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CHAPTER I
THE PURPOSE AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

The problem.—"Teachers taught from early in the morning until late at night, but often at the close of the day had not 'heard' all the recitations."

Hearing the recitations was taking place in the 1800's, but today many teachers are correcting papers and workbooks from early morning until late at night and still are not finished.

Every teacher has to do some kind of evaluating on each child in the class. This evaluation may consist of marking a simple card with a series of letters or numbers concerning the child's accomplishments. It may be a parent-teacher conference, or completing an involved card which considers many social as well as academic attributes.

Whatever the kind of evaluation that is done, daily paper and workbook results, and tests are considered of prime importance. All of the work done by the child has to be checked or corrected, or scored or valued in some way, which takes many hours of time. It is quite different from the


work of the teacher in the Dame School of whose job it was said, "It was not an arduous job, and the dame augmented this income by sewing or knitting while 'hearing lessons'."

The large and overcrowded classes found in many schools today mean more and more paper work. Each increase of one child results in a many-fold increase in the number of teacher-child contacts.
work of the teacher in the Dame School of whose job it was said, "It was not an arduous job, and the dame augmented this income by sewing or knitting while 'hearing lessons'."

The large and overcrowded classes found in many schools today mean more and more paper work. Each increase of one child results in a many-fold increase in the number of teacher-child contacts.

Many teachers are convinced that they must do the correcting of papers themselves. Several ideas are involved here: e.g.

1. The teacher feels that the child learns the most by having the teacher find the errors.
2. The teacher seems imbued with the idea that it is her duty to correct the papers.
3. Many teachers derive satisfaction from using a red pencil on a child's paper, although they would be loathe to admit it.
4. Correcting papers is another way of "hearing recitations" started in colonial days in America.

Because of these beliefs many teachers wonder about the value and ethics of having a pupil correct his own papers. Teachers also wonder about the problem of cheating when the child corrects his own papers. In order to help solve this

1/Massachusetts Teachers Association, Glimpses of Educational Progress Throughout the Years, 14 Beacon St., Boston, Massachusetts, 1957, p. 1.
problem and save time many teachers have children exchange papers, which in reality adds to the problem.

Purp Purpose of the study.--The purposes of this study are

1. To find out whether teachers at the elementary grade level are correcting papers, tests, and reading workbooks or having the children correct their own;

2. To uncover reasons teachers have for correcting papers themselves or having the children correct;

3. To find out the opinions of teachers concerning cheating, and whether or not these opinions are justified;

4. To discover how children feel about the problem of correcting papers;

5. To find out whether or not children do cheat when they correct their own papers; whether or not they deny the fact if they do cheat; and their opinions concerning cheating by classmates;

6. To verify an opinion that children gain more value from the correction of their own papers rather than from seeing the teacher's red marks;

7. To compile material so teachers can change their procedures if the results make them feel so justified;

8. To test an opinion that children can be responsible for finding and correcting their own errors, if guided by a democratic-leader-type teacher.
Cantor describes the democratic teacher as one who is concerned primarily with understanding rather than judging the individual; who keeps at the center of the teaching process the importance of the student's problems and feelings instead of his own; and one who realizes that constructive effort must come from the positive or active forces within the student.

Justification for the study.—Teachers are concerned about large classes and amount of paper work. Christensen says that teachers felt they were spending more time than was justifiable on the following activities placed in rank order: (1) Desk clerical work; (2) Maintaining or establishing control of the class; (3) Correcting papers; (4) Talking to group.

In addition to being concerned about the large amount of paper work, teachers have opinions on the method to be used for correcting, scoring and grading papers that are considered in evaluating a pupil, although there seems to be little scientific basis for their opinions. It appears that the personal opinion of the teacher is responsible for the method she uses in scoring and grading papers.

1/Nathaniel Cantor, The Dynamics of Learning, Foster and Stewart, Buffalo, 1946, pp. 83-84.

2/Paul E. Christensen, "Work-Sampling; A Stroboscopic View of Teaching," Educational Administration and Supervision, (April, 1956), 42:4-231.
That teachers have opinions was well-expressed by one teacher in comments written on the questionnaire used in this study. After checking "never" on the question, "Do you have the children correct their own daily papers?" she said: "No two teachers are the same temperament, and how we get our work done, should be a matter of our own concern. Just like housekeeping — some do things one way, some another; but as long as we get done, it makes no difference, how we get there." (Underlining writer's)

Such an opinion is in strong contrast to Symonds who says:

"And the child learns that marks help to determine the attitudes which parents take toward him — whether he will be praised or scolded, accepted or rejected. They help to determine his place in the family with his siblings and are important factors in sibling rivalry and jealousy."

The only inference that can be drawn is that since teachers' opinions do have an effect on their methods, these opinions are highly important. How teachers arrive at a conclusion as to what to do is another question, for there is very little information or study concerning methodology of scoring and evaluation. As Rothney says:

"To many teachers the process of evaluating and reporting pupil progress is one of giving a series of

1/P.M. Symonds, "Pupil Evaluation and Self-Evaluation" Teachers College Record, (December, 1952), 54: p. 139.

exercises and tests, marking them, adding or averaging
the marks, and entering them on a small card...Research
has shown us, however, that if evaluating and reporting
pupil progress is to be effective, it must be a continu-
ous, cooperative, and cumulative procedure."

Lastly, the results of a study concerned with correcting,
scoering, and marking papers should prove of some aid to the
teacher in her daily work.

Scope and plan of study.—In an effort to determine
the opinions of teachers and pupils in elementary grades
two through six, concerning the correction of papers, tests,
and workbooks, two questionnaires were devised.

In the teachers' survey, the first two questions were
concerned with whether or not the teacher felt that correcting
papers and workbooks was a problem. The 14 questions that
followed involved opinions on learning and cheating in having
the child correct, and methods which the teacher used to
correct papers and tests. Each question could be answered
by checking one of four categories: usually, occasionally,
ever, always. The two final questions were on the number
of years of experience and grade taught.

The children's questionnaire had ten questions, eight
of which concerned actions and opinions of the child regarding
his own, his classmates', and teacher's actions in correcting
papers. These could be answered by checking one of four
categories: never, a few times, sometimes, many times. The
remaining two questions concerned preference for a method to
be used in correcting.
Elementary school teachers and pupils in two small neighboring towns in Berkshire County, Massachusetts, were used. From these two towns elementary pupils go to a common junior high school.

Forty teachers completed the teachers' survey. Of these, 20 repeated the survey at a three-week interval to establish reliability. The remaining 20 participated in the "cheat check" on children's papers. The "cheat check" involved three sets of papers from 657 children or a total of 1971 papers checked. It is with the latter 20 teachers and 657 children that the major portion of this study is concerned.

Table 1. Participation in Major Part of the Project According to Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number of Classes</th>
<th>Number of Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the elementary schools in the town were used. The 22 classes were taught by 20 teachers, one teacher having
a Grade 2-3 combination and another a Grade 4-5 combination. In addition, 125 pupils of the teachers who repeated the teachers' survey also scored the children's survey twice as a reliability check.

The plan of study was to devise two surveys, administer them, and tabulate results from which conclusions could be drawn.

**Basic Assumptions.**—The assumptions which have been made concerning this study are, first of all, that teachers and pupils will answer carefully and truthfully. McNemar says:

> "The several techniques used for getting at opinions or attitudes boil down to the simple matter of asking people questions about an issue in order to elicit a response which is interpreted as the respondent's opinion about or attitude toward the given issue."

Second, that teachers and pupils polled will be representative of elementary grades 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Third, that findings will prove of value to the elementary school teacher in her everyday work.

---

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Historical concepts.—"Show slates," commanded the monitor under the Lancaster system, and probably what was as close to assembly line correction by a human being was done as the monitor quickly checked the ten slates displayed by the pupils. The familiar picture of a monitor reviewing the slate work can be seen in many popular education books as in Brubacher.

