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Problem

Nonclassroom teacher-student relationships were studied in the secondary-school setting with regard to their occurrence; their perceived value, adequacy, and effects; their preferred forms or types; and the perceived barriers to teacher-student association.

Method

This was a descriptive study employing survey research. A 53-item questionnaire was completed by 671 senior students, full-time teachers, and principals in the eleven SDA academies and two boarding academies in the Northern and Central California
Conferences. The data from the questionnaires were summarized—totaling responses and calculating percentages, means, and standard deviations. Comparisons were made and some differences were evaluated by applying t tests, accepting .05 as the level of significance.

**Findings**

The data revealed that although students do perceive their teachers as involved in nonclassroom teacher-student activities, teachers saw themselves as more involved outside the classroom than did their students.

Students, teachers, and principals rated nonclassroom contact as important, with teachers placing it higher in value than did students, as did females over males, high GPA students over low, and boarding- over day-school students.

Students were moderately to well-satisfied with the quantity and quality of their nonclass relationships. Teachers were more satisfied than students.

All groups surveyed agreed that students' receptivity to learning opportunities was increased by pleasant nonclassroom teacher-student contact.

Certain types of contact with teachers were valued more highly than others. Ranking high were: Be easily available just to talk even when the student has no special problem; be available to help students with assignments; invite students to their homes; and often smile at or greet students. Some differences between boarding- and day-student preferences appeared.
The main barriers to nonclassroom involvement perceived by students were teacher partiality, busyness, and fear of discipline breakdown.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Teachers disliked outside the classroom are perceived as a deterrent to learning; therefore pleasant nonclassroom teacher-student interaction should be seen as essential at all levels of education; teachers should be expected to have yearly objectives for nonclassroom involvement; and provision should be made in the teacher's schedule for these out-of-class activities.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

A study by Wilson (1976) challenges the view held by some that relationships in schools must be rather formal and impersonal. In evaluating the program of an alternative high school he dis­
covered that "students . . . enjoyed learning about teachers as people" (p. 86), and much of this learning occurred in nonclassroom settings. There were many contacts between teachers and students both in and outside of school which were perceived as contributing to a well-rounded education.

These teacher-student contacts included informal gatherings during free times at school where conversations could range from personal matters, such as family, friends, sex, and hobbies, to the more impersonal discussion of current events and other matters often reserved for the teachers' lounge. Teacher-student inter­
change extended beyond the school grounds and school day to weekend and afternoon events in the community and at teachers' homes.

This expanded teacher-student relationship, while offering rewards and fulfillments to many students and teachers, was not without problems. One of these, according to Wilson, was the "fatigue and emotional drain on teachers" (p. 91). This tension between rewards and teacher sacrifices was noted by a guiding voice
in Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) education as early as 1903:

The . . . teacher can impart to his pupils few gifts so valuable as the gift of his own companionship . . . . To strengthen the tie of sympathy between teachers and students there are few means that count so much as pleasant association together outside the schoolroom . . . . The sacrifice demanded of the teacher [will] be great, but he [will] reap a rich reward. (E. G. White, 1903/1952, p. 212)

In 1889 the teachers in Switzerland were commended for often going "out with their pupils while they are at play," for taking "their scholars" out for "a long walk with them," for entering "into the sports of the children." Teachers were urged to "join in the amusements of the children," to "be one with them," and thus "give the children confidence" (E. G. White, 1968, p. 58). The children referred to are young and the setting and time quite different from today, but is pleasant nonclassroom teacher-student association in some form desirable and effective at all age levels and in all times and places? S. Cohen (1980) states that a 1972 study indicates that "the more collegial student-faculty relations are, the higher the level of academic and nonacademic satisfaction students will express" (p. 132). W. White (1969, p. 68) suggests it is more important to the high-school student than to the college student to relate to the teacher as a person rather than at the "purely intellectual level."

Statement of the Problem

It was not known if secondary students, teachers, and principals in SDA academies in 1982 perceived nonclassroom teacher-student association to be an essential or important part of a student's educational experience. Nor was it known if students
and teachers were satisfied with the quantity and quality of these nonclassroom contacts. If teachers and principals perceive non-classroom associations as of lesser importance than do students, this difference may in itself prove a barrier to their occurrence. Whether there is this difference was an unknown.

Another unknown was whether students, teachers, and principals saw any relationship between nonclassroom teacher-student contacts and the students' receptivity toward the teacher in the classroom. Did the students see themselves as inclined to be more orderly and listen to and accept the knowledge and values which the teacher attempted to impart within the classroom? What types of contacts were perceived as most valuable; are these occurring in the present school setting? And if not, what reasons for this lack were perceived?

The problem was that answers to these and similar questions were available only in the form of broad unsupported generalizations, or in the form of goals, ideals, and purposes.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine nonclassroom teacher-student contacts in the secondary-school setting with regard to: their occurrence; their perceived value, adequacy and effects; their preferred forms or types; and the perceived barriers to such contacts.

**Significance of the Study**

It was anticipated that this study would place in the hands of teachers and administrators information which would assist them in evaluating and planning the total school program in view of the students' maximum benefit. It could affect the hiring and
retaining of teachers, the planning of teaching loads, the assignment of teachers to nonclassroom student activities, and the frequency and types of such activities. The individual teacher may be alerted to the importance of and opportunities for nonclassroom teacher-student contacts; or it may be that the entire philosophy, curriculum, and organization of a school should be called to scrutiny.

Questions Answered

Answers to the following questions were sought from students, teachers, and principals.

1. What proportion of teachers was perceived as available for or involved in nonclassroom student-teacher contacts?

2. What value did students, teachers, and principals place on nonclassroom teacher-student contact?

3. What was the level of satisfaction with the quantity and quality of nonclassroom teacher-student contact in the present school setting?

4. What were the perceived effects of nonclassroom contact on receptivity to and cooperation with learning opportunities?

5. Were certain types or forms of nonclassroom teacher-student contacts more highly valued than others? If so, what were these?

6. What were the main perceived barriers to nonclassroom student-teacher contacts?
Comparisons were made among the perceptions of the three groups questioned--students, teachers, and principals, and between the responses from respondents in boarding schools and those in day schools. Some comparisons were made between sexes, and between higher and lower academic achievers.

Definition of Terms

Academy. An educational institution offering secondary education, and under private control or offering specialized learning opportunities. Also known as "secondary school" or "high school."

Boarding school. An educational institution providing its students food and lodging accommodations.

Day school. A school attended by the students during part of the day, with the students coming from and returning to their homes.

Northern and Central California. Two adjoining geographical administrative units within the Seventh-day Adventist church extending from the city of Bakersfield to the northern border of the state.

Seventh-day Adventist Church. A worldwide Christian denomination with one of the larger Protestant parochial school systems in the U.S. and the world.

Delimitations of the Study

This was a descriptive rather than inferential study of the eleven SDA day academies and two boarding academies in the Northern and Central California Conferences. It is believed, however, that
much of what was discovered in these schools concerning attitudes toward nonclassroom teacher-student association is true in other schools as well. While specific inferences cannot be drawn from the study, it may be assumed that effects of and responses to the human relationships described are somewhat similar at other schools and at other levels of education. Schools are identified only by randomly assigned numbers, hence no identifiable interschool comparisons are possible. Comparisons are by number only and in descriptive terms.

The data obtained from the instructions at the bottom of page one of the survey instrument (appendix A) must be treated with care because, of those who completed the questionnaire, only 65 percent, 64 percent, and 69 percent of students, teachers, and principals, respectively, responded to this item. However, the apparent reasons for and perceived randomness of the oversight, along with the consistency of the responses, caused the researcher to believe the data were useful.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I includes the introduction, presents the background, the problem statement, the purpose and significance of the study, questions to be answered, the definition of terms, and delimitations. Literature and studies related to nonclassroom teacher-student contact are reviewed in chapter II. Chapter III presents the methodology, chapter IV the findings and analysis of the study, and chapter V contains a summary, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Organization

Twenty-three related studies, all of which deal in some way with nonclassroom contact between teacher and student, are cited first. Second, books and articles are discussed under three broad topics: importance and value of a positive, intimate teacher-student relationship; effects of nonclassroom relationships on learning, behavior, and values; and opportunities for, facilitators of, and barriers to nonclassroom teacher-student contact.

Third, the comments of E. G. White on the subject are considered separately inasmuch as her counsels on education have had, and continue to have, special significance to Seventh-day Adventist educators.

Related Studies

Fewer studies on teacher-student interaction in nonclassroom settings have been done on the high-school level than at colleges and universities. Though this study concerns grades nine through twelve, studies are cited from higher levels on the assumption that somewhat similar principles of human response and motivation apply at all levels. As inferred earlier in this study, if close teacher-student contact is important to college students, it is also significant to the high-school student.
High-school Studies

S. Wilson (1976) reports his study of an alternative high school under the significant title, "You Can Talk to Teachers: Student-Teacher Relations in an Alternative High School." He learned there was little limit placed on student-teacher interaction. They got "involved together on such topics as teaching technique, school administration problems, teacher personal life, student personal life, student relations with other adults, and nonclass-related current events and academic matters" (p. 85). "Students said they enjoyed learning about teachers as people" (p. 86).

Some of this interchange became as informal as playing checkers and practical jokes and extended beyond the classroom as far as weekends and teachers' homes (pp. 88, 89).

This study showed that secondary students do not generally want elementary level "liking" or "love" relationships with teachers, but neither do they want the purely instrumental relationships based primarily on respect and competence. . . . They do not want mere subject matter experts as teachers. Rather they want teachers who can understand what concerns them, who can offer appropriate help, who can make the subjects relate to their interests, who can serve as personal models, and who demonstrate that they are genuinely concerned about the student as a whole person, not only as a student." (p. 99)

Reporting his own findings along with those of a Gallup Poll (1978), Gholson (1979) showed that 90 percent of parents rated extracurricular activities as very important or fairly important (50 and 40 percent respectively); that the majority of students felt such activities are important; and that school administrators were committed to such programs. Nevertheless Gholson reported lack of funds, teacher apathy, and student apathy as the three most significant problems confronting extracurricular programs in
1975-1985. Principals rated both faculty and student attitudes toward such activities as 53 percent satisfactory, 4 and 16 percent enthusiastic, and 43 and 31 percent indifferent or unsatisfactory. Sponsors were rated by 78 percent of the students as needing more training.

Among other variables, Dudley (1977) found that "little personal interest of teachers" and "poor relationships with teachers" were "positively correlated with alienation from religion" (p. 109). He suggested that it is not sufficient to "have a personal interest in the welfare of each student; he must communicate that interest so that the youth senses it" (p. 113). Dudley (1978) further showed that nonclassroom activities bring out the "humanness" of a teacher, which students are glad to discover, and urged that teachers "not stand off on some kind of higher plane" (p. 79). He pointed out that when youth "perceive poor relationships with their parents or teachers [they] do not feel accepted by them, and/or do not feel free to discuss personal problems with them" (p. 120).

A Kentucky study (Gammel, 1975) of twelve high schools showed that smallness in school size had a positive relationship to student perceptions of school climate, student alienation, teacher-student relationships, student deviant behavior, and voluntary participation in extra-class activities.

Lapan (House & Lapan, 1978) drew from his interview with 211 students in three high schools in Connecticut that some students, at least, find it difficult to trust or find credible teachers who do not "act like you even exist," or, "didn't act like I counted for something."
From the survey responses of 10,478 secondary students in twenty-two states, Chase (1981) concluded that the majority feel they are "learning a lot," and about things they need to know "right now." They are "proud of their schools, have a sense of belonging, and believe that teachers really care whether they learn." Nevertheless, they also "feel that teachers, counselors, and administrators fail to take a strong interest in them as individuals."

In studying a desegregated, Individually Guided Education (IGE) middle school, Metz (1980) found that most, though not all, teachers held the belief "that to know these children [a significant number with serious problems] was to love them." And most teachers felt, because of the school organization, that they "can know most of the children quite well" (pp. 14, 20, 21).

One elementary study with apparent significance to the high-school level will be included here. Grapko and Fraser (1972) classified thirty-four teachers of grades four through six as "Hi awareness" or "Lo awareness" teachers. This awareness had to do with the teachers' accurate knowledge of the individual student's personality characteristics. The Hi-awareness teacher generally reported interest in the whole child and considered information about out-of-school and home and family experiences as relevant to his teaching role. The Lo-awareness teacher generally tended to regard such information as personal, private, and irrelevant to the primary teaching role, using a more traditional approach with strong emphasis on classroom presentation of information (p. 9).

Sabine (1971) in listening to a great many student responses regarding their high-school days learned that "one of the two
characteristics of 'best' teachers mentioned most frequently by students was 'caring';" and that "caring also means loving;" and that "part of caring is being involved with students beyond the class subject;" and that students dislike the "noninvolved teachers," identifying them as "their worst," while the "willing to help teachers" who would come early and stay late to give academic and personal assistance were classified as "best" (pp. 58-62).

**College and University Studies**

Steven Cohen (1980) concluded that "any overall policy to improve the quality of graduate education in political science should include a strategy to increase graduate student-faculty interaction" (p. 150).

While urging caution in cause-effect inferences, Pascarella (1975) showed from his two-college study that the findings generally suggest that faculty who are highly accessible beyond the classroom have a more accurate understanding of how both freshmen and seniors perceive their institutions' educational climate than faculty who tend to limit their interaction with students to their formal classroom role. (pp. 387, 389)

When for whatever reason, good or bad, much of the teacher's out-of-classroom time is off-limits to students . . . it is possible that faculty forfeit a potentially powerful means of exercising the same kinds of informal, immediate sanctions which characterize the influence of the student peer culture on student behaviors and attitudes. Thus, almost by default, the peer culture becomes the pervasive and dominant agent of informal socialization in most students' lives, leading to its powerful influence on student values, attitudes, and personal development during college (Newcomb, 1966; Wallace, 1964, 1965, 1966). (pp. 547, 548)

Pascarella also saw nonclassroom contact exerting a possible influence on student academic achievement:
While the informal student-peer culture may be one of the most potent campus influences in shaping student academic values, faculty may provide another potentially important informal influence in this area. If one is willing to assume that faculty generally attach substantial value to academic achievement (Wallace, 1963), and that faculty influence on students is accentuated when their mutual contact settings are not limited to the classroom, then it would seemingly follow that student-faculty informal contact and academic performance should be positively associated. Results from a number of studies generally support the presence of such an association. The evidence, however, is not unequivocal. (p. 556)

Also inferred from this study was the fact that:

Not all types of student-faculty nonclassroom contacts appear to have the same influence on educational outcomes, however. Rather it would appear that informal contacts focusing on intellectual/literary or artistic interests, value issues, or future career concerns have the greatest impact. In short, the most influential informal contacts between students and faculty appear to be those which extend the intellectual content of the formal academic program into the student's nonclassroom life. (p. 565)

It was further seen that the quality of nonclassroom contacts "appear to have a significant positive influence on such criteria as college persistence, personal developments, and educational aspirations" (ibid.).

Pascarella believed his study

\[ \text{\ldots \; suggests that an increased understanding of college impact might be gained from inquiry focusing on the nature of student-faculty interaction beyond the classroom as well as in it. (p. 571)} \]

In their university study, Bausell and Magoon (1976) perceived that the results "demonstrate a strong bias in course and instructor evaluations related to student perceptions of satisfaction with the availability of the instructor outside of class" (p. 55).

It was discovered that women were considerably more dissatisfied than men with instructor availability, as were freshmen expecting lower grades (C and D) when compared with seniors and
students expecting higher grades (A and B) (p. 54). The researchers suggested an institutional or instructor bias against interaction with students who have poor grades, who are younger, e.g., freshmen, or who are women (p. 55). Bausell and Magoon concluded with the following counsel:

The results of the present study should be provocative to instructors who may have been consciously or unconsciously differentially available to students. It is hoped that the very tentative description of those students who do not seek interactions with the instructor outside of the classroom will be informative to those instructors who value such interactions, make themselves available, and occasionally wonder why some individuals do not seek such encounters. Finally, the results may perhaps provide some guidance for those institutions which seek to provide more liberally for extra-class interaction between faculty and students. (Ibid.)

Snow (1973) interviewed university faculty and students, classifying faculty into high, medium, and low-contact teachers. The high-contact teacher was said to have an "interactionist style," more open and flexible, avoiding a counseling relationship, yet becoming occasionally involved "in a student's personal life," indicating a "desire to have a fuller relationship with a student than just an intellectual one" (pp. 492, 493).

The high contact teacher was seen as taking

... seriously the student's emotional as well as his cognitive growth. If a particular meeting seems promising--if the teacher and student are able to talk about issues which contribute to the student's growth--then the teacher will put a great deal of time into the interaction. Those meetings where important issues are not raised end fairly quickly. His meeting with a student is structured not by a time schedule, in which business is taken care of in a certain number of minutes, but by the material which is generated in the interaction itself. (p. 498)

After a survey of four colleges, Chickering (1970a) concluded that improved college governance relates to faculty accessibility, and that "accessibility is not satisfied by the typical statement,
'Feel free to come and see me.' Rather, a climate is required "where students do not feel guilty about 'taking up the professor's valuable time', where such contacts are recognized as an important and necessary part of teaching and learning" (p. 152).

Creativity in college students was studied by Chamber in 1973. He discovered that teachers who facilitated creativity were those who "were more often available to students" for help with class-related and even personal matters; "inhibiting teachers . . . spent little time with the students outside the classroom" (p. 330).

