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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

For many years, there has been a continued and extensive, though not completely successful effort, in trying to decide what constitutes effective teaching. One problem has been that of agreeing on what one means when he uses the term "effective." Some use one set of criteria, and some use another, making for confusion in semantic reference. It may be that differences in teaching tasks make the use of a general term inappropriate, since teaching effectiveness depends on the variability in the task.

Lists of personal qualities have been shown by Combs (3, p. 2) to be unproductive of results in orienting persons on how to perform the teaching role in an effective way. Attempts to link teaching success with specific personality traits have also been unproductive, according to Peck (5), except where the person is rather obviously neurotic or psychotic. Peck did produce evidence to show different types of interpersonal weaknesses, but the likelihood of isolating sets of characteristics which can be studied in reference to teaching efficiency does not appear to offer much hope because of the
diverse make-up of the combinations found among good teachers. If, however, a prospective teacher has consistently produced low scores on the battery of tests which are administered to prospective teachers (about ten tests in number), the conclusion seems to be that this person is a poor candidate for teaching. Peck does not isolate specific personality traits but attempts to use the total behavioral pattern as it emerges in the various situations to which the prospective teacher responds. Even when Peck used a total of ten tests and tried to set up a total behavior analysis, results were limited.

Selection procedures for choosing prospective teachers are used to some degree by all training institutions. The persons primarily responsible for teacher selection are college faculty members and school superintendents. Even when selection procedures are continually updated, the products of the colleges of education need constant evaluation. Some studies, Ryans (6), Combs (3), Sarason (7), have shown that when there is a flagging of interest in the programs, the teacher products are below good quality.

The present study is in the area of teacher selection. It is an attempt to evaluate a series of possible selection techniques. Interest in such a study came from several sources.

First, a study of the teacher selection methodology at the University of Texas revealed that those faculty members working with the program at the university appeared to have made some
substantial gains in the direction of better teacher selection. For one thing, they had developed several screening techniques that were not used elsewhere.

Secondly, the University of Texas researchers have started making a rather thorough analysis of their prospective teacher candidates by the use of many instruments rather than only a few.

Third, interest was generated in the present approach by a study of sociometric techniques which Moreno and Jennings (5, 6, 7) have made scientifically important. More specifically, the work of Bonney (1, 2) with his "normal personality" studies using sociometric techniques seemed to point out that something could be done in teacher selection by use of the sociometric method. This was partially demonstrated in Gronlund's (4) study, using sociometric data.

Fourth, the institution from which the data for this study were gathered had requested that some attention be given to teacher selection. This institution was specifically interested in a more comprehensive analysis which did not depend on an entirely subjective evaluation by faculty members. The usual sources of information about a candidate were grades and an adequate evaluation form which was a loosely constructed check-sheet producing little vital information about the prospective teacher.

The combined approach used in this study was an amalgam of pupil observations and peer choices. The University of
Texas developed norms on a pupil-rating of teachers on both male and female student teachers. The rating describes the behavior of prospective teachers in the classroom. It does not make any reference as to whether the resultant behavior is either effective or ineffective, although students do score "low," "medium," or "high." The follow-up studies on the student teachers tend to verify that those students taking the Pupil Observation Survey (POSR) who scored low do not function well in the classroom. Only tentative conclusions are being drawn at the present time on the validity and reliability of the POSR by University personnel. However, enough information has been uncovered to indicate that the instrument is worth further study. For this reason, the present study was conducted with the assumption in mind that the behavioral tendencies which the POSR measures were in the direction of teaching effectiveness. They were classified as such in this research.

The sociometric techniques in conjunction with the pupil observations seem to offer potentially useful methods of teacher selection. At this stage of research it is more appropriate to use a variety of approaches rather than using only the grades made in college classes and the cooperating teachers' ratings.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine how capable college students are in making choices relevant to each other's success as student teachers when compared with (a) college faculty ratings, (b) the judgments of cooperating teachers, and (c) scores from two objective self-rating scales. The self-rating scales used were the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Adjective Check List, to be described in Chapter III. The criterion of success as student teachers was the responses of the pupils to the Pupil Observation Survey. In addition to the more general problem stated above, there was the additional task of determining if the several ratings and peer choices would yield information useful in teacher selection. Also, attention was directed to determining if significant differences were present between the group of subjects who scored low on the POSR and the group who scored high on the POSR. In addition, the degrees of correlation between the study variables and the POSR were calculated. Since a large amount of work had been done in areas of socio-relations on pupil ratings, and on sociometric testing, it was believed that a study which would incorporate the two would augment student-teacher evaluation.

Hypotheses of the Study

The following hypotheses were tested:
Hypothesis 1. There will be a high positive correlation between sociometric choice status which a group of student teachers have in reference to each other, and ratings obtained on these student teachers by pupils in the classroom.

Hypothesis 2. The peer choice standings will show a higher correlation with the POSR than will the ratings given by faculty members, cooperating teachers, scores from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, and scores on the Adjective Check List.

Hypothesis 3. There will be significant differences between the means of the upper and lower 25 per cent groupings of the subjects of this study on the five study variables, namely (a) the sociometric choices, (b) the faculty ratings, (c) the cooperating teachers' ratings, (d) selected scores from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, and (e) selected scores from the Adjective Check List (ACL) when each of these assessments is measured against the five factors of the Pupil Observation Survey (POSR).

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made:

1. The student teachers knew each other well enough to respond to a sociometric test.

2. The Pupil Observation Survey (POSR) is an evaluation of effective teaching in the classroom; hence, it is used as the criterion of teaching effectiveness.
Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions of terms are used:

1. **Psychetele.**—Psychetele denotes the kinds of feelings that are held between individuals as persons and are based upon the ability to form interpersonal affiliations. They are a personal matter and do not concern situations which are common to a group of persons and do not involve some kind of product.

2. **Sociotele.**—Sociotele relationships refer to work oriented situations and depict the ability to function as a participating member of a work group.

3. **Cooperating teacher.**—The full-time teacher in the public school system under whom the student teacher functions for nine weeks.

4. **Supervising teacher.**—The full-time college faculty member who acts as liaison between college, student teachers, and cooperating teachers.

Limitations of the Study

The following were limitations in this study:

1. The study was limited to a sample population of approximately ninety-seven college seniors in a nine-week student teaching experience. These students were drawn from a general college population similar to those students found
on a midwestern college campus whose primary goal is the preparation of teachers.

2. Communications with cooperating teachers and faculty members were limited to mail contacts, thus creating some difficulty in explaining the nature of the study.

Value of the Study

This study should be valuable to those educators at the college and university level who are concerned with improving their methods of teacher evaluation generally. It has brought into focus several problems for future research which directly deal with the philosophy of teacher evaluation presently used by the college from which the study was made.
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CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The number of references in the literature dealing with this problem proved to be plentiful. Many of the articles deal with the long history of attempts to find ways of rating the teacher by pupils. Some of the first efforts to describe effective teaching characteristics go back to 1845. The articles reviewed stressed both the personal qualities of the teacher and his methods as factors in teaching success.

The literature on sociometry is also extensive. This review draws from the early work of Jennings (27) and Moreno (32). Some applications from Gronlund (21, 22, 23), Bonney (11, 12, 13, 14), and Peck (36, 37, 46, 47) will also be considered.

Background Materials

Early Schools and Programs

In 1845, there were not very many teachers. There were few persons who were interested in the teaching of young people, and the formal training they received was almost, if not altogether, nonexistent. There were some persons, however,
who were interested in teachers and in introducing changes for improvement. There were no teacher training institutions as such, and little attention was given to the schools and to teachers. School was a "luxury" item, and where schools existed, the offerings were limited. The idea was to teach the children to read, write, and calculate. One early view was expressed by the Reverend Denison Olmstead (32), who said, "... the ideal teacher was one who had a realistic command of his subject matter and related subjects, and possessed a knowledge of the world." Nathan Monroe (29), in August, 1846, cited the following traits as being complimentary to teaching: "a benevolent disposition, good health, pleasing appearance, and a genuine and earnest sympathy for the young." The traits listed by Monroe have frequently been among those mentioned by pupils when the latter have been allowed to name the things they liked best about teachers.

