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The problem of this study was to determine the relationships between student's self-perceptions and their perceptions of the teacher, and the students' ratings of teacher/course evaluations, utilizing the concept of Value Systems Analysis. Value Systems Analysis is based on the developmental theory of Clare W. Graves called "Levels of Psychological Existence," and provides a new way to look at the differences in people and their "modes of adjustment," and to help explain where man is, where he has been, and where he is going. A Coping Systems Inventory of Levels of Psychological Existence, designed to reveal a person's value systems with reference to his overall life style, is the basic instrument used by the National Values Center, Denton, Texas, to discover individual differences.

The Coping Systems Inventory and a Teacher Assessment Form designed to complement the Inventory and to allow the student to identify not only how "like" the teacher the value systems described are but also how "important" the systems are to the students, were the instruments utilized, with a teacher and course evaluation form used by the
Department of Speech Communication and Drama of North Texas State University. One hundred forty-nine students in this department participated in the experimental study.

To accomplish the purposes of this study, the following questions were examined: 1) What are the value systems of the students? 2) What are the relationships between the student's value systems and the student's perception of the teacher's value systems? 3) What are the relationships between the student's value systems and the student's rating of the teacher/course evaluation? 4) What are the relationships between the student's perception of the teacher's value systems and the student's rating of the teacher/course evaluation?

Six levels of existence or value systems were described in the test instruments: tribalistic, egocentric, absolutistic, achievist, personalistic, and existential. It was discovered that 48 percent of the students tested exhibited a primary value system at the personalistic level, and 22 percent ranked the existential level as a primary value system. Pearson product moment correlation was used to determine the relationships of all other variables in the study.

Specifically, the results of this study suggest these conclusions: 1) Students prefer their teachers to have value orientations similar to their own. 2) The value orientations of teachers as perceived by students are not as
similar to their own as students would prefer them to be.

3) Students do not appear to evaluate their teachers only in terms of the value levels they believe are important in their teachers. 4) Students appear to evaluate their teachers in terms of the value orientations teachers exhibit in the classroom. 5) The extent of the relationships of perceived similarity between the value systems orientations of the students in this study and the value systems orientations of the teachers they have evaluated is shown in the student ratings of teachers.

This study concludes that the use of the Coping Systems Inventory, a Teacher Assessment Form, and a Teacher/Course Evaluation Form to determine the relationships between student value systems and student evaluations of teachers has produced a sufficient number of positive relationships to recommend that the use of the three instruments together be further researched.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Student ratings of teachers and of course effectiveness are well established components of the evaluation of faculty performance, and their use appears to be steadily increasing (43, 58). These ratings are accepted, with some differences of opinion, in all educational areas. Student dissatisfactions in the late 1960's, current enrollment problems and budgetary cut-backs, and consumer concerns about educational accountability in the 1970's have contributed to an increased reliance on teacher/course evaluations, and many persons believe that students are in an admirable position to participate in their use. McKeachie (42) points out, for example, that because students are the consumers of the instruction, they provide the best criteria of teaching quality.

In a review of empirical studies made prior to 1971, Costin, Greenough, and Menges (6) conclude that students' ratings can provide reliable and valid information on the quality of course and instruction. They also report that up to 1971, there was very little evidence available to indicate that students' rating of college teachers was either influenced by or correlated with personality traits. How do basic personality differences between students and teachers
affect student ratings? Commenting on the influence of learner characteristics on student ratings, Trent and Cohen (53, p. 1043) conclude that "students' perceptions of teachers are more a function of internal frames of reference or value systems than of concrete teacher characteristics."

How students perceive teachers in relation to how they see themselves within their own frame of reference, value systems and attitudes, and how this relationship affects student ratings of teacher/course evaluations is an area which has had minimal research. In a 1977 study, Anderson, Alpert, and Golden (1, p. 36) suggest that

... the possible relationships between students' self-perceptions and their perceptions of their teachers have been virtually ignored in empirical studies of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness.

Additionally, they state that "the attributes that determine effective teaching and appropriate methods for measuring teaching effectiveness still lack clarity."

An apparent need exists for a framework within which a student's self-perception may be measured and his frame of reference, values and attitudes identified; and for a complementary means by which to measure the student's perception of the teacher, within the student's own frame of reference.

Clare W. Graves believes our values, attitudes, and behavior are consistent with one of seven "levels of psychological existence" (25, pp. 131-133). Graves, a former
professor of psychology at Union College, Schenectady, New York, has based his theory on nearly thirty years of research. His view of levels of existence, or value systems, is the developmental theory upon which the National Values Center, Denton, Texas, has based the concept called Value Systems Analysis. Value Systems Analysis provides a new way to look at the differences in people and their "modes of adjustment," and to help explain where man is, where he has been, and where he is going. A Coping Systems Inventory of Levels of Psychological Existence, designed to reveal a person's value systems with reference to his overall lifestyle, is the basic instrument used by Value Systems Analysis to discover individual differences.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the relationships between student's self-perceptions and their perceptions of the teacher, and the students' ratings of teacher/course evaluations, utilizing the concept of Value Systems Analysis.

Purposes of the Study

1. To create a written test instrument (Teacher Assessment Form) based on Value Systems Analysis, to measure the student's perception of the teacher.

2. To determine the relationship, if any, between the student's perception of his or her value system, as
indicated by the Coping Systems Inventory of Levels of Psychological Existence, and the student's perception of the teacher, as indicated by the Teacher Assessment Form.

3. To determine the relationship, if any, between the student's perception of his or her value systems, as indicated by the Coping Systems Inventory of Levels of Psychological Existence, and the student's rating of the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form.

4. To determine the relationship, if any, between the results of both the Coping Systems Inventory of Levels of Psychological Existence and the Teacher Assessment Form and the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form.

In developing these purposes, the study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What are the value systems of the students?

2. What are the relationships between the student's value systems and the student's perception of the teacher's value systems?

3. What are the relationships between the student's value systems and the student's rating of the teacher/course evaluation?

4. What are the relationships between the student's perception of the teacher's value systems and the student's rating of the teacher/course evaluation?
Background

Costin, Greenough, and Menges' conclusion that "the data . . . strongly suggest that the use of formal student ratings provides a reasonable way of measuring student reactions" (6, p. 531) has been substantiated by further investigations (13, 34, 36, 55, 58), but the questions remain.

What are the factors which contribute to student ratings of courses and instructors? What are the processes by which students arrive at these evaluations? What do student ratings of instruction really measure? Obviously no single study can cover the variety of experiences and conditions responsible for student judgment. Costin and Grush (7) note that one limitation of attempts to discover personality correlates of teaching effectiveness has been that personality and teaching effectiveness were not defined precisely enough to permit clear and useful interpretation of the data.

A number of studies have investigated the relationship between personality traits and student ratings, and in general a significant relationship has not been established. Personality may be defined as the characteristic way in which a person thinks and behaves as the person adjusts to his environment (41, pp. 610-611). Personality theory provides an explanation of why people think and feel and act as they do. It is multi-dimensional. The kind of interactive behavior and the quality of the communication which develops
in the teacher-student orientation must be dependent upon the ways in which both teacher and student think and act and feel. Teaching, and teaching effectiveness, is also multidimensional.

One frequent approach has been that of assessing the personality factors of teachers (4, 19, 34, 56). Other approaches deal with student's personality factors (37, 50), and with student and teacher characteristics taken together (10, 11, 57). Some studies are concerned with both teacher and course characteristics (7, 55); others with students' congruence with their environment (12, 26, 28, 44, 48). "College student raters' personality characteristics and expectations influence their ratings of instructors' teaching effectiveness," concluded Pollman (18, pp. 163-164) in his review of the influence of rater and ratee characteristics.

Only a few studies deal with the problem of students' self-perceived needs, values, or attitudes in relation to teacher evaluations. Rezler (50) attempted to demonstrate that student ratings of teachers are influenced by their psychological needs, though the findings are not clear. Crittenden and Norr's study (8) assessed the effects of student-perceived values on the evaluation process in relation to specific teacher behaviors and found support for the consideration of student values as part of the total evaluation process. Hazlett's study (30) correlated the evaluative dimensions of student academic self-concept with the
underlying dimensions of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness and finds the two dimensions significantly related. Johnson (35) in a study correlating a Rokeach Value Survey and an Educational Orientation Questionnaire with a course and instructor evaluation, found that student educational attitudes and student values have an interacting effect on students' evaluations which is stronger than the combined separate influences of each variable. Tetenbaum (57) found that certain social psychological needs of students congruent with teacher orientations are associated with evaluations of the instructor. In connection with her study, Tetenbaum pointed out that

there is an almost total neglect of what is probably the most important and certainly the most basic aspect of the act of rating: that is, the perceptual process that takes place when the student rates the teacher (57, p. 418).

A framework for exploring that "perceptual process"--a framework for investigating what and how students think and feel and act as they do--may be found within the developmental theory of psychologist Clare W. Graves.

Graves believes that human beings exist at different "levels of psychological existence." His model of adult psychosocial behavior is a hierarchical systems point of view, infinite rather than finite in nature. He proposes that

... the psychology of the mature human being is an unfolding or emergent process marked by the progressive subordination of older behavioral...
systems to newer, higher order behavior systems. The mature man tends normally to change his psychology as the conditions of his existence change. Each successive state or level is a state of equilibrium through which people pass on the way to other states of equilibrium.

When a person is in one of the states of equilibrium, he has a psychology which is particular to that state. His acts, feelings, motivations, ethics and values, thoughts and preferences for management are all appropriate to that state. . . (25, p. 133)

Man develops, then, a way of life appropriate to his current level of existence; a way of life or value system which is particularized as a result of individual, group, and environmental differences (25, p. 134). Not all men may progress from one level to the next; many may stabilize and live their lives at one level or a combination of levels in the hierarchy; under certain circumstances, man may regress to a lower level system (24, p. 72).

Graves notes that in certain respects, his work is a revision and extension of Maslow's views (25, p. 132). In her book *Ego Development: Conceptions and Theories*, Jane Loevinger groups Graves with psychologists Fromm and Riesman, calling them characterologists (38, p. 134). The four basic systems of human adjustment in the theoretical system of Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder also show similarity to Graves' levels of existence (29).

Graves has applied his theory to some specific areas, including management (20), education (23), and social welfare (21). Scott and Susan Myers, Charles Hughes, and
Vincent Flowers have been active in the application of Graves' theories, particularly to business environments; they developed a Values for Working test in 1973, which has been used in a number of corporations, workshops, and in seminars. Articles written about their work with Values Systems Analysis have appeared in The Harvard Business Review, Business Quarterly, Personnel, California Management, and others (15, 16, 17, 31, 32, 45, 46, 47).

Don Beck, formerly of North Texas State University, is also active in conducting workshops and seminars and now heads an organization called the National Values Center in Denton, Texas. He and his associates have applied Value Systems Analysis to areas within industry, education, state and federal governments, and social agencies (2, 3, 27). A number of descriptive studies based on Value Systems Analysis have been done by graduate students under Beck's direction (5, 9, 39, 40, 49, 51). Two studies have been concerned with some form of validity. Scoggin (53) correlated a Values for Working test with Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory, finding directionality but not predictability. Evans (14) investigated the construct validity of three tests, Values for Working, Values for Teaching, and Values for Helpers. In a doctoral study in Education, Rishe (52) investigated the reliability and validity of a Values for Helpers test, and found acceptable reliability but mixed results on validity. These studies have led to a recently
completed study. A new test instrument (*Coping Systems Inventory*), designed to reveal a person's value systems with reference to his overall life style, has been developed, and has been examined for reliability and validity by Hurlbut (33).

Graves describes his levels of existence as automatic, tribalistic, egocentric, saintly, materialistic, personalistic, and cognitive. These levels, as adapted by the National Values Center, are called reactive, tribalistic, egocentric, absolutistic, achievist, personalistic, and existential. A description of these levels, or value systems, is found in the Appendix, p. 135.

The use of the *Coping Systems Inventory* for the purpose of this study has added an additional dimension to Value Systems research. More important, this concept of levels of psychological existence may provide a framework within which to adequately and accurately discover the perceptual base from which students evaluate instructors and courses.

**Significance of the Study**

Instructors in a classroom are aware that not all of their students learn in the same way, but the reasons why they do not are not so readily apparent. Nor is it easy to discover which student learns in what way. How students learn is an important aspect of their value systems. How students assess their values may be an important determinant
and influence on student evaluations. The kind of interactive behavior and the quality of communication in the classroom may be significantly related to the degree to which students and teachers understand each others' value systems.

This study will be significant in that it will:

1. Determine whether a relationship exists between students' value systems and teacher/course evaluations.

2. Provide a basis, if such a relationship exists, for the initiation of programs designed to aid the teacher in a) understanding students' value systems, and b) developing processes and strategies that will be responsive to the needs and values of each student.

Definition of Terms

VALUE SYSTEMS. The terms value systems and levels of existence both refer to the various states of equilibrium in Graves' model of adult psychosocial behavior which he also calls "levels of psychological existence." As used by the National Values Center, value systems are "essentially modes of adjustment used by individuals and even cultures to cope with their perception of the reality of their world." Value Systems is the primary term used in this study.

CSI. Coping Systems Inventory, the instrument used to assess the student's value systems. The value systems, as used by the National Values Center to refer to Graves'
levels of psychological existence, are as follows: System 1—Reactive; System 2—Tribalistic; System 3—Egocentric; System 4—Absolutistic; System 5—Achievist; System 6—Personalistic; and System 7—Existential.

TAF. Teacher Assessment Form, the instrument used to assess the students' perception of the teachers' value systems, as defined by the National Values Center.

T/CEF. Teacher/Course Evaluation Form, the instrument used by the students in rating teachers.

Delimitations

The Coping Systems Inventory used in this study was expected, when developed, to be 1) valid only for speakers of Standard American English, and 2) valid for persons with the equivalent of a high school education.

The Teacher Assessment Form developed for this study was also expected to be 1) valid only for speakers of Standard American English, and 2) valid for persons with the equivalent of a high school education.
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CHAPTER II
A REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature which relates to 1) studies of student ratings related to individual differences, and 2) studies of means designed to identify individual differences. Only those studies which are especially applicable to the concern of this investigation are presented.

Programs of student evaluations are known to have begun over fifty years ago; more sophisticated and systematic rating scales began to be developed in the 1950's (4, 41). Since then, numerous studies have been made, assessing student evaluation on the basis of equally numerous variables.

"If one is forced to choose the most significant component of evaluating classroom teaching, it would be student evaluation . . .," states Miller, in Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluations (41, p. 30). He adds that the evidence clearly indicates that students can evaluate teaching fairly and perceptively; that we can count on the reliability of student-rating scales; and that these scales can be considered valid procedures for assessing the quality of good teaching.
The use of student ratings for "assessing the quality of good teaching" is a prime concern of this study. Good teaching is equivalent to teaching effectiveness. Yet teaching effectiveness continues to elude direct measurement (16, p. 19; 2, pp. 146-159). If teaching is thought of as communication, or as an influence process between the sender and the receiver, then the interactive behavior and the quality of the communication in the classroom are primary aspects of teaching effectiveness. Both the interactive behavior and the quality of the communication which develop in the teacher-student orientation are dependent on the ways in which both teacher and student think and act and feel, or how both student and teacher personalities interact within the classroom environment. Personality correlates of teaching effectiveness are as elusive as is a definition of good teaching, however (5).

Studies of Student Ratings Related to Individual Differences

With very few exceptions, teachers have no control over the selection or the characteristics of the students they meet in their classes. This means that in any classroom there are factors beyond the teacher's control. Many of the factors which may be considered variables which influence student ratings of teacher/course evaluations are therefore not within the range of either student or teacher
perception or understanding. Berliner states that "Research on teacher effectiveness, usually ignores . . . individual differences . . ." (2, p. 155). "Research on teacher effectiveness," he writes, "has to begin searching for interactions as it continues trying to establish more general links between teacher behaviors and student outcomes" (2, p. 156). Neglect of individual differences among students and teachers ignores a great deal of information which may potentially contribute to an understanding of teacher effectiveness.

It is generally agreed that a teacher evaluation is neither "equivalent to determining the teacher's ability to effect desired change in learners" (40, p. 240), nor an indicator of the kind of quality of communication which occurs between student and teacher. It is generally recognized that students differ greatly in their general personality characteristics, backgrounds, and interests (3, 10, 12, 40, 45). These differences greatly influence student evaluations. Different people see things in different ways. The interaction processes between the teacher and the student involve feelings, emotional states, subjective views, and personal preferences, for both teacher and student enter the classroom conditioned by their previous experiences. All of these experiences are contained within each individual's personality; all are influencing factors.
Many studies have attempted to identify the relationships between student evaluations and the variables which affect them. DeWolfe lists seventy-six student characteristics that have been studied as predictors of student evaluations, ranging from age to amount of travel experience (8, p. 73). Doyle reports that the most frequently studied characteristics fall into three classes: demographics, ability, and motivation (10, p. 73).

The interaction between student and teacher within the classroom influences both student motivation and achievement. As previously noted, Trent and Cohen concluded that "student's perceptions of teachers are more a function of internal frames of references or value systems than of concrete teacher characteristics" (53). Most studies, however, have dealt with what might be considered "concrete characteristics," either of the teacher or the student, rather than with an overall assessment of an individual's frame of reference.

Personality factors of the teacher which contribute to satisfaction on the part of the student have been one area of investigation. According to Costin and Grush (5, p. 35), a most frequently used approach is to have teachers describe their personality traits and to correlate these measures with student ratings of teaching effectiveness.

