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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Social studies teachers, being mostly concerned with the cultivation of characteristics of the "good democratic citizen" (7), might be expected to deal mainly with problems of cultural identification, civic duties, human relations, and economic responsibilities of individuals in a free society. Besides the transmission of knowledge and information, they hold positions which thus presume to be directly related to the youth's growth in citizenship.

If it can be accepted that the teacher himself has a primary influence upon the actual nature of the learnings of pupils in social studies, then it becomes important to understand what specific effect the social studies teacher's status with respect to critical dimensions of personality would have upon his teaching.

In general, teachers differ in the possession of personal qualities such as emotional behavior, mental ability, academic and professional competence. Presumably each of these would provide a different setting for the teacher's
influence upon the social learning of his pupils. In recent years, one of the focal points of speculation has been concerned with the different effects of "authoritarian," as contrasted with "democratic," teacher personality upon the learning of democratic citizenship by secondary school pupils. Some studies have provided evidence of this relationship (2, 6, 8, 10), while others have found no significant evidence to support a definite point of view (26, 31).

Since the personal characteristics of the teacher are so vitally important and so complex, it seems to be useful to study the specific relationships of the teacher's tendency toward authoritarianism, his philosophy of social education, and his instructional preferences to certain measures related to classroom behavior and thus, indirectly, to classroom learning under his direction.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the present study was to search for:

1. Relationships of certain personal characteristics (authoritarianism, philosophy of social education, and instructional preferences) of a representative group of social studies student teachers to measures respectively
of (a) their classroom behavioral traits, (b) their classroom teaching activities, and (c) their pupils' classroom behavior.

2. Interrelationships among the several measures of personal characteristics of this representative group.

3. Interrelationships among the several measures of the teaching behavior of this representative group.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were investigated by statistical analysis of the data collected.

1. There will be a significant relationship between certain measures of the personal characteristics of social studies student teachers and certain measures of their classroom teaching behavior.

   a. There will be a significant difference between the classroom behavioral traits of "authoritarian" student teachers and those of "nonauthoritarian" student teachers.

   b. There will be a significant difference between the classroom teaching activities of the "authoritarian" student teachers and those of "nonauthoritarian" student teachers.
c. There will be a significant difference between the pupils' behavior in the classrooms of "authoritarian" student teachers and of "nonauthoritarian" student teachers.

d. There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their classroom behavioral traits.

e. There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their classroom teaching activities.

f. There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their pupils' classroom behavior.

g. There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their classroom behavioral traits.

h. There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their classroom teaching activities.

i. There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their pupils' classroom behavior.
2. There will be significant relationships among the "authoritarianism," philosophies of social education, and the stated preferences for instructional procedures of the social studies student teachers.

   a. There will be a significant difference between the philosophies of social education held by "authoritarian" student teachers and by "nonauthoritarian" student teachers.

   b. There will be a significant difference between the stated preferences for instructional procedures of "authoritarian" student teachers and those of "nonauthoritarian" student teachers.

   c. There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their stated preferences for instructional procedures.

3. There will be a significant relationship among the student teachers' classroom behavioral traits, classroom teaching activities, and their pupils' classroom behavior.

   a. There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' classroom behavioral traits and their classroom teaching activities.
b. There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' classroom behavioral traits and their pupils' classroom behavior.

c. There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' classroom teaching activities and their pupils' classroom behavior.

Basic Assumptions

1. It was assumed that the total population of secondary social studies student teachers at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, during the spring term of 1962-63 school year represented a normal population of such individuals as might choose teaching of social studies in secondary schools as a profession.

2. It was assumed that all the measuring instruments used in this study were sufficiently valid and reliable for the purpose of this study.

3. It was assumed that the cooperating teachers were able to report the classroom behavioral traits of student teachers reliably and objectively, using Del Popolo's Observation Check Sheet (8).

4. It was assumed that the student teachers were able to report their own classroom teaching activities
objectively by checking the Self-Check List of Classroom Teaching Activities (Appendix VI).

5. It was assumed that the several measures of teaching behavior were related importantly to the teacher's effect upon the social education of his pupils.

6. It was assumed that other influences upon the students' performance in student teaching (e.g., the cooperating teacher, the school environment, etc.) did not operate in such a manner as to alter the findings of the study.

Limitations of the Study

1. The subjects of this study consisted of sixty-one people who were engaging in student teaching in the field of social sciences at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, during the spring term of the 1962-63 school year.

2. The personality structure studied was limited to a measure of authoritarianism as defined by Webster, Sanford, and Freedman, and as obtained by the use of Instrument in Studying Authoritarianism in Personality (33).

3. Other personal characteristics of subjects studied were limited to an inventory of philosophy of social education constructed for the purpose of this study (Appendix V).
and a measure of preferences for instructional procedures as defined by Patterson's Student's Instructional Preference Scale (22).

4. The student teachers' classroom teaching activities and their pupils' classroom behavior might have been influenced by the cooperating teacher, college coordinator, or other factors in the school environment, and hence the responses obtained or observed might have been influenced. It is assumed, however, that these effects could not have altered significantly the findings of the study.

Definition of Terms

One of the major concerns of this study was the overt manifestation of authoritarianism in personality as measured by Webster, Sanford, and Freedman's New Instrument for Studying Authoritarianism in Personality (33). The theoretical ground of this instrument is based on the general theory of The Authoritarian Personality (1). The terms used in the present study were defined as follows.

1. Authoritarianism.--As defined by the New Instrument included the following variables which go together to form a single syndrome, a more or less enduring structure in the personality.
a. Compulsiveness: Orderliness, carefulness, liking for routine; rigidity; intolerance of ambiguity.

b. Punitive morality (authoritarian aggression): Tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values.

c. Authoritarian submission: Exaggerated respect for parents; exaggerated respect for the state, laws, and prevailing moral agencies; identification with power.

d. Conventionality: Self-righteous moralism; conformity; preference for traditional feminine role.

e. Religious fundamentalism.

f. Anti-intraception: Emotional suppression; ideational suppression; anti-intellectual attitudes.

g. Ego-alien symptomatology.

h. Lack of self-confidence.

i. Cynicism: Generalized hostility, vilification of the human.

j. Projectivity: The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.

k. Romanticism.
1. Circumscribed aggression: Overt but safe aggression; inhibited and transformed aggression.

m. Sense of victimization.

2. Authoritarians.--Those whose authoritarianism scores placed them among the top third of the subject population as measured by Webster, Sanford, and Freedman's New Instrument for Studying Authoritarianism in Personality (33).

3. Nonauthoritarians.--Those whose authoritarianism scores placed them among the lower third of the subject population as measured by the New Instrument.

4. Philosophy of Social Education.--A position between two contrasting philosophical viewpoints (the traditionalist and the progressivist) with respect to the purposes, curriculum, organization, and techniques of teaching of the secondary school social studies program. The traditionalist and progressivist philosophies were defined as follows:

a. Traditionalist philosophy: Traditionalists lean to an idealistic educational philosophy; uphold absolute and eternal truth; emphasize intellectual learning; stress traditional cultural heritage; enhance learning of history; favor more discipline, imposed morality, closely supervised pupil experiences; glorify patriotism. Traditionalists prefer more rigid curriculum; may limit the
scope of social studies to basic principles in each discipline; follow more rigid sequence; adopt more formal, expository discourse and explanation by the instructor; rely more on textbooks or other formal sources of information. The traditionalist teacher would play a dominating role in any teacher-learning situation.

b. Progressivist philosophy: Progressivists lean to a pragmatist educational philosophy; regard truth as relative and individualized; emphasize social experience of pupils; stress social learning; value the personal-social interests and needs of pupils; favor self-imposed discipline, more group process. Progressivists prefer pupil participation in classroom planning. The scope and sequence of social studies program would be more flexible; using more problem-solving methods, panel discussions, individual or group projects. The progressivist teacher tends to act as leader rather than as the source and authority of knowledge.

5. Preference for instructional procedure.--A measure of group-oriented or lecture-oriented instructional preference as defined in Patterson's Student Instructional Preference Scale (22). Patterson defined lecture-oriented and group-oriented instructional methods as follows:
a. Group-oriented instructional method: Group-oriented instructional method may include one or more of the following: panel discussions, committee and individual reports, student-centered method, and the question and answer technique. Group-oriented instructional method may allow for student participation, the class decides upon its own activities, students are encouraged to contribute personal experiences, the instructor accepts student contributions, goals are determined by the class, students evaluate each other with emphasis upon affective and attitudinal change, and there is a de-emphasis of tests and grades.

b. Lecture-oriented instructional method: In the lecture method there is mainly instructor participation, the instructor determines the activities, discussion is kept on course materials, there is regular use of tests and grades, student contribution is evaluated by the instructor, and student participation is encouraged only for the purpose of seeking information from the instructor.

6. Teacher's classroom behavioral traits.--A measure of the possession of those traits which are identified by Del Popolo's Observation Check Sheet for Student Teachers(8)
7. **Pupils' classroom behavior.**—Pupil's behavior as classified and identified by Ryan's *Classroom Observation Record* (25).

8. **Student teachers' classroom teaching activities.**—Teaching activities as identified by the Student Teacher's *Self-Check List of Classroom Teaching Activities* constructed for the purpose of this study (Appendix VII).

9. **Social studies student teacher.**—A student engaged in senior student teaching who was a senior undergraduate or graduate student working for certification under the law of the state of Texas with the first teaching field in social sciences, including history, government, etc.

**Procedures for Collecting and Treating Data**

The subjects included in this study consisted of sixty secondary social studies student teachers at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, during the spring term of the 1962-63 school year. This group included all prospective social studies teachers in this semester with the exception of three. One of those excluded was enrolled in the "reverse" block plan in student teaching; another was allowed only to "observe" in a social studies class.
during the period of student teaching. The third lacked a complete response on one instrument.

The instruments used in this study included the following:

1. Webster, Sanford, and Freedman's New Instrument for Studying Authoritarianism in Personality (33) which was chosen to measure authoritarianism in personality.

2. Philosophy of Social Education Inventory (Appendix VI) which was constructed for the purpose of this study to measure the student teachers' philosophy regarding the secondary social studies program.

3. Patterson's Student Teacher's Instructional Preference Scale (22) which was chosen to measure pre-student teaching attitudes toward classroom instructional methods.

4. Del Popolo's Observation Check Sheet for Student Teachers (8, 9) which was used to obtain supervisory assessments of the classroom behavioral traits of student teachers.

5. Student Teacher's Self-Check List of Classroom Teaching Activities (Appendix VII) which was developed for the use of the student teachers to report their own classroom teaching activities.
6. Nyan's Pupils' Classroom Behavior Record (25)
which was used to record supervisors' judgments of the pupils' behavior in the student teachers' classroom.

The New Instrument, the Philosophy of Social Education Inventory, and the Student's Instructional Preference scale were distributed to all the subjects individually at the beginning of this study. The Observation Check Sheet for Student Teachers was mailed or passed through the college coordinators to the cooperating teachers for their execution. The Pupils' Classroom Behavior Observation Record was given to the college coordinators to record their accumulated impression of the pupils' behavior during their regular visitations with their student teachers. The Student Teacher's Self-Check List of Classroom Teaching Activities was distributed among the student teachers after they had completed their student teaching or during the last weeks of their scheduled student teaching.

After the data had been collected and the appropriate mean scores compared, each hypothesis was tested by t test and/or by simple correlation to determine the significance of difference or significant relationship as the case warranted. The methods and procedure used in this study
will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter III. The data collected will be reported and analyzed in Chapter IV.

Significance of the Study

In recent years, citizenship education has been a major concern in a number of extensive studies (23, pp. 18-22). The unique responsibilities of social studies teachers, and their personal, social, and professional qualities have been widely discussed and emphasized. Among all of the theoretical explorations, one of the most persistent speculations is that in education, especially in citizenship education, the personality of teachers may play an important role in the development of desirable character and attitudes of the pupils. Quillen and Hanna state:

In the life of the classroom and school, the example of the teacher is paramount. Good models inspire emulation and improvement, and the personal integrity, knowledge, and ideals which a teacher expresses in his relationships with his students affect their development strongly. Thus, the teacher who hopes to show his students the worth of their heritage and to fit them for the role they will play in the future should try to exemplify the qualities of mind and character he is seeking to develop in them (23, p. 56).

Commenting on the same subject, Beck, Cook, and Kearney said that "any class contains individuals whose feelings for each other make up an atmosphere. The teacher
is the most influential personality in this group." (3, p. 82). Thompson also asserted that:

"... there are many different kinds of social influences within the classroom, the teacher's behavior tends to establish the keynote of this "social climate." The teacher like any other person has a complex personality. His psychological needs, attitudes, conflicts and personal-social values are transmitted into behavior patterns which become potent influences on his pupils' growth (29, p. 529).

It is asserted, however, that it takes a democratic teacher, or at least that it is more desirable to have a democratic teacher, to teach democratic values to the children. Since the publication of The Authoritarian Personality (1) in 1950, its instrument (the F Scale) has been widely used in psychological and educational studies (31). However, while studies using this instrument or others have yielded some definite evidence in confirming the importance of teachers' personality upon the learning and attitude of the learner, the findings are far from being conclusive and they are sometimes even contradictory to each other (27, 31).

It is largely uncertain as to what extent the so-called authoritarian aspect of the personality is related to the beliefs, behavior, and effectiveness of social
studies teachers. It is also uncertain how the teacher's philosophy of social education or his preferences for instructional procedures would be related to his pupils' responses. On the one hand, studies by Taba (28), Washburne and Hel (32), Anderson and Brewer (2), Cogan (6), and others have shown that the teacher's personality has a clear and measurable effect on the progress of pupils academically and socially, and that pupils under more liberal teachers tend to undergo more desirable changes in attitude. If such a conclusion is true, it is, therefore, of utmost importance to identify and/or to encourage the development of democratically desirable personal traits in prospective social studies teachers. As Torgerson indicates, a study of such factors is "a challenging problem that may throw considerable light on the problem of measuring teaching success" (30, p. 246) and, as with Quillen and Hanna, "in the students' growth in citizenship" (23, p. 26).

However, because of the complexity of this problem, the present study was concerned only with the relationship between the specific dimensions of "authoritarianism-democracy" in personality, "traditionalism-progressivism"
in philosophy of social education, and "lecture-group orienteeess" in instructional preferences, on the one hand, and certain measures related to teaching behavior on the other. If significant relationships could be found between such personal characteristics of teachers and such variables of teaching performance, it would provide some very useful additional evidence leading to the improvement of prediction of performance and it could facilitate teacher education in the improvement of the screening, preparation, and placement of prospective social studies teachers.
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CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

There is a considerable amount of literature related to this study, since it is concerned with several areas of investigation. For the purpose of this study, however, the related literature reviewed briefly is limited to only three areas of major concern; e.g. (1) the objectives of social education, (2) personality as related to teacher behavior, and (3) the impact of teacher personality upon learning.

Objectives of Social Education

Objectives of social education emerge from objective analysis of subjective value judgment. The statements of such objectives have been long, numerous, and diverse. In addition to formal statements from academic or professional organizations, objectives have often been stated in the content of courses of study, textbooks, examinations, and other writings of a personal nature, mostly with highly theoretical or philosophical overtones. This survey of literature is limited to the objectives of social
education in general and some specific aims of social studies programs in the secondary schools in particular. Objectives of social education from specific philosophical points of view are not included for examination.

In the history of public controversy over the schools, one is struck by the persistence of public concern with the social studies. In a monumental investigation of social education by a committee of the American Historical Association, Horn points out some of the real issues involved in a social studies program in the schools:

There are real issues, the most vital of which are: First, shall the schools set up a social program and attempt to realize it through the inculcation and control of attitudes, habits, knowledge, pattern of thought, and value norms; e.g., shall they inculcate "sound" doctrines? Second, shall controversial issues be studied; and if so, by what methods? Third, shall freedom of teaching and discussion prevail? Fourth, shall the schools teach pupils what to think or how to think? Fifth, shall symbolism, slogans, conditioning, or emotional appeal be utilized; and if so, in what manner? (39, pp. 83-96).

These issues are obviously so closely interrelated that a decision on any one of them must influence the decisions on all the others and thus basically affect the objectives of social education in the community or the school. Historically, summaries of stated objectives of social education studied in chronological order have
revealed trends in educational philosophy as it has im-
inged upon the role claimed for social studies. Carr
and Wesley said:

A tabulation of the aims of teaching civics
during the period from 1897 to 1925 shows a decline
in emphasis on understanding the structure of
government and a corresponding increase on the
functions of government and the training of citi-
zens. Between 1888 and 1927 the aims in teaching
history shifted their focus from information and
mental discipline to citizenship. In the same
period there was an increased emphasis on the
"social aims" of American history and upon the
objective to "understand the present in the light
of the past" (18, p. 1218).

The trend towards the emphasis on citizenship has
been continued and accelerated especially since the Second
World War. In 1950, the National Council for the Social
Studies issued a report listing twenty-four characteristics
of "the good democratic citizen" (23). The report
was developed with elaborate process at the request of the
Armed Forces Information and Education Division, Department
of Defense. The implication of this report is that the
aims of social education should be the cultivation of such
characteristics in each individual citizen.