The introduction of slates in the early 19th century, although not hygienic, was an improvement from the standpoint of relieving the teacher of making pens. In teaching writing, the teacher's chief concern was making quill pens and "setting" copies for each pupil. The result was there was little time left for the examination and criticism of the pupil's writing. "Richard Mulcaster, an English schoolmaster of the sixteenth century, criticizing this method said masters 'spend their whole time about setting copies, whereas fewer copies, and more looking to his hand would help the child more'."


Barnard reports that until 11 years old, all the pupils did, in a whole afternoon or forenoon was to write one page of a copy book not exceeding ten lines. The pupils were never taught to make their own pens, and it occupied the master and usher two hours of every session to prepare them.

The article continues a description of the reading school where it was the custom for a child to read one verse of the Bible for a course. In spelling the custom was hearing the words spelled, while in grammar, the custom was to recite six or more lines a fortnight. Geography began to be a reading book about 1800.

From work on slates, copy books and recitations, the teacher drew conclusions to be used in the final evaluation, much as the teacher today draws conclusions from daily paper work and test results.

An evaluation from 1826 said:

"Elisabeth... hath been engaged, during her attendance at this school in storing her memory, that strong and capricious store house of the mind, with useful ideas, lessons and information generally.

Pursuant to this end, she hath deposited in her memory for future use the multiplication and other arithmetical tables.

1/ H. Barnard, American Educational Biography, C.W. Bardeen Company, Boston, 1912, p. 56-64.

She hath repeated the principal divisions, oceans, islands, etc. and answered 109 questions on the map of the world.

She hath recited the principal divisions, lakes, rivers, bays, gulfs, etc. and answered 41 questions on the map of North America.

She hath defined the boundaries of 12 of the United States and repeated 95 of the chief towns and 33 of the principal rivers belonging to these 12 states and answered 66 questions corresponding to the geography of that fine country.

On the map of South America she hath committed to memory the different countries belonging to that great peninsula and repeated 58 chief towns and 33 of the principal rivers and answered 39 questions corresponding with its geography.

Let no one say, hereafter that females cannot learn for that is an assertion without foundation. Elizabeth is living proof to the contrary and she merits the approbation and encouragement of her parents and friends."

It can easily be seen that the main concern was the commitment to memory of various facts. Nearly 100 years later some educators were preaching almost the same philosophy.

In a book published in 1922 it was stated that the work of the pupils not considered part of the formal recitation was not to be neglected but to be checked. It also said that it was not necessary for the teacher to mark every set of papers if her work was heavy, but that the marking of every third or fourth set would keep her in close touch

with the work of the pupils. The article continues:

"Of course, the greatest value will be realized by the pupils if every paper is examined carefully and returned with a personal consultation with its maker; but few teachers can give the time and energy necessary to do this. Teachers often devise schemes whereby this work is lightened to a certain extent. One plan requires the pupils to keep their work in notebooks. These are collected at intervals and given a cursory examination. Another plan secures a checking of the results by having the pupils exchange work and correct each other's papers. Neither of these plans is as satisfactory as when the teacher marks the individual sheets by herself, but they may be of much help to the busy teacher."

Current opinions.—A recent opinion concerning methodology of correction says, "The consensus is that children should not correct each other's papers." The authors go on to give several reasons why they shouldn't, such as the fact that the child's marks are private; mistakes in marking often cause trouble; a teacher doesn't save time because she must of necessity check over papers; and lastly that the child derives no value from the job.

In answer to a question concerning special techniques for grading papers, the same authors say there are several techniques for correcting papers, some better than others. "The general procedure is to red pencil errors; the purpose being to help the child discover and correct his mistakes. Checks should be no larger or darker than necessary." 2/

1/Margaret M. Phillips and Marjorie Carr, Try These Answers, Row Peterson and Co., White Plains, N.Y., 1956, pp. 18-19.

2/Ibid., p. 19.
Phillips and Carr also appear to feel that papers should be corrected at a time that will be most helpful to the child. Then, with what appears to be a disregard of reality they say:

"Papers that are collected one day, corrected and simply handed back are of little or no value to the average student. The best time to correct papers from the learning standpoint is when the child is making the mistake, to find it on his paper as he makes it. This, of course, is not always possible."

The writer would feel that this is seldom possible in most schools today. It is possible, and advantageous, for the teacher to spot-check difficulties by walking around the room during the written part of the lesson, working with the children. However, to spend just one minute correcting the paper of each child would usually run into more time than the length of the written lesson.

The NEA reports that in April, 1956, only 43 percent of the country's urban elementary school children were in classes of 30 or fewer. On the other hand, 35 percent were in classes of 31-35, 17 percent were in classes of 36-40, and 5 percent in classes of 41 or more.

In the group participating in the present study, number of pupils per teacher ranged from 21 to 50 with the predominant class size being about 32.

1/ Ibid., p. 19

In contrast to Phillips and Carr is the thinking of many modern educators who are of the opinion that the children should do the correcting rather than the teacher, and that the children should be encouraged to assume the responsibility for checking their own errors. In referring to an imaginary-type teacher who is not of this mold and "unfortunately" an example of some teachers, Arbuckle says:

"Miss Brown on the other hand, believes that her sole function as a teacher is to develop skills or to impart knowledge, and that the children must be able to indicate to her that they have retained this knowledge at least long enough to give it back to her. Her attitude toward children is often, at best, neutral, and she may frequently actually dislike them. She feels that in general children can do little for themselves, and they have to be told and directed if they are to do anything at all."

**Empirical evidence.**—Experimental studies concerning the amount of learning which results from having the children assume responsibility for evaluating their own work are difficult to find. Opinions based on experience, however, are not. Stoddard says, "Lacking satisfactory evidence, we may mention certain considerations that are borne out by the experience of teachers, counselors, and educational psychologists."

For instance, in some advice given to a fifth grade teacher

---


in answer to the question, "How often should pupils' written class assignment papers be graded?" Spitzer says:

"It is recommended that pupils' daily written arithmetic papers be graded by the teacher only 5 to 10 percent of the time. Instead let pupils do most of the checking. The chief reasons for these recommendations are: (1) A pupil learns little from the teacher's scoring of papers. (2) If he makes an error, he will profit more if he discovers the error soon after having done the original work than if he finds a red mark on a paper returned the next day. (3) Teachers learn more about the pupils' ability by observing and assisting them as they work on assignments. (4) Having pupils check their own work places responsibility on the pupil himself. (5) If pupils' daily papers are not graded often, overemphasis on marks can be avoided."

In line with this same type of thinking are some statements from Marion Lamb, who says, "One misapprehension that weakens the effectiveness of potentially effective teachers is the belief that the sole function of the teacher is to discover errors and to stop them at the source." She also believes that at every level the teacher should keep in close touch with her pupils and their work, but that the actual search for errors should be taken over by them as soon as they are capable of doing so. "As youngsters grow in competence, they should assume more responsibility for checking and correction of all their work."

1/ Herbert F. Spitzer, "Your Counselor Service," The Instructor, (October, 1957), 67:2-50.


3/ Ibid., p. 90.
The checking and correction of work should be used as a basis for learning on the part of the child. The teacher who believes that learning consists in the ability to reproduce material that has been memorized will see no learning value in having a child correct his own work. Ragan feels that for many years learning has been regarded as identical with knowing. He says:

"This concept of learning influenced every phase of the traditional elementary-school program. Rows of seats screwed to the floor, teachers trained in the presentation of subject matter in a limited field, motivation based on rewards and punishment, examinations designed to test memory of facts, annual promotions based on minimum grade standards - in short, the whole mechanism of the traditional elementary school-flowed naturally from this narrow, static concept of learning."

There has been an increasing acceptance in recent years of the view that learning is the modification of behavior which comes about through interaction with the environment. "Learning is the process by which an activity originates or is changed through training procedures whether in the laboratory or in the natural environment, as distinguished from changes by factors not attributable to training." 2/

Ragan also states that "Evaluation is not something


that is done after teaching has been completed; it takes place simultaneously with teaching and learning."