An important factor brought to light in this study relates to graduate versus undergraduate teachers. It appears that the teachers who most affect the creative development of students who ultimately receive the doctorate, do so in the course of graduate programs, not during undergraduate days. In addition, the significant effect upon the student appears not to be as a result of classroom experiences, but rather results from experiences in the laboratory, the office, the home, or other informal settings. The interactions that result in significant change for the student are usually a number of one-to-one experiences with the teacher over considerable periods of time, during which strong emotional ties are formed and mutual respect is developed. College teaching, and especially teaching at the graduate level as noted above, thus encompasses far more than classroom performance in the overall development of the student as a creative professional person. (pp. 333, 334)

R. C. Wilson, Woods, and Gaff (1974) reported that their 1968 findings suggest:

1. That "out-of-class interaction" may increase the teacher's knowledge about a student's "academic strengths and weaknesses, interests, problems and perspectives" (p. 88).

2. That faculty accessibility is determined more by the value teachers place on personal interaction with students than by sheer physical availability. "A teacher may be available to students without being truly 'accessible' to them in the sense of being
willing and even eager to listen, to exchange ideas, and to help if he can" (p. 82).

... The degree of out-of-class interaction a faculty member reported was not found to be affected by: membership and participation in professional associations or productivity in the publishing of articles, books or monographs. Even the percentages of time faculty reported spending in activities expected to directly detract from time available to undergraduates--such as time devoted to research, administration, and the teaching of graduate students--were not significantly different for faculty who reported different degrees of contact with undergraduates beyond the classroom. (p. 80)

3. That "out-of-class interaction seems to enhance both the enjoyment and the sense of accomplishment which a faculty member can derive from teaching" (p. 90).

From their 1968 and 1974 studies Wilson et al. (1975) concluded that while classes play an important role in continuing, productive teacher-student relationships, "much of what makes the difference in the growth of students has to do with nonclassroom factors" (p. 181). Faculty who reported frequent nonclassroom interaction were "perceived by students to have had greater impact on their educational and personal development" and were "perceived by their colleagues to be both superior teachers and to have the most significant impact on the lives of students" (p. 164).

Closeness to students in chronological age or being liberal or conservative in sociopolitical ideology and other matters had little to do with a teacher's nomination by students as impactful and effective (p. 103).

A West Virginia University study (Wheelees, 1974) "indicated significant relationships between immediate recall and attitudes toward course and instructor" (p. 4). These attitudes were
positively affected by a teacher's extroversion, sociability, and character which in turn led to out-of-class information seeking (pp. 5, 6).

Stayrook and Majer (1974) reported that 101 Indiana University students generally reacted positively to graduate student associate instructors (AIS) for three main reasons: students can respond well in class with AIS, they can approach AIS with problems in class, and AIS make themselves available outside of class.

In conducting a study among faculty at the University of New South Wales, though his questionnaire response was only 57 percent, Powell (1979) learned that "half of the respondents were not satisfied with their own relationships with students," listing "shyness on the part of students" as the "biggest obstacle" to interaction, and staff lack of time as the other major obstacle. Powell saw irony in the fact that 87 percent of these somewhat inaccessible teachers rate out-of-class contact as either "essential" (40 percent) to university education or "of considerable importance" (pp. 4, 5).

Thirteen small colleges were surveyed by Chickering (1970b). He discovered "limited" out-of-class communication (and even in-class thought and idea exchange) between teachers and students despite what he felt are typical small-school claims. E.g.:

One of the chief advantages of the small college lies in its wealth of teacher-student contacts. There are many opportunities for informal discussion and exchange between the faculty and the students. Each student is assigned to a faculty member with whom he counsels during the semester. Many faculty members live near the campus and use their homes frequently for social or academic enterprises with students. The friendly inter-relationship of faculty with students outside the classroom is viewed as one of the most important aspects of life here. (p. 1)
What Chickering called "limited contact" may be open to debate. For example he reported as evidence that in two colleges during one semester "roughly 80 percent of the students had conversations with five, or less than five, members of the faculty or administration" (p. 1). It seems apparent that a more positive interpretation could be made with more data concerning length of contacts and repetition of contacts with the same faculty members.

McDougle (1980, abstract) inferred from a 1968-69 survey of 120 college students that they "are influenced more by what goes on outside the classroom than inside and by how faculty members relate to them instead of by what faculty members know about the subject."

The freshman class of 1966, after four years at State University of New York-Buffalo, reported that most had established out-of-class contacts with faculty which they felt enhanced learning experiences (Rott, 1974, p. 78). Only a few had had no such contacts and only one felt it would have been impossible to establish nonclassroom contacts if he had tried to do so (p. 71). Some felt teachers should "invite and encourage students to meet with them" and many wanted faculty to be very accessible for "information, explanations, and advice" (p. 77). The majority described ideal faculty-student relationships in academic terms "but over 40 percent expressed interest in personal friendships with faculty" (pp. 78, 79).

In a follow-up to a 1975 study of Waubonsee Community College, Vojtisek (1978) found that students found teachers just as available and easy to talk to as before and yet for an unknown
reason students "talked less often about course work for at least 15 minutes with instructors outside of class time" (p. 7).

Related Books, Articles, and Papers

Importance and Value of a Positive Intimate Teacher-Student Relationship

Words from five titles are in themselves significant at the beginning of this section: Kids Don't Learn from People They Don't Like (Aspy & Roebuck, 1977); Schools Are People (National Education Assoc., 1971); "A Small Human School" (Wilkinson, 1977); Loneliness in the Schools (Robert, 1973); and "Humanizing Education: The Person in the Process" (Combs, 1967).

Aspy and Roebuck (1977) commented:

... We learned, in the words of one of the kids, that kids do not learn from people they don't like. In this respect students are no different from anyone else. We all defend ourselves against people who do not seem to appreciate us as individuals--and we all work a little harder for the one or two people who really seem to understand our own worth. (p. 17)

In the introduction to Schools Are People (National Education Assoc., 1971) it was asked:

... How can a kindergarten child tell about his day without mentioning his teacher and a roomful of five-year-olds? At the opposite end of the educational scale: How often can a graduate student discuss his dissertation without referring to his major professor?

Schools are curriculum too, of course. They are books and equipment. Also buildings. Budgets. These and more, schools are--but first and last, they are people. (p. vii)

Referring to one of the stories in the same work, teachers are forewarned: "You may suffer a stab of self-recognition when Mr. Marston's preoccupied 'Haven't time now' destroys a fragile bridge of communication" (ibid.).

William Glasser in his foreword to Robert (1973) said:
Since children must go to school and since many schools are lonely places where there is too much failure, it is crucial to listen to a man who has proved himself in the field. Students will want to go to the kind of school Dr. Robert works to develop. (p. ix)

Robert himself went on to declare in bold type:

In our preoccupation with broad programs and systems, we have ignored the need for human interaction within the schools and the personal needs of the students and teachers who live there from four to ten hours a day, five days a week, during the school year. (p. xi)

Combs concluded his address on humanizing education with a touch of serious humor:

Recently, it is said, the scientists have made a great discovery. They believe at last they have discovered the missing link between the anthropoid apes and civilized man. It's us! The missing link between the curriculum and humanism is also us, you and me. What is needed now is a rededication to the person in the process at every phase of our current efforts by every one of us who can be recruited for the effort. (p. 88)

Smith (1976), writing from Brigham Young University--Hawaii Campus, reminded his readers of the humanness of the student; he said:

Recent events on many campuses have highlighted what we have always known but not often verbalized, namely that both faculty and students are social beings with a variety of motives and personal hang-ups and not just academic role players. Existing institutionalized faculty-student role relationships have been attacked by many students and some faculty who see such relationships as standing in the way of creating learning environments where faculty and students can relate on both a task and non-task oriented level with respect to mutually relevant personal and social problems. (p. 27)

Smith believes a teacher as a resource person has a responsibility to make his factual knowledge and analytical skills practical and visible to the student.

... Faculty members are de facto resource people with respect not only to facts and analytical skills, but also to the implications of these elements in academic and personal areas. Many feel that their commitment to providing a total education
is compromised by not developing and maintaining an interest in things of concern to students. If universities claim to provide humanistic education, then such involvements in students' personal lives cannot be excluded easily from teacher-student interaction. (p. 30)

A high-school chemistry teacher reflects upon the significance of teacher-student interaction in this way:

. . . The kindergarten teacher may be interacting with a five-year-old in the process of discovery, or a graduate student may be interacting with his advisor as they map out the research necessary for completing the Ph.D. Human involvement and positive interaction are the important keys to a successful learning experience at any level of cognitive human development. A necessary catalyst to the learning process, however, is concern. Interaction without concern creates a learning situation that is essentially sterile. (Stapleton, 1975, p. 552)

In answer to the question, How important is it for college students to maintain close relationships with faculty members? A. M. Cohen (1971, p. 8) says that:

White argues that the instructor as a person is less important to the college student than he is to the high school student--and considerably less important than he is to the elementary student. Whereas the child does not compartmentalize but, rather, interacts holistically with the adult, the college student is "capable of interacting with the instructor at almost a purely intellectual level, in a manner that makes many of his personal characteristics irrelevant." (W. White, 1969, p. 68)

Cohen says further that:

Wise corroborates this observation, suggesting that students who seek contact with faculty do so for the purpose of establishing a close social relationship with available adults. They "are not nearly so eager to learn to know faculty members as people as they are to know them as teachers . . . as 'experts,' and to have further opportunity to explore with them the new ideas met in their courses." (Wise, 1958, p. 28)

A. M. Cohen (1971, p. 8), however, showed from his former study of 2,000 college freshmen that many students do respond to their instructors as people. "Students ranked 'instructor's personality' second in a list of eight 'things they look for'
when they enter a class for the first time ('specific learning objectives' was ranked first; 'course reading list' was last!)."

Contending that "constant and constructive cooperation between students and faculty . . . is one of the most important values in university education," was Herbert Stroup (1964). He explained:

... The apprehension of reality . . . requires two alternating efforts: contemplation and action. The curriculum represents the contemplative aspect of the university, the co-curriculum, including student activities, the active aspect. (p. 8)

Again, in an attempt to emphasize that education should be a more than humane process, Carswell and Roubinek (1974) in their Open Sesame asked, "Is there plenty of love at your school? at . . . your college? How happy are you at school? Are your students happy?" (p. 127).

In his article on suicides among children, Schuyler (1973, abstract) concluded:

The school probably has its greatest role to play with the pre-suicidal child, so that the suicidal crisis may be averted before it begins. In the schools this is effected by encouraging a more personalized teacher-pupil relationship--by encouraging extracurricular involvement as an alternative to withdrawal and isolation, and by educating teachers to recognize the warning signs of a potential suicidal crisis.

Becoming too friendly and familiar with students is an ever present risk, cautioned Le Grand (1969, p. 200). For a student to assume equality with the teacher or to become too friendly damages immensely the helping relationship. "Gone is that little extra respect which makes the student-teacher link so valuable." Yet despite this caution Le Grand insisted that to
cultivate close personal relationships with students is a risk the teacher must willingly take throughout his professional life.

Adolescents want to identify with someone. It may be a parent, friend, teacher or national figure. They do not want loneliness. They do need someone to identify with. Always remember that as teacher you can fill part of this need. It presupposes that you have a sincere love for students. You detest some of their actions, but not the individuals. This is easy to say but difficult to do. And it is essential that you be alert to the overwhelming power of warmth and sincerity, strong motivators for students in the classroom. (p. 35)

Le Grand urged further that the teacher can accomplish much which the school as an institution cannot if he does not fear to enter the realm of the student's moral and spiritual values and how they relate to his destiny.

The encouragement and strength which a true friend provides is beyond description. This holds true at every stage of life for enduring friendships are long-term excursions in mutual aid and understanding. In the frequently unstable world of the adolescent a solid source of guidance becomes an essential for survival. Students often turn to their teachers to get help with their many anxieties. And we must not turn away. It is essential above all else that we listen. Somehow, amidst all our demands and exactness, our readiness to listen to problems must be made clear. It can easily be the difference in adjustment for some students.

We often hear the remark, "This boy seems interested in everything but his studies." "Everything" in this context often refers to frivolous and even unwholesome activities. Here we fall short in school, partially because the climate of the school itself is not oriented towards morality. We cannot expect students to make value judgments on the basis of academic learning alone. The problem goes deeper--into the moral and spiritual values of man. And it is here that the individual teacher can make inroads where perhaps the school cannot. It is here that we must not fear speaking about the spiritual in man and its relation to his destinies. (p. 199)

B. P. Cohen (1980) said the basis for the "house plan" discussed by Kleinert (1969) and tried in some schools "is the theory that the student benefits more from his high school education when he is in more regular contact with a small group of teachers and students" (p. 9). Kleinert said:
When we confine the education of our young to formal academic experiences only, we deny them the opportunity to participate in meaningful social activities related to the school community which help them develop into contributing, mature citizens. (p. 35)

Carl Rogers (1969) contends that "learning is facilitated when the teacher is a real person . . . entering into a relationship with the learner . . . meeting him on a person to person basis" (p. 106). Teaching "requires the ability to create an atmosphere for learning," says Wakefield (1971, p. 99). He feared that "teaching proficiency, concern for students, or an understanding of the educational process tend to be minor concerns" and take second place in the hiring of teachers to the mere possession of academic degrees (p. 140). He believed that higher education, and the effect of the contemporary American culture in general, "has made it more difficult to build and sustain interpersonal relationships" and "has tended to depersonalize the learner, placing student in competition with student, and giving little opportunity for teacher-learner interaction" (p. 146). The biblical concept, contended Wakefield, is that "the teacher serves, helps, and supports the student in his learning venture" (p. 140).

The National School Board Association (1977) of the Dallas Independent School District affirms that many of the resources available to children outside the school are not being taken advantage of (p. 14). For many years there has been increasing recognition "that the classroom is too limited a facility to meet the real education demands of our society." There has been a thrust to make the "entire community . . . the new classroom" (Fauria, 1974, pp. 60, 70).
Effects of Nonclassroom Relationships on Learning, Behavior, and Values

Tumangday (1977), in her study of behavior modification through modeling, inferred:

Teachers who confine themselves to the academic and informational phases of their work limit their influence among the students and set themselves up as models of a circumscribed and lopsided life style. (p. 204)

Conversely,

Teachers who work or interact with their students outside the classroom widen the sphere of their influence and, by their example, impart values and attitudes. (Ibid.)

In discussing the size of secondary schools B. P. Cohen (1980) suggested that "the sense of loyalty, intimacy and friendliness toward the school and the teachers" in the small school "inhibits deviant behavior" (p. 6). In addition to affecting behavior, she perceived school size as a determining factor in teachers and students getting "to know each other well enough for constructive counseling to occur." A wholesome atmosphere, affecting achievement, is more available in the small school where students are not treated as cattle and have "the benefit of the steadying influence which a personal teacher-pupil relationship offers" (p. 5).

Le Grand (1969) emphasized that the teacher's close contact with students enhances teaching and learning opportunities.

... Adolescents would like to hear a tactful interpretation of topics which confuse them from an adult they respect. In order to offer such interpretations the teacher must be alert to this need and the proper time to offer assistance. This all presupposes close contact with students to understand what their problems are as expressed by their personalities, reactions, likes, and dislikes. ... To know student personalities is to know their needs. ...

In this highly emotional transition period, quite unlike any other stage of life, every scrap of information about
student thinking is relevant to the teacher's work. It must be actively sought by observation, conversation and participation. (pp. 27, 28)

Dunbebin (1978) in applying Glasser's "reality therapy" to student discipline pointed out that the cornerstone of reality therapy is involvement. The student must discover that the teacher cares for him and "is willing to talk about things and ideas that both of them consider interesting and worthwhile" (p. 52).

... Teachers and principals must always keep in mind that involvement is more than a matter of quantity. It is the quality of the time that makes the difference. A few minutes of warm, exclusive time each week can produce far more good than hours of railing and scolding can ever produce. A few minutes of individualized attention here and there throughout the week can produce a friendship that will minimize the need for spending hours of time with everybody. (p. 54)

There is another learning effect of a close teacher-student relationship:

... In the case of the unsure student, he may be finding out for the first time that he can carry on an intelligent conversation and a responsible adult is willing to listen to him and question him about his ideas. (p. 55)

Dunbebin further concludes from his study of Glasser:

... Each person in the involvement develops a sense of self-worth because a trusted and respected friend is willing to spend time with him ... The student finds he can have convictions that may differ greatly or even slightly from the teacher's and still talk adult-to-adult without being embarrassed in any way. Thus, the involvement process is teaching the student that adults are willing to show respect to responsible people regardless of their age. ...

... Remember, education flourishes best in schools where students and teachers are involved with each other at the friendship level. (pp. 55, 56)

Schain (1961) pointed out that a controlled, discreet, yet warm and sincere, friendship between teacher and student has a positive effect upon student behavior.

... A good deal of the tone of the class discipline will depend on the rapport that is established between teacher
and students. The teacher must not only be a "strong" person as indicated before, but he must develop a sound working relationship with the class. There must be warmth, interest in students and their problems, friendliness, sincerity, etc. If students feel that the teacher is "for them," they will tend to follow the rules. This is not to say that the teacher should become the "buddy" of his students. Nothing would be more productive of discipline problems than for the teacher--especially the new and young one--to allow students to think that he is their pal. (p. 23)

Feldhusen (1979) describes a program which transformed a high school

... from severe problems of violence, race tension, drop-outs, and absenteeism to the opposite condition in which all these problems had almost disappeared. A positive school climate was developed and efforts were made to meet the needs of disruptive youth. School was changed to a place perceived by students as designed to help them with meaningful, non-threatening success experiences in the classroom. Rules of conduct were developed cooperatively by students, staff and administrators. The following guidelines were followed in developing the program:

1. build a positive school climate
2. help students find success
3. model appropriate behavior
4. involve staff and students in all facets of school
5. have open and honest communication
6. build trust
7. model and teach good interpersonal relationships. (pp. 15, 16)

Woodson (1978) affirmed that the teaching of English composition can be improved by the teacher getting to know his/her students. She said,

... The best ways I have discovered to get to know the students as individuals is to talk to them outside of class, to make conferences an integral part of my teaching and to assure them by reminding them often that they are welcome in my office whenever I can help, to have in-class writing workshops during which they work on their papers while I circulate around the room, and to work in small groups often, groups in which I too participate. . . .

