhatia	66
The Evolution of Free Enterprise and Capitalism in the United States Sarvan K. Bhatia	70
On Shock Strengths with Respect to Flow Parameters Nazir A. Warsi	75
Keats' <i>Endymion</i> : A Critical History Dennis A. Berthold	78
<i>Paradise Lost</i> and the Modern Reader: Five Approaches Dennis A. Berthold	89
A Design for Campus Libraries Based on the Favorite Study Habits and the Preferred Study Locations of Students at Fayetteville State College Charles I. Brown, Nathalene R. Smith, and Charles A. Asbury	100
Apartheid and Morality David S. Roberts	106
A Study of Psycho-Social Behavior of College Freshmen— 1966-67 Lawrence C. Bryant	109

Table of Contents – (Cont'd.)

<i>Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?:</i> Some Factors that Generate and Sustain Dramatic Conflict Ollie Cox	114
Five Selected Poems Gershon B. Fiawoo	119
The Modern Dramatic Hero As Seen in the Plays of Brecht and Betti William T. Graves	124
Noah Webster as a Lexicographer William T. Graves	129
Whitman on Whitman: The Poet Introduces His Own Poetry Dennis A. Berthold	137
The Theory and Practice of Freedom David S. Roberts	143
The Nature of the Dispute Between Moscow and Peiping Liu Shia-ling	155
What Does it Matter to You? Samuel Williams	165
Ong, McLuhan, and the Function of the Literary Message Dennis A. Berthold	172
<i>In Vitro</i> Persistence of <i>Salmonella</i> Typhimurium in A Dually Inoculated Medium. I. With <i>Proteus Morgan II</i> Joseph L. Knuckles	177
<i>In Vitro</i> Persistence of <i>Salmonella</i> Typhimurium in A Dually Inoculated Medium. II. With <i>Aerobacter Cloacae</i> Joseph L. Knuckles	185
Experimental Transmission of Enteric Pathogens from Fly to Fly by Aseptically Reared <i>Phormia Regina</i> (Meigen) Joseph L. Knuckles	192
Mathematics in the Renaissance William M. Perel	193
Synthesis of Kaempferol-2-C ¹⁴ Kamalakar B. Raut	198
A Refutation to the Objections of Business and Vocational Subjects in the Secondary School Curriculum Mildred W. Glover	200
Teacher Personality and Teacher Behavior Shia-ling Liu	208
Poem: Epithalamia Luetta C. Milledge	222

The Nature of the Dispute Between Moscow and Peiping

by

Shia-ling Liu

The Sino-Soviet dispute has been one of the most important and complex issues of the day. The eruption of this dispute between the two Communist countries has exposed to the world some of the internal intrigues of World Communism and some of the inner inconsistencies and contradictions in the Marxist-Leninist ideology.¹ In tackling such an issue, different approaches and different emphasis would be highly commendable. In the search for a true understanding of the nature of Sino-Soviet dispute, this issue would be explored as follows: 1. the historical development of the dispute; 2. the area of the dispute; 3. the cause of the dispute; 4. the nature of the dispute; and 5. the impact of the dispute.

(1) The historical development of the dispute: A number of scholars chose to examine the recent dispute starting from the time when it erupted into the open in late 1959 and early 1960. This was indeed the historical turning point in the recent Sino-Soviet dispute. This goes without saying, however, that the dispute existed prior to this period especially since 1956-57 after Mao's successful effort in helping Moscow to settle its troubled relations with some of its East European satellite countries and the dispute has continued and even been intensified after Khrushchev's downfall last year.

(2) The area of the dispute: In the west, the discussion has been centered around the field of ideology. Some asserted that the Sino-Soviet discord has developed over the following major issues: on nuclear warfare, revolutionary movement, peaceful coexistence, proper paths to communism and revisionism.

The arguments advanced by Moscow and Peiping in supporting their respective view points have been summarized as follows.²

1. Nuclear Warfare

(Russia's case) 'The international communist movement is well aware of the fact that imperialism is in decline . . . but it also knows that it is armed with atomic teeth which it can put to use. Nuclear war would lead to the death of

¹One of the inconsistencies and contradictions of Marxism can very well be illustrated by the ideological difference of "one into two" versus "two into one" between Mao-Tse-Tung and Yang Hsien-chen which has significant implications in the Sino-Soviet dispute. Cf. Chen Yuts' and: *Issues and Studies*, "Ideological Differences Within the Peiping Regime," Institutes of International Relations, Taipei, pp. 3-34, April, 1964.

²*The Times* (London,) June 19, 1963, p. 6.

hundreds of millions of people, to a gigantic destruction of productive forces. This would make incomparably more difficult the building of a few society on the rabble left after a nuclear war. Communists should not keep silent about this, but should openly tell the masses about the existing threat. This encourages the people in their struggle for peace and against imperialism . . . World war, if it cannot be avoided, will immediately become a thermo-nuclear war . . . In their cynical game with human lives, some people allow themselves to jeer at those who defend the lives of hundreds of millions of people, accusing them of cowardice and softness. But Communists, particularly state and political leaders, cannot follow such irresponsible scribblers." (Pravda, 1-7-63.)

(China's case) 'For many years United States imperialism and its partners have been using nuclear blackmail against the people of the world . . . The Chinese Communists consistently and resolutely oppose the imperialist policy of nuclear war . . . At the same time they maintain that the socialist countries should rely on the just strength of the people, and their own just policies and should not engage in nuclear gambles in the international arena. The modern revisionists . . . deliberately lie to deceive the masses, alleging that the "dogmatists" hope to "push mankind to the brink of nuclear war." The modern revisionists often talk about "morality." But where is their "morality," when they tell such lies?' (Red Flag, 1-1-63)

'Should imperialism dare to take the risk of imposing a new world war on the peoples of the world, such a war would inevitably end in the destruction of imperialism and the victory of socialism.' (People's Daily, 12-31-62)

2. Revolutionary Movements

(Russia's case) 'The Soviet Union encourages by all means the development of national liberation revolutions . . . It has consistently offered and offers a helping hand to all people rising up against imperialism and colonialism . . . The dogmatists try to direct the fraternal parties only in an armed struggle for power under all conditions and in any circumstances . . . such a theory would be a complete rejection of Marxism which has always denied the "pushing on" of revolutions . . . it is the task of the proletariat of every country and particularly of its communist avant-garde - to decide what forms or methods of struggle the proletariat of this or that country should use in concrete historical conditions.' (Pravda, 1-7-63)

(China's case) 'The more the national liberation movement and the revolutionary struggles of the people's develop, the better for defense of world peace. The socialist

countries . . . must resolutely support the national liberation movements and all the revolutionary struggles of the peoples . . . and must resolutely support wars of national liberation and people's revolutionary wars. In branding this correct view of ours as "warlike," those who attack the Chinese Communist Party are in fact placing the struggle in defence of world peace in opposition to the movements of national liberations!" (People's Daily, 12-21-62)