The Educational Policies Commission of National Edu-
cation Association published in 1938 The Purpose of Educa-
tion in American Democracy which was intended to apply to
the entire educational program, but had specific implications in social education. The goals are grouped under four headings: "the objectives of self-realization," "the objectives of human relationship," "the objectives of economic efficiency," and "the objectives of civic responsibilities" (27, pp. 212-247). This statement has been widely quoted (58, 68) and, based on this statement, a statewide committee in California drafted the "Framework for Public Education in California" with similar headings and specific aims (68).

Probably the most ambitious postwar endeavor in social education was the Citizenship Education Project of Teachers College, Columbia University. This project listed some basic "Premises of American Liberty" under the titles such as "the free individual," "the free government," "the free economy," and "the free world," with specific beliefs and responsibilities noted with reference to each. The classroom implications of this study were developed with exhaustive experimental effort and documentation. At the outset of the study it was asserted that:

... good citizens are people who actively carry out their responsibilities as citizens. They understand the premises which are basic to American liberty.
They use their understanding of these premises to guide their thinking, their action, and their concern with civic affairs (67).

The general objectives of social education are indeed too numerous to mention. Clarke (20, pp. 150-152) listed "the integration of the individual in his relationship with the social environment," "competence in interpersonal relationships," and "effective membership in American institutional life" as the "three essential areas of social learning." An examination of articles and courses of study reveals considerable unanimity and a great overlapping of stated general objectives for most of the social studies offerings. Carr and Wesley made a general list of commonly accepted objectives of the social studies field, worded in terms of pupil purposes:

1. To respect the rights and opinions of others
2. To be skillful in securing, sifting, evaluating, organizing, and presenting information
3. To assume social and civic responsibility
4. To act in accord with democratic principles and values
5. To become a judicious consumer
6. To understand principal economic, social, and political problems
7. To learn about vocational activities and opportunities
8. To understand the interdependence of peoples and groups
9. To become a happy member of a home
10. To make intelligent adjustment to change
11. To get along with individuals and groups
12. To use basic social-studies skills
13. To exercise critical judgment
14. To understand and promote social progress (18, p. 1219; 37, p. 1298).

Several types of research dealing with objectives of social studies other than formulations of statements of purposes by professional or academic organizations have been undertaken. As early as 1928, Miller (68, p. 60) attempted to establish the relative importance of different objectives of history teaching during the period from 1888 to 1927 by tabulating them in order of frequency of mention in textbooks, committee reports, association proceedings, and professional articles. He found objectives in the following ten groups most frequently stated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To discipline the mind . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To promote social efficiency . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To explain the present in the light of the past, . . . . . . .</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To understand the development concept in history. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To give ethical training . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To give training in simple historical research . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To inculcate ideas of patriotism . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To train for citizenship . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. To give cultural training. . . . . . 66

10. To promote tolerance . . . . . . . . . 56

However, all the objectives on this list are very broadly stated, and their focus is on the teacher rather than on the student. Furthermore, the emphasis in recent years has been moved away from this rather traditional position (18, p. 1218).

Another type of investigation dealing with objectives has been concerned with the "import of social forces in determining social-studies aims." Keesecker (45), for example, has summarized some evidence in ascertaining the role of legislative requirements in establishing the objectives and program of the social studies.

A third type of study concerning objectives has been the effort to bridge the gap between theory and practices. In an attempt to find whether social studies objectives can be accomplished with textbooks, Samford (73) analyzed such objectives as were found in current periodical literature, in courses of study, in curriculum guides, and in methods books. His study included fifty elementary-school and fifty secondary-school social studies texts, some of which he found did appear to offer support to the accomplishment of these aims, while others did not. Bradfield (15)
found that most of the stated objectives for the social studies in courses of study were content centered and that there was a great disparity between stated aims and suggested learning activities and a need for much more selectivity.

In confirming Bradfield's findings, Quillen and Hanna listed several reasons to show "why statements of objectives have generally failed in the past to have much influence over classroom procedure":

... They were often so vague that they were difficult to understand; so long and unwieldy that they were discouraging to read; and so general that they were almost impossible to apply. In addition, they tended to remain static and thus failed to keep up with changing conditions, and since neither the teacher nor the students had a part in formulating them, they often bore little relation to actual classroom situations. Even at their best, they were seldom stated in behavioral terms and therefore offered little real help to teachers (68, p. 62).

Thus, Quillen and Hanna continued to suggest that:

If objectives are to be useful to administrators, teachers, and students, they must be carefully formulated with regard to the school's philosophy, contemporary culture, and democratic principles. Objectives should be formulated by those who will use them, stated in behavioral terms, and arranged in meaningful classifications. Only then will they be able to influence the subject matter, activities, teaching techniques, evaluation methods, and progress reports of the school (68, p. 74).
It seems to be agreed in general, at least among most writers active in secondary social education, that objectives of social studies should be defined behaviorally (68); be able to be practiced in classroom procedure (53); be related to subject matter, methods, organization, and evaluation (88); and, most important of all, be able to cultivate good citizenship (23).

Personality as Related to Teacher Behavior

In recent years, there has been an emergent recognition on the part of educators that the personality of a teacher and his attitude toward and understanding of children are of paramount importance for the total social and emotional growth and adjustment of his pupils. It is because of this new emphasis on the teaching personality that a considerable body of literature is available. One of the very recent publications puts the focus on the personality of the teacher in this way:

Individuals achieve as educators because of the persons they are quite as much as because of the technical knowledge and skills they possess. What the professional teacher is and does as a person is a dynamic factor in every educational function that he carries out. His effect upon others is contingent upon his behavior as a person. This applies not only to the direct teaching function but to the esteem in which the teaching
profession is held and the educator's role as a citizen contributing to the education and improvement of society. Being an educated person, then, for the professional educator means:

Focus on a personality and what the professional educator is and does as a person—his attitudes, ethical standards and value commitments, life-shaping attitudes, mental health, and self-understanding (55, p. 27).

In emphasizing the importance of the teacher, Hook said:

The function of the teacher is among the most important in our culture. He not only transmits essential knowledge and skills but, when he takes his calling seriously, strongly influences the formation of habits and the development of a philosophy of life (38, p. 221).

Bernard went further to state:

"As the teacher, so is the school." The oft repeated statement is coming to have increasing significance, as study after study confirms and reconfirms it. Despite the beautiful school buildings, up-to-date textbooks, liberal laboratory facilities, abundant instructional aids, and huge libraries, Mark Hopkins's definition of a school is still noteworthy; i.e., a school is a log with a teacher at one end and a pupil on the other. The best facilities count for little if the teachers are inadequate in personality or preparation—but particularly are inadequate in personality factors (11, p. 127).

Based on the hypothesis that "manner of teaching is an expression of the teacher's basic personality reactions, and that these reactions constitute the core of teaching behavior in the classroom situation," Symonds made an
exploratory intensive study based on observations, interviews, and tests of nineteen teachers to determine the relations between the manner of teaching and personality and came to this conclusion:

"... Teaching is essentially an expression of personality. The teacher adapts himself to teaching in a manner that is harmonious with his expressions toward life situations in general. Methods and procedures learned during college preparations may influence teaching superficially but they do not determine the nature of the relation of a teacher to his pupils or the teacher's basic attitude toward teaching (80, pp. 223-236).

Bricker expressed very much the same idea, when he said:

Whatever the personality of the teacher he cannot teach without expressing it. What he expresses will emphasize some traits in his pupils and reduce others. Identification between teacher and pupils and between pupils will vary in their form and degree largely in terms of what preferences the teacher, perhaps unconsciously indicates (44, p. 42).

A critical and comparative study made by Kliassen and Martin of factors related to teacher success in 1937-1939 and 1940-1943 also confirmed the emphasis on teacher personality:

A comparative study of the factors related to teachers now (1940-43) and three years ago (1937-39) show more emphasis on traits, and there is also a noticeable shift to personality as the most significant factor in determining teacher success (47, p. 122).
In a study to determine the relationship between personality characteristics and teacher attitudes, LaBue said:

All institutions educating teachers must continue to give attention to the assessment of the personality of prospective teachers. Those with maladjusted personalities irrespective of the amount of professional information they possess have no place in the classroom (50, p. 437).

After an examination of significant factors in teachers' classroom attitudes, Cook suggested:

A teacher who has an excellent knowledge of the principles related to educational psychology, child development and child behavior may obtain a high score on the MTAI, but the possession of undesirable personality characteristics may preclude his working effectively with students in the classroom situation (22, p. 279).

As one of the pioneers in the study of teacher-pupil relationships, Baxter dramatized the importance of the teacher's personality when she said:

Every classroom has an atmosphere created by the interaction of personalities which is either conducive or detrimental to the best all-around development of children. Since behavior is learned, the manner in which the child learns to conduct himself in the classroom contributes directly to his total behavior as a person. In school pupils acquire not only habits of work and study but also ways of reacting to others. They form attitudes about themselves and about others which are basic to subsequent living (9, p. 75).
Other writings and studies might be cited to stress the same point. Hillway, for instance, listed personality as the first among seven characteristics which "many educators believe make for success" for teachers in the junior colleges (37, p. 189). Michener listed "good teaching personality" as one of the five elements for "unusual success in teaching" (66, p. 6). As summarized by Knapp, the studies by R. J. Clinton, Bousfield, Trabue considered "personality" as one of the most important characteristics of superior teachers; the studies by Kelly, Knapp and Goodrich, Guthrie, Bogardus, Maslow and Zimmerman also stressed "personal factors" as "attributes of teachers of known or acknowledged distinction" (74, pp. 303-305). Amatora stated clearly and simply: "What the teacher is and what he does carries far more weight in the child's mind than what he says" (2, p. 9). Bernard also remarked that "one teaches what he is perhaps even more than he teaches what he says" (11, p. 129).

This limited number of studies may suffice to support the contention that there is much agreement on the importance of the teacher's personality. But there is less agreement as to what is a "good teaching personality" or whether one type of personality is better than any other.
Peek, for instance, in a part of a long range study, found that there is no one pattern of the "good teacher."

In his study involving sixty-nine women elementary education majors, although he found that some girls "should not enter teaching," because "they are too confused and hostile to do other than disturb children and actively interfere with their learning," he yet found various behavior patterns among good teachers:

Some are warmly friendly, a few are firmly impersonal; some are gaily outgoing, some are calmly reserved; some put their major emphasis on intellectual clarity and skill; some put it on building friendly, encouraging personal relationships with colleagues and pupils (none chooses one of these goals to the exclusion of the other) (66, pp. 173-174).

In general, however, some traits have been more frequently mentioned or stressed as more desirable than others. Bagley and Alexander listed ten individual characteristics as the ingredients which make up a "good teaching personality":

1. Reverence for truth
2. Intelligent optimism
3. Social altruism
4. Sympathy
5. Impartiality
6. Progressiveness
7. Interpretive mind
8. Curiosity
9. Culture
10. Imagination (6, p. 272).
Binning and Binning grouped personality elements of a good teacher into three major divisions:

(1) Physical aspects - personal appearance, recognition of amenities of life and so on. (2) Passive virtues - friendliness, sympathy and understanding, sincerity, tact, fairness, self-control, optimism, enthusiasm, patience. (3) Executive abilities - self-confidence and self-reliance, initiative, adaptability and resourcefulness, organizing ability, directive ability, industry (12, p. 192).

Sachry listed "ten frequently mentioned teacher traits" as follows:

(1) Cooperative, democratic attitude; (2) wide interest; (3) patient, kindly, sympathetic; (4) consideration for the individual; (5) pleasing personal appearance; (6) fairness; (7) sense of humor; (8) adaptability and flexibility; (9) good discipline and constant behavior and (10) friendly (90, p. 10).

Kearns listed eleven elements of "an integrating personality of a teacher":

(1) Basic democratic values, (2) good health, (3) communicative ability, (4) socially accepted ethical and moral code, (5) desirable person to person relationship, (6) participating group membership, (7) good intergroup relations, (8) intellectual power, (9) aesthetic expression and appreciation, (10) problem-solving techniques, and (11) social sensibility (45).

Barr and others in a tabular summary based on a comprehensive compilation listed personality qualities which are essential to teaching success as resourcefulness, emotional stability, considerateness, buoyancy, objectivity,
drive, attractiveness, refinement, cooperativeness, reliability. They also found that out of thirty-six personality traits in nineteen studies, all but two traits were positively related to teaching success (7, pp. 1499-1451).

Almost all of these studies were concerned primarily with the desirable traits for all teachers in general. However, in the field of social studies, some unique qualities of the teacher have specifically been mentioned.

Quillen and Hanna asserted that:

Probably no other teacher must be so well qualified in so many areas as the social studies teacher. To be effective, he must have a broad background of knowledge in many fields and be able to understand new situations and problems as they arise. He must have depth as well as breadth of knowledge. He must understand and be able to promote good human relations, and he must know how to stimulate critical thought in young people. Finally, he must possess personal integrity in the highest degree (68, p. 26).

Young people want teachers who are friendly, who like and understand them, who have a sense of humor, and who are happy and cheerful. They appreciate teachers who are well groomed, poised, cultured, and mature in their emotional responses. Because young people learn good citizenship partly from copying good models, the social studies teacher must be the kind of citizen he hopes to develop (68, p. 27).

Wesley and Wrongsik suggested that "the social studies teacher is or should be well informed, fair-minded, and communicative person" and that "in a democracy the teacher
must labor diligently to see that objectivity, honesty, impartiality, and co-operative spirit prevail" (89, p. 5).

At this point, a critical question must be raised as to what type of teacher personality possesses such desirable qualities. The answer, as pointed out by Kvaraceus, is a "democratic personality" as opposed to an "authoritarian personality" (49). On the other hand, in a classroom situation there is always a tendency toward being authoritarian. This tendency has been very well described by Stagner:

... This is true not only because the teacher presumably knows more than the students and is in a better position to decide what they need to know; it also follows because authoritarianism maintains the pattern, provides some substitute balm for the teacher's ego, and is less difficult than handling the class democratically (77, p. 452).

In consideration of such tendencies, personality structure would seem to be of primary importance in the preparation of teachers, especially the social studies teacher. With this in mind, Grambs projected a social education blueprint for the future:

... Only the liberated person can attempt to lead others toward the free life. Careful assessment will be made of the future social studies teacher to make sure that this person is a continuing learner, that he has a secure and guiding ethical system, that he has enough of the rebel to question and enough of
the conservative to provide security and support. This future teacher will have been exposed to children and adolescents in enough different situations . . . so that he and his instructors will know whether he can stand young people in continual daily association (35, pp. 276-277).

Aside from the impact of the teacher's personality upon the learning and attitudes of the students (this will be examined in the next section), some studies have found some evidence to show that the authoritarian teachers are less liked by their peers and that they are less favored by college students. In an experimental study, Frymier found that "authoritarians tend to be rejected by their peers. Authoritarians apparently are perceived as being less desirable. . . than non-authoritarians" (31, pp. 31-34). Maney conducted a study to ascertain the "popularity" of the authoritarian and democratic teachers by means of student evaluation, her major conclusion being that:

. . . Regardless of their own beliefs, students in this population tend to reject teachers whose personality make-up is such that they are disposed to express or act on the basis of autocratic ideas, as well as to uncritically support the ingroup authorities and to relate in status rather than in personal terms (56, p. 231).

Since the "democratic personality" of the individual appears to be important in his interpersonal relationships, the difference between the "democratic" and "authoritarian"
or "autocratic" personality has been subject to some extensive study. The Authoritarian Personality (1) has provided a very comprehensive description of the authoritarian in terms of his ideology, ethnocentrism, political and economic philosophy, and some other psychological manifestations. Rokeach (70) has provided some insight on some aspects of the authoritarian in terms of open and closed belief-disbelief systems. Webster, Sanford, and Freedman (88) have amplified some specifics in constructing the New Instrument in Studying Authoritarianism in Personality. Scodel and Mussen (76) have described authoritarian personality as "rigid, extrapestive, repressed, conforming, stereotypical in thinking and intolerant of ambiguity" and their study found specifically that "non-authoritarian individuals do, in fact, make more accurate judgment about non-authoritarians than authoritarians do about non-authoritarians." In general, they found that authoritarians are more restricted than non-authoritarians in their social perception. Jones' study seems to confirm that of Scodel and Mussen:

1. In the perception and judgment of others, authoritarians seem to be more insensitive than non-authoritarians to the psychological or personality characteristics
of others. Authoritarians may be more sensitive to such external variables as social status or position ... 2. Authoritarians show a greater tendency than non-authoritarians to differentiate the social environment in terms of power-related concepts, in spite of their reduced sensitivity to variations in personal power per se. 3. ... Authoritarians tend to be more positively evaluative of the leader than non-authoritarians, regardless of the leader's specific characteristics. 4. Authoritarians prefer autocratic leadership whereas non-authoritarians prefer democratic leadership in a military setting ... (41, p. 127).

