

gration, and successful sublimation. All these norms and more have been developed within several centuries. Are we about to discover that we have been preoccupied with a system of measures and criteria that tend to fragment the individual? Satir proposes a therapy of interrelationships in which there is a reordering of certain mutually reinforcing defense systems. It is a therapy about which we will hear much more in the years to come.

---

**SOCIAL CLASS AND THE URBAN SCHOOL:** The impact of pupil background on teachers and principals.

By Robert E. Herriott and Nancy Hoyt St. John. New York: John Wiley, 1966. xi + 289 pp. \$7.95.

Reviewed by David Bain,  
Faculty of Education,  
University of British Columbia.

Of interest to all school counselors are problems relating to the interactions between students and teachers, since such interactions can affect intellectual and emotional development, and may be causes of underachievement and dropping out. In studying "the impact of pupil backgrounds on teachers and principals," Herriott and St. John seem to have entered a new and potentially rewarding area of research.

Most research in education is concerned with academic and personality changes of pupils as consequents of variations in programmes, techniques, school reorganizations, and regroupings of pupils for different types of instructions. A few studies have examined the effects of teacher personality upon pupil performance. Those that have, have found that certain types of teacher personalities (usually termed authoritarian) have had a less desirable effect upon the personality development of the charges than less demanding personalities (often termed democratic). The authors have reversed this latter approach to educational change and examined the effects of pupil personalities upon teachers and principals.

Herriott and St. John present an excellent exploratory study into the effects of four levels of socioeconomic status of students in elementary, junior, and senior secondary schools in large urban centres across the United States. The socioeconomic levels were based upon fathers' professions, the combined family incomes, and the extent to which both parents of each student were educated. Four types of schools were selected; each type whose students were representative of one of these predetermined socioeconomic status (SES) levels. Thus the schools of the highest SES level had students of whom only 13% came from homes of under \$5,000 per annum income, only 17% of whom had fathers in a semi-skilled or unskilled trade, and only 20% of whose parents had completed high school. The comparable figures for the lowest SES schools were 85%, 89%, and 94%.

Compared to pupils in the highest SES schools, the pupils in the lowest SES schools had fewer parents who attended school events, initiated discussions with teachers, gave their children adequate supervision, or even appeared

to be interested in the schoolwork of their children. This disinterest seemed to have been passed on to these children, with the result that 43% of the elementary school children were retarded in reading by at least one year (10% in the highest SES schools); 44% expected to drop out before completion of secondary school (versus 7%); and 7% expected to go on into college (vs. 64%).

Teachers in schools having this community, parent, and pupil background were the youngest, the newest to the system, and the least experienced of all four SES school types. These characteristics do not necessarily work to the disadvantage of the pupils, the authors note. These teachers are probably the freshest, most energetic, and the most original of all the teachers. There was also no significant difference between the level of teacher training and the placement of the teachers in the four SES types of schools. However, the performance of the teachers in the lowest SES schools was rated consistently lower by their principals.

Such rating must be examined carefully, since these same principals are themselves the youngest, most inexperienced of all the principals in the study. Possibly this inexperience may be partly accountable for the facts that these principals were found to have the greatest effects upon their teachers in planning for the school, smoothing office routines, handling students, and upgrading the performance of their teachers. (In studies of authoritarian teachers many of these characteristics were found to be representative of them.) The principal ratings are largely, in effect, a rating of their own abilities rather than those of the teachers. It is interesting to note that both principals and teachers in the lowest SES schools were most dissatisfied with their own and each others' roles within the school.

Job satisfactions were achieved by both principals and teachers through an awareness that they could move to schools of higher SES levels. Many teachers considered this move to be more of a promotion than an administrative raise within their own schools or same school type.

The results of this study imply that the student-teacher interaction learning situation is affected profoundly, on the one hand, by the community and parental attitudes, behaviours, and expectations for the student, and on the other by the relative degree of independence of the teacher from close personal supervision by the principal. Another teacher factor is the teacher's own SES level with its accompanying expectations, attitudes, and behaviours. Since it was found that teachers in the lowest SES schools had a higher SES level than that of the pupils, might this gap be too much for the teachers to serve as adult models for pupil behaviour? This bears further investigation.

This study provides an excellent basis for the investigation of such questions as:

If the expectations of the pupils in the lowest SES schools can be raised, will this have a corresponding effect upon their academic performance, or is the combined effect of the home and the community overwhelming?

Should a distinct type of curriculum be offered to pupils in schools of different SES levels, so that (a) ideas and experiences are meaningful to the pupils of the different community levels; and (b) communication can occur at the level of the pupils rather than at the level of the educators.

Despite the plethora of research results on the "good" and "poor" teacher, would an examination of the characteristics of such teachers within specific SES communities be of value in determining appropriate teacher behaviour there?

What are the characteristics of the corresponding "good" and "poor" principals?

Can the effects of other SES variables on pupil, teacher, and principal personality and behaviour be factored out for consideration? Such factors might include race (which the authors do consider, but largely inconclusively), religion, non-urban community effects, ethnic and cultural traditions.

The authors have, I believe, successfully indicated that education is a total process involving a particular type of community with a particular type of educational institution whose services and staff should be deliberately chosen to meet the needs of that community.

---

#### BEHAVIOR THERAPY TECHNIQUES; A GUIDE TO THE TREATMENT OF NEUROSES.

By Joseph Wolpe and Arnold A. Lazarus. Toronto: Pergamon of Canada, Ltd., 1966, pp. ix + 198. \$3.50.

Reviewed by Justine Harris,  
Graduate Studies, University of British Columbia.

Because behavior therapy is a relatively new approach in psychotherapy, counselors may welcome a short book like *Behavior Therapy Techniques*, which describes the processes in, and outlines the theoretical bases for, these techniques. The book would be an informative supplement to *Revolution in Counseling—Implications of Behavioral Science*, edited by John D. Krumholtz and published in 1966. (The latter book was reviewed in the first issue of *Canadian Counsellor*.)

Joseph Wolpe and Arnold A. Lazarus are leaders in the field of behavior therapy—Wolpe has been publishing his results since the early fifties. The authors' combined experiences are described in the central chapters of *Behavior Therapy Techniques*, and are illustrated with brief case histories. They add a resumé of their own and other workers' results, and compare these with results of psychotherapy using other methods. They append an up-to-date bibliography and supply in appendices verbatim reproductions of some of the instruments they use. Their presentation is clear and their aim, "to facilitate the process of self-education" by those interested in the process, is certainly accomplished. As the title indicates, the techniques described are used with neurotic patients only.

In the Introduction and in Chapter 2, entitled "Basic Principles for the Practice of Behavior Therapy," the authors discuss underlying theory. They define behavior therapy here as "the application of experimentally established