Beyond knowing our students as individuals, we need to know all we can about them as a group of learners. If our students are more interested in the character of Darth Vader in "Star Wars" than in Hamlet, we have to be willing to let them be . . . knowing that each paper may have as much signifi-
Bash (1975) in discussing the desegregated school said "effective teaching requires good teacher-pupil relationships" even though "such relationships may be difficult to develop . . ." (p. 16). This has to do with relationships both in and out of the classroom, asserted Bash.

Wilkinson (1977, abstract) in speaking of a "human school" considered two of its indispensable attributes to be small size and extracurricular activities. These, he said, contribute to a student's academic progress, development of self-discipline and maturity.

Two of several "affective antidotes for problems in discipline" according to Faust (1977, pp. 65, 70, 73) are "Knowing your students" and "showing interest in your students." Walch (1960) agreed: "In order to maintain successful classroom discipline the teacher must," among other things, "maintain a healthy relationship with his pupils. He must like his pupils and understand them and he must win their liking and respect" (p. 33).

Smith (1976) held that teacher-student interaction on committees and in other nonclassroom settings is vital to a student's receiving maximum benefit from his university experience.

Faculty-student interaction on committees results in several potentially significant mutual learning experiences. First, it offers an encounter where both faculty and students can observe, one through the behavior of the other, perspectives each holds on crucial issues related to university governance. Although classes and personal discussion can be means of conveying subjective attitudes, teachers' philosophies of education do not carry meaning to some students unless they arise in a situation where decisions have to be made which stem from these philosophies. . . .
Another learning experience related to committee work comes from faculty and students watching each other make decisions. University committees are not the first experience students have had where they have participated in some form of democratic decision making, but it may be for many the first opportunity where they have felt they had meaningful involvement in decision making with members of an older generation.

When faculty and students participate on committees, they are engaged in interaction that communicates something about how each confronts and deals with problems in real life situations. Since so much of what both faculty and students learn is outside the setting of academic knowledge, the occasions when they come together to handle problems of mutual interest become important vital learning situations.

What needs to be recognized is that many students want to know what faculty members' values are, and that faced with this demand by students, faculty members should turn it into a learning experience rather than consider it inappropriate.

Moore (1976) referred repeatedly to the lessened discipline problems, the acceptance of higher values and the increased receptivity to learning in the classroom which result from companionate student-teacher labor on campuses from elementary school through university and professional school. These benefits were in addition to the social advantages, the mastering of various skills, and development of appreciation for the dignity of labor.

The possibilities for an effective, intimate, helping relationship between student and teacher in a work program were well described in Berea College's manual for supervisors (virtually all students at Berea are required to work).

The academy years are both exciting and trying times for a young person attempting many new things. This excitement and the individual concerns of students are brought daily into the work situation and form the basis of various interpersonal relationships between students and supervisors.

The work-learning atmosphere not only provides numerous rewards for students but for the supervisor who is willing to share something of himself with the students. Often these student-supervisor relationships extend beyond the actual work experience, even past the student's graduation.

One supervisor who obviously works quite diligently at
developing good relationships with student workers describes the situation as follows: "We may be vain, but we get the notion that our students care for us, as we are concerned for them. I guess I'm not at all beyond having a student with a problem talk about that problem and share it. This takes up time outside work hours, often in great blocks of time. What the student needs sometimes is nothing more than just somebody to take off their shoes and be friendly with. I think the benefits coming from the total relationship that we can create here by being this way far outweigh the inefficiencies. One student sees another one and knows that there is something involved here other than just work, and realizes that each has a warm, friendly place to deal with." (Berea College, n.d., p. 24)

Opportunities for, Facilitators of, and Barriers to Nonclassroom Teacher-Student Contact

Smith (1976) described a number of opportunities for exciting nonclassroom learning.

The values reflected in the type of humanistic education described by Sanford (1967) have led to examining the feasibility of faculty-student involvement in an increasing number of non-formal learning situations. Whereas classrooms and, to a lesser degree, research laboratories and field situations have traditionally been seen as relevant arenas in which to examine faculty-student interaction, the demands for relevant experience and the increased emphasis on unstructured learning situations have extended the scope of areas considered appropriate to learning. University committees, offices, lounges, private houses, and other less formal settings are providing many of the environments in which academic learning can become more exciting and can relate to the actors' social and personal as well as academic concerns. (p. 27)

Smith further suggested involving students as partners in faculty-initiated research projects, rather than using them as cheap labor. They should be involved in a "meaningful fashion in formulating or planning research" (p. 28). A barrier to this type of involvement is that

... many faculty members ... have difficulty relating to students who do not seem to be deeply interested in scholarly pursuits.... It is relatively easy for a faculty member to
place scholarship first, particularly since the criteria set
by one's colleagues of doing research and writing are more
highly valued and more prestigious than are student oriented
activities and concerns. (Ibid.)

While Smith saw increased teacher and student interest in
creating out-of-classroom learning opportunities, he also saw
faculty-student exchange within the classroom diminished by the
use of television, library assignments, and the computer.

Dunbebin (1978) urged that "teachers must approach their
students and not wait for them" in an endeavor to establish "warm,
intimate, and emotional friendship where none existed before" (p.
53).

As you become involved with another person, you will want
to become interested in all aspects of the person's life.
Anything two reasonable friends would talk about can be the
grist for developing and maintaining the involvement. Topics
such as: sports, books, hobbies, brothers and sisters, goals,
Pathfinder Club activities, classwork, and personal problems
can be talked about as the involvement is developing. (p. 54)

Whether fictitious or real is unknown to this writer, but
Irvine (n.d.) significantly presented his best loved professor
thusly:

Despite his reputation for entertaining "odd" notions,
he was one of the most popular teachers in the university.
He had a keen sense of humor. He enjoyed a joke on the
students or on his subject--which was Literature--but enjoyed
it equally well when the fun was at his own expense. In his
wit and humor there was no sting. He laughed with people--
ever at them. He was the only Professor I ever knew who
participated in and enjoyed spinning tops and shooting marbles
with the Seniors when in the spring-time they engaged in the
traditional sport. He did it because he liked it, and could
see no reason why age--he was forty-five then--should rob
him of this joy. (p. 4)

Engelkemier (1965) in his series "About Teenagers" referred
to pack trips, mountain climbing, camping trips, and other like
activities as opportunities for the teacher and student to have
meaningful nonclassroom interchange. Moore (1976), while allowing for such alternatives, persistently called for regular student-teacher work programs as the ideal nonclassroom opportunity for companionship, as does E. G. White, who is specifically cited in a separate section below.

Le Grand emphasized that a teacher who loves his students seizes even the slightest opportunity to show an interest.

Be sure of one fact which the love of students brings about in school, namely, the student sees and feels the interest of the teacher in him personally. You may say this is most difficult to do with five classes of 30 pupils. Surely, whether in class or out, you can find a moment to inquire about student work, college plans or previous accomplishment. You are thus showing a distinct personal interest in the student. They need this and you must be sensitive to it. (p. 36)

The next time you walk down the halls of your school observe the manner of some of your colleagues as they pass students. You may find that there is an unusual silence in the air. Students take no notice of teachers and vice versa. The teacher is hurrying to the faculty room; the students buzz at their lockers. Yet a few moments conversation could prove invaluable. How often students, passing their teachers in the hall, feel their greetings are met with an insincere nod!

Now here is a place where a pleasant smile will work wonders, where occasionally pausing to say hello can cement relationships with students (perhaps potential problem students) whether they are presently in your class or not. A congratulatory remark or an inquiry can easily be the stepping-stone to goodwill. Here is an easy opportunity to show that we do relate to our students. Learning itself can be the result of a hallway conversation, the positive attitude generated from repeated exposures, or a combination of both. (p. 192)

Sincere, intelligent, and enthusiastic involvement in athletic events is cited by Le Grand as an outstanding opportunity to come close to students and ultimately create a better classroom environment.

Because of the emotional nature of athletics and the morale they provide for the student body, the teacher should play a special role by being in attendance whenever possible. His presence evinces an interest in yet another aspect of his students' development. In addition, he does much by his
behavior and casual remarks to erase any bad impressions created in the classroom. He shows he can laugh and shout, cheer and sympathize, show a warm manner while contributing to the support of the athletic program. And the teacher must be a knowledgeable rooter, be able to interpret what he observes when he converses with students, so that the students who know the game will not think his interest insincere. The appearance of a teacher at an athletic event is an example for the students in school spirit. (p. 193)

Though many Christian schools do not sponsor dances, the alert, caring teacher immediately sees the application of Le Grand's counsel to events on the most conservative Christian campus.

School dances are a highlight of adolescent life providing a social setting of immense value and at the same time an experience in a particular type of required behavior. Properly organized and administered, to prevent rowdy conduct from developing while insuring a setting for educational benefit, such dances also provide an additional outlet and means of expression for adolescents. And like every other phase of the school program there is need for direction here, specifically towards the social courtesies and graciousness befitting these events.

Again, teachers who are invited guests or chaperones have an excellent opportunity to set the stage for exchange, mixing with students and building goodwill. Unless you can help adolescents to feel adult in your contacts with them, to fill their insatiable quest for adulthood, you will be losing one of the best opportunities for cementing relationships.

The single teachers as well as the married ones carry a heavy influence to be sure. We tend to support the belief that the former can sometimes be even more influential than the latter in this social setting. He can intimate the goodness and wholesomeness of boy-girl relationships. He can structure and carry on conversations which reduce the embarrassment common to these social events and set his listeners at ease. The teacher displays a different side of his personality ever cognizant that his manner is under careful scrutiny by the student. (pp. 193, 194)

Lamont and Rice (1976) described the Guidance Awareness Program (GAP) during which each incoming sophomore was visited by a staff member during the summer prior to his enrollment at Bend Senior High School. This was identified as perhaps the most critical time in the student's high-school experience inasmuch as
"a large number of students are unable to identify their own personal purpose for being in school and are, therefore, unable to develop a plan for the future" (p. 4).

In order to assist students in this critical area, a home visitation and guidance program was developed. Twenty-five teachers, administrators and counselors were assigned 20 to 25 student guidees. During the summer, the staff members were to visit their assigned students in the student's home. During the visit with the student and his parents, they were to explain the registration procedure and help the student select his sophomore year classes. Tentative selection of classes for the junior and senior years, which would work toward the vocational goals of the student, were also made. The advisor would answer questions and discuss other aspects of the high school experience, in order to help the student, understand and feel more at ease about entering high school. The person who visited the student would continue to assist the student when school commenced, through group and personal guidance. The student would know someone to go to for help and encouragement from the very first day.

The long term goal of this project is to include a group guidance program that will encompass all students enrolled at Bend Senior High School. (pp. 4, 5)

The enthusiasm and support for GAP on the part of community, staff, and students continued at a high level during the ensuing school year.

... Faculty members were very encouraged by their experiences in the community and were willing to accept the additional responsibilities that they were assuming as advisors. ... In a year when extreme public criticism has been directed at Bend Senior High School, the GAP program seems to be one of the few programs to achieve broad support from parents, students, educators and the community in general. It is at least surprising, if not remarkable, that this program is still included in our local school budget, which will be submitted to the voters for the third time this year. Administrative support at the district and high school level has been consistently strong. (pp. 7, 8)

Stapleton (1975), a chemistry teacher, spoke of taking students on field trips, of showing them class-related, interesting films outside of class time, and of taking students to visit a former student in a research lab at Cal-Tech. He adds, "No truly dedi-
cated chemistry teacher could ever limit his pursuit of the fascinating subject of chemistry solely to the school day" (pp. 553, 554).

Robert (1973) listed "ways to improve the quality of human relationships in school" (p. 98). Earlier in his book he stated, "Although most of what I have to say pertains to the elementary school, much of it is applicable to high schools" (p. xi). It is not difficult for the high-school teacher to agree. Here are some of his suggestions which require teacher initiative and bring teachers close to students.

Teachers inviting one or more students into their homes for planning and carrying out off-campus activities together.

A schoolwide clean-up day during which the principal, entire school staff, and students wear old clothes and scour the school. In one depressed Los Angeles community, parents followed up by painting the entire school.

Teachers occasionally parking their cars a block or two from school in the morning and walking to school with the students. Some teachers tried this, and both teachers and students learned a great deal.

Teachers occasionally playing on the playground with their classes at recess and at noon—if the teachers have the stamina.

Teachers eating lunch with their classes in the lunch area once in a while. Some school districts adopt family-style, in-class food-serving programs, with students assuming responsibility for serving and cleaning up.

Individual and student group interviews in which teachers gather data by asking students how they feel about school. Are they having any problems? If so, what are they? These interviews may also be used to get acquainted with new students, to evaluate programs, and to gather information in order to give special help.

Teachers socializing with students outside of the classroom at noon, recess, or before and after school.

Teacher and class writing notes to ill or hospitalized students or teachers.

Maintaining contact and involvement with students who move on to a higher grade or to another school. (pp. 98-100)

**Ellen G. White Comments**

White urged parents and teachers to come into a "social relation" with their children and students by taking an interest in
and participating in all aspects of their lives.

There is danger that both parents and teachers will command and dictate too much, while they fail to come sufficiently into social relation with their children or scholars. They often hold themselves too much reserved, and exercise their authority in a cold, unsympathizing manner, which cannot win the hearts of their children and pupils. If they would gather the children close to them and show that they love them, and would manifest an interest in all their efforts and even in their sports, sometimes even being a child among them, they would make the children very happy and would gain their love and win their confidence. And the children would more quickly learn to respect and love the authority of their parents and teachers. (1913/1943, pp. 76, 77)

The teacher can become one with the students and learn to understand them by pleasant nonclassroom association.

... The true teacher can impart to his pupils few gifts so valuable as the gift of his own companionship. It is true of men and women, and how much more of youth and children, that only as we come in touch through sympathy can we understand them; and we need to understand in order most effectively to benefit. To strengthen the tie of sympathy between teacher and student there are few means that count so much as pleasant association together outside the schoolroom. In some schools the teacher is always with his pupils in their hours of recreation. He unites in their pursuits, accompanies them in their excursions, and seems to make himself one with them. Well would it be for our schools were this practice more generally followed. The sacrifice demanded of the teacher would be great, but he would reap a rich reward. (1903/1952, p. 212)

Sharing in the care of the physical plant, performing helpful deeds for others in the community and time spent in recreation and physical culture, may seem to interrupt the school day, but the time will be well spent. Students take better care of that which they have helped to beautify, and in the

... binding together of pupil and teacher by the ties of common interest and friendly association, the expenditure of time and effort will be repaid a hundredfold. A blessed outlet will be afforded for that restless energy which is so often a source of danger to the young. As a safeguard against evil, the preoccupation of the mind with good is worth more than unnumbered barriers of law and discipline. *Ibid., pp. 212, 213)
In 1903 teachers at one school were reminded their work did not end in the classroom, that "several hours each day should be devoted to working with the students in some line of manual training. In no case should this be neglected" (1913/1943, p. 211). This was to assure that the teachers' "hearts will be bound up with the hearts of students," and, in turn, "open the way for successful teaching" (Ibid., p. 203).

The instructors will find it greatly to their advantage to take hold disinterestedly with the students in manual labor, showing them how to work. By co-operating with the youth in this practical way, the teachers can bind the hearts of the students to themselves by the cords of sympathy and brotherly love. Christian kindness and sociability are powerful factors in winning the affections of the youth. (Ibid., p. 208)

Intimate, loving association with children and youth a variety of ways is urged to help effect behavior change, to keep youth from discouragement and from losing their hold on God.

... All narrowness should be avoided. Let the teacher so far unbend from his dignity as to be one with the children in their exercises and amusements, without leaving the impression that they are being watched. His very presence with them will give a mold to their actions, and will cause his heart to throb with new affection.

The youth need sympathy, affection, and love, or they will become discouraged. A spirit of "I care for nobody and nobody cares for me" takes possession of them. They may profess to be followers of Christ; but they have a tempting devil on their track, and they are in danger of becoming disheartened and lukewarm, and of backsliding from God. Then some feel it a duty to blame them and to treat them coldly as if they were a great deal worse than they really are. Few, perhaps none, feel it their duty to make personal efforts to reform them and to remove the unhappy impressions that have been made upon them. (Ibid., pp. 502, 503)

The teachers in the schools in Switzerland were commended in 1889:

I see some things here in Switzerland that I think are worthy of imitation. The teachers of the schools often go out with their pupils while they are at play and teach them how to amuse themselves and are at hand to repress any disorder
or wrong. Sometimes they take their scholars out and have a long walk with them. I like this; I think there is less opportunity for the children to yield to temptation. The teachers seem to enter into the sports of the children and to regulate them. I cannot in any way sanction the idea that children must feel that they are under a constant distrust and cannot act as children. But let the teachers join in the amusements of the children, be one with them, and show that they want them to be happy, and it will give the children confidence. They may be controlled by love, but not by following them at their meals and in their amusements with a stern, unbending severity. (1968, p. 58)

Home visitation was recommended as another way teachers and students could come into a close relationship and prepare for a better teaching-learning environment.