From a "world view" (Weltanschauung), Maslow described the authoritarian character structure as an interaction of psychological and sociological concepts. According to him, the basic philosophy of the authoritarian person conceives the world as a sort of "jungle," in which man's hand is necessarily against every other man's. Authoritarians tend to regard as important the existence of a hierarchy, generalized in "superiority-inferiority" terms; tend to have strong drive for power; tend to have relatively pronounced hostility, hatred, prejudice "against some group or another"; tend to formulate judgments by externals rather than by internals; tend to have a single scale of values; tend to identify kindness with weakness; tend to use people; tend to have
a sadistic-masochistic inclination, and to have guilt feelings and conflicts (58, pp. 401-411).

In a doctoral study of decisional behavior of teachers, Stally was able to find some contrasting differences between the highly authoritarian teachers and less authoritarian ones:

1. Teachers who more frequently say they would punish the pupil in a disciplinary situation tend to be more authoritarian (as measured by the F Scale), to have more negative attitudes toward school-related objects (as measured by the MTAI), to perceive other persons less frequently in negative terms (as measured by Rep Test), and tend to be younger.

2. Teachers who more frequently say they would use verbal appeal to pupils to conform in a disciplinary situation tend to be more authoritarian, to perceive others less frequently in negative terms.

3. Teachers who more frequently say they would seek additional information in seeking a solution to disciplinary situations tend to be less authoritarian, to have more positive attitudes toward school-related objects, and to be older.

4. There is a rather marked positive relationship between authoritarianism and negative attitudes toward school-related objects.

5. The more highly authoritarian teachers tend to perceive other persons less frequently in negative terms and more frequently in superficial, impersonal terms (78, pp. 1090-1091).

In an attempt to identify some observable teacher behavior, some interesting studies have been undertaken (32, 71, 72). However the behaviors were classified in more than two dimensions. Ryans and Wandt did a factor analysis
of observed teacher behaviors in secondary schools and obtained evidence of the existence of five independent qualities:

1. Sociable and understanding in dealing with students
2. Business-like, organized, and responsible
3. Encouraging to student participation, challenging, and interesting
4. Enthusiastic, reactive, buoyant, and excitable
5. Open-minded, original, tolerant, and democratic
6. Manifesting superficial appearance of the teacher (72).

In a similar study of college teachers, Gibb identified four factors or dimensions as follows:

1. Friendly, democratic behavior
2. Communicative behavior
3. Systematic, organized behavior
4. Academic emphasis behavior (32).

Similarly, the Teacher Characteristics Study identified three major clusters of observable teacher behaviors which were accorded primary attention throughout the research and served as criteria in the effort of the study to determine correlates of teacher behavior in the classroom.
These three principal dimensions, or criteria, of teacher classroom behavior were:

- **TCS Pattern Xo**: understanding, friendly vs. aloof, egocentric, restricted teacher behavior
- **TCS Pattern Yo**: responsible, businesslike, systematic vs. evading, unplanned, slipshod teacher behavior
- **TCS Pattern Zo**: stimulating, imaginative, surgent or enthusiastic vs. dull, routine teacher behavior (71, p. 77).

The specific teacher behaviors which were observed were divided into eighteen dimensions clustered around these three patterns. These dimensions are: partial-fair; autocratic-democratic; aloof-responsive; restricted-understanding; harsh-kindly; dull-stimulating; stereotyped-original; apathetic-alert; unimpressive-attractive; evading-responsible; erratic-steady; excitable-poised; uncertain-confident; disorganized-systematic; inflexible-adaptable; pessimistic-optimistic; immature-integrated and narrow-broad (71, pp. 86-92).

In a more simplified approach, Beck, Cook and Kearney (10) used the adjectives, autocratic (authoritarian) and democratic, to distinguish general tendencies of a teacher on the theory that a teacher who is "generally democratic" will display attitudes and behavior patterns clearly different from those of the authoritarian-autocratic
teacher. At the same time they insisted that few teachers would be described as thoroughgoing autocratic or democratic teachers. "It is a question of which set of traits shows up most frequently in our attitudes and behavior" (10, p. 81). They described the behavior of the autocratic and democratic teachers in some detail:

I. The autocratic (authoritarian) teacher

The autocratic (authoritarian) teacher attempts to dominate whenever possible. When he succeeds, the probable result is a classroom atmosphere marked by tenseness, fear, and submission. If he fails and, as a result, allows himself to grow nervous, fearful, and distraught, students will be quick to recognize his confusion and will become restless, inattentive, and disrespectful. . . . The teacher tends to think in terms of his status, his judgment, and the subject matter to be covered, rather than in terms of what the pupil feels, knows, and can do, and what is essential to his development.

The extremely autocratic teacher is insecure in his social relations. He has never developed attitudes and graces that insure his success in normal social intercourse. . . . He is not comfortable in an equalitarian atmosphere. . . . He has developed an aggressive attitude that takes the form of general hostility toward people. . . . He believes that most children are disobedient (they are, with him), but do not appreciate what is done for them, cannot be trusted, and in class are continuously conspiring against him. . . . It is difficult for him to find security in his relations with other people, so he seeks refuge in asserting his power and authority.

Security through virtue. . . . The authoritarian teacher holds rigidly to the obvious conventional standards and values. . . . He regards all misbehavior as a serious threat to his security so he is
compelled to seek out, condemn, and punish severely anyone who violates a rule. There is little sense of humor in this teacher, but there is a strong sense of duty combined with a perverted sense of justice... 

The authoritarian teacher is disposed to think in rigid, "all or none," "black or white" categories... and that he is always and unquestionably in the right...

Security through position and power. Power and position are needed by the authoritarian personality...

Regarding authority as he does, he is often submissive and uncritical toward authority from above and domineering and overbearing toward subordinates and pupils.

Security through knowledge of subject matter.
The authoritarian teacher often seeks security through developing his knowledge of subject matter. He is likely to assert that if one knows his subject, little else matters in teaching, and he is prone to believe that a teacher should never acknowledge his ignorance of a topic in the presence of his pupils...

II. The democratic personality

The single most important factor in creating a democratic social atmosphere in a classroom is the personality of the teacher. (This was true of the autocratic teacher and classroom, as well.) The democratic teacher has a deep affection for people and confidence in them. He is sensitive to the feelings of others, and his greatest satisfaction comes from working to further their welfare. Being neither a reformer nor a perfectionist, he accepts himself and his limitations and is willing to accept others on the same basis. He is slow to condemn and quick to forgive and accepts criticism objectively without becoming emotionally upset. Because he feels secure in his social relations, he is not greatly concerned with his status as such. The virtues he deems most important are those that contribute to harmonious and satisfying social relations. He recognizes that any form of behavior carried to excess may be harmful. Being secure, he seeks adventure and welcomes the imaginative, the creative, and the innovative.
The democratic teacher (unlike his opposite, the
authoritarian) is less inclined to be impressed by titles, degrees, or position. Also, he seeks ideas from the most humble, tries to establish what is true, and expects people to listen to him not because of his position but because of what he says. He remembers that subject matter is only a part, though a valuable part, of the learning process and of the educational development of the child (10, pp. 83-85).

A similar categorization of teacher behavior into a dichotomy was attempted in a series of studies by Anderson and Brewer (3, 4, 5). Teacher behavior was classified as dominative vs. integrative. Dominative behavior was defined as:

... the use of force, commands, threats, shame, blame, attacks against the personal status of an individual. ... It is characterized by a rigidity or inflexibility of purpose, by an inability or an unwillingness to admit the contribution of another's experience, desires, purposes, or judgment in the determining of the goals which concerns others. Domination is thus behavior that is based partly on a failure to admit the psychological inevitability of individual differences. Domination may therefore be regarded also as a frustration of the behavior of someone else. As such it tends to obstruct the spontaneous behavior of another, domination is the antitheses of the scientific attitude; it is an expression of resistance against change; it is consistent with bigotry and with autocracy. It is the technique of a dictatorship (3, p. 152).

In integrating behavior, on the other hand, "one asks for responses accompanied by explanation which makes the request meaningful to the other so that the other can
voluntarily co-operate." Such behavior is to a certain extent a matter of seeking and

... discovering common purposes. For such expenditure of energy in common purposes, for an attempt to reduce instead of augment or incite conflict, the term socially integrative behavior is used. A person changing his mind when confronted with new evidence which has grown out of the experience of another is said to be integrating differences. Integrating behavior is ... consistent with concepts of growth and learning. It makes allowance in one's own behavior for differences in the others. Whereas domination stifles or frustrates individual differences, socially integrative behavior promotes the interplay of differences, advances the psychological processes of differentiation, facilitates the emergence of originals. Integrative behavior is flexible, adaptive, objective, scientific, co-operative. It is an expression of the operation of democratic personal processes (4, p. 124).

It was also pointed out in many studies that the question of dominative vs. integrative tendencies is not limited to teachers and pupils.

They are current issues between school teachers and school administrators, between university professors and university administrators, and between employers and employees. They are present in all social relationships (75, p. 225).

The basic conclusion, however, is that the authoritarian personality tends to lead to more dominative behavior and the democratic personality tends to manifest more socially integrative behavior. In an attempt to investigate the relationship between an individual's personality structure
and his opinions and attitudes toward pupil-teacher relationships and his observable behavioral traits in a classroom setting, Del Popolo (25, 26) found some evidence which in general tends to support this position:

The investigation lent support to the main hypothesis that a significant relationship exists between an individual's personality structure and his opinions and attitudes toward pupil-teacher relationships and his observable traits in a classroom setting.

Authoritarian student teachers tend to get significantly lower scores than equalitarian student teachers on an inventory of attitudes and opinions about pupil-teacher relationships.

Authoritarian students tend to display behavioral traits during student teaching which imply an inability to establish harmonious pupil-teacher relationships. On the other hand, equalitarian students tend to display behavioral traits which are felt to be conducive toward the establishment of harmonious pupil-teacher relationships (25, pp. 252-253).

The findings by Kingston and Newsome (46) also lent strong support to the same position. A comparison of the Webster, Sanford, and Freedman's A Scale with two other scales which presumed to measure classroom administrative philosophy and pupil-teacher relationship yielded significant correlations, all at the 1 per cent level of confidence (46, p. 335). The data of this study indicated that highly authoritarian teachers possess less democratic classroom administrative philosophy and manifest less equalitarian attitudes and opinions toward pupil-teacher relationships.
Commenting on the importance of the human relations factor in teaching, Boodish (13) asserted that it is "dependent on both the personality of the teacher and the varied and collective personalities of the pupils." Since "the internal forces within [the teacher]... influence his philosophy of life, his attitudes, and his basic feelings toward people," the more the teacher is aware of the dynamics of his own personality and those of the pupils, the better can he regulate and manage his own actions. It seems to be that only the open-minded, democratic teacher would be able to conduct himself in such a manner.

Impact of Teacher Personality upon Learning

There is much agreement on the importance of the teacher's personality and there is even some agreement on the effect of the teacher's personality on the behavior and achievement of pupils, but there is less agreement as to what extent what kind of teacher with what kind of personality is influential in the pupils' improvement of learning and betterment of behavior. Lagey, for instance, found "no discernible direct relationship between course content and attitude modification" and that "teaching per
se does not necessarily produce attitude change" (51, p. 310). Symonds (80) found some evidence in asserting that "aggressive and hostile attitudes of the teacher were not the result of learned, intelligently critical positions; they were personality factors and they were not greatly influenced by methods courses taught in college"; that teacher personality or teaching techniques had nothing much to do with the attitudes of the students, at least at the college level.

Some studies, however, have supported the general contention that the teacher's personality has an effect on the progress of pupils, but that different kinds of teachers may get varying responses from different kinds of children. In a study involving nine public schools in three different socio-economic areas at New York City, Washburne and Hell found that:

The one striking positive result of the experiment has been clear evidence that the teacher's personality has a clear and measurable effect on the progress of her pupils academically and socially. . . . There appears also to be a relationship between the type of teacher and her children's emotional adjustment. . . .

The results verified the major hypothesis of the study—that different kinds of teachers get varying amounts of achievement from different kinds of children. The self-controlling teacher got the
most achievement from the several different kinds of children; the fearful teacher got the least achievement. The turbulent teacher got almost as much achievement as the self-controlling teacher from children classified as conformers and strivers but less than half as much achievement from children classified as opposers and waverers. Although the fearful teacher got the greatest achievement with strivers the amount of such achievement did not differ appreciably from that obtained by the self-controlling teacher and the turbulent teacher.

In terms of growth in friendliness, the fearful teacher got more gain than either the turbulent teacher or the self-controlling teacher from children categorized as waverers \( (87, \text{p. 428}) \).

Somewhat similar findings were also present in Bush's study. His study involved twenty-seven classrooms and 650 teacher-pupil relationships in those classrooms. He found that in general teachers who knew most about their pupils and were most aware of and sympathetic toward their individual needs and interests had effective relationships with a larger number than did teachers who were interested only in their pupils' mastery of subject matter. He found, however, that teachers whose main concern was knowledge of subject matter

\[
\ldots \text{usually developed very effective relations with students of marked academic talent and interest, but students generally tended to experience more success and satisfaction with teachers sensitive to broader needs and interests (17, 189-190).}
\]
The experimental study on problem pupils by Ojemann and Wilkinson provided some further evidence to support the findings of Bush's study:

The data obtained in this study are consistent in showing that when teachers learn to know their pupils as personalities in their respective environments, teachers tend to become more effective guides for learning—the pupils achieve more in academic areas—teachers also become more effective personality "developers" (65, p. 147).

In recognizing the teacher's "strategic position to prevent and reduce mental hygienic problems," Baruch (8) concentrated on instilling an attitude of acceptance of the child's emotional problem (as opposed to moralistic, disciplinary, rejecting attitude). As the teacher's self-understanding and understanding of children's problems improved, the handling of pupils was materially changed for the better.

The study by Boynton, Dugger, and Turner (14) has shown that the emotional type of the teacher may affect his pupils in a very significant way:

... It seems to give very definite, clear-cut evidence to the effect that emotionally stable teachers tend to be associated with more emotionally stable pupils. While the assignment of causes is precarious, it does appear to be reasonable to assume that if a teacher is of a hyper-emotional type, she tends to disturb her pupils emotionally, but if she is
emotionally stable she tends to bring about emotional stability among her pupils (14, p. 232).

More significantly, however, a considerable number of writings and studies have supported the conclusion that democratic group environment under the leadership of democratic teachers is much more desirable than any other. Goodson asserted that:

... neither the autocratic nor the laissez-faire situation is sufficient for providing children with the necessary boundaries and the required freedom. In the authoritarian teacher-class relationship, children do not internalize boundaries to become self-secure and self-sufficient. Therefore, they remain overly dependent upon the teacher. Also, they possess no real power either to reject or to accept new ideas and actions. In the laissez-faire situation, children lack the security of boundaries. Also, they lack the effective power either to reject or to accept because ideas and actions cannot be clear to them (34, p. 143).

In a study made at the University of Chicago Education Department Laboratory, Thelen found:

a. That the teacher's behavior in large measure determines the quality of emotional condition in the classroom.
b. That learning of certain social attitudes and human relations principally is affected by teacher-pupil interaction.
c. That teacher-pupil interaction patterns may affect the student at deep (e.g., subconscious) levels.
d. That pupil-pupil interaction (e.g., status role) can be influenced by the nature of teacher-pupil interaction.
e. That the assumption that teacher behavior significantly influences the quality of student participation can be generalized to adult groups (82, pp. 90-91).
He subsequently suggested that the democratic pattern would be the "ideal" pattern in a classroom situation (82, p. 101).

Based on studies made by Lippitt and White at the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, involving clubs of ten-to-eleven-year-old boys, Lewin reported on the effect of different social atmospheres (democratic and autocratic) upon the boys:

1. Probably the greatest quantitative difference ... is the amount of hostility expressed among the members of the group. It is about thirty times as high in the autocratic group as in the democratic group.
2. The autocratic group shows a less stable group structure.
3. The autocratic group shows more dominating behavior and less objective behavior.
4. The autocratic group shows more dominating behavior and less objective behavior.
5. The democratic group showed 47 per cent more feeling of "we-ness" as expressed in language and in test situations; the autocratic group [expressed] 27 per cent more feeling of "I-ness."
6. It is in line with this that the democratic group showed more cooperative endeavor ... .
7. There was more expression of an objective, matter-of-fact attitude in the democratic group as against the more personal feelings in the autocratic one ... .
8. The constructiveness was higher in the democratic group as shown in the superiority of the group products ... .
9. Feeling for group property and group goals was much better developed in the democratic group.
10. During the twelve meetings of the club twice the situation of scapegoat arose (in the autocratic group), where the whole group ganged together against one of the members [both of them were forced to quit] (54).
In the same experiment, Lippitt and White found sufficient evidence to conclude that "in nearly all cases differences in club behavior could be attributed to differences in the induced social climate rather than to the constant characteristics of the club personnel" (54, p. 350). However, one more important point was made:

... The adult restrictiveness of the benevolent authoritarian role and the environmental unstructuredness of the laissez-faire situation were both found to inhibit greatly genuine "psychological freedom" as contrasted to "objective freedom" (54, p. 354).

The implication of this experiment for the classroom is clear. Not only do autocratic and laissez-faire environments tend to induce frustration and aggression, but they are also less productive than a democratic environment. The students are likely to lack self-direction and to be more dependent and less able to cooperate and to make suggestions for the group's welfare.

