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This research had three main purposes. The first was to determine some of the major characteristics of elementary teachers. Second was to see how student teachers and supervising teachers perceive the importance of certain characteristics of elementary teachers. The third was to discover what changes result in the perceptions of student teachers as to the importance of these characteristics after completing student teaching.

A Q-sort instrument was developed to use in the study. It contained 54 teacher characteristics found to prevail in teacher evaluation guides in use in eight northern Texas educational systems. Participants were requested to designate their perception of the importance of the given teacher characteristics.

Participants were obtained from a random sampling of North Texas State University students who were senior elementary education majors, who had completed their junior student teaching, and who would complete their student
teaching during an eight-week period in the spring of 1971. Supervising teachers of the student teachers were also included in the project.

The student teachers were administered the Q-sort instrument both before and after the student teaching experience while the supervising teachers were surveyed only prior to the experience. This procedure permitted comparison of the perceptions of experienced teachers with opinions of novices and enabled examination of changes in ideas brought about by the experience.

Most responses from student teachers were obtained by first-hand contact. Responses from supervising teachers were obtained by mail. Thirty-eight matched sets of responses resulted.

Data were processed at the North Texas State University Data Processing Center. Arithmetic means of the weighted responses indicated that the three groups, student teachers (pre), student teachers (post), and supervising teachers were in general agreement as to how they perceived the importance of certain characteristics at the high and low ends of the continuum. Characteristics ranked most important were understanding of children, ability to motivate students, enthusiasm in position, and provision for individual differences. Items ranked least important included handwriting/printing aptitude, written expression, performance of report-record keeping, and housekeeping and organization.
Standard deviations of separate teacher traits revealed less deviation in opinions of the respondents on the most important and least important designations.

The Pearson product moment correlation was completed on each of the separate characteristics used in the Q-sort comparing supervising teachers' responses with responses from student teachers (pre) and (post). At the .05 level, significance was found between student teachers (pre) and the supervising teachers on two items; student teachers' (post) and supervising teachers' correlations showed twelve items with significance, and the pre-post student teachers' comparisons revealed thirty items showing significance.

Computation of the Hotelling's $T^2$ statistic revealed a significant difference between the responses of the student teachers (pre) and supervising teachers and also between the student teacher (post) responses and the supervising teachers. No significant difference was found to exist between student teachers (pre) and their (post) responses. It was concluded that the student teachers made little change in their perceptions toward the opinions held by the supervising teachers as to what characteristics are important for elementary teachers, and change resulting after the experience of student teaching was not significant.

Recommendations were made for similar studies to include (1) comparative responses of school administrators, (2) a
study of current teacher evaluation guides, and (3) a review of methods used in designating supervising teachers.
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED
CHARACTERISTICS OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AS
PERCEIVED BY STUDENT TEACHERS AND
SUPERVISING TEACHERS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Doctor of Education

By

Charles E. Wellington, B. A., M. S. Ed.
Denton, Texas
August, 1971
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| LIST OF TABLES | iv |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background and Significance of the Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the Instrument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for Collecting Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Student Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Characteristics of Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the Sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Use of the Instrument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing the Hypotheses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Means of the Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pearson Product Moment Correlations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's T² Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Further Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Calculated Means and Standard Deviations of Q-sort Responses</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Importance of Selected Elementary Teacher Characteristics as Designated in Q-sort by Student Teachers (Pre)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Importance of Selected Elementary Teacher Characteristics as Designated in Q-sort by Supervising Teachers</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Importance of Selected Elementary Teacher Characteristics as Designated in Q-sort by Student Teachers (Post)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Correlation Coefficients Between Respondent Groups on Items of Characteristics</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Hotelling's $T^2$ Statistics</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

North Texas State University serves a highly important function in educating prospective school teachers for the state of Texas in particular and education systems in general. In 1970 some 1315 North Texas State University students were recommended for Texas teaching certificates (16). In fulfilling this vital function there should be some agreement between the college, on one hand, and the public schools, on the other, as to what qualities are desirable in a successful elementary teacher. The school systems should communicate their ideas as to teacher qualities to the colleges, and the colleges in turn should reflect their research and experience to the public schools.

As prospective teachers near the final phase of their formal education toward a baccalaureate degree and teacher certification, they are ordinarily obliged to undergo a period of student teaching in a practical field situation. During this aspect of their education the students are assigned to observe and work with an experienced school teacher in a public school classroom in order to put their education into practice. The supervising teacher in this situation is expected to rate the student teacher thus
assigned as to qualities and potential as a teacher. The grade and recommendations from this situation are regarded as extremely important to the novice teacher's future. The possibility of the student teacher's future employment or career opportunities may hinge upon the evaluation of this experience.

In the several years that students attend North Texas State University they are normally educated and oriented in the particular ways of the college and its professors. Since a student teacher may be assigned to work with a supervising teacher who is of a different orientation or holds ideas that may or may not be in harmony with what the student has been taught, it is believed that this study should be of some value.

Statement of the Problem

The problems in this study were to determine the degree of relationship that existed between the perceived importance of characteristics of elementary teachers as viewed by supervising teachers in public elementary schools and student teachers in an elementary education program and to determine the degree and direction of change of perceptions which resulted from the student teaching experience. A Q-sort instrument incorporating items from contemporary teacher evaluation guides was developed as a unique approach to researching the problem.
Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study were as follows:

1. To determine the relationships between the student teachers before student teaching and their supervising teachers in regard to the perceived importance of certain individual characteristics of elementary teachers.

2. To determine the relationships that existed between supervising teachers and the student teachers after the student teachers have completed student teaching in regard to the perceived importance of certain individual characteristics of elementary teachers.

3. To determine the relationships that existed between the ideas of the student teachers before they student teach and their ideas after the completion of student teaching in regard to certain individual characteristics of elementary teachers.

4. To ascertain any significant difference in the overall perceptions of the group of student teachers before they student teach with the ideas of their supervising teachers in regard to the importance of certain characteristics of elementary school teachers.

5. To determine any significant difference between the overall perceptions of the group of supervising teachers and the student teachers after student teaching in regard to
their ideas as to the importance of certain characteristics of elementary school teachers.

6. To determine any significant relationship between the overall perceptions of the group of student teachers before they student teach and the same group of student teachers after they complete student teaching in regard to the importance of certain characteristics of elementary teachers.

Hypotheses

In implementing this study the following hypotheses were formulated and have been tested in this project:

1. There will be no significant correlation between like items in the Q-sort rankings by student teachers before student teaching and their supervising teachers in regard to the perceived importance of certain individual characteristics of elementary teachers.

2. There will be no significant correlation between like items in the Q-sort rankings by supervising teachers and the student teachers after the student teachers complete their student teaching in regard to the perceived importance of certain individual characteristics of elementary teachers.

3. There will be no significant correlation between like items in the Q-sort rankings by student teachers before they student teach and the same student teachers after they
student teach in regard to their perceptions of the importance
of certain individual characteristics of elementary teachers.

4. There will be no significant difference in the overall Q-sort rankings by the student teachers before they
student teach and the overall rankings of their supervising
teachers in regard to the perceived importance of certain
elementary teacher characteristics.

5. There will be no significant difference in the overall Q-sort rankings by the student teachers after com-
pleting their student teaching and the overall rankings of
the supervising teachers in regard to the perceived im-
portance of certain elementary teacher characteristics.

6. There will be no significant difference in the overall Q-sort rankings by the student teachers before they
student teach and the same group of student teachers after
they complete student teaching in regard to the perceived
importance of certain elementary teacher characteristics.

Background and Significance
of the Problem

A review of the vast changes in method, content, and
quests for relevance in education circles the past decade,
will reveal an increasing awareness that the end results of
education must be consistent with the needs of society.
Teacher education has developed considerably since 1722 when
one John Campbell apprenticed himself to George Brownell to
"learn the art, trade, and mystery of teaching" (3). There is still a long way to go.

The need for continuing research in education was re-emphasized in the recent work by Fox, who states

Much functional in-depth research may help eliminate the current gap between the researcher and the practitioner in education, and to enable us to realize more fully and more quickly the potential contribution of the research approach to current efforts to evaluate and improve the qualities of educational programs (8, p. 5).

In order to develop needed innovations in education, effort must be exerted to evaluate the existing processes. This idea is not new. The development of the Ohio Teaching Record at Ohio State University in 1939 was a unique contribution to the process of evaluation in teaching (1). It reported that

The development of the Record reveals a basic change in the point-of-view about evaluation. Traditionally, evaluation had been a process in which instruments of appraisal were used on someone. From the beginning, the Record was conceived as an instrument to be used with teachers and student teachers (1, p. 5).

In an effort to make a worthy contribution to the field of education, this study has investigated some of the perceptions of characteristics of elementary teachers that are commonly held as important to the success of a teacher. As evidence of their importance, these characteristics of teachers are cited as items for evaluation in many school districts across the nation. The rhetoric used in teacher
evaluation guides varies from school to school in describing similar teacher characteristics.

A survey of the literature, student-teacher handbooks, and evaluation guides developed by schools and organizations interested in improving teacher education reveals diverse opinions as to what should be done. Boykin (2) sums it up by reporting, "It is unlikely that educators would agree on the specific details of evaluation in a student teaching program" (p. 27). The problem persists.

Devor (7) lists six major areas of characteristics important to the success or failure of a student teacher. They are

(1) Interest in teaching.
(2) Emotional balance.
(3) Ability to attract, interest, and get along with others.
(4) Skill in human relations with peers and adults.
(5) Intellectual and professional energy.
(6) Breadth of interests.

Under each of these categories could be listed a number of sub-headings used by professionals in the field to identify the desirable characteristics of teachers.

A teacher in a classroom must function in many different capacities. The impact of the day-to-day routine and demands on elementary teachers cannot be fully implanted by reading textbooks. There is no substitute for experience.

Briggs (4) in a study at North Texas State University concluded from results of an inquiry using an instrument
developed by Allport, Vernon and Lindzey entitled the *Study of Values* that generally the values held by student teachers do not determine their classroom behavior.

Passmore (17), also at North Texas State University, found that there was a definite relationship between a student teacher's self-concept and his teaching success. She recommended further study into personality factors as predictors of student teacher success.

To learn what perceptions are held as to desired teaching characteristics and what changes may occur from field experience is the significance of this study. If the student teachers, supervising teachers, and the university coordinators can improve in their understanding of one another, some progress will have been made.