In a summary of the characteristics of good teaching, Miller (41) points out that the ten items found by French
in 1957 to be contributing factors to effective teaching included five items which Guthrie had found to be important nearly a generation earlier. These ten items were: interprets abstract ideas and theories clearly, interests student in the subject, increases skills in thinking, broadens interests, stresses important material, makes good use of examples and illustrations, motivates to do best work, inspires class confidence in teacher's knowledge of the subject, provides new viewpoints or appreciations, and explains clearly (41). The four most frequently mentioned characteristics described by students in a study by Crawford and Bradshaw in 1968 were: thorough knowledge of subject matter; well-planned and organized lectures; enthusiastic, energetic, lively interest in teaching; and student-oriented, friendly, willing to help students (6).

These characteristics are included among the most important factors in a number of other studies summarized by Miller (41, p. 31-33). For example, Cadzella, in 1968, presented a questionnaire to 443 randomly selected college students. The responses indicated that the five most important criteria of the "ideal professor" were: knowledge of subject (has a thorough knowledge, both basic and current, of the subject he teaches); interest in subject (has a deep interest in and enthusiasm for the subject he teaches); flexibility (is inspiring, has the ability to present material to meet students' interests and needs);
well-prepared (has daily lessons well organized, provides an outline of the course and its objectives and a list of basic references); and vocabulary (uses appropriate language, has ability to explain clearly, presents material at the students' level of comprehension)(17).

Student's personality factors have been another area of study. McNeil and Popham note that "A focus on pupils reveals far more about the effectiveness of teachers than does direct study of teachers themselves" (40, p. 218). Yonge and Sassenrath (58) examined the classes of three instructors in an educational psychology course, each of whom used a distinctly different method of teaching. Because correlations between the students' personality traits and their ratings of teaching performance varied considerably from one instructor to another, Yonge and Sassenrath concluded that these differences were a function of the different teaching methods.

Noting the limitations of such studies (particularly the imprecision of personality and effective teaching definitions), Costin and Grush (5) investigated the relationships between college student's ratings of classroom behavior and the following variables: a) students' perceptions of their teachers' personality traits; b) teachers' self-described personality traits; c) students' self-described traits; and d) discrepancies between the personality traits students preferred in their teachers and the
teachers' traits that students actually observed in the
classroom. They discovered that students' perceptions of
classroom behavior were more highly correlated with students'
descriptions of the teachers' personality traits than to
their own traits or to the teachers' self-described traits,
consistent with the fact that expression of personality
traits may vary according to the situation. Since the
classroom is a specific environment, the findings indicated
that students' descriptions of teachers' traits reflected
that particular environment. Teachers' descriptions of
their own traits probably reflected their view of them-
selves both in and out of the classroom, consistent with the
fact that the expression of certain personality traits may
be relatively stable across a variety of situations. Costin
and Grush point out, therefore, the need for research in
which both students and teachers describe their own person-
ality traits, as they perceive them, within and without the
classroom environment (5, p. 42).

These findings that student perceptions of teacher
personality traits were correlated positively with student
ratings of teacher skill initiated another study by Grush
and Costin (25) which stated these hypotheses: 1) Student
perceptions of teacher personality traits would be
correlated with student ratings of teacher skill, while the
students' own personality traits would not be related, and
2) student attraction to their instructors "as teachers"
would be positively correlated with teacher skill, but that student attraction to their instructors "as persons" would not be related. The Gordon Personal Profile and the Gordon Personal Inventory were both used in both studies. The data supported both hypotheses. Teacher skill was correlated positively with certain teacher personality traits and attraction to instructors "as teachers." Grush and Costin concluded that student judgments should be solicited more to identify teaching traits and classroom behaviors which are important to effective teaching (25, p. 67).

Another area of research has been that of teacher-student congruence related to educational orientations and teaching styles. Ryans, in extensive research on teacher effectiveness, identified in 1967 three personality patterns or behaving styles. Pattern X--friendly, understanding, sympathetic teacher behavior; Pattern Y--responsible, businesslike systematic teacher behavior; and Pattern Z--stimulating, imaginative teacher behavior (49, p. 61, 215).

Hall's study of the effect of teacher-student congruence upon student learning in college classes did not confirm the hypothesis tested that the fit between the teachers' actual teaching style and the student's ideal teacher style would correlate more highly with learning than would either of these constructs alone (26). Rather, the actual teaching style of the instructor was generally
a better predictor of learning than were the fit scores or the student's ratings of ideal instructor behavior. This discrepancy suggested to Hall that the concept of person-environment fit (in this study represented by student learning-teacher as perceived by student fit) is not as simple as it may appear, and that more objective measures of teaching style and ideal teacher style, as well as of other variables of person-environment fit, are necessary (26, p. 212).

A study by Morstain (42) had as its purposes: 1) to assess the relationship between students' educational orientations and their degree of satisfaction with their academic program, and 2) to investigate whether there was a discernible association between congruence in faculty and student educational orientations in relation to student satisfaction. The findings suggested that dissatisfied and satisfied students had noticeably divergent educational orientation profiles and that dissatisfied students were least congruent with faculty orientations. Morstain, in an earlier pilot study (42), found that these varying states of incongruence regarding student and faculty educational orientations were associated with course evaluation ratings. The conclusions of the studies "underscore the need to gain a better overview of the characteristics and orientations of students and faculty, especially in relation to the effectiveness and saliency of academic programs" (42, p. 14).
Some studies have been based on theories of adjustment to a particular environment. A study by Harvey, Prather, White, and Hoffmeister (29) reinforced earlier findings that preschool teachers of concrete and abstract belief systems differed markedly in the classroom environments they created for their students. The main aim of the study was to assess the relationship between students' performance and teachers' resourcefulness,dictatorialness and punitiveness. Ninety-two kindergarten classes, twenty-six first grade classes, and ninety teachers were involved in the study. The teachers completed the "This I Believe" Test and/or the Conceptual Systems Test. The "This I Believe" Test (TIB) was developed specifically as a measure of concreteness-abstractness of conceptual or belief systems; the Conceptual Systems Test (CST) is an objective measure of the four principle belief systems theory presented by Harvey, Hunt, and Shroder in 1961 (28). Each of the classes was observed and rated as a class. The findings made it clear that "variation in the concreteness-abstractness of teachers' beliefs generates theoretically consistent and predicatable parallels in the overt behavior of these individuals" (29, p. 159), and that the classroom behavior of the teacher and the behavior of the students are significantly related (29, p. 163). The authors also point out that while students no doubt affect the behavior of their teachers, it appears more likely that, because of teachers' "socially prescribed
power," their influence is greater and more direct than that of their students (29, p. 163). While this particular study dealt with pupils in beginning classes, other studies by Harvey and his associates have dealt with secondary classes and college students, as well as teachers and administrators (27).

In an exploratory study initiated by Friedlander's concept of a contingency approach to the study of organizations, DiMarco attempted to explore the effects of teacher-student life styles and student life-style-learning structure congruences on student's attitudes toward the teacher and class, respectively (9). Within Friedlander's framework are two major concepts, Life Style and Organizational Structures and Processes. Life Style is described as encompassing the values, beliefs, and perspectives of the individual. Organizational structure is described as the social and technological relationships within an organization. Vinton (54) has developed a concept of learning structures as a counterpart to the organizational structure dimension, using Friedlander's concept of life style. Both Vinton's Learning Structure Questionnaire and Friedlander's Life Style Orientation Questionnaire, along with two attitude scales, were used by DiMarco in his study. In general, the results "seem to suggest that a student's attitude toward his teacher is related to the degree to which they share certain values, namely, the degree to
Which one's behavior should be influenced by rules and regulations, group norms and by what the individual feels is right" (9, p. 207). The study also suggested that a student's attitude toward his classroom is related to the degree to which the classroom structure fits his life style orientation (9, p. 208).

Several studies deal with the relationship of students' self-perceived needs, values, or attitudes and teacher evaluations. Hazlett's study (30) deals with the dimensions of student academic self-concept, focusing on that one aspect of a student's internal frame of reference in relation to the students' concept of a good teacher. Students on the college level evaluated themselves in terms of academic skill and ability, interpersonal effectiveness, and quality of scholastic involvement, as well as on self-confidence and style of intellectual inquiry. Semantic differential scales developed to measure the concept of a good teacher and a student's academic self-concept were used. Dimensions of student academic self-concept were found to be significantly related to students' judgments of teaching. College students' frames of reference were found to be influenced most by intellectual academic judgmental dimensions. Hazlett suggests that "future research should attempt to study other complex student, teacher, and environment interactions, as well as relating academic self-concept to other aspects of a student's personal and academic growth" (30, p. 57).
A study by Rezler (43) in which she attempted to demonstrate that student ratings of teachers are influenced by their psychological needs, did not consider any differences in teaching behaviors or teaching styles demonstrated by the teachers being rated. The findings were inconsistent and unclear. Rezler's study, and that of Crittenden and Norr (7), appear to view student ratings of teachers as an instance of person perception, as does Tetenbaum (52).

Crittenden and Norr proposed that a student's overall evaluation of an instructor (or of a course) is an additive combination of evaluations of teaching behavior weighted by the student's view of the importance of those aspects for good teaching (7). Two hypotheses were investigated, and both were supported by the data collected from 1718 students in 52 college classes. The correlations between student evaluations of specific teaching characteristics and the importance of the characteristic to the student were found to be positive. The findings support the consideration of student values and expectations as part of the teacher evaluation process.

Tetenbaum (52) hypothesized that specified student needs would be related to ratings of specific teacher orientations congruent with those needs. Student's needs were assessed by an abbreviated version of Jackson's Personality Research Form. Student's ratings of teachers were obtained on the College Teacher Observation Schedule.
(CTOS) constructed by Tetenbaum. The CTOS consists of twelve vignettes each describing a college classroom in which the teacher was portrayed as engaging in a particular set of behaviors corresponding with the need factors derived from Jackson's data: Need for Control, Need for Intellectual Striving, Need for Gregariousness-Dependence, and Need for Ascendancy. Each of these four needs was depicted in three of the vignettes. Raters (405 graduate students) evaluated hypothetical teachers described in these brief vignettes. The students' perception was not based on a real or actual teacher. While the findings "clearly demonstrated that specific needs were related to the ratings of specific teacher orientations" (52, p. 426), all vignettes did not load equally highly within a given cluster; and the vignettes could not reflect the complexity of an actual classroom situation. The study demonstrated that student ratings involve a perceptual task which is affected by the perceiver's needs, and says Tetenbaum, "call attention to the necessity for approaching the administration and interpretation of ratings rationally and within a broader theoretical social-psychological framework" (52, p. 428).

The conceptual premise upon which Johnson (32) based his study of student evaluations was that an evaluation of a course and instructor by students is their decision of the worth of a course and instruction as seen through their values and selected attitudes. Data were collected on
students' values, educational attitudes and course evaluations, using the Rokeach Value Survey, the Hadley Educational Orientation Questionnaire, and a Course and Instructor Evaluation instrument (32, 55). Student evaluation of faculty was the main dependent variable; values and attitudes independent variables. Multiple regression and path analysis showed that a) educational attitudes and selected values were responsible for 27 percent of the variance in student evaluation of faculty, and b) educational attitudes were responsible for eight percent of the student evaluation of faculty. The most significant find was that values and attitudes interacting would have greater influence on students' evaluations than either acting alone (32; 55, p. 23). The implication that instructors should interpret the results of student ratings in terms of their knowledge of the characteristics of the students doing the evaluating holds further implications for instructors concerned with improving their teaching effectiveness.

Most of the studies on student evaluation of teachers attempt to establish the validity of ratings on the basis of comparison with selected variables: personality characteristics of the teacher (primarily defined as "concrete characteristics"), student's personality factors, teaching styles, student's educational orientations, classroom environment, student learning, specific needs, values, or attitudes of the teacher and the student, and to some
degree, belief systems and life-style orientations, along with demographic and ability variables.

Each of these factors is important in student ratings, but neither one nor a combination of several variables provides a complete view of the student rating process. Costin and Grush point out the need for the kind of research that provides information about both students and teachers, both within and without the classroom environment (5), as do Hall (26) and Morstain (42). Crittenden and Norr (7) support the consideration of student values and expectations as part of the teacher evaluation process, and Johnson and Trent (32, 55) report that the interaction of values and attitudes has greater influence than either acting alone. Hazlett (30) suggests that complex student, teacher, and environment interactions be investigated. Tetenbaum recognizes the necessity for approaching ratings "within a broader theoretical social-psychological framework" (52, p. 428).

"In a broad sense," state Getzels and Jackson, "personality means the person as a psychological or unique whole, and refers to the dynamic organizations of motive within the individual" (18, p. 407). Very few studies have examined the evaluator (or the instructor being evaluated) in terms of overall characteristics and perceptions as they affect the individual's adjustment to the total classroom environment, or are reflected in student evaluation of teachers.
Studies of Means Designed to Identify Individual Differences

"When a particular teacher and a group of quite different students get together and attempt to define and accomplish intellectual tasks, other events inevitably occur" (46, p. 285). Some of these events occur because students have very different expectations, desires, and personality styles. Some occur because of changes in the interpersonal situation in the classroom. Still others depend upon the teacher's expectations of his role in the classroom. All indicate a need for a broad conception of what happens between teachers and students in the classroom.

How can such a broad conception be accomplished? No study which deals with particular or concrete characteristics or specific variables will satisfy this need. An instrument which can provide an overall view of an individual's interactions with his own world, and which can then be particularized to a specific environment is necessary. Too often suggested or even tested ways of eliciting a desired response fail within a classroom--very possibly because the wide differences among people are not fully considered. What works for one teacher may not work for another; what works in one class may not work in another; what one student responds favorably to may not appeal to the student at the next desk. Teachers recognize that differences exist, and often conscientiously and
continually attempt to use new ways, new procedures, to reach their students—and these new ways fail for the same reasons that the old ways failed.

Ways in which individuals look at the world have become increasingly popular topics in recent years. This search for understanding is not new, but the increasing complexity of our world has made more complex the relationships within it. Most recently, many divergent forms of social change and personal revolution have occurred in our culture. In 1970, Toffler, in his book Future Shock, articulated these changes and called them "life style changes" (53). He wrote:

How to choose a life style, and what it means to us, looms as one of the central issues of the psychology of tomorrow. For the selection of a life style, whether consciously done or not, powerfully shapes the individual's future. It does this by imposing order, a set of principles or criteria on the choices he makes in daily life . . . (53, p. 306).

Man's "selection of a life style, whether consciously done or not," not only shapes his future, but also informs his present. Toffler says that change in relation to objects, people and places will continue to accelerate. What is needed is an approach sufficiently comprehensive to allow us to understand the developments and changes that occur within an individual's life.

What means are presently available to measure these developments and changes in a comprehensive way? What
means are presently available which can be particularized to an educational setting? What means have been applied to the student-teacher interaction in the classroom?

Research into the concept of difference and choice is not completely new or unique. There are formal theoretical orientations which view the human being as a maturing social organism in which change is natural, continuous, and even necessary. In her book *Ego Development: Conceptions and Theories*, Jane Loevinger (36, p. 68-136) presents a comprehensive summary and comparison of the alternative conceptions of Erikson, Perenczi, Ausubel, Piaget, Fromm, Riesman, Graves, Adorno, Sullivan, Peck, Kohlberg, Bull, Perry, and Issac, all of whom share a belief in the hierarchical progression of man. Loevinger notes that "When many people operating from different assumptions and different kinds of data have convergent conceptions, that convergence confirms the common elements" (36, p. 68). Most of the theories have in common a generalized movement from concrete thinking to abstract thinking, from an absolutistic view of the world to a pluralistic view of the world, and from dependency to autonomy.

Milton Rokeach (48), Abraham Maslow (39), and Sidney Simon (51) are well known names in the literature on human values. They have chosen to study man's attempt to understand himself by identifying his value systems. Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder (28) have developed a concept of four
basic belief systems which condition man's adjustment to his world. Carl Roger's developmental view is confined primarily to a therapeutic setting (47). Kohlberg's extensive research deals with the moral development of the child (33); the theory and research of Kolb (34) is focused primarily on the learning style of the individual adult.

Levinson's *The Stages of Man* (35), Sheehy's *Passages* (50), and Gould's *Transformations* (20) have developed the phases of adult life chronologically, identifying the stages of development, and the milestones that mark the transition from one state of being to another. These works recognize the role that self-concept or self-perception plays in the development of a life style. The relationship between work, as it is carried on in organizations, and life style has been studied by Friedlander (14). Maccoby, in *The Gamesman*, has categorized the players—the corporate managers—he has found in a study in high technology corporations (37).

Research has moved forward in the areas of family, work, health, and education, and many professions—medicine, law, sociology, psychology—are attempting studies within their own areas. But the concept of life style needs integrated knowledge; a number of methods of study need correlation. Lake and Lake state that these methods should include

1) personality measurement methods capable of weighing value orientations toward objects, persons, places, and self;
2) assessments for determining sources of motivation;
3) assessments of physiological stress; and
4) learning style measurement methods (1, p. 35).

When a developmental theory begins to approach ful-
filling these needs, there will be substantial gains in
knowledge.

It appears that these requirements are met to a con-
siderable degree by Clare Graves' Levels of Psychological
Existence theory, and in turn by the Coping Systems Inventory
of Levels of Psychological Existence developed through the
National Values Center.