Along the same line, Regan (69) found that children under authoritarian teachers experienced more school-related fears. The dominant fears were of school in general, teachers, tests, specific subjects, grades and marks, each of which would appear to have an adverse effect on the pupil's learning. Mowrer's findings (63) in an experiment
in the democratic management of a group of delinquent or problem children are also rather interesting:

Democratic self-government for children effectively encourages real independence of a kind that probably makes for the development of individuals who are less susceptible of being exploited and misled than are individuals who as children were intimidated and rendered submissive by autocratic authority (63, p. 125).

Yet, when the problem children were shifted from autocratic to democratic control, with a great deal of self-government, the number of disciplinary problems decreased, children learned to cooperate and live in a civilized manner together, and emotional adjustment improved.

French (30) has given a detailed account of the technique of an autocratic group leader and the devices by which he was retrained in democratic methods. As expected,

... he had changed from an unsuccessful autocratic leader to a successful democratic leader ... and the whole group atmosphere was changed. The members participated in an easy manner with evident interest and satisfaction. The leader maintained more friendly relationship with the members and no longer showed the sharp differentiation of status (30, p. 234).

The specific instance is that of a scoutmaster, but the applicability to school teachers is plain. More directly concerned with a school situation, some studies have
revealed some similarly significant findings. To measure the teacher's influence upon the social attitudes of boys, Kroll (48) compared six social studies and English teachers, three of whom were known to be much more conservative than the others. He administered an attitude scale to the six classes of high school seniors before and after a semester's work. He found that pupils under more liberal teachers underwent more improvements in desirable attitudes in a semester than those under more conservative teachers.

Anderson and Brewer (3, p. 128) found that children placed in a nursery school under a dominative teacher showed significantly more dominative and aggressive behavior in the classroom and on the playground than children who were placed under more democratic and permissive (socially integrative) teachers. If the children were changed, however, to a teacher with different characteristics, it was not long before the children's play took these new attitudes. Furthermore, observations on the play relationships of children...

... demonstrated consistently that dominative behavior in one child tended to incite dominative behavior in his companion and that socially integrative behavior tended to elicit socially integrative behavior in his companion. Dominative and socially
integrative behavior were each thus found to be "circular" in their effects; as a stimulus to others, each tended to produce its like (3, p. 53).

The same generalizations were found to hold for the effect on pupils of the behavior of teachers. In the case of two teachers in the second grade, for example,

... fourteen statistically significant differences between children in the two rooms were found. ... The children with the more integrative teacher ... showed significantly lower frequencies of looking up at seat work, playing with foreign objects, and both conforming and non-conforming behavior. The children with the more integrative teacher were significantly higher in frequencies in several categories representing spontaneity and integrative and social contributions (4, pp. 85-86).

In subsequent studies, it was found that teachers maintain their characteristic approach from one year to another and continue to affect children in the same way. "The more dominating the teacher was found, in both years, to be using 'high frequencies' of a technique which could be expected either to stifle spontaneity and initiative or to intensify, not reduce, conflict and misunderstanding in her room" (4, p. 153). Consequently a child may thus formulate a lifelong personality pattern which is permeated with habituated responses, if he is under teachers of one type year after year.
As a part of the Harvard Teacher Education Research Project, Cogan (21) studied specifically "the relationship between warmth and friendliness in teachers and the amount of required work and self-initiated work performed by their pupils." As a result of the survey which involved 987 junior high school pupils in the general Boston area, the data indicated that:

... the more friendly and warm the teacher, the more self-initiated and required work they do. However, those teachers who were rejecting had no influence either on self-initiated or required work. These findings suggest that pupil motivation is dependent upon certain qualities of teacher personality. Since pupil motivation is usually considered an important goal of teaching, these findings may well be applicable to the selection of teachers (52, p. 434).

Juul (42) studied the authoritarian personality in relation to teacher's attitude toward child behavior. Based upon his findings, he made a rather strong suggestion:

In the interest of children, students who display extreme authoritarianism should be encouraged to enter some field of endeavor that does not entail constant contact with children (42, p. 189).

He further suggested that teachers "should be helped to understand the causes of an authoritarian personality and be made aware that many practices within the classroom
tend to aggravate these tendencies toward authoritarianism" (42, p. 143).

Summary

In summary, objectives of social education emerge from value judgment and sometimes may be supported by research. The statements of such objectives have been long, numerous, diverse, and controversial. In recent years, great emphasis has been put upon the cultivation of citizenship. The development of desirable social attitudes and skills has been stressed as much as, if not more than, the transmission of knowledge and information as a major objective of social education. Increasingly, the specific objectives of courses of study have also been formulated and developed in behavioral terms and keyed to school philosophy, contemporary culture, democratic principles and particularly to classroom procedures.

In order to achieve such objectives of social education, the personality of the teacher, especially that of the social studies teacher, has been the focus of investigation. In general, there is much agreement on the importance of the teacher personality. Specific teacher behaviors have been identified, classified, compared, and
studied. A number of elaborate research efforts has been made which provide some evidence to support the contention that the teacher's personality has an effect upon the developing knowledge, skills, and attitudes of the learner.

Undeniably, there is evidence that different kinds of teachers get varying responses from different kinds of children. While there is no conclusive evidence to show that a certain type of teacher is definitely more desirable than any other, some types of teachers have been found to be factors in the development to certain desirable conditions in the classroom. As of now, the field seems to be wide open for further investigation as to what type of teacher shares what sort of philosophy, prefers what methods of instruction, selects what sorts of teaching activities, manifests what patterns of teaching behavior, and gets what kinds of pupil reaction. As an effort in the over-all field of needed research, this study was undertaken to investigate certain interrelationships of personality and teacher behavior in the hope of providing some useful documentation for further exploration.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The present study was concerned with certain personal characteristics of secondary social studies student teachers and certain measures of their potential teaching behavior. The sampling of the subjects, the selection and administration of instruments and procedures for testing or observing were conditioned by the scheduling of student teaching and other instructional arrangements of the institution and the cooperating school systems in which the subject students were involved in teacher education. The subjects studied, the instruments employed, and the procedure followed in the study will be described briefly in this chapter.

The Population

The subjects included in this study consisted of sixty secondary social studies student teachers from the School of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, during the spring term of the 1962-63 school year.
This group included all prospective social studies teachers in this semester with the exception of three for whom complete returns were unobtainable.

The total population involved in this study included forty-two males and eighteen females. This ratio between sexes is 70 per cent to 30 per cent, which coincides with the ratio between sexes of the college graduates with qualifications as social studies teachers in the nation in a year from September 1, 1958, to August 31, 1959 (70 per cent to 30 per cent). It approximates the ratio of the sexes of 1959-1960 (68 per cent to 32 per cent), of 1960-1961 (65 per cent to 35 per cent), and of 1961-1962 (64 per cent to 34 per cent) (9). It also approximates the ratio of the sexes of all the social studies teachers who completed requirements for certification in Texas in the year of 1957-1958 (69 per cent to 31 per cent), 1958-1959 (61 per cent to 39 per cent) (9).

The homogeneity of the subjects was assumed on the basis of university prerequisite requirements for student teaching. To qualify for student teaching all students were required to have a minimum grade average of "C" in their teaching field, in all college courses, and professional education courses completed. Most of the subjects
were senior undergraduates, only six of them being enrolled for some graduate credits during the period of student teaching. While their social science course backgrounds differed, all had obtained a common minimum of courses required to qualify for certification as a social studies teacher in Texas.

Instruments

1. Webster, Sanford, and Freedman's New Instrument for Studying Authoritarianism in Personality (hereafter referred to as A Scale) (10) was chosen to measure authoritarianism in personality. It consists of 149 items. In the construction of the A Scale, 677 items were used in the first sample of a group of 441 college freshmen. A careful selection of 123 items was made from the initial scale as a result of analysis of these data. After a cross-validation of the scale a year later with a new sample of 402 college freshmen, a final 149-item scale was developed. The added 26 new items had validities at the .05 level or better in both samples separately, and at the .01 level in at least one sample. The test validity of the A Scale was checked by four methods: (1) cross-validation; (2) comparison with independent criteria;
(3) psychological meaningfulness of the component items; and (4) empirical validity.

The Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficient (KR-20) for the 123-item scale in the first sample was .88. The estimated correlation with the California F Scale (1) of the 149 items pooled into one test for both samples can be safely said to exceed .74. In addition, the new instrument was less "ideological," and more personality centered than the F Scale. Commenting of this point, the authors said:

We should expect, therefore, that scores on the present scale would be less dependent upon the individual's contemporary culture or group memberships than is the case with the F Scale. . . . The F Scale is a poor device for measuring authoritarianism in political leftists in the United States, particularly in college educated ones, for they can see the ideological implications of the items and, hence, they tend to respond in accordance with the over-all ideological picture of themselves which they wish to present. We believe the new instrument can get around this difficulty (10, pp. 82-83).

In an independent research project conducted at New York State, Del Popolo incorporated 28 items for the F Scale into the 149-item A Scale and he found the coefficient of reliability of the total 177-item scale to be of .92 (2, 3).
A higher score on the A Scale indicates a leaning toward authoritarianism; a lower score indicates less authoritarianism. The highest possible score is 149, the lowest possible score is zero.

2. Patterson's Student's Instructional Preference Scale (hereafter referred to as SIPS) (6) was developed in 1959 by Howard Patterson as a part of a doctoral study at North Texas State College, Denton, Texas, with the purpose to "measure attitudes toward classroom instructional methods."

Reliability was established by the test-retest method on a heterogeneous group of 58 college seniors at North Texas State College. The scale was administered during two regular class meetings, with a test-retest interval of two weeks. . . . The SIPS had a test-retest reliability coefficient of .966. A critical ratio of 7.29 established the significance at greater than the 1 per cent level of confidence. . . .

To establish a check on the internal consistency of the instrument, nine statements were reversed with respect to instructional method preference. . . . The scale had an internal consistence of -.80 and was significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence. It was concluded that the instrument was fairly consistent in determining teaching method preference.

On the basis of logical validity, it was assumed that each statement was adequately defined and that scores defined attitude toward methods of instruction (6, pp. 40-41).

A high total score on the SIPS shows a preference for group-oriented instruction. A low total score shows a preference for lecture-oriented instruction. Out of the
55-item scale, the highest possible score is 275. The lowest possible score is 55 (6, pp. 45).

3. Del Popolo's Observation Check Sheet for Student Teachers (hereafter referred to as Teacher's Check Sheet) (2, 3) was used by supervisory personnel to report the classroom behavioral traits of student teachers. The construction of this Check Sheet involved three major steps. The first step was to determine the constellation of items within the five classification areas set up by the authors of the MTAI (Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory) for the primary work in constructing that instrument. The five classification areas were moral status, child knowledge, discipline, educational principles, and personal reaction of the teacher. A panel of ten experts in the field of teacher education from various institutions throughout New York State and Pennsylvania was asked to classify items in the different areas. The second step was to transform such items into observable practices. A group of twelve experts throughout the country was asked to evaluate the initial work and to help in the rewriting, substituting, and eliminating of the items. The last step was the selection of the best statements of observable practices. A final assembly of seventy-five
items was developed with almost an equivalent number of positively and negatively stated practices to record the observable behavioral traits of a student teacher during student teaching (3, pp. 49-51). The reliability of coefficient revealed by the Kuder-Richardson method in the pilot study involving seventy-six student teachers was found to be .96 (3, p. 52). The reliability of coefficient revealed in the experimental group involving 300 student teachers was also found to be .96 (3, pp. 74-75).

A higher score on this inventory indicates a higher degree of desirable classroom behavioral traits (appropriate, varied, and effective teacher behavior), while a lower score indicates a lower incidence of such behavior.

4. Ryan's Pupils' Classroom Behavior Observation Record (hereafter referred to as Pupils' Behavior Record) (7), was used by supervisory personnel to record the pupils' behavior in the student teachers' classroom. This instrument was developed in connection with the Teacher Characteristics Study (7). The four dimensions of the personal social behavior of the pupils in a teacher's classroom which were chosen to be recorded are apathetic-alert pupil behavior; obstructive-responsible pupil behavior; uncertain-confident pupil behavior; and dependent-initiating pupil
behavior. Although these dimensions do not provide a complete inventory of pupil behavior or their achievements, "it could perhaps be argued . . . that with individual pupil ability and study habits held constant, such dimensions as these four might reasonably be expected to reflect academic achievement" (7, p. 111). It was also asserted that:

... the correlation pattern of the pupil behavior dimensions as suggested by the factor analysis, is fairly clear in the case of secondary school teachers--the pupil dimensions being substantially intercorrelated and contributing to a factor which may be designated as "pupil behavior" (7, p. 112).

Correlations of the assessments of different observers conducted on 1,513 elementary and 1,907 secondary teachers revealed reliability coefficients for the four dimensions of pupil behavior ranging from .43 to .65. The reliability coefficients were based on item analysis which would tend to reflect a higher level of reliability for the total score rating (7, pp. 95-98).

A high score on this scale indicates a higher degree of desirable pupils' classroom behavior; a low score indicates the absence of it. The highest possible score is 28; the lowest possible score is 4.

5. Philosophy of Social Education Inventory (hereafter referred to as Philosophy Inventory (Appendix VI)
was used to measure the student teacher's philosophies regarding social education in the secondary schools. It was developed for the purpose of the present study.

In the construction of such an inventory, different approaches might be used. The first would be a compilation of a long list of statements covering the general field of social education. By asking the test subjects to respond to all these statements, the philosophy of each individual or a group of individuals would be obtained and analyzed on the basis of each item or a group of items.

The other approach would be to use a predetermined axis. The selection of each item would be based on a different criterion and for a different purpose. The items to be included would be those which would readily reflect one point of view or the other along the same axis. By asking the test subjects to respond to such statements, the philosophy of a group or groups of subjects would be identified as leaning to one or the other point of view and be tested by statistical analysis.

Each of these approaches has advantages and disadvantages. From the theoretical standpoint, the first approach has the advantage of being able to present more
insight into the philosophical outlook of the test subjects in different directions. From the practical standpoint and especially for the purpose of the present study, the second approach would be far simpler and more easily related to the hypotheses of the study. The second of these approaches was therefore used in this study.

The first step in the process of constructing this inventory was the selection of the axis upon which the statements were to be based. In view of prevailing present-day philosophical issues in social education, an axis of traditionalism-progressivism was finally chosen, although it was rather difficult and potentially controversial to find suitable or adequate definitions. After a rather extensive deliberation, the definitions of traditionalism and progressivism were decided as shown in Chapter I.

The next step was the selection of appropriate individual items to be included in the inventory as based on the selected axis. In this step, different approaches might also have been used. One of the conventional approaches is to ask a certain number of leading authorities to list such statements as based on the selected axis. The other would be the development of items through an extensive
survey of literature in the field. It was decided to adopt the second approach in the selection of items.

Initially, fifty items were selected from a wide range of written materials for the purpose of identifying the two contrasting philosophies (the traditionalist and the progressivist) with respect to (a) the purposes of social studies, (b) the curriculum (content, scope, and sequence) of social studies, and (c) the methods and techniques in teaching social studies at the secondary school level. The statements were then submitted for validation to eight faculty members from North Texas State University, Denton, Texas. Each statement was placed by each judge on a continuum of reference to the two opposing points of view. A point score on a 1-2-3-4-5 scale with a point score of 1 representing full agreement with the "traditionalist" viewpoint, a score of 5 representing full agreement with the "progressivists" viewpoint, and other scores employed on a range between these two extremes. Any statement receiving a point total from all judges of from 16 to 32 was eliminated (the lowest possible score was 8, the highest possible score was 40). The statements which received 15 or fewer points were classified as traditionalist viewpoints; the statements which
received 33 or more points were classified as progressivist viewpoints. Out of eight complete returns, a total of forty-two items were judged to be valid for the purpose of identifying these two contrasting philosophical viewpoints as defined in Chapter I and in the transmittal letter to the judges for validation (Appendix I). Each selected statement received no fewer than six judges' agreement as reflecting one of these two viewpoints to the exclusion of the other. The remaining judges marked the middle point indicating uncertainty. In no case did any judge mark toward a direction opposite that of the majority.

As suggested by some judges, certain items were edited and improved without changing the meaning and direction of the original item. However, two items (Numbers 13 and 15) were eliminated because of ambiguity, although they met all other requirements. The points received by each item in the original 50-item inventory and its direction as indicated by the judges are reported in Appendix III. The items with asterisks in Appendix II were excluded in the 40-item inventory.

The 40-item inventory was submitted for further validation following the procedure suggested by Edwards (4,
pp. 151-156) and adopted by Adorno and his associates in the construction of the *California F Scale* (1, pp. 222-279) (Appendix IV). A total of 138 responses was received from six classes in the School of Education, North Texas State University, containing mostly seniors with different first teaching fields at elementary and secondary levels.