Many thinkers today are convinced that self-evaluation and judgment of one's own work is a necessary and important part of the total educational process. Grimm points out that there are several advantages of pupil participation in evaluating progress. The pupil learns to become increasingly independent in appraising his own progress, problems, and growth. Through daily sharing and participating in the total learning process, he will use the data gathered in the evaluation program to guide his progress more effectively toward his goals. The school is serving a vital function when it enables the pupil to learn better how to judge and place values upon his daily adjustments to life.

Virginia Axline discusses the fact that it is not enough for a teacher to be a dispenser of facts and tester of knowledge, to hear recitations and to maintain order. She feels that the greatest contribution that educators can make to the younger generation "is the type of guidance that places emphasis upon self-initiative and transmits to the young people by living example the fact that each individual is responsible for himself."


Emphasizing even more strongly the need for every child to be able to judge and criticize his own work and growth, Stoddard says:

"Every child, whether in a small group or a large classroom, must be expected to carry on a vast amount of self-teaching, self-correction, and self-adjustment. There is an inner check on efficiency that is, in essence, distinctly ethical. No child should be allowed to shortchange himself intellectually - to cheat at solitaire, whether it be played with cards, words, digits, or data. Within limits of his knowledge and his ability to apply appropriate validation, the child is his own inspector generally; he should never turn over to teacher, parent, or companion the smallest fragment of work that he knows to be wrong. He should get the habit of assuming full responsibility, let us say for a problem in arithmetic, composition, or science, within limits of his power, leaving for the teacher only those duties that transcend his own. This crucial lesson if learned early by every child, can be tremendously helpful to the teacher, supervisor, and curriculum maker. In the long run it will prove to be good training and good mental hygiene for the child himself."

Cheating and self-evaluation.—Although there is little research on the learning which results from self-evaluation rather than teacher-evaluation, there is a body of research on the various phases of cheating, and the dynamics involved. Many of the articles on cheating refer to the over-emphasis on marks. "The most basic cause of cheating, according to many educators, is the American worship of marks."¹

¹/G.D. Stoddard, op. cit., pp. 396-397.

²/Lawrence Lader, "What are the Facts on Classroom Cheating?" Parents Magazine, (October, 1952), 27:10-43.
This worship starts very early in the grades when the child tightly clutches the papers bearing the teacher's stamp of approval, the gold star, or the red "Very Good" and conveniently loses the "Poor" or "D" papers. He has no conception of the value of the paper either of itself or to him. He soon learns, however, that being judged an "A", whatever it might be, is the sort of behavior that brings approval both from teacher and parents. The aim of many children soon tends to be the mark rather than the abilities, understandings and attitudes to be learned. Because of this false emphasis on marks, some educators believe that they are not even necessary. "For all practical purposes, grades and report cards could be dispensed with today without serious loss."

Macomber also believes that overemphasis upon marks tends to develop dishonesty and adds that "from a psychological point of view, the present marking practice is wrong and should be greatly modified."

Hartshorne and May report that:

"It is reasonable to suppose that the influence of the school and the teacher, whether for good or ill, is reflected not only in the immediate acts of


the children but also in their growing stock of attitudes and habits.

It is conceivable that those attitudes and habits, becoming more fixed each year, may in the course of a few school sessions prove stronger than the influence of any but the most able teacher."

Whitsel suggests that perhaps teachers need to effect a change in their teaching methods instead of trying to reform students in order to alleviate cheating. She says it should be the responsibility of teachers not only "to treat children decently and to teach in a cordial, cooperative manner, but to handle with non-restrictive methods something that is important to every child so that each has a chance to undergo a success experience." She ends her article by asking, "What price are our students having to pay to secure passing grades?"

Stilwell lists four reasons why children cheat, starting with the fact that the teacher acts as though he expects them to cheat; that the grade system is mostly foolishness, and adds that the student knows it. He claims that written examinations, as now required are a painful, pointless business, and feels that cheating in school is nothing more than a reflection of a way of life in the adult world.


Because so many believe that cheating is the result of over-emphasis on marks, is not to say that a child must never experience competition. The competition is necessary in order that the child gain some perception of himself in relation to others. In addition, the competition gives impetus to work and play.

The competition becomes unhealthy when it becomes compulsive. "No hard and fast line can be drawn between healthy and unhealthy competitiveness, but...some distinctions can be made." Jersild goes on to draw several comparisons between healthy and unhealthy such as spontaneous rather than compulsive, productive rather than destructive, and when most of competing outweigh bitterness of losing.

He says, "When competitive tendencies and the motives underlying them have such strength that instead of being governed by a person they govern him, we have a situation in which the person's conduct has a compulsive quality."

It would appear then that the goal of modern democratic education is to assist students to become individuals, as Rogers says:

"Who are able to take self-initiated action and to

---

2/Ibid., p. 219.
be responsible for those actions;
who are capable of intelligent choice and self-direction;
who are critical learners, able to evaluate the contributions made by others;
who have acquired knowledge relevant to the solution of problems;
who, even more importantly, are able to adapt flexibly and intelligently to new problem situations;
who have internalized an adaptive mode of approach to problems, utilizing all pertinent experience freely and creatively;
who are able to cooperate effectively with others in these various activities;
who work not for the approval of others, but in terms of their own socialized purposes."

Measurement of attitudes and opinions.—In our vast and changing society, it is natural that the whole process of education is open to investigation and criticism. As each succeeding generation passes through the school it becomes the adult population, swayed, influenced and molded by the opinions and attitudes of the teacher and the school.

Remmers claims that the measurement of attitudes and opinions has become a vital part of the educational system, with educators, especially those interested in the guidance area, making more and more use of them. He feels that the democratic orientation of teachers and administrators has

led them to encourage expression of ideas which can be evaluated and used in improving relationships within the school system. There has been considerable discussion over the years as to just what constitutes an attitude and how attitudes are caused or changed.

Murphy and Likert contend that "attitudes are dispositions toward overt action." Wang says that "the distinguishing feature of an attitude statement lies mainly in that it expresses an attitude."

Symonds has listed seven different meanings that the term attitude may carry, as employed in psychological literature. It may refer: (a) to the organic drives more familiarly known as purposes or motives; (b) to muscular set or adjustment; (c) to generalized conduct; (d) to neural set; (e) to the emotional concomitant of action; (f) to the feeling concomitant of action, and, (g) to certain verbal responses indicating liking or disliking, acceptance, or rejection. Symonds goes on to say that the term possesses little distinction from the terms "habit," and "skill."


Behavior is determined "directly and completely by the phenomenal field at the instant of action" say Snygg and Combs. Regarding the problem of attitude change they state: "The closer a deviant perception lies to that portion of the phenomenal self which we have called the self-concept, the more difficult change is likely to be." The two authors say the reason for this is that:

"The phenomenal self is the only frame of reference which the individual possesses. It is the only self he knows. Whether other persons would agree to his self-definitions or not, the phenomenal self has the feeling of complete reality to the individual. Wherever he is, whatever he does, the maintenance of this self is the prime objective of his existence."

Concerning the instrument to be used, McNemar says, "Other things being equal, the less the personal relevance of an issue, the lower the reliability and validity."

From this statement one can infer that the higher the personal relevance of an issue the higher the reliability and validity.

Kirkpatrick and Stone remark that "it is possible that there is no perfect method and no perfect instrument.


2/Ibid. p. 230.


It may be that certain methods and certain instruments are better than others for certain purposes."

"Let us say at the most general level that one's opinions and attitudes serve as mediators between the inner demands of the person and the outer environment - the material, social, and most immediately, the informational environment of the person," say Smith, Bruner and White, who continue, "Figures of speech may be misleading, yet we do well to think of a man's attitudes as his major equipment for dealing with reality."


