



What Some Trade And Industrial Arts Teachers Say

CRESENCIO PERALTA

The facts and figures used in this article were derived from the answers to a questionnaire which 88 industrial arts teachers* from different parts of the country accomplished at our request. At best the facts mentioned are *indicative* of some conditions which exist in some schools, but not necessarily conclusive for all the schools of the country. Even as *indications* these findings are at least symptomatic of conditions which may be true (or not) with the rest of our schools where industrial arts is taught. Symptomatic or not the findings are nevertheless interesting. These findings have a story to tell. Here is the story:

I—Factual data on the Industrial Arts Teachers Involved in this Inquiry

A—*Age range*: This inquiry shows that in this group the youngest industrial arts teacher is 22 years old and the oldest is 61 years old. This is the age distribution picture:

Age	Cases						
61	1	34	—	—	—	—	3
52	1	33	—	—	—	—	1
50	1	32	—	—	—	—	7
44	5	31	—	—	—	—	5
42	3	30	—	—	—	—	6
41	3	29	—	—	—	—	9
40	4	28	—	—	—	—	7
39	5	27	—	—	—	—	2
38	3	26	—	—	—	—	2
37	3	25	—	—	—	—	4
36	5	24	—	—	—	—	3
35	3	23	—	—	—	—	1
		22	—	—	—	—	1

B—*Civil status*: Of the 88 who responded 19 are unmarried and 69 are married. The unmarried ones come from the lower 22-30 age range.

C—*Educational attainment*: This part of the inquiry presents an interesting picture. It revealed that *not* all the teachers who now teach industrial arts were prepared to do so. Here is the random picture:

ETC PNC (and others)	19
Secondary Trade	15

*—Acknowledgement is due Mr. H. Belen, Supervisor, Vocational Education Division, B.P.S, for assistance in securing the data.

Trade, Teachers' Course	12
High School (Academic)	11
Various Trade Technical Courses	11
Bldg. Const. Woodworking	5
Central Luzon Agricultural School	3
Secondary Agriculture	3
Civil Engineering—incomplete	2
Associate in Arts	1
Electricity	1
Bachelor of Sc. in Mech. Engineering	1
Bachelor of Sc. in Education (inc.)	1
Provincial Normal	1
Drafting	1
Dentistry (1st year)	1

D—*Total number of years of teaching experience:* The 88 teachers ranged from 1 to 33 years of teaching experience distributed thus:

<i>Years</i>	<i>Cases</i>		
33 — — — —	1	9 — — — —	2
23 — — — —	1	8 — — — —	2
20 — — — —	1	7 — — — —	2
19 — — — —	1	6 — — — —	4
16 — — — —	1	5 — — — —	8
14 — — — —	2	4 — — — —	10
13 — — — —	1	3 — — — —	16
12 — — — —	1	2 — — — —	13
10 — — — —	5	1 — — — —	15

Incidentally, the above also shows, a sad picture of a big yearly turnover. It appears our industrial arts teachers leave the service for more lucrative jobs when they can find one; they look for "greener pastures" one might say after 8 or 10 years of service in the schools.

E—*Where these teachers teach:* To give the reader an idea of the school levels where the subjects of this inquiry teach the following is presented:

27 teach in barrio schools
39 teach in central schools
7 teach in high schools
15 teach in trade schools

F—*What grades they teach:* This question inescapably follows the preceding one (E) hence these data are included:

Trade Schools (1st—4th yr.)	13
High School (1st—4th yr.)	7
Grade VI	20
Grades V-VI	26
Grade V	8
Grades IV-V	1
Grade IV	6

Grades III-IV	6
Grades I-II	1

Roughly, the foregoing is the composite picture of the 88 industrial arts teachers as far as the items of our inquiry indicate. It is not over-stressing the point when we say that this particular group is a responsible one aside from being fairly representative, to a certain degree, of the rest in the field belonging to the same bigger group: that of industrial arts teachers in our elementary grades.

And now we are ready for the second part of this inquiry: the industrial arts teachers' answers to questions regarding their professional relations with their (a) principals, and (b) supervisors.

II—a. *WHAT SOME INDUSTRIAL ARTS TEACHERS SAY ABOUT THEIR PRINCIPALS*: The following were culled at random from their replies—

She visits the shop just once a year.

She observes me outside of the window, peeping.

He is too ignorant of the improvements in the shop.

Too much favoritism.

He points out the mistakes of teachers directly during meetings.

The principal is a fault-finder.

She gossips about your social standing.

Looking forward for regalos.

Teachers are not consulted in adopting rules and regulations.

Make false comments without actual observations in class.