Colleges must be certain that all parties concerned are fully oriented as to what is expected of them in the teacher education program.

In conclusion this study was designed to discover some areas in which the education and experiences for student teachers might feasibly be improved. There have been other studies to determine changes in student teacher's attitudes and behaviors. Most such research has made use of standardized test instruments. Considering the ever-increasing pace of change in education, periodic efforts using a variety of
approaches are necessary to continue to assess the direction and progress in public education.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined in the way that they apply to this research. The definitions presented are consistent with the terms and meaning used in Texas Public Law Number 8, as it applies to state financial support of public schools student teaching programs.

**Q-sort Technique**—A system of research developed by William Stephenson in 1953, which is useful in the social sciences for evaluations of rankings of abstract qualities.

**Student Teacher**—A college upperclassman seeking teacher certification who is officially assigned to observe and work directly with an experienced school teacher in an elementary classroom for an extended period of time to gain practical experience for a teaching career.

**Supervising Teacher**—A teacher in an elementary classroom who accepts assignment of a student teacher and supervises the student's experience in the practical aspects of teaching.

**Teacher Characteristics**—Used collectively to identify those particular traits, attributes, and qualities that can be observed through the overt actions of elementary teachers.
University Coordinator—A member of the college faculty who oversees the student teaching experience and acts as liaison between the university and the public school.

Limitations and Conditions

This study was limited to include a random sampling of students who as elementary education majors at North Texas State University were scheduled to do their required student teaching in the spring of 1971 in public elementary schools.

The supervising teachers included in the survey were those qualified and experienced elementary school teachers who were assigned to work with the North Texas student teachers who had been included in the survey.

The characteristics used in describing elementary school teachers in this study are not intended as exclusive or all-inclusive but are used here as a matter of practicality.

A minimum acceptable number of responses necessary in order to treat the data statistically was established at thirty (30) matched sets of student teacher-supervising teacher replies.

Basic Assumptions

For the purpose of the research in this study, the following basic assumptions were established:

It was assumed that the participants had a sincere interest in a career in the elementary teaching profession
and therefore cooperated and responded with frank, forthright answers and in return expected to remain anonymous in their replies.

It was further assumed that the student teacher responses reflected a mature understanding of the importance of certain elementary teacher characteristics since all of the students participating had previously experienced a limited amount of public school classroom routine in the form of junior student teaching. At North Texas State University student teaching is scheduled during the student's junior year and is an assigned formal observation and participation in a public school classroom situation for about an hour a day for approximately sixty hours total.

The Instrument

To facilitate the research in this project, a Q-sort type of instrument was developed. Initially a number of sample evaluation sheets used to rate school teachers in elementary schools were obtained from area universities and public schools. The schools included Denton, Dallas, Fort Worth, and Lewisville Public Schools and North Texas State University, Southern Methodist University, Texas Christian University, and Texas Woman's University. From these sheets a composite of characteristics of elementary teachers was assembled. Schools sometimes used different rhetoric to
describe the same general teacher characteristic. Where this difference was encountered, similar characteristics were listed under a common heading. A frequency distribution chart was devised to ascertain how many different schools included the same item in their evaluations.

The items which appeared more than one time were developed into a Q-sort instrument. The names of the separate characteristics were printed on small slips of paper, which also carried an identifying number. No weight or significance was attached to the order or number. An instruction sheet and a packet of slips listing teacher characteristics were supplied each person participating in the study. A response sheet was also included. Instructions explained that each characteristic was to be ranked as to its importance and placed in a relative position. The responses were then recorded on the sheet provided which was then returned to the researcher for study.

This instrument was given to eight full-time staff members of the North Texas State University faculty in elementary education who supervise student teachers for their judgement as to the relative importance of these characteristics of elementary teachers and their suggestions in improving the instrument.

When the responses were returned by these professional educators, a review was made of the characteristics that
were selected by the majority of the group as being most important. From these items and suggestions a refined Q-sort instrument was developed.

Procedures for Collecting Data

From the 196 names on the official college list of North Texas State University students who were scheduled to do their student teaching from February 22 to April 23, 1971, forty-four names were randomly drawn out of a hat to be used along with their respective supervising teachers as participants in the study.

Previous to the students’ beginning their senior student teaching, each of the participants was given an envelope which contained information on the study, the Q-sort instrument, instructions, a response sheet, and a pre-addressed return envelope. Participants were contacted by phone, mail, through classes, etc., with personal contact being favored.

The replies received were partially processed in the interim of the eight weeks while the student participants were completing their student teaching assignments. At the conclusion of the student teaching experience the same Q-sort instrument was administered a second time as a post test to the same students who took part in the original survey.

The information collected was processed to determine the acceptance or rejection of the several hypotheses.
Procedure for Analysis of Data

When all data were collected, the information was processed using the facilities of the Data Processing Center at North Texas State University. The information was transferred to IBM cards to facilitate processing and computations.

Numerical values were assigned to the categories established in the Q-sort responses as they were compiled by the researcher. By design, distribution of responses for this study approximates the outline of the normal curve of distribution. The single characteristic that the participants ranked as most important and was placed in "Position A" on the response sheet was weighted eleven points for calculation. The positions were weighted as follows:

Position A - 11  
B - 10  
C - 9  
D - 8  
E - 7  
F - 6  

Position G - 5  
H - 4  
I - 3  
J - 2  
K - 1

The information so weighted was treated as interval data.

The arithmetic means and the standard deviations were determined for each of the fifty-four characteristics and for each of the three groups. The three groups in the study were (1) the supervising teachers, (2) the student teachers before the student teaching experience, and (3) the student teachers after the student teaching experience. Responses were weighted and the calculations enabled generalizations
to be made in regard to the relative importance of each
listed teacher characteristic in the opinion of the participat-
ing groups.

The Pearson (r) product moment correlation was calcu-
lated in testing hypotheses one, two, and three. This calcu-
lation permitted study of similarities between the Q-sort
rankings of the total group of students previous to their
student teaching experience with the total responses of the
group of supervising teachers for each of the separate
characteristics. Similar computations were made with the
same two intact groups to reveal any similarities in their
Q-sort rankings of the same characteristics at the conclusion
of the student teaching experience. A level of rejection of
the hypotheses was established at the .05 level. The hy-
potheses were rejected where the calculated Pearson "r" was
equal to or was greater than the critical values of the
Pearson correlation coefficient by using a two-tailed test and
the appropriate degrees of freedom.

The Hotelling's $T^2$ test was calculated in order to test
hypotheses numbered four, five, and six. A level of rejection
for each of the formulated hypotheses was established at the
.05 level of significance by using a two-tailed test in refer-
ence to the tabled values (18). This operation was performed
by the electronic computer. Appropriate procedures were em-
ployed to accommodate the data which utilized related samples
such as in the case of student teachers' pre and post responses and information from independent samples.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

Successive sections of this study deal with information corroborating the importance and the need of such research and giving details as to the processes employed with the results obtained.

In the review of the literature only that research which has been published within the past ten years was used as reference in an effort to keep the study as contemporary as possible.

Appropriate tables and arrays are included where they give emphasis and support to the study. An appendix has been established which contains the pertinent supporting documents.
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CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

A Review of the Literature and Related Research

This chapter is concerned with the scope and content of the research in the area relating to (1) the effect of the student teaching experience on the participants and (2) studies in regard to the characteristics of elementary public school teachers. An emphasis of concern in these areas is apparent from the noticeable increase in the number of titles and corresponding research in the field in the past few years. A cursory review of the topics available through ERIC (Educational Recovery Information Center) would also generally attest to this tendency.

Research on the Effects of the Student Teaching Experience

Education in general and public schools in particular continue to be alternately praised for their advances and condemned for the nation's short-comings. It is significant that the most vociferous critics of professional education have usually spared student teaching from their criticisms or have at least treated it kindly. Such reputable commentators on American education as Conant (12) enthusiastically
endorse this aspect of teacher education. Researchers' opinions vary, however, as to the effects that the student teaching experience may have on different individuals.

Student teaching began to develop more in the public schools after 1955, according to Lindsey (23). Previous to that time most teacher education institutions maintained their own laboratory schools in which a different relationship existed between the student teachers and the supervising teachers. The characteristics of the teachers in the laboratory schools took on a different appearance since they were college staff members rather than independent public school faculty. Lindsey summed up her work by stating

... supervising teachers became of great influence on future classroom teachers. They began to feel that they were important, that the job they were doing was significant. The shadow boxing and the guessing games are out of place for now we realize the impact of the supervising teacher on the student teachers (23, p. 45).

Lindsey also reported that there were three major characteristics common in student teachers and supervising teachers. They were (1) emphasis on classroom goals, (2) teacher communication skills, and (3) concern for the climate in their classrooms.

Buckley (9) concluded after extensive research with student teachers using a semantic differential instrument that the field experience resulted in changing the attitude
of the student teacher toward a more negative concept of self and a more positive attitude toward the pupils they taught. No particular change was observed in the student teacher's attitude toward the overall teaching profession as having resulted from the student teaching experience.

A somewhat similar effect was found by Johnson (21) in working with student teachers from the George Peabody College. Using as an instrument the "Dogmatism Scale, Form E" he concluded that there was a significant change in the degree of student teacher open-and-closed-mindedness which was seen as a function of the degree of dogmatism of the supervising teacher.

Gladfelter (19) as part of a study with student teachers in the St. Louis area found relatively little animosity and/or jealousy between student teachers and their respective supervising teachers. The study extended over a two-year period and revealed also that few student teachers were made to feel uncomfortable when the college coordinator was present. The influence of the supervising teacher was acknowledged as being more effective than the influence of the college coordinator.

The change resulting from the field experience of student teaching is not all just by the student teacher.
The effects on the supervising teacher are presented from a project by Rosenfield, who established

As the statistics reveal the teacher associated with the more open-minded student teacher tends to develop more favorable attitudes toward his pupils; and the supervising teacher with the more close-minded student teacher, less favorable attitudes (29, p. 38).

Bradley (8) used a Q-technique to investigate the supervising teacher's role in influencing the student teacher's behavior. One characteristic deemed most important in the study by the supervising teachers and the student teachers was the cooperation of the student teacher with the fellow professionals in a given situation. The trait of cooperation was also a characteristic in the study at hand, and its designated importance with a different population was ascertained.