Personality may be described more easily than it may
be measured. But personality assessment is concerned with
the description of what individuals are like at a partic-
ular point in time. Within the levels of psychological
existence, value orientations toward objects, persons,
places and self, sources of motivations, reactions to stress-
ful situations, and learning styles are all assumed in kind,
and to a degree, in strength. The Coping Systems Inventory
considers value systems essentially modes of adjustment
used by individuals to cope with their perceptions of the
reality of the world. Thus each mode of adjustment con-
tains a set of assumptions about the nature of man, methods
of learning, modes of thinking, preferred motivational
strategies, and total life-styles.
Clare Graves' Levels of Existence Theory

Graves' research began early in the 1950's when, as a psychology instructor, he began to ask himself if there was not, somewhere, a theory with the capacity to take confusing and contradictory information in the field of behavioral science and make sense of it all. Choosing as his area of investigation the different conceptions of psychological health and maturity, he discovered a great deal of variance in the answers he received when he asked people to describe the psychological healthy mature human being. Posing a number of research questions to himself, he began to ask questions of his classes, and observed them in small groups as they discussed with each other their conceptions of a healthy personality. Then he subjected the students to the influence of authorities in the field through lectures and reading assignments, and asked them a second time to either defend their original conception of the psychologically healthy mature human being or to explain their present conception if their original conception had changed. Data was then turned over to an outside group of judges, who were able to classify around sixty percent of the information into two categories. Graves followed this procedure until he had collected 1,065 conceptions, using different judges each year. The two categories with two subtypes each which had been discovered originally remained
constant. Next, Graves investigated the effect of peer authority and higher authority, and as the years went by and the social climate in which the students lived began to change, new conceptions were revealed. Studies extended beyond his classroom into other parts of the world and other cultures, and he began to investigate groups other than students. More categories emerged, both above and below the original categories, in what he had now decided was not only a hierarchical process, but also an open-ended hierarchical process (31, pp. 20-35).

Finally, Graves concluded that his theory—which he called Levels of Psychological Existence—"offered a systems conception that integrated the confusing and contradictory information which existed in the field of behavioral science when he began his research in 1952" (31, p. 36).

The basic premises of Graves' theory are:

1. That man's nature is not a set thing, that it is ever emergent, that it is an open system, not a closed system.

2. That man's nature evolves by . . . quantum-like jumps from one steady state system to another.

3. That man's values change from system to system as his total psychology emerges in new form with each quantum-like jump to a new steady state of being (24, pp. 132-133).

Man evolves, according to Graves, through a hierarchy of psychological levels as he sequentially becomes aware of, and solves, the problems he encounters. When man arrives
at a certain level, his values and attitudes, as well as his "learning systems, belief systems, . . .preferences for and conceptions of management, education, economic and political theory and practice, etc., are all appropriate to that state" (23, p. 82). When man solves his current problems, he is able to move on to new problems, and in doing so, moves on to the next level of existence. If no new problems arise, or if problems remain constant, man may stabilize within a particular level or value system. Man may also regress to a previous or lower level system under certain circumstances (23, p. 72).

Graves calls his theory an "emergent-cyclical, double helix model of adult psychosocial behavior" (23, p. 72), and each level is designed for a particular set of existence problems, which may be not only cultural but also individual. He has delineated seven levels of existence, and sees an eight level already emerging which he calls experientialistic. The first seven levels he labels as automatic, tribalistic, egocentric, saintly, materialsitic, personalistic, and cognitive. From these labels have evolved the names used by the National Values Center—reactive, tribalistic, egocentric, absolutistic, achievist, personalistic, and existentialistic. He calls the first six levels "subsistence levels" because they are concerned with the establishment of individual survival and dignity. Level seven is the first of the "being" levels in which
man is free to consider the quality of life. Graves also calls levels two, four, and six "other directed" and levels three, five, and seven "inner directed."

Graves' first published article concerning the results of his research appeared in the Harvard Business Review in 1966. Entitled "Deterioration of Work Standards," the article attracted a good deal of attention, for Graves applied his theory to a business environment (21). He suggested that his point of view was a more viable alternative to the main problem of deteriorating work standards--the tendency to apply particular styles of management to too many people who do not fit those styles--than other theories such as McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y or Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid (21, p. 117). Graves' theory suggests that the solution lies in more appropriately matching worker, manager, and job specifications, and provides management a frame of reference for thinking about the employee that allows for constant reorganization of managerial control systems (21, p. 119). Loevinger, commenting on the article, asks,"What will be revealed when we use a common scale of ego level to look at teachers and their students, social workers and their clients, psychiatrists and their patients, parents and their children?" (36, p. 104).

Since Graves' first publication, others have applied his theories not only to the business environment, but also
to other areas of concern, as previously noted in Chapter I. Graves further explained his theory in articles in the *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* in 1970 (24) and in *The Futurist* in 1974 (23).

In *The Futurist*, he traced the thinking style, motivational system, specific motivation, means values, ends values, nature of existence, problems of existence, and learning system of each level. A summary in chart form is found in Tables I and II (pages 45, 46).

Graves' theory holds that human beings develop through a series of "levels" or behavioral states. At each level, a person learns and acts in a way that is consonant with that particular level. The tables provide a schematic outline of Graves' theory (23, pp. 77-79). It is also interesting to note that "while certain aspects of Graves' theory have evolved and been modified by new information or insight . . . other aspects, such as Graves' description of the characteristics of people centralized at each of the existence levels, have remained constant. His description of each system has varied little over the years" (31, p. 41).

In a *tribalistic* value orientation, a person seeks safety and security in a threatening world by fixating on power, chieftains, clans, rituals, or superstitions. The *egocentric* value orientation refers to a person who is self-centered, unabashed, and overly aggressive. He perceives a hostile world, breaks with tradition, but at
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Nature of Existence</th>
<th>Problems of Existence</th>
<th>Learning System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>Maintaining physiological stability</td>
<td>Habituation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Achievement of relative safety</td>
<td>Classical conditioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Living with self-awareness</td>
<td>Operant conditioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>Saintly</td>
<td>Achieving ever-lasting peace of mind</td>
<td>Avoidant learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>Materialistic</td>
<td>Conquering the physical universe</td>
<td>Expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>Living with the human element</td>
<td>Observational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Restoring viability to a disordered world</td>
<td>Any and all systems named above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Motivational System</td>
<td>Specific Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>Physiological</td>
<td>Periodic physiological needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Autistic</td>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Aperiodic physiological needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>Psychological survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>(dogmas, rules)</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Order, meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>Multiplistic</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Adequacy, competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>Relativistic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Love, affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Systemic</td>
<td>Existence</td>
<td>Self-worth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
times is very creative. In the absolutistic value orientation, a person feels comfortable in the security of a predictable system. He tends to be rigid, and is guided by sacrifice, discipline, and adherence to established norms. The achievist orientation likes winning and successful achievements, and tends to be assertive and self-serving. Human dignity, the uniqueness of the person, self-discovery, and the inherent worth of people are important to a person in the personalistic orientation. In the existential orientation, a person tends to be inner-directed, self-motivating, and enjoys maximum personal freedom within society's restraints; he values competence, but he is also tolerant of the ambiguities in life.

Persons at different levels of existence learn in different ways. According to Graves, persons existing at the first or reactive level are motivated only by stimuli which affect their imperative physiological needs. A reactive person does not judge or believe; he simply reacts to the environment and adapts through a process of habituation.

At the second level, tribalistic, learning takes place through the classical conditioning method of Pavlov. Safety and security are the primary concerns of tribalistic people. For egocentrics, at the third level, learning takes place through operant conditioning. Egocentrics, who value power and conquest, learn best for an immediate reward.
In contrast, fourth level absolutistic people learn best through avoidant learning, and may not learn at all without the threat of punishment. Absolutistics work best with rigid rules and regulations. Achievists, at the fifth level, learn best when the outcome of their behavior meets their expectations. They learn through their own efforts, with mild risk, and much variety in the learning experience. Achievists enjoy the satisfaction of accomplishment.

Personalistic people, at the sixth level, learn best through observation, by watching others and watching what happens when others respond or behave in one way or another. The personalistic person likes being in groups and is concerned with himself in relation to others. Seventh level individuals, in the existential system, have extremely flexible learning patterns. They are open to diverse experiences, like to learn in their own way, and wish to make their own decisions about what to learn (22, 56).

Since people learn in different ways, Graves maintains that educators must develop separate learning systems for people at different levels of existence. He suggests that people in educational systems should be grouped, according to their level of existence, and each group educated in a way that is congruent with its members' level of existence (22).

A student in the absolutistic value system, then, will do best in a rigid, authoritarian setting where he is
taught "the right way to think, act, and believe." The egocentric, who is impulsive and anger-prone, will have difficulty in this kind of setting. Achievists do best in a setting which allows them to learn in an impersonal, objective and rationale way, but personalistics are less interested in analyzing a learning experience than they are in relating learning to their own personal experience. For the existentialist, a teacher's job is to pose problems, help provide ways to see them, but leave to each person the decision of which answers to accept (22).

While such grouping may be ideal, the solution itself opens up many additional problems. The concept, however, suggests numerous possibilities for implementation.

Other Developmental Theorists

Clare Graves is a developmental structuralist, as are many of the other theorists with whom he may be compared. Structuralism establishes a system or sequence of structure changes, or stages, which Graves terms levels; these levels are not predictive of specific, concrete behavior as much as they are predictive of behavior in general.

Erik Erikson may be called a cognitive-developmentalist, although Loevinger points out that for Erikson, interpersonal relations are the primary topic (36, p. 134). She also describes Graves as a characterologist, and compares him especially with Fromm and Riesman (36, p. 134). Almost
every theorist uses different words or phrases to describe theoretical states; it is difficult, therefore, to compare theories precisely. Graves' theory can be contrasted with that of Erikson, whose name may be the one most associated with the concept of stages of development. Erikson presents these formulations:

1. . . . the human personality in principle develops according to steps predetermined in the growing person's readiness to be driven toward, to be aware of, and to interface with, a widening social radius; and

2. . . . society, in principle, tends to be so construed as to meet and invite this succession of potentialities for interaction and attempts to safeguard, and to encourage the proper rate and proper sequence of their enfoldings (11, p. 270).

Erikson translates these basic concepts into what is popularly referred to as eight "Stages of Man." He also believes that they will occur within specified years, as follows: 1) Trust vs Mistrust, first year; 2) Autonomy vs Shame, second and third years; 3) Initiative vs Guilt, fourth and fifth years; 4) Industry vs Inferiority, sixth through eleventh years; 5) Identity vs Role Diffusion, twelfth through eighteenth years; 6) Intimacy vs Isolation, young adulthood; 7) Generativity vs Self-absorption or Stagnation, middle age; and 8) Integrity vs Despair, old age (11). These last stages, then, will have a profound effect on any individual's life style. But when Erikson states that "the possessor of integrity is ready to defend
the dignity of his own life style against all physical and economic threats" (11), he is indicating that when man reaches the final stage, that of integrity, man's life style also becomes stable. Graves disagrees with Erikson on this point; he believes that man has the potential of moving beyond what Erikson sees as the ultimate stage (31, p. 84-85). Graves' theory is contrasted with that of Erikson in Table III (page 52).

Abraham Maslow was one of the earliest to stress the importance of values and their effect on human behavior; he believed that we cannot live without values. Maslow's theory of human motivation can be, and has been, applied to almost every aspect of individual and social life. Maslow considered the following assumptions basic to his theory:

1. The individual is an integrated, organized whole,
2. Most desires and drives in the individual are interrelated,
3. The human being is motivated by a number of basic needs which are species-wide, apparently unchanging, and genetic or instinctual in origin (19, pp. 27-38).

Maslow detailed his theory of needs in Motivation and Personality, published in 1954. A pyramid is the familiar way in which the ascending order of man's needs are illustrated. Physiological needs, the need for safety, the need for love, belonging and identification, and the need for respect and self-esteem are all at the bottom of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graves</th>
<th>Maslow</th>
<th>Erikson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Subsistency Levels)</td>
<td>Instinctive Needs</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Physiological Needs</td>
<td>vs Mistrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Need for Safety</td>
<td>Autonomy vs. Shame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Need for Belonging and Love</td>
<td>Initiative vs. Guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(also at Personalistic Level)</td>
<td>(also at Personalistic Level)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>Need for Respect and</td>
<td>Industry vs. Inferiority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>Identity vs. Role Diff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Being Levels) Existentialistic</td>
<td>B (Being) Needs Self-Actualization</td>
<td>Intimacy vs. Isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experientialistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generation vs. Stagnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ego Integrity vs. Despair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pyramid. At the top of the pyramid is the need for growth and self-actualization (38, 39).

Graves' research constitutes a revision and extension of Maslow's views in some respects (24, p. 132). As he did with Erikson, Graves disputed the fact that human development stabilizes, in Maslow's case with self-actualizing man (31, p. 97). There are very apparent similarities between the two theorists, however. Table III (page 52) compares Graves' theory with that of Maslow.

Social psychologist O. J. Harvey has investigated belief systems in terms of two basic aspects, content and structure. Content includes belief referents or attitudes; structure relates to how these beliefs are organized in terms of such attributes as openness-closedness, consistency-inconsistency, and complexity-simplicity. Harvey, Hunt and Schroder dealt with several such systems in their 1961 book, Conceptual Systems and Personality Organization (28). Most of Harvey's research has concentrated on four major belief systems. He has studied how these systems operate, the environments that seem to produce them, and some of their implications for education (27, p. 10).

System I represents the most concrete way of seeing and responding to the world. It is characterized by high absolutism toward social roles and status positions, a high tendency to view the world in an overly simplistic way, a high positive attitude toward institutional authority,
conventionality, and ethnocentrism. System I is the highest of the four groups in dogmatism (27, p. 11).

System II represents strong negative attitudes toward institutions and traditions, low self-esteem and high alienation and cynicism. Only slightly less dogmatic than System I, a System II person tends to denounce power and authority only when he is without it; given power and authority, he appears to use it abusively and rigidly. This system is without the social referents which provide reliable and stable guidelines to System I (27, pp. 10-11).

A strong emphasis upon social intercourse—friendship, interpersonal harmony, and mutual aid—is reflected in System III. There exists a generalized dependency on others and a need to control others in dependence relations through subtle manipulation, often disguised under the desire and need to help others (27, p. 11).

System IV is more abstract than any of the other three. This system represents more diversity of experience and more ability to cope with conflict. It is information oriented, self-reliant, more flexible, more creative, and more relative in thought and action. System IV persons are more reliant on their own internal standards, and the system is the lowest in dogmatism (27, p. 12).

Harvey's belief systems and Graves' value systems show many similarities, although Harvey's system does not include a system equivalent to either the Reactive or Tribalistic
level and his System II appears to have Achievist characteristics as well as Egocentric. The systems are compared in the following table:

**TABLE IV**

**A COMPARISON OF THE THEORIES OF GRAVES AND HARVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graves</th>
<th>Harvey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>System II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>System I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>System II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>System III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>System IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Studies by Harvey and his associates have produced some significant data concerning systems in education. A study involving several thousand liberal arts students, as reported in 1970, revealed that approximately thirty-five percent represented System I, fifteen percent represented System II, twenty percent represented System III, and seven percent System IV. Seventy-five percent of principals and ninety percent of superintendents surveyed in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico were found to be in System I; none in any other system (27). These results speak to the climate these administrators bring to their educational systems.
From a different point of view, and within a different orientation, Friedlander has investigated the relationships between work, as it is carried on in organizations, and life style (13, 1). He has developed the view that everyone, to some degree, looks to authority, to their peers, and inside themselves for directions, guidance, value setting, and so on. He has proposed three basic life styles that interact with various kinds of organization to result in task accomplishment and human fulfillment. These three basic life styles are as follows:

1. **Formalistic**, which takes direction from authorities, guidance from precedent and policy, has faith in rules, laws, policies and order, and strives for advancement and prestige in order to achieve security and comfort.

2. **Sociocentric**, which takes direction from discussion and agreement with others who are close, guidance from close relationships with others, has faith in group norms, and strives for advancement and prestige in order to achieve intimate relationships and shared values.

3. **Personalistic**, which takes direction from within the individual, guidance from self-knowledge of what one wants to do, has faith in one's own sense of justice, and strives for experimentation and self-discovery (1, pp. 31-32, 162-163).

These basic life styles are seen as orientations or tendencies, and appear to be comparable with Graves' levels of existence. According to Friedlander's theory, military officers would tend to have relatively high formalistic
scores and relatively low sociocentric scores. This formalistic dimension compares with Graves' Absolutistic value system. Human relations specialists would tend to score highest on the sociocentric dimension; this compares with Graves' Personalistic level. Scientists would tend to score highest on Friedlander's personalistic style and low on the others; this compares with Graves' existentialistic value system.

This concept has stimulated studies on a number of life style issues, including the interactions between people with similar and different life styles and the repercussions of people with different life styles operating within incongruous organizational structures or environments. At least one adaptation of the concept to the educational environment has been made (57). Friedlander is also developing concepts of progression through life styles in the cognitive-developmental tradition (1, p. 32).

The organizational climate has provided Maccoby with an opportunity to study the management leaders in several large high-technology corporations. Maccoby, who was a student of Riesman, and who has collaborated with Fromm, discovered four clearly different character types. In his book, The Gamesman: The New Corporate Leaders, published in 1976, he labels these typologies the Company Man, the Gamesman, the Craftsman, and the Jungle Fighter (37). The viability of high-technology enterprises depends on a symbiosis of these
character types, but Maccoby sees as dominant the Gamesman, particularly those Gamesman who have matured sufficiently to acquire some of the qualities of the Company Man.

The Company Man provides stability and institutional cohesion; his sense of identity is based on being part of the powerful, protective company. The Gamesman is more adventurous; his main interest is in challenge, and in competitive activity where he can prove himself a winner. The Jungle Fighter is not interested in being a part of the "team," he wants "to look good while doing well and doing others in" (44, p.57). The Craftsman is a perfectionist; he cares about the challenge of the work or the problem itself. Maccoby points out that everyone is to some degree a mixture of character types. There are fewer Jungle Fighters in large corporations than in small business; Maccoby suggests that they are more apt to be found in the academic setting (37).

The Company Man resembles Graves' Absolutistic level and the Jungle Fighter his Egocentric level. The Achievist level is represented by the Gamesman, and the Craftsman appears to resemble Graves' Existentialistic level. Maccoby also discusses in depth what he calls the "creative gamesman" (37, pp. 124-180) who seems to combine both achievist and personalistic orientations, but found very few corporate leaders in this category.
Summary

This chapter has presented a review of the literature which relates to: 1) studies of student ratings related to individual differences, and 2) studies of means designed to identify individual differences. Only those studies which have been judged to be especially applicable to the concern of this investigation have been presented.