G. Stanley Hall (25) was one of the first to apply scientific principles to the study of teachers. He tried to instruct teachers in the more accurate observation of behavior. He and his associates taught the teachers his methods, and then discussed their results shortly afterward. During the first twenty years of the twentieth century, interested persons continued to study the impact of the teacher-student relationship. These included the eminent educators, John Dewey, William James, William Heard Kilpatrick, and Gardner Murphy.
Correlations between what the teacher considered to be effective teaching and such things as intelligence, amount of formal education, sex, grades in various college subjects, overall class standing, and the like were computed. These correlations were generally low, indicating that more research was necessary if progress was to be made in more accurately describing effective teaching.

**Teacher Evaluation by Students**

A. S. Barr (6) has shown considerable tenacity in reference to the subject of teacher evaluation. He tried to show the difficulties encountered in assessment and evaluation. One of the main problems, according to Barr, was that there was little communication of purposes between administrators and teachers. Barr felt that a rather wide disparity existed between what pupils and administrators considered a teacher should be.

Hunt (24) pointed out that pupils are good judges of teacher behavior because they are "... the one constant factor in the educational program." Pupils see the teacher in a variety of situations. They will be able to observe certain kinds of behavior; for example, if the teacher is friendly, helpful, neat in appearance, considerate of them as persons, or the opposite of these traits. In reference to the opportunity of pupils to make observations, Veldman and Peck (42) say,
No one would argue that students are totally accurate and objective judges of teaching behavior . . . but there is no evidence that the few adults who may be in a position to observe and evaluate the behavior of student teachers are, on the average, any more objective.

This indicates that Veldman and Peck are willing to accord pupils a place in the overall rating system of teachers.

Witty (47) conducted a study of pupil compositions on the subject of "The Teacher Who Helped Me Most" in an attempt to discover what aspects of teacher behavior the students felt meant most to them. In the first such study, approximately fourteen thousand letters were submitted by students in grades one to twelve. The letters were analyzed to determine the frequency of traits mentioned. Twelve traits were cited consistently over the next three years in similar reports. Some of those traits which were mentioned throughout were kindliness and consideration of the individual, patience, wide interests, fairness and impartiality, sense of humor, pleasing personal appearance and manner, and unusual proficiency in teaching a particular subject. The second study received even greater attention when 33,000 letters were submitted. The most important single finding from all these essays was that very much the same traits were consistently mentioned by the pupils.

Amatora (1) in a study in which teachers were rated by pupils, observed that for the development of wholesome personality in children, "... it is of vital importance ... that
teachers possess well-adjusted personalities." Amatora found a significant positive relationship between teacher and pupil personality. Williams (46) gave a questionnaire to freshmen high school students in an attempt to determine what the students felt they needed from teachers. The findings, which were similar to Witty's and Amatora's, listed such things as understanding, fairness, sense of humor, and the like. It will be noticed that few of these listings make reference to subject matter per se. The pupils may have felt that if these qualities they mentioned were present in their teachers, learning the subject was a natural outcome. This is supported by a statement by one of the children in Witty's study when he said, "Miss X didn't teach me to read--it was just like magic. Suddenly I could read out of my reader. She taught me and I didn't know it" (47).

Symonds (4) determined that pupil ratings agreed with each other when rating effective teacher characteristics. The correlations ranged from the .70's to the .90's. Although there were only seven questions in Symond's study, these relationships are impressive in so far as rater reliability is concerned. Symonds said of them, "... they indicate considerable halo effect in the rankings...." Symonds tabulated correlations between pupil ratings and principal ratings, teacher relationships with pupils, and teacher ability to secure pupil achievement. A finding of
Symonds relevant to this study was that superior teachers liked children while inferior teachers disliked them.

Mearns (28) felt that effective teachers take steps to minimize attempts to make children what they eventually ought to be, and instead concentrate on the practical business of seeing what they really are now. He felt that there were few teachers who practiced such a philosophy of teaching and that not very many teachers attempt to achieve this level of practice.

In another study by Peck (42), he and Veldman made the statement that, "... pupils have one major advantage over the observers: they see the teacher perform on many different occasions as she encounters a wide variety of problems... and as she deals with individuals known personally to the observers." The continued interest in pupil evaluations of teacher behavior led these researchers to the development of their instrument, the Pupil Observation Survey (POSR). They feel that it offers several possibilities of being a potential aid in the assessment of good and poor teacher behavior. In still another study of teacher personality, Peck (33) revealed that some persons planning to become teachers were decidedly too far down the mental health scale to be effective teachers. This group was found to be deficient in many of the traits recognized to be necessary for the healthy development of children. Peck concluded that this group of subjects would
need extensive counseling before they met an acceptable standard of healthy teacher behavior. In a study relative to the subject of teaching, Symonds (40) made the observation that "... the basic criterion of teacher effectiveness is the change in pupils." The change sought by Peck and by Symonds cannot be accomplished by teachers who are so in need of psychological help themselves that they are unable to recognize the needs of the pupils. With the increasing need to furnish more teachers for more classrooms, the problem of deleting those whose personalities do not measure up to health criteria becomes more critical.

Peer Evaluation

An investigation into the prediction and assessment of teacher effectiveness was made by Gronlund along sociometric lines. Gronlund (22) studied the accuracy of sociometric perception using as one of the criterion choices on his form "... indicate which five classmates you would prefer first as future teaching companions." The subjects (student teachers) were then asked to predict the rank order of all members of the group, including themselves. Thus, each subject was included in two sets of data. One was his own relative sociometric status within the group, as judged by the criterion, and the other indicated his judgments of the relative sociometric status of self and others. Gronlund found that the self-prediction of the five students who had the
lowest sociometric status was, on an average, an overprediction of thirteen ranks. They also were found to have the minimum number of personal assets which would recommend them as teachers. Gronlund's study supports the view taken by sociometrists that those who are low in sociometric status are unable to determine their own stimulus-value.

Cannon (15) studied the stability of sociometric scores as well as their predictive value. He found correlations in the .70's and .80's between the choice status of students tested over a three-year period from grades nine through twelve. Gronlund and Holmlund (22) found, in a study of sociometric choices, that the sociometric status of students in the sixth grade was strongly indicative of a similar rank in high school. They further found that such status was related to continuance in and later graduation from high school.

Wertheimer (45) studied the consistency of sociometric status positions in high school boys and girls and found that the relationship was very high for any particular position between retests. The intervals she used in her study were twelve months, twenty months, and eight months. The consistency of position was maintained by both boys and girls. Bonney (14) studied the constancy of sociometric ranks of college students over a two-year period. His findings support the hypothesis that sociometric ratings remain fairly
stable over this period. Hall (23) studied the constancy of sociometric ranks of elementary school children over a two-year period and found a high correspondence of relative positions among the group. During the period of the study, there was relatively little turnover in student population.

There are ways by which individuals change their sociometric ranking. The most usual way is when they become more friendly and outgoing. Their stimulus-value continues to increase as they improve in personality traits which others interpret as being of a cooperative, helpful nature. Nonetheless, personality characteristics tend to be very persistent. Neilon (35) was able to identify with a better-than-chance success several elements of personality which had been identified in twenty-five babies fifteen years after they were first studied at age three. Her study lends support to the idea of the persistence of personality traits. The good school takes the position that personal-social relations can be improved and that such an effort is one of its major functions. The school's objectives along these lines cannot be reached unless the teachers are capable of perceiving as one of their responsibilities the improvement of human relations. It has been indicated earlier that teachers who have low status are unable to recognize their own inadequacies in this regard. As teachers increase their abilities in the development of personal-social relations of students, the
improvement in human relations is a somewhat natural occurrence.

Smith (43) studied the social attraction patterns between elementary school children and student teachers. The student teachers' acceptance by children showed more rejection after three months than at the start. The later rejection was more emphatic than the early rejection, i.e., the rejection scores were higher. However, Smith found shifts in status occurring with a degree of frequency which would "warrant efforts for improvement." It appears that as student teachers become better able to enhance and develop pupil interest, the pupils recognize this change on the part of the student teacher's attitude and respond positively to the change.

Jennings (27) brought the matter of the importance of social interaction into focus when she stated,

Social relationships of choice, in which selective affinity between animals operates, can be observed in many species. Man differs in this respect from lower organisms only by the greater complexity and subtlety of the choices he makes. No man lives unto himself. Each of us lives our life interacting with other persons (p. 3).

The elementary and secondary school classrooms offer a greater opportunity for the students to form affiliative relationships than does the college classrooms in most cases because the students in the public schools come from the same community and have known each other while growing up. On the other
hand, the college community draws its population from quite large areas. It is easier for a student to "disappear" on the college campus than for a public school student to "disappear" in his home town. Most college students know only a few other students well. However, if Gronlund's findings can be assumed to be valid for college levels, those college students who have been high sociometrically during elementary and high school days are more than likely to score high sociometrically in college.