3. Peaceful Coexistence

(Russia's case) 'The balance of power in the world today is such that the forces of peace and socialism are capable of restraining the aggressive force of imperialism . . . We have certainty in the eventual victory of our ideas. We do not search for this triumph along the road of war, but along the paths of peaceful coexistence and competition with capitalism. We reject not only global thermonuclear war but also all wars between states, with the exception of just wars of liberation and defensive war of a people subjected to aggression. Apparently the Albanian leaders and those who encourage them (i.e., the Chinese Communists) have lost faith in the possibility of a victory of socialism without wars between states . . . such madness cannot attract peoples of other countries to the communist parties. More - it threatens to repel millions and millions of people from the communist cause.' (Khrushchev, 12-12-62)

(China's case) 'It is absolutely impermissible and impossible for countries practicing peaceful coexistence to touch even a hair of each other's social system. The class struggle, for national liberation and the transition from capitalism to socialism in various countries is quite another thing. They are all bitter, life-and-death revolutionary struggles which aim at changing the social system. Peaceful coexistence cannot replace the revolutionary struggles of the people. The transition from capitalism to socialism in any country can be brought about only through the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in that country . . . Can peaceful transition be made into a new world wide strategic principle of the international communist movement? Absolutely not . . . The old government never topples even in a period of crisis unless it is pushed. This is a universal law of class struggle . . . The proletarian party must never base its entire work on the assumption that the imperialists and reactionaries will accept peaceful transformation. (People's Daily, 6-17-63)

4. Different Paths to Communism

(Russia's case) 'Opposing different forms of transition to socialism, the dogmatists usually argue as follows: Hitherto history has not witnessed a single example of

peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism.” But if Marx and Engels had based themselves on this “argumentation,” they would have been unable to reach the conclusion about the inevitable victory of socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, since at the time it did not exist anywhere in the world. The strength of Marxist-Leninist theory lies in the ability to analyse the main current of an epoch, to draw conclusions from this analysis which illuminate the path of revolutionary forces for decades to come.’ (Pravda, 1-7-63)

(China’s case) ‘It would naturally be in the interest of the proletariat . . . if peaceful transition could be realized . . . Hitherto, history has not witnessed a single example of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism. Communist should not pin all their hopes for the victory of the revolution from capitalism to socialism. Communist should not pin all their hopes for the the victory of the revolution on peaceful transition. The bourgeoisie will not step down from the state of history of its own accord. This is a universal law of class struggle. Communists must be prepared to repel the assaults of counterrevolution and to overthrow the bourgeoisie by armed force . . . Communists should not lay one-sided stress on peaceful transition.’ (People’s Daily, 12-31-63)

5. Revisionism

(Russia’s case) ‘One cannot mechanically repeat now on this question (the inevitability of war) what Vladimir Ilyich Lenin said many decades ago on imperialism . . . we live in a time when we have neither Marx nor Engels nor Lenin with us. If we act like children who, studying the alphabet, compile words from letters, we shall not get very far.’ (Khrushchev, 6-21-60)

(China’s case) ‘The present world situation has obviously undergone tremendous changes since Lenin’s lifetime, but these changes have not proved the obsolescence of Leninism; on the contrary, they have more and more clearly confirmed the truths revealed by Lenin . . . Does the whole, integrated teaching of Lenin on imperialism, on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, on war and peace, and on the building of socialism and communism still retain its vigorous vitality? . . . These questions now confront us and must be answered. Marxist-Leninists must thoroughly expose the absurdities of the imperialists and modern revisionists on these questions, eradicate their influence among the masses, awaken those they have temporarily hoodwinked and further arouse the revolutionary will of the masses. (Red Flag, April, 1960)

In a close examination of formal exchange between Moscow and Peiping, both sides, indeed, differed on these statements and others, on the meaning of our epoch, on the inevitability of war, on the relationship of local wars to total one, on the meaning of coexistence, on relations with the national bourgeoisie, on the national liberation struggle, on the stages of building socialism-communism, on the war in Viet Nam, etc. However, the dispute is not limited only to the field of ideology, although it remains the focal point of the open argument. On the practical side, issues such as border dispute and

The focus of the Sino-Soviet dispute has been sharpened by Lin Piao's article of September 2, 1965,³ in which he explained that:

1. "The Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution is the theory of the seizure of state power by revolutionary violence."
2. The proletarian revolution is "the inevitable sequel to the national-democratic revolution."
3. The proletarian revolution "can only be, nay must be, lead by the proletariat and the genuinely revolutionary party armed with Marxism-Leninism, and by no other class or party."
4. The more thorough the national-democratic revolution the better the conditions for the proletarian revolution; and
5. Finally, "This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries."

even occasional border clashes, personal accusations, leadership for World Communism, spheres of interest in and relationship with underdeveloped and neutralist countries also provided grounds for mutual denunciation and constant antagonism.⁴ During the course of the so called "proletarian cultural revolution" in the Chinese Mainland in 1966-67, the controversy between the two Red Giants has erupted into such a proportion which led some of the keen Western observers to speculate that a "hot war" between Russia and Red China is a distinctive possibility sometime in the future.

(3) The cause of the dispute: Western Commentators explained the cause of the dispute in terms of the following factors: different degrees of industrialization, economic development, and modern armament resulted in different outlook on war and world revolution; Soviet economic pressure and trade policies forced Peiping to resort to economic measures of self-effort and self-support; Moscow over-estimation of the superiority of the Russia system generated the inferiority complex of the Peiping regime and it resulted in the personality clash between Mao and Khrushchev. These factors certainly contributed very greatly to the eruption of the dispute. However, some other factors might be equally responsible. Professor Brzezinski, for instance, has asserted that "the Sino-Soviet divergence can be said to have been rooted in the interaction within the Soviet and Chinese contexts of three elements: domestic development; their

³Cf. New York Times, November 9, 1965, p. 42.

⁴Zbigniew K. Brzezinski, *The Soviet Bloc: Unity and Conflict*, pp. 424-425.

relationship to bloc affairs; the interaction of the two with world affairs—all as perceived within the jointly shared Marxist-Leninist outlook of the two parties.”⁵

Others have also suggested that the inner inconsistencies and contradictions of the dialectic Marxism-Leninism are an inherent factor in the present dispute and all other disputes in the history of World Communism.⁶ According to them, struggle, disintegration, crisis are always present in Communist structure. For the Communists, struggle is in fact a way of life. A brief review of some of the inner contradictions of the Marxist dogmatic doctrine may suffice to substantiate this point of view.