Since parents so rarely acquaint themselves with the teacher, it is the more important that the teacher seek the acquaintance of parents. He should visit the homes of his pupils and gain a knowledge of the influences and surroundings among which they live. By coming personally in touch with their homes and lives, he may strengthen the ties that bind him to his pupils and may learn how to deal more successfully with their different dispositions and temperaments. (1903/1952, p. 284)

Lawson (n.d., p. 1) introduced his E. G. White compilation by saying 72 percent of the references regarding what students should learn deal with moral development or character building. He concluded that a regular curriculum, even including Bible classes, would not meet the demands of these counsels to SDA educators.

**Summary**

Studies done on the high school level revealed that students want teachers who are concerned with them as whole persons. Parents, administrators and students placed a high value on extracurricular activities; yet some of the same studies cited student and teacher apathy as present deterrents to such activities. Overt communication of teacher interest in students as individuals was seen as necessary to establishing the credibility of the teacher and making
his/her values acceptable to the student. It was shown that students value the teacher involved beyond the classroom in caring, loving, helpful ways, and dislike the noninvolved teachers, identifying them as "their worst."

College and university studies are believed by the researchers to show: that when a teacher's nonclass time is off-limits to students a powerful means of enhancing a student's education and development is forfeited; that "high quality" student association with academically oriented teachers is seen to almost certainly affect academic achievement, college persistence and educational aspirations; that there is evidence of teacher bias against interaction with low achievers, younger students, and females; that psychological accessibility is more important than mere physical availability of a teacher; that teachers involved beyond the classroom door are seen as happier in their work, and more often rated as superior teachers by both their colleagues and students.

Some literature cautions against over-familiarity but the predominant call is for a more personalized teacher-student relationship, strengthening teacher influence on student values, attitudes, and achievement. Laboratories, committees, field trips, and companionate physical labor; "open" offices, lounges, homes, and lunch hours; or, social functions, recreational activities and sports, were all cited as opportunities for and facilitators of nonclassroom interchange to the enhancement of the student's total learning experience.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Type of Research, Population and Sample

Survey research was employed in this descriptive study. The sample was the thirteen senior academies in the Northern and Central California Conferences of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Secondary-school teachers and administrators from these two adjoining conferences meet together regularly in curriculum meetings, principals' councils, and teachers' conventions—a reason for treating them as a unit for this research. The day academies surveyed were: Armona, Bakersfield, Fresno, Golden Gate, Lodi, Modesto, Mountain View, Paradise, PUC Preparatory, Redwood, and Sacramento. The two boarding schools were Monterey Bay Academy and Rio Lindo Academy.

Only the seniors among the students were surveyed on the assumption that they knew best the overall pattern and practices with regard to teacher-student relationships. It was believed by the researcher that they would give a more thoughtful, serious, and hence more accurate response than would a random sampling of the entire student body. It was assumed that most seniors would have been in attendance at least one full year prior to their senior year. The survey confirmed this with 94 percent of those
responding from day schools and 92 percent of those from boarding
schools stating they had attended that school two or more years.
Juniors were excluded because many students attend senior academies
for the first time in their junior year; this is especially true
in boarding schools. The entire senior class in each school was
surveyed.

All full-time faculty (three or more classes daily) and the
principals were surveyed.

Research Instrument

A 53-item questionnaire using Likert-type questions (see
appendix A) was employed to survey students, teachers, and
principals. After development in counsel with researchers at
Andrews University, the questionnaire was submitted for further
scrutiny to six educators at Pacific Union College. Changes were
made as necessary before field testing with the junior class at
Pacific Union College Preparatory School.

Procedure

The 53-item questionnaire was distributed to principals,
along with letters of instruction (see appendix B), at a principals'
meeting in Lodi, California, in January 1982. Each questionnaire
from faculty and students was returned to the principal in an
unmarked envelope provided by the researcher. The principal
checked off the name of each faculty member and senior until all
respondents had returned an envelope with the completed question-
naire enclosed. These envelopes along with the principal's
questionnaire were returned by early February to the researcher in
a larger container provided, either in person or by mail.

Of 564 seniors, 521, or 92 percent, completed the question-
naire. Teacher response was 89 percent (137 of 156) and all 13
principals responded.

Apparently because of not being separately numbered and/or
insufficient instruction, the item at the bottom of page one of the
questionnaire (appendix A) was omitted by many of the respondents.
This item asked the respondent to circle five of seventeen items
which he/she most liked to see teachers doing, involved in, avail-
able for, etc. Of the students, teachers, and principals who
completed the questionnaires, only 65 percent, 64 percent, and
69 percent, respectively, responded to this item. Because of a
possible random oversight of this item, and because of rather clear
trends in the choices made, the data were included in the study.

The questionnaire responses were entered on disks at the
computer center at Pacific Union College and verified by a second
entry of the responses from the 671 completed questionnaires. The
data were separated by day and boarding schools, by individual
schools, and by students, teachers, and principals. The disks and
a printout of these verified entries were taken to Andrews Uni-
versity in June 1982 where, because of incompatibility of equip-
ment, the data from the verified printout were key punched a second
time. The printout from the University computer center was
checked against the verified copy from Pacific Union College for
the elimination of errors.
Analysis

Appropriate computer programming to group and compare data and apply appropriate tests was done at the direction of the researcher by Statistical Computing Services within the education department of Andrews University. Response frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were calculated.

Descriptive tables were developed to report findings. Percentage comparisons were made among schools identified only by randomly chosen numbers. Responses from boarding schools and day schools were compared, as well as teacher, student, and principal responses. Significance of differences of means was determined by applying t tests.

Responses to certain questionnaire items were compared by grouping male and female students separately at both day and boarding schools. Students with higher and lower grade-point averages were also compared.

Summary

This descriptive study used a 53-item questionnaire to survey the seniors, faculty, and principals of the thirteen Seventh-day Adventist senior academies in the Northern and Central California Conferences. Ninety-two percent of the seniors responded, and 89 percent of the teachers. All thirteen principals responded. Comparisons were made among schools, between sexes, between higher and lower academic achievers, and among the three groups (faculty, students, and principals) surveyed. The only identified comparisons made relative to schools were between boarding schools as a unit and...
day schools as a unit. Schools were assigned random numbers and were in no way identified in this study. Primary emphasis was given to answering the questions stated in chapter 1, page 4.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Introduction and Organization

The data for this study were received from 671 completed student, faculty, and principal questionnaires exploring nonclassroom teacher-student relations in the thirteen Seventh-day Adventist schools with grades nine to twelve in the Northern and Central California Conferences. Eleven were day schools and two boarding schools. The responses were from 521 seniors (92% of the total of 564); 137 full-time teachers (88% of the total of 156); and the principals (100%).

The subheadings under which the findings are reported in this chapter are: Teacher Availability and Involvement, Value Placed on Nonclassroom Association, Quantity and Quality of Nonclassroom Contact, Effects on Receptivity to Learning Opportunities, Preferred Types of Nonclassroom Involvement, and Barriers to Teacher-Student Association.

Teacher Availability and Involvement

To assess perceived teacher-availability for and involvement in nonclassroom teacher-student contact and association, the seventeen items listed below appeared on page one of the questionnaire. Responses possible were from 5 (almost all) to 1 (almost none).
Circle the proportion of teachers at this school who:

1. Are easily available to help students with assignments
2. Often attend school-sponsored social activities
3. Are occasionally involved in student missionary/community service projects
4. Often attend weekly student sports events
5. Have visited some students in their homes or rooms
6. Occasionally invite students to their homes
7. Are usually present at big events (track meets, play-off games, ski trips, etc.)
8. Attend chapels/ assemblies quite regularly
9. Occasionally actively participate in student sports and/or play
10. Occasionally work with students at "manual labor" (custodial, food preparation, etc.)
11. Often smile at and/or greet students in hall, on campus, etc.
12. Stop in halls or on campus to visit with students occasionally
13. Show a strong personal interest in students as individuals
14. Are easily available just to talk even if the student has no special problem
15. Often attend youth Sabbath Schools
16. Eat lunch with students occasionally
17. Work with students on committees

Since a choice of 3 would indicate about one-half the teachers were perceived to be available for or involved in that particular nonclassroom activity, it was arbitrarily decided to use 3 as a norm
for an indication of nonclassroom involvement. Since seventeen items all marked 3 would give a total of 51, this was accepted as the mean score a faculty at any given school should receive to be considered "involved" and "available" (see table 1).

Considering student opinions, the mean score for the thirteen schools was 54, or three points above the established norm of 51. Students in the thirteen schools taken as a unit consider their teachers involved with students outside the classroom. Five schools dropped below this norm from one to seven points; eight schools were from four to ten points higher. No tests of significance were applied to these differences.

Teachers gave their nonclassroom involvement a higher rating than did students with a mean score of 60. No school dropped below the 51 norm. No tests of significance were applied to the differences between student and teacher responses.

Value Placed on Nonclassroom Association

To measure the value students, teachers, and principals placed on nonclassroom teacher-student contact, respondents were asked to respond to item 42 on the questionnaire which stated: I believe out-of-class contact or association between teachers and students is--. The responses were on a 5 to 1 scale, 5 meaning very important and 1 meaning not important.

All thirteen principals responded important to very important, ten circling 5 and three circling 4 (see table 2). One hundred thirty-four teachers responded to this item; 100 chose 5, or very important, twenty-six chose 4, seven circled 3, and one circled 1.
TABLE 1

TEACHER AVAILABILITY FOR AND INVOLVEMENT IN NONCLASSROOM TEACHER-STUDENT CONTACTS AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS AND TEACHERS IN THIRTEEN SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>Mean Student Response</th>
<th>Difference from Norm</th>
<th>Difference from Mean</th>
<th>Mean Teacher Response</th>
<th>Difference from Norm</th>
<th>Difference from Mean</th>
<th>Difference from Student Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Student Response</td>
<td>49 56 45 57 56 55 61 47 56 44 50 56 56 51</td>
<td>-3 +5 -6 +6 +5 +4 +10 -4 +5 -7 -1 +5 +5</td>
<td>-5 +2 -9 +3 -2 +1 +7 -7 +2 -10 -4 +2 +2 -3</td>
<td>56 59 63 61 58 62 60 54 66 57 53 66 63 51</td>
<td>+5 +8 +12 +10 +7 +11 +9 +3 +15 +6 +2 +15 +12</td>
<td>-4 -1 +3 +1 -2 +2 0 -6 +6 -3 -7 +6 +3 -9</td>
<td>+7 +3 +18 +4 +2 +7 -1 +7 +10 +13 +3 +10 +7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from Norm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from Mean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from Student Responses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Responses are to items 1-17 on the questionnaire. See page 45.

2 A norm averaging all "3" responses, or approximately 50 percent, was accepted as indicating an "involved faculty."
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Level</th>
<th>Day Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th>Boarding Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Day and Boarding</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 or Below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15—Very Important; 1—Not Important. Responses are from questionnaire item 42. I believe out-of-class contact or association between teachers and students is ___.
All but 6 percent felt nonclassroom teacher-student association was important or very important.

Of 519 students responding from thirteen schools, 435, or 84 percent, felt nonclassroom teacher-student association was important or very important, with 56 percent circling 5, and 28 percent circling 4 (see table 3). Only twenty students, or 4 percent, circled 1 or 2.

Comparing female and male student responses (see table 2), it was found that 89 percent, or 239 of 269 female students rated nonclassroom contact as important or very important, while 78 percent (196 of 250) of male students gave it this level of importance. Of female students, 65 percent circled 5, or very important; 46 percent of males chose 5. Seven females and thirteen males circled 1 or 2 indicating they placed little or no importance on extra-classroom association with teachers.

To test the significance of the differences among group responses to item 42, rating the importance of nonclassroom teacher-student association, all value choices from 5 to 1 (very important to not important) were totaled and a mean established (see table 4). By applying a t test, significant differences were discovered among a number of groups. The female sample from the thirteen schools taken as a whole placed a significantly higher value on nonclassroom contact than did males. Comparing males and females at day schools only brought a similar result. However when males and females were compared at boarding schools alone there was no significant difference; males placed a 4.45 value on nonclassroom contact, nearer to the female value of 4.64. Boarding-school students in general value contact with
### TABLE 3
VALUE PLACED ON NONCLASSROOM TEACHER-STUDENT ASSOCIATION IN THIRTEEN SCHOOLS
(Percentage of Responses at Each Value Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Numbers</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Responses are from questionnaire item 42, I believe out-of-class contact or association between teachers and students is _____.

a School samples ranged from 13 to 147 students and from 3 to 23 teachers. Caution must therefore be exercised when making percentage comparisons among schools or between teachers and students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Compared</th>
<th>38 Friendships¹ Means</th>
<th>39 Conversations Means</th>
<th>40 Satisfaction Means</th>
<th>41 Pleasantness Means</th>
<th>42 Importance Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Male</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Day</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.58*</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Boarding</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Day</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Boarding</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Boarding</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Boarding</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Day</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.58*</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Day</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Day</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.03*</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boarding</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hi GPA</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lo GPA</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Teachers</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹See Appendix C for questionnaire items. ²The critical t value is 1.96 at the .05 level.
teachers outside the classroom more highly than do day students. This was supported with a mean of 4.56 as compared to 4.19. This difference was significant (see table 4). Boarding students chose 5, or very important, as their evaluation of non-classroom contact 69 percent of the time, while day students did so 46 percent of the time.

Higher grade-point average (GPA) students (above 2.5) rated nonclassroom contact with teachers more highly than did those with a lower GPA. Of the eighty-two students who declared their GPA at 2.5 or below, 72 percent felt nonclassroom contact to be important or very important, while 86 percent of those with a GPA above 2.5 gave it this rating. This difference was found to be significant when their mean responses of 4.02 and 4.42 were compared.

Student responses from ten of the thirteen schools surveyed showed a difference (range, 61% to 91%) from the overall 84 percent of students who rated nonclassroom contact as important or very important (see table 3). And teacher responses from these schools revealed a faculty at schools number 5, 8, 10, 12, and 13 who placed less value on out-of-class association than the overall 94 percent who chose 4 or 5 as their ratings (see table 3). However, since sample sizes in the 13 schools ranged from 13 to 147 students and from 3 to 23 teachers, caution must be exercised in making percentage comparisons among schools or between teachers and students.

**Quantity and Quality of Nonclassroom Contact**

To assess more specifically than did items 1-17 on the questionnaire the quantity and quality of, and level of satisfaction with, nonclassroom teacher-student contact, the following items were included:
38. The number of teachers during grades 9-12 I have considered close personal friends is: 1. None; 2. 1-2; 3. 3-4; 4. 5-6; 5. 7 or more.

39. Approximately how many teacher-student out-of-class conversations have you had during the last two weeks which lasted one minute or longer? 1. None; 2. 1-2; 3. 3-4; 4. 5-6; 5. 7 or more.

40. How satisfied are you with the amount of nonclassroom teacher-student association you have had this year? Satisfied 5 4 3 2 1 Unsatisfied.

41. Most of my out-of-class student-teacher contacts have been: Pleasant 5 4 3 2 1 Unpleasant.

Means of the 1 to 5, or 5 to 1, choices were calculated on each item for students and teachers, and for specific student groups, e.g., males, females, day, and boarding (see table 4).

The mean response from all students to item 38 inquiring about the number of close teacher-friends during grades 9-12 was 2.88. A choice of 2 represented one or two close teacher-friends and a 3 represented three to four such relationships. There were no significant differences among the groups tested.

Inquiry about the number of one minute or more teacher-student conversations beyond the classroom during the previous two weeks (item 30) brought a mean response of 2.92. Again 2 represented one to two such conversations and 3 represented three to four. The only significant difference among groups compared concerned GPA. Those with a GPA above 2.5 had a mean of 3.00 while those whose GPA was 2.5 and below had a mean response value of 2.53. This difference in tendency of higher GPA students to have more conversations with their teachers was significant.

Females rated their contacts with teachers as significantly more pleasant (item 41) than did males and the higher GPA students.
generally looked upon these contacts as more pleasant than did those with lower grades. The overall mean for students was 4.12, meaning they found their out-of-class association pleasant to very pleasant. Teachers with a 4.64 mean were even more positive. This difference was also significant. (See table 4.)

Teachers were significantly more satisfied than were students with the amount of nonclassroom contact they had had during the current year (item 40) with a mean of 3.58 compared to the student mean of 3.18 (see table 4). Day students were significantly more satisfied than were boarding students with means of 3.26 and 3.05, respectively.

It should not be overlooked that 7 percent, or thirty-six, of the 521 seniors surveyed placed most of their contacts with teachers beyond the classroom on the "unpleasant" side of the scale, that 9 percent, or forty-seven felt they had had no close personal teacher-friends during grades 9-12, that 14 percent, or seventy-three, had had no conversations of one minute's length with teachers during the previous two weeks, and 28 percent, or 146, tended toward dissatisfaction with the quantity of nonclassroom association by choosing 1 or 2. Forty-seven chose 1. Fourteen percent, or seventy-two, chose the satisfied (5) position. An additional 26 percent chose 4. Fifty-four percent of teachers tended toward satisfaction and 20 percent toward dissatisfaction. See tables 5-7 for a comparison of the responses from the thirteen schools on items 38 to 41.
TABLE 5
NONCLASSROOM TEACHER-STUDENT CONVERSATIONS AND CLOSE FRIENDSHIPS AS EXPERIENCED BY STUDENTS IN THIRTEEN SCHOOLS (Percentage of Responses at Each Value Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Numbers</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38. The number of teachers during grades 9-12 I have considered close personal friends is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (7+)</td>
<td>0ª</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (5-6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3-4)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (1-2)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (None)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Approximately how many teacher-student out-of-class conversations have you had during the last two weeks which lasted one minute or longer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (7+)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (5-6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3-4)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (1-2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (None)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ªSchool samples ranged from 13 to 147 students and from 3 to 23 teachers. Caution must therefore be exercised when making percentage comparisons among schools or between teachers and students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Numbers</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Responses are from questionnaire item 40, How satisfied are you with the amount of non-classroom teacher-student association you have had this year?

a. School samples ranged from 13 to 147 students and from 3 to 23 teachers. Caution must therefore be exercised when making percentage comparisons among schools or between teachers and students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Numbers</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Response:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Responses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Responses are from questionnaire item 41, *Most of my out-of-class student-teacher contacts have been:*.