A major portion of the student teachers' guidance and instruction takes place outside the classroom situation, according to Bradley's study. The practicing student teacher is more susceptible to change when he finds himself in a situation where the emphasis is placed on the use of personal, private conferences between student teacher and supervising teacher. The student teacher is most influenced by the supervising teacher who can discreetly direct the student teacher through the unique experiences in the field situation.

In a study by Fling (18) using an observation and recording instrument developed by Midley and Mitzel, Flint
collected data on the verbal behavior of supervising teachers prior to placing student teachers in their classrooms. Similar data were collected on the behavior of the student teachers prior to, during, and following their student teaching. Analysis of the data revealed clearly that the student teachers tended to take on the verbal teaching behavior of the supervising teachers in whose classrooms they had worked. Beginning teachers were also asked what seemed to have influenced their teaching most, and it was the general consensus that it was the impact of the supervising teacher.

Waimon and Hermanowicz (35) at Illinois State University developed a system using a semantic differential and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory before and after student teaching and found resultant changes in student teachers' beliefs that were not attributed to chance. The procedure used tended to clarify the student teacher understandings of what teachers actually do and also to make the students more aware of this behavior.

It seems reasonable to assume that in performing these tasks student teachers acquired techniques which can be used by them to learn from their own future experiences. The study of other teachers should equip student teachers to study themselves. If students have learned to reflect upon their own experiences and to evaluate their own performance,
they will have taken a significant step forward toward becoming life-long students of teaching.

The relationship and influence of the supervising teacher on the student teacher was researched by McAulay (24), who concluded that the more formal the supervising teacher was in the relationship with the student teacher, the more the student teacher seemed to be influenced. The study included such aspects of teacher characteristics as orderliness and housekeeping in the classroom, the relationships of the teacher with the students, and the approaches to the teaching of reading.

Remmers (28) points out that most of the research efforts have failed to find that teacher characteristics and personality types are very predictive of the success or the effectiveness of a teacher. In a study of student teachers, he found that they differed in the ways which they approach and teach from one subject to another dependent upon interest, originality and flexibility. Still, it is important that the best means at hand are used to improve the profession.

In a survey by Allee (1) one hundred student teachers on several different campuses were polled as to their feelings on the student teaching experience. The report states that students wanted to know just what was expected of them in their student teaching assignments, especially how they were
to be evaluated, and what the university coordinator was looking for when he made his visits. The participants also indicated dissatisfaction over many of the grading systems that were used in evaluating the student teaching performance. It was recommended that definite criteria be established and the students informed as to what is expected of them in the field situation. The student teacher then would be in a better position to attain the desired degree of proficiency.

In one of the earlier studies by Barr (4) an attempt was made to identify the characteristics of good and poor teachers. Barr saw a need to determine good teachers from their overt classroom behavior. He established categories for the various traits and developed a series of symbols and abbreviations that could be used in the process. His methods and procedures were generally found too unwieldy and were never greatly acclaimed. If a simplified system could be developed, student teachers who possess the desirable characteristics could be readily identified as prospective good teachers.

Not all research has positively proclaimed the influence of the supervising teacher in the student teaching situation. Both Farrow (15) and Terwilliger (34) using different methods studied the verbal behavior of student teachers in the practical field situation and were unable to determine much change
in the student teachers as a result of the influence of the supervising teacher.

If the student teacher is influenced by a good supervising teacher during the student teaching experience, the results would be beneficial. How good teachers can be recognized remains a problem. One national organization, the Association for Student Teaching, has been formed and supports such organized study to improve student teaching, a result which in turn would tend to upgrade teaching in general.

Teacher education has as its primary purpose the preparation of good teachers. What is meant by good or successful is highly objective and speculative. By isolating some of the characteristics of the teachers who are accepted by peers, professionals, students, and the community as being able to facilitate learning, certain individuals are deemed effective, and so a relationship is established between the observable characteristics of a teacher and his alleged success.

Studies in Regard to the Characteristics of Teachers

Trying to identify the characteristics that make a good teacher has been the goal of a number of persons and has been pursued with different degrees of sophistication. Ryans (3) headed a distinguished group who conscientiously studied the problem for the American Council on Education. During the
six-year life of the project approximately 100 separate studies were carried out and more than 6,000 teachers in some 1,700 public schools participated in various phases of the research.

In one aspect of the research by Ryans the actual classroom behavior of the teachers was observed and then factor-analyzed. From the study it was concluded that insofar as the teacher's classroom conduct was concerned there were three major characteristics. These were

(1) Understanding, friendliness, responsiveness vs. aloofness, egocentrism

(2) Responsible, businesslike, systematic vs. evading, unplanned, slipshod

(3) Stimulating, imaginative, original vs. dull, routine (3, p. 77).

These characteristics are commonly found as items in teacher evaluation guides in contemporary elementary schools.

Grispino (20), working with the results of a Missouri study on developing a teacher readiness instrument, is optimistic that reliable prediction of good teachers will be an actuality in the near future. Working with senior college students who had completed their student teaching, Grispino used a RANC - Measure of Teaching Readiness instrument to determine the insights and abilities of prospective teachers with a high degree of success. The responses of the student teachers with the instrument were correlated with the evaluation by the supervising teacher and the university coordinator
as to the student teacher's latent potential as a successful teacher. The results appear promising and are being pursued further.

There are no quick and easy methods for selecting students who will make good teachers or for screening teachers for employment or promotion. Leavitt (3) reported on research in the use of the National Teachers Examinations that the tests have very little value as predictors of individual success in student teaching. Grade-point averages were likewise found to be poor predictors. A study by McCall (25) generally supports this conclusion.

When teachers were asked in a study by Fishburn (16) how or where they learned their role as a teacher, they listed three main sources: their teachers, their own performance as a teacher, and their pupils. In most teacher education programs an effort is made to provide experience from each of these major sources. Future teachers have the opportunity to study under and observe experienced and successful teachers and to observe, assist, and teach in a classroom under the supervision of experienced teachers and college supervisors.

In a recent study by Nelson (16) steps were taken to discover how students perceived their professional role as teachers during the practical field experience of student teaching and how they modified their perceptions after two
or more years' actual teaching experience in the public schools.

One of the more complete descriptions of the professional characteristics of the teacher is to be found in a monograph published by the California Teachers Education Association in 1964 (17). In this paper teacher characteristics were detailed under six areas of teacher competence. These included being alert, sympathetic, understanding, cooperative, aware of public relations, and reliable as a member of the profession and of the community.

On the other side of the nation in New York another dimension was examined by Weil (36). A study was made which listed the first ten characteristics of good teachers based upon students' opinions. These were, in order of importance, sense of humor, justice, consideration, friendliness, appropriate dress, good voice, neatness, attractiveness, interest in students, and sincerity.

It is interesting to note that knowledge of the subject matter was rated as sixteenth. This ranking was felt not to lessen its importance, but it served to show that pupils judge their teachers first as persons rather than on their intellectual prowess. The educative process takes place with a blending of pupil and teacher personality. A careless appearance, an unpleasant voice, or an annoying manner may cause even the most valuable message to fall on deaf ears.
Bond (7) in a California project reported on the characteristics of some 855 student teachers that were studied. Common characteristics of the group revealed such items as appearance, cooperation, courtesy, and conscientiousness toward students and associates.

It is re-emphasized by Wesley (37) that much care should be exerted in the selection of the supervising teachers. The enormous contribution of the supervising teacher to the total program has been established. No one else has the intimate and continuous contact with the student teacher or has more to do with his success or failure. Wesley listed three teacher characteristics important in the development of the student teacher. They are "(1) possessing an established reputation for teaching excellence; (2) having a sincere desire to assist and counsel students, and (3) a warm and friendly personality (37, p. 114).

Student teaching is a key phase of learning for the student teacher. Supervisors tend to think of student teachers as half student and half teacher. The supervising teacher must be open-minded and encourage the student teacher to be creative and teach in new ways. Peterson (27) reported that teachers colleges do not want carbon copies of the supervising teachers. Student teachers should be so informed. It was observed that most student teachers do tend to follow at least the basic pattern of teaching of their supervising teachers.
It is perhaps worthy of mention that the most frequently named problems in student teaching programs were concerned with the identification and preparation of the desirable classroom teacher to serve as supervising teachers to work with the student teachers.

In summarizing contemporary research and literature having to do with student teaching, it is generally conceded that this phase is most vital to the teacher education program.

There are divergent ideas as to the effects that the student teaching experience has on the various participants. Studies indicate changes both in the student teacher and the supervising teachers resulting from the student teaching experience. The individual's personality and the circumstances surrounding the field experience are relative to the personal changes discovered.

To identify the characteristics that are apparent in the identification of good public school teachers remains an evasive problem.

Work in both of the aforementioned areas is continuing and professional educators are optimistic that this objective will become an actuality and thus make the student teaching experience even more beneficial.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE FOR COLLECTING DATA

The purposes of this chapter are multiple—first, to describe the population samples and the participants in each of the respondent groups; second, to describe the instrument used in the study and how it evolved; third, to show the steps in the data collection; and fourth, to list the null hypotheses and show how the data were treated statistically to test each hypothesis.

Description of the Sample

The participants for this study were selected at random from the list of North Texas State University students who scheduled student teaching for the eight-week period from February 22, 1971, to April 23, 1971. All were senior students, elementary education majors who had completed "junior student teaching" during the year previous. Of the 196 students in this category a random sample comprised of forty-four names was drawn of people to be used in the study. It was intended that using a sample of this size would result in a total of more than the thirty usable sets which were designated as the absolute minimum.

From the official College of Education listings, the assignment for each participant in regard to his student
teaching schedule was obtained. The name of the school, the
grade level, the supervising teacher's name, and the address
of the school were secured for later reference.

It is interesting to note that of the 196 students in
the original listing only four were males. Proportionately,
in the random sampling for this study there were 45 women's
names and one male's name drawn. No distinction was made
in this study for the variable of sex of respondent.

For each student thus selected his or her individually
assigned supervising teacher was also to be utilized. The
assignments of the supervising teachers were those that had
been made officially by the various elementary schools co-
operating with the university. These respective supervising
teachers were contacted and invited to participate in the
study.

From these two initial samples a further distinction
was made in the student group, thus in effect making a total
of three groups with which to be concerned in the research.
The students included in the original sample were first
categorized as "pre student teaching," and then the same
intact group was contacted again at the conclusion of the
experience and referred to as the "post student teaching"
group.