Efforts to study the problem of the "normal personality" through sociometric techniques were made by Bonney (11, 12). It is not to be inferred from these studies that "normal" necessarily means "healthy." A person may exhibit normal personality for the group to which reference is made and be a "sick" person when compared to other personalities in other groups. Note the behavior of Nazis or their victims in concentration camps, as described by Frankl (19). To quote Bonney, the contention is made that normal personality taken from peer evaluation is a "... strong component of any descriptive picture of normality based on social definitions" (12). Therefore, no matter what the basic composition, order, or intentions of the group, peers are capable of making judgments as to the degree to which another member upholds the values and standards, attitudes, and objectives of a particular group. Generally, it follows that those who are perceived
to be marginal members of the group are the ones who receive the low status positions.

**Student Teaching**

In an attempt to review the problems pertaining to the training of student teachers in a more comprehensive way, Sarason, Davidson, and Blatt (42) directed their attention to the area of the "unknowns" of the student teaching experience. These researchers were unable to find, after an exhaustive study of the problem, such things as the parent-teacher conference, student-teacher conferences in disciplinary problems, and the like in the professional training of teachers. This, to Sarason and his associates, is like sending an M.D., who has never seen an appendectomy performed but only been lectured to about the subject, into the operating room with the high hope of not having to "bury the mistake." Sarason and others feel it to be unfortunate that so little is known concerning the psychological effects of student teaching. The systematic study of the problems encountered by real live teachers in real live teaching situations has not achieved its full prominence by those who are concerned by the problem.

Fuller (20) was well acquainted with the deficiencies in this area of research when she stated that "... knowledge of student teaching experience ... should not be based on armchair speculation about what kinds of things
teachers need to know, but upon the simple brutality of teaching." In the project on teacher education with which she is associated, Fuller attempts to introduce prospective elementary teachers to variable teacher behaviors. That is, she indicates different problems and discusses various teacher responses to the on-going activities in the classroom. There are many ways to approach situations which are encountered in everyday experiences. Those approaches which lead to the formation of attitudes that make learning more meaningful would seem to be of greater value than those approaches which lead to a dislike of formal education. In an effort to elicit responses on what the prospective teachers would do under a given set of conditions, Fuller and others in the project have devised what they call the Tensit Test. It is similar to the kinds of situations to which trainees of the wartime OSS* responded. The meaning of the name "Tensit" stands for "Tendency in the Situation." An example of the Tensit Test follows:

Things had been going well in the 6th grade when at 9:15 someone set off a smoke bomb. Immediately the girls started to cough and the boys to roll on the floor. Two boys pretended to climb out the window. At 9:16 the principal casually walked in with the day's absentee list (20).

There is a free response form to this test as well as a structured form. Four categories have been identified into

*Office of Strategic Services, World War II Training Exercises.
which the great majority of student responses fell. One of these categories is primarily self-protective, i.e., "Tell the principal it was not my fault." A second category is primarily punitive—locate and punish the offender. A third includes responses which are class protective—see that no one is hurt. The fourth category includes responses which are learning oriented, i.e., show the pupils how a smoke bomb works or what chemicals do to tissue. It can be seen from the listing of these categories that they differentiate between those teachers who are effective and those who would be considered ineffective.

There are students, according to Fuller, who "pass through" the student teaching experience, who are essentially unnoticed by peers, teachers, and college faculty, but who may be judged by qualified observers to be potentially damaging to children.

Teachers are appointed to their positions of authority in classrooms, but the students they teach are able to determine fairly accurately the degree to which the teacher has the pupils' well being in mind. Reference is again made to Witty's study (51) in support of this point, where it was found that the students believed the teacher should conduct class in a nonhostile, friendly manner. Groups of persons have many functions which may be very involved, extending, at the other extreme, to just living in the same structure. Hierarchies of friendship and isolation seem to be present in
all such groupings. Bonney, Hoblit, and Dryer (13) found that preferences for companions in a male dormitory follow, generally, preferences in other situations. That is, those who were named on a sociometric test as being most sought after were the ones who were perceived as having those qualities which most persons consider to be "good." They further stated that a clearly evident characteristic "... in the highly preferred males was that of a strong self-regarding attitude." It seems that all persons who are liked well by large numbers of other persons tend to feel themselves to be self-confident and capable. Teachers who are most preferred by students are those who have a high degree of ego integration, are self-confident, and are capable persons. She is the recognized leader who gains prestige in the eyes of the students not because of her position but, rather, because the students know their "better selves" are seen and supported by the teacher.

Teachers who have the ability to realistically evaluate their own assets are the more able ones when it comes to assessing the capabilities of others. Combs (17) supported this when he stated, "... false beliefs about the nature of people can result only in the selection of inappropriate ways of dealing with them." Some of the persons mentioned in this review believe that some of the prospective teachers who are potential mental health hazards for children can be determined...
prior to student teaching. Others can be determined while doing student teaching. At the University of Texas, tapes, films, conferences, and interviews are used to study their prospective teachers. These are in addition to the battery of tests given to the students who choose education as a major.

**Personality and Teaching**

In an attempt to suggest why some teachers are ineffective in the classroom, Combs said, "... teachers rarely fail because of a lack of knowledge of subject matter but almost always because they are unable to transmit what they know so that it makes a difference to their students" (17).

Maslow (30) also made an observation along this line when he stated that individuals who have the human touch "... have deeper and more profound interpersonal relations than any other adults. ..." This statement is not to be confused with what Riesman (39) was speaking about when he brought up the concept of "other direction" in people. On the contrary, Maslow's people are able to offer other persons the best of themselves without depending wholly on others for a personal definition of what and who they are. Bonney and Hampleman (10) stated that, "If a teacher is going to help various pupils in his class, he needs to know not what now exists, but what the pupils would like to have exist so that they could better realize their personal desires." This
statement is similar to Mearns' comment above. Bonney and Hampleman would go directly to the pupils to determine what they are most concerned about, probably not to the extent that Mearns would, but they, nonetheless, have identified the starting point upon which later decisions are based.

Murphy (34) suggested that those teachers who are seen as the most effective are those who allow children to grow in self-enhancing ways. He feels that it is the basic responsibility of the teacher to create a sense of curiosity in the great majority of pupils. Murphy observed that it was "the child's felt need for peer contact which caused it to look beyond the present to see what may be in the storehouse of life which is the future."

Decision Making

Another aspect of the teaching process which is sometimes overlooked is that of decision making, according to Bonner (9). Many complicated bits and pieces of information constitute the final act of a person which brings about the resolution of a problem in an integrative manner or results in further disturbance and hostility. The matter of decision making takes practice which leads to improved skills. Bonner (9) stated, "Decision making is a skill, and, like all skills, has to be learned or acquired." Competent teachers know the importance of the development of such a factor and encourage
its development. Competent teachers also provide such experiences in the day-to-day routine of the classroom for children. With proper guidance and direction, competence in decision making is attained by the pupil. Erikson (18) said of this, "Competence, then, is the free exercise of dexterity and intelligence in the completion of tasks. . . ." The more competent a person becomes at forming friendly, two-way friendships, the better able he is to understand the value of himself. Such success generally leads to feelings of serenity and personal worth. Objectivity is also helpful in the classroom, and Tyron (45) had something to say about it. He conducted a study designed to increase the understanding of the behavior of children and observed that, "Objectivity of observation is important both for the welfare of the student and the openly experiential attitude of the teacher."

Summary of the Literature

The bases upon which the present study was conceived led to the assumption that predictions could be made concerning the future teaching behavior of student teachers. The literature has indicated that there is enough constancy and accuracy in sociometric status to be worthy of further research. Those who have written extensively on the subject of sociometry are convinced of its importance in educational settings. The literature on pupil ratings of teachers has been shown to
yield potentially useful data as a research tool to study the
effectiveness of teachers. Finally, the literature on per-
ception as described by Kelley (28) and Cantril (15) shows
that the matter of similarity of the "real" world is
described differently by different individuals, thereby
creating the many conceptions of what may be considered
"effective" or "ineffective," "good or bad," and the like.
The combination of these approaches to the study of student
teachers would appear to be on solid ground.
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CHAPTER III

GATHERING THE DATA

Dates and Locale

The data for this study were gathered during the first nine weeks of the Spring semester of 1966 at a midwestern college whose primary role is teacher education, and all of whose divisions and departments support the primary objective. The following discussion describes the procedures used in data gathering and describes the rating scales and instruments.