2. School samples ranged from 13 to 147 students and from 3 to 23 teachers. Caution must therefore be exercised when making percentage comparisons among schools or between teachers and students.
Effects on Receptivity to Learning Opportunities

To determine the perceived effects of nonclassroom association on student receptivity to learning opportunities, ten items requested a response on a 5-1 scale, strongly agree to strongly disagree. A total score of 35 or more on the ten items was accepted as an indication of agreement that nonclassroom teacher-student association generally has positive effects on student receptivity. Scores of 25 or less indicated general disagreement. The questions and statements preceding the 5-1 strongly agree to strongly disagree scales were stated as follows:

43. How much would you agree with the book title: Kids Don't Learn from Teachers They Don't Like

When a student has had pleasant contacts or associations with a teacher outside the classroom, I believe he will, in that teacher's class:

44. Listen more closely

45. Turn assignments in more regularly

46. Obey classroom conduct rules more willingly

47. Study harder for tests

48. Have a more receptive attitude toward the subject (math, Bible, history, English, etc.)

49. Be more likely to accept the teacher's moral and spiritual advice

50. Participate more in class discussions

51. Tend to be more "noisy" in class

52. Have less respect for the authority of the teacher.

In table 8 the mean responses on the 5-1 scale for these ten items are compared--teachers with students and teachers with principals. In addition, the t value is given to test the significance of the differences. Mean student, teacher, and principal responses to each item
TABLE 8

COMPARISONS OF PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTS OF PLEASANT NONCLASSROOM TEACHER-STUDENT ASSOCIATION ON RECEPTIVITY TO LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES, CLASSROOM CONDUCT, AND RECEPTIVITY TO MORAL AND SPIRITUAL ADVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Compared Groups</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Significance at .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.38*</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.03*</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.72*</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>-2.30*</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51a</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52a</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Compared Groups</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Significance at .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total of Students</td>
<td>39.99</td>
<td>1.99*</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items Teachers</td>
<td>38.66</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-52 Principals</td>
<td>39.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1See p. 58 for a statement of the questionnaire items.

2The means of the choices on a 5-1 scale, strongly agree to strongly disagree.

3The critical t value is 1.96 at the .05 level for comparing students with teachers and for comparing teachers with principals.

a5-1 values inverted to 1-5 on these items.

were compared as well as the mean response of each group to all ten items considered as a unit. The 5 to 1 response values were inverted on items 51 and 52, making a 1 response mean strongly agree rather than strongly disagree, for example. Therefore, high scores (3.5+, or 35+ total) on all ten questionnaire items would indicate that the respondents believe pleasant nonclassroom teacher-student association had a generally positive effect on learning attitudes.

In asking (item 43) for a strongly agree to strongly disagree (5 to 1) response to the message of the book title, Kids Don't Learn from Teachers They Don't Like (Aspy & Roebuck, 1977), the student mean response was 3.97. In actual count, of 518 students, 224 (43%) chose the strongly agree position and 157 circled 4, placing 381, or 74 percent, on the agree side of the scale. Only seventy students, or 13 percent disagreed. Thirty-four, or 7 percent strongly disagreed and 13 percent took a neutral position.
Principals agreed with students with a mean response of 4.0; only two took 3 and 2 positions on this item.

Teachers differed significantly with students and with principals with a mean response of 3.45. Sixty-nine, or 54 percent, of 127 teachers agreed, twenty-three (18%) strongly. Twenty-six (20%) were on the disagree side and one-fourth, or thirty-two, took a neutral position. Several students mentioned this item in their "further comments" (see appendix C); one writing, "Statement 43 is true!" Apparently most students, teachers, and principals concurred.

All three groups—students, teachers, and principals—were on the agree side on all ten items on learning effects. There were no significant differences between teachers and principals, but on five of the ten items there were significant differences between student and teacher responses. In addition to a more positive response to item 43, related to nonclassroom association by implication, students were also more certain than their teachers that pleasant student-teacher contacts beyond the classroom door would cause them to: listen more closely in class, turn in assignments more regularly, obey classroom rules more willingly, and study harder for tests.

Some students' comments following open-ended item 53 (see appendix C) in the questionnaire confirm the general response to items 43 through 52:

When I find out how nice a teacher is outside of class, I get to like the class more, or at least listen to the teacher more.

I think it [nonclassroom association] is extremely important. It affected the way I filled out this survey because I don't like the teacher whose class I am in now!
The student will likely have more interest in class.

I feel that if the teacher and student can get to know each other somewhere else besides in the classroom setting, the student will feel that he has a friend in the teacher and will not be afraid to be himself/herself and really try to do his or her best in the class. . . . A teacher can then become a guide and a helper to the student . . . and can work together as a team, both helping each other. . . .

Preferred Types of Nonclassroom Involvement

To discover which types of teacher-student involvement were preferred above others, questionnaire respondents were asked to circle, without rank order, five of seventeen items on page 1 of the questionnaire (see table 9), which they "most like to see teachers doing, involved in, available for, etc." Of those who completed the questionnaire only 65 percent of students, 64 percent of teachers, and 69 percent of principals responded to this instruction. It is believed by the researcher that this was a relatively random oversight because this instruction was poorly placed on the questionnaire and/or not separately numbered.

Because of the possible randomness of the oversight and because of the very clear predominance of certain choices in each group of respondents, it is believed this data can be taken seriously. Noting the highest number of choices in each column in table 9 indicates that the five top-ranking teacher behaviors in this list are:

1. Show a strong interest in students as individuals
2. Be easily available just to talk even if the student has no special problem
3. Be easily available to help students with assignments
TABLE 9

PREFERRED TYPES OF NONCLASSROOM TEACHER-STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AS EXPRESSED BY STUDENTS, TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

From the list of 17 items below, circle 5 which you most like to see teachers doing, involved in, available for, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Students Day</th>
<th>Students Board.</th>
<th>Students Totals</th>
<th>Teachers Day</th>
<th>Teachers Board.</th>
<th>Teachers Totals</th>
<th>Principals Day</th>
<th>Principals Board.</th>
<th>Principals Totals</th>
<th>Grand Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are easily available to help students with assignments</td>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>(161)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Often attend school-sponsored social activities</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are occasionally involved in student missionary/community service projects</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often attend weekly student sports events</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Have visited some students in their homes or rooms</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Occasionally invite students to their homes</td>
<td>49 (116)</td>
<td>(175)</td>
<td>17 (10)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are usually present at big events (track meets, play-off games, ski trips, etc.)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Attend chapels/assemblies quite regularly</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Occasionally actively participate in student sports and/or play</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Occasionally work with students at &quot;manual labor&quot; (custodial, food preparation, etc.)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Often smile at and/or greet students in hall, on campus, etc.</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(149)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Stop in halls or on campus to visit with students occasionally</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Show a strong personal interest in students as individuals</td>
<td>(119)</td>
<td>(119)</td>
<td>(238)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are easily available just to talk even if the student has no special problem</td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>(194)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Often attend youth Sabbath Schools</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Eat lunch with students occasionally</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Work with students on committees</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers indicate the number of times each item was circled by each group. Those in parentheses indicate the highest five numbers in each column.*
4. Occasionally invite students to their homes
5. Often smile at and or greet students in halls, on campus, etc.

Other teacher behaviors which placed highly were: Stop in halls or on campus to visit with students occasionally and, occasionally actively participate in student sports and/or play. One hundred sixteen of the 162 boarding students who responded circled as one of their five choices of preferred student-teacher involvement: Occasionally invite students to their homes. Only fifty-nine of 176 day students responding circled this item. Item 10, manual labor with students, was chosen a total of ninety-four times, sixty-eight times by the 338 students responding, twenty-four times by eighty-seven teachers, and twice by the nine principals. Visiting students in their homes or rooms was circled 100 times; eighty of these were student choices, including fifty-five boarding students. Missionary activities was one of the five most chosen by boarding school teachers, and ten of nineteen boarding school teachers circled: occasionally invite students to their homes.

**Barriers to Teacher-Student Association**

To determine the perceived barriers which keep students and teachers from nonclassroom association, teachers, students and principals were asked to respond on a 5 to 1 scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree) to sixteen items, numbers 19-33 on the questionnaire (see table 10).

Accepting 5-4 as agreement and 2-1 as disagreement, it was found that teacher-busyness (item 18) was agreed upon as a barrier
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Day Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th>Boarding Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals Day &amp; Board.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Day and Boarding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students 5a-4 2-1a</td>
<td>Teachers 5-4 2-1</td>
<td>Students 5-4 2-1</td>
<td>Teachers 5-4 2-1</td>
<td>Students 5-4 2-1</td>
<td>Teachers 5-4 2-1</td>
<td>Principals 5-4 2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>39^b 16 53 21</td>
<td>52 12 57 14</td>
<td>44 14 54 19</td>
<td>46 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>24 40 21 35</td>
<td>35 37 22 42</td>
<td>29 39 21 37</td>
<td>23 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>13 59 11 74</td>
<td>16 55 5 76</td>
<td>14 57 9 74</td>
<td>8 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>35 33 33 44</td>
<td>37 35 19 68</td>
<td>36 33 22 50</td>
<td>23 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>30 43 19 47</td>
<td>41 28 19 43</td>
<td>35 36 19 46</td>
<td>46 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>29 40 13 54</td>
<td>44 37 24 51</td>
<td>35 39 16 53</td>
<td>8 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>14 63 9 73</td>
<td>16 65 5 78</td>
<td>16 64 8 74</td>
<td>0 85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>14 67 4 91</td>
<td>17 60 3 92</td>
<td>15 64 4 91</td>
<td>31 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>19 54 16 60</td>
<td>28 46 24 57</td>
<td>22 50 18 59</td>
<td>31 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>36 34 56 22</td>
<td>46 26 43 24</td>
<td>40 31 53 23</td>
<td>54 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>27 40 12 50</td>
<td>35 33 19 45</td>
<td>31 37 14 49</td>
<td>8 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>54 22 31 39</td>
<td>68 13 22 49</td>
<td>60 18 29 42</td>
<td>31 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>35 32 32 36</td>
<td>27 43 16 65</td>
<td>31 37 28 44</td>
<td>15 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>43 42 15 60</td>
<td>55 26 16 62</td>
<td>28 36 11 67</td>
<td>0 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>45 33 13 71</td>
<td>43 30 8 68</td>
<td>50 29 0 67</td>
<td>8 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>17 67 9 71</td>
<td>25 59 8 68</td>
<td>21 79 22 67</td>
<td>15 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^1 See appendix A.  ^5-Strongly Agree; 1-Strongly Disagree.  ^b Expressed in percentages
by more than three times as many respondents as those who disagreed. Day students were at the lowest level of agreement, 30 percent. It should be noted that 21 percent of day and 14 percent of day and boarding school teachers disagreed that teacher busyness was a reason for teachers and students failing to get together outside of class. Two of the thirteen principals surveyed also disagreed that teacher busyness was a problem, one strongly. Responses to item 27, which attached teacher busyness to the "daily schedule," tended less strongly toward general agreement, though all groups, except for day students, agreed more often than they disagreed. All groups of respondents (teachers, students, and principals) chose 4 more often than the "strongly agree" position on items 18 and 27.

Related to teacher busyness was item 33 suggesting that students feel guilty about taking teachers' time. Fifty-nine to 69 percent of students, teachers, and principals disagreed, almost half (208 of 434) strongly. It should not be overlooked, however, that 104 of 521 students agreed that students may feel guilty about taking teachers' time; thirty-seven of these strongly agreed.

Teachers and students generally objected to the suggestion (item 20) that one barrier to nonclassroom involvement was teachers' lack of interest in being socially involved with students. Again, it should not be overlooked that of 137 teachers, thirteen agreed and twenty-two took a neutral position. Considering how the prefix to items 18-33 was worded, this could be a self-evaluation and/or an evaluation of the attitudes of their noninvolved colleagues. Six of thirteen principals also took a neutral position and one agreed by choosing 4.
Item 30 takes the reverse approach suggesting student lack of interest in social involvement with teachers as a barrier to nonclassroom teacher-student contact. There is considerably less clarity here, especially in the case of day students and teachers whose responses distributed about equally among agree, disagree, and neutral. Principals and boarding school teachers disagreed most often that student lack of interest was a problem and boarding students disagreed more often than they agreed.

It should be mentioned at this point that some of items 18-33 in the questionnaire may have been misunderstood by some respondents because of failure to attach each item to the prefix: If teachers and students fail to get together outside of class it is because ____. Item 30, discussed just above, for example, could bring a different response when detached from the prefix. The same observation applies to items 20 and 25. The number of "disagree" responses to certain items may indicate that the "if" prefix was overlooked. Despite this caution, the researcher believes that with or without the prefix the responses to these items have value. The cumulative responses are believed to be worthy of notice despite the probability that some respondents were less careful in reading and following the instructions to this set of items than were others.

Considering lack of teacher interest in students as individuals (item 25) as a possible barrier to nonclassroom contact, there was predominant disagreement that this was a possibility. Most teachers strongly disagreed; students and principals were somewhat less certain. Age difference between teachers and students
(item 24) drew a similar reaction with few agreeing that this was a barrier to nonclassroom involvement. The fact that eighty-five took the position that this could be a problem and 102 took a neutral position should not be ignored, however. Twenty-five percent of the teachers were unsure, either choosing a neutral 3, or agreeing (8%).

Items 31 and 32 explored the possibility that the teacher's need to maintain dignity and school discipline may keep him/her from being too "friendly" with students. Teachers and principals seemed rather certain this was not the case with responses in the disagree column ranging from 60 to 77 percent. Students generally were less certain with approximately one-fourth choosing the neutral position and the remainder dividing somewhat evenly between the agreement and disagreement columns. Students in boarding schools appear to perceive teachers' concern to maintain their dignity as a possible barrier more often than do those in day schools.

Teacher unfriendliness and classroom conduct which "turns students off" were considered (items 26 and 28) as possibly militating against nonclassroom interaction. In each response group except one there was more disagreement than agreement that these were hindrances to nonclassroom involvement. In the case of boarding-school students approximately one-third of the responses fell in each of the three areas, agreement, neutral, and disagreement. Only 12 and 9 percent respectively, fell in the strongly agree and strongly disagree columns.

Six of thirteen principals felt that failure on the part of teachers to make the first move to get acquainted (item 22) was a possible problem, but only three agreed that student shyness (item 19) was a retardant to nonclassroom association. More students and
teachers disagreed than agreed that shyness kept students and teachers apart outside the classroom. Nevertheless, 140 students felt student shyness was a barrier, seventy-three in day schools and seventy-six in boarding schools. Forty-one percent of boarding students cited teacher failure to make the first move toward acquaintance as a barrier; only 28 percent disagreed. Ninety-one of 221 boarding students and ninety-one of 300 day students agreed.

Fifty-one to 54 percent of teachers and principals disagreed that failure of students to make teachers feel welcome at student events is a deterrent to their participation (item 23). Thirteen (of 100) day-school teachers and nine (of 37) boarding-school teachers considered this a possible problem. Students seem less sure that they make teachers feel welcome. Forty-four percent of boarding students agreed that this was a possible barrier; 37 percent disagreed. In day schools it was 29 percent and 40 percent.

Teacher partiality and tendency to associate with certain students more than with others (item 29) was seen by 68 percent of boarding students as a reason some students do not get involved with teachers beyond the classroom. Half of these 149 students expressed strong agreement. Twenty-eight disagreed; only eight strongly. Day students felt less strongly with 22 percent (or 66 of 300) in the 5 column, 32 percent (or 96) in the 4 column, for a total of 54 percent agreeing that the tendency of teachers to associate more with certain students contributes to others being neglected outside the classroom. By contrast to the 68 percent of boarding students who saw teacher partiality as a problem, only 22 percent of boarding-school teachers saw this as a contributing factor. Forty-nine
percent disagreed and 30 percent chose the neutral 3 position. Day-school teachers were distributed 31 percent, 29 percent, and 39 percent, respectively, among agree, neutral, and disagree with only 6 and 7 percent in the strongly agree and strongly disagree positions.

Looking at the totals column (table 10) reveals the strongest agreement among students on perceived barriers to nonclassroom association was in the areas of teacher partiality or tendency to associate with certain students more than others, teacher busyness and full daily schedules, and teacher fear of a breakdown of discipline. Teacher and principal responses are weighted most heavily toward agreement in the areas of teacher busyness and the daily schedule, but disagreed with students in the areas of teacher partiality and fear of a discipline breakdown. One additional response weighted more heavily toward agreement for principals was the suggestion that teacher failure to make the first move may be a barrier to involvement. Students were equally weighted between agree and disagree on this item and teachers disagreed 27 percent more often than they agreed.

Students' "disagree" choices were most heavily weighted against the possible barriers of age difference, student guilt for taking teachers' time, teacher lack of interest in students as individuals, teachers' feeling it unimportant to be involved socially with students, and teacher unfriendliness. Teachers and principals also disagreed with these, as well as with the possibility that barriers are formed by teachers "turning students off" in class and feeling they must maintain their dignity. In addition teachers and principals disagree that students keep teachers away by making
them feel unwelcome at student events or unwanted at the social level.