Every individual is different and human behavior is very complex. Methods of assessing "personality" include a broad range of affective and cognitive variables. The use of such assessments is equally broad. Student evaluations of teachers are generally accepted as valid and reliable reports, and the perceptual process involved in such evaluation deemed an important consideration.

Graves' theory of Levels of Existence compares well with the work of other recognized theorists who have had an impact in many areas, including education. Several inventory or assessment tests have been developed and used in conjunction with some of these theories. The Coping Systems Inventory, designed to look at an individual within the framework of Graves' theory, or Value Systems Analysis, provides for this study a new and experimental look at the way students see themselves in an academic setting by investigating the way they see themselves coping with their own worlds. Their perceptions are influential to teacher/course evaluations.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES USED IN THIS STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to present the procedures used to implement the problem of this study: to determine the relationships between student's self-perceptions and their perceptions of the teacher, and the students' ratings of teacher/course evaluations, utilizing the concept of Value Systems Analysis. The following areas are presented: 1) selection of students for the study, 2) selection of measuring instruments, 3) administration of the tests, and 4) treatment of the data.

Selection of Students for the Study

With the permission of the Department of Speech Communication and Drama of North Texas State University, instructors in each of the four divisions of the department—drama, interpersonal communication, communication disorders, and radio/television/film—were asked to consider participation in this study. Consideration was given to those classes which would be appropriate (classes involving laboratory work primarily and some small seminars were judged to be inappropriate), and individual instructors were approached for permission to administer the tests in their classes. Eleven instructors agreed to participate; sixteen classes were
involved. Administration time was set for regular class periods during the final week of the first Summer Term, 1979, at the discretion of the individual instructor. The number of students participating was dependent upon the number present in classes on the days set by the instructors. N for the study was set at a minimum of eighty. 170 test packets were distributed; 149 subjects successfully completed the Coping Systems Inventory; 137 subjects completed all three tests.

All classes during the summer session were taught by regular departmental faculty; no teaching assistants were involved in the study. While no population homogeneity of any kind is required for the Coping Systems Inventory or the Teacher Assessment Form, it was necessary that the same Teacher/Course Evaluation Form be used by all subjects. Therefore, a single department was deemed best for the collection of data for this study; the Speech Communication and Drama department was selected because of the researcher's familiarity with the department and the evaluation form regularly used.

Selection of Measuring Instruments

Three instruments were used in this study. The first instrument, the Coping Systems Inventory of Levels of Psychological existence, is based on the theoretical concepts of psychologist Clare W. Graves. The test was developed and is
owned by the National Values Center, Inc., of Denton, Texas. Permission to use the Coping Systems Inventory was obtained from the National Values Center (see Appendix, p. 138).

The second instrument, the Teacher Assessment Form, was prepared by the researcher for use in this study. Designed to complement the Coping Systems Inventory, the Teacher Assessment Form provides a way for the student to look at the teacher within the framework of Value Systems Analysis.

The third instrument, the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form, is the student rating form regularly used by the Speech Communication and Drama department of North Texas State University. The form, which has been in use for a number of years, is based on W. J. McKeachie's "Student Opinion of Teaching and Course" scale, prepared under the auspices of the American Association of University Professors and published in 1969 (10, pp. 443-444).

Coping Systems Inventory

The Coping Systems Inventory is the most recent of a series of tests which have been utilized by the National Values Center to measure value systems and value orientations. Previous tests, however, have been designed primarily for specific interest groups. The first value scale, developed by Myers, Myers, Flowers, and Hughes, was a Values for Working test. This test began as an instrument consisting of eighteen multiple choice questions, later factor-analyzed
and refined to eight multiple choice questions (14, 18). Later tests were based on this format, and include those created in connection with descriptive studies done under Don Beck's direction at North Texas State University. These are Values for Military Organizations (16), Values for Teaching (9), Values for Law Enforcement (8), Values for Religion (15), Values for Playing and Coaching (2), and Values for Group Management (3). Other tests devised have included Values for Helping (17), Values for Learning (5), and Values for Living (1, 13).

These tests were based on a version of Graves' levels of psychological existence devised by Myers and Myers and first published in 1973 (13). With the exception of the work done by Scoggin (18), Evans (4), and Rishe (17), which dealt with Values for Working, Values for Teaching, and Values for Helping tests, "the pragmatic validity of Graves' theories was assumed and accepted . . . no instrument . . . had been satisfactorily validated and tested for reliability" (7, pp. 11-12). The intent of a recent study by Hurlbut, therefore, was "to create a measuring tool which would render operational the theories of Clare W. Graves" and provide a "standardized instrument thoroughly tested for reliability and validity" (7, p. 13).

In developing the test instrument, these considerations were made:
(a) The test was designed to reveal a person's levels of existence with reference to his overall lifestyle and ... was aimed at revealing the test taker's overall dominant value system, secondary value system, and so on. Therefore, most of the questions on the test instrument do not pertain to compartmentalized areas of life.

(b) The test instrument was designed to include both negative and positive aspects of the various systems.

(c) Equal representation among the levels of existence being tested was provided.

(d) The test was designed to be completed in forty-five minutes or less (7, pp. 140-141).

The test consists of thirty questions devised to contain all possible combinations of value systems matched against each other in a power-matching forced choice structure. An additional ten questions contain six choices representing all of the value systems being examined.

For Hurlbut's study, the test was administered to a total \( n \) of 4,029. Using the split-half technique and correlating the two halves of each individual's test, reliability indices of .91 (\( n = 105 \)) and .88 (\( n = 2,220 \)) were obtained. Using the split-half technique and correlating the various levels of existence separately for two groups (\( n = 105 \) and \( n = 2,220 \)), reliability indices which ranged from .51 to .85 were obtained (7, pp. 158-163).

Concurrent validity was established by comparing the predicted scores for thirty respondents with their actual scores on the test instrument. A correlation of .8858 resulted (7, pp. 177-178).
Construct validity was investigated with three hypotheses. The first hypothesis predicted that the Levels of Existence test would discriminate between different occupational groups of people. Comparisons were made between counselors, managers, and clerical employees on their scores in Absolutism, Achievism, and Personalism. On the basis of results of two statistical tests, t-Tests for Two Independent Samples (n 179) and hierarchical grouping (n 99) this hypothesis was accepted. The second hypothesis predicted that a person's primary level of existence and secondary level of existence would be within three levels of each other for 90 percent of those tested (n 216), and the hypothesis was accepted. The third hypothesis predicted that the results of the Levels of Existence test for persons under thirty years of age would differ significantly from the results for persons thirty years of age and over. The differences at the .05 level (n 179) were not significant and the hypothesis was not accepted (7, pp. 178-197).

Content validity of the test was established by the evaluation and concurrence of the National Values Center. Both Don Beck and Chris Cowan of the Values Center have utilized and developed the concept of Value Systems Analysis extensively in workshops and seminars in the United States as well as in Canada, Alaska, and Spain. Clare Graves visited the Values Center in 1978, and is well acquainted with both Beck and Cowan and the work that is being done by
them in interpreting his theory of levels of psychological existence. The Values Center, therefore, is considered a competent resource (7, pp. 139-140; 163-165).

The generalized conclusion of Hurlbut's test of the Coping Systems Inventory for reliability and validity is that "the Levels of Existence test meets the standards of reliability and validity accepted within psychometrics sufficiently to recommend that it be revised and further researched" (7, p. 205). The revisions based on her study were done by the National Values Center, and are included in the Coping Systems Inventory used in this study. A copy of the Inventory is in the Appendix, p. 139.

**Teacher Assessment Form**

The Teacher Assessment Form (TAF) designed specifically for this study, is based, in part, on the format of two existing tests developed by the National Values Center for use in other areas. The TAF test is designed to enable the student to assess a teacher in terms of the levels of existence of value systems analysis, and also to allow the student to identify the kind of teacher, as defined by value systems analysis, he believes most important to him.

The form has three parts. The first section of the test consists of six descriptive paragraphs, each depicting a teacher operating out of one of Graves' levels of existence and utilizing the terminology of the National Values Center.
Item A describes a tribalistic teacher; Item B describes an egocentric teacher; Item C, an absolutistic teacher; Item D, an achievist teacher; Item E, a personalistic teacher; and Item F, an existential teacher. The following paragraph illustrates both the format and the content of Items A through F.

A. This teacher: Is usually pleasant and reassuring. Upholds school traditions and rituals and dislikes changes in our classroom procedures. Sometimes superstitious and often very vulnerable. Is easily influenced, even by us. Relies strongly on supervisor and other teachers for guidance. Likes to be told everything is going well, and wants his superiors to approve what he/she is doing.

For this section of the test, a nine-point, Likert-type scale is employed, using an adaptation of the semantic differential technique. End position responses are Not like this teacher and Like this teacher. A second statement, using the same technique, concludes each item in the test. It reads as follows:

This kind of teacher is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Important to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important to me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second section of the test contains two questions, dealing with student-class/teacher compatibility, with a five-point Likert response.

In considering the content of each of the descriptive paragraphs depicting teachers operating out of a particular value system, several considerations were made. First,
lists were compiled, describing each of the six value systems—tribalistic, egocentric, absolutistic, achievist, personalistic, and existential—in terms of beliefs, attitudes, and behavior characteristics. Resources for these lists included Graves' publications, notes taken during a lecture by Graves at North Texas State University in April, 1978, and an unpublished paper distributed during that lecture, along with publications from the National Values Center, notes taken at Values workshops, and other available relevant literature. Particular attention was paid to items pertaining to the educational process—values for teaching, values for learning, values in group management, etc. From these lists, descriptive paragraphs were written. An effort was made to use words and phrases which would be recognized by students operating out of particular value levels.

Second, an effort was made to construct each paragraph to be of the same length, to include approximately the same number of sentences, and to present, for evaluation and comparison, a description of somewhat similar beliefs, attitudes, or behaviors notable in a classroom environment and typical of each value level. For example, each paragraph contains a sentence particularly characteristic of the style of a teacher's interaction with students on that level of existence, as conceived by Graves, and applied by the National Values Center:
A (tribalistic): Is usually pleasant and reassuring.
B (egocentric): Is assertive, independent, often abrasive.
C (absolutistic): Accepts the authority in his/her position; treats class members equally.
D (achievist): Is ambitious, competitive, and achievist oriented.
E (personalistic): Is friendly, warm, and sensitive, and cares about us as people.
F (existential): Is highly resourceful, competent, and genuine.

Each paragraph also contains a sentence believed to be especially typical of that particular value level in terms of a teacher's classroom management behavior:

A (tribalistic): Upholds school traditions and rituals and dislikes changes in our classroom procedures.
B (egocentric): Runs class his own way—no matter what.
C (absolutistic): Is well organized; provides carefully detailed course outline, and follows it without deviation.
D (achievist): Is in control of the classroom situation.
E (personalistic): Provides supportive environment and wants us to become an understanding and harmonious group.
F (existential): Provides flexible guidelines under which class can function, and an open classroom environment with minimum control.

In addition, each paragraph contains phrases descriptive of a teacher's willingness to help students, attitudes toward
learning, attitudes toward others both in and out of the classroom, and personal outlook on life, all within the framework of Graves' levels of existence. It is not likely that any one teacher would be exactly described by one of these paragraphs; one of Graves' major premises is that "Man's nature is not a set thing ..." (6, p. 132). While a few individuals may assume single modes of adjustment, or settle into a single value system, most individuals develop clusters of several systems, with one of the value levels predominant.

The first level of existence, Reactive, is not included in this test, nor is it in the Coping Systems Inventory, because it is a level at which few people operate, other than the very young or very old.

The Teacher Assessment Form was submitted to the National Values Center for evaluation for content validity, and suggested revisions were made. A copy of the form is in the Appendix, p. 144.

Teacher/Course Evaluation Form

The third instrument is the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form, which is the "Student Opinion of Teaching and Course" form currently in use in the Department of Speech Communication and Drama of North Texas State University. It has two major sections. The first is "Characteristics of the Teacher and the Teaching," and contains twelve questions on
a seven-point Likert scale. Following is a sample question:

Is he/she actively helpful when students have difficulty?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
NOT HELPFUL HELPFUL

The second section is "Characteristics of the Course," and contains eight questions in a similar format.

In addition, each section contains a question asking for a rating ranging from Superior to Poor on a five-point scale: one for "course," and the other for "teacher." For the purpose of this study, these two global questions will constitute a third major section.

The "Student Opinion of Teaching and Course" form is based on a sample scale published in the AAUP Bulletin, Winter, 1969 (10). Designed by W. J. McKeachie, the scale accompanied an article on "Student Ratings of Faculty," commissioned by the Association's Committee C on College and University Teaching, Research, and Publications, of which McKeachie was a member. Two of the four purposes of the use of a scale for student ratings listed by McKeachie are particularly pertinent to this study. They are 1) To help instructors improve their teaching, and 2) To improve student morale and stimulate student thinking about their educational objectives and learning (10, p. 440).

McKeachie also states his belief that ". . . . the procedures and the form suggested . . . , with appropriate adjustments for existing circumstances, are worthy of
consideration by all who seek to secure more effective use of student evaluations of courses and teachers" (10, p. 439). He is supported in this belief "of appropriate adjustments for existing circumstances" by Miller, who states succinctly that "the cardinal rule is adapt—not adopt—an instrument" (11, p. 35). The Speech Communication and Drama Department has adapted McKeachie's sample scale. The first section includes eleven of fifteen questions suggested, and adds a twelfth question; the second section includes five of six suggested items, and adds three questions.

A copy of the instrument, labeled Teacher/Course Evaluation Form (T/C EF) for this study, is found in the Appendix, p. 147.

Administration of the Tests

During the final week of Summer Term I, 1979, the test instruments were administered to all students attending classes in the Speech Communication and Drama Department of North Texas State University whose instructors agreed to participate. Administration time was set at the discretion of the individual instructor. A block of time not to exceed one hour was requested; it was expected that the actual time involved in completing all instruments would be less than an hour.

All of the instructors participating asked that all three instruments be administered in the same block of time.
All but two of the instructors asked that the teacher/course evaluation forms be returned for departmental use after scoring; these two instructors chose to administer the rating form a second time themselves. Consequently, the forms were scored as quickly as possible, and returned in sealed envelopes to the Speech Communication and Drama Department office, identified, as requested, by instructor name and class section. The data was recorded on specially prepared sheets designed to hold the raw data from all three instruments.

The **Coping Systems Inventory**, the Teacher Assessment Form, and the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form were distributed in numbered packets. The procedure was planned to make maximum use of the relatively brief time permitted for gathering data, and to keep to a minimum any unnecessary interference with regular class activities. A verbal explanation of the purpose of the study and verbal instructions for taking the tests were given to each class by the researcher. It was necessary to answer questions from students regarding the tests during the time period. Although Hurlbut's study established thirty minutes as the official time required to take the **Coping Systems Inventory** (7, p. 155), a few students completed all three tests within thirty minutes. Most subjects, however, required from fifty to sixty minutes to complete all three instruments; a few students did not finish the tests within the allotted time.
The data generated includes raw scores for the **Coping Systems Inventory**, raw scores for the Teacher Assessment Form, and raw scores for each of the three dimensions of the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form (characteristics of the teacher and the teaching, characteristics of the course, and global ratings).

**Treatment of the Data**

Treatment of the data was conditioned by the following specific questions devised to implement the problem of this study:

1. What are the value systems of the student?
2. What are the relationships between the student's value systems and the student's perception of the teacher's value system?
3. What are the relationships between the student's value systems and the student's rating of the teacher/course evaluations?
4. What are the relationships between the student's perception of the teacher's value systems and the student's rating of the teacher/course evaluations?

No statistical analysis is required to answer questions regarding the value systems of students. The data is recorded in tabular form for analysis (see Appendix, p. 150).

To answer the remaining questions of this study, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used for the
statistical treatment of the data. All possible combinations of variables were computed. Coefficients of correlation were computed between each of the measures of value systems revealed by the Coping Systems Inventory and each of the measures of value systems indicated by the Teacher Assessment Form. Correlation coefficients were computed between each of the measures revealed by the Coping Systems Inventory and each of the measures indicated by the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form. Coefficients of correlation were computed between each of the measures of the Teacher Assessment Form and the measures of the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form. To determine the statistical significance of the relationships of the variables, the .05 level of significance was used.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present the procedures used in studying the relationships between student's self-perceptions and their perceptions of the teacher, and the student's ratings of teacher/course evaluations. Three instruments, a Coping Systems Inventory, a Teacher Assessment Form designed specifically for this study, and a Teacher/Course Evaluation Form were completed by 137 subjects. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used for the statistical treatment of the data.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the data which was secured to answer the following questions:

1. What are the value systems of the students?

2. What are the relationships between the student's value systems and the student's perception of the teacher's value systems?

3. What are the relationships between the student's value systems and the student's rating of the teacher/course evaluations?

4. What are the relationships between the student's perception of the teacher's value systems and the student's rating of the teacher/course evaluations?

Three instruments were used to secure this data. These three instruments were the Coping Systems Inventory (CSI) to determine the student's value systems; the Teacher Assessment Form (TAF) to determine the student's perceptions of the teacher; and the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form to determine the student's ratings of the teacher and the course.

The Coping Systems Inventory produces forty "most like me" and forty "least like me" responses. These responses
were hand-scored, and the data processed by computer to produce systems scores for each individual. Each system score indicates on a percentage basis the number of answers given at each value level. The systems scores were then converted into ranking scores for each value system. These scores are shown in tabular form in the Appendix, p. 150.

The Teacher Assessment Form produces six scores, one for each system, in both "Like" and "Important" categories. These scores were marked on a linear scale and converted into ranking scores for each value system. Teacher/Course Evaluation Form responses for "Characteristics of the Teacher and the Teaching" were summed (total possible 84), and ranked on a scale of one to seven. Responses for "Characteristics of the Course" were summed (total possible 56), and ranked on a scale of one to seven. Responses for part III of both the TAF and the T/CEF were ranked on a scale of one to five. These scores are also shown in tabular form in the Appendix, p. 154.