* The essence of Marxism may include dialectic materialism or material dialectism, class struggle, proletariat dictatorship, communism, etc. His theory is actually more maneuverable than a systematic doctrine, the purpose of which is to agitate subversive or revolutionary activities against existing social order. Marx's theory of class-struggle is based on a pathological doctrine of social hatred by playing the proletariat against the bourgeoisie with the immediate end to establish a system of proletariat dictatorship which in turn will be eventually transformed into a system of a classless society. Here lies one of the most irrevocable contradictions of Marx's theory. If his theory of class struggle is to be taken at face value, how in the world could a classless society ever be possible? If a classless society is ever possible, then history of mankind could be explained on a theory other than that of class struggle. Furthermore, if a system of proletariat dictatorship is being established with complete elimination of the bourgeoisie and other classes, the meaning of proletariat dictatorship would be at best obscure. How can there be a dictatorship of the proletariat over the proletariat? In this eventuality, or either there would be no dictatorship at all, or only a dictatorship of some one else over the proletariat.

It is in this light that the history of international communism should be examined. To use Marx's own argument, a proletariat dictatorship will not therefore result in a classless society, but a kind of dictatorship of a group of people over the other. This group of people might well be the “vanguard of the Communist Party” as asserted by Lenin. Thus the Communist Party would be by itself of a distinctive class in the meaning of traditional Marxism-Leninism. To carry the argument one step further, there should be “classes” even within the Communist Party because according to Marx's theory any society must have some classes and the Communist Party is also a society. If Marx's theory of class-struggle is indeed valid, struggle among leaders or cliques of a Communist Party and between countries controlled by the Communist parties is indeed inevitable. Thus the Sino-Soviet dispute and other disputes in history are not surprising at all.

⁵Ibid. p. 414.

⁶C. K. Lee: An Analysis of Khrushchev-Mao Conflict, Central Daily News, Taipei, January 16, 1964.

In philosophical terms, the Communists regard internal struggle as a sign of healthy progress which should be, by all means, encouraged. If there is no struggle there is no progress. The progress of so-called self criticism is a sign of progress within one's self. However, the theories advanced by Marx himself at his early age is directly contradictory to those advanced by him at his old age. He mutilated Hegel's dialectic idealism into a transformed dialectic materialism. Despite his insistence on the materialistic interpretation of history, his glorification of "revolution", "violence," "dictatorship" as the motivating forces in social changes would only be interpreted as idealistic.

Still others would insist that the direct factor in causing the present Sino-Soviet dispute is simply a struggle for power between Mao and Khrushchev and, now, Khrushchev's successors.⁷ The ideological discord, the border clashes, and the economic and trade irritations are only incidental because of the relativization of Soviet power and the emerging economic strength of Peiping and its increasing influence in bloc and world affairs.

In ascertaining the cause of the dispute, the factor of national interests has also been suggested. However, Mao is not and never will be a nationalist. Nevertheless, one would certainly concede that Mao and his associates are far too clever not to utilize the national sentiment of the Chinese people in a contest for power with the Russians, especially in a time when the Chinese people might have turned their economic and national frustrations against the Red rulers themselves in the late 1950's and early 1960's.

(4) The nature of the dispute: From these brief observations, it would seem clear that the Sino-Soviet dispute is something more than or other than an ideological dispute. It might be a power struggle pure and simple in the tradition of the dialectic Marxist-Leninism with some nationalist overtones.

In fact in the history of international communism, the purges of leaders are always geared or disguised on a higher level usually on ideological grounds. The relationship between ideology and power is evident in an authoritarian country. Ideology is inherent in power as when it serves to raise morale or stimulate fanatical convictions. Ideology also shapes the purposes for which power may be used, helping to determine the direction in which power is applied; it often serves to rationalize power, to justify it, thereby in effect becoming part of it while implicitly transforming power into authority.⁸

However, in a Communist country, the holding of power is even more important than "correctness" of ideology. Those who are in power will be in a position to dictate what official ideology will be. Based on a dialectic doctrine, ideology should be necessarily relative, yet the ideological position favored or cherished by those

⁷Yao Meng-sien: *New Developments in the Peiping-Moscow Conflict*, Institutes of International Relations, May, 1964.

⁸Brzezinski, p. 386.

who are in power at a given time should be the "official" and "absolute truth" at that given time.

Consequently, the direct cause in upholding one person in power in a given time is not necessarily because of the superiority of "the" ideology held by that person. It is rather because of the relative power position of that person with respect to that of others within that power structure. Within this frame of reference the dispute between Moscow and Peiping developed recently could be well explained to our satisfaction. At a time when Red China needed Russian assistance the most, Mao would not hesitate to declare a "lean-to-one-side" policy in the early 1950's. As a result of relativization of Soviet power in the late 1950's, however, Peiping was almost ready to challenge the leadership of Russia in 1957. Nevertheless, Red China would still "emphasize" that the socialist camp could have the Soviet Union at its "head." In 1964, however, when Red China was in a position to challenge, yet not strong enough to wrestle away the leadership from Moscow, Peiping shifted its argument and insisted upon the "independence and complete equality" of the "fraternal parties" protesting the flagrant violation of the guiding principles of 1957 "for the leaders of the C. P. S. U. to consider themselves the leaders of the international communist movement and to treat all fraternal parties as their subordinates."⁹

In the same statement, it also paved the way for outright break between Moscow and Peiping in the years ahead by charging that the leaders of the C. P. S. U. automatically forfeited the position of "head in the International Communist Movement" by embarking "on the path of revisionism and splitism."¹⁰

Historically, other outstanding struggles in Russia and Red China followed the same pattern. The conclusive power struggle between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks (1917-1919), between Stalin and Trotsky (1929), between Khrushchev and Malenkov (1953-1955), between Breznev and Khrushchev (1964) in Russia and those waged by Mao against Chen Tou-Sheu, Chang Kuo-Tao, Li Li-san, Liu Shao-Chi, and most recently other "powerholders" in the current "Great Cultural Revolution" successively did not provide any conclusive proof that the ideological doctrines adopted by the victors in those struggles were definitely superior than those adopted by the defeated. On the other hand the ideological position by the defeated were usually adopted by or at least incorporated in part by the victor after a power struggle.

(5) The impact of the dispute: In analyzing the present Sino-Soviet dispute, one of the observers suggested that, "one should avoid the prevailing tendency toward extremist conclusions. Talk of a Sino-Soviet conflict leading even to a Soviet-American alliance against the 'Chinese peril' merely illustrates a profound misconception of the essence of the historical phenomenon of Communism, which while affected by traditional national considerations, have from its

⁹New York Times, February 7, 1964. p. 7.

¹⁰Ibid., February 7, 1964. p. 7.

very beginning reflected a conscious emphasis on supranational perspectives. Similarly, change within the Sino-Soviet bloc should not be viewed as a presaging either its imminent disintegration, or conversely, its eventual consolidation in a single Communist state." Indeed the "conflict and competition between the partners to the alliance will continue and may even lead to a radical deterioration of relations." But this will proceed within a self-limiting framework of basic struggle against the West.¹¹ However in the recent years,

the split between the Russians and the Chinese Communists seems to have reached a point of no return. Nevertheless, the outcome is still not in sight since the current "Great Cultural Revolution" is still wedged inconclusively in the Chinese Mainland. By and large, its impact should be examined from three angles: the impact within the Communist bloc; the impact upon the developing countries and finally the impact upon the West.