CHAPTER III
PROCEDURE AND RESPONSE TO THE SURVEY

Procedure used.—It was decided that the way to obtain opinions of elementary school teachers and pupils concerning methods and attitudes on the correction of children's written work was to ask them. The direct interview method was not considered feasible, and so two survey-type questionnaires were devised. Teachers were asked the following questions:

1. Do you feel that correcting papers is a problem in your everyday work?
2. Do you feel that correcting reading workbooks is a problem in your everyday work?
3. Do you have the children correct their own daily papers?
4. Do you have the children correct their own reading workbooks?
5. Do you have the children correct their own arithmetic, spelling, or objective-type tests?
6. Do you have children exchange papers for correction?
7. Do you feel that children cheat when they correct their own papers?
8. Do you feel that children cheat when they correct each other's papers?
9. Do you feel that children learn by marking their own errors?
10. Do you feel that children learn by seeing teacher's marks on errors?
11. If you have the children correct their own papers do you collect them and review them?

12. Do you record marks from the papers that the children correct?

13. Do you average daily paper scores for arriving at report card grades?

14. Does the number of children in your class have any effect on the method of correcting you use?

15. Do you correct papers at your desk while children do study work?

16. Do you correct papers after school hours?

17. How many years have you been teaching?

18. What grade do you teach?

The children's questionnaire asked the following:

1. When papers are corrected do you like to correct your own? like to exchange papers? like to have teacher correct all papers?

2. When workbooks are corrected do you like to correct your own? like to exchange workbooks? like to have teacher correct all workbooks?

3. Do you change answers when you correct your own papers?

4. Do you change answers when you correct your own reading workbook?

5. Do the other boys and girls in your room change answers when they correct their own papers?

6. Do the other boys and girls in your room change answers when they correct their own reading workbooks?

7. Do you change answers when you correct someone else's papers?

8. Does your teacher like to have you correct your own papers?

9. Does your teacher like to have you correct your own reading workbook?
10. Does your teacher like to have you correct your own tests?

As a first step, the teachers' survey was completed by 20 teachers who were to repeat the survey in three weeks. They were not told this would happen. This included all the teachers in one town except the first grade. Arrangements were made to have the superintendent, who was most cooperative, administer the survey to the children while their teacher was completing the teachers' form. All surveys were put into an envelope in the classroom and sealed immediately.

The same directions were given to all of the people involved. Teachers were asked to complete the form as quickly as possible and were assured that no names would be used in any way. The first group was also asked, "Does this questionnaire cover the problem of correcting papers, or do you have any suggestions?" No additional questions were raised.

Children were asked to fill in name, school and grade on the form. They were told the reason for the survey was to find out how boys and girls felt about correcting papers. The directions also said, "Just as soon as all of you have finished, the papers will be put into this big envelope (shown) and sealed and sent to the person who needs the information." To make certain that there would be no errors because of inability to read, all questions were read to the children by the person administering the questionnaire.
This method also forced a quick choice that was more apt to be correct than attempting to check the answer it was thought was wanted.

When the first group of questionnaires was completed, a reliability check was made. The reliability of responses to the teachers' inquiry form was estimated by computing the correlation between first and second administrations with a group of 20 teachers. The four-fold point correlation coefficient (phi coefficient) computed by the following formula was found to be .76.

\[
\phi = \frac{bc-ad}{\sqrt{(a+b)(a+c)(c+d)(b+d)}}
\]

It was seen that 88.44% of the responses were the same for both queries with 11.56% changing. The phi computed represents a conservative estimate of the reliability, which is sufficiently high to justify the analysis of responses given. A correction for a phi coefficient of this size corresponding to the tetrachoric correlation is .93.

The reliability of responses to the children's questionnaire was estimated by computing the correlation between first and second administrations with a group of 125 children. The four-fold point correlation coefficient (phi coefficient) computed by the above formula was found to be .60.

It was seen that 79.76% of the responses were the same
for both queries with 20.24% changing. The phi computed represents a conservative estimate of reliability which is sufficiently high to justify the analysis of responses given. A correction for a phi coefficient of this size corresponding to the tetrachoric correlation is .81.

The following procedure was used after the reliability of the questionnaire was determined. At an elementary teachers association meeting in the second town, the writer announced to the group that she was to conduct a survey and asked if they would be willing to participate. It was hoped that the largest number agreeing to would be from Grades 4, 5 and 6, although they were not told this fact, as all who desired were to be included. Because of the size of the school system nearly all had to agree to in order to have the 20 deemed necessary for an adequate sample.

Those volunteering were distributed as follows: Grade 2, three; Grade 3, three; Grade 4, five; Grade 5, six; Grade 6, six; with two teachers each having two classes. This group of teachers were the ones who were to participate in the complete study. They were told that there would be three parts to the study for them - a teachers' questionnaire, a record of three sets of papers from all the children in their classes, and finally a children's questionnaire.

The questionnaires for the teachers in the six elementary
schools were sent to the principals. Teachers were asked to complete the survey as quickly as possible and without discussing it with anyone. Each teacher was provided with an addressed, stamped envelope so she could make a return to the writer without showing her replies to anyone else. They were also told they could return the survey unanswered if they had changed their minds about participating. The letter is shown in the Appendix. A total of 21 surveys was completed.

Because one of the teachers, some of whose remarks have already been referred to (page 5) was so hostile to the whole idea, and did not wish to continue, she naturally was relieved of the duty. It was believed that only those who were really interested would willingly perform the extra work involved, so the study continued with 20 teachers.

All of the questionnaires were returned by mail to the writer within two days. The teachers were then supplied with tally sheets for each child in the class and given detailed instructions on how to proceed. Both are shown in the Appendix.

Briefly, each teacher was to score three sets of papers, one in spelling, one in social studies, and one in arithmetic without marking the papers in any way. Second grade teachers substituted reading for social studies. None of the tests was teacher-made, but were taken from the textbook in spelling,
and purchased from the book company in arithmetic and social studies. The errors made by the children were recorded on tally sheets. The next day unmarked papers were returned to the class who were told that the teacher did not have time to correct and the children were to correct their own papers as the teacher read the answers.

The papers were then collected and errors that the children had marked were recorded on the tally sheet. It was possible with a quick look to see where errors marked by the teacher had also been marked by the pupil or disregarded. When not marked, it was assumed the child gave himself credit for a right answer, either by changing an answer, filling in a blank, or just disregarding the error.

When all of the tally sheets had been returned to the writer, copies of the children's questionnaire were sent to the teacher for her class. The children were not informed that their papers had been checked. A large envelope was included so results could be sealed immediately, and in front of the children without perusal by the teacher, as children had been promised.

Results of the survey.--Because the results of the survey are many and varied it was thought best to include much of the information in table form. This is done in the following chapter along with an analysis of the data found.
Of the teachers participating in any way, the median number of years in teaching was between 15 and 19 years, with 19 of the group having 20 or more years of service.

Table 2. Chart Showing Number of Years in Teaching by Teachers Participating in Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years in Teaching</th>
<th>Teachers Town I</th>
<th>Teachers Town II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than five years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5 and 9 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 10 and 14 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 15 and 19 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison with national figures supplied by the NEA shows that the median total experience for women teachers in 1956 was 15.4 years, and that elementary teachers reported slightly longer experience. Only women teachers participated in the study under consideration, and number of years of experience compares very favorably with the NEA figures.

At least 75 percent of the group reported that correct-

ing papers and reading workbooks is a problem in everyday work. The questionnaire showed that the teacher who never has the children correct any of their work is rather rare. So also is the teacher who admits that she usually has the children correct most of their work. The teacher does not record grades from child-scored papers, even though she usually averages daily paper scores for report card marks. She corrects papers after school.

The teachers in this study were of the opinion that children cheat only occasionally, and that they usually learn from correcting their own errors. In fact, these teachers say that children learn more from correcting their own errors than from seeing teacher's red marks on papers.

