

# Effective way of treating children

According to <sup>the</sup> author, educationists focus on negative effects of not <sup>meddling with</sup> child's affair rather than ~~let~~ <sup>enjoying</sup> ~~them enjoy~~ their company. If children are treated like pets, they would behave in a better way. No kid would like this concept that he <sup>has</sup> to vote or sacrifice his body for someone. Good <sup>teachers</sup> ~~teacher's~~ <sup>interfere</sup> ~~interfere~~ less in child's affair without damaging their mental health. It is impossible for <sup>teachers</sup> ~~teacher~~ who are overworked to have normal love for children. Strict rules cause fatigue and fatigue causes restlessness in kids. There should be ~~no~~ <sup>no</sup> rule about handling of naughty kids rather one should handle them with ~~no~~ <sup>no</sup> care as there is <sup>264</sup> no alternative of love.

Idea is ok. Connectivity is missing. Spelling and grammar mistakes identified.

## Passage.

Examination (CSS) 2019

I think modern educational theorists are inclined to attach too much importance to the negative virtue of not interfering with children, and too little to the positive merit of enjoying their company. If you have the sort of liking for children that many people have for horses or dogs, they will be apt to respond to your suggestions, and to accept prohibitions, perhaps with some good-humoured grumbling, but without resentment. It is no use to have the sort of liking that consists in regarding them as a field for valuable social endeavour, or what amounts to the same thing as an outlet for power-impulses. No child will be grateful for an interest in him that springs from the thought that he will have a vote to be secured for your party or a body to be sacrificed to king and country. The desirable sort of interest is that which consists in spontaneous pleasure in the presence of children, without any ulterior purpose. Teachers who have this quality will seldom need to interfere with children's freedom, but will be able to do so, when necessary, without causing psychological damage.

Unfortunately, it is utterly impossible for over-worked teachers to preserve an instinctive liking for children; they are bound to come to feel towards them as the proverbial confectioner's apprentice does towards macaroons. I do not think that education ought to be anyone's whole profession: it should be undertaken for at most two hours a day by people whose remaining hours are spent away from children. The society of the young is fatiguing, especially when strict discipline is avoided. Fatigue, in the end, produces irritation, which is likely to express itself somehow, whatever theories the harassed teacher may have taught himself or herself to believe. The necessary friendliness cannot be preserved by self-control alone. But where it exists, it should be unnecessary to have rules in advance as to how "naughty" children are to be treated, since impulse is likely to lead to the right decision, and almost any decision will be right if the child feels that you like him. No rules, however wise, are a substitute for affection and tact.