

thought to direct and purposive feeling to impel. We must think of all three viewpoints of a child's total mentality in the attitude of learning something new. And by the same token, it makes the teacher tremble in the face of the tremendous responsibility that lies before her, for the task is not to know and appreciate the working of her own mind in the face of a new problem for her, but the mind of the child in grappling with his problem, not to know, the giver, the questioner, the imparter of knowledge and director of efforts to acquire skill, but rather the child as learner, the child as inquirer, the child in a situation, in which his attitudes, his unformed skills, his developing interests are the one important thing, giving not only a complex to be simplified, but as well, the key to the situation.

The obvious lessons from all this is first; that intelligence testing is not complete mental testing; the value of any scheme of mental testing may be read off by comparing it with the test of free social life itself. Secondly, the testing of information gained is rarely indicative of motivated learning. Thirdly, that testing the school attainments of pupils shows up results that are dependant on many factors besides the mental ability of children, not the least of which is, of course, teaching.

Tests of all sorts are designed to be given either to groups or to individuals. Necessarily, the latter take longer time to administer they bring out a greater variety of individual differences and because they are so intensive they have definite and readily imagined limitations for general application.

Again; group testing may be divided into testing for Range of General Information, and Tests for determining School Attainments. The ordinary school tests, are tests of information in particular subjects. They are our old familiar friends, Examinations, albeit under more controlled conditions, standardized, graded as to difficulty, designed to cover certain fields, and not necessarily intergraded with one another. By the use of these tests we determine how much school children have learned of any school subject, as for example, Arithmetic, Reading, Spelling, Handwriting, English, Composition, Latin and so on.

Teachers ought to be familiar with the Spelling and Handwriting scales of both Dr. L. P. Ayer's of the Rockefeller Foundation and Professor G. L. Thorndike of Columbia University, as well as The Courtis Arithmetic and Geography Scales, the Reading Scales of Professor Grey of the University of Chicago, of Professor Kelly of Kansas City and of Professor Starch of the University of Wisconsin. In fact, nearly all the largest of American City School Administra-

tions and many State Departments of Education employ them for scales, records and rating.*

The best of the literature of this special feature of testing is always well summarized and kept up to date in the new *Journal of Educational Measurements* under the editorship of Prof. C. B. Buckingham, University of Illinois.

In addition to determining the school attainments of pupils it is often found necessary for control or checking purposes, to give a group Range of Information Test. Group tests of this sort offer the best service when such tests are given simultaneously to a large group of children for education purposes so that those children showing widely divergent variations may later be subjected to individual testings. Among the Group Informational tests that are in most general use, are, The Otis Intelligence Tests, published by the World Book Co., Yonkers, N. Y. and Chicago; The Pressey Group Intelligence Scale issued from the Department of Measurements and Statistics of the University of Indiana; The Meyer Group Tests published under the patronage of The Sentinel of Carlisle, Pa., and several others of like character. Some of which are equally serviceable to those mentioned, though less well known.

An easy transition to consider briefly, Tests for Individuals is made for us here through our preceding sketch of Tests of information. It must be remembered that what is desired is to test inherent natural ability. It is perfectly reasonable to make the distinction between actual or potential power, and the use, the training, the exercise to which that power has been subjected. A person may have an excellent mind and that mind may not have been trained to anything but the slightest degree. All sorts of opportunities may have been lacking for training; all degrees of lack of interest may be evidenced during the life history; all sorts of handicaps may have been imposed by life upon the individual. So that the person may be very unskilled and very ignorant, in short this person is considered to have very meagre attainments and little general information, and withal may be the possessor of superior native endowment. Individual tests, then that emphasize amount of information, must be themselves carefully evaluated. Moreover, they may be largely language tests. Therefore, teachers should be on their guard constantly, against a too literal interpretation of the results or findings of all such tests. To supplement this defect Performance Tests are usually added and there is a nearer approach to the common-to-all elements, which are evidence in our psy-

(Continued on page 219)

*Any one desiring sample copies can obtain the same at cost from Educational Review.