The 657 elementary school children participating in the study showed no preference as a group or as a grade for any particular method of grading and scoring papers and reading workbooks. A pattern of choice appeared in each individual class, however. A high agreement between what teacher says she does and what children like to do was found. This was even more apparent when teacher was more definite and checked "usually" or "never" rather than "occasionally." The same high correlation was found between what teacher says she does and what children like to do pertaining to correcting reading workbooks.

Roughly 50 percent of the children reported they never
changed answers on their own papers while 62 percent said they never changed answers in reading workbooks. Only 26 percent felt that classmates never changed answers on papers and about one-third never changed workbook answers.

Results show that children claim they do not change answers when they correct a classmate's written work, with 92 percent of them saying they never made a change. Children were of the opinion that the teacher liked them to correct more times than she indicated on the teachers' survey. The question on the correcting of tests brought forth a class response with 16 out of 20 classes agreeing with teacher on the method used.

Of the 657 pupils in the survey, 612 had opportunities to better their scores through self-correction of papers which teacher had already scored but had not marked in any way. Children did not know the teacher had checked the papers. Of the 612 who could have changed, 238, or 36.5 percent of the girls, and 40 percent of the boys, did. However, 70.2 percent of the boys admitted they changed answers, while only 55.4 percent of the girls admitted doing so.

Another interesting result was found when a check was made comparing the number of children who cheated and denied it, but who accused classmates of changing answers. This was done by over 66 percent of the girls in this category and about 58 percent of the boys.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data presented in table form.--For purposes of simplification and making the findings more readily available, it was decided to present the material wherever possible in table form together with a supplementary interpretation.

Weeks says that the research student is obligated to make detailed reports of progress or to give well-rounded accounts of units of reflective thinking as he progresses toward the largest generalizations possible for him in the realm of inquiry where he is at work.

The items in the tables are worded as they were in the original questionnaire. The tables are presented in the order that seemed the most logical. Following each table there is a discussion as to the relevance of the material found, together with a summation and interpretation.

1/Edward Weeks, This Trade of Writing, Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1936, p. 7.
Table 3. Attitudes of Two Groups of 20 Elementary School Teachers Concerning Correcting Papers and Reading Workbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes %</td>
<td>No %</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Yes %</td>
<td>No %</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Do you feel that correcting papers is a problem in your everyday work?</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Do you feel that correcting reading workbooks is a problem in your everyday work?</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Table 2.—Table 2 shows the attitude of two groups of 20 elementary school teachers concerning the problem of correcting daily papers and reading workbooks. Reading workbooks were used in preference to another subject workbook because it was the opinion of the writer that a workbook in reading is perhaps the one most common to all.

Teachers in Group I are the ones who participated in the reliability check on the survey. Agreement between the two groups of teachers is very close, implying that many of today's teachers probably consider correcting a problem.

It was the writer's opinion of the word "problem" to mean that it required time that could be better spent in more meaningful and fruitful pursuits such as planning or in giving individual help. The word "problem" has as a general connotation the implication of needing a solution.

"Although the primary function of the teacher is to teach, his role has expanded immensely.....In addition, he is required to devote long hours to preparing plan books, grading innumerable papers (underlining writer's) and taking care of details."  

Table 4. Opinions and Practices of 20 Elementary School Teachers Concerning the Correcting of Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions and Practices</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Ans.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have the children correct their own papers?.....</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you have the children correct their own reading workbooks?........</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you have the children correct their own arithmetic, spelling, or objective type tests?........</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you have children exchange papers for correction?........</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you feel children cheat when they correct their own papers?........</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you feel children cheat when they correct each other's papers?........</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you feel children learn by marking their own errors?...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you feel children learn by seeing teacher's marks on errors?........</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If you have children correct their own papers do you collect and review them?........</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you record marks from papers that children correct?...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(concluded on next page)
Table 4. (concluded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions and Practices</th>
<th>Always (1)</th>
<th>Usually (2)</th>
<th>Occasionally (3)</th>
<th>Never (4)</th>
<th>No Ans. (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you average daily paper scores for arriving at report card grades?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Does the number of children in your class have any effect on the method of correcting you use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do you correct papers at your desk while children do study work?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you correct papers after school hours?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Table 4.—Table 4 tells us that the teacher in the study has children correct papers and workbooks only occasionally. As far as objective-type tests are concerned, the total picture is much less clearly defined. Just slightly more than 50 percent say they have children correct tests occasionally, while 30 percent report a strong "never." The teacher implies that she is doing most of the correcting herself, and one can only surmise the reason for this.

The composite teacher in this questionnaire occasionally has children exchange papers for correction and is of the opinion that they cheat only occasionally. If they cheat only occasionally, one might ask the reason for having them exchange papers other than that the teacher thinks there is really more than occasional cheating.

She is of the opinion, 80 percent of the time, that children learn by correcting their own errors and 60 percent of the time that they learn by seeing teachers' marks on errors. Again what she says she believes and what she actually does do not agree, for if children learn by correcting their own work, why not let them correct.

Concerning actions on reviewing papers corrected by the children, the table shows that 70 percent "usually" or "always" look at them; 10 percent "never" do. When it comes to recording marks from papers that children correct, 40
percent never record the marks, 30 percent do so only occasionally. On the other hand, the teacher does say that 90 percent of the time she averages daily paper scores for arriving at report card grades, which implies that she really does not trust the children to correct their own work, or at least doesn't consider the papers they correct worthy.

About 50 percent of the time the number of children in the class has an effect on the method used. The teacher says she occasionally corrects at her desk but nearly always, 95 percent of the time, corrects after school hours. It appears then, that many would do the correcting themselves regardless of the number of papers, or any learning on the part of the child.

As a result of the analysis of this data we find the teacher an enigma. She says that correcting is a problem. Not only is it a problem, but it appears to be nearly impossible under the methods reported. If "always" and "usually" can be interpreted to mean most of the time and "occasionally" and "never" to be very little of the time, the teacher in this study is spending many long hours each day correcting papers and recording marks.

Summarizing, the teachers say the children correct workbooks and papers only occasionally and objective-type tests even less than that. Then in the next breath, with a
check of the pencil, our figurative teacher reports that even though children do cheat a little, and they definitely learn by marking their own errors, she will agree most of the time to look over the papers the children correct, but she is hardly amenable to recording these marks. Nevertheless, she does feel very strongly that marks should be averaged for report card grades. She uses the marks from the papers she corrects even though she reports that children learn more by correcting their own errors.

The final conclusion from the figures provided is that 95 percent of the teachers correct after school hours. If one minute is allowed for correcting a paper and recording the mark, this means an average of one-half hour for each set of papers. In addition, there are other types of work to be evaluated such as art and music. If one considers the number of reading workbook pages, arithmetic, language, spelling, social studies and penmanship papers done in one week by a class, the task becomes almost insurmountable. Not only is the task insurmountable, it probably isn't done to the degree indicated.

An interpretation of the enigma might be that the teacher is having the children correct their own work more times than she is willing to admit, believing it is her duty to correct as it was the colonial teacher's duty to hear
recitations. Another might be that since she usually does not record scores from child-corrected papers, she really believes that the kind of learning that goes on when the child corrects his own work is not the kind of learning she evaluates. It also shows that the teacher is not distinguishing between using a test as a technique for recitation and as a measurement.

Another reason might be that being in the habit of doing most of the evaluating herself, it becomes an attitude that this is the way it should be done, and so this is what she says she does. Also, perhaps she does all that is done, but in this way many papers go uncorrected, or unchecked by the teacher.
Table 5. Preferences of 657 Elementary School Pupils Concerning Correcting Papers According to Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number of Pupils</th>
<th>Like to Correct Own</th>
<th>Like to Exchange</th>
<th>Like to Have Teacher Correct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Table 5.—The obvious conclusion that can be drawn from the figures shown in Table 5 is that no pattern of preference either by grade, or group as a whole, appears concerning the method to be used in correcting papers. The only grade which shows agreement for any one method is the sixth grade. In each of the six classes in Grade 6, the group considered the most undesirable method of three possibilities to be the correction of their own papers. There was no grade concurrence, however, on the other two methods, i.e., correcting through exchange, or having teacher correct.