A complete set of usable data would consist of the
individual responses from a selected student before student
teaching, the responses from the same student after student
teaching, and responses from his or her supervising teacher.

The Instrument

A major purpose of this study was to determine some of
the effects of the supervising teacher upon the student
teacher from the formal student teaching experience. In
order to accomplish this objective and add another dimension
to the research on student teachers, a Q-sort instrument was
developed. A Q-sort is a part of the general Q-methodology
devised by Stephenson which concerns the use of psychometrics
and statistical procedures which center around the sorting
of individual cards containing the names or descriptions of
items to be considered and ranked into prescribed categories
from a high position to a low position in a continuum. Be-
cause of its versatility in converting individual's opinions
to a common numerical scale, Q-methodology is especially
useful in the educational and social science fields.

The first step in developing a suitable instrument for
this study was to collect teacher evaluation guides that
were currently in use in public schools and colleges. These
teacher evaluation guides, often referred to as rating sheets,
contained items of teacher characteristics that are typically
observed by a supervisor in designating the strengths and
weaknesses in a teacher's performance. Such evaluation guides
were obtained from four public school systems and four
universities in the north Texas area. Both the guides used and this research project are concerned with teaching in the elementary school.

From the various items of teacher characteristics appearing in the sample evaluation guides, a composite list and a frequency distribution chart were developed. Of the total of seventy-seven different items ranging from appearance and attitude to vocabulary and zeal, sixty of these items were listed by two or more schools. (See Appendix A). These sixty items were selected for use as the basic criteria for a Q-sort instrument comprising elementary teacher characteristics. The characteristics were briefly described in one or a few words.

For the purposes of the survey instrument each of the characteristics was printed on small separate pieces of paper. An identifying number from 1 to 60 was also printed on each slip. No order or significance was maintained in the numbering.

The next step was to construct a set of directions (See Appendix A) so that each of the participants would understand the process in working with the Q-sort. In brief the philosophy of the Q-methodology is to compel the participants to make a decision in regard to the importance that they place on each item of a group of items. There is no standard or norm to compete with; only the variance of
responses by a participant from one occasion to another is studied. The participants were asked to review all of the items and then, first, to select the one item out of the sixty that in their opinion was the most important. The item was then placed in position "A" and the identifying number for the item was recorded on the response sheet for that position.

The directions then asked for the item to be selected out of those remaining that was considered least important and the identifying number so recorded. The process was repeated until finally there remained twelve items for which the person had no especially strong feeling either one way or another, and these were recorded by number in the center position "F." There was no distinction made in the order that the multiple numbers were listed in the various positions. In effect the characteristics had been separated into three groups: those of more importance, those of lesser importance, and those categorized in position "F" for which no particularly strong feelings one way or the other were indicated.

As a preliminary check of the proposed Q-sort, the instrument with supporting information was given to eight full-time North Texas State University professors in elementary education. From their experience and expertise
many helpful suggestions were obtained. These suggestions resulted in some refinement of the original Q-sort instrument. Certain items were slightly expanded for clarity, and other items were eliminated where the consensus showed that they were irrelevant. As a result an improved instrument (See Appendix A) was formulated.

The refined instrument was reproduced and a quantity of sets were prepared for distribution. Each set included a brief introductory letter to the randomly selected individuals with an invitation for their participation (See Appendix A), a set of instructions, a complete set of fifty-four Q-sort slips, and a response sheet for recording responses. All of these were placed in a number ten envelope. In those packets destined for mailing to a supervising teacher a number ten pre-addressed, stamped envelope was also included to facilitate return mailing of responses.

Data Collection

During the initial contact with the members of the North Texas State University faculty in elementary education for the preliminary check of the instrument, arrangements were made to use college class time and elementary education students as subjects. By this method responses were readily obtained from thirty-eight of the forty-four students in the original random sample made for the study. The remaining six were contacted on an individual basis.
The cooperation of the North Texas State University faculty members in the elementary education department who permitted the students in their classes to participate greatly facilitated the first student responses that were necessary to the study before the pupils departed the campus to complete their student teaching assignments.

The next phase of the survey consisted of contacting the respective supervising teachers of the sample respondents and inviting their participation. Information about the study with a request for their cooperation was mailed to each supervising teacher of the sample respondents. A high degree of cooperation was received. Within three weeks of the initial contact a total of thirty-eight usable responses was received from the supervising teachers of the randomly selected student participants.

The students with whom this research is concerned completed their student teaching experience on April 23, 1971. During the week following this date all of the original student participants were contacted, mainly through campus education classes, and asked once again to complete the same Q-sort. This post-test was then compared to their original responses, which were made before their student teaching experiences to see if any significant changes in ideas regarding teacher characteristics had resulted.
When all anticipated responses had been received, the replies were reviewed to note any discrepancies or omissions. Only one set of responses was eliminated because of item-number duplications and obvious misapplication of instructions. Code numbers were assigned to each individual's response. The confidence of the respondent was thereby preserved and the numbers facilitated later computational processes.

The responses were next recorded on the work sheets in proper form in preparation for remission to the North Texas State University Data Processing Center. At the Data Processing Center the information was transferred to IBM punch cards so that the desired mathematical processes could be performed by the electronic computer.

Statistical Treatment of the Hypotheses

All research hypotheses were stated in the null form and treated statistically as follows:

1. There would be no significant correlation between the Q-sort rankings of student teachers before student teaching and their supervising teachers in regard to the perceived importance of certain individual characteristics of elementary teachers.

In order to resolve this hypothesis the responses from the student teachers (pre) and their supervising teachers were weighted as to the designated importance. After being transcribed into the proper form, the data were processed
by electronic computer which calculated Pearson ("r") product moment correlations on each separate characteristic and between the two groups. The "r's" obtained were compared to tabled values to reveal whether the factors were significant. Any value equal to or greater than .321 was designated significant at .05 level. A review of the "r's" was made for a determination of the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis based upon whether the responses could be expected to happen by chance or by some other factor.

2. There will be no significant correlation between the Q-sort responses of supervising teachers and the student teachers after the student teachers complete their student teaching in regard to the perceived importance of certain individual characteristics of elementary teachers.

To resolve hypothesis number two the responses from the supervising teachers and the student teachers (post) were weighted as to their designated importance. The raw information was transcribed into the necessary form and processed by the electronic computer. Pearson ("r") product moment correlations were calculated on each separate characteristic and between the two groups concerned. The "r's" obtained were compared to tabled values to reveal whether the factors were significant. Any value found to be equal to or greater than .321 was designated significant at the .05 level. By reviewing these "r's" a determination was made as to the
acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis based upon whether the responses could be expected to happen by chance or by some other factor.

3. There will be no significant correlation between the Q-sort responses by student teachers before they student teach and the same student teachers after they student teach in regard to their perceptions of the importance of certain individual characteristics of elementary teachers.

To respond to hypothesis number three the responses from the student teacher pre and student teacher post were weighted as to the designated importance. The information was transcribed into proper form and processed by electronic computer. The Pearson ("r") product moment correlation was calculated on each individual teacher characteristic and between the two groups indicated. The "r's" obtained were compared to the tabled values to reveal whether the factors were significant. Any value equal to or greater than .321 was designated significant at the .05 level. After a review of the "r's" a determination was made as to the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis based upon whether the responses could be expected to happen by chance or by some other factor.

4. There will be no significant difference in the overall Q-sort rankings by the students before they student
teach and the overall rankings of their supervising teachers in regard to the importance of certain elementary teacher characteristics.

In order to accept or reject hypothesis number four the responses from the student teachers (pre) and the supervising teachers were weighted from one to eleven according to their designated importance. The information was transcribed into the proper form and processed by electronic computer. The Hotelling's $T^2$ statistic was computed. This procedure obtained a $T^2$ factor, an $F$ value, and the actual level at which the obtained $F$ value was significant. The level of significance was established at the .05 level. A determination was made as to whether or not the responses could be expected to happen by chance or by some other reason.

5. There will be no significant difference in the overall Q-sort rankings by the student teachers after completing their student teaching and overall responses of the supervising teachers in regard to the perceived importance of certain elementary teacher characteristics.

In order to resolve this hypothesis the responses from the student teacher post and supervising teachers were converted to the weighted values from one to eleven as designated in importance. The information was transcribed into proper form and processed by the electronic computer. The
Hotelling's $T^2$ statistic was computed. Such procedure obtained a $T^2$ factor, an F value and the actual level at which the obtained F value was significant. The level of significance was established at the .05 level. A determination was made as to whether or not the responses could be expected to happen by chance or by some other reason.

6. There will be no significant difference in the overall Q-sort rankings by the student teachers before they student teach and the same group of student teachers after they complete student teaching in regard to the perceived importance of certain elementary teacher characteristics.

To make a determination as to whether to accept or reject hypothesis number six, the responses from the student teachers pre and the same student teachers post were weighed one to eleven depending upon their designated importance. The information was transcribed for processing by electronic computer. In this instance the Hotelling's $T^2$ statistic was computed. The procedure obtained a $T^2$ factor, and an F value and indicated the actual level at which the F value was significant. The level of significance was established at the .05 level. An examination of the results was made to determine whether or not the responses obtained could be expected to happen by chance or because of some other reason.


CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

In this chapter the data which were collected will be presented and treated in order to test the proposed hypotheses. The data have been correspondingly divided to facilitate the several treatments which were necessary to support the appropriate conclusions.