The mean score of the total population (134) for each item, the item discriminating power, the rank order in item discriminating power are listed in Appendix V. The Discriminating Power (DP) of each item was obtained by the following procedure. Subjects whose total scores fell in the highest 25 per cent of the distribution were considered high scorers, while those whose scores fell in the lowest 25 per cent of the distribution were considered the low scorers. The means of the high scorers and the low scorers (34 in each group) was obtained for each item. The discriminating power for each item was the difference between these two means for that item (1, p. 77). Only twenty items with discriminating power of more than 1.00 in group mean differences were included in the final inventory (Appendix VI) which were considered to be a sufficient number of items desired for such scales (4, p. 154). Consideration
was also given to include approximately the same number of statements indicating these two viewpoints to avoid undesirable effects upon the subjects' responses (4, p. 155). As a result, the final 20-item inventory included nine items reflecting the traditionalist viewpoints and eleven items indicating the progressivist viewpoints.

The reliability coefficient of the 20-item inventory as calculated by split-half correlation and corrected by Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula was .86. The reliability coefficient of the 38-item inventory (except two items which indicated negative signs in Column DP as shown in Appendix V) was .61 (8, pp. 183-184). It was decided that the 20-item inventory would be used for the purpose of this study. The final 20-item Philosophy Inventory is shown in Appendix VI.

A high total score indicates the leaning toward "progressivist" viewpoints; a low score indicates the leaning toward "traditionalist" viewpoints. The highest possible score is 100 and the lowest possible score is 20.

6. Student Teacher's Self-Check List of Classroom Teaching Activities (hereafter referred to as Self-Check List) (Appendix VII) was developed for the use of student teachers in making their own report of the classroom
teaching activities during the period of student teaching when classes were conducted by the student teacher. The activities were divided into five major categories, e.g., planning for and of teaching, assignment of learning activities, selection of learning activities, direction of learning activities, and evaluation. Each item under each category was to be reported independently of the other. Each was to be reported on the basis of what could be recalled as actually occurring in the classes conducted by the student teacher during the period of student teaching. In assigning numerical points to each item under each category, consideration was given to the involvement of the pupils, the responsibilities of the student teacher in making professional decisions, and the creative quality of each activity in comparison with that of others. The weighted point value for each item in the inventory is given in the parenthesis under each item in Appendix VIII corresponding to the items in the Self-Check List in Appendix VII, except in Category III. The choices within each item were assigned score values in terms of the extent to which each reflected a cooperative situation in which pupils were able to participate responsibly in the classroom activity. Furthermore, the
score attained by the respondent on this basis was weighted by the extent that he, as a student teacher, was allowed responsibility for leadership of the activity.

In Category III, for items 8, 9, 10, 12, and 13, a 0-1-2-3-4 point range was applied to responses A, B, C, D, and E, respectively. For items 11, and from 14 to 24, a 4-3-2-1-0 point range was applied to responses A, B, C, D, and E, respectively. Then the items were grouped into five clusters, in terms of generally similar levels of adherence to or freedom from textbook-oriented verbal activity, and each cluster was given different weight, with greater weight assigned to more imaginative types of activity. Items from 8 to 10 thus were given the weight of 1; items from 11 to 14 were given the weight of 2; items from 15 to 17 were given the weight of 3; items from 22 to 24 were given the weight of 4, and items from 18 to 21 were given the weight of 5. The total points all the items obtained in this manner would then be divided by 17, the resultant figure was considered as the total score for this category.

A high score indicates that the teaching activities are free from textbook or teacher domination; a low score
indicates that the teaching activities are textbook or teacher-dominated.

The validity and reliability of this instrument were assumed to be adequate for the purpose of this study, on the basis of the assumption that each student teacher was objectively and honestly reporting such activities which had actually occurred in the classroom during his period of student teaching. Any loss in his recollection or in his reporting would operate to make the instrument a measure, therefore, of the composite recollection of the students in the group rather than of the actual occurrence in their respective classrooms.

It should be recalled that the scoring systems on all instruments were arranged so as to point in the same direction in terms of the hypotheses of the study. Thus, except in the case of the A Scale, high scores on the personal characteristics measures would suggest (a) freedom from authoritarianism, (b) "progressivist" philosophy of social education, and (c) preference for group-oriented classroom activities. Similarly, high scores on all measures of classroom behavior would mean (a) appropriate, varied, and effective teacher behavior, (b) desirable
pupil behavior, and (c) pupil-oriented, creative and varied teaching activities.

Procedure

The A Scale, the Philosophy Inventory, and the SIPS were administered to student teachers at the last week of March, 1963. For those student teachers who were on the campus, the assistance of the instructors involved was solicited to distribute and collect the three instruments. The three instruments were mailed directly to those who were out in student teaching with a letter to solicit their assistance and another letter from the Director of Teacher Education, North Texas State University, urging them to cooperate in the research project. Copies of both letters are included in Appendix VIII.

The Teacher's Check Sheet was either directly mailed to the cooperating teachers or distributed through college coordinators to the cooperating teachers. In one instance, this instrument was distributed through the School Superintendent's office to the cooperating teachers in the district. A letter which explained the study and which asked for the cooperating teacher's assistance, as well as a letter from the Director of Teacher Education, North Texas State University, to the cooperating teacher in
urging his or her cooperation, were accompanied with the Teacher's Check Sheet (Appendix VIII).

The Pupils' Behavior Record was distributed among the college coordinators with written and verbal explanations. This instrument was returned immediately following the conclusion of the student's teaching.

The Self-Check List was administered to some student teachers at the end of student teaching and to some during the last two weeks of student teaching. This instrument was mailed to those who were still out student teaching.

This study undertook to obtain data from sixty-two student teachers and sixty-two cooperating teachers, it involved the help of twelve college coordinators and it made use of six instruments. With the full cooperation of all concerned, the returns were very nearly complete. Only one student teacher who did not have the opportunity to teach a social studies class during student teaching failed to return the Self-Check List and one cooperating teacher failed to return the Teacher's Check Sheet on another student teacher. These two student teachers were deleted from this study and consequently the population included in this study was reduced from sixty-two to sixty.
In order to test the hypotheses set forth in Chapter I, the following specific procedures were used:

1. The selection of "authoritarians" and "non-authoritarians."—The selection of authoritarians and nonauthoritarians was based on the raw scores of the subjects on the A Scale (ranging from 32-98) (10). As defined in Chapter I, the top one third was to be classified as authoritarian and the low one third was to be classified as nonauthoritarian. As a result, the subjects who scored 76 and above were classified as authoritarians and the subjects who scored 57 and below were classified as nonauthoritarians. Because each group was to include one third (20) of the total population (60), two more subjects who scored 76 and one more subject who scored 57 on the A Scale were excluded by random deletion from the authoritarian and nonauthoritarian groups, respectively. As shown in Table I, the subjects numbered from 1 to 20 and those numbered from 41 to 60 were then classified as authoritarians and nonauthoritarians, respectively.

2. In the first group of hypotheses, subhypotheses a, b, and c were tested by the t test of the difference between the means of the opposing thirds of the total group. In addition, Pearson r's were also calculated for the
entire student group. Subhypotheses d, e, f, g, h, and i were tested by the Pearson formula applied to the two performances of the total group. Tests of significance for the \( t \) values and Pearson \( r \)'s were made to determine the rejection or acceptance of these subhypotheses.

3. In the second group of hypotheses, subhypotheses a and b were tested by the \( t \) test of the difference between the means of the opposing thirds of the total group and the Pearson \( r \) formula applied to the total group performance. Subhypothesis c was tested by the Pearson \( r \) formula. Tests of significance were then made to determine the rejection or acceptance of each subhypothesis.

4. In the third group of hypotheses, subhypotheses were tested by the Pearson \( r \) formula. Tests of significance were then determined.

5. Acceptable levels of significance for the \( t \) values and Pearson \( r \)'s in all hypotheses were set at .05 and .05, respectively.

6. The results obtained by following these specific steps were then tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted. The following chapter contains a report of the findings, and of the analyses and interpretation of these data.


CHAPTER IV

REPORT AND INTERPRETATIONS OF FINDINGS

The data collected for the purpose of this study will be presented in a series of tabulations in the first section of this chapter. The specific hypotheses set forth in Chapter I will then be analyzed separately with reference to the findings of the study. Finally, some comments will be made in the interpretation of these findings.

Data Collected in the Study

Table I includes all raw scores of the total population (sixty secondary school social studies student teachers) on all six instruments (A Scale, Philosophy Inventory, Student's Instructional Preference Scale or SIPS, Teacher's Check Sheet, Self-Check List, and Pupils' Behavior Record) employed in this study. This table was arranged first according to the raw scores of all subjects on the A Scale. As explained in Chapter III, a high score on the A Scale indicates a leaning toward authoritarianism, a low score indicates a leaning toward nonauthoritarianism. The highest possible score is 149, the lowest is zero. On the Philosophy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>A Scale</th>
<th>Philosophy Inventory</th>
<th>SIPS</th>
<th>Teacher's Check Sheet</th>
<th>Self-Check List</th>
<th>Pupils' Behavior Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>A Scale</td>
<td>Philosophy Inventory</td>
<td>SIPS</td>
<td>Teacher's Check Sheet</td>
<td>Self-Check List</td>
<td>Pupils' Behavior Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inventory, a high score indicates a leaning toward "progressivist" viewpoints, a low score indicates a leaning toward "traditionalist" viewpoints. The highest possible score is 100, the lowest is 20. On the SIPS, a high score indicates a preference for group-oriented instructional procedures, a low score indicates a preference for lecture-oriented instructional procedures. The highest possible score is 275, the lowest is 55. On the Teacher's Check Sheet, a high score indicates a high degree of desirable behavioral traits, a low score indicates a low degree of desirable behavioral traits. The highest possible score is 320, the lowest is zero. On the Self-Check List, a high score indicates that the teaching activities are free from textbook or teacher domination, a low score indicates that the teaching activities are more textbook or teacher dominated. The highest possible score is 52, the lowest is zero. On the Pupils' Behavior Record, a high score indicates a high degree of desirable pupils' behavior, a low score indicates a low degree of desirable pupils' behavior. The highest possible score is 28, the lowest is 4. The meaning of the raw scores of the sixty student teachers on each of the six instruments may be more clearly revealed by a close examination of Table II.
TABLE II

GROUP MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, RANGES, AND POSSIBLE RANGES OF SCORES OF 60 STUDENT TEACHERS ON EACH OF SIX INSTRUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Scale</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>98-32</td>
<td>149-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Inventory</td>
<td>76.06</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>97-57</td>
<td>100-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPS</td>
<td>174.70</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>232-121</td>
<td>275-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Check Sheet</td>
<td>214.06</td>
<td>31.05</td>
<td>275-143</td>
<td>320-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Check List</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>32-2.2</td>
<td>52-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils' Behavior Record</td>
<td>18.47</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>28-8</td>
<td>28-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II includes the group means, standard deviations, ranges, and possible ranges of scores of sixty student teachers on each of the six instruments. The possible range for each instrument as shown in this table is the range between the highest possible score and the lowest possible score. As a result of differing scoring for each instrument, the possible range for each instrument also differs. A score on a certain instrument should...
be interpreted in terms of the mean, standard deviation, range, and possible range of that particular instrument. However, scores of any individual on each of the six instruments could be easily compared by transforming his scores into standard scores by using the figures in Tables I and II (3, pp. 34-40).

Table III includes the means, standard deviation, mean differences, t values, and levels of significance between the "authoritarian" and "nonauthoritarian" groups on five measures of philosophy or teaching behavior.

The negative signs shown in the column under "Mean Difference Between Groups" are due to the fact that the A Scale is scored toward authoritarianism. A higher score indicates the leaning toward authoritarianism, while a lower score indicates the leaning toward nonauthoritarianism. A "plus" difference thus reflects a higher mean score by the authoritarians. Due to the orientation of each of the other measures, it would be expected that all of these correlations would therefore be negative. The implications of this table are discussed more in detail in the next section of this chapter.
TABLE III

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MEAN DIFFERENCES, t VALUES, AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF AUTHORITARIAN AND NONAUTHORITARIAN GROUPS' SCORES ON EACH OF THE FIVE REMAINING INSTRUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Mean Difference Between Groups</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Levels of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritarians</td>
<td>Nonauthoritarians</td>
<td>Authoritarians</td>
<td>Nonauthoritarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Inventory</td>
<td>76.95</td>
<td>77.20</td>
<td>- .25</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPS</td>
<td>168.20</td>
<td>182.95</td>
<td>-14.75</td>
<td>24.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Check Sheet</td>
<td>212.35</td>
<td>216.35</td>
<td>- 5.50</td>
<td>32.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Check List</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>- 1.55</td>
<td>7.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils' Behavior Record</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>- 4.45</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df = 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 < p < .1.
Table IV presents the Pearson product-moment correlations and their levels of significance between all pairs of the six instruments used in this study. The level of confidence for each $r$ is obtained from tables of Fisher and Yates (1, p. 59). Since the result presented in this table and that in Table III were the essence of this study,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs of Instruments</th>
<th>$r^*$</th>
<th>L.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Scale: Philosophy Inventory</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Scale: SIPS</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Scale: Teacher's Check Sheet</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Scale: Self-Check List</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Scale: Pupils' Behavior Record</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Inventory: SIPS</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Inventory: Teacher's Check List</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Inventory: Self-Check List</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Inventory: Pupils' Behavior Record</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPS: Teacher's Check Sheet</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPS: Self-Check List</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPS: Pupils' Behavior Record</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Check Sheet: Self-Check List</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Check Sheet: Pupils' Behavior Record</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils' Behavior Record: Self-Check List</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N for all instruments = 60

* Rounded to nearest hundredth.
they are referred to in part in several remaining portions of this chapter.

Statistical Analysis

Three groups of hypotheses listed in Chapter I were investigated by statistical analysis of the data collected. The rejection or acceptance of each of these hypotheses will be reported separately on the basis of this analysis.

Hypotheses Regarding Relationship Between Measures of Personal Difference and Teaching Behavior

The first principal hypothesis was: "There will be a significant relationship between certain measures of the personal characteristics of social studies student teachers and certain measures of their classroom teaching behavior." The personal characteristics measures included the A Scale, the Philosophy Inventory, and the Student's Instructional Preference Scale (SIPS). The teaching behavior measures included the Teacher's Check Sheet, the Self-Check List, and the Pupils' Behavior Record. Consequently, there were nine subhypotheses among the first group of hypotheses set forth at the outset of the study.

The first subhypothesis (1a) in the first group was: "There will be a significant difference between the classroom behavioral traits of 'authoritarian' student teachers
and those of 'nonauthoritarian' student teachers." The classification of "authoritarian" and "nonauthoritarian" student teachers was explained in Chapter III. As shown in Table V, the $t$ value between the measures of these two groups of student teachers as measured by the Teacher's Check Sheet was .57 which was not significant. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant difference between the classroom behavioral traits of authoritarian student teachers and those of nonauthoritarian student teachers" was, therefore, accepted and subhypothesis 1a was rejected. In addition, the Pearson $r$ between scores of all sixty student teachers on the A Scale and the
The Teacher's Check Sheet was -.02 which was not significantly different from zero (see Table IV). It was thus concluded that there was no significant relationship between student teachers' authoritarianism in personality and their classroom behavioral traits as measured by the A Scale and the Teacher's Check Sheet, and that there was no significant difference between the classroom behavioral traits of authoritarian student teachers and those of nonauthoritarian student teachers as measured by these two instruments.

The second subhypothesis (lb) in the first group was:

"There will be a significant difference between the classroom teaching activities of 'authoritarian' student teachers and those of 'nonauthoritarian' student teachers." As shown in Table VI, the t value between mean scores of these two groups of student teachers on the Self-Check List was .72 which was not significant. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant difference between the classroom teaching activities of 'authoritarian' student teachers and those of 'nonauthoritarian' student teachers" was, therefore, accepted and subhypothesis lb was rejected. In addition, the Pearson r between scores by all sixty student
TABLE VI
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MEAN DIFFERENCE, t VALUE, AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE OF AUTHORITARIAN AND NONAUTHORITARIAN STUDENT TEACHERS' SCORES ON THE SELF-CHECK LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>L.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarians</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonauthoritarians</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 38

The third subhypothesis (lc) in the first group was: "There will be a significant difference between the pupils'
behavior in the classrooms of 'authoritarian' student teachers and of 'nonauthoritarian' student teachers."

As shown in Table VII, the $t$ value between mean scores of these two groups of student teachers on the Pupils' Behavior Record was 2.49 which was significant at better than the .02 level of confidence. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant difference between the pupils' behavior in the classrooms of 'authoritarian' student teachers and of 'nonauthoritarian' student teachers" was, therefore, rejected and subhypothesis 1c was accepted. In addition, the Pearson $r$ between scores by

### Table VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>L.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarians</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>-4.45</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonauthoritarians</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df = 38$
all sixty student teachers on the A Scale and the Pupils' Behavior Record was -.25 which was significantly different from zero at the .05 level of confidence. It was thus concluded that there was a significant negative relationship between the student teachers' authoritarianism in personality and the desirability of their pupils' behavior in their classrooms and that there thus was a significant difference between the pupils' behavior in the classroom of authoritarian student teachers and of nonauthoritarian student teachers as measured by these two measures. It was also concluded that pupils tended to manifest significantly more desirable behavior (being more alert, responsible, confident, and initiating) in the classrooms of nonauthoritarian student teachers than in the classrooms of authoritarian student teachers.