Within the Communist bloc, the dispute has transformed a formerly solid Soviet bloc into a divergent unity of Communist camp which included the solid Soviet bloc, the Chinese-Albanian alignment, and possibly other "Communist neutralists." A tendency toward duocentricism or polycentricism has thus emerged in the international communist movement.

With respect to the underdeveloping countries, both Russia and Red China are contending for leadership in the national liberation movement. Moscow is now advocating a softer line, yet it can not afford not to encourage revolutionary movement. Peiping is more outspoken in the hope that it will wrestle the leadership away from Moscow. In general, the hard-core Communists in the underdeveloping countries would certainly lean more to Peiping, but the true leaders of the nationalist movement in these areas would certainly favor Moscow's line. At present, the hard line taken by Peiping, in fact, does not meet the approval of the leaders of national liberation movement in the recently emerging, neutral, non-communistic countries in Africa and Asia, yet in time if the Communist infiltration in the national liberation movement has been completed, Peiping's position would be further strengthened over that of Moscow.

With respect to the free world, the dispute brings danger as well as opportunity to the West. One may agree with the assertion that the Sino-Soviet dispute "is strictly an internal affair and there will be no change at all in their fundamental policies toward the free world." The dispute is indeed not a dispute over the question of whether their design for world domination should be abandoned, but it is a discord over how and when to do it. Neither Russia nor Red China would hesitate to resort to whatever means, peaceful or otherwise, in their long pronounced quest for world domination. Evidently, both have and will continue to use whatever means seem likely to be to their advantage. The possible conditioning factor is the course of action which the free world might take in a confrontation of power

¹¹cf. Donald S. Zagoria, *The Sino Soviet Conflict, 1956-1961*, p. 4 and Brzezinski; p. 435.

between the East and West. In fact, the West is now in a better position than ever before to bring some bearing upon the Sino-Soviet dispute and its outcome. In dealing with the Communists, Russians or Chinese, however, one should be cautious. A recently published U. S. Senate Committee Report warned, "We are not dealing, as sometimes suggested in the western world with another Hitler . . . The Communist Chinese and Russia alike are professional revolutionaries, capable of bluster and bluff, but also of extreme caution and circumspection, depending on their assessment of objective reality . . . They were and are capable of retreat in the face of a superior enemy, or even a seemingly determined one."¹²

¹²Khrushchev's Strategy and Its Meaning for America, Committee on The Judiciary, United States Senate, 1960. pp. 18-19.

Teacher Personality and Teacher Behavior

By

Shia-Ling Liu

In recent years, numerous studies have been made to ascertain the impact of teacher personality upon learning¹ and some tentative conclusions could be made to support the proposition that besides the transmission of knowledge and information, the teachers, especially the social studies teachers, hold positions which presume to be directly related to the youth's citizenship. If it can be accepted that the teacher himself has primary influence upon the actual nature of the learnings of pupils in social studies, then it becomes important to understand what specific effect the social studies teachers have with respect to critical dimensions of personality would have upon his teaching.

In general, teachers differ in the possession of personal qualities such as emotional behavior, mental ability, academic and professional competence. Presumably, each of these would provide a different setting for the teacher's influence upon the social learning of his pupils. In recent studies, one of the focal points of speculation has been concerned with the different effects of "authoritarian," as contrasted with "democratic," teacher personality upon the learning of democratic citizenship by secondary school teachers. While disagreement existed as to the extent of impact of the teacher's personality upon his pupils, since the day of Confucius and Socrates, no one doubted the importance of the teacher himself. Indeed, as asserted by Hilgard, "Reports of great teachers commonly stress their personalities rather than scholarship or teaching skills."² One of the recent publications put the focus on the personality of the teacher in this way.

Individuals achieve as educators because of the persons they are quite as much as because of the technical knowledge and skills they possess. What the professional teacher is and does as a person is a dynamic factor in every educational function that he carries out. His effect upon others is contingent upon his behavior as a person. This applies not only to the direct teaching function but to the esteem in which the teaching profession is held and the educator's role as a citizen contributing to the education and improvement of society. Being an educated person, then, for the professional educator means:

¹Shia-Ling Liu, "Impact of Teacher Personality Upon Learning", *Quarterly Review of Higher Education*, January, 1967, pp. 38-44.

²Ernest R. Hilgard, "The Human Dimension in Teaching," *College and University Bulletin*, Association for Higher Education, March 15, 1965, pp. 1-3. 5-6.

Focus on a personality and what the professional educator is and does as a person — his attitudes, ethical standards and value commitments, life-shaping attitudes, mental health, and self-understanding.³

In emphasizing the importance of the teacher, Hook said:

The function of the teacher is among the most important in our culture. He not only transmits essential knowledge and skills but when he takes his calling seriously, strongly influences the formation of habits and the development of a philosophy of life.⁴

Bernard went further to say:

“As the teacher, so is the school.” The oft repeated statement is coming to have increasing significance, as study after study confirms and reconfirms it. Despite the beautiful school buildings, up-to-date textbooks, liberal laboratory facilities, abundant instructional aids, and huge libraries, Mark Hopkin’s definition of a school is still noteworthy: a school is a log with a teacher at one end and a pupil on the other. The best facilities count for little if the teachers are inadequate in personality or preparation — but particularly are inadequate in personality factors.⁵

Based on the hypothesis that “manner of teaching is an expression of the teacher’s basic personality reactions and that these reactions constitute the core of teaching behavior in the classroom situation,” Symonds made an exploratory intensive study based on observations, interviews and tests of nineteen teachers to determine the relations between the manner of teaching and personality and came to the conclusions:

. . . Teaching is essentially an expression of personality. The teacher adapts himself to teaching in a manner that is harmonious with his expressions toward life situations in general. Methods and procedures learned during college preparations may influence teaching superficially but they do not determine the nature of the relation of a teacher to his pupils or the teacher’s basic attitude toward teaching.⁶

Bricker expressed very much the same idea, when he said:

Whatever the personality of the teacher he can not teach without expressing it. What he expresses will emphasize some traits in his pupils and reduce others. Identification between teacher and pupils and between pupils will vary in their form

³Margaret Lindsey (Editor), *New Horizons for the Teaching Profession*, National Education Association of the U. S. Washington, D. C. 1961, p. 27.

⁴Sidney Hook, *Education for Modern Man, A New Perspective*, New York, Alfred A. Knoff, 1963.

⁵H. W. Bernard, *Mental Hygiene for Classroom Teachers*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1952, p. 127.