Item Means and Standard Deviations

The first section includes Table I (pp. 50-51), which contains the arithmetic means and the standard deviations that were computed from the weighted Q-sort responses. Values were assigned to the various categories in the Q-sort instrument on a continuum from eleven points for the items which were recorded as the most important characteristics to the weight of one for those items which were recorded as least important by the respondents. From examination of Table I of the arithmetic means of the individual characteristics of elementary teachers, it was found that there was considerable consensus in the items at the two extremes. That is, individuals in the three respondent groups, the student teachers before student teaching (Pre), the student teachers after student teaching (Post), and the supervising
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Student Teachers (Pre)</th>
<th>Student Teachers (Post)</th>
<th>Supervising Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>8.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Student Teachers (Pre) Mean</td>
<td>Student Teachers (Post) Mean</td>
<td>Supervising Teachers Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.26 1.55</td>
<td>6.18 1.25</td>
<td>6.00 1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.26 1.18</td>
<td>6.97 1.42</td>
<td>6.74 1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.50 1.47</td>
<td>7.79 1.70</td>
<td>7.13 1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.16 1.81</td>
<td>5.42 1.54</td>
<td>5.84 1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.76 5.31</td>
<td>3.74 1.48</td>
<td>3.50 1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.00 2.05</td>
<td>5.37 1.44</td>
<td>5.29 1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.03 1.72</td>
<td>5.00 1.87</td>
<td>5.05 1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.37 2.07</td>
<td>6.37 1.98</td>
<td>6.08 1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.74 1.41</td>
<td>6.55 1.37</td>
<td>6.82 1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.95 1.92</td>
<td>6.82 1.50</td>
<td>6.68 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.05 2.05</td>
<td>5.45 2.16</td>
<td>4.82 1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.29 1.80</td>
<td>5.34 2.00</td>
<td>5.05 1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.95 1.68</td>
<td>6.63 1.67</td>
<td>6.29 1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.05 1.77</td>
<td>6.05 1.25</td>
<td>6.68 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.63 1.51</td>
<td>6.42 1.55</td>
<td>6.55 1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.71 1.25</td>
<td>4.61 1.67</td>
<td>4.50 1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.11 1.29</td>
<td>6.26 1.37</td>
<td>6.13 1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.05 1.63</td>
<td>2.92 1.70</td>
<td>6.42 1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.24 1.57</td>
<td>6.45 1.57</td>
<td>6.42 1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.08 1.68</td>
<td>4.45 1.48</td>
<td>5.08 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.47 1.69</td>
<td>5.84 2.07</td>
<td>5.74 2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.18 1.69</td>
<td>6.86 1.47</td>
<td>6.82 2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.76 1.87</td>
<td>4.58 1.97</td>
<td>3.87 1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.76 1.42</td>
<td>8.58 1.24</td>
<td>8.82 1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers were in general agreement as to which of the elementary teacher characteristics they regarded as most important and which of the items they regarded as least important.

The means show that item number eight, understanding of children, was ranked most important of the fifty-four characteristics. Out of a possible 11 points the mean for item eight was calculated at 10.40 for supervising teachers, 9.74 for student teachers (post), and 9.34 for student teachers (pre). A definite trend in this item progressing toward more similarity in the perceptions was shown from the experience of student teaching. The supervising teachers had definite strong feelings about the importance of this quality as the calculated mean for the group on this item was 1.58 points higher than the next high mean and tended to set this item apart and ahead of other responses.

The three next highest items in each of the three groups were reasonably close in values of the calculated means. These means ranged from 8.82 to 8.18. The three characteristics were item 54, ability to motivate students, item 25, provision for individual differences, and item 14, enthusiasm in position. There was some minor variation in the positions as ranked by means in the three different groups, but these three qualities held the next three places.

At the other end of the continuum not as much consistency was found in comparing calculated means. Five
items which were generally found to be least important ranged in values from 4.58 to 2.42. The five characteristics in this classification were No. 17, written expression, No. 19, handwriting/printing aptitude, No. 30, absence of distracting ticks or mannerisms, No. 53, performance of report-record keeping and No. 11, housekeeping and organization.

Item No. 48, cheerfulness, made the biggest fluctuation in designations as revealed by the calculated means. Student teachers (pre) had considered the trait of some importance, and it was ranked in thirteenth place by them. Student teacher (post) responses ranked this item as fifty-third or one of least importance, and the supervising teachers rated it in the middle area, ranking it twenty-fourth, a position which designated no particular importance to the item.

Items which appeared in the broad middle category, those on which no particularly strong feelings one way or another were indicated by the ranking, seem to vary most in comparing the items means.

From the examination of the standard deviation in Table I it is found that the dispersion of scores for the various separate items of character ranged from a low of .79 to a high figure of 5.31. This indicates that on item number eight, understanding of children, which carried the lowest standard deviation, the persons were in relative agreement as to the rank designated for that characteristic. Item thirty-five,
participation in school activities, had the highest deviation and was an item of considerable disagreement in ranking by student teachers (pre). Just how important participation in school activities is to elementary teachers perhaps has never been confronted by the student teacher either in discussions or in practice.

When the standard deviations and the means were compared, generally those teacher characteristics which were consistently ranked as particularly important or particularly unimportant held smaller deviations. Where groups showed some consistency in their perceptions, there was also more similarity within the group as to the choices.

By the design of the study the distribution of the calculated means tended to resemble a normal curve. A grand mean of 5.5 resulted from calculations, a figure which attested to the accuracy of individual item means.

Review of Tables II-IV

To enable a more complete understanding of the data that appear in Table I each of the numerical means has been transcribed into the name of the particular characteristic and ranked in order accordingly from the highest calculated mean to the lowest. These conversions appear in Tables II-IV. A review of these tables reveals the relative importance of each of the fifty-four teacher characteristics as perceived by each of the three respondent groups.
From examination of the descriptive arrays in Tables II, III, and IV the quality which rated highest was number eight, understanding of children. All three respondent groups held this attribute as most important. The supervising teachers consistently rated this characteristic high, an action which tended to set it considerably ahead and apart from the other items. The student teachers also tended to rank this elementary teacher quality very high in importance both before and after the field experience.

The three other traits which the three groups were in general agreement in giving a high-importance ranking to were

No. 54 Ability to motivate students  
No. 25 Provision for individual differences  
No. 14 Enthusiasm in position

To reiterate from Table I by comparison of the calculated means of these three items, they were not ranked in the exact same order for all three respondent groups. All three of the characteristics were listed in one of the first four places.

At the other end of the listing were those qualities which the individual participants perceived as less important traits for elementary teachers. Here too there is considerable similarity in the three sample group responses.
### TABLE II

**IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED ELEMENTARY TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AS DESIGNATED IN Q-SORT BY STUDENT TEACHERS (PRE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>(A) 8. Understanding of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) 54. Ability to motivate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Enthusiasm in position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) 25. Provision for individual differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Self confidence and poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Enthusiasm in position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. Maintains classroom control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Sense of humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) 32. Fairness in evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Preparations completed for daily work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52. Skill in explaining, questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. Emotional self control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Dependability, reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48. Cheerfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E) 22. Knowledge of subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40. Pupil achievement and progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43. Exhibits and promotes creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Initiative, self-starting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39. Conscious of pupil morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. Disciplining, fair, firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. General classroom atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Adaptability to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38. Management toward class objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elementary Teacher Characteristics Which No Strong Opinions Were Indicated by Student Teachers (Pre)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(F) 31. Skill in evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49. Efficient use of school time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Courtesy, consideration of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Constructive in criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Use of sound judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Plans made in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Prompt, punctual on job and habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Reception to suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Appearance, dresses for occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Skill in use of teaching aids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE II—Continued**

Characteristics of Elementary Teachers  
*Designated Less Important in Q-Sort*  
*by Student Teachers (Pre)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Importance</th>
<th>(G)</th>
<th>(H)</th>
<th>(I)</th>
<th>(J)</th>
<th>(k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Follows through on suggestions</td>
<td>10. Control of physical environment</td>
<td>35. Relationships with peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Grooming, appropriate for position</td>
<td>35. Participation in school activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Important</td>
<td>(J)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Housekeeping and organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III

**IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED ELEMENTARY TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AS DESIGNATED IN Q-SORT BY SUPERVISING TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>(A) 8. Understanding of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) 54. Ability to motivate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. Provision for individual differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) 14. Enthusiasm in position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Sense of humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Preparations completed for daily work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Adaptability to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) 33. Maintains classroom control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Follow through on suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. Emotional self control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. General classroom atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Dependability, reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Knowledge of subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E) 52. Skill in explaining, questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39. Conscious of pupil morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. Fairness in evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44. Use of sound judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40. Pupil achievement and progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45. Shows resourcefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Self confidence and poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. Disciplining, fair, firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Courtesy, consideration of others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elementary Teacher Characteristics Which No Strong Opinions Were Indicated by Supervising Teachers**

<p>| (F) 49. Efficient use of school time |
| 48. Cheerfulness |
| 43. Exhibits and promotes creativity |
| 4. Initiative, self-starting |
| 47. Constructive in criticisms |
| 38. Management toward class objectives |
| 15. Professional conduct |
| 31. Skill in evaluation |
| 6. Plans made in advance |
| 9. Moral qualities in speech and actions |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Importance</th>
<th>(G)</th>
<th>24. Physical health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Gives worthy and understandable assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Stamina for the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Appearance, dresses for the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Prompt, punctual on job and habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Reception to suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Relationship to peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Oral expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Skill in use of teaching aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>50. Grooming, appropriate for position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Exhibits and promotes originality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Cooperation with administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Leadership shown by teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Control of voice, pitch, volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Control of physical environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>46. Knowledge of school rules and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Participation in school activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Absence of distracting tics or mannerisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Handwriting/printing aptitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(J)</td>
<td>11. Housekeeping and organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Important</td>
<td>(K)</td>
<td>53. Performance of report-record keeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Important</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>8. Understanding of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>25. Provision for individual differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54. Ability to motivate children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>14. Enthusiasm in position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33. Maintains classroom control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23. Emotional self-control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Preparations completed for daily work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>26. Disciplining, fair, firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Self confidence and poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28. Adaptability to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Dependability, reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32. Fairness in evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Sense of humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E)</td>
<td>52. Skill in explaining, questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40. Pupil achievement and progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22. Knowledge of subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43. Exhibits and promotes creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Initiative, self-starting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Plans made in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39. Conscious of pupil morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27. General classroom atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49. Efficient use of school time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary Teacher Characteristics Which No Strong Opinions Were Indicated by Student Teachers (Post)

| (F)   | 45. Shows resourcefulness                        |
|       | 38. Management toward class objectives           |
|       | 47. Constructive in criticism                    |
|       | 31. Skill in evaluation                          |
|       | 44. Use of sound judgement                       |
|       | 12. Courtesy, consideration for others           |
|       | 51. Stamina for the job                          |
|       | 29. Prompt, punctual on job and habits           |
|       | 15. Professional conduct                         |
|       | 3. Skill in use of teaching aids                 |
TABLE IV—Continued

Characteristics of Elementary Teachers
Designated Less Important in Q-Sort
by Student Teachers (Post)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Importance</th>
<th>(G) 41. Leadership by teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. Gives worthy and understandable assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36. Relationship with peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42. Exhibits and promotes originality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Oral expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Appearance, dresses for occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. Physical health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Control of physical environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Reception to suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>37. Cooperation with administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Follow-through on suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Control of voice, pitch, volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Moral qualities in speech and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46. Knowledge of school rules and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53. Performance of report-record keeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>50. Grooming, appropriate for the position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Written expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. Participation in school activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Absence of distracting tics or mannerisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J)</td>
<td>19. Handwriting/printing aptitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48. Cheerfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Important</td>
<td>(K) 11. Housekeeping and organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Except for one item there were five characteristics which consistently ranked lowest in examination of the calculated means of the three groups. The items generally ranked lowest by all three groups but not necessarily in this order were

No. 17  Written expression  
19  Handwriting/printing aptitude  
30  Absence of distracting tics or mannerisms  
53  Performance of report-record keeping  
11  Housekeeping and organization

Item No. 48, cheerfulness, was one of the few qualities which was found to vary considerably from the general pattern. The student teachers (pre) listed this attribute in some importance, the supervising teachers generally listed it in the middle area as not especially important or unimportant, and the student teachers on returning from the experience of student teaching listed the characteristic as one of least importance.