Procedure

At the beginning of the Spring semester on the day the students were given their student teaching assignments, all the subjects of this investigation were informed of the study. They were asked to meet in a room to be given the reason for the research and to receive instructions relevant to the study. A list of all students who were going to be engaged in student teaching for the first nine weeks had been compiled in advance. Each student was given a copy of this total list of students with accompanying directions in both written and verbal form on how to respond to the sociometric aspects of this research investigation. A copy of the directions is in Appendix A.
The students were also administered the **Tennessee Self-Concept Scale** (sometimes referred to as Scale) and the **Adjective Check List** (ACL) during this meeting. Total time for administering the three instruments was approximately one hour. As the students completed the testing, they were free, individually, to leave. Few students took longer than one hour to complete the three instruments.

The students were at their respective student teaching assignments when the remaining data were gathered. The final steps included obtaining the data from the faculty members' ratings of the student teachers and the POSR. During the time the students were responding to the sociometric test and the two self-report scales, they were asked to name three or more faculty members with whom they had taken two or more courses and to place the names of these faculty members in the upper right hand corner of the first sheet of the list of student teachers' names. From these names, faculty were sent the faculty rating scales with instructions on how to score the ratings.

The cooperating teachers received letters detailing the major points of the study and were asked to participate with the freedom to refuse. A self-addressed card was enclosed in the letter. The card asked for the number of pupils in one of the classes which the student teacher would be teaching. This figure had to be known in order to send the correct
number of Pupil Observation Surveys' (POSR). During the fifth or sixth week of the student teacher training, the POSR's were mailed to the cooperating teachers along with the two rating sheets which the cooperating teachers were to fill out and a self-addressed, stamped envelope to facilitate handling.

When all information from these sources was received, an IBM card was prepared with all the information punched into it.

The Rating Scales and the Sociometric Test

There were five variables which were compared with the POSR results. Some of the variables had more than one part. Only three scores were used from each of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the Adjective Check List. The following discussion describes the scales, the scores used, and how the total test was conducted in reference to the POSR.

The Sociometric Test

Reference has been made above to how the data were gathered for the sociometric portion of the study. The choices made by the students about each other, as given in the directions, were divided into two main criteria—a sociotele criterion and psychetele criterion. Choices 2 and 3 in the directions to subjects were used as the sociotele criterion because they dealt primarily with work-oriented relationships. Choices 4 and 5 were selected as the psychetele criterion because they dealt primarily with friendship relationships.
The scores for the sociotele and for the psychetele criteria were found by tabulating the number of nominations each subject received from the peer group. Criteria 2 and 3 formed the sociotele score, and criteria 4 and 5 formed the psychetele score. Each criterion was checked against the POSR. The selection of the sociometric criteria followed standard procedures for the gathering of sociometric data.

The Faculty Rating

The faculty rating scale is found in Appendix B. It is a five-point scale with a five-item selection of various behaviors which are commonly expected of teachers on the job. It attempts to orient the faculty member doing the rating to answer the scale in reference to his judgment of the student's behavior while a class member. Three faculty members assessed each student and an average rating of the total scores from the three members was obtained. This score was punched on the master card and used as the score which was later checked against the POSR. On the faculty rating a score of 1 was high and a score of 5 was low for each of the five items on the rating. Therefore, each faculty member could give any one student a total rating of from 5 to 25. When the three faculty members' ratings were combined, the student could receive scores ranging from 15 to 75.
The Cooperating Teacher Ratings

There were two separate rating scales for the cooperating teacher to evaluate each student. One was a scale similar to the faculty members' rating scale so that these two groups, college faculty and cooperating teachers, would be responding to similar characteristics of the students. The same description of scoring technique applies to the cooperating teachers' ratings as to the faculty members' ratings, except that a student teacher only had one cooperating teacher who rated him. The other scale filled out by the cooperating teacher was an eleven point scale used at North Texas State University and developed at San Diego State College. It is found in Appendix D. The five-item scale is found in Appendix C. When the scores from each of these rating scales were tabulated for each student, they were placed on the IBM master card along with all other data.

The Self-Rating Scales

There were two self-rating scales used in this study. One was the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale which has been developed by William H. Pitts at Nashville, Tennessee. The Scale has two distinct uses and has separate forms for each use. One form is a "Counseling Form" and is used primarily for counseling purposes. It is shorter, easier to score and less technical than the other form. Its usefulness has been demonstrated by twelve to fifteen years of development and
research. The other form is called the "Clinical and Research Form" and is utilized specifically for those purposes.

The test-retest reliability of all the major scores, on both forms, range predominately in the .70's through .90's. In a study with psychiatric patients, Congdon (1) in 1958 used a shortened version of the Scale and obtained a coefficient of reliability of .88 for the Total Positive Score. Reliability coefficients for various profile segments used in computing the NDS (Number of Deviant Signs) Score fall mostly in the .80 to .90 range (1). The NDS Score is a test of the hypothesis that individuals who deviate sharply in minor behaviors are very likely to deviate in major aspects of behavior as well. Fitts stated he had "demonstrated that the distinctive features of individual profiles are still present for most persons a year or more later" (2).

There were four different kinds of validation procedures, (a) content validity, (b) discrimination between groups, (c) correlation with personality measures, and (d) personality changes under particular conditions. An item was retained in the Scale only if there was unanimous agreement by the judges that the item was correctly classified.

The ability of the Scale to discriminate between groups holds up quite well. The tables in the Scale Manual give a complete analysis of such validation. The Scale was validated against other personality measures which included the MMPI, the
Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Inventory of Feelings. Considerable data is reported in the Scale Manual. In his concluding remarks on the validity of the Scale, Fitts says, "... there is considerable evidence that people's concepts of self do change as a result of significant experiences. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale reflects these changes in predictive ways, thus constituting additional evidence for the validity of the instrument" (2).

The three scores from the Research Form which were used in this study were the Personal Self score, the Social Self score, and the Total score. These three scores were used because they are more closely related to the overall study than the other scores.

The Adjective Check List (ACL) was developed by Gough at the University of California, Berkeley. The reliability of the ACL has been tested by Gough on a test-retest procedure. The mean coefficient was +.54, which is not necessarily high but seemed to differentiate reliably between two main groups of 100 men. Each subject in this 100 men study was described by ten observers on the ACL. The results were as follows:

(a) The "reliable man" (higher stability coefficient) appears to be an identifiable kind of individual: quick, cooperative, friendly, insightful, fair-minded, spontaneous, energetic, and so on.
(b) The "unreliable man" (lower stability coefficient) seems to be at odds with himself: awkward, arrogant, prejudiced, mild, unassuming, smug, resentful (3).
The reliability values for the full group of ten judges ranged from .61 to .75. "These values are satisfactory and indicate that the ACL can be used by trained observers to describe others with adequate reliability" (3).

In a study by Heilburn (4), several scales "were shown to have significant relationships to nontest indices of the same dimensions." Heilburn made several validity studies, and in one study (5) found that "... 6 of the 15 need scales were significantly related to dropping out of college among females. ..." The ACL correlated with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPFS) +.60. There have been numerous studies made between the MMPI and the ACL, and the correlations have ranged from -.30 to +.49 on various counterparts of these two scales. The same things are not measured by each of the scales in the ACL with any other measure. Therefore, the studies show correlations for specific dimensions of the ACL with other measures. Correlations have been done with many instruments, some of which are Welsh's A-Scale, the California Psychological Inventory, EPFS, and MMPI. A statement by Gough on page 15 of the manual says,

The coefficients and relationships just reported do not by any means exhaust the information ... they are cited merely to indicate in a general way the meaningful correspondence between the ACL and the scales of these two well-validated instruments (3).

The ACL yields a total of twenty-two scores, but only three were felt to be appropriate to the nature of this study.
The three scores from the ACL which were used were Personal Adjustment, Intraception, and Affiliation. Intraception, according to Gough, is defined as "the attempts to understand one's own behavior or the behavior of others." Affiliation means "to seek and sustain numerous personal friendships." These three scores as well as those from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale were measured against the POSR separately. The ACL and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale score sheets were sent back to the respective developers of these instruments for scoring.