⁶M. Percival Symonds, “Teaching As a Function of the Teacher’s Personality,” *Journal of Teacher Education*, V. (March, 1954), pp. 28.

and degree largely in terms of what preferences the teacher, perhaps unconsciously indicates.⁷

A critical and comparative study made by Klaiszen and Martin of factors related to teacher success in 1937-43 also confirmed the emphasis on teacher personality:

A comparative study of the factors related to teacher now (1940-43) and three years ago (1937-39) show more emphasis on traits, and there is also a noticeable shift to personality as the most significant factor in determining teacher success.⁸

In a study to determine the relationship between personality characteristics and teacher attitudes, LaBue said:

. . . All institutions educating teachers must continue to give attention to the assessment of the personality of prospective teachers. Those with maladjusted personalities irrespective of the amount of professional information they possess have no place in the classroom.⁹

After an examination of significant factors in teachers' classroom attitudes, Cook suggested:

A teacher who has an excellent knowledge of the principles related to educational psychology, child development and child behavior may obtain a high score on the MTAI, but the possession of undesirable personality characteristics may preclude his working effectively with students in the classroom situation.¹⁰

As one of the pioneers in the study of teacher-pupil relationships, Baxter dramatized the importance of the teacher's personality when she said:

Every classroom has an atmosphere created by the interaction of personalities which is either conducive or detrimental to the best all-around development of children. Since behavior is learned, the manner in which the child learns to conduct himself in the classroom contributes directly to his total behavior as a person. In school pupils acquire not only habits of work and study but also ways of reacting to others. They form attitudes about themselves and about others which are basic to subsequent living.¹¹

Other writings and studies might be cited to stress the same point. Hillway, for instance, listed personality as the first among seven characteristics which "many educators believe make for success"

⁷Quoted in Joseph A. Del Popolo, *Authoritarian Trends In Personality As Related To Attitudinal and Behavioral Traits of Student Teachers*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, Pennsylvania State University, 1959, p. 42.

⁸R. H. Klaiszen, and R. L. Martin, "Pretraining Selection of Teachers During 1940-43," *Journal of Educational Research*, XXXIX (May, 1945), pp. 618-677.

⁹A. C. LaBue, "Teachers' Classroom Attitudes," *Journal of Educational Research*, X (December, 1959), 433-434.

¹⁰Walter W. Cook, "Significant Factors in Teachers' Classroom Attitudes," *Journal of Teacher Education*, VII (September, 1956), 274-279.

¹¹Bernice Baxter, *Teacher-Pupil Relationship*, New York, McMillan, 1948, p. 75.

for teachers in the junior colleges,¹² Michener listed "good teaching personality" as one of the five elements for "unusual success in teaching."¹³ As summarized by Knapp, the studies by R. J. Clinton, Bousfield, Trabue considered "personality" as one of the important characteristics of "superior teachers"; the studies by Kell, Knapp and Goodrich, Guthrie, Bogardus, Maslow and Zimmerman also stressed "personal factors" as "attributes of teachers of known or acknowledged distinction."¹⁴ Amatora stated clearly and simply: "What the teacher is and what he does carries for more weight in the child's mind than what he says."¹⁵ Bernard also remarked that "one teaches what he is perhaps even more than he teaches what he says."¹⁶

This limited number of studies may suffice to support the contention that there is much agreement on the importance of the teacher's personality. But there is less agreement as to what is a "good teaching personality" or whether one type of personality is better than any other. Peck, for instance, in a part of a long study, found that "there is no one pattern of the 'good teacher'." In his study involving sixty-nine (69) women elementary education majors, although he found that some girls "should not enter teaching", because "they are too confused and hostile to do other than disturb children and actively interfere with their learning", he yet found various behavioral patterns among good teachers:

. . . Some are warmly friendly, a few are firmly impersonal, some are outgoing, some are calmly reserved, some put their major emphasis on intellectual clarity and skill; some put it on building friendly, encouraging personal relationships with colleagues and pupils (none choose one of these goals to the exclusion of the other.)¹⁷

In general, however, some traits have been more frequently mentioned or stressed as more desirable than others. Bagley and Alexander listed ten individual characteristics as the ingredients which make up a "good teaching personality":

1. Reverence for truth
2. Intelligent optimism
3. Social altruism
4. Sympathy

¹²Tyrus Hillway, *The American Two-Year College*, New York, Harper, 1958, p. 189.

¹³James I. Quillian, and Lavone A. Hanna, *Education for Social Competence*, Chicago: Scott-Foresman and Company, 1961, p. 6.

¹⁴Nevitt Sanford, (Editor), *The American College, A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning*, Stanford University Press, 1962.

¹⁵Mary Amatora, "Similarity in Teacher and Pupil Personality," *The Journal of Psychology*, XXXVII (January, 1954), pp. 45-50.

¹⁶H. W. Bernard, op. cit., p. 129.

¹⁷Robert F. Peck, "Personality Pattern of Prospective Teachers," *Journal of Experimental Education* XXIX (December 1960), pp. 169-175.

5. Impartiality
6. Interpretive mind
7. Progressiveness
8. Curiosity
9. Culture
10. Imagination¹⁸

Bining and Bining grouped personality elements of a good teacher into three major divisions:

(1) physical aspect - personal appearance, recognition of amenities of life and so on. (2) passive virtues — friendliness, sympathy and understanding, sincerity, tact, fairness, self-control, optimism, patience. (3) executive abilities — self-confidence and self-reliance, initiative, adaptability and resourcefulness, organizing ability, directive ability, industry.¹⁹

(1) cooperative, democratic attitude, (2) wide interest, (3) patient, kindly, sympathetic, (4) consideration for the individual, (5) pleasing personal appearance, (6) fairness, (7) sense of humor, (8) adaptability and flexibility, (9) good discipline and constant behavior and (10) friendly.²⁰

Kearn listed eleven elements of “an integrating personality of a teacher”:

(1) basic democratic values, (2) good health, (3) communicative ability, (4) socially accepted ethical and moral code, (5) desirable person to person relationship, (6) participating group membership, (7) good intergroup relations, (8) intellectual power, (9) aesthetic expression and appreciation, (10) problem solving techniques, and (11) social sensibility.²¹

Barr and others in a tabular summary based on a comprehensive compilation listed personality qualities which are essential to teaching success as resourcefulness, emotional stability, considerateness, buoyancy, reliability. They also found that out of 36 personality traits in nineteen (19) studies all but two traits were positively related to teaching success.²² Almost all of these studies were concerned primarily with the desirable traits for all teachers in general. However,

¹⁸William C. Bagley and Thomas Alexander, *The Teacher of Social Studies*, New York, Scriver, 1937, p. 272.

¹⁹Arthur C. Bining and David H. Bining, *Teaching the Social Studies in Secondary Schools*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952, p. 192.