Value Systems of the Students

One hundred forty-nine students completed the Coping Systems Inventory. One hundred eight of the students were enrolled in undergraduate courses; forty-one students were enrolled in graduate courses. The ranking scores of each value system for each of these two groups and the total group are shown in Table V.
TABLE V

RANKING SCORES OF VALUE SYSTEMS
GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE COPING SYSTEMS INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSI Value System</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate N 41</td>
<td>Undergraduate N 101</td>
<td>Total N 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1—Most Important; 6—Least Important

Both graduate and undergraduate students as a group indicated that level six, personalistic, was of primary importance to them, and that level seven, existential, ranked next in importance. Graduate students next ranked level four, absolutistic, important, while undergraduates ranked level five, achievist, in third place. The differences in these choices as shown in the systems scores from which the rankings were made, however, were very small. Somewhat more significant were the differences between the fifth and sixth ranked levels for graduate students (level two, tribalistic; level three, egocentric) and the fifth and
sixth ranked levels for undergraduates (level three, egocentric; level two, tribalistic). It should be noted that the students are grouped only by the level of the class in which they were enrolled, not by their academic standing. In a few instances, graduate students were observed to be enrolled in upper-level undergraduate courses; upper-level undergraduate students in graduate classes.

Value systems ranking scores for the total group of 149 (graduate plus undergraduate students) follow the pattern of scores for the undergraduate group. Mean scores show that students view level six, personalistic, as the most important value system, or "mode of adjustment." Level seven, existential, ranks in second place, followed by level five, achievist; level four, absolutistic; level three, egocentric; and in the least important position, level two, the tribalistic orientation.

Students in the Department of Speech Communication and Drama are enrolled in one of four divisions: Drama, Interpersonal and Public Communication, Communication Disorders, and Radio/Television/Film. Ranking scores for the value systems for each of these divisions are shown in Table VI. Three divisions, Drama, Interpersonal Communication, and Communication Disorders, had mean scores showing level six, personalistic, as their primary value system. The division of Communication Disorders scored highest in this system, making thirty-three percent of their primary choices at the
personalistic value level. Communication Disorders students also showed less preference for the egocentric level, with only five percent of their choices at that level. Students in the Radio/TV division made twenty-five percent of their choices at the existential level and twenty-four percent at the personalistic level.

TABLE VI
RANKING SCORES OF VALUE SYSTEMS
COPING SYSTEMS INVENTORY
BY DEPARTMENT DIVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value System</th>
<th>Drama N=11</th>
<th>Interpersonal N=95</th>
<th>Comm. Disorders N=21</th>
<th>Radio/TV N=22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1--Most important; 6--Least important

All divisions gave less than eight percent of responses to the tribalistic or egocentric orientations. The largest division, Interpersonal Communication, gave the highest percentage of responses to level five, achievist, which was in
third rank. All other divisions gave third rank to level four, the absolutistic value system.

Responses to the Coping Systems Inventory revealed an item of special interest. Two students indicated that level two, the tribalistic orientation, was of primary importance. Three students indicated that level three, the egocentric orientation, was of primary importance. These two levels ranked fifth or sixth in importance overall. In her study using a total N of over 4,000 respondents to the CSI, Hurlbut (5) discovered very few respondents who ranked first or even second in either tribalism or egocentricism. The five respondents who ranked these two levels first or second in this study, then, appear to be very unusual in a total N of only 149. While it is possible that these rankings may be the result of random or systemic error, it is also possible that the delimitations of the study were not met in the population responding. No student demographics were taken. It is possible that several students in the classes who responded to the study were foreign-born individuals for whom English is a second language. Such students are likely to have cultural backgrounds which differ greatly from those represented by other students in the study.

Hurlbut's study also noted very few respondents who indicated that either the personalistic or existential levels ranked fifth or sixth place (5, pp. 175-176). In this study one person ranked level seven, existential, in
last place, and three people ranked level six, personalistic, in last place. Distribution of the rank of Value Systems in first, second, fifth, and sixth place is shown in Table VII. Value systems ranked in third and fourth place were quite evenly distributed, with the achievist value level having the highest third place ranking and the absolutistic level holding the highest fourth place ranking. Fewer responses placed the tribalistic level as least important in both the third and fourth rankings.

TABLE VII

DISTRIBUTION OF RANK OF VALUE SYSTEMS
COPING SYSTEMS INVENTORY
N=149

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSI Value System</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
<th>Sixth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of students responding

Students responding to the Coping Systems Inventory demonstrate as a group the following value systems, in
order of decreasing importance: personalistic, existential, achievist, absolutistic, egocentric, and tribalistic. Seventy-one students, or 48 percent, ranked the personalistic value level first. Thirty-three students, or 22 percent, ranked the existential value level first. One hundred four students, or 70 percent, ranked the existential and personalistic levels as the two value systems most important to them.

Forty-eight students, or 32 percent, ranked the existential value level second. Thirty-four students, or 22 percent, ranked the personalistic value level second. Eighty-two students, or 55 percent, ranked the existential and personalistic levels as the two value systems second most important to them.

According to Graves, these responses are typical of the students enrolled in colleges and universities today in terms of the ways in which they view their worlds. The personalistic level is one in which "an individual becomes centrally concerned with peace, with inner self and the relation of his self to the inner self of others . . . and is likely to go along with whatever everyone else thinks is best and likes being with groups" (9, p. 18). This is a level into which students and others moved in great force in the last years of the 1960's and the early years of the 1970's, and it is represented by the humanistic psychology movement today.
The existentialistic level is one in which a person tends to be "inner-directed and self-motivating," pursues individualistic interests, and responds to reasons rather than rules (6). Graves calls this level the cognitive level of existence, and believes that it is a threshold level where many political and cultural activists stand today (9). In 1952, Graves found that 34 percent of his students were at the absolutistic or fourth level and 10 percent at the existential or seventh level. By 1972, he stated that these figures were approximately reversed (10 percent at the absolutistic level and 34 percent at the existential level) (3, p. 85). This is an indication of the shift away from the absolutistic level toward the existentialist level in our country.

Seventy percent of the Speech Communication respondents chose either the sixth level, personalistic, or the seventh level, existential, as most important, and 55 percent of the respondents chose either the sixth or seventh value level as second in importance. Only twenty respondents chose the absolutistic level as the primary value.

With the few exceptions reported in Table VII, page 90, students reject both the tribalistic and egocentric levels of existence as important value systems. Few tribalistically oriented people reach the level of college education, although college students do demonstrate a "variation on a tribal theme" when they join sororities or fraternities, or
some other campus "clan" (1, p. 3). While there are egocentric students (as well as teachers and administrators), they are not a large part of the total college population (1, p. 4; 7, p. 57). A tribalistic individual has a great need for stability and seeks to continue a way of life that he may not understand but strongly defends. Egocentricism is often demonstrated on a campus by radical thinkers, as well as by creative and innovative persons who are willing to express themselves and their ideas freely.

Only 13 percent, or twenty students, chose level four, absolutistic, as a primary value system. Another 13 percent, or twenty students, chose level five, achievist, as a primary value system. At the absolutistic level, people tend to be conformists, and are sometimes very rigid in following established rules and regulations. They can also be very responsible persons, with a strong sense of law and order and tradition. Achievists are competitive, highly motivated, and often highly manipulative. Success, progress, and a good life are important to them. Few individuals operate exclusively out of a single value system; most embrace several modes of adjustment.

One of the hypotheses of Hurlbut's study testing the CSI for reliability and validity was that the secondary value system of an individual would be within three levels of that individual's primary value system. For example, if the primary value system is personalistic, the secondary
value system will be existential, achievist, or absolutistic; if the primary value system is achievist, the secondary value system will be existential, personalistic, absolutistic, or egocentric, and so on. Using an N of two hundred sixteen respondents (managers, educators, and technical personnel attending Value Systems Analysis workshops, and graduate counseling students from North Texas State University), Hurlbut found this hypothesis to be true in all but three cases (5, pp. 193-194). In this study, the hypothesis was true for one hundred twenty-nine of one hundred thirty-seven cases investigated. In fact, sixty-six respondents had secondary value systems within one or two levels of the primary value systems. Hurlbut also noted that one of the patterns she observed was that the secondary level is "not usually the level immediately below the primary level" (5, p. 197). In this study, thirty students, or 22 percent, chose secondary value systems immediately below the primary level, and third rank systems within one or two levels of the primary value system. Overall, a diversity in profile scores was noted, ranging from descending order to high scores at the extremes. Diverse scores were also observed by Hurlbut (5, p. 196).

Student's Perceptions of the Teacher's Value System

The Teacher Assessment Form (TAF) is designed to enable the student to assess a teacher in terms of the levels of existence of Value Systems Analysis, and also to allow the
student to identify the kind of teacher, as defined by Value Systems Analysis, he believes most important to him. The TAF asks first how the value systems described are "like" the teacher, and second how "important" the value systems described are to the student. Each question asks for an assessment on a nine-point Likert-type scale. The responses were ranked in importance for each value system. A third section of the TAF asks for a single judgment on a five-point scale for each of two questions, one on "fit" and one on "compatibility." All scores for the TAF are found in the Appendix, p. 154. One hundred and thirty-seven students completed the TAF.

The Pearson Product moment correlation coefficient was used as a statistical test to determine the questions of relationship posed by this study. Coefficients of correlation were computed for all possible combinations of variables. The correlation coefficients between the Coping Systems Inventory and the Teacher Assessment Form on both Like and Important scales are shown in Table VIII.

The correlation coefficients between the CSI and the TAF in the Like category show minimal correlation between the way in which students see themselves and the way they see their teachers in terms of individual value systems. There are, however, more significant correlations between the CSI and the TAF in the Important category in all value systems except the tribalistic and achievist; that is, there
are significant correlations between the way students see themselves and what they believe they find important in their teachers.

TABLE VIII

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN COPING SYSTEMS INVENTORY AND TEACHER ASSESSMENT FORM ON LIKE AND IMPORTANT SCALES

N=137

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSI Value System</th>
<th>TAF Like</th>
<th>TAF Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.238**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05     **p < .01

Correlations which fall between .40 and .70 are considered moderate correlations with a substantial relationship (4, p. 145). Yet Roscoe notes that

... the nature of the group and the variables being studied plus the use to which the coefficient is to be put will determine whether a particular coefficient is large or small ... (8, p. 101).

Given the size of the sample (N=137) and the restricted range of the relationships investigated (6-5, 6-4, 6-3,
etc.), the correlations shown between the CSI and the TAF Important scores have decided significance, as do similar correlations in this study.

Correlations are also indicated between the Like and Important scales of the Teacher Assessment Form, as shown in Table IX.

**Table IX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAF Like</th>
<th>TAF Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05     **p < .01

These correlations demonstrate some similarity between how students perceive their teachers' value systems and how students perceive value systems important in their teachers.

The last section of the TAF asks the student to assess the class and the teacher in two additional ways. They are:

A. Some people seem to be comfortable in certain classes because of who they are; yet others
simply don't "fit" the class they are in. 
In my case, this class . . .

B. Different people seem to be compatible, either 
professionally or personally, with different 
kinds of teachers. Overall, this teacher and 
I are . . .

Responses for these judgments on "fit" and "compatibility" 
were made on a five-point scale. There is a significant 
correlation coefficient of .57 between these two responses 
indicating that students who feel they "fit" in a particular 
classroom also tend to feel "compatible" with their teacher. 
The range of responses was from one to five. The mean score 
for the question on "fit" was 3.569; for the question on 
"compatibility" the mean score was 3.672.

Student Value Systems and Student 
Ratings of Teachers

The Teacher/Course Evaluation Form has three sections. 
The first deals with "Characteristics of the Teacher and the 
Teaching." The second deals with "Characteristics of the 
Course." The third section requests two ratings from the 
student, one of "course" and the other of "teacher." Pear-
son product moment correlation coefficients between the CSI 
and the T/CEF are shown in Table X.

The only significant correlations shown between the 
CSI and the T/CEF are at level three, egocentric. Overall, 
this value system ranks fifth in importance on the CSI and 
on both scales of the TAF.
TABLE X

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN THE COPING SYSTEMS INVENTORY AND THE TEACHER/COURSE EVALUATION FORM
N=137

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSI Value Systems</th>
<th>T/CEF I-Teacher</th>
<th>T/CEF II-Course</th>
<th>T/CEF III-Teacher</th>
<th>T/CEF III-Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.188*</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.172*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.0614</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.0161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05   **p < .01

The mean score for the first section, "Characteristics of the Teacher and the Teaching" (T/CEF I-Teacher), was 5.927. The range of scores for this section was four; no student gave a teacher a score lower than three on a seven-point scale. The mean score for the second section, "Characteristics of the Course" (T/CEF I-Course), was 5.606. The range of scores for this section was five; no student gave a course a score lower than two. These first two sections show a high correlation coefficient of .7133, significant at the .01 level. The proportion of the variance explained by these two measures is 50.88 percent.
The third section of the T/CEF contains two questions rated on a scale ranging from "Superior" to "Poor." These questions ask, "Considering everything, how would you rate this teacher?" and "Considering all of the above qualities which are applicable (including others that you added), how would you rate this course?" The mean score for the T/CEF-III-Course is 3.2847; for the T/CEF III-Teacher, the mean score is 3.6596. The range of scores for both sections was five; responses were made at all points on a five-point scale. The high correlation between the responses to these two questions is shown by a coefficient of .7794 which is significant at the .01 level. The proportion of the variance explained by these two measures is 60.74 percent.

Students' Value Systems, Perceptions of Teachers, and Students' Ratings of Teachers

Pearson product moment correlations between the T/CEF and the TAF Important scale are minimal, as shown in Table XI, though significant correlations exist between the T/CEF and the TAF Like scale, as shown in Table XII. These statistics appear to indicate that students give minimal consideration to the value orientations they perceive to be important in a teacher when they are evaluating teachers. In contrast, the significant correlations between the T/CEF and the TAF Like scale appear to indicate that what students judge their teachers to be like influences them.
**TABLE XI**

**CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN THE TEACHER/COURSE EVALUATION FORM AND THE IMPORTANT SCALE OF THE TEACHER ASSESSMENT FORM**

N=137

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAF Important</th>
<th>T/CEF I-Teacher</th>
<th>II-Course</th>
<th>III-Teacher</th>
<th>III-Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01

The TAF Like scale is significantly related to the section of the T/CEF, "Characteristics of the Teacher and the Teaching," on levels two through six--tribalistic, egocentric, absolutistic, achievist, and personalistic, and is inversely related at level seven, existential. Other sections of the T/CEF are significantly related to the TAF Like scale on the tribalistic, egocentric, and absolutistic levels. All other correlations are inversely related.

These relationships are not similar to those shown between the CSI and the TAF, which showed minimal correlations on the Like scale, and significant correlations on the Important scale.
**TABLE XII**

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN THE TEACHER/COURSE EVALUATION FORM AND THE LIKE SCALE OF THE TEACHER ASSESSMENT FORM

N=137

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAF Like</th>
<th>T/CEF I-Teacher</th>
<th>II-Course</th>
<th>III-Teacher</th>
<th>III-Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01

Significant correlations at the .01 level of significance are also shown between the rating scales of the TAF and the T/CEF, as well as between the rating scales of the TAF and the first two sections of the T/CEF. These correlations are shown in Table XIII. The rating scales on these two instruments do not ask the same questions, but students may have believed they were rating similar qualities. For example, the correlation coefficient between TAF III (fit in a classroom) and the T/CEF III-Course is .45. The correlation coefficient between TAF III (compatibility) and T/CEF III-Teacher is .57.
TABLE XIII

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE TEACHER ASSESSMENT FORM III-FIT AND III-COMPATIBILITY AND THE TEACHER/COURSE EVALUATION FORM ON ALL VARIABLES

N=137

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAF</th>
<th>T/CEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Fit</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Compatibility</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

More significant relationships between the CSI and the TAF on both the Like and Important scales are shown by a comparison of the rank values for all levels. Mean scores for the variables indicate that the value levels held by the students as a group are very similar to the ranking scores indicated on both the Like and Important scales, as shown in Table XIV. Tribalistic and egocentric orientations are not only least important to the students themselves, but also seem to be least evidenced in their teachers, and least important in students' selection of the levels important to them in a teacher. Personalistic and existential levels are highest ranked on all scales.
### TABLE XIV

**Comparison of Ranking Scores for Coping Systems Inventory and Teacher Assessment Form on Like and Important Scales for All Value Systems**

N=137

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value System</th>
<th>CSI</th>
<th>TAF Like</th>
<th>TAF Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1—Most important; 6—Least important

As a group, students show a primary value orientation at the personalistic level. Their secondary value level is existential, followed by achievist, absolutistic, egocentric, and tribalistic. If we assume that value orientations students would like to see in an "ideal" teacher (that is, value orientations important to them) would be similar to their own, we can expect the value levels on the Important scale of the TAF to coincide with those of the students. They do, as indicated by the ranked scores, with the exception that they apparently prefer a teacher with an absolutistic viewpoint to a teacher with an achievist viewpoint. That is, students would prefer a teacher who is very
carefully organized and often authoritarian to a teacher who is ambitious, competitive, and success-oriented. Students rank the egocentric and tribalistic orientations as least possible for them, and do not feel they are of importance in a teacher.

As shown by the ranked scores, students judged that the teachers they evaluated on the Like scale of the TAF held a primary value level at the existential orientation, with the personalistic system in secondary importance. Existentialist teachers operate in a very flexible environment with minimum controls, and expect their students to be responsible for their own progress. The personalistic teacher is very concerned with group harmony, and especially sensitive to the needs of students. Students judged that teachers next showed behavior patterns at the achievist level, matching their own, and the remaining levels, absolutistic, egocentric, and tribalistic, were also the same as their own expressed preferred modes of adjustment.