The fourth subhypothesis (1d) in the first group was: "There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their classroom behavioral traits." The Pearson r between scores by all sixty student teachers on the Philosophy Inventory and the Teacher's Check Sheet was .11 which was not significantly different from zero. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant positive relationship
between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their classroom behavioral traits" was, therefore, accepted and subhypothesis ld was rejected. It was therefore concluded that there was no significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their classroom behavioral traits, as measured by these two instruments.

The fifth subhypothesis (le) in the first group was: "There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their classroom teaching activities." The Pearson r between scores by all sixty student teachers on the Philosophy Inventory and the Self-Check List was .19 which was not significantly different from zero. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their classroom teaching activities" was, therefore, accepted and subhypothesis le was rejected. It was therefore concluded that there was a positive but non-significant relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their classroom teaching activities, as measured by these two instruments.
The sixth subhypothesis (1f) in the first group was: "There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their pupils' classroom behavior." The Pearson r between scores by all sixty student teachers on the Philosophy Inventory and the Pupils' Behavior Record was -.08 which was not significantly different from zero. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their pupils' classroom behavior" was, therefore, accepted and subhypothesis 1f was rejected. It was therefore concluded that there was no significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their pupils' classroom behavior, as measured by these two instruments.

The seventh subhypothesis (1g) in the first group was: "There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their classroom behavioral traits." The Pearson r between scores of all sixty student teachers on the SIPS and the Teacher's Check Sheet was .08 which was not significantly different from zero. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant positive relationship
between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their classroom behavioral traits was, therefore, accepted and subhypothesis 1g was rejected. It was therefore concluded that there was no significant positive relationship between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their classroom behavioral traits as measured by these two instruments.

The eighth subhypothesis (1h) in the first group was:

"There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their classroom teaching activities." The Pearson $r$ between scores by all sixty student teachers on the SIPS and the Self-Check List was .26 which was significantly different from zero at better than the .05 level of confidence. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant positive relationship between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their classroom teaching activities" was, therefore, rejected and subhypothesis 1h was accepted. It was therefore concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their classroom teaching
activities as measured by these two instruments. It was also concluded that student teachers with a stated preference for group-oriented instructional procedures had tended to select more classroom teaching activities free from textbook domination during student teaching.

The ninth subhypothesis (H1) in the first group was:
"There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their pupils' classroom behavior." The Pearson r between scores by all sixty student teachers on the SIPS and the Pupils' Behavior Record was .06 which was not significantly different from zero. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant positive relationship between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their pupils' classroom behavior" was, therefore, accepted and sub-hypothesis H1 was rejected. It was therefore concluded that there was no significant positive relationship between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their pupils' classroom behavior as measured by these two instruments.

In summary, of the nine subhypotheses in the first group of hypotheses, seven were rejected and two were
accepted. Subhypothesis 1c was accepted at the .05 level of confidence and subhypothesis 1h was accepted at better than .05 level of confidence.

**Hypotheses Regarding Relationships Among Measures of Personal Differences**

The second principal hypothesis was: "There will be significant relationships among the 'authoritarianism,' philosophies of social education, and the stated preferences for instructional procedures of social studies teachers." The instruments involved in this group of hypotheses were the A Scale, the Philosophy Inventory, and the SIPS. There were three subhypotheses among the second group of hypotheses as set forth at the outset of the study.

The first subhypothesis (2a) in the second group was: "There will be a significant difference between the philosophies of social education held by 'authoritarian' student teachers and 'nonauthoritarian' student teachers." As shown in Table VIII, the t value between the scores of these two groups of student teachers on the Philosophy Inventory was .39 which was not significantly different from zero. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant difference between the
TABLE VIII
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MEAN DIFFERENCE, t VALUE, AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE OF AUTHORITARIAN AND NONAUTHORITARIAN STUDENT TEACHERS' SCORES ON THE PHILOSOPHY INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>L.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>76.95</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonauthoritarian</td>
<td>77.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 38

philosophies of social education held by 'authoritarian' student teachers and 'nonauthoritarian' student teachers" was, therefore, accepted and subhypotheses 2a was rejected.

In addition, the Pearson r between scores by all sixty student teachers on the A Scale and the Philosophy Inventory was -.08 which was not significantly different from zero (see Table IV). It was therefore concluded that there was no significant relationship between the student teachers' authoritarianism in personality and their philosophies of social education and that there thus was no significant difference between the philosophies of social education held by authoritarian student teachers and by
nonauthoritarian student teachers as measured by these two instruments.

The second subhypothesis (2b) in the second group was: "There will be a significant difference between the stated preferences for instructional procedures of 'authoritarian' student teachers and those of 'nonauthoritarian' student teachers." As shown in Table IX, the $t$ value between the mean scores of these two groups of student teachers on the SIPS was 1.81 which was not significant. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant difference between the stated preferences for instructional procedures of 'authoritarian' student teachers and those of nonauthoritarian student teachers as measured by these two instruments."

### Table IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>L.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>168.20</td>
<td>-14.75</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>N.S.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonauthoritarian</td>
<td>182.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$.*.05 < p < .1.$

$df = 38$
'nonauthoritarian' student teachers" was, therefore, accepted and subhypothesis 2b was rejected. However, the Pearson r between scores of all sixty student teachers on the A Scale and the SIPS was -.52 which was significantly different from zero at the .01 level of confidence. It was therefore concluded that there was a significant negative relationship between student teachers' authoritarianism in personality and their stated preferences for creative and pupil-oriented instructional procedures, but that, in this group, there was no significant differences between the stated preferences for instructional procedures of authoritarian student teachers and those of nonauthoritarian student teachers as measured by these two instruments.

The third subhypothesis (2c) of the second group was: "There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their stated preferences for instructional procedures." The Pearson r between scores of all sixty student teachers on the Philosophy Inventory and the SIPS was .59 (see Table IV) which was significantly different from zero at better than .001 level of confidence. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant positive
relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their stated preferences for instructional procedures was, therefore rejected and sub-hypothesis 2c was accepted. It was therefore concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their stated preferences for instructional procedures as measured by these two instruments and that student teachers with a more "progressivist" viewpoint would tend to prefer more group-oriented classroom procedures.

In summary, of the three subhypotheses in the second group of hypotheses, two were rejected and subhypothesis 2c was accepted at better than .001 level of confidence.

**Hypotheses Regarding Relationships Among Measures of Teaching Behavior**

The third principal hypothesis was: "There will be significant relationships among the student teachers' classroom behavioral traits, classroom teaching activities, and their pupils' classroom behavior." The instruments involved in the group of hypotheses under this heading were the Teacher's Check Sheet, the Self-Check List, and the Pupils' Behavior Record. There were three subhypotheses
among the third group of hypotheses as set forth at the outset of the study.

The first subhypothesis (3a) in the third group was:
"There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' classroom behavioral traits and their classroom teaching activities." The Pearson r between scores of all sixty student teachers on the Teacher's Check Sheet and the Self-Check List was .25 which was significantly different from zero at better than the .05 level of confidence (see Table IV). The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant positive relationship between student teachers' classroom behavioral traits and their classroom teaching activities" was, therefore, rejected and subhypothesis 3a was accepted. It was therefore concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between student teachers' classroom behavioral traits and their classroom teaching activities as measured by these two instruments and that student teachers who manifested more "democratic" classroom behavioral traits tended to select more classroom teaching activities free from textbook domination.

The second subhypothesis (3b) in the third group was:
"There will be a significant positive relationship between
the student teachers' classroom behavioral traits and their pupils' classroom behavior." The Pearson r between scores of all sixty student teachers on the Teacher's Check Sheet and the Pupils' Behavior Record was .38 which was significantly different from zero at better than the .01 level of confidence. The null hypothesis that "there will be no significant positive relationship between the student teachers' classroom behavioral traits and their pupils' classroom behavior" was, therefore, rejected and sub-hypothesis 3c was accepted. It was therefore concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' classroom behavioral traits and their pupils' classroom behavior as measured by these two instruments and that student teachers who manifested more "democratic" classroom behavioral traits tended to contribute to more desirable pupil behavior.

The third subhypothesis (3b) in the group was: "There will be a significant positive relationship between the student teachers' classroom teaching activities and their pupils' classroom behavior." The Pearson r between scores of all sixty student teachers on the Self-Check List and the Pupils' Behavior Record was .17 which was not significantly different from zero. The null hypothesis that
"there will be no significant positive relationship between the student teachers' classroom teaching activities and their pupils' classroom behavior" was, therefore accepted and subhypothesis 3c was rejected. It was therefore concluded that there was no significant positive relationship between the student teachers' classroom teaching activities and their pupils' classroom behavior as measured by these two instruments.

In summary, of the three subhypotheses in the third group of hypotheses, one was rejected and two were accepted at better than the .05 and .01 levels of confidence respectively.

Discussion

On the basis of statistical analysis, the results did not support all the hypotheses set forth in the outset of this study. Nevertheless, the investigation revealed some significant findings worthy of discussion. The discussion will follow generally this sequence:
(1) relationships among the three personal characteristics measures; (2) relationships among the three teaching behavior measures; (3) relationships between authoritarianism and the three teaching behavior measures; (4) relationships between philosophies and the three teaching
behavior measures; (5) relationships between instructional preferences and the three teaching behavior measures; and (6) summary.

Relationships Among the Three Personal Characteristics Measures

The three personal characteristics measures included the A Scale, the Philosophy Inventory, and the Student's Instructional Procedure Scale (SIPS). All of the three measures involved direct responses by student teachers. As shown in Table III on page 203, and analyzed in the previous section, the results of t tests revealed that authoritarian and nonauthoritarian secondary school social studies student teachers did not differ significantly in their respective philosophies of social education or in their stated preference for instructional procedures. However, as shown in Table X, while no significant correlation was found to exist between the authoritarianism of the total group and their philosophy of social education, a significant relationship was found between the students' authoritarianism and their stated preferences for instructional procedures.

The apparent lack of significant relationship between student teachers' authoritarianism and their philosophies
TABLE X
PEARSON r's AMONG SCORES OF SIXTY STUDENT TEACHERS ON THE THREE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Philosophy Inventory</th>
<th>SIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Scale</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Inventory</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.59*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant.

of social education cannot be fully explained. It is possible, however, that the latter measure reflects the tendency of student teachers to give what they believe to be approved responses regardless of their personal distinctions. There is a possibility also that what student teachers have been led to verbalize honestly in reflecting beliefs that may not be entirely consistent with what they are as personalities. The fact that their stated instructional preferences were related to their reports of teaching activities, while their levels of authoritarianism were related to their pupils' behavior, suggests the relative insignificance in practice of conscious belief as compared to preconscious personal characteristics.
The somewhat paradoxical relationship between student teachers' authoritarianism and their stated preferences for instructional procedures, on the other hand, may also be explained in the same manner. However, this somewhat unexpected phenomenon might be caused in part by statistical conditions. The fact that the injection of the "middle" score group into the Pearson r calculation caused an appearance of higher correlation might suggest the rather wide dispersion of the middle group away from the mean. The difference might also have been affected by the classification of "authoritarians" and "nonauthoritarians" (top and low thirds rather than fourths or fifths). Furthermore, it might also be due to the fact that "authoritarian" or "nonauthoritarian" student teachers may equally use similar classroom procedures but for different purposes.

A highly significant relationship ($r = .59$ at better than the .001 level, see Table A) was found to exist between student teachers' philosophies of social education and their stated preferences for instructional procedures. This implies that student teachers leaning more toward "progressivist" viewpoints on philosophy of social education tended more to state a preference for group-oriented
instructional procedures and that student teachers leaning more toward "traditionalist" viewpoints tended more to state a preference for lecture-oriented instructional procedures. Since both the Philosophy Inventory and the SIPS cover similar grounds and perhaps overlap each other, the relatively high correlation between these two instruments was not altogether surprising. Furthermore, the fact that both instruments were measuring the personal perceptions of the subjects and that they were checked by student teachers presumably at the same time might also be partially accountable for the significant relationship between the two. However, regarding the question as to whether student teachers would (or could) practice during student teaching what they professed to believe on these two measures, a close examination of the relationships of these two instruments to the several measures of teaching behavior used in this study is revealing.

**Relationships Among the Three Teaching Behavior Measures**

The Teacher's Check Sheet was checked by the cooperating teachers, the Self-Check List was checked by student teachers, and the Pupils' Behavior Record was checked by
the college coordinators. The results are shown in Table XI. Among these three measures, two of the three possible correlations were found to be statistically significant. While no significant relationship was found between student teachers' recall of their classroom teaching activities and their supervisor's judgments of their pupils' classroom behavior, significant positive relationships were found between student teachers' classroom behavioral traits and both their reported classroom teaching activities and their pupils' classroom behavior. Student teachers manifesting more desirable classroom behavioral traits thus reported having planned and conducted more
classroom teaching activities not rigidly adhering to the
textbook nor heavily teacher dominated. Student teachers
manifesting less desirable classroom behavioral traits
reported that they planned and conducted their classroom
teaching activities in ways more pointedly oriented to the
teacher and/or to textbooks.

The significant positive relationship found between
student teachers' classroom behavioral traits and their
pupils' classroom behavior lent support to one of the
basic hypotheses of this study. This finding was even
more noteworthy since these respective instruments were
checked by cooperating teachers and college coordinators
and thus were independent of student teachers' personal
perceptions. It might therefore be inferred with a degree
of confidence that student teachers manifesting more de-
sirable classroom behavioral traits tend to have more
alert, responsible, confident, and/or self-initiating
pupils' behavior in their classrooms. Conversely, student
teachers manifesting less desirable classroom behavioral
traits tend to have more apathetic, obstructive, uncertain,
and/or dependent pupils' behavior in their classroom.
Relationships Between Authoritarianism and the Three Teaching Behavior Measures

As shown in Table III, page 103, and analyzed in the previous section, the t test results justified the conclusion that authoritarian and nonauthoritarian student teachers did not differ significantly with regard to their cooperating teachers' reports of their classroom behavioral traits or in their own reports of their teaching activities. However, it was found that pupils' classroom behavior was significantly different in the classrooms of these two student groups. These findings were supported further by using the Pearson product-moment formula as shown in Table XII. It was found there that no significant relationship existed between student

TABLE XII

PEARSON r's BETWEEN SCORES OF SIXTY STUDENT TEACHERS ON EACH OF THE THREE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS MEASURES AND THE THREE TEACHER BEHAVIOR MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Teacher's Check Sheet</th>
<th>Self-Check List</th>
<th>Pupils' Behavior Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Scale</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Inventory</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPS</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant.
teachers' authoritarianism and either their classroom behavioral traits or their classroom teaching activities.

A significant negative relationship was found to exist, however, between student teachers' authoritarianism and their pupils' classroom behavior. The slight positive correlation (.04) found between student teachers' authoritarianism and their classroom teaching activities might be due to the fact that student teachers were more externally influenced in their planning of teaching activities than in their behavioral traits, yet from the findings of this investigation it is not safe to conclude that nonauthoritarian student teachers would manifest more desirable classroom behavioral traits or plan more teaching activities free from textbook or teacher domination than authoritarian student teachers. Nonauthoritarian student teachers would seem, however, to contribute more to their pupils' desirable classroom behavior than authoritarian student teachers would do to theirs.

Relationships Between Philosophies of Social Education and the Three Teaching Behavior Measures

No significant relationships were found between student teachers' philosophies of social education and any
of the three measures of their classroom teaching. The Pearson r's between scores of all sixty student teachers on the Philosophy Inventory and, respectively, the Teacher's Check Sheet or the Self-Check List were nonsignificant, yet positive (.11 and .19, respectively). Somewhat surprisingly, a slight negative relationship (-.08) was found between student teachers' philosophies of social education and their pupils' classroom behavior (see Table XII). This appears to imply that, in this sample, as judged by college coordinators, student teachers with "traditionalist" viewpoints had a slight edge over student teachers with "progressivist" viewpoints so far as their respective pupils' desirable classroom behavior was concerned. On the other hand, student teachers with more "progressivist" viewpoints seemed to have a slight edge over their "traditionalist" classmates on the measures of teaching classroom behavioral traits as observed by cooperating teachers and self-reporting of classroom teaching activities. However, all these small correlations were significant only with unacceptably low levels of confidence. Thus it might be concluded that either student teachers' philosophies of social education were not significantly related to these
three teaching behavior measures or that the Philosophy Inventory did not provide an adequate measure of true belief.

**Relationships Between Instructional Preferences and the Three Teaching Behavior Measures**

In checking on the relationships of SIPS with respect to measures of teaching behavior, student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures were found not to be significantly related to their classroom behavioral traits or their pupils' classroom behavior, although in this sample some slight positive relationships (.08 in both cases) were present (see Table XII, page 129). However, the relationship between student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their classroom teaching activities was found to be significant. Presumably student teachers with a stated preference for group-oriented instructional procedures tended to plan more teaching activities free from textbook domination during student teaching. The explanation offered in discussing the significant relationship between student teachers' philosophies of social education and their stated preferences for instructional procedures could be applied in this connection as well since the classroom
teaching activities were reported by student teachers themselves on the basis of their personal observation. In light of this factor, in the interpretation of this statistically significant relationship between student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their classroom teaching activities based on their self-reporting or recollection, the possibility of superficiality should be borne in mind, especially if it was not very strongly supported by their classroom behavioral traits as checked by their cooperating teachers or by their pupils' classroom behavior as checked by their college coordinators. It is possible that student teachers tend to remember their teaching with a bias related to their respective preferences.