Much conjecture could be made as to why perceptions of the importance of cheerfulness might vary so much. Student teachers who originally held cheerfulness to be of some importance may have felt obliged to displace cheerfulness with seriousness and firmness when confronted with a real situation. The characteristics of fairness and firmness did move up in importance in the student teachers' opinions after student teaching. Novice teachers are often advised to start off
by being strict with the students as it is easier to ease up than to clamp down later on.

Experienced teachers do not discount that there is a place for cheerfulness in the classroom, but apparently it is neither one of the most important or least important attributes for a teacher.

Several generalizations could be made upon inspection of the ranking of items as shown in the tables. Those items which are rated more important are those having to do primarily with associations with the pupils. College preparations in these areas would emphasize subjects such as psychology and human growth and development. Those qualities which were rated least important were for the most part in the skill or aptitude areas or had little relationship toward accomplishment of pupils' educational objectives. The ability to write or print neatly is not emphasized in college classes. Formal training to develop this aptitude is usually concluded in elementary grades.

Housekeeping and record keeping have long been contended by professional teachers to be of secondary importance. The advent of para-professional teacher aides to relieve the teacher of many of these non-teaching duties would give support to this belief.

Absence of distracting tics or mannerisms appeared to be of low importance. This might indicate that often the
teachers accepted some peculiarities in individuals as inescapably human traits. Perhaps too, prospective teachers who possessed extreme tics or mannerisms may have been screened out of teaching by college advisors or school administrators before the particular trait became a serious professional problem.

Fairness in evaluation was rated consistently more important than the skill in evaluation. Here again the human element of empathy and understanding apparently exceeded the emphasis on skill in arriving at statistically correct equations.

Knowledge of the subject matter was not rated especially important. In this regard most of the subject matter is perhaps simple enough that an alert elementary teacher can grasp ideas and stay ahead of her young pupils.

Both student teachers and supervising teachers gave the characteristics of appearance, dresses for occasion, and grooming appropriate for position, relatively low ratings of importance. The responses from student teachers in this regard were surprising in view of the high interest, peer influences, and concern that many youthful college students have toward possession of fad clothing and appearances.

Teachers and student teachers rated the items of cooperation with administration, follow through on suggestions, and knowledge of school rules and procedures as of minor
importance. These items may be held in different regard by school superintendents or principals. The same Q-sort might be given to administrators to see if there might be conflicts revealed in the ways they view the importance of certain qualities in comparison with teachers such as in these three items. A suggestion for further study in this area is included in the recommendations.

It appears that both the experienced teacher in the field and the new teachers entering the profession hold some definite ideas that their time in the classroom should be spent working with students and not devoted to the more physical aspects and appearances of the situation.

The design of the Q-sort instrument in this research compelled the respondents to make a choice as to the teacher characteristics considered most important and those considered least important. It will be noticed that by this method a large number of the items were left indeterminant. Some twenty-eight characteristics fall into this broad category. No strong feelings were registered one way or the other in the Q-sort. Such characteristics were placed in positions E, F, and G in the Q-sort by the respondents. The consistencies in this classification can be noted from examination of the tables.
Review of Table V

The Pearson ("r") product moment correlation was calculated on each of the fifty-four characteristics used in the Q-sort and comparing the three groups' responses. Table V reveals that there were twenty-two negative correlations between student teachers (pre) and supervising teachers. Only two correlations were shown to be significant at the .05 level. One was significant at the .01 level. Item No. 27, general classroom atmosphere, was found to be significant at the .05 level between the student teachers (pre) and the supervising teachers. It carried a negative correlation -.3363. The same item was not significant in comparison between other groups. The characteristic was not shown to be too important in the ranking of means.

Item No. 11, housekeeping and organization, was found to be significant at the .05 level in all three comparisons. It will be recalled that this quality was ranked consistently as least important by all three groups of respondents. This trait was also found to be significant at the .01 level in comparing student teachers pre and post responses to supervising teachers' replies.

In the correlations of student teacher (post) results with supervising teachers' responses there were seven negative correlations determined. Twelve "r's" were found significant
### TABLE V

**CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN RESPONDENT GROUPS ON ITEMS OF CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Groups Compared</th>
<th>Groups Compared</th>
<th>Groups Compared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S_1$-$T$</td>
<td>$S_2$-$T$</td>
<td>$S_1$-$S_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>-.0947</td>
<td>.3299*</td>
<td>.3340*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.2981</td>
<td>.2963</td>
<td>.3172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.0232</td>
<td>.3621*</td>
<td>.4864**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.2675</td>
<td>-.0625</td>
<td>.1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>-.0309</td>
<td>.2616</td>
<td>.1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>-.0540</td>
<td>.0342</td>
<td>.2132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.0116</td>
<td>.1542</td>
<td>.2879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.0945</td>
<td>-.0492</td>
<td>.3573*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>.1717</td>
<td>.4258**</td>
<td>.6257**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>.1934</td>
<td>-.1132</td>
<td>.4312**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>.4330**</td>
<td>.4819**</td>
<td>.3585*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>.0721</td>
<td>-.0211</td>
<td>.1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>.2013</td>
<td>.2571</td>
<td>.6256**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>.1782</td>
<td>.2627</td>
<td>.3292*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>-.0409</td>
<td>.3573*</td>
<td>.5454**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>-.1262</td>
<td>-.0680</td>
<td>.7125**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>-.0248</td>
<td>.0381</td>
<td>.1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>-.0245</td>
<td>.2202</td>
<td>.2798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>.2203</td>
<td>.1869</td>
<td>.3301*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>-.0261</td>
<td>.0584</td>
<td>.1693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>.0514</td>
<td>.0948</td>
<td>.5556**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>.0187</td>
<td>.1109</td>
<td>.3642*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>-.0364</td>
<td>.0741</td>
<td>.1411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>.0199</td>
<td>.4049*</td>
<td>.3430*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>-.1327</td>
<td>.1930</td>
<td>.3846*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>-.2895</td>
<td>.0681</td>
<td>.3023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>-.3363*</td>
<td>.2159</td>
<td>.2878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Groups Compared</td>
<td>Groups Compared</td>
<td>Groups Compared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S_1-T$</td>
<td>$S_2-T$</td>
<td>$S_1-S_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>0.2697</td>
<td>0.3998*</td>
<td>0.7054**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>0.1003</td>
<td>-0.0345</td>
<td>0.4625**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>-0.0509</td>
<td>0.3504*</td>
<td>0.0239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>0.1892</td>
<td>0.4857**</td>
<td>0.5174**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>0.0637</td>
<td>0.5040**</td>
<td>0.1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>0.0334</td>
<td>0.2643</td>
<td>0.2175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>0.1923</td>
<td>0.0592</td>
<td>0.2770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>0.1251</td>
<td>0.1943</td>
<td>0.4141**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>-0.0576</td>
<td>0.1943</td>
<td>0.4749**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>0.0544</td>
<td>0.1432</td>
<td>0.4267**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>0.2144</td>
<td>0.1809</td>
<td>0.5198**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>-0.2847</td>
<td>0.0880</td>
<td>0.5119**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>0.2602</td>
<td>0.1615</td>
<td>0.2778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>-0.0111</td>
<td>0.2338</td>
<td>0.4203**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>-0.1199</td>
<td>0.2509</td>
<td>0.3616*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>-0.0045</td>
<td>0.0644</td>
<td>0.5733**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>0.1450</td>
<td>0.3628*</td>
<td>0.3039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>0.1858</td>
<td>-0.1542</td>
<td>0.0218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>0.0240</td>
<td>0.3417*</td>
<td>0.1381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>0.1230</td>
<td>0.3142</td>
<td>0.4123*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>-0.1570</td>
<td>0.2053</td>
<td>0.3635*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>0.0779</td>
<td>0.1914</td>
<td>0.4167*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>-0.0412</td>
<td>0.1619</td>
<td>0.3103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>0.1166</td>
<td>0.0156</td>
<td>0.1609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>-0.0295</td>
<td>0.0737</td>
<td>0.4006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>0.0566</td>
<td>0.1174</td>
<td>0.2812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>-0.2451</td>
<td>0.2196</td>
<td>0.1407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level (r .321)

**Significant at .01 level (r .413)

DF = N-2 = 36
at the .05 level. None were negative relationships. Those characteristics that showed significance at the .05 level in comparing student teacher post with supervising teacher responses are listed with their "r" values as follows:

No. 1 Reception to suggestions (.33)
3 Skill in use of teaching aids (.36)
9 Moral qualities in speech and actions (.43)
11 Housekeeping and organization (.48)
15 Professional conduct (.36)
24 Physical health (.41)
28 Adaptability to change (.39)
30 Absence of distracting tics or mannerisms (.35)
31 Skill in evaluation (.49)
32 Fairness in evaluation (.50)
44 Use of sound judgement (.36)
46 Knowledge of school rules and procedures (.34)

Four of the characteristics were significant at the .01 level in correlation of the student teacher post group with the supervising teacher responses. These included

No. 9 Moral qualities in speech and actions
11 Housekeeping and organization
31 Skill in evaluation
32 Fairness in evaluation

Three of these correlations were similarly high in this group of comparisons. They were No. 11, housekeeping and organization, with an "r" of .48, No. 31, skill in evaluation, with an "r" of .49 and No. 32, fairness in evaluation, which had an "r" of .50. Significance was determined when the "r's" were equal to or larger than .321 for the .05 level of significance and equal to or larger than .413 at the .01 level of significance.
In comparing the student teacher (pre) response with the same group's responses after student teaching, there were thirty cases of significance found at the .05 level and seventeen items significant at the .01 level. Since in this phase of the study the same persons recorded their perceptions using the identical instrument two times, a high degree of correlation would be expected. The changes in their perceptions from one occasion to the other were concluded to have been precipitated by the student teaching experience and the influence of the supervising teacher. The highest correlations were found in the "r's" determined for these comparisons. The highest correlations in the study were found to exist in the pre-post comparison of item No. 16, dependability, reliability, which had an "r" of .7125 and item No. 28, adaptability to change, with an "r" of .7054.