Zachery listed “ten frequently mentioned teacher traits: as follows:

²⁰Bill Zachery, *The Frequently Mentioned Teacher Traits*, unpublished master's thesis, North Texas State College, Denton, Texas, 1958, p. 10.

²¹James Kearn, *A Pattern of Teacher Education*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State College, Denton, Texas, 1956.

²²A. S. Barry, “Teaching Competence,” in *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, edited by Walter Monroe, New York: McMillan, 1950, pp. 1449-1451.

in the field of social studies, some unique qualities of the teacher have specifically been mentioned. Quillen and Hanna asserted that:

Probably no other teacher must be so well qualified in so many areas as the social studies teacher. To be effective he must have a broad background of knowledge in many fields and he must be able to understand new situations and problems as they arise. He must have depth as well as breadth of knowledge. He must understand and be able to promote good human relations, and he must know how to stimulate critical thought in young people. Finally, he must possess personal integrity in the highest degree.

. . . Young people want teachers who are friendly, who like and understand them, who have a sense of humor, and who are happy and cheerful. They appreciate teachers who are well groomed, poised, cultured, and mature in their emotional responses. Because young people learn good citizenship partly from copying good models, the social studies teacher must *be* the kind of citizen he hopes to develop.²³

Wesley and Wrongski suggested that "the social studies teacher is or should be well informed, fair-minded, and communicative person" and that "in a democracy the teacher must labor diligently to see that objectivity, honesty, impartiality, and co-operative spirit prevails."²⁴

At this point, a critical question must be raised as to what type of teacher personality possesses such desirable qualities. The answer, as pointed out by Kvaraceus, is a "democratic personality" as opposed to an "authoritarian personality."²⁵ On the other hand, in a classroom situation there is always a tendency toward being authoritarian. This tendency has been very well described by Stagner:

. . . This is true not only because the teacher presumably knows more than the students and is in a better position to decide what they need to know; it also follows because authoritarianism maintains the pattern, provides some substitute balm for the teacher's ego, and is less difficult than handling the class democratically.²⁶

In consideration of such tendencies, personality structure would seem to be of primary importance in the preparation of teachers, especially the social studies teacher. With this in mind, Grambs projected a social education blueprint for the future.

²³James Quillen and Lavone Hanna, *Education for Social Competence*, Chicago: Scott-Foresman and Company, 1961, pp. 26-27.

²⁴Edgar Wesley and Stanley Wrongski, *Teaching Social Studies in High School*, Boston, Heath, 1958, p. 5.

²⁵William Kvaraceus, "Tomorrow's Youth and Tomorrow's Citizens," *In Citizenship and a Free Society, Education for the Future*, The Thirtieth Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D. C., The Council, 1960.

²⁶Ross Stagner, *Psychology of Personality*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961, p. 452.

. . . Only the liberated person can attempt to lead others toward the free like. Careful assessment will be made of the future social studies teacher to make sure that this person is a continuing learner, that he has a secure and guiding ethical system, that he has enough of the rebel to question and enough of the conservative to provide security and support. This future teacher will have been exposed to children and adolescents in enough different situations . . . so that he and his instructors will know whether he can stand young people in continual daily association.²⁷

Aside from the impact of the teacher's personality upon the learning and attitudes of the student, some studies have found evidence to show that the authoritarian teachers are less liked by their peers and that they are less favored by college students. In an experimental study, Frymier found that "authoritarians tend to be rejected by their peers. Authoritarians apparently are perceived as being less desirable . . . than non-authoritarians."²⁸ Maney conducted a study to ascertain the "popularity" of the authoritarian and democratic teachers by means of student evaluation, her major conclusion being that:

. . . Regardless of their own beliefs, students in this population tend to reject teachers whose personality make-up is such that they are disposed to express or act on the basis of autocratic ideas, as well as to uncritically support the ingroup authorities and to relate in status rather than in personal terms.²⁹

Since the "democratic personality" of the teacher appears to be important in his interpersonal relationships, the difference between the "democratic" and authoritarian" or "autocratic" personality has been subject to some extensive study. *The Authoritarian Personality* has provided a very comprehensive description of the authoritarian in terms of his ideology, ethnocentrism, political and economic philosophy, and some other psychological manifestations.³⁰ Rokeach has provided some insight on some aspect of the authoritarian in terms of open and closed belief-disbelief systems.³¹ Webster, Sanford, and Freedman have amplified some specifics in constructing the *New Instrument in Studying Authoritarianism in Personality*. Scodel and Mussen have described authoritarian personality as "rigid extraceptive, repressed, conforming, stereotypical in thinking and intolerant of ambiguity" and their study found specifically that "non-au-

²⁷Jean Grambs, "The Challenge to Social Studies," in *Citizenship and a Free Society*, Thirtieth Yearbook of National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D. C., The Council, 1960, pp. 276-277.

²⁸Jack R. Frymier: "The Relationship of Authoritarianism to Rejection," *Journal of Educational Research*, LIII, September, 1959, pp. 33-34.

²⁹A. C. Maney, "Authoritarianism Dimension in Student Evaluation of Faculty," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, XXXII (January, 1959), p. 231.

³⁰T. W. Adornot et. al, *The Authoritarian Personality*, Harper, 1950.

³¹Milton Rokeach, *The Open and Closed Mind*, New York, Basic Books, 1960.

³²Sanford, Webster and M. Freedman, "A New Instrument for Studying Authoritarianism in Personality," *Journal of Psychology*, XL (July, 1955) pp. 73-84.

thoritarian individuals do, in fact, make more accurate judgment about non-authoritarian than authoritarians do about non-authoritarians." In general, they found that authoritarians are more restricted than non-authoritarians in their social perception.³³ Jones' study seems to confirm that of Scodel and Mussen:

1. In the perception and judgment of others, authoritarians seem to be more insensitive than non-authoritarians to the psychological or personality characteristics of others. Authoritarians may be more sensitive to such external variables as social status or position.

2. Authoritarians show a greater tendency than non-authoritarians to differentiate the social environment in terms of power-related concepts, in spite of their reduced sensitivity to variations in personal power *per se*.

3. . . . Authoritarians tend to be more positively evaluative of the leader than non-authoritarians, regardless of the leaders' specific characteristics.

4. Authoritarians prefer autocratic leadership whereas non-authoritarians prefer democratic leadership in a military setting. . .³⁴

From a "world view" (Wltuaschauung), Maslow described the authoritarian character structure as an interaction of psychological and sociological concepts. According to him, the basic philosophy of the authoritarian person conceives the world as a sort of "jungle," in which man's hand is necessarily against other man's. Authoritarians tend to regard as important the existence of a hierarchy, generalized in "superiority-inferiority" terms; tend to have strong drive for power; tend to have relatively pronounced hostility, hatred, prejudice "against some group or another"; tend to formulate judgments by externals rather than by internals; tend to have a single scale of values; tend to identify kindness with weakness; tend to use people; tend to have a sadistic-masochistic inclination; and to have guilty feelings and conflicts.³⁵

In a doctoral study of decisional behavior of teachers, Stahly was able to find some contrasting differences between the highly authoritarian teachers and less authoritarian ones:

1. Teachers who more frequently say they would punish the pupil in a disciplinary situation tend to be more authoritarian (as measured by the F scale), to have more negative attitudes toward school-related objects (as measured by the MTAI), to

³³Alvin Scodel and Paul Mussen, "Social Perception of Authoritarians and Non-Authoritarians," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, (April, 1953).