In summary, the scores which were measured against the POSR and called "study variables" were the following:

1. Sociometric Data
   a. Psychetele
   b. Sociotele

2. Faculty Ratings

3. Cooperating Teachers' Ratings
   a. 5 Item Scale
   b. 11 Point Scale

4. Tennessee Self-Concept Scale
   a. Personal Self
   b. Social Self
   c. Total Score

5. ACL
   a. Personal Adjustment
b. Intrapection

c. Affiliation

The Pupil Observation Survey (POSR)

The POSR was developed at the University of Texas by Robert Peck and Donald Veldman and their associates. It has a sound basis in theory, much of which was reviewed in the literature in Chapter II. The pupils scored the student teachers on the POSR. The directions for punching the information from the POSR's onto cards was given by the researchers at the University of Texas. The punched cards were sent to the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas for scoring. Complete information was received from the Center for utilization in this study. The POSR has five factors which are as follows:

1. Friendliness
2. Intellectual Poise
3. Liveliness
4. Strict Control
5. Democratic Procedures

The factors appear in the tables in the following chapter as they are listed above.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

The raw data were processed by an IBM 1620 Computer. The correlations were computed by the usual Pearson method. A t-test procedure was used to determine levels of significance for the mean differences between the study variables and the POSR factors. The hypotheses were classified into two main categories, and the report to follow will utilize the same organization, and the last hypothesis deals with the mean difference data.

Correlation Results and Analysis

Empirical test of Hypothesis 1 required computation of the correlations between the sociometric data and the POSR factors. It was hypothesized that the correlations would be high and positive. Table I shows the findings relevant to Hypothesis 1.

TABLE I

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE POSR FACTORS AND THE SOCIOMETRIC DATA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSR FACTORS</th>
<th>Sociometric Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychetele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Poise</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liveliness</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict Control</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Procedure</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No correlations were significant.
The correlations in Table I range from -.08 to .21. While most were positive, they were rather low. None of the correlations was high enough to show significance at either the .05 or .01 levels. On the basis of these findings, Hypothesis 1 was rejected.

In Hypothesis 2, the problem was to determine if higher correlations existed between the sociometric data and the POSR factors than between these POSR factors and (a) the faculty ratings, (b) the cooperating teachers' ratings, (c) the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, and (d) the ACL. Table II shows the results of these correlations. The correlations in Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY VARIABLES</th>
<th>POSR FACTORS</th>
<th>FRIENDLINESS</th>
<th>INTELLECTUAL POISE</th>
<th>LIVELINESS</th>
<th>STRICT CONTROL</th>
<th>DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociometric Data:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotele</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociotele</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rating:</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Point Scale</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Item Scale</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Self-Concept Scale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adj.</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraception</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level.
range from -.29 to .36. The correlations were not high and only two were significant. The first two rows of Table II are to be compared to the remaining rows of this table in order to determine how Hypothesis 3 tested out. It can be seen that the correlations are low and that only two are significant. Other than these two correlations which showed significance, the predictive value of the correlational data was obviously limited by the low relationships which were found. Since it had been predicted that the sociometric data would show high correlations and this fact did not occur, Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Discussion

A correlation between two variables is most useful for predictive purposes when (a) it is fairly high and (b) it is statistically significant. The highest correlation of .36 was between ACL Intraception and POSR Democratic Procedure. According to Gough (1) a person scoring high on Intraception attempts to understand his own behavior and the behavior of other persons. Gough says, "He is a doer, not a thinker." The items on the POSR relating to Democratic Procedure seem to be asking for the behavior of the student teacher who would be considered a "doer." Some of the subjects who scored high on ACL Intraception were selected by pupils to rate high on POSR Democratic Procedure. There were not enough of these corresponding high scores on both instruments to produce a high correlation.
However, the correlation of .36 was significant beyond the .01 level. The correlation of -.29 was significant at the .01 level.

There were two separate and distinct groups of raters who were probably responding to two different orientations. One group was composed of college students who were responding to a list of 300 adjectives about themselves. The other group was composed of approximately 2,000 high school pupils who were responding to a list of the 38 sentences of a rating scale. In reference to checking adjectives against sentences, Gough (1, p. 14) believes that a list of adjectives about oneself does not necessarily call out the same "response sets" as when checking a list of sentences about oneself. When two separate groups of raters are rating one of the groups, a similar principle may be involved. The reliability of checking the ACL against the POSR in the manner used in this study seems to be open to question. The two significant relationships which were found are in need of further research if they are to be made meaningful.

The correlation of -.29 which was found to exist between the Cooperating Teachers' Five-Item Scale and POSR Intellectual Poise seems to indicate that the two different groups of raters (teachers on the one hand and pupils on the other) were responding to different perceptions of the subjects. Extensive research needs to be done if these two scales are to be of any great value.
to persons interested in using them as complementary evaluating
devices of teacher behavior.

The Cooperating Teachers' Five-Item Scale included cri-
teria which indicated whether the cooperating teachers felt
the student teachers had sufficient grasp of the teaching be-
haviors of teachers to warrant their inclusion within the
Teaching Field. The pupils, on the other hand, also are
responding to the subjects in a limited fashion, timewise.
They, as a large heterogeneous, unstructured group, were
responding to restricted and circumscribed behaviors of student
teachers who possessed different levels of competence. One
thing seems to stand out in the correlation of -.29 found be-
tween the large group of pupils and the smaller group of
cooperating teachers, and that is that each group was rating
a group of student teachers from different frames of reference.
The differences in perception may account for the negative
correlation. It is again evident from the data that there
was no way to offer consistent instructions to groups of raters.

The correlational study did not "turn up" enough possi-
bilities for drawing conclusions about the relationships be-
tween the study variables and the POSR factors. They were
low, and only two were significant at the .01 level of sig-
nificance. The several groups of raters, the subject them-
selves, the faculty members, the cooperating teachers, and
the pupils in the classrooms, seem to have been responding to
different traits or characteristics or different perceptions of the subjects of the study. The subjects who were high on one of the ratings and the subjects who were in the middle or low did not maintain these positions across all rating instruments. The low correlations show this fact. A sample was taken on two rating instruments in order to determine if many subjects changed places from one to the other instrument. The results are not shown, but there were only eight common subjects within the two twenty subjects on these two instruments. It was not necessary to include such a listing of subject-position changes from rating to rating, since the correlations verify that this phenomenon occurred.

Mean Difference Data and Discussion

The data for this part of the study stemmed from comparisons of the upper and lower 25 per cent groupings of the subjects on the five study variables when each of these assessments was measured against the five factors of the POSR. The upper and lower fourths of the POSR factors were determined by the scores made by the subjects on the POSR. The mean differences between the scores on the other variables were then determined. The same subjects who were in the upper fourth on a particular POSR factor were not the same subjects who achieved high scores on the other variables, as can be determined from the following data.
Hypothesis 3 stated that a significant difference would be found between the upper group and the lower group on the study variables when differentiated by the five POSR factors. For convenience, the mean difference results have been divided into five separate tables. Presented in each table are the means and standard deviations of the upper and lower groups for a given POSR variable.

Table III shows the results of the comparisons between means of the upper groups and the lower groups on the POSR factor of Friendliness. A mean difference was significant at .05 (df=38) if the \( t \) ratio was 2.02 or greater. As can be seen from Table III, there were three \( t \) tests which were beyond 2.02. These tests achieving significance were on the ACL. These differences between the upper and lower groups indicate that there are major differences between these groups on the study variables on this POSR factor. Psychetele showed an almost significant \( t \) ratio at 2.01 on this POSR factor. The remaining \( t \) ratios indicate that there was not enough difference between the upper and lower groups on this POSR factor to create recognizable differences. Table III is on page 51:

Table IV, on page 52, shows the results of the tests of significance between means of the upper and lower groups on the study variables of the POSR factor Intellectual Poise.
TABLE III

**t** SIGNIFICANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LOW AND HIGH 25 PER CENT GROUPS OF STUDY VARIABLES WHEN DIFFERENTIATED ON POSR FRIENDLINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Low 25%</th>
<th>High 25%</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociometric Data:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotele</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociotele</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rating:</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Point Scale</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Item Scale</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Self Concept Scale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67.10</td>
<td>69.10</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70.70</td>
<td>69.25</td>
<td>6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>352.15</td>
<td>360.05</td>
<td>23.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>2.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraception</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>2.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>2.21*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

The only **t** test that showed significance in Table IV was on the sociotele part of the sociometric data. Read under the Study Variables column under Sociotele across to the **t** column to find the **t** ratio of 2.05. The remaining **t** tests did not show significance which indicated that there was not much difference between the groups on the remaining study variables. The **t** ratio of 2.05 (df=38) was significant at the *p < .05* level.
TABLE IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Variables</th>
<th>POSR Intellectual Poise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometric Data:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychetele</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociotele</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rating:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Point Scale</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Item Scale</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Self Concept Scale:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraception</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

The psychetele showed a t ratio of 1.86 (df=38), which is fairly high but not significant. In some cases, the differences were so slight that there does not appear to have been two separate groups which were being compared.