Actually, there were 15 opportunities where the five grades could have agreed on the choice of method, but it appeared only in the one instance already referred to. In every case, the totals for the grade show one method that is preferred, but in the opinion of the writer it would be a false assumption to draw a conclusion from this, since it was possible for just one class to change the choice of the entire grade, especially if that class were large.

Some interesting questions can be raised from the figures in Table 5 concerning the correction of papers. For instance, why does just one child out of 30 in Grade 2A like to exchange? Why was there 0 response to "like to have teacher correct" in Grade 4B? Why was there 0 response to "like to exchange" in Grade 5B? Why in 6B did just one
child out of 28 choose "like to correct own?" Through an analysis of Table 6 it is hoped to answer these questions, for the answers do not seem apparent from the information in Table 5.

If Table 6, which follows, is considered a measure of validity of teacher responses, a phi coefficient can be computed on the corroboration of children and teacher using the following formula:

$$ \phi_p = \frac{bc-ad}{\sqrt{(a+b)(a+c)(c+d)(b+d)}} $$

In the distribution of agreement between teachers' responses and children's preferences, "usually" was considered to be more than 50%, "occasionally" to be 11 to 49%, and "never" less than 10%. The following method was used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O-N</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-49%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each instance certain cells had small frequencies, thus reducing the reliability of the statistics. Nevertheless, this at least gives an approximation of agreement. The phi coefficients of correlation for the three sections in Table 6 are .40, .20, and .45 with a correction corresponding to the tetrachoric correlation being .59, .31 and .65.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Method 1 Teacher Corrects</th>
<th>Method 2 Pupils Exchange</th>
<th>Method 3 Pupils Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Reports</td>
<td>Pupils Prefer by Percent</td>
<td>Teacher Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>T*</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>U****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*T-Teacher
**-O-Occasionally
***-N-Never
****-U-Usually
*Of-Often
Analysis of Table 6.—The method teacher reported she used is indicated by a "T" in the proper column in the table, while preference of the children is shown by percentage. When teacher stated that she had the children correct occasionally, this was interpreted to mean that the teacher did most of the correcting. In the instances where the teacher checked "never" or "usually" this also is so indicated in the table by use of "O," "N," and "U."

The high degree of agreement between what teacher says she does and what children like to do is very apparent. The more definite the opinion or attitude of the teacher, the higher the degree of agreement. It would appear that it is the teacher's opinion that is the important influence, for her opinion determines her method.

Answers to questions raised in the analysis of Table 5 now become apparent. In the case of 5B where teacher indicated class never exchanged and papers were corrected both by teacher and by children, the pupils' preference ran, teacher 51 percent, exchange 0 percent, and self-correction, 49 percent.

In class 4C where teacher reported that she never had children exchange and never had them correct their own papers, pupils preferred teacher, 63 percent; exchange, 23 percent; self, 14 percent. In 4D, teacher said "never" on exchange. Pupils chose teacher, 63 percent; exchange 16 percent and
and self, 21 percent. In 5E, teacher checked "usually" for exchange and having the children correct. This class chose teacher, 23 percent; exchange 44 percent, and self, 33 percent. In 4E and 5D where teacher checked occasionally on all three methods, class opinion was split three ways. In three cases, 6E, 2B, and 3C, where more than 50 percent of the children had a preference for a method not so indicated by the teacher cannot be explained.

One reason for the disagreement might be that the teachers are using a certain method more often than they indicated on the survey. The fact that children prefer the method teacher uses points out that children seem to choose what they are used to doing. It also indicates a desire for approval from the teacher in choosing her method.
Table 7. Preferences of 657 Elementary School Pupils Concerning Correcting Reading Workbooks, According to Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Like to Correct Own</th>
<th>Like to Exchange</th>
<th>Like to Have Teacher Correct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Pupils</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number of Pupils</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 166 25.3 187 28.3 304 46.4 657 100
Analysis of Table 7.—From the figures presented in Table 7, it can be seen that no pattern of preference, either by grade, or group as a whole, appears concerning the method to be used in correcting reading workbooks. Another factor is that preference for a method sometimes changes between correcting papers and reading workbooks, as a comparison of Tables 5 and 7 shows.

The five grades had 15 opportunities when concurrence on a method could have been made. This did not occur even once. Some questions that can be raised with reference to correcting the reading workbook are: Why in 3G did no child prefer to correct his own, with 75 percent preferring to exchange; while in 5B nearly 63 percent prefer to correct their own and only 5 percent to exchange; why in 6B does no one like to correct his own, but 75 percent like to have the teacher correct?

Through an analysis of the table that follows, it is hoped to answer these questions. Here also, as for Table 6, a phi coefficient was computed between method the teacher reported using and method pupils preferred, i.e., teacher corrects, pupils exchange, pupils correct. The phi coefficients of correlation for the three sections in Table 8 are .39, .31, and .33, with a correction corresponding to the tetrachoric correlation being .57, .47 and .50.
Table 8. Method Teacher Reports Using for Correcting Reading Workbooks Compared With Method Pupils Prefer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Method 1 &lt;br&gt;Teacher Corrects</th>
<th>Method 2 &lt;br&gt;Pupils Exchange</th>
<th>Method 3 &lt;br&gt;Pupils Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Reports</td>
<td>Pupils Prefer by Percent</td>
<td>Teacher Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>T*</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>O**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>N***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>U****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*T-Teacher  
**O-Occasionally  
***N-Never  
****U-Usually
Analysis of Table 8.---The conclusions obtained from Table 6 are verified by the conclusions from Table 8, that is, it is the teacher who determines what method the children prefer. In 5B where teacher reported children usually corrected, 63 percent preferred this method, and only 6 percent chose the teacher's "never" category of exchange. In 4D, 63 percent like what teacher does, with 15 percent choosing exchange, which she reported as never doing. In 6D, 82 percent of the children agree with teacher to have her correct, while only 4 percent prefer to correct their own work, which teacher says she never does. In 6B, the choice is again teacher's method, 75 percent strong against 0 percent for correcting their own.

The general conclusion to be drawn is that the children like to do what the teacher usually has them do. Thus the pupils reflect to a relatively high degree the philosophy of the teacher. At this point, the writer feels that this conclusion may not be based on proof beyond a doubt, but as proof strongly supported by evidence and presented as new insight between relations of pupil and teacher.
Table 9. Method Teacher Reports Using to Correct Objective-Type Tests Compared With What the Children Say the Teacher Likes Them To Do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Teacher Never Has Children Correct</th>
<th>Teacher Sometimes Has Children Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Table 2.—The 80 percent agreement between pupils and teacher concerning method of correcting tests is rather obvious when seen in table form, showing that the children do know what the teacher likes them to do. The numbers ran very heavily in favor of one method over another, so there was no difficulty in considering what the class meant. In one class, for instance, scores were as follows: Never, 34; a few times, 1; sometimes and many times, 0, in answer to the question, "Does your teacher like to have you correct your own tests?"

In another class, "never," "a few times," "many times," had 0 checks with the entire class of 52 choosing "sometimes." Still another group checked: "never" 35 times, and 0 times for the three other categories.

In Class Q which checked "never" 19 times; "a few times," 15; "sometimes," 3; "many times," 1, it was decided to place the class total in the "sometimes correct" column, in the table. It was the opinion of the teacher of this class that correcting the three tests for the survey was the reason why many children chose the "sometimes" category.