Summary

The data revealed that students perceive their teachers as involved in nonclassroom teacher-student activities. Teachers saw themselves as more involved than did their students. Students, teachers, and principals rated nonclassroom contact as highly important, with teachers placing it higher in value than did students, as did females over males, high GPA students over low, and boarding over day-school students. Students were moderately to well satisfied with the quantity and quality of their nonclass relationships. Teachers were more satisfied than students.

All groups surveyed agreed that students' receptivity to learning opportunities was increased by pleasant nonclassroom teacher-student contact. Certain types of contact with teachers were valued more highly than others. Ranking high were: Be easily available just to talk even when the student has no special problem; be available to help students with assignments; invite students to their homes; and often smile at or greet students. Some differences between boarding and day student preferences appeared.

The main barriers to nonclassroom involvement perceived by students were teacher partiality, busyness, and fear of discipline breakdown.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary
Every school is composed of two broad areas of learning: the classroom and beyond the classroom. The relationship of the teacher and student in nonclassroom settings was the focus of this study.

The Problem, Purpose, and Significance

There were unknowns about nonclassroom teacher-student association in SDA secondary schools. What were the relative attitudes of students, teachers, and principals toward these? Did perceptions of nonclassroom relations of boarding-and day-school students differ? Did males and females, high and low academic achievers view them differently? The purpose of this study was to examine nonclassroom teacher-student contacts in the secondary-school setting with regard to their occurrence; their perceived value, adequacy, and effects; their preferred forms or types; and the perceived barriers to the occurrence of such contacts. The literature survey, findings, conclusions, and recommendations were planned to be of significance to administrators and teachers in planning the total school program in view of the students' maximum benefit.
Literature

Studies, articles, and books were cited giving support for the concept that nonclassroom teacher-student contact or association is not only desirable but essential to optimal educational success. This association was shown by the literature reviewed to have predominantly positive effects on behavior, academic interest, and achievement. A great variety of opportunities for nonclassroom teacher-student contacts were suggested; it appeared from the literature that the responsibility to initiate such associations rests primarily with the teacher. He must be not only physically available but psychologically accessible. He must not only feel an interest in the student but manifest that interest in unmistakable acts.

Methodology

This was a descriptive study employing survey research. A 53-item questionnaire (appendix A) was completed by 671 senior students, full-time teachers, and principals in the eleven SDA day academies and two boarding academies in the Northern and Central California Conferences. The data from the questionnaires were summarized calculating response frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Comparisons were made and some differences of means were evaluated by applying t tests, accepting .05 as the level of significance.

Findings and Analysis

The data received from the questionnaires completed by seniors, teachers, and principals from thirteen SDA academies in Northern and Central California were reported in chapter 4 under the
subheadings: Teacher Availability and Involvement, Value Placed on Nonclassroom Association, Quantity and Quality of Nonclassroom Contacts, Effects on Receptivity to Learning Opportunities, Preferred Types of Nonclassroom Involvement, and Barriers to Teacher-Student Association. A summary of each section follows:

**Occurrence.** Considering the thirteen schools as a unit it was found by a predetermined norm that students rated teachers as available for and involved in nonclassroom association with students. Teachers at all schools except one perceived their own involvement outside the classroom at a higher level than did students. A minority of students and teachers, however, felt there was relatively little teacher-student nonclassroom association.

**Importance.** All groups surveyed—teachers, students, and principals—rated nonclassroom teacher-student association as highly important. Teachers placed it at a significantly higher level than did students, as did female students over male students, and boarding students over day students. Higher GPA students valued out-of-class contact more highly than did students with lower grades. All these differences were significant.

**Satisfaction.** Teachers were significantly more satisfied than were students with the amount of nonclassroom teacher-student interaction. Students were moderately satisfied (3.18 mean on a 1-5 scale), with day students expressing significantly more satisfaction than did boarding students. Male and female students were equally satisfied, claiming from two to four close personal friends among teachers during their high-school years and about the same number of out-of-class conversations with teachers during the
previous two weeks. Most students (4.12 mean on a 1-5 scale) found their nonclassroom associations with teachers pleasant, females significantly more often than males. Teacher evaluations of the pleasantness of these contacts were significantly higher than were the evaluations of their students.

**Effects.** There was general agreement among students, teachers, and principals that receptivity to learning opportunities and to teachers' moral and spiritual advice was increased by pleasant nonclassroom teacher-student association. Students were significantly more sure than were teachers that these pleasant out-of-class associations would cause them to: listen more closely in class, turn in assignments more regularly, obey classroom rules more willingly, and study harder for tests. Students and principals agreed with the book title *Kids Don't Learn From Teachers They Don't Like* with mean responses of 3.97 and 4.00 on a 1-5 scale. Teachers were significantly less certain with a 3.45 mean.

**Types.** The five most preferred types of nonclassroom involvement, chosen from among seventeen by students, ranked from highest to lowest as follows: Show a strong personal interest in students as individuals, be easily available just to talk even if the student has no special problem, be easily available to help students with assignments, occasionally invite students to their homes, and often smile at or greet students in halls, on campus, etc. Other teacher behaviors which placed highly were: Stop in halls or on campus to visit with students occasionally, and occasionally actively participate in student sports and/or play. Boarding students appeared more interested than day students in
being invited to teachers' homes and being visited in their rooms. Chosen by 20 percent of the students responding was: Occasionally work with students at manual labor, and among the top five chosen by boarding-school teachers was missionary activities.

**Barriers.** Ranking high as barriers to nonclassroom involvement, as perceived by students, were: teacher partiality, or tendency to associate more with certain students, teacher busyness, and teacher fear of a breakdown of discipline. Teacher busyness ranked high with principals and teachers but they generally objected to the possibility that partiality and a fear of discipline breakdown are barriers to nonclassroom contact.

All groups—teachers, students, and principals—agreed that teachers and students were interested in close teacher-student associations and that age differences, teacher unfriendliness, and student shyness or guilt for taking the teacher's time were not barriers to their nonclassroom involvement. Again, however, the minority who disagreed, some strongly, in each of these areas should not be overlooked.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Effects on Learning**

Perhaps the most significant conclusion of this study is that the quality of nonclassroom teacher-student relationships is perceived by students to affect a student's receptivity to learning opportunities—and to a significantly greater degree than is perceived by teachers in general.

The researcher is persuaded by the evidence of this study that the statement, "Nobody likes him, but he's a good teacher."
has within it a gross contradiction. It is concluded, not that all liked teachers are good teachers, but that all really "good" teachers are liked. A "good teacher" is here understood to be one not only skilled in conveying cognitive knowledge of his subject matter, but who has personal qualities which encourage a positive attitude toward the discipline taught, toward learning in general, toward upright behavior, and toward the moral and spiritual values of the teacher and the school. A "liked" teacher is defined here as one respected and not generally disliked. It is believed that it was in this sense that students, teachers, and principals more often agreed than disagreed with the statement, "kids don't learn from teachers they don't like." Actual achievement of students under "liked" and "disliked" teachers was not measured. This may indicate a need for a long-range study relating student affection for teachers and academic achievement.

A conclusion of this study is that one of a school's greatest liabilities is a teacher generally disliked by students "as a person." Disliked persons who are teachers are disliked teachers, and disliked teachers are not good teachers. It must again be clarified (for it is ever the defense of the disliked teacher that the popular teachers are not the good ones), that it is not believed that liked teachers are necessarily good teachers.

Liked, good teachers should be sought for, developed, and valued for their service on a school campus, for what they do in helping to form positive attitudes toward their particular teaching discipline, toward learning, and toward the school and church with
which they are connected. Certainly Christian schools above all others should place a premium on the liked, good teacher and call into question the value of the so-called disliked, good teacher.

One item on the questionnaire explored the idea that a student is more likely to accept the moral and spiritual advice of the teacher with whom he or she has been pleasantly associated beyond the classroom. The response from students was definitely on the agree side with a mean of 4.29 on a 1-5 scale. This should cause the administrator to question if even one generally uninvolved, disliked teacher is affordable on a Christian campus. The administrator is urged to work toward the goal of having his/her teachers relating in a positive way to students. If this cannot be effected within a reasonable length of time, then changes in staffing may be indicated.

Age Differences Not Important

Another related and important conclusion reached from this study is that age difference between teacher and student does not generally militate against close nonclassroom teacher-student association.

Understanding this, administrators are urged to be cautious in their tendencies either to favor the "young and popular" or the "old and good." Other factors are more important to consider than age, and herein may be a partial solution to finding the liked, good teacher. She or he is probably the teacher who is either young or old who is competent in the classroom and involved beyond.
Involved Teachers Are Liked

Student responses to the open-ended questions in this survey (see appendix C) indicate that it is not necessarily the liked teacher who is most involved, but, conversely, the teacher most involved in student life is the most liked.

If the liked teacher is the one from whom students are most likely to learn and if the most liked are the most involved, it is recommended that more teacher involvement beyond the classroom be the focus of administrators rather than seeking more likeable, popular teachers.

However, in attempting to measure student perceptions of the effects of nonclassroom teacher-student association on receptivity to learning opportunities (items 44-52), it is possible the responses were more to the pleasantness or quality of the association than to the fact that it was nonclassroom association. Conclusions from this part of the survey, as with item 43, may have more to do with "liking and learning" than with nonclassroom association and learning.

Some written student responses (see appendix C) to item 53 do indicate a relationship between the student's affection for a teacher and his/her association with that teacher outside of class, and while the existence of this relationship may seem a safe assumption, it is not clearly established by the survey. A further study may be indicated in order to more clearly assess student perceptions of this relationship.
Minority Responses Important

Considering the predominant student belief that receptivity to learning is positively or negatively affected by the pleasantness or unpleasantness of teacher-student relationships, it is further concluded that the minority responses to the survey done in this study in some cases have immense importance. To be noted are the nearly 10 percent of the 521 seniors who felt in four years they had had no close personal teacher-friends, and the seventy-three who had had no significant out-of-class conversations with teachers during the previous two weeks (one can wonder if the response would have been different had the query read "two months," or "nine months"). And can the 7 percent who felt most of their non-classroom teacher contacts had been unpleasant, and the ninety students who were not sure if they were unpleasant or pleasant, be ignored or treated lightly? And what about the 146 students of 521 who expressed dissatisfaction with their amount of teacher-student nonclassroom association, and the 162 who were not sure whether they were satisfied or not? And can the 104 be forgotten who believe students do feel guilty about taking the teacher's time?

In light of the strong general agreement among students, teachers, and principals that both teachers and students are interested in "getting together," that teacher unfriendliness and age differences are not considered barriers by most, it is further concluded that something can and must be done for those students, albeit the minority, who seem shut out and dissatisfied.

The literature reviewed, including studies, would cause one to expect that similar minority responses would result
from a survey at higher levels of education.

It is therefore recommended that teachers at the secondary, college, and graduate level be expected by administrators to have specific yearly objectives for friendly nonclassroom involvement with students, much as they would be expected to be able to produce class or course objectives. The tendency for certain persons and/or departments to specialize in "student affairs" can be a bad tendency unless one of the chief goals of such persons or departments is to involve the total school staff in "student affairs," which on college campuses, at least, are generally thought of as activities, services, etc. beyond the classroom.

To assess progress toward the goal of greater student satisfaction with their involvement with teachers, a simple, yet well-designed, yearly survey is recommended. It could employ ten or fewer well-developed questions from those used in this study and/or those suggested by the college and high-school studies reported in chapter 2. Between these yearly survey times school-wide plans for further development of student-teacher nonclassroom interaction should be implemented. Teachers, as recommended above, should be asked to submit specific goals for this aspect of their teaching role. They should be encouraged to creatively plan for more personal and/or departmental involvement in the lives of students outside the classroom.

It should not be thought "nonclassroom activities" need be always or mostly outside the area of learning or academics. Far from it. One of the complaints of a significant number, though not a majority, of students surveyed in this study was the unavailability
of teachers after class for classroom-related activities, such as help with school work. Social, sport, and play activities are not necessarily the focus here, though included. The teacher who enjoys physics, or computers, or drama, or cooking, or music, or welding should be encouraged to be creative in developing more intimate one-to-one teacher-student relationships in any of these areas of learning.

The teacher who believes students and teachers should work side by side in manual labor should not only be allowed but encouraged to do so. This should, within reasonable limits, be considered not only legitimate but a desirable and valuable part of the teacher's contribution toward reaching institutional goals.

Referring to the yearly survey mentioned above, it would be the goal to have student satisfaction with nonclassroom student-teacher relationships increase to an optimal level. No minority dissatisfaction should be ignored, however great the improvement.

**Day-School Students Value Nonclassroom Association**

This study shows that though boarding-school students express greater need or desire for contact with their teachers beyond the classroom than do day-school students, day students nevertheless do place a high value on nonclassroom contact. Day-school personnel cannot assume that a student's home life is adequately providing for the students' felt needs for academic, social, and emotional support.

It is therefore recommended that both day-school and boarding-school administrators and faculties place high priority on making concrete plans for reaching students effectively in nonclassroom relationships.
Misinterpreting Student Sympathy

Students' acceptance of teacher busyness and teachers' full daily schedule as a major barrier to student-teacher involvement may militate against solving the problem. The fact that teachers and principals now know that students are understanding and sympathetic (see student comments in appendix C) with their overloads may cause them to continue to be satisfied with what seems inevitable.

It is therefore recommended that serious study be given by administrators to teacher unavailability and noninvolvement as it is related to teacher busyness and overload. Provision should be made in the teacher's daily and yearly schedule for opportunity for nonclassroom association.

It may be discovered, however, that the busy, unavailable teacher is the nonclassroom-involved teacher who simply does not have the capacity to include in his nonclassroom, noncommittee, nonresearch, nonadministrative life all the students who are trying to reach him or her, or all those to whom the teacher himself would like to reach out. The solution may not be found in reducing the classloads of these involved teachers, but, as recommended above, in expecting all teachers to bear their share of the nonclassroom load.

The accusation of teacher partiality, the tendency to associate with certain students more than others, may simply reflect the incapacity of the more involved teacher to reach beyond those who repeatedly press into his or her presence. Hence, all teachers should seek by unmistakable acts to be available, willing, and even
eager to relate to students beyond the classroom door.

Studies reviewed in the literature section support the view that the overloaded teacher is often the involved one, who in addition to all the assignments imposed upon him has an assignment from within based on the conviction that students are people who need also to discover that teachers are people.

Therefore, it is urged that administrators give extrinsic motivation to the classroom-centered teacher to develop yet another area of competence in his school life, and that this aspect of teaching be considered vital, or indispensable, or even mandatory, rather than optional and reserved for the "young" and the "popular" teachers.

Teacher Self-Evaluations May Mislead

Student and teacher responses to survey questions rather consistently show that teacher perceptions of themselves—their attitudes, their actions, their interests—are not the same as student perceptions of them. For example, teachers perceive themselves as more involved beyond the classroom, more available, more interested in students as individuals, and less concerned about their dignity and the fear of discipline breakdown than do students.

It is therefore recommended that teachers constantly evaluate how they are "coming across" by critical self-observation, and by actively seeking student feedback. Regular student evaluations of teachers are recommended.
Student Involvement Precedes Liking

It is believed that the relatively low ranking of missionary/community-service projects and manual labor among preferred teacher-student activities should not be interpreted as student lack of interest in these activities. It is rather believed that this low preference level is correlated with the low occurrence level, also expressed by students in this study.

As students will learn to like teachers with whom they have pleasant associations, so, it is believed, they will learn to enjoy activities in which they are pleasantly involved with teachers. Untried activities and uninvolved teachers can become more popular by student exposure to them.

Therefore, teacher-student manual labor and missionary-service activities, if philosophically desirable, should not be given up as unappealing to students simply because they were lower than teacher-student sports in the preference ranking. Quite the opposite—renewed efforts should be applied to these currently neglected areas of student-teacher life.

E. G. White Concepts Confirmed

This study, including the literature surveyed and the studies cited, gives support to E. G. White's concepts on non-classroom teacher-student association. They are summarized by one written in 1903:

The . . . teacher can impart to his pupils few gifts so valuable as the gift of his own companionship. . . . To strengthen the tie of sympathy between teachers and students there are few means that count so much as pleasant association...
together outside the schoolroom. . . . The sacrifice demanded of the teacher [will] be great, but he [will] reap a rich reward. (E. G. White, 1903/1952, p. 212)

It is concluded that the application of this counsel should not be proscribed to elementary playground supervision, but that it applies to all levels of education through graduate school and that it must be considered indispensible to the education of even the most mature students in years and experience.

It is further believed with new certainty that the following amazing educational objective can never be realized apart from a strong emphasis on nonclassroom teacher-student association:

It is not the highest work of education to communicate knowledge merely, but to impart that vitalizing energy which is received through the contact of mind with mind, and soul with soul. It is only life that begets life. . . . (E. G. White, 1898/1972, p. 209)

It is recommended that a report of this study, or a similar one, be placed in popular literary form and distributed widely among educators on the secondary level. College level educators will benefit also, especially if the literature and studies reviewed are considered. It may be that a similar study should be done on a college campus, or that all SDA college campuses in the U.S. should be surveyed.

Learning from Student Insights

The researcher believes a great understanding of student needs can be gained by every teacher and school administrator by reading the insightful comments made by some 200 different students (out of 521) under the survey item 53: "Further comments about this whole matter of non-classroom student-teacher association." (See
appendix C.) Teacher and principal comments are helpful as well.

It is therefore recommended that these comments be made available, at least to the thirteen schools surveyed, for purusal and discussion by administrators and faculties, and to provide impetus and guidelines for continued and more total student-teacher involvement beyond the classroom.

Conclusion

The researcher's conclusions and recommendations may best be supported by these survey responses from, first, a principal, then a teacher, and a student:

[Nonclassroom teacher-student associations] may well be as important as the subject matter learned.