Table V shows the different tests which were run on the POSR factor Liveliness between the upper and lower groups of the study variables. There was one test of difference which
### TABLE V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Variables</th>
<th>POSR Liveliness</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Low 25%</th>
<th>High 25%</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociometric Data:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychetele</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>16.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociotele</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Rating:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>11.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperating Teacher:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Point Scale</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>9.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Item Scale</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennessee Self Concept Scale:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.65</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>67.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.40</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>374.10</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>351.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>11.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraception</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>23.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

showed significance and that was on the Total Score of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. This difference was -2.60 (df=38). The minus sign indicates that the low group achieved higher scores on the Tennessee Total Score than did the upper group on this factor of the POSR. The Personal Self score of the Tennessee showed -1.93 (df=38) of difference between the two groups but did not achieve a value great enough to show significance.
Table VI shows the computations for the t-tests which were run on the POSR factor **Strict Control**.

**TABLE VI**

**t SIGNIFICANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LOW AND HIGH 25 PER CENT GROUPS OF STUDY VARIABLES WHEN DIFFERENTIATED ON POSR STRICT CONTROL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Variables</th>
<th>POSR Strict Control</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Low 25%</th>
<th>High 25%</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociometric Data:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychetele</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>2.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociotele</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>2.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Rating:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>-.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperating Teacher:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Item Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Item Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennessee Self Concept Scale:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>69.30</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70.30</td>
<td>71.80</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>353.20</td>
<td>363.85</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraception</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>23.15</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

There were two tests of significance in Table VI which achieved the **p < .05** level. The t ratios which achieved the required level were the two sets of data from the sociometric test. Psychetele yielded a t of 2.28 (df=38), while sociotele yielded a t of 2.31 (df=38). The t test on ACL Intraception
was almost significant with a $t$ ratio of -2.01 ($df=38$). Also, the Five Item Scale of the cooperating teachers' rating was -1.98 ($df=38$). The sociometric data shows that on the POSR factor of **Strict Control** the upper and lower groups had measurable differences when rated by the pupils on this POSR factor. Most of the $t$ ratios show little or no difference between groups.

Table VII shows the results of the $t$ tests between the upper and lower groups on the POSR factor of **Democratic Procedure**.

**TABLE VII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Variables</th>
<th>POSR Democratic Procedure</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Low 25%</th>
<th>High 25%</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociometric Data:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychetele</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociotele</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>12.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rating:</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>10.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Point Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Item Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Self Concept Scale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68.65</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>65.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>355.10</td>
<td>33.77</td>
<td>345.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercapation</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05*
There were no significant differences between the groups on this factor. The upper group is relatively indistinguishable from the lower group on most of the tests for difference. There seems to be only slight differences between groups on some of the others.

Hypothesis 3 stated that significant differences would be found between the upper and lower groups of the study variables when differentiated on the five POSR factors. Differences were found in only a few instances; therefore, Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Discussion of the Mean Difference Results

On the POSR factor of Friendliness, the ACL produced three significant differences between the upper and lower groups. These three ACL scores produced differences which were significant at the p < .05 level of confidence. The scores on Personal Adjustment, Intraception, and Affiliation on the ACL apparently have some characteristics which are similar to POSR Friendliness. At any rate, the pupils in the classroom were able to differentiate between the upper and the lower groups, and this selection process corresponds to the responses of the subjects as they rated themselves on the ACL.

The psychetele part of the sociometric data on POSR Friendliness produced a difference between the means of the high and low groups that was very nearly significant. This t ratio was 2.01, but 2.02 was needed to show a significant difference
between the groups. In reference to this difference, it appears that peers are perhaps as capable of selecting the effectiveness of prospective teachers as are faculty members and cooperating teachers on the POSR factor Friendliness.

On the POSR factor of Intellectual Poise, the sociometric data yielded a significant difference between means on the sociotele criterion. Once again, it appears that peers are in a better position to judge potential teaching qualifications than are faculty members and cooperating teachers. However, it may be that peers and pupils are rating on similar perceptions of the subjects, and these perceptions may be quite different to those of faculty members and cooperating teachers. However, in this set of grouped data, college faculty and cooperating teachers did not differentiate in the same manner as pupils in the classroom. It is clear that faculty and cooperating teacher ratings were not successful in making the differentiation on the POSR factor of Intellectual Poise.

Intellectual Poise on the POSR is a measure of the spontaneity and freedom of expression of the teacher. Subjects of this study who were well-grounded in their teaching areas would tend to reflect confidence, provided they are not too rigid and uncompromising in their behavioral patterns. As an example of this, one student in the lower group is known to have set up stringent rules of behavior and attempted to
enforce them. He failed in this regard, and at the same time failed in his attempts to interest the pupils in his subject.

Another student, in the upper group, is known to have walked into a very "tough" class. Several boys in this tenth grade biology class were unruly, disrespectful, and generally caused the class to disintegrate into something other than a healthy learning climate. This young student teacher announced the topics for study and consideration, set up field trips, and so on. He never became upset over the disorderly behavior of these boys. Soon he noticed them paying attention to some of his comments and demonstrations. By the end of two weeks, all of these previously "bad" boys were busily engaged in some sort of experiment. One boy was extremely bright and performed an original research experiment. The class asked this student teacher to apply for a teaching position at this school when he graduated. He applied for a teaching position in this school and was hired, but later resigned because he received a graduate fellowship from his department of biology in order to continue graduate study.

On the POSR factor of Liveliness, the Total Score of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale showed a significant difference between the means of the upper and lower groups which was -2.60. The negative sign indicates that the lower group scored higher than the upper group on this variable. Liveliness on the POSR is the factor which most closely corresponds
to the pupils' concept of an effective teacher. Some compensating behaviors in the classrooms on the part of the low Tennessee Scorers could have caused the variation.

On the POSR factor of Strict Control, the sociometric data produced significant differences between the upper and lower groups. On psychetele, the \( t \) ratio was 2.28, while sociotele showed a \( t \) ratio of 2.31.

For POSR Democratic Procedure, no difference between high and low groups was apparent. A good deal of position changing from one measure to the other seems to have occurred.

The study variables did not seem to orient the several groups of raters to similar response sets. The language used in the different instruments may have been that of the researcher and not that of the groups of raters. Differences in degree of familiarity with the total problem may have caused the results to turn out as they did. Degree of understanding and the amount of time given to the task by different groups could also have influenced the results.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The present study was an attempt to determine if a variety of measures of student teacher characteristics were related to scores obtained on a scale for measuring pupils' responses to student teachers. This scale is designated as the Pupil Observation Survey or the POSR. The measures of student teacher characteristics were (1) Sociometric Choices, (2) Faculty ratings, (3) Cooperating Teachers ratings, (4) the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, (5) the Adjective Check List. The POSR is a test of teacher effectiveness which consists of these five factors which are: (1) Friendliness, (2) Intellectual Poise, (3) Liveliness, (4) Strict Control, (5) Democratic Procedure.

In the first phase, the measures of teacher characteristics were correlated with the POSR factors.

In the second phase, the upper and lower groups on the POSR factors were contrasted on the various study variables of teacher characteristics to see if significant mean differences could be found between the upper and lower groups.

Development of the Hypotheses

The literature supplied background for the hypotheses used, first by showing that numerous problems still exist...
in the area of evaluating teaching effectiveness, and second that some promising avenues for further study were available.

Research on pupil ratings of teachers has shown that the pupils have a fairly good idea which teachers have the pupils' best interests in mind. It has also shown that there is a marked difference between what administrators conceive to be "good" teaching and what children consider to be "good" teaching. In addition to this, there seems to be a growing interest in trying to perfect pupil rating scales to the point where teacher behavior can be improved through use of them.