³⁴E. E. Jones, "Authoritarian Personality in Relation to Teacher's Attitude Toward Child Behavior," *Dissertation Abstracts*, VIII, 1953, p. 1089.

³⁵A. H. Maslow, "The Authoritarian Character Structure", *Journal of Social Psychology*, XVIII (August, 1943), pp. 401-411.

perceive other persons less frequently in negative terms (as measured by Rep Test), and tend to be younger.

2. Teachers who more frequently say they would use verbal appeal to pupils to conform in a disciplinary situation tend to be more authoritarian, to perceive others less frequently in negative terms.

3. Teachers who more frequently say they would seek additional information in seeking a solution to disciplinary situations tend to be less authoritarian, to have more positive attitudes toward school-related objects, and to be older.

4. There is a rather marked positive relationship between authoritarianism and negative attitudes toward school-related objects.

5. The more highly authoritarian teachers tend to perceive other persons less frequently in negative terms and more frequently in superficial, impersonal terms.³⁶

In an attempt to identify some observable teacher behavior, some interesting studies have been undertaken, however, the behaviors were classified in more than two dimensions. Ryans and Wandt did a factor analysis of observed teacher behaviors in secondary schools and got evidence of the existence of five independent qualities:

1. Sociable and understanding in dealing with students.
2. Business-like, organized, responsible.
3. Encouraging to student participation, challenging, interesting.
4. Enthusiastic, reactive, buoyant, and excitable.
5. Open-minded, original, tolerant, democratic.³⁷

In a similar study of college teachers, Gibb identified four factors as follows:

1. Friendly, democratic behavior
2. Communicative behavior
3. Systematic, organized behavior
4. Academic emphasis behavior³⁸

Similarly, the *Teacher Characteristics Study* identified three major clusters of observable teacher behavior which were accorded primary

³⁶Leroy Stahley, "A Theoretical and Empirical Study of Decisional Behavior of Teachers," *Dissertation Abstract*, XXII, 1962, pp. 1090-1091.

³⁷David Ryans and E. Wandt, "Factor Analysis of Observed Teacher Behaviors in Secondary Schools: A Study of Criterion Data," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, XII (Winter, 1952), pp. 574-586.

³⁸G. A. Gibb, "Classroom Behavior of the College Teacher," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, XV (Autumn, 1955), pp. 245-263.

attention throughout the research and served as criteria in the effort of the *Study* to determine correlates of teacher behaviors in the classroom. These three principal dimensions, or criteria, of teacher classroom were:

TCS Pattern Xo: understanding, friendly vs. aloof, ego-centric, restricted teacher behavior

TCS Pattern Yo: responsible, businesslike, systematic vs. evading, unplanned, slipshod teacher behavior

TCS Pattern Zo: stimulating, imaginative, surgent or enthusiastic vs. dull, routine teacher behavior³⁹

The specific teacher behaviors which were observed were divided into eighteen (18) dimensions clustered around these three patterns. These dimensions are: partial-fair, autocratic; aloof-responsive; restricted-understanding; harsh kindly; dull-stimulating; stereotyped-original; apthetic-alert; unimpressive-attractive; evading-responsible; erratic-steady; excitable - poised; uncertain - confident; disorganized-systematic; inflexible-adaptable; pessimistic-optimistic; immature-integrated, and narrow-broad.⁴⁰

In a more simplified approach, Beck, Cook, and Kearney used the adjectives, autocratic (authoritarian) and democratic, to distinguish general tendencies of a teacher on the theory that a teacher who is "generally democratic" will display attitudes and behavior patterns clearly different from those of the authoritarian-autocratic teacher.⁴¹ At the same time they insisted that few teachers would be described as thorough-going autocratic or democratic teachers. "It is a question of which set of traits show up most frequently in our attitudes and behavior."⁴² They described the behavior of the autocratic and democratic teachers in some detail:

I. The autocratic (authoritarian) teacher

The autocratic (authoritarian) teacher attempts to dominate whenever possible. When he succeeds, the probable result is a classroom atmosphere marked by tenseness, fear, submission. If he fails and, as a result, allows himself to grow nervous, fearful, and distraught, students will be quick to recognize this confusion and will become restless, inattentive, and disrespectful. . . . The teacher tends to think in terms of his status, his judgment, and the subject matter to be covered, rather than in terms of what the pupil feels, knows, and can do, and what is essential to his development.

³⁹David Ryans, *Characteristics of Teachers, Their Description, Comparison, and Appraisals: A Research Study*, Washington, D. C. American Council on Education, 1960, p. 77.

⁴⁰*Ibid*, pp. 86-92.

⁴¹R. Beck, W. Cook, and W. Kearney, *Curriculum in the Modern Elementary School*, New York, Prentice-Hall, 1953.

⁴²*Ibid*, p. 81.

The extremely autocratic teacher is insecure in his social relations. He has never developed attitudes and graces that insure his success in normal social intercourse. . . He is not comfortable in an equalitarian atmosphere. . . He has developed an aggressive attitude that takes the form of general hostility toward people. . . He believes that most children are disobedient (they are, with him), but do not appreciate what is done for them, cannot be trusted, and, in class are continuously conspiring against him. . . It is difficult for him to find security in his relations with other people, so he seeks refuge in asserting his power and authority.

Security through virtue. . . The authoritarian teacher holds rigidly to the obvious conventional standards and values. . . He regards all misbehavior as a serious threat to his security so he is compelled to seek out, condemn, and punish severely anyone who violates a rule. There is little sense of humor in this teacher, but there is a strong sense of duty combined with a perverted sense of justice. . .

The authoritarian teacher is disposed to think in rigid, "all or none", "black or white" categories . . . and that he is always and unquestionably in the right. . .

Security through position and power. Power and position are needed by the authoritarian personality. . . Regarding authority as he does, he is often submissive and uncritical toward authority from above and domineering and overbearing toward subordinates and pupils.

Security through knowledge of subject matter. The authoritarian teacher often seeks security through developing his knowledge of subject matter. He is likely to assert that if one knows his subject, little else matters in teaching, and he is prone to believe that a teacher should never acknowledge his ignorance of a topic in the presence of his pupils. . .