When students at each primary value system are grouped together, thirty-one students have a primary preference at the existential level; sixty-four students are at the personalistic level, and twenty students at the achievist level. Eighteen have indicated that the absolutistic orientation is most important as their primary level; three students have indicated an egocentric orientation, and only one student has made choices on the CSI which show him to be tribalistic.
These figures are for the group of one hundred thirty-seven students who completed all three instruments. The distribution of ranks shown in Table VII (page 90) was based on the scores of one hundred forty-nine students who completed the CSI.

An examination of the mean scores of student ratings of teachers on all variables of the T/CEF, grouped by the students' primary value systems, is shown in Table XV.

TABLE XV

MEAN SCORES OF STUDENT RATINGS OF TEACHERS ON ALL VARIABLES OF THE TEACHER/COURSE EVALUATION FORM FOR PRIMARY VALUE SYSTEMS OF STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Value System</th>
<th>T/CEF*</th>
<th>T/CEF**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Teacher</td>
<td>II-Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic N=1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric N=3</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic N=18</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist N=20</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic N=64</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential N=31</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1--low to 7--high
**1--Poor, 2--Fair, 3--Good, 4--Excellent, 5--Superior
Similar relationships between the value orientations of students and teachers are shown in the mean scores on the "fit" and "compatibility" questions of the TAF for students grouped in their primary value systems. These scores are shown in Table XVI.

**TABLE XVI**

**MEAN SCORES OF STUDENT RATINGS OF TEACHERS ON ALL VARIABLES OF THE TEACHER ASSESSMENT FORM FOR PRIMARY VALUE SYSTEMS OF STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Value System</th>
<th>TAF III</th>
<th>Compatibility**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1--doesn't fit me at all, 2--fits me just enough to tolerate this class, 3--fits me some of the time, 4--fits me most of the time, 5--fits me exactly.

**1--absolutely incompatible, 2--incompatible, 3--fairly compatible, 4--moderately compatible, 5--absolutely compatible."
The thirty-one students in the existential orientation rated all sections of the T/CEF higher than did any of the others except the tribalistic student. The single tribalistically-oriented student gave the teacher and the teaching the highest rank possible, and the course the next highest score. Egocentric students gave scores at the average range or below; all other students gave scores well above the middle rank of four. The mean score for all students on the T/CEF I-Teacher was 5.927; on the T/CEF I-Course, the mean score was 5.606.

Summary

The following are the more significant findings summarized in terms of the questions posed in this study:

1. What are the value systems of the students?

Students responding to the Coping Systems Inventory demonstrated as a group the following value systems, in order of decreasing importance: personalistic, existential, achievist, absolutistic, egocentric, and tribalistic. One hundred and four students, or 70 percent, ranked the existential and personalistic levels as the two value systems of primary importance to them. Eighty-two students, or 55 percent, ranked the existential and personalistic levels as the two value systems of secondary importance to them.

2. What are the relationships between the student's value systems and the student's perception of the teacher's value systems?
No significant correlations were found between the Coping Systems Inventory and the Teacher Assessment Form Like scale; the personalistic value system, though significant at the .05 level, was negatively correlated. Significant positive correlations were found between the CSI and the TAF Important scale on all levels except the tribalistic and the achievist. The size of the sample and the restricted range of the relationships investigated make these correlations which appear to be moderate decidedly significant. The Like and Important scales of the TAF were significantly correlated at all levels, as were the "fit" and "compatibility" questions of the third section of the instrument. When value systems were ranked for the CSI and each scale of the TAF, the ranks are very similar.

3. What are the relationships between the student's value systems and the student's rating of the teacher/course evaluation?

The only significant correlations between the CSI and the T/CEF were at the egocentric level, a value system ranking fifth in importance on both the CSI and the TAF scales. T/CEF I-Teacher (Characteristics of the Teacher and the Teaching) and T/CEF II-Course (Characteristics of the Course) show a highly significant correlation coefficient of .7133. The two questions of T/CEF III (How would you rate this teacher? and How would you rate this course?) were also highly correlated with a coefficient of .7784.
4. What are the relationships between the student's perception of the teacher's value systems and the student's rating of the teacher/course evaluation?

Only one positive significant correlation was found between the T/CEF and the TAF Important scale. T/CEF III-Course was correlated significantly with the egocentric level of the TAF. T/CEF I-Teacher and the TAF on the achievist level show a negative significant correlation.

The TAF Like scale and the T/CEF I-Teacher were significantly related on levels two through six (tribalistic, egocentric, absolutistic, achievist, and personalistic), and inversely related on level seven, existential. Other sections of the TAF Like scale were significantly related to the T/CEF on the tribalistic, egocentric, and absolutistic levels. All other correlations were inversely related.

Mean scores on the students' rating of the teacher/course evaluation, by primary value systems, show a significant relationship to the students' perception of the teachers' value systems.
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The problem of this study was to determine the relationships between student's self-perceptions and their perceptions of the teacher, and the students' ratings of teacher/course evaluations, utilizing the concept of Value Systems Analysis.

The purposes of the study were 1) to create a written test instrument (Teacher Assessment Form) based on Value Systems Analysis, to measure the student's perception of the teacher; 2) to determine the relationship, if any, between the student's perception of his or her value system, as indicated by the Coping Systems Inventory of Levels of Psychological Existence, and the student's perception of the teacher, as indicated by the Teacher Assessment Form; 3) to determine the relationship, if any, between the student's perception of his or her value systems, as indicated by the Coping Systems Inventory of Levels of Psychological Existence, and the student's rating of the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form; and 4) to determine the relationship, if any, between the results of both the Coping Systems Inventory of Levels of Psychological Existence and the Teacher Assessment Form and the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form.
The questions this study attempted to answer were the following:

1. What are the value systems of the students?
2. What are the relationships between the student's value systems and the student's perception of the teacher's value systems?
3. What are the relationships between the student's value systems and the student's rating of the teacher/course evaluation?
4. What are the relationships between the student's perception of the teacher's value systems and the student's rating of the teacher/course evaluation?

This study, dealing primarily with how students think and act and feel, recognizes that an apparent need exists for a framework within which students' self-perceptions may be measured and their value systems identified. It also recognizes the need for a complementary means by which to measure the ways in which students view their teachers, in terms of their own value systems. This study assumes that the kind of interactive behavior and the quality of communication in the classroom, important aspects of teaching effectiveness, may be significantly related to the degree to which students and teachers understand each others' value systems.
The research began with the development of a written test instrument, based on Value Systems Analysis, to measure the student's perception of the teacher. The development of this test, called the Teacher Assessment Form, is described in detail in Chapter III. The test was designed to complement the Coping Systems Inventory of Levels of Psychological Existence developed through the National Values Center of Denton, Texas, and is based on the theoretical concepts of psychologist Clare W. Graves. The Coping Systems Inventory is designed to reveal a person's value systems with reference to his overall life style. Value Systems Analysis defines value systems behaviorally as "modes of adjustment," used by individuals to cope with their perceptions of the reality of their world. Each mode of adjustment, or value system, contains a set of assumptions about the nature of man, methods of learning, modes of thinking, preferred motivational strategies, and total life-styles, and is designed for a particular set of existence problems. This concept provides a framework within which to assess individual differences which is broad enough to apply to diverse areas of human endeavor, including education.

The Teacher Assessment Form was developed to enable the student to assess a teacher in terms of the levels of existence of value systems analysis, and also to allow the student to identify the kind of teacher, as defined by value systems analysis, he or she believes most important to him.
The TAF asks how the value systems described are "like" the teacher, and also how "important" in a teacher the value systems described are to the student.

Subjects for this study were administered the Coping Systems Inventory (CSI) to determine the student's value systems; the Teacher Assessment Form (TAF) to determine the student's perceptions of the teacher; and the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form (T/CEF) to determine the student's ratings of the teacher and the course. One hundred forty-nine subjects completed the CSI, and one hundred thirty-seven subjects completed the CSI, the TAF, and the T/CEF. Subjects were students in the Department of Speech Communication and Drama of North Texas State University, and the T/CEF administered was the evaluation form regularly in use in that department.

Summary

Value Systems of the Students

As a group, students exhibit value systems which are typical of today's college students, according to Graves' observations. The personalistic value system was chosen as a primary level by seventy-one students, or 48 percent of the total subjects. Graves notes the move toward the sixth or personalistic level in the 1960's, as individuals began to "reject competition for cooperation and seek inner self-knowledge rather than power, position, and things" (3).
Some individuals are moving now into the seventh or existential level, to "focus once again on the external world and . . . the use of power in relation to it," confident that they "can put the world back together again" (3, pp. 75-77). This, too, is reflected in the value systems of the students reporting. Thirty-three students, or 22 percent, ranked the existential system as a primary level.

It should be remembered that the population in this study was exclusively college students, most of them in the age bracket usually associated with undergraduate students. College years are years during which students are discarding or strengthening the value orientations—the ways they view their world—that they developed in home and community environments, and are developing value systems uniquely their own. Many students may be experiencing the periods of dissonance that Graves maintains are necessary to instigate change and move from one level of existence to another (3, p. 77).

Educationally, this may mean that student value systems are changing very rapidly, or at least that students are indecisive or vacillating in their modes of adjustment. While they may learn or react favorably to behavior modes with which they have been familiar through previous school years, they may also be experiencing conflicts reflected in their value systems, as they encounter new problems and search for ways of behaving that will solve their problems.
Some classes in the Interpersonal division of the Department of Speech Communication and Drama, notably the beginning speech courses, also are service courses for other divisions or other departments of the University, and are therefore required courses outside of students' major areas. Students enrolled in other speech classes, however, with very few exceptions, have chosen the department as a major or minor field, in effect electing to take the required courses. The nature of the discipline of speech and drama may attract students as majors or minors who exhibit more similar attitudes, beliefs, and behavior modes than would other groups of university students. Speech and drama teachers, too, may exhibit value systems with overall similarity to each other, but dissimilarity to teachers in other disciplines.

**Student's Perceptions of the Teacher's Value Systems**

While the findings of this study indicate that students do not appear to judge that their teachers are operating from the same modes of adjustment as are the students themselves, they do indicate that students feel it is important for teachers to have value orientations which are similar to their own. There are also significant correlations between the Like and Important scales of the Teacher Assessment Form.

The highest correlation between the TAF Important scale and the CSI is at the egocentric level. This level is of
fifth or sixth importance to most of the students; they appear to reject this orientation in their teachers as well. The correlation at the personalistic level reflects the primary value system of almost half the students. Personalistic teachers provide a supportive environment and are interested in students as people.

There is also a significant correlation at the absolutistic level. Students may here be recognizing the authority of the teacher, and indicating that they think it is important to have some structure and organization within a classroom. The existential level is also significant. While this value level is the secondary value system for the students as a group, it exhibits the lowest correlation. This may be an indication that while some students are beginning to embrace the beliefs and attitudes of the existential level, they are not yet comfortable with this behavioral mode. There are no correlations at the tribalistic or achievist levels.

Correlations between the questions of "fit" and "compatibility" of the TAF indicate that students who feel they "fit" a particular classroom also tend to feel "compatible" with their teacher. Conversely, if they feel "compatible," they will also believe that the particular environment "fits" them as well. These findings support the findings of previous studies (1, 4).

Students have responded to the Important scale of the Teacher Assessment Form in a way that indicates that what is
important to them in a teacher reflects their own value systems. The absence of correlations between the CSI and the TAF Like scale indicates that they do not recognize their own value systems in the value orientations they see in their current teacher. A comparison of the rank values for all levels, however, indicates decided similarity between the way students report their own values on the CSI and both Like and Important TAF scales (see Table XIV, page 104). Students as a group indicate that the personalistic level is their primary value system, for example, and indicate that this orientation is important to them in a teacher. They perceive that their teachers do not exhibit this level as a primary value, but as a secondary value. Similar relationships are evident in the absolutistic and achievist levels.

**Student Value Systems and Student Rating of Teachers**

How a student reacts to the teacher and the teaching will tend to influence his reaction to the course; conversely, his reaction to the course will tend to influence his rating of the teacher and the teaching. The high correlation coefficient of .7133 between the first two sections of the T/CEF (Teacher and Course characteristics) is meaningful in that it indicates this influencing relationship between the two. Approximately 50 percent of the variance of one scale is accounted for by the other. A similarly high correlation
coefficient of .7794 between the questions rating the course and the teacher demonstrates the same influencing relationship. Approximately 60 percent of the variance of one scale is accounted for by the other.

Further, a correlation coefficient of .7878 is shown between the two parts of the T/CEF dealing with the teacher (Characteristics of the teacher and How would you rate this teacher?). Approximately 62 percent of the variance of one rating is accounted for by the other. A correlation coefficient of .6230 exists between the two parts of the T/CEF dealing with the course (Characteristics of the course and How would you rate this course?) Approximately 38 percent of the variance of one rating is accounted for by the other. This demonstrates some student consistency in rating both the teacher and the course.

This consistency is supported by the correlations shown between the TAF III and the T/CEF III (see Table XIII, page 103). While it might be assumed that students mistakenly believed they were rating the same qualities on both of the instruments, the relationships give credence to the importance of the kind of interactive behavior and the quality of the communication in the classroom.

Faculty viewpoints are critical to the direction and dynamics of any course. It is the teacher who has the primary responsibility of selecting not only the content to be covered, but also the nature of reading assignments, exams,
and other class assignments. A teacher's value orientation will influence his conception of the course, shaping both the instructional context, the atmosphere in the class, and the teaching "style." For example, a teacher operating out of an absolutistic value system would prefer a more structured and formal class design than would a teacher operating out of either an existential or personalistic orientation. A student who preferred a very structured class would then tend to give higher scores to the teacher whose classroom environment best met those preferences, and lower scores to the teacher whose classroom environment was incongruent with the student's preferences. Thus, teachers whose value orientations were relatively congruent with those of the student would receive somewhat higher ratings; those who were not would receive lower ratings. This is substantiated by the results of this study.

Students' Value Systems, Perceptions of Teachers, and Students' Ratings of Teachers

Similarity between the way students report their own value orientations on the Coping Systems Inventory, and the Like and Important scales of the Teacher Assessment Form is shown in a comparison of the rank values for all value levels, as shown in Table XIV. The mean scores on the Teacher/Course Evaluation Form for all students within each value system confirm the relationships between the CSI, the TAF, and the T/CEF. Mean scores reflect the value
orientations of students grouped in their primary value system as well as their view of the teacher in the classroom (see Table XV, page 106).

The tribalistic student, for example, is very dependent upon a leader or a chieftain—in this case, a teacher—for guidance in all things, and gave the teacher the highest score possible, a seven. A high ranking of six was given the course. Nevertheless, a tribalistic student could be uncomfortable in a class led by a teacher whose orientation was primarily either personalistic or existential; this may account for the low scores of two and three which the student gave on the "fit" and "compatibility" questions of the TAF, as shown in Table XVI, page 107).

Students whose primary value systems are at the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh levels tended to give scores well above average, with the existential students giving the highest marks. Only the egocentrically-oriented students gave scores at the average range or below on all variables.

It is interesting to note that no student gave a teacher a score lower than a three, and no course received a score lower than a two, on a seven-point scale. The range of scores on the rating questions, however, was for the total scale. Perhaps students are generally conditioned to give their teachers scores which are higher than average on scales evaluating the teaching and the course, but do not judge "rating" scales in the same way. They may interpret such
scales as an opportunity to judge teachers and course (or fit and compatibility) in relation to other teachers and courses they have experienced, though these scores did place the teachers within the "Good" to "Excellent" range.

According to Graves, people in different value systems learn in different ways (see pages 47-49), and he believes that learning systems for people at different levels must be developed. He suggests that ideally students should be grouped according to their present value levels, and each group could then be educated in a way congruent to its value system. Harvey suggests grouping also, but by belief systems (4). Both theorists acknowledge the inherent problems within such groupings. Harvey notes that an environment needs to be provided where the needs of an individual can be met in such a way that the student "can grow out of them" (4, p. 5). Graves suggests also that educators should be aware that students encountering problems should be placed with others encountering the same kind of problems, and that as these are solved, regrouping may be necessary (3). He believes that the teacher should be "one who paces the growth of an individual" and that education should be organized so that a person is taught through his own system by one who understands that system.

If, for example, all one hundred thirty-seven students in this study were grouped together in one large lecture class, and then separated into small groups on the basis of
their value systems for laboratory or discussion classes led by teachers whose modes of adjustment were known, what would be the results? What would be the cognitive, affective, and behavioral outcomes for different types of student/teacher groupings?

Would teaching be more effective if students exhibiting similar value systems were taught by a teacher with the same value system? Would teaching be more effective if students exhibiting similar value systems were taught by a teacher whose value system was immediately above—or immediately below—that of the student? Would students in the classroom be more compatible (and thus possibly more receptive to the teacher and the teaching) if all students held similar value systems? Or would dissimilarity within the students' value systems be more successful? Would teaching be more effective if the teacher was trained to "teach to" all value systems within a class, no matter what value orientations the teacher held? Within this laboratory-type setting, these and other questions could be answered. The answers to the questions would be significant not only for teachers presently in the classroom but also for administrators and faculty involved in teacher education.

Within the climate of business organizations, Myers and Myers have studied supervisors and subordinates, and have observed that in general, "... the supervisory style or system characteristics at any psychological level is best
suited for the level below it, and except for level 7, is not usually satisfactory for people at the same level" (6, p. 17). Thus a supervisor exhibiting value level seven, existential, would be compatible with a subordinate also at level seven. The level seven supervisor would also be compatible with subordinates at level six, personalistic, and at level five, achievist, but would find a compatible relationship difficult with subordinates at level four, absolutistic, at level three, egocentric, and at level two, tribalistic.