Research on peer ratings has shown some promising beginnings. For example, some previous work has been done by Gronlund (1) on the specific problem of peer "ratings" (choices of a sociometric nature) on student teachers. Graduate seminar students are sometimes asked to rank-order their classmates including themselves in the order which they feel they should rank. This latter is one form of sociometric rating. There have been studies which have shown that peers have a good conception of the relative mental health of each other. These studies were in the interests of describing the "normal" personality, using sociometric techniques. The literature on sociometric evaluations has produced many studies which could serve as a basis for such a study as the present one. When using
this method, one of the preconditions is that peers have enough information about each other to make the kinds of decisions asked for in the criteria. In the present study, it was apparent that they did not know each other to that degree. For example, some of the students who received high POSR ratings did not receive a single peer choice. These students are known to be friendly and outgoing but did not come to know many of their peers to the degree required for choice selection in this study.

Some of the students who were subjects in this study were off-campus commuters, and they did not receive many peer choices but received high POSR ratings. It seems necessary that if peer choice selections are to be used to study teaching efficiency as measured by the POSR, the peers should be aware of the kinds of behavior in each other which would form an adequate basis for making realistic decisions. One subject gave approximately twenty ratings on each peer criterion, and it is known that although he was in and around the campus for several years, he rarely associated with students. He never, or only rarely, dated; he had no close associates; and he was what could be generally called "unfriendly." His choice selections were completely out of proportion to his knowledge of the qualities of those he chose on the several criteria. He received only one or two choices on the criteria. There were several subjects who
fitted a similar pattern but none as unrealistic as this subject.

Previous work on the POSR has established sufficient reliability and validity of teacher behavior to make it feasible as an anchor for the present study. When put to use in the manner outlined in the present study, the POSR held out some hope for future research along these lines. If an instrument is to show some positive results, its primary purpose must be kept in mind. Also, if other ratings are to be compared to it, a similarity of requested perceptions has to be included in the items and directions.

The hypotheses of the study were as follows:

Hypothesis 1. There will be a high positive correlation between sociometric choice status which a group of student teachers have in reference to each other and ratings obtained on these student teachers by pupils in the classroom.

Hypothesis 2. The peer choice standings will show a higher correlation with the POSR than will the ratings given by faculty members, cooperating teachers, scores from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, and scores on the Adjective Check List.

Hypothesis 3. There will be significant differences between the means of the upper and lower 25 per cent groupings of the subjects of this study on the five study variables, namely (a) the sociometric choices, (b) the faculty ratings,
(c) the cooperating teachers' ratings, (d) selected scores from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, and (e) selected scores from the Adjective Check List (ACL) when each of these assessments is measured against the five factors of the Pupil Observation Survey (POSR).

Results: Correlations

Correlations were run between the assessment variables listed above and the five POSR factors. The correlations were low, so that the predictive efficiency is highly questionable. Thus, the study variables cannot be used to predict future teaching efficiency where the POSR is the criterion of teacher efficiency. There appeared to be many differences in perceptions between the groups of raters and the pupils. There were only two correlations which showed significance. However, they were not relatively high. The two which were significant were between the cooperating teachers Five Item Scale and POSR Intellectual Poise, which was -.29 and between ACL Intraception and POSR Democratic Procedure, which was .36. The cooperating teachers checked the student teachers, as a group, significantly different than the pupils responding to the POSR. The negative relationship between the items indicates some inverse relations which are hard to interpret.

The ability of peers to make choices which were in agreement with pupils' evaluations of teaching efficiency
proved to be no better nor any worse than the judgments of cooperating teachers, faculty members, and self-rating scales when using the POSR to gauge teaching efficiency. If the POSR is an adequate criterion, none are successful. The study variables also had limitations. For example, the request to "mark with a W those persons with whom you would like to work after graduation" may be too indeterminate a criterion for assessing effective teaching.

Results: Differences

The mean difference portion of the study produced more positive results than did the correlation study. There were several significant differences between the means of the upper groups and the lower groups on the study variables as differentiated by the POSR factors. It was again apparent that the pupils scoring the POSR were responding to perceptions of traits or qualities of the student teachers which were different than the characteristics or traits viewed by the other groups of raters. It was not assumed that these various groups would be looking at exactly the same things when rating the student teachers. It seems to be, partially at least, a fault of the rating instruments in not orienting the groups of raters toward similar perceptions which caused the differences between these upper and lower groups to show insignificance. When one person rates another person on the latter's teaching
skills, many factors are involved, including the rater's ego needs and his perceptions of how the rated person fulfilled these needs.

The study variables showing significance at the .05 level were the three scores of the ACL when compared with POSR Friendliness. They were Personal Adjustment 2.17, Intraception 2.37, and Affiliation 2.21. This finding probably is a result of a fairly close association of these particular ACL scores and the POSR factor of Friendliness. The ACL norm tables list high reliability and validity coefficients. The POSR has high values for these features as well. Therefore, a difference between the upper and lower groups is probably a telling one on Friendliness. Apparently adolescents have an ability to measurably detect friendliness in others.

A significant difference between the means of the upper and lower groups was found on the sociometric data of sociotele and POSR Intellectual Poise. This finding appears to be an important one for this reason, the POSR factor of Intellectual Poise is a result of positive self-regarding attitudes. Apparently peers were able to make their choices of persons who held these kinds of attitudes as the criterion of sociotele—those with whom they would prefer to work after graduation.

On POSR Liveliness, the Tennessee total score showed a significant difference between the means of the upper and
lower groups which was -2.60. It could be that some of the low group on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale over-valued their relative self-worth. Since, according to the developers of the POSR, the factor of Liveliness is felt to be the factor which the pupils conceive as being most indicative of teaching efficiency, this problem needs further elaboration.

On the POSR factor of Strict Control, both parts of the sociometric data showed significance at the .05 level. Psychotele was 2.28 and sociotele was 2.31. Psychologists regard this factor as a negative dimension. It means that those who score high on this factor are overcontrolling and are somewhat repressive of classroom behavior. It appears that peers made choices of persons who tended to be authoritarian and directive. The upper group was rated by the pupils as being more strict in the classroom than the lower group.

There were no significant differences between the upper and lower groups on POSR Democratic Procedure. This seems strange when ACL Intraception is closely related to the democratic process in a classroom. Therefore, it is suggested from these data that the POSR and the study variables are not capable of differentiating similar behaviors.

Summary of Findings

1. When using the rating scales in this study, general college faculty members were unable to predict which students
would be effective as student teachers when using the POSR as the measure of teaching efficiency.

2. The rating scales used by cooperating teachers in this study were ineffective in selecting those subjects who would be most successful as student teachers when the POSR is the criterion of teaching effectiveness.

3. The self-rating scales used in this study predicted teaching efficiency better than did any of the other variables as measured by the POSR.

4. The correlations did not indicate much ground for predicting the teaching success of student teachers when using the variables in this study measured against the POSR.

5. The t ratios showed some positive results and held out some hope for a future study if reinforcements are incorporated in such a study.

Conclusions

The conclusions drawn from these data are as follows:

1. None of the groups studied appeared to be capable of fully judging potential success in teaching, including peers, college faculty, and cooperating teachers when teaching efficiency is assessed by the POSR factors.

2. The POSR factor of Friendliness showed the highest degree of congruence with other related variables of the study.

3. Psychetele and sociotele measurements produced positive indication for further research.
Recommendations

1. When using sociometric techniques and the POSR together in a study of this nature, the sociometric criteria should be more closely related to the general theme of the POSR. Such a procedure would more adequately insure that the two groups of raters (peers and pupils, respectively) would have similar conceptual frames of reference in mind. It would also give a more valid basis for comparing the scores from each source.

2. The criteria of the rating instruments of all adult raters—that is, college faculty members, cooperating teachers, and others—should be as close in wording as possible so that similar ideas would be called forth from these various groups. This procedure would give greater assurance that similar perceptions of those who are being rated would be made by those doing the rating.

3. When using sociometric techniques, subjects of a future study could be brought together for a semester's or quarter's duration classroom situation in which much interpersonal interaction would be encouraged. For example, the class could have small group discussions, individual reports or demonstrations, and large group discussions. These activities would give students a better opportunity to know the strengths and weaknesses of each other. They could then more accurately assess each other's teaching potentials at some later time.
4. During the time when college students are in preparation for the student teaching experience, more emphasis should be given to what actually occurs in a classroom. Many examples of pupil behavior could be demonstrated either by role playing situations, written-discussion questions, or student presentations of outstanding events from personal observation. Further, a public school teacher could speak to this class on what she actually expects of his student teachers.