Make voluntary contributions compulsory.

Scolding or sometimes criticizing teachers in the presence of pupils.

In Form 178 stated that they to do me my work (?) so I work like a carabao.

She overloads the teachers.

Giving destructive criticisms.

Efficiency ratings are kept confidential as such I can't see where I am weak.

Looks upon me as a laborer among teachers.

Gives more attention to the home economics and neglects the shop.

He had marked my efficiency against me for his principal defects (1932).

Favoritism among female teachers.

The head teacher gives work to the shop teacher which are beyond his reach.

Principal teacher assigns building repair work to the shop teacher whose boys are too young for the work.

Vocational teachers are "underlooked" because the H.T. is an academician.

Our principal does not give any opportunity to any barrio teacher to voice his own opinion. No freedom of speech.

I am sometimes belittled by my co-teachers in the field.

Head teacher usually makes up his own program of activities for the whole year without getting the opinion of his teachers.

The principal is sometimes harsh in giving orders. He belittles the shop teacher.

She is bossy.

Her supervision is coercive.

She monopolizes activities that deserve merit; even those outside the school.

Neglects to furnish the necessary materials for her rush work. Not listening to the voice of her subordinates or their suggestions.

He got angry with a teacher and he bowled him out of the office.

Unfair dealings with teachers and pupils. Use of other school incomes such as PTA or other contributions.

Giving destructive instead of constructive criticisms.

Principals are not considerate.

II—b. WHAT SOME INDUSTRIAL ARTS TEACHERS SAY ABOUT THEIR SUPERVISORS: The following were culled at random from their replies—

Looking forward to your faults.

Favoritism.

Acting as if he is a dictator among teachers. He scolds.

Howling and shouting at me in front of pupils and co-teachers.

Discouraging me whenever I ask for help.

Distributing tickets to teachers to be sold and if not all are sold the teacher is required to pay for them.

Our industrial arts supervisor is a fault finder.

Practicing personal equation; revengeful when you get no tips for him.

The supervisor does not have good concept of shop work.

He said to me that I shall be replaced by a normal graduate.

Keeping the teachers long on a Sunday conference.

Dictatorial type in giving assignments.

Scolding teachers during teachers' meetings.

The industrial arts and garden teachers are "underlooked."

They are autocratic.

The district supervisor is cranky; he is selfish in giving help specially to the industrial teacher.

Does not give any advice or suggestion as to the way I did my shop work.

Having no right connections with the supervisor I was stationed in a remote barrio not considering my attainment and eligibility.

III—DID SOME INDUSTRIAL ARTS TEACHERS PUT IN SOME GOOD WORDS FOR THEIR PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORS?

Yes, very few did, and here is what they wrote:

My supervisor is good.

Good relations with my principal.

His administration is good.

My principal has a remarkable character.

He is good in his dealings with us teachers.

He held conferences after observing class.

He is good in teaching the teachers the better methods and principles.

My district supervisor is very democratic.

Our principal is very considerate to his co-teachers.

Our supervisor is kind and faithful to us.

He is all right.

I am good to him because he is good to me.

Industrial arts teachers, or shop teachers, as many are wont to call them are human beings—not beasts of burden. As human beings they react to praise as well as to insult. They experience pain as well as pleasure. They abhor injustice and love fair play. They are first of all human beings and should be treated as such. They are next teachers and as teachers are entitled to all the respect, the consideration, the privileges as well as the rights which teachers of academic subjects are entitled to. They are the equals (if not the betters) of some of their academic colleagues by virtue of their ability to use their hands as well as their heads constructively. They are a silent and humble group—who would rather work and produce instead of lecture and argue. I have yet to meet an arrogant industrial arts teacher!

We tell our pupils of the dignity of labor but fail to accord those who labor with their hands the respect and dignification they deserve. At this point some industrial arts teachers are not themselves blameless. They should so conduct themselves in and out of the school as to command respect and inspire confidence in their ability and work. Their speech, their manner, and their professional contacts should serve to elevate and not misplace them either as individuals or as a group. They should feel that they are the equal of their academic colleagues. They should with dignity stand for their rights and not allow petty school officials to take undue advantage of them in any way.

School officials whose previous training is purely academic will have to go out of their way in trying to sincerely understand the nature and position of industrial arts teachers as contributing members of their staff. Supervising the industrial arts teachers as well as the academic teachers involves the same basic principle: that of *human relations*. Why we go at length in helping academic teachers and yet neglect if not deliberately ignore the industrial arts teachers is indeed not only unprofessional but inhuman. Why don't we give our industrial arts teachers a break? Is this not long over due?