The characteristics which were found to have significant correlation at the .05 level in the student teacher pre and student teacher post calculations with "r" values in the thirty individual cases are as follows:

No. 1 Reception to suggestions (.33)
3 Skill in use of teaching aids (.36)
8 Understanding of children (.36)
9 Moral qualities in speech and actions (.63)
10 Control of physical environment (.43)
11 Housekeeping and organization (.36)
13 Sense of humor (.63)
14 Enthusiasm in position (.33)
Professional conduct (.55)
Dependability, reliability (.71)
Handwriting/printing aptitude (.33)
Appearance, dresses for occasion (.56)
Knowledge of subject (.36)
Physical health (.34)
Provision for individual differences (.38)
Adaptability to change (.71)
Prompt, punctual on job and habits (.46)
Skill in evaluation (.52)
Participation in school activities (.41)
Relationships with peers (.47)
Cooperation with administration (.43)
Management toward class objectives (.52)
Conscious of pupil morale (.51)
Leadership shown by teacher (.42)
Exhibits and promotes originality (.36)
Exhibits and promotes creativity (.47)
Constructive in criticisms (.41)
Cheerfulness (.36)
Efficient use of school time (.42)
Skill in explaining, questioning (.40)

From a comparison of the figures presented in the foregoing tables it appears that there were few changes made in the perceptions of the student teachers in what characteristics they held as important before student teaching as compared with their ideas after the experience. Since the interval between the pre responses and their post responses was occupied principally by the field experience, it is concluded that no particularly great influence was exerted on the student teachers by the individual supervising teachers in this regard.

Review of Table VI

The information presented in Table VI was obtained through calculation of the Hotelling's $T^2$ statistic. The
process is an analysis of variance technique which tests for the differences between means on multiple measures and between two groups. The computation was accomplished by electronic computer. In the calculations the mean for each of the fifty-four separate items in the Q-sort for one respondent group was compared with the mean for the like item from another of the respondent groups. The result was a single factor which was algebraically equivalent to the usual F statistic. From examination of these factors a determination was made as to whether significant change took place in the student teachers' perceptions after their student teaching experience.

The calculation of the $T^2$ statistic in comparing the student teachers' (pre) responses with the supervising teachers' replies disclosed statistical factors as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T^2$</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>418.79</td>
<td>54, 21</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of significance having been previously established at the .05 level, the calculated "$F$" was larger than the tabled value of 1.94. Therefore, the statistic was significant. This shows there was significant differences in the item means of the matched responses of the student teachers (pre) with the supervising teachers. This result could be expected by chance in 25 out of 1000 times.
TABLE VI
RESULTS OF GROUP COMPARISONS USING HOTELLING'S $T^2$ STATISTIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Compared</th>
<th>Hotelling's $T^2$</th>
<th>$F$ Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers (Pre) with Supervising Teachers</td>
<td>418.79</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers (Post) with Supervising Teachers</td>
<td>452.63</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers (Pre) with Student Teachers (Post)</td>
<td>170.03</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Significance .05
Degrees of Freedom 54,21
R: $F$ 1.94

In matching the student teachers' (post) responses with the supervising teachers' replies the Hotelling's calculations resulted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T^2$</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>452.63</td>
<td>54,21</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the calculated "$F$" was larger than the tabled value, which was determined to be 1.94 at the .05 level of significance, the statistic was significant. This indicates significant
differences between means on the individual items of the Q-sort responses of the supervising teachers and the student teachers after student teaching. The factor obtained would happen by chance approximately 16 times in 1000 trials.

The Hotelling's $T^2$ was also calculated to determine any difference between the matched means of the responses of the student teachers (pre) with the replies on the same instrument after the student teaching experience. The results from this process are given as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T^2$</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170.03</td>
<td>54,21</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case the calculated "F" statistic was considerably smaller than the .05 level so the probability showed no significant differences in the means of the student teachers' perceptions. Such a result might be expected to happen by chance approximately 642 times in 1000 trials.

From a review of the computations it was determined that there was no significant change made in the perceptions of student teachers as to the importance of certain teacher characteristics resulting after student teaching.

Testing the Hypotheses

In order to test the hypotheses which were formulated at the inception of this study, several calculations were
completed through the services of the North Texas State University Data Processing Center. Reference is made to Table V to support conclusions.

Hypothesis number one which states that there would be no significant correlation between Q-sort rankings of student teachers before student teaching and their supervising teachers in regard to the perceived importance of certain individual characteristics of elementary teachers is accepted. Only two significant correlations were found.

Hypothesis number two which states there would be no significant correlation between the Q-sort responses of supervising teachers and the student teachers after the student teachers complete their student teaching in regard to the perceived importance of elementary teachers, is accepted. Only twelve items were found to be significantly correlated out of the total of 54 traits. This amounted to approximately 22 per cent of the total group of characteristics. The hypothesis is accepted as written.

Hypothesis number three states that there would be no significant correlations between the Q-sort responses by student teachers before they student teach and the same student teachers after they student teach in regard to their perceptions of the importance of certain individual characteristics of elementary teachers. Thirty separate items were found to correlate significantly between the pre
and post test responses. Thirty out of fifty-four amounts to approximately 56 per cent of the cases. Since this amounts to slightly over half the total cases, the hypothesis is rejected as false.

To test hypotheses number four, five, and six the Hotelling's $T^2$ statistic was calculated. Reference is made to Table VI for conclusions. Hypothesis four, which states that there would be no significant difference in the overall Q-sort rankings by the student teachers before they student teach and the overall rankings by their supervising teachers in regard to the perceived importance of certain elementary teacher characteristics, is found to be false and is rejected. There is significant difference in the rankings of the two groups by the Hotelling's $T^2$ statistic at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis number five stated that there would be no significant difference in the overall Q-sort rankings by the student teachers after completing their student teaching and the overall rankings of the supervising teachers in regard to the perceived importance of certain elementary teacher characteristics. The hypothesis is rejected as there was significant difference found to exist between the means of the responses as determined by Hotelling's $T^2$ statistic at the .05 level of significance.
Hypothesis number six stated that there would be no significant difference in the overall Q-sort rankings before they student teach and the same group of student teachers after they complete student teaching in regard to the perceived importance of certain elementary teacher characteristics. This hypothesis is retained. There was no significant difference determined by the Hotelling's $T^2$ statistic at the .05 level.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine some of the thinking of contemporary education groups as to what characteristics they believe are important for elementary teachers to possess and also how student teachers' perceptions in this regard might change after the experience of student teaching.

In order to investigate this aspect of educational concern a number of rating guides which were currently in use to evaluate elementary teachers and student teachers in the field were obtained from eight northern Texas area educational systems. From these evaluation guides a composite list and frequency distribution of all the various teacher characteristics, traits and qualities was formulated. The same characteristics which were shown to be in use by two or more institutions were selected for use in this project.

A Q-sort instrument was developed using these sixty items for characteristics important to elementary school teachers. The Q-sort consisted of each of the individual characteristics being printed on separate slips of paper and a complete set of the items with response sheets, instructions, etc., being given to participants. In brief the instructions asked the person to review the various characteristics and
select the item he felt was the most important and then the item that was least important. The process was completed by alternating back and forth between remaining characteristics until a group of ten items remained which no particularly strong feelings as to their importance or unimportance were indicated.

To pre-test the instrument and the worthiness of the study, the Q-sort was given to eight North Texas State University professors in elementary education for their suggestions. From their constructive criticisms a refined Q-sort containing fifty-four items was devised.

From the list of 396 North Texas State University education students who were scheduled to complete their student teaching in an eight week block from February 22 to April 23, 1971, a random sample of 44 pupils was selected to include in the study. The supervising teachers of these particular student teachers were also included.

The study was to consist of administering the Q-sort instrument to the sample group before the students did their student teaching, to give the same Q-sort to the respective supervising teachers in the field, and then to re-administer the Q-sort to the same student teachers after they had completed student teaching.

Several hypotheses were established to be tested with the data received. It was intended to find out whether the
different education groups that participated showed any consensus as to the perceived importance of the various teacher characteristics included in the study. By use of a post-test by the student teachers some insight could be obtained as to the change in ideas after the experience of student teaching, the direction of change and the amount of similarity to the perceptions of supervising teachers.

A high degree of cooperation was received in the research. Most student responses were obtained through instructors permitting completion of the Q-sort by students during college class-time. In the end a total of 38 usable sets of responses was obtained, a number which was well over the established minimum of 30 completed sets.

The data were transcribed in the necessary form for processing by the North Texas State University Data Processing Center. The computations performed revealed some consistencies and some differences in the thinking of the respondents in regard to the perceived importance of certain characteristics of elementary teachers. The pattern of responses from calculated means indicated that four characteristics were ranked high in importance by the three groups. They were understanding of children, ability to motivate children, provision for individual differences, and enthusiasm in position. Five characteristics were regularly placed as least important. These were written expression, handwriting/ printing aptitude, absence of distracting tics or mannerisms,
performance of report-record keeping and housekeeping and organization.

Standard deviations on the items revealed that there was much deviation in the ranking of individual characteristics by respondents. On the traits which were ranked especially important or unimportant there was less variance than on the items in the middle area for which no strong opinions were registered.

The calculation of the Pearson product moment correlation revealed relatively few significant correlations between participating groups and their thinking on certain characteristics. In the student teacher pre group-supervising teacher correlations there were two items significant at the .05 level. In the student teacher post group-supervising teacher correlations there were twelve items that were significant. In the student teacher before and after student teaching comparisons there were thirty separate characteristics found with significant correlations.