**Summary**

In summary, certain specific relationships among the measures in different categories were found to be significant while some others were found to be nonsignificant. As a consequence, the subhypotheses in different groups set forth in the outset of this study were either rejected or accepted. The implications or interpretations of the rejection or acceptance of specific hypothesis or groups
of hypotheses have been discussed in this section. More specific and detailed summary will be found in Chapter V.

Finally, it should be noted that in interpreting the findings of this study, the fact that the student teachers' teaching behavior might have been influenced by their cooperating teachers, their college coordinators, or other factors in the school environment should constantly be taken into account.
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SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to provide a basis for determining:

1. Relationships of measures of certain personal characteristics (authoritarianism, philosophy of social education, and instructional preferences) of a representative group of social studies student teachers to (a) cooperating teachers' reports of their classroom behavioral traits, (b) self-reports of their classroom teaching activities, and (c) college coordinators' appraisals of pupils' behavior in the student teachers' classrooms.

2. Interrelationships among the several measures of these personal characteristics of this representative group.

3. Interrelationships among the several measures of the teaching behavior of this representative group.

The subjects of this study were sixty secondary social student teachers at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, during the spring term of the 1962-63 school year.
The instruments used in this study were (1) Webster, Sanford, and Freedman's *New Instrument for Studying Authoritarianism in Personality* (A Scale); (2) Philosophy of Social Education Inventory (Philosophy Inventory) (see Appendix); (3) Patterson's *Student's Instructional Preference Scale* (SIPS); (4) Del Popolo's *Observation Check Sheet for Student Teachers* (Teacher's Check Sheet); (5) Student Teachers' Self-Check List of Classroom Teaching Activities (Self-Check List) (see Appendix); and (6) Ryan's *Pupils' Classroom Behavior Record*. The Philosophy Inventory and the Self-Check List were developed for the purpose of this study.

The top third of the student group, including students scoring 76 or higher on the A Scale was defined as "authoritarians," the low third, with scores of 57 or less, was defined as "nonauthoritarians." The mean scores made by authoritarians and nonauthoritarians on the other five instruments were analyzed by $t$ tests, and Pearson $r$'s between all possible pairs of scores by all sixty student teachers were calculated. Tests of significance were then made for all $t$ values and Pearson $r$'s. The hypotheses grouped into three categories were analyzed and discussed, with findings for the hypotheses as follows:
1. The first group of hypotheses related to the determination of relationships between the several measures of the personal characteristics of secondary social studies student teachers and the several measures of their classroom teaching behavior. Seven of the nine hypotheses in this group were rejected and two of these hypotheses were accepted.

a. No significant difference was found in the cooperating teachers' judgments of the classroom behavioral traits of authoritarian student teachers and of nonauthoritarian student teachers.

b. No significant difference was found between the self-reported classroom teaching activities of authoritarian student teachers and those of nonauthoritarian student teachers.

c. A significant difference (at better than the .02 level of confidence) was found between college coordinators' judgments of the pupils' behavior in the classrooms of authoritarian student teachers and of nonauthoritarian student teachers. It was also found that in the whole group student teachers' authoritarianism in personality was also significantly correlated with the assessments of
their pupils' classroom behavior (at better than .05 level of confidence), and that the more authoritarian a student teacher was, the less desirable his pupils' behavior appeared to be.

d. No significant relationship was found between student teachers' philosophies of social education and evaluations of their classroom behavioral traits.

e. No significant relationship was found between student teachers' philosophies of social education and their self-reported classroom teaching activities.

f. No significant relationship was found between student teachers' philosophies of social education and evaluations of their pupils' classroom behavior.

g. No significant relationship was found between student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and evaluations of their classroom behavioral traits.

h. A significant relationship (at better than the .05 level of confidence) was found between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and their own reports of their classroom teaching activities. The student teacher who stated that he preferred
more group-oriented instructional procedures would appear to plan classroom teaching activities freer from textbook or teacher domination.

i. No significant difference was found between the student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures and evaluations of their pupils' classroom behavior.

2. The second group of hypotheses was related to the determination of relationships among the levels of authoritarianism, philosophies of social education, and stated preferences for instructional procedures of the secondary social studies student teachers. Two of the three hypotheses were rejected and one of the three was accepted.

a. No significant difference was found between the philosophies of social education held by authoritarian student teachers and those held by nonauthoritarian student teachers.

b. No significant difference was found between the stated preferences for instructional procedures of authoritarian student teachers and those of nonauthoritarian student teachers. But a significant relationship (at the score on the .01 level of confidence) was found
in the correlation of the total group of student teachers' authoritarianism and their stated preferences for instructional procedures.

c. A significant relationship (at better than the .001 level of confidence) was found between the student teachers' philosophies of social education and their stated preferences for instructional procedures. A student teacher leaning more toward a progressivist viewpoint would more likely state a preference for group-oriented instructional procedures.

3. The third group of hypotheses was related to the determination of relationships among the student teachers' classroom behavioral traits, classroom teaching activities, and their pupils' classroom behavior. One of the three hypotheses was rejected and two of these were accepted.

a. A significant relationship (at better than the .05 level of confidence) was found between the student teachers' classroom behavioral traits and their classroom teaching activities. The more desirable a student teacher's behavioral traits were, the more likely he would plan his classroom teaching activities free from textbook domination.
b. A significant relationship (at better than the .01 level of confidence) was found between the student teachers' classroom behavioral traits and their pupils' classroom behavior. The more desirable a student teacher's classroom behavioral traits were, the more desirable his pupils' classroom behavior would be.

c. No significant relationship was found between the student teachers' self-reporting of classroom teaching activities and their pupils' classroom behavior as reported by the college coordinators.

Conclusions

The findings of this study provided some evidence to support the following conclusions.

1. There was no clear cut composite support for the conclusion that personal characteristics in student teachers are related to their teaching behavior. Except in the case of levels of authoritarianism of student teachers and their respective pupils' classroom behavior and in the case of their stated preferences for instructional procedures and their self-reported classroom teaching activities, student teachers with different personal characteristics did
not differ in measures of their teaching behavior with respect to their personal characteristics.

2. In general, student teachers were fairly consistent in their responses on both projective and objective measures. Consequently, student teachers' levels of authoritarianism were found to be significantly related to supervisory judgments of their respective pupils' classroom behavior; and supervisory judgments of student teachers' classroom behavioral traits were found to be significantly related to supervisory judgments of student teachers' respective pupils' classroom behavior.

3. Student teachers were fairly consistent in their responses on measures of their personal perceptions. Consequently, student teachers' stated preferences for instructional procedures were found to be significantly related to their philosophies of social education and their own report of classroom teaching activities.

4. In most cases, student teachers' responses on measures of their personal perceptions did not coincide with their responses on measures of projective nature or with supervisory judgments based on objective observations. Except in the case of student teachers' self-reports of
classroom teaching activities and supervisory judgments on their respective pupils' behavior, the hypothesized relationships between responses of student teachers on these two groups of measures were not statistically supported by the findings of this study. It is possible that in the measures of personal perception the subjects may tend to give what they believe to be approved responses regardless of their personal distinctions or to express learned verbalizations which are inconsistent with the factors which condition their school teaching behavior. Or it is also possible that in measures of personal perceptions, while student teachers tended to verbalize approved responses, their inner personality trends and their preconscious behavioral traits revealed truthfully in their interaction with their classroom pupils.

5. The fact that the less rigid, dominating, dogmatic, and/or autocratic a student teacher was, the more alert, responsible, confident, and/or self-initiating his pupils were and the fact that the more friendly, flexible, sympathetic, and/or understanding a student teacher's behavioral traits were, the more positively his pupils reacted lent support to two of the basic hypotheses of this study. This conclusion could have important
implications in teacher education, since in cultivating more desirable social attitudes in the nation's youth, it would appear to be better to select those teachers in social education with less-authoritarianism and with more democratic behavioral traits in their dealing with pupils.

Recommendations

Based on the experience of this investigation, the following recommendations are made for further exploration.

1. To test further the real significance of relationships of these personal characteristics of social studies teachers to the measures of teaching behavior used in this study, the same design and procedure should be duplicated on a larger number of social studies student teachers. Some of the low and/or nonsignificant relationships found in this study, particularly in contrast with empirical expectations, might be more reliably reflected in a larger population.

2. The same design or similar procedures would be useful if applied to a larger group of social studies teachers. Such an effort would avoid some of the limitations imposed upon the present study by its necessary use of student teachers. It would also involve a population
whose personal characteristics and qualities of teaching behavior would be more stable than is true of student teachers.

3. The same design or similar procedures might be followed to test student teachers in different teaching fields (such as physical science, business, etc.) at the same or different levels. Useful insights might be gained by comparing the findings in such studies.

4. The design of the present study could be improved if instruments to obtain direct pupils’ reactions could be added. Also, the two instruments developed for the purpose of this study could be refined so as to gain more insights of the subjects in these two areas of major concern in teacher education.

5. This study was limited to certain measures of personal characteristics of secondary school social studies student teachers and certain measures of teaching behavior. A third factor of the similar kind of investigation might be the measurement of pupils' actual achievement or progress under teachers or student teachers with these personal characteristics and/or these teaching behaviors.

6. Future studies along similar lines would be so designed as to control or isolate the influence of
cooperating teachers, college coordinators, and/or school systems. Such an effort might avoid some unaccounted influence upon the findings of the study.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

TENTATIVE SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES PROGRAM

PHILOSOPHY INVENTORY*

Directions

In the following you will find a number of statements selected for the purpose of identifying two-polar viewpoints (the traditionalist and the progressivist) concerning secondary social studies program. The statements are so selected as to focus on the sharp contrast of these two viewpoints with regard to the purpose of social studies; the curriculum (content, scope, and sequence) of social studies; and methods and techniques in teaching social studies at the secondary school level. You are asked to validate this tentative inventory by indicating any statement which will reflect clearly one point of view to the exclusion of that of the other.

If any statement in your judgment reflects clearly the traditionalist point of view but not that of the progressivists, please circle T at the left margin of that statement.

If any statement in your judgment reflects clearly the viewpoint of the progressivists, but not that of the traditionalists, please circle P at the left margin of that statement.

If any statement in your opinion reflects either the traditionalist or the progressivist point of view, but not so clearly sure to the exclusion of the other, please check on either side of U in the direction which the statement indicates.

If you are uncertain about any statement, please check U at the left margin of that statement.

*This was used as instructions to the judges in the validation of the Inventory.
Spaces are provided after each statement for your comment, suggestion, modification, correction, etc.

Traditionalist and Progressivist viewpoints concerning social studies program at secondary schools are defined as follows:

**Traditionalist Viewpoints.**—Traditionalists lean to an idealistic educational philosophy; uphold absolute and eternal truth; emphasize intellectual learning; stress traditional cultural heritage; enhance learning of history; favor more discipline, imposed morality, closely supervised pupil experiences; glorify patriotism. Traditionalists prefer more rigid curriculum; may limit the scope of social studies to the basic principles in each discipline; follow more rigid sequence; adopt more formal expository discourse and explanation by the instructor; rely more on textbooks or other formal source of information. The traditionalist teacher would play a dominant role in any teaching-learning situation.

**Progressivist Viewpoints.**—Progressivists lean to a pragmatist educational philosophy; regard truth as relative and individualized; emphasize social experience of pupils; stress social learning; value the personal-social interests and needs of pupils; favor self-imposed discipline, more group process. Progressivists prefer experience- or activity-centered curriculum; encourage more pupil participation in classroom planning. The scope and sequence of social studies programs would be more flexible; using more problem-solving methods, panel discussions, individual or group projects. The progressivist teacher acts as a leader rather than as the source and authority of knowledge.

**Inventory**

**T U P 1.** All of the social studies courses in the secondary schools should be requisite.

**T U P 2.** The primary objectives of a social studies program in secondary schools should be the learning of factual knowledge.

**T U P 3.** Social studies should be so taught as to produce pupils who conform to the present social order rather than who question it.
TUP 4. In the social studies program the pupils should be taught to undoubtingly believe in and to have faith in all the traditional principles in the American heritage.

TUP 5. High morality should be taught to the pupils in a social studies program.

TUP 6. Social studies should emphasize studies of the past rather than studies of the present-day life.

TUP 7. American democracy must be presented to the pupils in social studies as a way of life and a social faith superior to all others.

TUP 8. The present social studies program in secondary schools is teaching subject-matter at the expense of teaching social attitudes and skills.

TUP 9. A social studies program should be based on the personal-social needs of young people.

TUP 10. A social studies program should be related to life situations with which pupils identify themselves.

TUP 11. Courses of study in the social studies should be flexible rather than rigidly prescribed.

TUP 12. Courses of study in the social studies should follow a certain sequence rigidly prescribed for secondary schools.

TUP 13. The chronological approach should be used in history courses.

TUP 14. The topical approach should be used in the social studies program.

TUP 15. The problem approach should be used in the secondary school social studies program.

TUP 16. The chronological, topical, and problem approaches should all be used in the secondary school social studies program.

TUP 17. A wide range of materials other than the textbooks should be used in social studies courses.

TUP 18. Direct community experience should be used in secondary school social studies courses.

TUP 19. Social and civic competence of pupils should be developed through direct participation in community and civic affairs.

TUP 20. In social studies, pupils should be encouraged to think for themselves even to the point of their revising and rejecting what we now believe.
TU P 21. Social studies teachers should be opposed to any form of indoctrination.

TU P 22. Secondary school pupils should have full opportunity to participate in the formulation of objectives of social studies.

TU P 23. The social studies curriculum should be experience-centered rather than subject-centered.

TU P 24. The merits and weakness of any political system, including Communism, should be studied in the secondary school social studies courses.

TU P 25. All political systems, but not Communism, should be studied in the secondary school social studies program.

TU P 26. Study of international organizations such as the United Nations should be included in the social studies program.

TU P 27. The content of each discipline in social studies should be primarily concentrated in the basic principles of each discipline.

TU P 28. Character education should be emphasized in the social studies.

TU P 29. All pupils' school activities should be closely watched and supervised.

TU P 30. Each secondary school pupil should have the same basic mastery of the content in social studies.

TU P 31. In teaching social studies in secondary schools, group processes should be used more often than lecture by the instructor.

TU P 32. The interests and purposes of children should determine the social studies program.

TU P 33. In teaching social studies, the lecture and explanation by the instructor should be practiced more than the group process.

TU P 34. In social studies, class activities should be planned cooperatively by pupils and the teacher.

TU P 35. The problem-solving approach should be the dominant method in teaching social studies to cultivate creative thinking.

TU P 36. Special subjects in social studies should be provided for specialized interests of pupils in secondary schools.

TU P 37. The social studies teacher should not be bothered with the community affairs.

TU P 38. The social studies teacher may be required to take part in school functions, but nothing else.
TUP 39. Social studies should be concerned primarily with the cultivation of the intellectual for all pupils.

TUP 40. The social studies should teach all pupils a common cultural and ethical orientation and a similar point of view.

TUP 41. Social studies should be primarily concerned with the development of common humanity rather than the development of individuality.

TUP 42. A social studies program should be concerned with the process as well as the results of education.

TUP 43. Study of tradition is not a substitute for an attempt for solving problems in social studies.

TUP 44. The social studies program should equip pupils with the ability to be identified with eternal and absolute truth.

TUP 45. Social studies teachers should have a specialized training in the social foundations, child and adolescent psychology, the structure and dynamics of social groups, guidance, and problem-method of teaching.

TUP 46. The social studies program should give consideration to both social education and individual education.

TUP 47. The social studies program should emphasize functional activity rather than passive receptivity.

TUP 48. The purpose of social studies is not only to educate the pupils's mind, but the pupil as a total or whole organism.

TUP 49. Nothing should be put in the social studies curriculum that is not needed for social performance.

TUP 50. The social studies curriculum should be the sum total of the pupil's experience; its scope is the extent of human living.
### APPENDIX II

**TABLE XIII**

**SUMMARY OF RETURNS OF EIGHT JUDGES ON THE FIFTY-ITEM PHILOSOPHY INVENTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Direction of Item by Majority of Judges</th>
<th>Number of Judges in Majority</th>
<th>Total Points Received by Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13c</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14c</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16c</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25c</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28c</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XIII—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Direction of Item by Majority of Judges</th>
<th>Number of Judges in Majority</th>
<th>Total Points Received by Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36C</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38C</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to Chapter III, pp. 84-85, for process of validation.

T indicates traditionalist.

These items were excluded from the 40-item inventory.

U indicates Uncertain.

P indicates Progressivist.
APPENDIX III

Philosophy of Social Education Inventory*

Directions

In this inventory you will find a number of statements designed to sample opinions about the purpose, curriculum, organization, and techniques of the social studies program in the secondary schools. There is considerable disagreement as to these vital issues. There is no "right" or "wrong" answer to any statement. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Please mark each statement in the answer sheet according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one.
If you agree strongly, please circle 1.
If you agree with reservation, please circle 2.
If you are uncertain, please circle 3.
If you disagree with reservation, please circle 4.
If you disagree strongly, please circle 5.