There is no explanation for the disagreement in the other three classes that can be derived from the figures. Sometimes teachers have children correct quizzes but the children do not feel that these are tests and this may account for the difference of opinion.
Table 10. Opinions of 657 Elementary School Children Concerning Actions in Correcting Papers and Reading Workbooks, Including Both Numbers and Percents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>A Few Times</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Many Times</th>
<th>No Ans.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you change answers when you correct your own papers?...............</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you change answers when you correct your own reading workbook?.....</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do the other boys and girls in your room change answers when they correct their own papers?</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do the other boys and girls in your room change answers when they correct their own reading workbooks?</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you change answers when you correct someone else's papers?......</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does your teacher like to have you correct your own papers?..........</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does your teacher like to have you correct your own reading workbook?</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does your teacher like to have you correct your own tests?.........</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*insignificant
Analysis of Table 10.—A general opinion of the elementary school child concerning the correcting of papers is that nearly 50 percent of them never change answers on papers and 62 percent never change answers on reading workbooks. (Changing answers was considered to be the cheating part of the study, since the cheating was concerned with correcting only, and not in any other way such as copying). The table which follows shows that roughly 40 percent of those who had an opportunity, did improve their scores, adding credence to the conclusions found in Table 10.

Accusation of classmates was high with only 26 percent feeling that others "never" change answers when they correct their own papers. They felt 32.3 percent of the group never change reading workbook answers. Both concerning themselves and classmates, children felt there was less cheating on the reading workbooks. An interesting observation can be made from this. Children feel that the teacher likes them to correct papers more than she does the reading workbook.

The strongest agreement concerned changing answers on classmates' papers with 91.9 percent saying this was never done. The unanimity of choice here seems a very strong point. The rather high "no answer" score on Question 4 resulted from the parochial school total where children perhaps felt that they were acting wrongly to accuse a classmate. The high correlation between children and teacher's
opinion on the correcting of tests has already been shown in Table 9.

The important consideration is, can these figures be accepted? It is felt that they can be, and based on the evidence shown, are a true indication of the elementary school child's actions.
Table 11. Number of Pupils Who Had Opportunities to Change Scores, Those Who Did, and Those Who Admitted, and Those Who Denied the Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>Denied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Pupils</td>
<td>Answers</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>of Pupils</td>
<td>Answers</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Number of Pupils Who Had Opportunities to Change Scores; Percentages Who Did, and of Those Who Did Change, Percentages Who Admitted and Who Denied the Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Pupils</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>of Pupils</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>Denied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Tables 11 and 12.—An analysis of the two preceding tables shows, first of all, that of 612 pupils who had opportunities to improve a score on a paper through self-correction, 38.8 percent did so. Categorized according to sex, 36.5 percent of the girls and 40 percent of the boys gave themselves more credit on their papers than the teacher did. It does not appear that sex is a significant variable in this instance.

A significant difference can be found between the sexes when it comes to admitting the form of cheating which is being considered in this paper, namely that of changing answers. In every grade at least 59 percent of the boys who changed answers admitted it, with a mean of 70.2 percent acknowledging that they did.

The girls were not so prone to admit they changed answers. Only 30 percent of the girls in the third grade who increased their scores answered in the affirmative, with the highest percentage one of 76 in Grade 5. Mean percentage for the girls on the question was 55.4. One reason for this might be that in our society perhaps girls are more repressed or even feel more guilt.
Table 13. Percent of Those Admitting Changing Answers Who Accused Classmates of Changing; Percent of Those Denying Changing Answers Who Accused Classmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Girls Number</th>
<th>Girls Percent</th>
<th>Boys Number</th>
<th>Boys Percent</th>
<th>Girls Number</th>
<th>Girls Percent</th>
<th>Boys Number</th>
<th>Boys Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Table 13. From Table 13 it can be seen that the boys and girls who changed answers but who checked "never" when asked the question, "Do you ever change answers when you correct your own papers?" were in favor of accusing classmates of changing answers 50 percent of the time. Those who admitted changing answers accused classmates of doing the same 80 percent of the time. These figures account for some of the results in Table 10. Those admitting they changed answers accused classmates of doing the same. In addition those who denied changing answers also accused classmates thus accounting for the higher percentage on accusation of classmates than on self.

The accusation came in the question, "Do the other boys and girls in your room change answers when they correct their own papers?" The high percentages of boys and girls who admit changing answers were so close as to rule out sex as a variable. However 16 percent more of the girls denied changing answers, so sex appears to be an important factor in this case.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions.—"Children are so plastic and suggestible as to be singularly vulnerable to Procrustean methods," says Stoddard. That children are plastic and vulnerable seemed apparent from the present study. The children repeated time after time that they like to do what teacher prefers to have them do. Thus it appears that the teacher has the power to develop in the children in her care a sense of independence, responsibility and worth, or to train them to be dependent on her as a superior and masterful person.

Lamb says, "In too many classrooms the teacher is the star performer, probably because he is laboring under the idea that since he is paid for teaching, he should do all of the work." This study points out the fact that the teachers reported doing most of the work of scoring and grading papers. They claimed this in spite of the fact that they said a child learns more from correcting his own errors.

Of course, "One should recognize that in making judgment about pupils, teachers are in part responsive to their own


2/Marion M. Lamb, Your First Year of Teaching, South-Western Publishing Company, New Rochelle, 1956, p. 89.
personal needs and philosophies. In addition, it is also possible to maintain that: "An attitude is a predisposition to experience, to be motivated by, and to act toward, a class of objects in a predictable manner." If one considers elementary school children a class of objects, then we may again say that the predictable manner of the teacher will be determined by her philosophy of education.

Another conclusion seen from the study is that nearly 40 percent of the children cheated through self-evaluation, with sex of the child being an insignificant variable. Most of them did not try to hide the fact, however, almost implying that this is the normal course of events. Thus it seems that the desire to show a better grade on the paper was of preeminent concern for the child. Of the 20 teachers taking the survey, 18 of them said that children cheat occasionally. According to the results they are justified in their opinions.

One might ask since the child knew his true score, what was the purpose for improving it falsely. Certainly it was not to please himself, for in falsifying his score, he may even set up guilt feelings within himself. Perhaps more likely it was to satisfy externally established standards of


performance, or possibly to compare more favorably in a competitive situation, rather than judging himself on his own merits.

Referring to some of the other problems considered in this paper, it was found that teachers are using daily written work results in evaluation, i.e., for report card grades. Most of the evaluation being done, however, is of the judgmental type with little concern or even acceptance of any evaluation attempt on the part of the child, even as to belief in the integrity of the child in scoring his own work. If teachers record scores from papers which they correct, but refuse to accept the scores from the child, the conclusion is that the relation is one of distrust. It appears that the reason for having the child correct his own work is to save the teacher time. There is little self-enhancement or development for the child in this kind of action by the teacher.

That the child learns more from finding the error himself after he makes it rather than from teacher's red marks has been brought out by writers. Stroud\(^1\) refers to the fact that there is a long list of experiments in psychology demonstrating the importance of knowledge of results in practice and the futility of practice in the absence of such knowledge. "Knowledge of results serves as a guide to the learner in his subsequent practices and, as such,

functions as a basis of selection and elimination - a characteristic of most complex acts of learning." Of the 20 teachers participating in the survey, 16 said children usually learn by marking their own errors, verifying the opinion of the writer. It can also be seen that teachers in this study appear to have strong personal philosophies which determine their methods. The conclusion points to the fact that these philosophies are not, for the most part, student-centered.

Recommendations.--In the opinion of the writer, the child must be helped from his very first year in school to judge his own work as the product of a person of worth and to accept nothing but the very best from himself. This can only be done by a teacher who has "a genuine respect for the potentialities and personal worth of each student and a corresponding interest in and sympathy with his strivings for self-maintenance and self-enhancement."

This cannot be done by a teacher who does not have an honest and sincere belief in such a philosophy. For:

"A teacher's philosophy of education grows out of his understanding of the nature and the needs of the child, his understanding of the nature of the learning process, and his understanding of the nature and the needs of the society to be served by the school. This philosophy determines his conception of the aims and purposes of education, and in turn, the classroom curriculum, including the teaching process itself."