I feel that student-teacher relationships are very important and have a high correlation with the values a student sets for his life in his school experience. Many teachers also fail to experience the spiritual gains received in these relationships. Many teachers avoid these close relationships because they feel they are so busy already with their duties of teaching, not realizing that the value of the time they spend with students outside of the classroom is of a higher level.

I feel that if the teacher and the student can get to know each other somewhere else besides in the classroom setting, the student will feel that he has a friend in the teacher and will not be afraid to be himself/herself and really try to do his or her best in the class. In this way, the pressure of teacher-student relationships is eased. A teacher can then become a guide and helper to the student, for they now have the right to be two individuals and can work together as a team, both helping each other, and pulling equally. This forms one of the strongest, most helpful relationships for both.

The teachers who attempt to justify limiting their relationships with students to the classroom seem to this researcher to be narrow-minded and shortsighted in the extreme. In the words of a student (p. 129), "I don't see how they could be more wrong!"
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
NONCLASSROOM TEACHER--STUDENT RELATIONS

Circle the *proportion* of teachers at this school who:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Almost All</th>
<th>Almost None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are easily available to help students with assignments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Often attend school-sponsored social activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are occasionally involved in student missionary/community service projects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often attend weekly student sports events</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Have visited some students in their homes or rooms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Occasionally invite students to their homes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are usually present at big events (track meets, play-off games, ski trips, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Attend chapels/assemblies quite regularly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Occasionally actively participate in student sports and/or play</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Occasionally work with students at &quot;manual labor&quot; (custodial, food preparation, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Often smile at and/or greet students in hall, on campus, etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Stop in halls or on campus to visit with students occasionally</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Show a strong personal interest in students as individuals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are easily available just to talk even if the student has no special problem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Often attend youth Sabbath Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Eat lunch with students occasionally</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Work with students on committees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the list of the 17 activities above, circle 5 which you most like to see teachers doing, involved in, available for, etc.
If teachers and students fail to get together outside of class it is because:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Teachers are too busy</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Students are too shy</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teachers feel it is unimportant to be involved socially with students</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Teachers <em>feel</em> students don't care to be involved socially with teachers</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Teachers fail to make the first move to get acquainted</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Students fail to make teachers feel welcome at student events</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. There is too great an age difference between students and teachers</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teachers aren’t interested in students as individuals</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Teacher’s personality fails to communicate friendliness</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The daily schedule is too full for teachers to have time for nonclassroom involvement with students</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Teachers turn students off in class</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Teachers are partial/associate with certain students more than with others</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Students don’t care to be involved socially with teachers</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Teachers feel they need to maintain their position of dignity</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Teachers fear discipline will break down if they get too friendly with students</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Students feel guilty about taking the teacher’s time</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Other reasons (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. My sex is:  
1. Female  
2. Male

36. This is which year for me at this school?  
1. First  
2. Second  
3. Third  
4. Fourth or more

37. My cumulative high school GPA is  
1. Above 2.5  
2. 2.5 or below

38. The number of teachers during grades 9-12 I have considered close personal friends is:  
1. None  
2. 1 - 2  
3. 3 - 4  
4. 5 - 6  
5. 7 or more

39. Approximately how many teacher-student out-of-class conversations have you had during the last two weeks which lasted one minute or longer?  
1. None  
2. 1 - 2  
3. 3 - 4  
4. 5 - 6  
5. 7 or more

40. How satisfied are you with the amount of nonclassroom teacher-student association you have had this year?  
Satisfied  
5 4 3 2 1  
Unsatisfied

41. Most of my out-of-class student-teacher contacts have been:  
Pleasant  
5 4 3 2 1  
Unpleasant

42. I believe out-of-class contact or association between teachers and students is:  
Very important  
5 4 3 2 1  
Not Important

43. How much would you agree with the book title: *Kids Don't Learn from Teachers They Don't Like*  
Strongly agree  
5 4 3 2 1  
Strongly disagree
When a student has had pleasant contacts or associations with a teacher outside the classroom, I believe he will, in that teacher's class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44. Listen more closely in class</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Turn assignments in more regularly</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Obey classroom conduct rules more willingly</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Study harder for tests</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Have a more receptive attitude toward the subject (math, Bible, history, English, etc.)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Be more likely to accept the teacher's moral and spiritual advice</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Participate more in class discussions</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Tend to be more &quot;noisy&quot; in class</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Have less respect for the authority of the teacher</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. My further comments about this whole matter of non-classroom student-teacher association are:
APPENDIX B

LETTERS OF INSTRUCTION FOR QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear (name of principal):

It is my ever deepening belief that an important indicator of the valuable teacher on an academy campus is his/her willingness, or eagerness, to be involved with students in extra-classroom settings. This may be in counseling, sponsoring student activities, personal assistance with class assignments, producing a play or program, inviting students to one's home, giving Bible studies, supervising janitor or reader work, on-the-job work with students, playing/refereeing/watching a basketball game, riding a chairlift, working with students in food preparation for a banquet, or just pausing for a one minute chat in the hallway.

I would be very grateful if each of your seniors could complete the questionnaire enclosed and return it to you in the sealed envelope we have provided. Perhaps this could be done in a class. I also ask that all full-time teachers (three or more class periods daily), and principal, complete the questionnaire except for items 37 and 38. These should also be returned sealed in the unmarked envelopes provided.

You may then return to us all the sealed envelopes in the larger envelope provided, along with your affirmation that all, or almost all, seniors and full-time faculty have returned an envelope to you with questionnaire enclosed. When I receive your questionnaires and those from the other schools, each school will be assigned a randomly chosen number and all data will appear by number and not by name in the research report. Please accept my assurance that the anonymity of yourself, your teachers, your students, and your school will be carefully preserved. If you wish a summary of the research it will be given you revealing to you only the number which identifies your school.

Thank you so much for your help. We trust this study will prove valuable to administrators, teachers, and ultimately to many students.

Sincerely yours,

John G. Kerbs

P.S. Will it be possible to have these returned to me by February 1, 1982? I will surely appreciate it. A 100 percent response will, of course, make the study more reliable. If you have questions, please phone me person-to-person collect at (707) 965-7272.
Principal:

Please return in the envelope provided this completed page along with the sealed envelopes containing the questionnaire completed by faculty, seniors, and principal.

I affirm that to the best of my knowledge a total of ________ senior students and ________ full-time teachers (3 or more class periods daily) have completed and returned the questionnaires which are all enclosed. We have a total of ________ seniors and ________ full-time faculty. This is the nearest we can come to a 100 percent response.

Signed: ____________

Principal

________________________

School

__________ I would like a summary of the results of this study.
Dear Senior:

Is it important for teachers and students to be involved together in out-of-classroom activities? It is our request that you assist us in discovering answers to some questions about the nonclassroom relationship between teacher and student.

Would you therefore be kind enough to complete the attached questionnaire and return it to your principal sealed in the envelope provided? Your name will not be attached to your answers. All envelopes will be mixed and lose their identity before they are opened.

Is it too presumptuous of me to ask that you take 10-15 minutes to complete the questionnaire today? In a study of this type it is important that everyone respond in order to draw accurate conclusions.

Thank you for your help to me, to your teachers, your principal, and, most important, to your friends who will still be in academy after you graduate.

Very sincerely yours,

John G. Kerbs
Dear Teacher:

Your principal has been asked to give the questionnaires attached to all full-time teachers at your school. It is our desire to study the perceived importance of out-of-classroom teacher-student association. The seniors at your school have also been asked to complete the questionnaire. Teachers should complete each item except numbers 37 and 38.

Please place your completed questionnaire in the unmarked envelope provided. Seal it and return it to your principal. He will forward the sealed envelope unopened to me. All envelopes from your school will be mixed and opened together with no attempt at identification of teachers. The responses from a specific teacher will be known by no one and therefore will not be communicated to anyone, including your principal.

Thank you for participating in this study, and may God be very near to you in your most important work.

Sincerely yours,

John Kerbs
APPENDIX C

STUDENT, TEACHER, AND PRINCIPAL COMMENTS
Questionnaire item 34. Other reasons why students and teachers fail to get together outside of class. (All comments related to the question under consideration have been included with minimal editing.)

Principal Responses

Lack of time . . . the biggest.

Teacher Responses

Students are too busy with heavy class and work loads.
Lack of time and opportunity or a natural setting.
School-sponsored activities are nil.
It is not always convenient with everyone's time schedules being so different.
Other higher priorities demand time--family, church, etc.
They are scared to approach us, especially if the teacher is short-tempered.

I am sorry but these are gross generalizations that I will not apply to teachers generally or to students generally. All are true of someone, I am sure, but all are untrue of many, as well.

Student Responses

(Schools here have been randomly assigned letters A-M which have no identifiable relationship to the numbers 1-13 assigned to the schools throughout the study.)

School A
Students who work after school for long hours rarely get the help they need in the classroom.

School B
Students don't have time or don't want to.
School A
At school so much they [teachers] want to spend some time at home. Some need to retire.

School C
Both students and teachers are on terribly busy schedules.

School D
Teachers don't feel they need to associate with students outside of class!

They tend to look for specific things they can get students in trouble for in meetings, chapel, church, etc. It makes it very unenjoyable because they stand in the aisles like police and it really upsets me and 95 percent of others.

Some teachers have such an attitude of which students are "good" and which students are "bad", that they pre-judge them. This is the main problem between the faculty and the students!

Students don't feel like they want to be a teacher's friend because the students are too "good" to be the teacher's friend.

Teachers are too busy with other interests or running all over town or making phone calls to sit down and help you.

They [teachers] just don't want to be around.

School G
Teachers tell you to see them after class and then they don't have the time when you see them.

School H
Maybe their personalities don't mix.

Students are too busy to take time to talk; schedules clash; no reason to talk (no subject to talk about).

Ignorantism complexes: an adult mannerism designed to insinuate superior knowledge, thus giving way for student inferiority complexes.

Teachers have their own families.

Teachers say they are too busy at home to get involved.
School H

Teachers are just tired of students at the end of the day.

I often feel teachers are too busy to be bothered with me; not by their attitude--just a feeling of mine.

Students are too busy or not comfortable with teachers.
They just don't like each other.

School J

We don't have the extra free time to talk to the teachers about homework etc., because our breaks conflict with theirs and so they say, "see us after school." A lot of us have jobs and rides to meet and can't do that."

School L

Students don't know when teachers are available and who have time. They don't really know how to make themselves "available" to talk to.

Most students react from peer pressure and feel they cannot reach out and include some teachers.

Both students and teachers are too busy with their "own thing" to do things with each other.
Questionnaire item 53. Further comments about non-classroom teacher-student association. (All comments related to the question under consideration have been included with minimal editing.)

**Principal Responses**

It may well be as important as the subject matter learned.

An extremely important part of the educational process.

**Teacher Responses**

It is extremely important.

Making them feel we are really concerned and love them is the only way to win them. Out-of-school (classroom) association is extremely beneficial. The kids find out we're human beings.

It helps to open up the human side of the teacher to students, and vice-versa--a key to communication.

Non-classroom activities are very important. The students need to see Christ in the lives of the teachers out of the classroom!

The positive attitude and character development that can take place with these student teacher social interactions can be almost as valuable as is class instruction. So many valuable things can be obtained out of class that can't be in class, both for teachers and students--and these things don't necessarily have to carry over into the classroom.

Very important--need more of it.

I use these principles all the time.

Teachers need to have contacts with students outside of the classroom. It is a must!!

The more--the better. (Work, study, play, devotions.)

Non-classroom association with the parents of students that you know will usually strengthen the relationship and eliminates any problems or misunderstandings. Thus a broader base of support for student, teacher, and school is achieved. I rarely have any problems with a student that I have an out-of-class association with and if this extends to parents, it's even better.
It is very important that the student view the teacher outside of class. (Without the total class.)

This school lacks this communication because of a lack of:
1. Regular chapels
2. Regular social activities
3. Active ASB

We need more of it!

I feel that student-teacher relationships are very important and have a high correlation with the values a student sets for his life in his school experience. Many teachers also fail to experience the spiritual gains received in these relationships. Many teachers avoid these close relationships because they feel they are so busy already with their duties of teaching, not realizing that the value of the time they spend with students outside of the classroom is of a higher level.

I think this is a vital aspect of education. It is true that what is caught between the lines rather than the "rigid" taught is of great importance.

Perhaps a title for the book in #43 that would more closely align with my ideas on the effect of student-teacher relationships on learning would be: Kids Don't Learn From Teachers They Don't Respect. A friendship, with out-of-class pleasant contact, between teacher and student does not necessarily generate a learning environment in the classroom unless respect provides structure and security.

I believe that non-classroom contact is very important. However, it is more important that the teacher be respected (in my opinion) than to be liked! Even if the teacher is liked by the student, that doesn't guarantee that learning will take place--nor does it guarantee that it will be positive learning! Often on campuses--the teachers who are liked the most--"try to be popular"--often at the expense of allowing students to break rules to become "friends" with them.

It is as important as what is taught in the classroom!

1. To be a friend, be friendly.
2. Be yourself, don't be phoney.
3. Admit that you are human and can make human mistakes when dealing with humans.
4. Be as good a listener as you are a talker.

The more one to one--the more we both grow closer together in understanding of the mental, physical, and spiritual. Hardships are easier to bear if we had an understanding before.

Teachers in this school need to make a special effort to contact students in their homes and outside school situations. Students' attitudes towards teachers are not that of respect as they should be. I feel it is this way because the teachers and students do not associate together in non-school activities except an hour or two on Sabbath morning.
I hate to see these types of generalizations plugged into a computer and analyzed with elaborate statistical packages. The results look impressive and people who have somewhat fuzzy minds will use them to plan "programs" and push good teachers to adopt practices they are not really comfortable with. Students often do not "like" a teacher who is trying to teach something that makes them uncomfortable i.e., responsible behavior. My son says he doesn't "like" me at times. So what? Evaluate teachers' whole program, not whether they eat lunch with the kids or not.

Student Responses

(Schools here have been randomly assigned letters A-M which have no identifiable relationship to the numbers 1-13 assigned to the schools throughout the study.)

School A
There should be more.
I think it's important to associate with your teachers. It makes things easier on the student.
I don't like it when the teachers favor only students who are popular. During my four years, not one has ever sat at our table at lunchtime.
I've been lucky at this school—I think it has a higher ratio of friendly teachers than most schools. This year we do have several new faculty. Only 1 or 2 are not very friendly people.
Our teachers here are fantastic and I feel lucky to go to this school.
Some teachers I feel are my close friends—others--no!
The relationship between student and teacher is an important one.
The teachers should spend more individual time with students in the classroom.

School B
We don't really need it!!!!
Some teachers here are sometimes hard to relate to for genuine friendships.
I feel if you were to push non-classroom association you would scare off a lot of people. My school is not a boarding academy and a lot of the students feel their home life is theirs and no one else's. If they don't mess up at school leave them alone. The ones that don't feel that way are too busy making A's to have out-of-class associations.
School B
I think there should be more contact out of class. I strongly agree with #43.

Statement #43 is true!

School C
I've been with teachers a lot. If you are with them it seems like rumors get started because I'm female and the teacher's male. Being that we are of the opposite sex, definitely means we have to be fooling around. Wrong.

Need more of it.

The teachers are happy to listen and talk, but it's usually the students who must "spark up" the conversation. The teachers will not know you have something you wish to talk about unless you tell them.

I think it is very good for both teacher and student.

That if we could have more teachers understand that they can be friends with the students and vice-versa. They would find that it is a much better environment to learn in and teach in.

I think it's important to have good relationships with your teachers. Beneficial both in and out of classrooms.

I wish there was time for more of it. No one seems to have the time. But it's good when it occurs.

I think it is good for teachers and students to have a type of friendship in and out of class.

I think that student and teachers should have a good outside classroom relationship but the student should respect the teacher as being older and having authority and the student shouldn't take advantage of this.

If there is more contact, the teachers and students can work together to make the school a better place.

The teachers—we need more who can share with us as students. Some kids are not willing to come to a teacher if they think he's too busy.

It depends on the teacher and the student. A good teacher will not have too many problems above, but the bad (not-too-good student) will, I think pay attention a little more, because the teacher has included him/her in the classroom activities. When the teacher has not included the student, I have noticed the student tends to slack off in classwork.

More participation in sports events with students, a few teachers do.
School D

Teachers seem to be put-ons and stuck-up and think kids are just a bunch of goof-offs.

The teachers that are single and young help me the most.

I am very non-caring about this subject. You see if I let things like teacher's attitudes affect me, I would be upset all the time. So what I do basically is not bother with this issue at all. My relationship with most if not all of my teachers is a 'hi' and 'goodbye' kind of thing.

I think it should be greatly encouraged. It makes you feel good.

I really don't care whether we have more student/teacher activities. I can have a better time without faculty around. Lots of times it's harder to have fun because they have such stilted and conservative views. They also need time to themselves. Why should we take time away from their families. Let the faculty do their thing and we'll do ours.

If you like a teacher and get along with that teacher "personally" I think you respond better, in a more positive way. But if you dislike a teacher personally, 'cause you feel that he doesn't grade fairly, and tends to be making favorites in the class, you tend to grow to hate that course and the teacher! I think teachers should keep their family problems in the home.

Some teachers and faculty don't take care of our needs.

Both teachers and students don't really want to make the first move to get acquainted because they are afraid of what the other person will think or do to them or about them.

Most teachers feel they only work while in the classroom. So what they do is leave and forget about their students until the next day. This is the wrong attitude for social workers. (Teachers).

I feel that since this is a boarding academy and the faculty supposedly take the place of our parents that we should have at least some non-classroom contact with them.

Teachers need to remember that they were students once, too. We're human just like they are and we need to work together instead of against each other.