This inventory is for the purpose of research only; your identification will not even be revealed to your instructor. Please feel at ease to respond to all of these statements.

Inventory

1. None of the social studies courses in the secondary schools should be elective.
2. The primary objectives of a social studies program in secondary schools should be the learning of factual knowledge.
3. Social studies should be so taught as to produce pupils who conform to the present social order rather than who question it.

*This is the 40-item inventory submitted for validation to the 134 students in this study.
4. In the social studies program the pupils should be taught to undoubtingly believe in and to have faith in all the traditional principles in the American heritage.

5. Social studies should emphasize studies of the past rather than studies of the present-day life.

6. The present social studies program in secondary schools is teaching the subject-matter at the expense of teaching social attitudes and skills.

7. A social studies program should be based on the personal-social needs of young people.

8. A social studies program should be related to life situations with which pupils identify themselves.

9. Courses of study in the social studies should be flexible rather than rigidly prescribed.

10. Courses of study in the social studies should follow a certain sequence rigidly prescribed for secondary schools.

11. A wide range of materials other than the textbooks should be used in social studies courses.

12. Direct community experience should be used in secondary school social studies courses.

13. Social and civic competence of pupils should be developed through direct participation in community and civic affairs.

14. In social studies, pupils should be encouraged to think for themselves even to the point of their revising and rejecting what we now believe.

15. Social studies teachers should be opposed to any form of indoctrination.

16. Secondary school pupils should have full opportunity to participate in the formulation of objectives of social studies.

17. The social studies curriculum should be experience-centered rather than subject-centered.

18. The merits and weakness of any political system, including Communism, should be studied in the secondary school social studies courses.

19. Study of international organizations such as the United Nations should be included in the social studies program.

20. The content of each discipline in social studies should be primarily concentrated in the basic principles of each discipline.
21. All pupils' school activities should be closely watched and supervised.
22. Each secondary school pupil should have the same basic mastery of the content in social studies.
23. In teaching social studies in secondary schools, group processes should be used more often than lecture by the instructor.
24. The interests and purposes of children should determine the social studies program.
25. In teaching social studies, the lecture and explanation by the instructor should be practiced more than the group process.
26. In social studies, class activities should be planned cooperatively by pupils and the teacher.
27. The problem-solving approach should be the dominant method in teaching social studies to cultivate creative thinking.
28. The social studies teacher should not be bothered with the community affairs.
29. Social studies should be primarily concerned with the cultivation of the intellectual for all pupils.
30. The social studies should teach all pupils a common cultural and ethical orientation and a similar point of view.
31. Social studies should be primarily concerned with the development of common humanity rather than the development of individuality.
32. A social studies program should be concerned with the process as well as the results of education.
33. Study of tradition is not a substitute for an attempt for solving problems in social studies.
34. The social studies program should equip pupils with the ability to be identified with the eternal and absolute truth.
35. Social studies teachers should have specialized training in the social foundations, child and adolescent psychology, the structure and dynamics of social groups, guidance, and problem-method of teaching.
36. The social studies program should give consideration to both the social education and the individual education.
37. The social studies program should emphasize functional activity rather than passive receptivity.
38. The purpose of social studies is not only to educate the pupil's mind but the pupil as a total or whole organism.

39. The social studies curriculum should be the sum total of the pupil's experience; its scope is the extent of human living.

40. Nothing should be put in the social studies curriculum that is not needed for social performance.
### APPENDIX IV

**TABLE XIV**

**DISCRIMINATING POWER OF ITEMS IN FORTY-ITEM PHILOSOPHY INVENTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
<th>Rank Order of D.P.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All social studies</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2. Primary objectives</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3. Conform and question</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4. Faith in heritage</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Studies of past</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Subjects vs. attitudes</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*7. Personal-social needs</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*8. Life situations</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Flexible vs. rigidity</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*10. Sequence of courses</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Range of materials</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*12. Community experience</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*13. Civic competence</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Think for themselves</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Indoctrination</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Formulation of objectives</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*17. Experience vs. subject</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Political system</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. International organization</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Basic principles</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Activities supervised</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*22. Basic mastery of content</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*23. Group vs. Lecture</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*24. Interests of children</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*25. Lecture vs. group process</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*26. Class activities</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Problem-solving</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Community affairs</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*29. Cultivating intellectuality</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>D.F.</td>
<td>Rank Order of D.F.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Common orientation</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*31. Development of common humanity</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Process and result</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*33. Study of tradition</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*34. Eternal truth</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Specialized training</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Social and individual education</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*37. Functional activity</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Pupil's mind</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*39. Scope of social studies</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Social performance</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: N = 138; N of top quartile = 34; N of low quartile = 34.

*These items were retained, as the result of this analysis, in the final 20-item inventory. Refer to Chapter III, p. 86 for definition of D.F. (discriminating power).
APPENDIX V

Philosophy of Social Education
Inventory*

Directions

In this inventory you will find a number of statements designed to sample opinions about the purpose, curriculum, organization, and techniques of the social studies program in the secondary schools. There is no "right" or "wrong" answers to any statement. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Please mark each statement in the answer sheet according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one.

If you agree strongly, please circle 1.
If you agree with reservations, please circle 2.
If you are uncertain, please circle 3.
If you disagree with reservations, please circle 4.
If you disagree strongly, please circle 5.

This inventory is for the purpose of research only; your identification will not even be revealed to your instructor. Please feel at ease to respond to all of these statements.

Inventory

1. The primary objectives of a social studies program in secondary schools should be the learning of factual knowledge.

2. Social studies should be so taught as to produce pupils who conform to the present social order rather than to question it.

*This is the final 20-item form used in this study.
3. In the social studies program the pupils should be taught to undoubtingly believe in and to have faith in all the traditional principles in the American heritage.

4. A social studies program should be based on the personal-social needs of young people.

5. A social studies program should be related to life situations with which pupils identify themselves.

6. Courses of study in the social studies should follow a certain sequence rigidly prescribed for secondary schools.

7. Direct community experience should be used in secondary school social studies courses.

8. Social and civic competence of pupils should be developed through direct participation in community and civic affairs.

9. The social studies curriculum should be experience-centered rather than subject-centered.

10. Each secondary school pupil should have the same basic mastery of the content in social studies.

11. In teaching social studies in secondary schools, group processes should be used more often than lecture by the instructor.

12. The interests and purposes of children should determine the social studies program.

13. In teaching social studies, the lecture and explanation by the instructor should be practiced more than the group process.

14. In social studies, class activities should be planned cooperatively by pupils and the teacher.

15. Social studies should be primarily concerned with the cultivation of the intellectual for all pupils.

16. Social studies should be primarily concerned with the development of common humanity rather than the development of individuality.

17. Study of tradition is not a substitute for an attempt for solving problems in social studies.

18. The social studies program should equip pupils with the ability to be identified with the eternal and absolute truth.

19. The social studies program should emphasize functional activity rather than passive receptivity.

20. The social studies curriculum should be the sum total of the pupil's experience; its scope is the extent of human living.
APPENDIX VI

STUDENT TEACHER'S SELF-CHECK LIST OF CLASSROOM TEACHING ACTIVITIES

Student teacher's name or student number __________________________ Date __________

Subject(s) and grade(s) __________________________ Time of actual teaching __________ weeks

Explanation: This list of multiple choice items is for the use of secondary social studies student teachers in making their own report of the classroom teaching activities during the period of student teaching when (and only when) classes were conducted by the student teacher.

The activities are divided into five major categories. Each item under different categories is to be reported independently of the other, i.e., the marking of an item is not to be construed as determining the marking of items in the same or other categories. Each is to be reported on the basis of what actually occurred in the classes conducted by the student teacher during the period of student teaching. No single item in any category is necessarily to be considered as the only one correct educationally.

In marking this check list, you may select any one (and only one) class in the field of social sciences which you think is the most representative of your student teaching as the single reference of reporting. Please mark the most appropriate completion in each statement by placing a cross (X) within the parentheses that precede it except in the case of Category III (special explanation is given for marking the completion in that category). Please mark one completion and only one completion in each item.

I. Teaching planning:

1. Teaching plans were made
   ( ) independently of the textbook
   ( ) independently of the textbook, but using the textbook materials as the major source
   ( ) following the organization of the textbook but supplemented with some additional materials
   ( ) following very closely both the organization and materials of the textbook

2. Integrated teaching plans were usually made to cover
   ( ) more than a week
   ( ) about a week
   ( ) two or three class periods
   ( ) about a day
   ( ) no definite pattern

3. The objectives of a unit (or a lesson) were decided
   ( ) by the pupils and the student teacher
   ( ) by the pupils, the student teacher and the cooperating teacher
   ( ) by the student teacher and the cooperating teacher
   ( ) by the student teacher alone
   ( ) without the student teacher's participation
1. The contents of a unit (or a lesson) were decided
   ( ) by the pupils and the student teacher
   ( ) by the pupils, the student teacher, and the cooperating teacher
   ( ) by the student teacher and the cooperating teacher
   ( ) by the student teacher alone
   ( ) without the student teacher's participation

5. Methods of presentation of classroom activities were decided
   ( ) by the pupils and the student teacher
   ( ) by the pupils, the student teacher, and the cooperating teacher
   ( ) by the student teacher and the cooperating teacher
   ( ) by the student teacher alone
   ( ) without the student teacher's participation

II. Assignments of learning activities:

6. Most assignments of learning activities were made
   ( ) on a voluntary basis by the pupils
   ( ) on a voluntary basis by the pupils with the help and approval
     of the student teacher
   ( ) jointly by the pupils, the student teacher, and the cooperating
     teacher
   ( ) by the student teacher alone
   ( ) without the student teacher's participation

7. Usually assignments of learning activities were made
   ( ) on an organized unit basis, covering several days' activities
   ( ) from day to day only
   ( ) from time to time without definite pattern
   ( ) daily except for routine assignments such as turning in term
     papers, notebooks...etc.
   ( ) on a term basis

III. Selection of learning activities:

Explanation: In answering questions in this category, please follow
this special procedure: Read each of the listed activities below,
circle the letter which indicates how frequently this activity has
been used in your teaching.

If the activity was used most of the time, please circle (A)
If the activity was used very often, please circle (B)
If the activity was used twice, please circle (C)
If the activity was used once, please circle (D)
If the activity was never used, please circle (E)

8. Textbook reading assignments A B C D E

9. Written reports, outlines, questions, etc. from the textbook A B C D E

10. Workbooks A B C D E

11. Required readings other than the textbook A B C D E
12. Direct question-and-answer between the student teacher and individual pupils (recitations, etc.) A B C D E
13. Lectures A B C D E
14. Full-class discussions A B C D E
15. Small group discussions or "buzz" sessions A B C D E
16. Panel discussion A B C D E
17. Drama, "mock" situations, etc. A B C D E
18. Individual research projects A B C D E
19. Individual creative projects (maps, charts, drawings, models, etc.) A B C D E
20. Small group research or creative projects A B C D E
21. Bulletin board, wall displays, or other exhibitions of illustrative materials A B C D E
22. Mechanical audio-visual aids A B C D E
23. Field trips A B C D E
24. Outside speaker or speakers A B C D E

IV. Direction of learning activities:

25. In classroom learning situations
   ( ) the pupils provided direction most of the time
   ( ) the pupils provided direction in several types of situations
   ( ) the pupils provided direction only when making presentations
   ( ) the student teacher provided direction all the time
   ( ) the student teacher and the cooperating teacher provided direction all the time

V. Evaluation:

26. After each unit or lesson
   ( ) the pupils evaluated whether the objectives of the unit or lesson had been achieved
   ( ) the pupils and the student teacher did the evaluation
   ( ) the student teacher and the cooperating teacher did the evaluation
   ( ) the student teacher alone did the evaluation
   ( ) the cooperating teacher alone did the evaluation
27. The means of evaluation, other than final examinations, which carried the most weight was
   ( ) evaluation of classroom participation or performance
   ( ) evaluation of outside activity, such as themes, projects, reports, etc.
   ( ) written tests over longer units
   ( ) daily or "pop" quizzes
   ( ) chapter tests

28. The results of evaluation were used primarily for the purpose of
   ( ) self-evaluation by the student teacher
   ( ) advising the pupils in further studies
   ( ) assisting in planning of further teaching
   ( ) as a part of final evaluation of the pupils
   ( ) as a means of cooperating teacher-student teacher planning

29. During the period of student teaching, provision was made for pupils to evaluate the class activities
   ( ) often
   ( ) occasionally
   ( ) once
   ( ) never
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Scoring key for the student teacher's Self-Check List of Classroom Teaching Activities.*

1. (4)  II. (4)  V. (4)
   (3)    (2)     (2)
   (2)    (1)     (-1)
   (1)    (-2)    (-2)

2. (4)  7. (0)  27.
   (3)  (4)    (3)
   (1)  (2)    (4)
   (0)  (1)    (2)
   (2)  (3)    (0)

3. (0)  (0)    (1)
   (2)  
   (1)
   (-1)
   (-2)

III. 7-24*

IV. 25.

4. (4)  (2)  (3)
   (2)  (2)  29.
   (1)  (-2) (4)
   (-1) (0)  (3)
   (-2) (0)  (1)
   (0)

5. (2)  (1)
   (1)
   (-1)
   (-2)
   (0)

*The point values assigned for questionnaire items 7 to 24 are explained in detail in Chapter III, p. 89.
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LETTERS

Post Office Box 8026
N. T. Station
Denton, Texas
March 21, 1963

In view of the increasing complexity of social problems in a modern society, the tasks of secondary social studies teachers have been even more important in recent years. In preparing future social studies teachers, all institutions of higher learning have encountered a number of challenging difficulties. With the purpose of meeting some of these challenges, a research project is undertaken, with the full approval and cooperation of the faculty of the School of Education, North Texas State University, to ascertain some of the factors involved in the preparation of prospective social studies teachers.

You are cordially asked to participate in this joint effort by providing some valuable answers to some of the crucial issues of the day. Enclosed please find copies of some inventories used in this study. If answer sheets are provided, you are asked to return only the answer sheets within a day or two in the return envelope. You may keep or throw away the accompanying inventories after you have answered the questions.

I will keep in touch with you for further development. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

I look forward to seeing you at the campus and hope you enjoy successful student teaching.*

Sincerely yours,

Shia-ling Liu

Enclosures:
No. of Inventories: 3
No. of Answer sheets: 3

*A letter from the investigator to the student teacher.
Mr. Shia-ling Liu, a doctoral candidate at North Texas, is presently undertaking a research project with the purpose of finding ways and means to improve the preparation of future social studies teachers. His project has the approval of the faculty of the University. This study requires the collection of several kinds of data from all NTSU students in the social sciences who are in student teaching during the spring semester.

I want to urge your cooperation in completing this study. I believe that you will find the things Mr. Liu asks you to do are not difficult and in some instances may be helpful and interesting to you.

The information gained from you will be used by Mr. Liu solely for his research and will not be seen by anyone on the University faculty or in the public schools. You may, if you wish to do so, talk with Mr. Liu about your own information.*

Sincerely yours,

C. M. Clarke

* A letter from the Director of Teacher Education to the student teacher.
In view of the increasing complexity of social problems in a modern society, the tasks of secondary social studies teachers have been ever more important in recent years.

In preparing future social studies teachers, all institutions of higher learning have encountered a number of challenging difficulties. With the purpose of relating certain personality characteristics of the social studies student teacher to his classroom behavior, I am undertaking a doctoral dissertation, and I hope that it may contribute to the preparation of social studies teachers in the future.

You are respectfully asked to participate in this effort by providing the information requested on the enclosed Observation Check Sheet.

Enclosed please find a copy of the Observation Check Sheet for Student Teachers. You are to record your frank and objective observation of your social studies student teacher during his (or her) stay with you throughout the period of student teaching. You will find more detailed explanation in using it in the first part of the check sheet. It is not necessary that you sign this sheet. For your convenience you may hand this sheet to the University coordinator or return it to me in the enclosed envelope.

The information given by you will be kept confidential and will be used for the purpose of research only. Your assistance, which is essential for the successful conclusion of the study, will be very highly appreciated.*

Sincerely yours,

Shia-ling Liu

*A letter from the investigator to the cooperating teacher.
Dear Fellow Teacher:

The accompanying request from Mr. Shia-ling Liu for your assistance in the collection of data regarding your social studies student teacher is a part of a research project which is important not only to Mr. Liu as a doctoral candidate at this University, but also to the field of social education as well.

We know far too little about the conditions and forces which contribute to good teaching in the social studies. Mr. Liu's study hopes to contribute to our knowledge in this area and thus to our efforts in the preparations of social studies teachers in the future.

I believe that you will find that the report which Mr. Liu is asking you to make will fit into your normal evaluation of your student teacher. It should serve as a sound basis for advising the student and for discussing his work with the college coordinator working with you.

I want to express my sincere hope that you will return the evaluation material which Mr. Liu is seeking, and in your help to him have a part in the improvement of social studies teaching.*

Sincerely yours,

C. M. Clarke

* A letter from the Director of Teacher Education to the cooperating teacher.
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