To the writer's recommendation that the children find their own errors, score and grade their own work is advice given to teachers by several modern elementary textbook writers. McKee says several times such things as: "Check your paper as your teacher reads the correct answers aloud. If you made a mistake, find out why it is a mistake... Check your letter as your teacher tells you what sentences should be left out... Correct your work... Correct your paper."

A spelling text says to the child: "Take the trial test on the new words and the review words. Check your list of words." To the teacher the text says: "Dictate very distinctly... Help the pupils to check their words and find any error."

A social studies Teacher's Guide says: "Don't be too concerned about how to grade all the exercises in the activity book. But the main thing is to have the child do the activities for the reasons they were placed there - to apply information and gain understandings." Concerning the tests, the author advises teachers to use them for the purpose for which they were intended - to help children. He says that testing results should not be the thing for which we are


working, but tests should be considered as another means
toward an end - children with understandings and appreciation
for things around them.

The child is not expected to flounder around by himself,
to be treated in a laissez-faire method, but the teacher
should remember that "all evaluation should be a cooperative
enterprise in which all who are concerned with the outcome
will engage. 1/" If the evaluation is a cooperative one
rather than a judgmental one, and if the main concern is
with the growth of the child rather than with marks, it is
felt that the rather high percentage of cheating found in
this study would not occur.

In conclusion, the writer would like to quote Burnham
who feels that the success of the great teacher has apparently
been due to the possession and practice in a high degree of
virtues and abilities in which all teachers in some degree
share. He says that the source of success in the great
teachers can be summed up as follows: "Their great aim was
mental health and normal development. They were simple and
dynamic. They emphasized the essential, gave opportunity to
their pupils to learn and to do. They had great skill in sug-
gestion, they faced the future, they faced reality, and
were optimists."

of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Develop-
ment, p. 229.

2/William H. Burnham, Great Teachers and Mental Health,
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APPENDIX
APPENDIX A
Letter Sent to Principals Concerning Teacher's Survey

Wells Road, RFD
Adams, Mass.
November 23, 1957

Dear Principal,

Enclosed are enough copies of the survey for teachers in grades 2 through 6, who said they would participate in my study. Please ask your teachers to complete the survey by checking one reply for each question. I would like them to do it in as short a time as possible and without discussing it with anyone.

There are enough stamped envelopes for everyone and I would appreciate having the surveys returned just as soon as they are finished. If anyone has changed her mind about participating, please let me know.

Tally sheets and directions for the second part of the study will be sent just as soon as the surveys are returned to me. No names will be used in any way.

Will you please indicate on the attached sheet the number of children in each of the grades and return it in your envelope.

Thank you,

Dolores E. Toporowski
APPENDIX B

The Teachers' Survey Used in the Study

1. Do you feel that correcting papers is a problem in your everyday work?
   ____ yes
   ____ no

2. Do you feel that correcting reading workbooks is a problem in your everyday work?
   ____ yes
   ____ no

3. Do you have the children correct their own daily papers?
   ____ usually
   ____ occasionally
   ____ never
   ____ always

4. Do you have the children correct their own reading workbooks?
   ____ usually
   ____ occasionally
   ____ never
   ____ always

5. Do you have the children correct their own arithmetic, spelling, or objective-type tests?
   ____ usually
   ____ occasionally
   ____ never
   ____ always

6. Do you have children exchange papers for correction?
   ____ usually
   ____ occasionally
   ____ never
   ____ always

7. Do you feel that children cheat when they correct their own papers?
   ____ usually
   ____ occasionally
   ____ never
   ____ always

8. Do you feel that children cheat when they correct each other's papers?
   ____ usually
   ____ occasionally
   ____ never
   ____ always
9. Do you feel that children learn by marking their own errors?
   _____ usually
   _____ occasionally
   _____ never
   _____ always

10. Do you feel that children learn by seeing teacher's marks on errors?
    _____ usually
    _____ occasionally
    _____ never
    _____ always

11. If you have the children correct their own papers do you collect them and review them?
    _____ usually
    _____ occasionally
    _____ never
    _____ always

12. Do you record marks from the papers that the children correct?
    _____ usually
    _____ occasionally
    _____ never
    _____ always

13. Do you average daily paper scores for arriving at report card grades?
    _____ usually
    _____ occasionally
    _____ never
    _____ always

14. Does the number of children in your class have any effect on the method you use?
    _____ usually
    _____ occasionally
    _____ never
    _____ always

15. Do you correct papers at your desk while children do study work?
    _____ usually
    _____ occasionally
    _____ never
    _____ always

(concluded on next page)
16. Do you correct papers after school hours?
   ______ usually
   ______ occasionally
   ______ never
   ______ always

17. Have you been teaching
   ______ less than 5 years?
   ______ between 5 and 9 years?
   ______ between 10 and 14 years?
   ______ between 15 and 19 years?
   ______ 20 or more years?

18. What grade do you teach?
   ______

NAME ___________________________________________
APPENDIX C

Directions Sent to Teachers for Tally Sheets

Dear Teacher,

Enclosed are enough tally sheets for each child in your room. On each sheet I would like

1. Name of youngster (so later we can check to see if he does what he says he does).

2. Scores from three sets of papers — spelling, social studies, and arithmetic. Spelling can be the weekly test, social studies one of the unit tests, and arithmetic, one of the textbook tests.

3. I would like the teacher to correct these three sets of papers without indicating to the children that she has done so, and without putting any marks on the papers. All errors should be recorded on the tally sheets under the "T" (teacher) column. Children should then correct their own papers. The errors marked by the child and his score should be recorded under the "P" (pupil) column.

I am not interested in scores as such but only in number of changes made. If you find you have a pupil who is changing answers, please do not let him know. Any indication that the teacher knows what the child is doing could spoil results.

Dolores E. Toporowski
## APPENDIX D

Tally Sheets Used in This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers in Test</th>
<th>Test I Spelling</th>
<th>Test II Social Studies</th>
<th>Test III Arithmetic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Guide for Administering Children's Survey Used in This Study

Distribute the survey to all of the children in the class. Then say, "Today we would like to know how boys and girls feel about correcting papers. No one here will see what you check. Put your name, grade and school on the paper.

"Just as soon as all of you have finished, the papers will be put into this envelope (show large envelope) and sealed and sent to the person who is trying to find out how boys and girls feel about correcting papers.

"There is no right or wrong answer - only how you feel.

"I will read each question and you can check one answer for each as we go along."

Read questions and choices so there will be no chance for error because of inability to read. Also, it will speed the process.
APPENDIX F

The Children's Survey Used in This Study

1. When papers are corrected do you
   _____ like to correct your own?
   _____ like to exchange papers?
   _____ like to have teacher correct all papers?

2. When workbooks are corrected do you
   _____ like to correct your own?
   _____ like to exchange workbooks?
   _____ like to have teacher correct all workbooks?

3. Do you change answers when you correct your own papers?
   _____ never
   _____ a few times
   _____ sometimes
   _____ many times

4. Do you change answers when you correct your own reading workbook?
   _____ never
   _____ a few times
   _____ sometimes
   _____ many times

5. Do other boys and girls in your room change answers when they correct their own papers?
   _____ never
   _____ a few times
   _____ sometimes
   _____ many times

6. Do the other boys and girls in your room change answers when they correct their own reading workbooks?
   _____ never
   _____ a few times
   _____ sometimes
   _____ many times

7. Do you change answers when you correct someone else's papers?
   _____ never
   _____ a few times
   _____ sometimes
   _____ many times

   (concluded on the next page)
6. Does your teacher like to have you correct your own papers?
   Never
   a few times
   sometimes
   many times

9. Does your teacher like to have you correct your own reading workbook?
   Never
   a few times
   sometimes
   many times

10. Does your teacher like to have you correct your own tests?
    Never
    a few times
    sometimes
    many times