I'm glad somebody is looking into it and I hope results come back.

We need more of it and not just the same people over and over.

If teacher-student relationships improved out-of-class relationships then relationships in the classroom would improve also.
School D

When students and teachers get together and form friendships, it helps the kids to understand what pressures teachers are under. They don't have it easy. I wouldn't want to try and relate to 100 or more different teenagers every day. We can be real pains sometimes.

It is very important to have a good student-teacher relationship--for the sake of students and teachers.

When students and teachers get together, the teacher should have something that the student would feel comfortable and enjoy doing. Of course the student should do his part in the matter too.

I think it is extremely important. It affected the way I filled out this survey because I don't like the teacher whose class I am in now.

It takes both teacher and students to make the relationship work.

Let's get it up!!

Teachers sometimes feel that they have to keep teaching (e.g. Bible theory) while they are at strictly social functions. They don't really relax.

When I find out how nice a teacher is outside of class, I get to like the class more or at least listen to the teacher more.

If you don't have it you'll have rebellion.

It's OK!

We need more interaction between students and teachers on a "friend" level.

It's fun to visit with teachers.

I probably have a biased view because I always seem to have more trust in the friendliness of the teacher from the start. So I admit sometimes I have gotten better treatment from the teachers.

Get to know your teachers personally! It's great getting to know them.

Some teachers have such an attitude of which students are "good", and which students are "bad", that they pre-judge them. This is the main problem between the faculty and the students!

Why do you think that this subject is important enough to waste all this money printing up these things? You ought to be able to guess that a bigger school than ______, such as ______, would be more negative about teacher-student association because there is more students than teachers than at ______.

It can be helpful, but it is the attitude a student holds that, to a great degree, will determine how much he can learn from a teacher.
School D

Most of the teachers here are too old to relate to the students of this age.

School E

I feel that it is very important for students and teachers to have a non-classroom experience. I think it is important to both the student and the teacher.

Teachers are not aliens; they were kids once too, and they would like to be your friend, and I know you want to be theirs.

School F

I believe that this school is performing very well in the type of relationships they have between the student and teacher.

I feel it is very important for teachers to make time for their students...I think that at _____ many of the teachers are only close to certain students and have hardly spoken more than a few words to other students. Teacher/student relationships are important and definitely help the student learn better.

Even though the student/teacher have an outside contact; that doesn't mean the student enjoys the class in which the teacher teaches.

I don't think the teacher decides whether you like the class or not. There is one teacher I don't care for at all but I really like the way he teaches and like what I'm studying--I've never been so regular at turning in my assignment in any other class. Then there's a teacher who I once did like--but after telling me I was a no-good and I'd never make it in life, I lost all respect for him. Now I don't do anything in his class. I dread it everyday. I haven't learned a worthwhile thing all year! A wasted period.

It is important to have student-teacher association. It helps both to feel more ease with each other. The student will more likely have more interest in class. I like the whole idea.

I think it's good to converse out of the classroom!

That teachers should get to know the students better; we aren't as bad as they think. (At least a percentage of us.) I don't think that teachers get to know the students. If there is any kind of non-classroom student-teacher association, the students make the first move. It's more like the students getting to know the teachers.

I feel it is very important. I can see that if good relationships aren't being made it isn't always the teacher's fault. Sometimes when a teacher tries to be friendly, the student just closes him/her off. Sometimes the students resent another student who is close to a lot of teachers, but I don't think that's a problem here. We have excellent people, good Christian men and women working in our school. They don't really have time, I'm sure, for all they'd like to do.
School F

It's better to associate than not to associate.

I enjoy them and I think it does help to be able to meet out of class. And when you get in class they do try harder to please the teacher and learn themselves.

I feel that if the teacher and the student can get to know each other somewhere else besides in the classroom setting, the student will feel that he has a friend in the teacher and will not be afraid to be himself/herself and really try to do his or her best in the class. In this way, the pressure of teacher-student relationships is eased. A teacher can then become a guide and helper to the student, for they now have the right to be two individuals and can work together as a team, both helping each other, and pulling equally. This forms one of the strongest, most helpful relationships for both.

That I think it's important and helps a lot. I have a teacher friend who has helped me a lot and given me good advice and I couldn't have done it without her.

If you want to talk to your teacher go ahead, you have a right to do what ever you want.

I have basically adapted to the type of association I have with the teachers outside the classroom and it is easier for me to attempt greater association.

School G

There should be more of this kind of thing going on.

They need to be improved. I think stronger student/teacher relationships would improve both atmosphere of the school and the overall study habits of the students.

If you know the teacher well you will feel better about the class and you might even do better.

I feel it is very necessary and important. I know it has helped me a lot. I feel fortunate to have gone to this school where student-teacher relations are quite high.

I think it is a very important thing, and it's really great when it takes place.

I think students and teachers should really get to know each other. It really helps in school and you really want to try harder to get good grades.

I feel that when students and teachers get along they do a lot better in their subjects and are more willing to accept help when things get tough.
School G

If you hold a grudge with a teacher, you don't like him—so you won't like what he says.

It is easier to relate to someone you know (or at least know something about). I find I respect teachers who show that they are human (who don't act as if they are too good or too old for students).

I feel that more teachers and students for that matter should take more time and put forth more effort in getting to know each other out of the classroom. Here at _____ we have some great teachers that are just like family; they're friendly, and they really care about you as a student and a friend, about your spiritual life as well as social life. I wish that all our teachers could be this way.

I think it is a very necessary part of schooling.

You have to get along with the teacher to get along in the class.

That I feel that it is very important that students and teachers should get together outside of the class to talk and give advice.

It is good if a student and teacher can be friends outside of class but it isn't good if it affects the way either the student or teacher reacts in class.

I like this sort of association but, too much isn't very good.

If a student needs help I feel the teacher should help him or her in their problem.

Teachers often will participate with students in personal hobbies and introduce a hobby to a student who shows an interest or personal aptitude.

School H

A teacher can change a person's life. A good teacher or a bad teacher both can change a person's life.

Teachers should associate with students in their off-school activities. Then the teacher will experience things with their students and grow closer to them. Most teachers will not associate with students when not in class for various reasons.

Sometimes, the teachers here don't regard us as people who are mature. I feel like I should be treated as an equal, outside of class. Personally I'm sick of being treated like a 12 yr. old. If I myself do something wrong I do not care to be yelled at but rather to discuss it.
While teachers definitely should interact with students, they should not try to come down to our level. A 50-year-old teacher sounds a bit ridiculous using the slang he imagines that we understand, especially since usually that slang is outdated just enough to sound absolutely corny! Also, they need to accept us as intellectuals and not assume that all high-school students have one foot in the door to juvenile hall and the other on a banana peel.

I think that teachers are more worried about the rules and things they have to uphold than anything else.

I think the teachers and students do need to get more involved. There are a select few that have close contact with teachers, but the other "not so special student" is the one that probably needs the most attention. Especially at a boarding academy the teachers need to be more involved with students because of the lack of parents or other adults.

I appreciate that some one is investigating this "problem" with student-teacher relations. I would be interested in the results in what you find, but so many times we never hear any results from things like this. I feel this is somewhat of a problem in academies that could use some attention.

Seems the teacher-student contacts are great.

I feel that there should be more teacher and student non-classroom association. I realize that sometimes teachers are busy, but teachers should make students one of their first priorities. Students sometimes need someone older to talk to, or someplace besides the dorm to just relax. They don't get a chance to get away very often.

I very much enjoy being friends with my teachers and wish we all had more time to do things together. I think the teachers should invite a wider range of students to their homes. Not just the same ones that are involved in everything.

I think it's important.

Teachers should make the first move more often.

All I can say is that I enjoy my non-classroom student/teacher association. I have 3 very special teachers and they always take time for me. But I looked at this survey through the whole student body eyes.

I think that if you know and respect the teachers more you'll want to perform better in their class. The teachers associating with the students won't diminish their respect for them.

It is very important and it can make or break a school. Also the kids feeling loved and cared for while away from home makes for much happier students.
School H

The majority of teachers do smile and are somewhat nice, but they are at the same time impersonal. They tend to avoid speaking to you unless you're very close friends with the family or your parents are very influential in the surrounding community and rich.

I feel very strongly that there is a need for the students and teachers to have more time together outside of class. It always seems to be the teachers against the students. But those feelings are usually felt only towards those teachers who are unfriendly.

It is very important. I believe teachers should try to take the initiative and always be friendly. I don't like the trend toward—teachers get to know the naughty students and give them more attention than the quiet, good student. Although I know it is hard not to do, I don't like teacher's pets. Often the "noisy" kids get privileges, maybe to keep them quiet, while the "good" kids don't.

I usually get along very well with adults, teachers included. The only reason I don't have more teachers as close friends is due to my lack of time and their lack of accessibility.

I feel it is very important for the students and teachers to be close; that's what makes the school a neat place, when it's fun for everybody and everyone can have someone to talk to, and I think it brings the school closer together socially, spiritually, emotionally.

There are two teachers here that really cause a lot of friction with students. They seem to act like everybody is inferior to them. They are always getting upset for little things. They let too many things bother them. They don't seem too happy.

We need a lot more of it!

I get frustrated when the teachers don't take the time for us students; it seems like the only time a teacher or dean and even principal wants you it's 'cause you're in dutch. I feel its so important to have a close relationship with them.

Teachers need to be companions, not authoritative army chiefs like ______.

It is most important for teachers and students to be involved together.

I think the teachers are so worried about getting the kids respect that they forget to see we need social life with them so we can understand that their ways are much easier to understand.

That the teacher should put themselves in cur shoes and be more of a friend and not disciplinarians.

I think a teacher's duty is not only to teach but to get to know the students as people. This way they are more apt to be fair in reacting to student misconduct, bad grades, etc. Because... they really know every one's character.
School H

Just that this survey is a great idea. Keep up the good work!!

I think students and teachers need to be friends. But still have the respect for each other to not use it to one's own advantage. I'm all for student-teacher friendships!

I would encourage it strongly.

I feel it is very important for the student to get along well with the teacher; this situation is more conducive to better studying, and helps both.

The social contact between students and teachers is very important to the student. It means a lot when a teacher cares for you as a person and it also gives them more incentive to put forth their best in the class.

I think there could be more willingness on the teacher's part to help take students off campus because it gets very tiring to be stuck on campus for so long. Many times you try to find someone and all the time they are "too busy".

I believe student-teacher out-of-class association to be vitally important because their relationships should be well-rounded in areas of respect and love. Students need warmth and encouragement as well as instruction. One encourages the other.

Often students are very shy to approach teachers and just ask to talk. I would rather just stay alone and not communicate with teachers rather than approach them and ask to talk.

This last quarter I took a class and the teacher was always saying to have true Christian fellowship with the other sex, meet at faculty's houses on Friday and Sabbath. But we can't; the same group does it every time and they don't invite new people. But all in all they do the best they can I suppose.

Teachers shouldn't look at us students as students but friends. Students should look at faculty with respect and know they are welcome to talk to them most anytime. Students shouldn't feel they are down graded just because they are students which means faculty should always give a feeling of welcome.

There's a difference between favors now and then, treating kids like your own...and allowing your friendship to take away your authority as a teacher. Others lose respect for you. It's hard to play two parts sometimes: teacher and friend. But deep down kids will respect you if you stand for the rules. I appreciate teachers with open minds. Teachers who associate with kids show they're concerned by spending outside time. It's especially vital in a boarding academy.

Teachers shouldn't be partial.
That student-teacher association is very important and people will get along better if they have theirs.

The teacher shouldn't put on an air of superiority so that the students don't want to be around them. If a teacher can show good conduct at social events but at the same time have a good time on the students' level they'll get more respect cause actions speak louder than words.

I think this a very important attribute of a teacher, if he or she can talk and communicate to the students.

The better I know the teacher the easier it is for me to participate in the class.

If students want to learn from any teacher they will in or out of class.

I feel that students and teachers should be more responsive and work together to get to know each other, not just teacher to student--but friend to friend. And should try to cut out the barrier or role that you aren't friends with teachers, and that they're authority therefore you'd rather not be around them too much.

I like it when teachers take time for us. I like to get to know them, they are neat people, too. I do not like "cold" teachers, or ones that put on a front while around kids. We know when they are being fake, they aren't fooling us.

There should be more of it.

I wish more teachers would try to get to know the students more on a friendship level than being authoritative.

I've always wanted to be able to sit down with a teacher I really respect or admire but most of them portray the image: we don't have time, or that they just don't want to. I wish they would ease up.

I think it's very good for students and teachers to be friends outside of the classroom.

I think it is very important to have friendships with teachers!

Many expect teachers to treat and feel the same about all kids. They don't and can't. They're entitled to their friends too, and if it doesn't affect classroom treatment, people should allow teachers to have their friends, even if it is a student.

Teachers should maintain their respect from the kids through a God-fearing spirit!

There are certain teachers here who would not rate up to my overall evaluation of them and there are others I haven't done them justice by this evaluation. The ones who do rate high help make up for the ones who do not.
School H

It makes a big difference in the attitude of the student-body as a whole because student peer-pressure can affect how a teacher exists socially in school. It affects the respect he or she gets and the friction that may occur.

It's a waste of time to answer this questionnaire. Since it will not help the situation. The questions are not valid because of the difference in likes of subject and personality.

If a student likes a certain teacher he usually will be a better student.

They are average!

Teachers should try to have a positive (attitude) impact on their students in and out of class.

School I

I believe that it is more healthy to have out-of-the classroom student-teacher relationships, than to have no relationship at all, because if the students can be friends with the teacher they will respect each other more and therefore the student would have a reason to really work for a good grade and know that the teacher really does care.

I feel that non-classroom student-teacher association is a good thing and that it does help out the student and teacher.

It works.

Teachers are far too afraid to just be our friend. They are afraid we'll loose respect for them. If anything we'd respect them more. I'm outgoing so it's easier for me to make friends with my teachers, but some of the kids need the teachers to make the first moves towards friendship.

The more personal and into the kids themselves the teachers get and show more respect for the kids and be fair, then the kids will respect the teacher much more.

Teachers shouldn't act like kings or like they're too good for socializing with students. They should be their friends and be genuinely interested in kids. They shouldn't gossip among themselves about students' personal lives.

I like best a teacher who makes the students their life and their friends.

Number 31 and 43 are good questions!
School J

We need more of it.

It increases a positive attitude.

I think it's a good idea to develop at least a friendly relationship with teacher and student. I think it would help the student out at least 40 percent more all around.

My feelings are that it's always nice to have a good relationship with your teacher. It would make the students feel a lot better!

School K

Teachers should get more involved with what students are doing and students should get involved in what the teachers are doing.

School L

It is very important for students and teachers to get along. But the teachers still have to be good teachers in order for the students to learn. It doesn't happen automatically because the students and teachers relate well. There are cases in which, for me personally, I really like the person up at the chalk board, but they aren't very good teachers, so I don't get much out of the class. On the other hand, I have really gotten close to some excellent teachers, and it has definitely enhanced my learning experience.

Teachers that are proud in a bad way have poor out-of-class student relations.

That we have a pretty good faculty but there is still quite a bit of static between students and teachers.

I feel very strongly that teachers fear discipline will break down if they get too friendly with the students.

Needs more.

I think that it is good. More teachers should take advantage of the opportunity to get to know their students and know why they react the way they do in various situations.

The teachers we tend to like are closer our own age and they can relate to us.

I think that here at ____ the teachers are not in their offices enough and they are not really trying to reach out to the kids.

If you make the students your friends then they will respect you as a person thus being much more willing to accept what you have to offer.
School L

I feel that it is important for teachers to respect their students and become personal friends with them. I feel they do better all around in school when they like their teacher.

I think it is very important to have non-classroom student-teacher activities. I think the students would have a much better learning attitude if they knew and liked the teacher.

We each have to stick ourselves out in making friends.

There is no genuine interest in students, as an individual, by teachers, who have a "reputation"; there are "favorites" in every class and seem to get more grace. Once you are branded as being loud mouthed it sticks with you.

Should really start having more teacher-student relationships. I feel that the teacher should always make the first move.

I think it is very important that the teacher should at least say "hi" to students in out-of-classroom situations.

I think the advantage of a Christian atmosphere of a school, if one is present, will stem from a unity among people in the school. Inter-personal relationships, devoid of age-prejudices, is the link that makes a school one unit. This school is almost void of this principle. I think this may be reversed if the teachers could be open and honest and a little less judgemental to students. At this age, students need love, acceptance, and a hand behind their back there to catch them if they fall, more than anything else.

I have a lot of teachers who are my friends who I feel super close to. But when I tell my other friends how I feel, they disagree with me because that certain teacher acts really snotty or different to him or her.

If teachers treat students more as a specific individual than just looking at what kind of grade they can get, or how capable they are, things will run a lot smoother.

Teachers ought to be a little more involved.

Teachers should be more involved with students outside of class!

Nonexistent

Student-teacher relationships greatly influence the school morale, which I feel will make everyone feel better and do better, if the relationships are positive ones.

School M

They are enjoyable but not vital for me.
School M

That we really need more. The teachers need to get out with us and really "let their hair down." Then maybe they'd see that we can be fun to be around. Have some faculty vs. students sports, etc.

Teachers seem to think that classroom education is the only aspect of school. I don't see how they could be more wrong. They let classroom work interfere with our education.

It is a good idea. The teachers need to be less stuffy. Our principal encourages teachers to wear ties etc. I don't think this is necessary. When dressed with a tie or in a dress teachers feel less willing to get into activities with the students. Teachers should be encouraged to dress as they like and do what they want.

I wish they would associate with us more but they come down too hard on us about everything. They are cold. They demand respect without earning it first, but to me, it has to be earned.

What are you planning on doing? to make things better? or what?
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