5. The public school cooperating teachers should be brought together in a large one-day workshop to discuss their ideas concerning student teaching. At that time, some opening comments should be made by those who are to conduct the research which would help to gain the general approval of the study. The total group of teachers should then be divided into smaller groups of five or six to discuss problems and procedures they believe to be important for future student teachers. The latter part of the workshop should be used for the assembling and correlating the major issues and ideas from the smaller group discussions. This procedure would insure greater cooperating and ego-involvement by the public school teachers when the student teachers were assigned to them, and then the research on student teachers was actually conducted.

6. There should be a central theme running through the criteria on the various rating instruments in order to more adequately test a particular variable.
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APPENDIX A

DIRECTIONS

Below is a list of students now enrolled in secondary education.

Place your name at the top of the page containing the list of names.

First, you are to go through the list of names handed you and underline the names of the students you know well or fairly well.

Second, you are to place an E to the left of the names of those students with whom you would like to participate in an education seminar.

Third, you are to place a W to the left of the names of those students with whom you would like to teach after graduation if you could have your choice of co-workers.

Fourth, you are to place an A to the left of the names of those students whom you believe display a high degree of adjustment. (See attached sheets which describe the characteristics of high adjustment.)

Fifth, you are to place an S to the left of the names of those students with whom you would most like to spend a coffee or coke break.
There will probably be some overlap on your selections, but it is also expected that there will be a number of differences. You are asked to designate five (5) persons on each criterion.

This study is being conducted for research purposes. The results will not be made available to individuals, nor will any student know the selections made by any other student.
CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGH ADJUSTMENT

1. Objective judgment: the ability to look at all kinds of facts squarely and accurately, neither overlooking some nor exaggerating others out of proportion. This has been called rationality, good sense, and even common sense.

2. Autonomy: the ability to deal with daily events in a self-starting, self-directing manner. Such terms as initiative, self-direction, and emotional independence are often used to convey this ideal.

3. Emotional maturity: the ability to react to events with emotion which is appropriate in kind and in degree to the objective nature of the situation.

4. Self-realizing drive: the habit of working hard and purposefully to one's full capability. People vary greatly in their physical, intellectual, and social potentialities, but it is possible to see in each case how far the given individual is putting his own particular potentialities to work to achieve personally worthwhile results; his powers, of course, are delimited by his developmental stage, and they are shaped by the opportunities he has had, as well as by his innate potentialities.
5. Self-acceptance: a positive, self-respecting attitude toward one's self. Conscious self-insight or self-understanding may not be absolutely essential to an attitude of self-acceptance, but they seem to enhance considerably the objectivity and the wisdom of a person's self-regard.

6. Respect for others: a positive, acceptant attitude toward other people.
APPENDIX B

STUDENT ______________________ FACULTY MEMBER ______________________

Directions: Circle the selection which seems to best describe the student from your point of view.

The above student is rated as follows:

1. The student is friendly and cheerful.

   Genuinely  Usually  Sometimes  Not too  Somewhat
   friendly friendly  friendly  friendly  friendly

2. The student's rating on Adjustment seems to be (see attached sheet for orientation toward this item).

   Very high  High  Average  Below  Low
   average

3. As a member of a seminar in my field, this student would be

   Highly  Desired  Acceptable  Not  Generally
   acceptable desired  undesirable

4. As a faculty member, this student would be

   Highly  Looked  Acceptable  Hired  Undesirable
   desirable  upon  favorably  as a last  resort

5. Socially, this student seems to

   Rate high  Get along  Be about  Be on the  Have a
   with peers  more than  average  on the  number of
   peers  peers  most with  periphery  number of
                           of  undesirable
                           peer  characteristics
APPENDIX C

STUDENT____________________COOPERATING TEACHER____________________

Directions: Circle the selection which seems to best describe the student from your point of view.

The above student is rated as follows:

1. The student is friendly and cheerful.
   Genuinely  Usually  Sometimes  Not too  Somewhat
   friendly  friendly  friendly  friendly  friendly

2. The student's rating on Adjustment seems to be (see attached sheet for orientation toward this item)
   Very high  High  Average  Below  Low
   average

3. As a member of a curriculum conference group, this student would be
   Highly desired  Acceptable  Not generally desired  Generally unacceptable

4. As a faculty member, this student would be
   Highly desirable  Looked upon  Acceptable  Hired only as a last resort
   favorably

5. Socially, this student seems to
   Rate high with peers  Get along more than average  Be about most with peers
   Be on the periphery of undesirable peer groups
   Have a number of undesirable characteristics
APPENDIX D

COOPERATING TEACHERS' RATING SCALE

Student Teacher __________ Cooperating Teacher __________

Semester __________ Spring, 1966

Place a check mark before the description below which, in your opinion, most nearly describes this student teacher's prospects. If you believe that two adjacent descriptions are applicable, feel free to indicate this fact by checking both.

___ Student teacher still falls short of being ready to take on a regular teaching position; needs further improvement before I could honestly predict for him success in the teaching profession.

___ Student teacher is making progress and shows promise; for his own good, however, it would probably be best if in his first position he could continue to receive close supervision and support for a while longer.

___ Student teacher has done a reasonably good job, and I feel he is now competent to handle a classroom of his own satisfactorily.

___ Student teacher has done an unusually good job; with a little more opportunity for professional growth that will come from having a job on his own, he is almost certain to become an outstanding teacher.

___ Student teacher has done such an outstanding job that I believe that right now he could step into any secondary school in this area and be considered an outstanding teacher.
APPENDIX E

Directions

To the Student:

The Division of Teacher Education at Kansas State Teachers College is studying several ways of preparing student teachers. The college wants to know how you have felt about working with your student teacher this semester. Your answers to these questions will be used for research only, and will have nothing to do with the grade your student teacher gets. When you answer the questions on the next pages, it is important to mark the way you really feel.

After you read each question, put a circle around one of the four letters that follow each statement. If you think the statement is completely true, circle the capital T. If you think the statement is more true than it is false, put a circle around the small t. If you think the statement is more false than it is true, circle the small f. If you think the statement is completely false, circle the capital F.

Here is an example:

My student teacher has a loud voice.  T t f F
If you think she has a very loud voice, you would circle the big T:
                                     T t f F
If her voice is a little louder than most people, circle the small t:
                                     T t f F
If her voice is a little softer than most people, circle the small f:
                                     T t f F
If her voice is very soft, you would circle the big F:
                                     T t f F

When you finish the second page of questions, please go back and make sure that you did not accidentally skip any of them. Please answer all of the questions.

Thank you.
APPENDIX E (Cont'd)

Name of Student Teacher ________________________________

STUDENTS' RATING OF STUDENT TEACHERS

Note: The word "He" will be used for all student teachers whether male or female.

1. He is admired by most of his students. T t f F
2. He has made the subject alive and interesting for me. T t f F
3. He expects a lot from his students and usually gets it. T t f F
4. He explains assignments clearly and completely. T t f F
5. He hardly ever gets flustered about anything that happens. T t f F
6. He seems to understand the problems students have. T t f F
7. He is never stumped by a student's question. T t f F
8. Before he decides on a new project, he often asks the students what they think. T t f F
9. He usually looks on the bright side of things. T t f F
10. He is the best teacher I have ever had. T t f F
11. I would like to be like him in some ways. T t f F
12. His class is never dull or boring. T t f F
13. You can depend on him to be fair with you. T t f F
14. He doesn't let the class discussion get too far off the subject. T t f F
15. He always seems sure of himself in front of the class. T t f F
16. You can tell that he really likes his students. T t f F
17. He knows a great deal about his subject. T t f F
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. He never seems to order his students around.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. He smiles most of the time.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I wish all my teachers were like him.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. He sets a good example of his students.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. He knows how to put his subject across in a lively way.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Students respect him because he means what he says.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. He doesn't try to cover the lesson too fast.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. He doesn't seem to be afraid to make mistakes.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. He is always friendly toward his students.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. He must have studied hard to know so much about his subject.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. He likes to give the students a choice of how to do an assignment.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. He always seems cheerful and happy.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I would like to have him as a personal friend.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. He makes learning seem more like fun than work.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. He doesn't let his students get away with anything.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. He always seems to know just what he'll do next.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. He doesn't get confused by unexpected questions.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. He is as interested in his students as he is in his subject.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. He seems to know more about his subject than just what is in the book.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. He is always interested in hearing a student's ideas.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. He is good-natured and easy to get along with.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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