To determine the significance of the relationship between means in comparing the overall groups of individuals, the Hotelling's $T^2$ test was computed on the weighted data. This procedure revealed that there were significant differences at the .05 level between the student teachers before student teaching when compared to their supervising teachers. Significant differences were found in the total group of
student teachers (post) results when compared to the group of supervising teachers. Such results might occur by chance only 16 out of 1000 times. There was no significant difference in individual means between the student teachers pre and post responses since such results might be attributed to happening by chance some 642 times out of 1000. There was no significant change in student teachers after the experience of student teaching.

Through a review and study of the data obtained, it appears that there is some consistency but not perfect agreement between supervising teachers and student teachers in regard to their perceptions as to the importance of certain characteristics for elementary teachers. Although there has been much copy given in educational publications to the changes in education, the potential elementary teachers completing their college work today apparently hold to some of the same ideas as to characteristics necessary for elementary teachers that the experienced elementary teachers adhere to. The perceptions of the student teacher are susceptible to change and may become more solidified from the practical classroom experience, tending to reemphasize the need to find the best possible teachers in the classroom to serve as supervising teachers because of the effect that the experienced teacher in such a one-to-one relationship has with a malleable apprentice.
There were basically several different types of teacher characteristics drawn together in this research instrument. It was beyond the scope of the project to elaborate on or analyze each of the items used. The fifty-four characteristics could be generally categorized into three divisions as follows:

(1) Personal qualities  
(2) Professional characteristics  
(3) Teaching effectiveness

Many of the foundations as to the importance of these particular qualities in elementary teachers were probably implanted in student teachers in college classrooms and in exposure to experienced education faculty. These perceptions were nurtured and eventually stabilized by the practical experience the student teacher sustained in the student teaching experience.

Conclusions

Conclusions based on the findings of this study can be listed as follows:

1. There is some consensus of opinions of contemporary student teachers and supervising teachers that the most important characteristic for elementary teachers is the understanding of children. Similarly housekeeping and organization is considered least important by the participating groups.

2. Student teachers and supervising teachers apparently believe that their efforts and energies in the classroom should be toward actual teaching pursuits as opposed to the non-teaching tasks that commonly accompany teaching assignments.
3. Student teachers, before they student teach, and their supervising teachers hold but few similar perceptions as to the importance of certain teacher characteristics. Consensus was mainly found on those items which were designated in the extreme categories as most important or least important. The relationships in the perceptions held by the two groups is small and not considered statistically significant.

4. After eight weeks of student teaching the perceptions of student teachers in comparison with supervising teachers perceptions as to the importance of certain characteristics was more similar but still not statistically significantly alike.

5. Student teachers do change in some of their perceptions as to the importance of certain characteristics of elementary teachers after the experience of student teaching but the change is not significant.

The underlying idea of this project has been to help improve a small aspect of the complex business of education. If teacher-education institutions or school administrators can incorporate some of the findings presented here to develop a better understanding of teachers or to improve in the evaluation of teachers or prospective teachers, some progress will have been made.

A statement from Ryans in the Teacher Characteristics Study seems appropriate in conclusion.

There have been many investigations which have yielded hypotheses for which some support has been found in our twentieth-century culture. We must recognize that changing educational values in the future may lead to the changing of teacher behavior and to further revision of our understanding of characteristics related to teacher effectiveness (p. 37).
Recommendations for Further Study

Since the original development of the Q-sort instrument in this study for a particular project, several questions and recommendations have been formulated. A valuable study, it is felt, could be developed from a more complete and comprehensive investigation into the content and construction of teacher evaluation guides currently in use. Undertaking a worthy formal rating of teachers is a complex, highly subjective task. Any improvements that could be made in the procedures or the designs of these teacher evaluations should be welcomed in public education systems.

Another area for research would be to administer such a Q-sort instrument to superintendents, elementary school principals, supervisors, and elementary teachers in one or more school systems. A comparison of these responses would reveal possible differences and similarities between the teacher and the individual doing the evaluation and show what each believes is important in a particular pedagogy assignment.

The study at hand did not take into consideration any variables such as age, sex of respondents, years of service, size of school, or amount of education. A similar study could be developed on a larger scale which might distinguish between such variables in investigating possible relationships.
between personal factors and the responses on such a Q-sort instrument.
APPENDIX
Dear Supervising Teacher:

Your name has been selected to help in the completion of a study in regard to the importance of certain characteristics for elementary teachers. Your respective assigned student teacher from North Texas State University is also participating.

I would appreciate it if you would examine the enclosed Q-sort items and arrange them as YOU consider their importance following the enclosed instructions. You will no doubt recognize many of the characteristics from evaluations on which you at some time may have been rated. Your name and responses will be held in strict confidence.

A self-addressed envelope is included for the return of the materials. An early return will be appreciated.

Thank you!

Respectfully,

Charles E. Wellington
Doctoral candidate
North Texas State University
Q-SORT

Included with this information is a packet containing names of characteristics often found in public elementary school teachers.

An attempt is being made to determine what several different educational groups perceive as to the important qualities for elementary school teachers.

Please review the quality listed on each slip and then according to the following method rate it as to the value of its importance as you consider it.

1. Pick the quality you believe as most important and put it alone, at the top, in position A.

2. Decide on the one item that you feel is least important and place it at the bottom, in position K.

3. Out of the remaining items pick the two qualities you feel are most important. Place these two in position B. (NOTE--The sequence of items within a position is immaterial.)

4. Out of the remaining items select the two that you feel are least important. Place in position J.

5. From those remaining pick the four you feel are most important and place them at position C.

6. From those remaining pick the four qualities you conceive as least important and place in position I.

7. From those remaining select the six that you feel most important and place in position D.

8. From those remaining pick the six that you feel are least important and place in position H.

9. From those remaining pick the nine qualities that you feel most important and put in position E.

10. From the items remaining pick the nine that you feel are least important and place in position G.

11. The remaining ten should be listed for position F.
Each item is numbered. Please write the numbers of the items selected in the appropriate blanks. Complete the information requested at the top of the reply sheet.

Return all materials in the envelope provided.
ORIGINAL LIST OF CHARACTERISTICS OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS PROPOSED AS ITEMS IN Q-SORT INSTRUMENT

(Order is Not Significant)

1. Reception to suggestions
2. Follow through on suggestions
3. Skill in use of teaching aids
4. Initiative
5. Self confidence, poise
6. Plans made in advance
7. Preparations for daily work
8. Understanding of children
9. Moral qualities
10. Environment (temperature, air, light)
11. Housekeeping
12. Courtesy
13. Sense of humor
14. Enthusiasm
15. Professional conduct
16. Dependability, reliability
17. Written expression
18. Oral expression
19. Handwriting
20. Voice
21. Appearance
22. Knowledge of subject
23. Emotional control of self
24. Physical health
25. Provisions for individual differences
26. Disciplining of students
27. General classroom atmosphere
28. Adaptability
29. Wise use of unscheduled time
30. Loyalty
31. Use of public relations
32. Prompt, punctual
33. Absence of distracting tics or mannerisms
34. Participation in school activities
35. Skill in evaluation
36. Fairness in evaluation
37. Classroom control
38. Gives worthy assignments
39. Relationships with peers
40. Cooperation with administration
41. Management toward objectives
42. Pupil morale
43. Pupil achievement
44. Leadership in evidence
45. Originality
46. Creativity
47. Constructive in criticism
48. Cheerfulness
49. Efficient use of time
50. Grooming
51. Stamina for the job
52. Skill in questioning, explaining, illustrating
53. Report-record keeping
54. Ability to motivate
55. Personal life satisfactory
56. Ambitious
57. Professional growth
58. Sound judgement
59. Resourcefulness
60. Knowledge of school rules
LIST OF CHARACTERISTICS OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS
USED AS ITEMS IN Q-SORT INSTRUMENT

(Order is Not Significant)

1. Reception to suggestions
2. Follow through on suggestions
3. Skill in use of teaching aids
4. Initiative, self-starting
5. Self confidence and poise
6. Plans made in advance
7. Preparations completed for daily work
8. Understanding of children
9. Moral qualities in speech and actions
10. Control of physical environment (heat, air, light)
11. Housekeeping and organization
12. Courtesy, consideration of others
13. Sense of humor
14. Enthusiasm in position
15. Professional conduct
16. Dependability, reliability
17. Written expression
18. Oral expression
19. Handwriting/printing aptitude
20. Control of voice, pitch, volume
21. Appearance, dresses for occasion
22. Knowledge of subject
23. Emotional self control
24. Physical health
25. Provision for individual differences
26. Disciplining, fair, firm
27. General classroom atmosphere
28. Adaptability to change
29. Prompt, punctual, on job and habits
30. Absence of distracting tics or mannerisms
31. Skill in evaluation
32. Fairness in evaluation
33. Maintains classroom control
34. Gives worthy and understandable assignments
35. Participation in school activities
36. Relationships with peers
37. Cooperation with administration
38. Management toward class objectives
39. Conscious of pupil morale
40. Pupil achievement and progress
41. Leadership shown by teacher
42. Exhibits and promotes originality
43. Exhibits and promotes creativity
44. Use of sound judgement
45. Shows resourcefulness
46. Knowledge of school rules and procedures
47. Constructive in criticisms
48. Cheerfulness
49. Efficient use of school time
50. Grooming, appropriate for position
51. Stamina for the job
52. Skill in explaining, questioning, illustrating
53. Performance of report-record keeping
54. Ability to motivate students
RESPONSE SHEET

Name ___________________________ Age __ Sex __

College standing: Fresh Soph Jr Sr Grad

Probable student teaching assignment:

School ___________________________ Town ______________

Grade ______ Teacher's name if known _________________

Please write in responses

Position A (1) Number __
Position B (2) Numbers __, __
Position C (4) Numbers __, __, __, __
Position D (6) Numbers __, __, __, __, __, __
Position E (9) Numbers __, __, __, __, __, __, __, __, __
Position F (10) Numbers __, __, __, __, __, __, __, __, __, __
Position G (9) Numbers __, __, __, __, __, __, __, __, __
Position H (6) Numbers __, __, __, __, __, __
Position I (4) Numbers __, __, __
Position J (2) Numbers __, __
Position K (1) Number __
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