II. The democratic personality

The single most important factor in creating a democratic social atmosphere in a classroom is the personality of the teacher. (This was true of the autocratic teacher and classroom as well.) The democratic teacher has a deep affection for people and confidence in them. He is sensitive to the feelings of others, and his greatest satisfaction comes from working to further their welfare. Being neither a reformer nor a perfectionist, he accepts himself and his limitations and is willing to accept others on the same basis. He is slow to condemn and quick to forgive and accept criticism objectively without becoming emotionally upset. Because he feels secure in his social relations, he is not greatly concerned with his status as such. The virtues he deems most important are those that contribute to harmonious and satisfying social relations. He recognizes that any form of behavior carried to excess may be harmful. Being secure, he seeks

adventure and welcomes the imaginative, the creative, and the innovation. The democratic teacher (unlike his opposite, the authoritarian) is less inclined to be impressed by titles, degrees, or position. Also, he seeks ideas from the humble, tries to establish what is true, and expects people to listen to him not because of his position but because of what he says. He remembers that subject matter is only a part, though a valuable part, of the learning process and of educational development of the child.⁴³

A similar categorization of teacher behavior into a dichotomy was attempted in a series of studies by Anderson and Brewer. Teacher behavior was classified as dominative vs. integrative. Dominative behavior was defined as:

The use of force, commands, threats, shame, blame, attacks against the personal status of an individual. . . It is characterized by a rigidity or inflexibility of purpose, by an inability or an unwillingness to admit the contribution of another's experience, desires, purposes of judgment in the determining of the goals which concern others. Domination is thus behavior that is based partly on a failure to admit the psychological inevitability of individual differences. Domination may therefore be regarded also as a frustration of the behavior of someone else. As such it tends to obstruct the spontaneous behavior of another, domination is the resistance against change; it is consistent with bigotry and with autocracy. It is the technique of a dictatorship.⁴⁴

In integrating behavior, on the other hand, "one asks for responses accompanied by explanation which makes the request meaningful to the other so that the other can voluntarily co-operate." Such behavior is to a certain extent a matter of seeking and

discovering common purposes. For such expenditure of energy in common purposes, for an attempt to reduce instead of augment of incline conflict, the term socially integrative behavior is used. A person changing his mind when confronted with new evidence which has grown out of the experience of another is said to be integrating differences. Integrating behavior is . . . consistent with concepts of growth and learning. It makes allowance in one's own behavior for differences in the others. Whereas domination stifles or frustrates individual differences, socially integrative behavior promotes the interplay of differences, advances the psychological processes of differentiation, facilitates the emergence of originals. Integrative behavior is

⁴³*Ibid*, pp. 83-85.

⁴⁴Harold Anderson and Helen Brewer, "Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalities, I. Dominative and Socially Integrative Behavior of Kindergarten Teachers", *Applied Psychology Monograph* no. 6, Stanford University Press (For American Association for Applied Psychology), Stanford University, California, 1945, p. 153.

flexible, adaptive, objective, scientific, co-operative. It is an expression of the operation of democratic personal processes.⁴⁵

It was also pointed out in many studies that the question of dominative vs. integrative tendencies is not limited to teachers and pupils. "They are current issues between school teachers and school administrators, between university professors and university administrators, between employers and employees. They are present in all social relationships."⁴⁶ The basic conclusion, however, is that the Stanford University Press (For American Psychological Association), authoritarian personality tends to manifest more socially integrative behavior. In an attempt to investigate the relationship between an individual's personality structure and his opinions and attitudes toward pupil-teacher relationships and his observable behavioral traits in a classroom setting, Del Popolo found some evidence which in general tends to support this position:

The investigation lent support to the main hypothesis that a significantly relationship exists between an individual's personality structure and his opinions and attitudes toward pupil-teacher relationships and his observable traits in a classroom setting.

Authoritarian student teachers tend to get significantly lower scores than equalitarian student teachers on an inventory of attitudes and opinions about pupil-teacher relationships. . .

Authoritarian students tend to display behavioral traits during student teaching which imply an inability to establish harmonious pupil-teacher relationships. On the other hand, equalitarian students tend to display behavioral traits which are felt to be conducive toward the establishment of harmonious pupil-teacher relationships.⁴⁷

The findings by Kingston and Newsome also lent strong support to the same position. A comparison of the Webster, Sanford, and Freedman's *A Scale* with two other scales which presumed to measure classroom administrative philosophy and pupil-teacher relationship yielded significant correlations, all at the one percent level of confidence. The data of this study indicated that highly authoritarian teachers possess less democratic classroom administrative philosophy and manifest less equalitarian attitudes and opinions toward pupil-teacher relationships.⁴⁸

⁴⁵Harold Anderson and Joseph Brewer, Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalities, II: Effect of Teachers Dominative and Integrative Contacts on Children's Classroom Behavior, *Applied Psychology Monographs*, no. 8, Stanford University Press (For American Psychological Association), Stanford University, California, 1946, p. 128.

⁴⁶Douglas E. Scates, "Teaching as a Contribution to Personal Integration," *Journal of Teacher Education*, II (March, 1951), pp. 223-226.

⁴⁷Joseph A. Del Popolo, "Authoritarian Trends in Personality as Related to Attitudinal and Behavioral Traits of Student Teachers," *Journal of Educational Research*, LIII (March, 1960), pp. 252-247.

⁴⁸Albert Kingston and George L. Newsome, "The Relationship of Two Measures of Authoritarianism to the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory," *The Journal of Psychology*, XLIX (April, 1960), pp. 333-338.

Commenting on the importance of the human relations factor in teaching, Boodish asserted that it is "dependent on both the personality of the teacher and the varied and collective personalities of the pupils." Since "the internal forces within himself (the teacher) . . . influence his philosophy of life, his attitudes, and his basic feelings toward people," the more the teacher is aware of the dynamics of his own personality and those of the pupils, the better can he regulate and manage his own actions. It seems to be that only the opened-minded, democratic teacher would be able to conduct himself in such a manner.⁴⁹

In a study involving 60 social studies student teachers, this author was able to conclude that with some expectations student teachers with different personal characteristics did differ consistently in measure of their teaching behavior. The fact that the less rigid, dominating, dogmatic, and/or autocratic a student teacher was, the more alert, responsible, confident, and/or self-initiating his pupils were; and the fact that the more friendly, flexible, sympathetic, and/or understanding a student teacher's behavioral traits were, the more positively his pupils reacted lent support to the general proposition that "in cultivating more desirable social attitudes in the nation's youth, it would appear, therefore, to be better to select those students in social education who are found to possess less authoritarian and more democratic characteristics on valid pre-service inventories."⁵⁰

⁴⁹H. M. Boodish, "Human Relations Factor in Teaching," *Social Studies*, XLVIII, (April, 1957), pp. 135-139.

⁵⁰Shia-ling Liu, "Personal Characteristics in Secondary School Social Studies Student Teachers as Related to Certain Measures of Potential Teaching Behavior," *Faculty Research Edition: Savannah State College Bulletin* XX, (December, 1966), pp. 159-164.