A supervisor at level six, personalistic, according to the Myers' observations, would find compatibility difficult with subordinates at level seven, six or four, but would be compatible with level five and incompatible with levels two and three. Other compatibility patterns would be these: level five--compatible with four, difficult with five, three and two, incompatible with seven and six; level four--compatible with three, difficult with four and two, incompatible with seven, six and five; level three--compatible with two, difficult with three, incompatible with seven, six, five and four; level two--incompatible with all levels.

Myers and Myers point out that people with conflicting levels of existence are capable of satisfactorily adapting to each other, and suggest training programs for people at any level to help them understand the problem of potential incompatibility and to learn how to adapt to each other (6, pp. 17-18).
These observations about supervisors and subordinates in a business climate can certainly be transferred to an educational environment. Just as some management styles are best for people at different levels of existence in a business, some teaching styles are best for students at different levels of existence in education. Only when adequate measuring tools are developed to discover the particular modes of adjustment of students can teachers develop and utilize appropriate methods to reach, and teach, students most successfully.

In concluding that student ratings are valid and reliable criteria, researchers have investigated numerous factors influencing the evaluations. Doyle lists four major sources of error (2, p. 34). The first is imprecision due to computational error. These are errors in tabulation, arithmetic, keypunching, etc., and are considered to be random errors because they are essentially unpredictable. The second refers to the rater's "task" and is very pertinent to this study.

Has the rater observed or had the opportunity to observe what he is asked to rate? Certainly the rater has had the opportunity to observe the behavior, trait, or other specific factor questioned in a teacher evaluation, if it is administered, as it customarily is, near the end of a semester. The student has had continued experience at these observations. Evaluating the teacher on an instrument such
as the Teacher Assessment Form, however, may present problems to the student. The TAF asks students to judge descriptive paragraphs, in effect isolating and determining the importance of factors which make up the total description. Do college students have the evaluative experience to do this accurately, easily, or quickly? Are they, in fact, willing to do so? Are the questions asked the rater ambiguous, offensive, or irritating? College students, especially in schools with graduate divisions, are often asked to participate in experiments which are not necessarily related to their class work, nor does their participation enhance their standing in the class. Even the most willing participant has little to gain.

A third major source of error listed by Doyle concerns the environment. The lighting, ventilation, and general comfort in a rating situation are important, as is the social climate at the time or immediately before the rating. Social circumstances, Doyle notes, appear to have considerably more impact on ratings than do physical circumstances (2, p. 34).

A fourth possible source of error is the rater himself. This error possibility is also especially pertinent to this study. If the rater lacks the skill or the motivation to observe, or lacks the capacity to "draw his memories together perceptively," the reliability of the ratings may suffer. If the rater is thoughtless or careless or tired, or in an
especially good or bad mood, the reliability of the ratings may suffer. When the task is ambiguous and the rater is deficient in skill and motivation, rating errors occur (2).

Other kinds of error influence student ratings as well as ratings like the TAF. For example, a student's accumulated experience with previous instructors or people in general may cause him to have preconceptions about the instructor or the course, as may his expectations or first impressions of either or both the instructor or the course.

The format of the Teacher Assessment Form may itself contribute to error, although authorities agree that all measurements will contain some amount of measurement error (2, p. 25). The halo-effect and the leniency-effect are two kinds of systematic error observed in the responses to the TAF. Halo-effect is the tendency of the rater to let his ratings of specific qualities be influenced by his overall impression of the experience. The leniency-effect is the tendency of raters to be generous. Both of these errors are also evident in the responses to the T/CEF. In the TAF, however, they may be responsible for the tied-ranks which appeared in a number of responses.

The Coping Systems Inventory is a forced-choice test. In a forced-choice scale there are a number of variants, and the rater is required to choose among what may appear to be equally desirable alternatives. It was observed that a number of students found the CSI difficult or annoying to
take. They appeared frustrated by decision-making, and anxious as they investigated their own value systems. Nevertheless, several studies have found forced-choice scales more resistant to measurement error than other kinds of scales. Particularly, they do not usually show leniency-effect (2, p. 26). If the Teacher Assessment Form in its present form was converted into a forced-choice test, it would not only be complementary in theoretical conception but also complementary in format to the CSI, possibly easier for students to evaluate, and certainly less susceptible to the possibility of systemic error. The addition of a ranking scale to the present format of the TAF, asking students to evaluate each of the value systems in terms of its relative importance to them on a scale of one to six, would add affirming data to the accuracy of their evaluation of the paragraphs descriptive of each value level.

There is, of course, no perfect question format or measuring instrument. All rating forms are and will continue to be influenced by some amount of measurement error. But any measure is not just an end in itself; it is also a means for improving teaching, and relevant and reliable measuring tools are necessary if meaningful teaching techniques and strategies are to be employed.
Conclusions

This study concludes that the use of the Coping Systems Inventory, a Teacher Assessment Form, and a Teacher/Course Evaluation Form to determine the relationships between student value systems and student evaluations of teachers has produced a sufficient number of positive relationships to recommend that the use of the three instruments together be further researched, with some revisions in the instruments complementary to the Coping Systems Inventory.

Specifically, the results of this study suggest the following conclusions:

1. Students prefer their teachers to have similar value orientations to their own.
2. The value orientations of teachers as perceived by students are not as similar to their own as students would prefer them to be.
3. Students do not appear to evaluate their teachers only in terms of the value levels they believe are important in their teachers.
4. Students appear to evaluate their teachers in terms of the value orientations teachers exhibit in the classroom.
5. The extent of the relationships of perceived similarity between the value systems orientations of the students in this study and the value systems orientations of the teachers they have evaluated is shown in the student ratings of teachers.
Recommendations

This study has been an experimental investigation. The Coping Systems Inventory has been used for the first time in conjunction with both a complementary instrument to assess the teacher and a teacher rating form, in an educational setting. As such, this study has answered some questions and suggested others.

1. It is recommended that the use of the Coping Systems Inventory, a Teacher Assessment Form, and a Teacher/Course Evaluation Form in the classroom setting be further researched, with some revisions in the Teacher Assessment Form. Specifically, these possible revisions are suggested: a) A ranking scale, added to the TAF in its present form, would provide a check on individual ratings and would resolve identical ratings, b) Conversion of the TAF to a forced-choice test of six or twelve questions would aid the student in evaluation, avoid some systemic error, particularly the leniency-effect, and allow for the use of statistical tests other than simple correlation.

2. It is recommended that the three instruments used in this study be administered to a larger and more heterogenous sample, across various disciplines, as well as to populations in specific disciplines, to provide a comprehensive look at differences in value systems orientations in both students and teachers.
3. It is recommended that in further research consideration of the value systems of teachers as well as students would provide pertinent information to implement additional studies.

The following questions are suggested as areas for future research:

1. What are the relationships between the way teachers perceive their value systems, and the way students perceive teachers' value systems?

2. How do the value systems of students and teachers differ in various disciplinary fields?

3. Is teaching more effective when student and teacher hold similar or dissimilar value systems?

4. What kind of programs may be designed to help teachers understand and develop instructional techniques and motivational strategies to reach all value systems of students?

5. How may these instructional programs for teachers be evaluated?

6. What specific skills are important to a teacher utilizing the concept of value systems analysis to improve the kind of interactive behavior and the quality of the communication in the classroom?
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APPENDIX
SUMMARY OF PSYCHOLOGICAL LEVELS OF EXISTENCE*

Level One—Reactive—Functions at the physiological level. Reacts to stimuli such as hunger, pain, cold, warmth, and sleep in order to obtain the immediate satisfaction of basic human needs. Pure Reactives are virtually value-less—concerned only with survival. Seen in new-born infants, profoundly retarded, severe stroke victims, and the senile elderly. Can be either a temporary state (like a person on drugs or in a state of emotional or physical shock) or a permanent state of existence.

Level Two—Tribalistic—Seeks safety and security in a threatening world by fixating on power, chieftains, clans, rituals, or superstition. Strong reliance on chieftain(s) (parents, teachers, coaches, supervisors, etc.) or the norms established by a clan (family, work-unit, team, or tribe). Depends on the mystical forces inherent in life and tends to be both superstitious and ritualistic. Needs to find some way to explain the unexplainable. Expressed in highly-visible group affiliation and preference for "paternalistic" atmospheres.

Level Three—Egocentric—Unabashed, self-centered, assertiveness. Aggressiveness takes many forms as he rebels against authority figures, norms, rules, and standards. Somewhat flamboyant in behavior in order to gain attention.
Often brash, rough, brazen, abrasive, and even uncouth. May appear "paranoid"—feels that the world is a hostile and alien place. May internalize the impulses into an angry, embittered, and bristling personality. Manifests itself positively in creativity, willingness to break with tradition, and dogged determination.

**Level Four—Absolutistic**—Finds structure, security, and predictability in systems of various types rooted in directive design. Strongly committed to what he considers to be the "right way." Promotes clearly-defined social roles. Prefers order, structure, patterns, and sequential time-frames. Somewhat rigid in responding to diversity and ambiguity. Likes a "cut and dried" kind of world and is prone to impose his system, concepts of right and wrong, rules and procedures on others. Places a premium on sacrifice, discipline, and adhering to the established norms of society.

**Level Five—Achievist**—Achievement-oriented, self-serving, and aggressive, but within the constraints of society. Enjoys wheeling and dealing, engaging in various forms of competition, and demonstrating his ability to motivate, attain goals, and get ahead in life. Manipulation may be either concealed and private or it may be open, above-board, and displayed. Designed to produce evidence of success, accomplishment, and winning. This mode of adjustment will be found in abundance in politics, management, and in sales and marketing professions.
Level Six—Personalistic—Personalistic concern for self-discovery, acceptance, human dignity, and the uniqueness of each person, as well as the inherent worth of people as a whole. By finding basic value in people and humanity in general, a Personalistic individual will spend his time and/or energy working in behalf of social causes. Personalistics are opposed to the manipulative use of people as well as the mindless punitiveness of rigid conformity systems. Reflected in the "helping" professions and new theories and methods of personal introspection.

Level Seven—Existential—A personal activist who seeks to live within society's constraints while enjoying his maximum individual freedom. Tends to be inner-directed and self-motivating. Readily accepts ambiguity in people and situations. This value system is quite tolerant, but, at the same time, expects high levels of performance of itself and others. Responds to reasons, not to rules, and is managed through competence, not status or position. May be expressed by dropping out of society in order to pursue individualistic and alternative life-styles.

*Based on the Theoretical Concepts of Clare W. Graves and adapted by the National Values Center (from promotional flyer).*
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**COPING SYSTEMS INVENTORY©**

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Below are sets of statements describing attitudes or personal characteristics of people. In each set choose the one statement that you most prefer, that is most like you or that applies most to you. Black in the one most appropriate Most Like Me box. Then examine the remaining statements and choose the one statement that you least prefer, that is least like you, or that applies least to you. Black in the one most appropriate Least Like Me box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Like Me</th>
<th>Least Like Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. □ -1- □ Leaders look out for their people and I trust my leader.  
   □ -2- □ It feels good to reach out and help other people cope with life.  
   □ -3- □ Don't just tell me "it's the rule"; I've got to have a reason.  
   □ -4- □ When I play a game — I play to win.

2. □ -1- □ I would willingly sacrifice myself for the good of my group.  
   □ -2- □ It's people who really count — not materialistic gain.  
   □ -3- □ Life's a game and I'm in it to win.  
   □ -4- □ The basic Truths that have existed from the beginning will always be the same.

3. □ -1- □ Morally speaking, most things are either right or wrong.  
   □ -2- □ The world is a very complex process without any easy answers.  
   □ -3- □ Love and tolerance are more important than dogma or material gain.  
   □ -4- □ I intend to get somewhere in life.

4. □ -1- □ When the "spirits" get angry, horrible things can happen.  
   □ -2- □ I don't think one should live just for the moment; it's irresponsible.  
   □ -3- □ I think of myself as a "humanist" first and foremost.  
   □ -4- □ I admire functionality and competency in anything.

5. □ -1- □ Diversity is stimulating.  
   □ -2- □ The basic Truths that have existed from the beginning will always be the same.  
   □ -3- □ It's a dog-eat-dog kind of world no matter what anybody says.  
   □ -4- □ It feels good to reach out and help other people cope with life.

6. □ -1- □ Whatever turns you on — do it — to hell with what others think.  
   □ -2- □ If everyone did what was right we'd all get along a lot better.  
   □ -3- □ There's always one best way and if we want to progress we'll find it.  
   □ -4- □ I wish the world weren't so scary, but when I'm with my own people I feel safer.

7. □ -1- □ I love to meet the challenge of competition and prove myself.  
   □ -2- □ The work I do must be relevant to me; money is not that important.  
   □ -3- □ I would willingly sacrifice myself for the good of my group.  
   □ -4- □ You've got to be tough or the world will eat you alive!

8. □ -1- □ The only way to survive in this world is to band together with others.  
   □ -2- □ The law's the law and, whether right or wrong, it must be followed.  
   □ -3- □ I make my own decisions in life and even if they differ from what most people think I'll accept the consequences.  
   □ -4- □ It's stupid to save a lot of money because you can't take it with you.
1. I choose to judge myself and don't need to ask the opinions of others.
2. I like to negotiate and get the best deal possible.
3. You've got to be tough or the world will eat you alive!
4. I want to invest my life in people—not possessions or power.

5. Doing the right thing will eventually bring rewards.
6. I don't like anyone telling me what to do.
7. Enjoy matching my wits and resources against others.
8. I'm usually the one who can see the "big picture" and understand the long-term consequences of decisions.

9. I wish the world weren't so scary, but when I'm with my own people I feel safer.
10. I wish people would get off my back.
11. I feel guilty when I don't follow the rules.
12. If you really understand a person, you can't dislike him/her.

13. Each individual must contribute to the betterment of humankind.
14. My good luck charms help protect me.
15. Love 'em and leave 'em—that's my motto!
16. The world's there for the taking—if we are ambitious enough.

17. I make my own decisions in life and even if they differ from what most people think I'll accept the consequences.
18. I can't imagine life alone without my own people or the person I look up to.
19. If you don't look out for yourself, nobody else will.
20. If I trust a person, I'm not afraid to tell him/her who I am.

21. "Work now—play later" is the safest motto for life.
22. It's stimulating to be with people who think differently than I do.
23. I like a little competition; it makes life more lively.
24. Leaders look out for their people and I trust my own leader.

25. The past is awe inspiring.
26. I seek inner peace and harmony with others.
27. I function best in an open and flexible environment.
28. I've learned to "play the game" and expect to be successful.

29. I often feel helpless in a world that's often threatening.
30. Each life should contribute to human well-being.
31. We can conquer our problems and control our own destiny.
32. Doing the right thing will eventually bring rewards.

33. I often feel guilty when I don't do what's right.
34. I respond more to competency than authority or position.
35. Feelings and emotions and their expressions are important to me.
36. I pride myself in taking advantage of my opportunities.
19. ☐ - 1 - ☐ I feel the safest when I'm with my own people.
☐ - 2 - ☐ I expect loyalty and dedication to be recognized.
☐ - 3 - ☐ We should be patient with people and understand why they do things.
☐ - 4 - ☐ I respond much more to reasons than to rules themselves.

20. ☐ - 1 - ☐ I need more variety and diversity than most people I know.
☐ - 2 - ☐ I always try to do my duty.
☐ - 3 - ☐ Sometimes it's fun to rock the boat just for the sake of it.
☐ - 4 - ☐ Everyone should have an equal opportunity to develop to the fullest.

21. ☐ - 1 - ☐ I don't blame anyone for grabbing everything he/she can.
☐ - 2 - ☐ Children who are taught discipline will be good citizens.
☐ - 3 - ☐ The world is full of opportunities for those who are ambitious.
☐ - 4 - ☐ My life is filled with sacred objects that I rely on.

22. ☐ - 1 - ☐ I don't mind a little "wheeling and dealing."
☐ - 2 - ☐ Personal freedom and autonomy are bottom line with me.
☐ - 3 - ☐ The day-to-day problems of life often overwhelm me.
☐ - 4 - ☐ You only live once so you should eat, drink, and be merry.

23. ☐ - 1 - ☐ I sometimes feel the spirits are controlling my life.
☐ - 2 - ☐ The well-disciplined life is a happy and stable life.
☐ - 3 - ☐ I am more a non-conformist than an anti-conformist.
☐ - 4 - ☐ I usually do what I damn well please.

24. ☐ - 1 - ☐ I believe that a human is human — neither inherently good or bad.
☐ - 2 - ☐ I enjoy matching my wits and resources against others.
☐ - 3 - ☐ I get a real thrill out of risky fun.
☐ - 4 - ☐ If we truly put people first our other problems will vanish.

25. ☐ - 1 - ☐ Even though I don't like some rules I still must accept them and live by them.
☐ - 2 - ☐ Everybody has his or her price and can be bought.
☐ - 3 - ☐ Winning is a high priority with me.
☐ - 4 - ☐ I pretty much "hear my own drummer" in dealing with life.

26. ☐ - 1 - ☐ I usually need for someone to show me what to do — and when.
☐ - 2 - ☐ I call the shots and let the chips fall where they may.
☐ - 3 - ☐ We should build on the traditions we have inherited from our ancestors.
☐ - 4 - ☐ I wish everybody had all they wanted in life.

27. ☐ - 1 - ☐ Lots of people see me as "flashy" because of what I do.
☐ - 2 - ☐ We should strive to preserve our customs and traditions.
☐ - 3 - ☐ I have strong needs to achieve.
☐ - 4 - ☐ Life is a beautiful experience when we trust and help each other.

28. ☐ - 1 - ☐ I prefer work or activities that are important to human welfare.
☐ - 2 - ☐ My life has been full of honors that I have earned and respected.
☐ - 3 - ☐ People will try to trip you up if given a chance.
☐ - 4 - ☐ I like to take the initiative and make things happen.
29. □ 1 — □ I enjoy viewing life from a broad perspective — observing the continuous flow of people and events.
   □ 2 — □ Sometimes living scares me.
   □ 3 — □ People will try to rip you off if given a chance.
   □ 4 — □ Each individual develops in a unique and beautiful way.

30. □ 1 — □ I usually need for someone to show me what to do and when to do it.
    □ 2 — □ I make decisions based on what is right and logical.
    □ 3 — □ Learning the world's secrets helps us enrich our lifestyles.
    □ 4 — □ What I value is more self-determined than society-dictated.

31. I am a person who is . . .
   □ 1 — □ a real free spirit — self-reliant, flexible, and non-judgmental.
   □ 2 — □ stable and responsible with firm convictions, beliefs, and traditions.
   □ 3 — □ security-conscious, sometimes superstitious, loyal to group/family/club.
   □ 4 — □ spunky, bold, often abrasive, aggressive and rather self-centered.
   □ 5 — □ ambitious and prestige-seeking, with strong aspirations and initiative.
   □ 6 — □ open and authentic, sensitive to feelings and people-oriented.

32. I like a job that has . . .
   □ 1 — □ a lot of security with a close group of co-workers like me.
   □ 2 — □ a lot of action with a chance to make lots of cash — quick!
   □ 3 — □ a lot of stability with orderly work and which rewards loyalty.
   □ 4 — □ a lot of opportunity for advancement, with pay based on merit and my performance.
   □ 5 — □ a lot of responsiveness to human needs and feelings.
   □ 6 — □ a lot of freedom to do interesting things on my own terms.

33. I can best be managed when I have . . .
   □ 1 — □ the power to influence my own destiny and challenges that test me.
   □ 2 — □ a boss who calls the shots but doesn't hassle me or get on my back.
   □ 3 — □ a management system that is fair, consistent, and sticks by the rules.
   □ 4 — □ a supervisor who shows a personal interest in me and stays in charge.
   □ 5 — □ an atmosphere that responds to the needs and feelings of everyone.
   □ 6 — □ access to the information I need and the freedom to do a job my own way.

34. I prefer to work for an organization that . . .
   □ 1 — □ is well organized, consistent, and rewards loyalty and dedication.
   □ 2 — □ understands and accepts individual uniqueness without being judgmental.
   □ 3 — □ offers action and adventure, pays me well, and leaves me alone.
   □ 4 — □ considers the needs, feelings, and well-being of both employees and customers.
   □ 5 — □ creates a protective and secure "family" atmosphere for us employees.
   □ 6 — □ provides avenues and incentives to climb the job ladder and get ahead.

35. I learn best when . . .
   □ 1 — □ I see the personal payoffs and get involved in competitive activities.
   □ 2 — □ there's lots of action and fun and the instructor doesn't watch too close.
   □ 3 — □ the instructor is well-organized with clear objectives and job-related knowledge.
   □ 4 — □ the instructor shows me step-by-step what I'm supposed to learn.
   □ 5 — □ we are encouraged to explore our feelings and understand the learning process.
   □ 6 — □ resources are made available to me so I can learn in my own way.
36. Laws, rules, and regulations are . . .
   [ ] -1- [ ] necessary, but we only make progress when we can bend them a bit.
   [ ] -2- [ ] absolutely essential in order to maintain stability and discipline.
   [ ] -3- [ ] generally designed to protect selfish interests and punish the rest of us.
   [ ] -4- [ ] functional guidelines that should encourage personal responsibility.
   [ ] -5- [ ] protective of those in trouble and tell the rest of us what's expected of us.
   [ ] -6- [ ] helpful if they benefit all people and are enforced in a humane manner.

37. The best way for me to cope with life is to . . .
   [ ] -1- [ ] attach myself to a person or group which will take care of me.
   [ ] -2- [ ] be tough enough to take care of myself so I can get what I want.
   [ ] -3- [ ] hold to my beliefs and keep doing what's right — then everything will be OK.
   [ ] -4- [ ] learn to negotiate with the world in order to enjoy life to its fullest.
   [ ] -5- [ ] seek peace with my inner being and the inner selves of others.
   [ ] -6- [ ] transcend the usual human needs and concerns and accept reality as it is.

38. Different people see the world in different ways. To me, "the world" is . . .
   [ ] -1- [ ] an experience through which a person explores what it means to be human
       and becomes aware of the humanness of others.
   [ ] -2- [ ] somewhat scary and mysterious, but it's a good feeling when I know I'm safe.
   [ ] -3- [ ] a synthesis of man, nature, and events resulting in an atmosphere of diversity
       and the inevitability of change.
   [ ] -4- [ ] like a jungle where the toughest survive and the most powerful dominate.
   [ ] -5- [ ] full of opportunities for those who are willing to take the risks necessary to
       advance themselves and achieve the good life.
   [ ] -6- [ ] an orderly place, controlled by a set of basic laws and principles which
       determine our destinies and show us the right way to act.

39. To me, money is important because it . . .
   [ ] -1- [ ] pays for the basic necessities that I need to keep going.
   [ ] -2- [ ] lets me buy the things I want so I feel like somebody.
   [ ] -3- [ ] provides me a decent standard of living and security for a rainy day.
   [ ] -4- [ ] allows me freedom to be myself and to do what I find interesting.
   [ ] -5- [ ] is a means whereby we can provide for the needs of people.
   [ ] -6- [ ] demonstrates that I've been successful and deserve to enjoy life's good things.

40. I make decisions based on . . .
   [ ] -1- [ ] the impact of my decision on the well-being of other people.
   [ ] -2- [ ] what is right and consistent with our standards and ways of living.
   [ ] -3- [ ] what's in it for me — now, if you don't, somebody else might rip you off.
   [ ] -4- [ ] what will pay off for me in terms of material gain and/or personal recognition.
   [ ] -5- [ ] what the signs indicate is best for me to do.
   [ ] -5- [ ] the effect on our total life system — and on man's basic freedom to be.
TEACHER ASSESSMENT FORM

This form is designed to reflect your perceptions of your teacher and will be used within the context of a current research project.

1. Characteristics of the Teacher

How do you see your teacher? Respond to each of the following statements based on your perceptions of your teacher. Intersect the line where you think appropriate in order to characterize your teacher. Assume that you are comparing this teacher against all other teachers you have known.

A. This teacher: Is usually pleasant and reassuring. Upholds school traditions and rituals and dislikes changes in our classroom procedures. Sometimes superstitious and often very vulnerable. Is easily influenced, even by us. Relies strongly on supervisor and other teachers for guidance. Likes to be told everything is going well, and wants his superiors to approve what he/she is doing.

Not like this teacher

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Like this teacher

This kind of teacher is:

Not important to me

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Important to me

B. This teacher: Is assertive, independent, often abrasive. Runs class his own way - no matter what. Not impressed with other "so-called" authorities. Lets us know where we stand and wants us to shoot straight with him/her. Helps us if he/she thinks we need it, but won't let us get away with anything. Sees life as a battle, and believes we've got to take charge of our lives and be tough to survive.

Not like this teacher

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 9 Like this teacher

This kind of teacher is:

Not important to me

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Important to me
C. This teacher: Accepts the authority in his/her position and is well organized. Provides carefully detailed course outline, and follows it without deviation. Lets us know what requirements and standards are for the class. Is fair and consistent in grading, and treats class members equally. Expects us to study hard and follow class rules and regulations.

Not like this teacher 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Like this teacher

This kind of teacher is:

Not important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Important to me

D. This teacher: Is ambitious, competitive, and achievement oriented. Is in control of the classroom situation. Lets us know how course will help us win what we want out of life. Provides lots of challenges and opportunities to reach our goals. Is open to negotiation, and recognizes achievement. Is willing to bend the rules, but expects us to show progress.

Not like this teacher 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Like this teacher

This kind of teacher is:

Not important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Important to me

E. This teacher: Is friendly, warm, and sensitive, and cares about us as people. Provides supportive environment, and wants us to become an understanding and harmonious group. Lets us know how learning will help us express ourselves, gain acceptance with others, and serve society. Places the responsibility of following rules and regulations on the group.

Not like this teacher 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Like this teacher

This kind of teacher is:

Not important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Important to me
**Teacher Assessment Form, p. 3**

**F. This teacher:** Is highly resourceful, competent, and genuine. Provides flexible guidelines under which class can function, and an open classroom environment with minimum controls. Gives us access to the information we need, and allows us to explore problems in our own way. Places responsibility of achievement on each individual, but expects us to do our best.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Not like</strong> 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th><strong>Like</strong> this teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This kind of teacher is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Not important</strong> 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th><strong>Important</strong> to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**2. Student-Course Matching**

**A.** Some people seem to be comfortable in certain classes because of who they are; yet others simply don’t "fit the class they are in."

In my case, this class ... (CHECK ONE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fits me exactly</th>
<th>fits me most of the time</th>
<th>fits me some of the time</th>
<th>fits me just enough time to tolerate</th>
<th>doesn't fit me at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**B.** Different people seem to be compatible, either professionally or personally, with different kinds of teachers.

Overall, this teacher and I are ... (CHECK ONE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>absolutely compatible</th>
<th>moderately compatible</th>
<th>fairly compatible</th>
<th>incompatible</th>
<th>absolutely incompatible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TEACHER AND THE TEACHING

Each of the items below deals with a characteristic of instruction which students feel to be important. Indicate your rating of your instructor by a check at the appropriate point on the scale. The exact point at which you rate is less important than the general impression. Write in after the questions any additional comments that you wish to make. Give examples wherever possible.

1. Is he/she actively helpful when students have difficulty?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   NOT HELPFUL  HELPFUL

2. Does he/she appear sensitive to students' feelings and problems?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   UNAWARE  RESPONSIVE

3. Is he/she fair and impartial in his dealings with the students?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   UNFAIR  FAIR

4. Does he/she belittle students?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   BELITTLES  RESPECTS

5. Does he/she tell students when they have done particularly well?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   NEVER  ALWAYS

6. Does he/she make students feel free to ask questions, disagree, express their own ideas, etc?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   INTOLERANT  ENCOURAGES STUDENT IDEAS

Examples or Comments: Related to Items 1-6
7. Is he/she interested in the subject?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
SEEMS UNINTERESTED SEEMS INTERESTED

8. Is his/her speech adequate for teaching?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
UNINTELLIGIBLE CLEAR

9. Does he/she use enough examples or illustrations to clarify the material?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
NONE MANY

10. Does he/she present material in a well-organized fashion?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
DISORGANIZED WELL ORGANIZED

11. Does he/she put the material across in an interesting way?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
DULL VERY INTERESTING

12. Does he/she stimulate thinking?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
UNSTIMULATING STIMULATING

Examples or Comments: Related to Items 7-12

13. Other important characteristics—Please specify:

14. Considering everything, how would you rate this teacher? (Circle your rating)

SUPERIOR EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR POOR

Now go back over the list and place a check before the five items which were most important to you in making your judgment.
II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COURSE

1. A. Are the objectives of the course clear?

  UNCLEAR  CLEAR

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   B. Do you feel that the course accomplished its objectives?

   POORLY VERY WELL

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

2. Is the amount of work required appropriate for the credit received?

   TOO LITTLE AVERAGE TOO MUCH

3. A. Did you do the assigned readings (including textbook)?

   NEVER CONSCIENTIOUSLY

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   B. Was the assigned reading difficult?

   TOO EASY AVERAGE TOO HARD

   C. Was the assigned reading helpful?

   NOT AT ALL VERY HELPFUL

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

4. Are the tests fair?

   UNFAIR FAIR

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

5. Are the grades assigned fairly?

   UNFAIR FAIR

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Examples or Comments:

Considering all of the above qualities which are applicable (including others that you added), how would you rate this course? (Circle your rating)

SUPERIOR EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR POOR
### TABLE XVII

**STUDENT'S VALUE SYSTEMS MEASURED BY THE COPING SYSTEMS INVENTORY**

N = 149

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Tribalistic</th>
<th>Egocentric</th>
<th>Absolutistic</th>
<th>Achievist</th>
<th>Personalistic</th>
<th>Existential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>4 6 3 5 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>5 6 1 3 4 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>6 3 4 5 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>4 6 2 5 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>5 6 1 3 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>6 5 3 4 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>6 5 2 4 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>5 6 2 3 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>5 6 4 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>6 5 4 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>6 2 1 5 4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>5 6 3 4 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>6 5 2 1 4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>5 6 2 4 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>6 4 5 2 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>6 5 3 4 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>6 5 3 2 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>5 6 3 2 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>6 5 4 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>6 5 4 2 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>6 4 5 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>Existential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>Existential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>058</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>059</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>063</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>064</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>Existential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>076</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>078</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>081</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>082</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>083</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>084</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>085</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>086</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>087</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>089</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>093</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>094</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>096</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>097</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>098</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>099</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>Ego-centric</td>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>5 6 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>4 6 1 2 3 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>6 5 3 4 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>6 4 3 5 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>6 4 3 5 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>5 6 4 3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>5 6 1 5 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>5 6 3 4 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>6 5 4 2 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1 6 2 4 5 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>1 6 2 4 2 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>4 6 1 5 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>4 6 3 5 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>5 6 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>5 6 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>5 6 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>6 4 5 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>6 4 5 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>6 5 1 4 3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>5 6 1 3 4 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Tribalistic</th>
<th>Ego-centric</th>
<th>Achievist</th>
<th>Personalistic</th>
<th>Existential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>6 3 4 1 5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>3 4 2 5 6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>5 6 2 3 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>6 5 1 4 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>6 5 2 4 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>5 6 3 2 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>6 5 2 4 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>2 6 1 5 4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>3 6 1 5 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>5 6 3 1 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>4 6 2 5 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>5 6 3 2 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>6 6 4 3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>6 5 2 3 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>6 4 5 1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>5 6 2 4 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>6 3 2 4 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>6 5 2 4 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>4 6 1 5 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>5 6 3 2 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>5 4 6 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XVII—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>System Scores</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>System Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribalic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tribalic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td></td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>5 6 3 1 2 4</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3 5 1 2 4 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>6 3 5 2 4 1</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6 3 4 2 1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>6 5 4 1 2 3</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>6 3 5 4 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>5 6 3 2 4 1</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>5 6 3 4 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>5 6 4 3 1 2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>4 6 5 3 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>5 6 4 3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Number</td>
<td>TAF Like&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>TAF Important&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>TAF III&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>50&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Number</td>
<td>TAF Like&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>TAF Important&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>TAF III&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T   E   Ab   A   P   Ex</td>
<td>T   E   Ab   A   P   Ex</td>
<td>F   C   TC   CC   TR   CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>50&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; 50 50 15 30 15</td>
<td>50 60 20 20 40 20</td>
<td>20 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>45 60 45 20 20 20</td>
<td>50 60 10 30 30 30</td>
<td>40 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>60 50 40 30 15 15</td>
<td>60 50 40 30 15 15</td>
<td>40 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>60 50 30 40 15 15</td>
<td>60 50 25 40 25 10</td>
<td>40 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>25 25 25 50 25 50</td>
<td>30 30 30 30 30 60</td>
<td>40 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036</td>
<td>40 60 50 25 25 10</td>
<td>45 60 45 25 25 10</td>
<td>30 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>50 60 40 30 10 20</td>
<td>50 60 40 30 15 15</td>
<td>40 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>55 55 20 40 10 30</td>
<td>60 20 35 10 50 35</td>
<td>30 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>60 50 25 25 25 25</td>
<td>60 50 25 25 25 25</td>
<td>40 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>60 25 25 50 40 10</td>
<td>60 40 15 50 30 15</td>
<td>30 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>60 20 20 40 50 20</td>
<td>60 15 15 35 50 35</td>
<td>40 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>55 40 30 20 55 10</td>
<td>60 20 40 40 40 10</td>
<td>30 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>60 35 15 15 15 35</td>
<td>60 50 10 25 40 25</td>
<td>40 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>30 15 50 50 15 50</td>
<td>55 55 25 25 25 25</td>
<td>30 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>30 15 60 15 50 40</td>
<td>35 50 15 60 15 35</td>
<td>20 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>60 20 20 45 20 45</td>
<td>60 20 20 50 20 40</td>
<td>30 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>60 15 30 35 35 15</td>
<td>60 30 30 30 30 30</td>
<td>50 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>10 45 45 45 45 20</td>
<td>60 15 15 45 45 30</td>
<td>20 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>60 50 20 20 20 40</td>
<td>25 60 25 25 25 25</td>
<td>40 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td>60 40 20 20 50 20</td>
<td>35 35 35 35 35 35</td>
<td>40 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>60 10 35 50 35 20</td>
<td>60 30 30 30 30 30</td>
<td>30 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td>60 20 45 10 30 45</td>
<td>35 20 50 10 35 60</td>
<td>40 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>50 60 40 20 30 10</td>
<td>45 60 45 25 10 25</td>
<td>40 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>40 50 60 25 25 10</td>
<td>50 50 50 15 15 30</td>
<td>30 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>60 20 50 10 40 30</td>
<td>60 20 30 10 45 45</td>
<td>30 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>058</td>
<td>60 15 30 15 40 45</td>
<td>60 25 25 10 50 40</td>
<td>50 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>059</td>
<td>60 40 50 15 30 15</td>
<td>50 40 60 15 30 15</td>
<td>40 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>60 15 35 35 50 35</td>
<td>45 60 15 45 30 15</td>
<td>30 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Number</td>
<td>TAF Like^a</td>
<td>TAF Important^b</td>
<td>TAF III^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>063</td>
<td>10d</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>064</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>076</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>081</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>082</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>083</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>084</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>085</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>086</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>087</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>088</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>089</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>093</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>094</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XVIII--Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>TAF Like&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>TAF Important&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>TAF III&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>T/CRF&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T    E A  P  Ex</td>
<td>T    E A  P  Ex</td>
<td>F    C</td>
<td>TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>15   15 40 30 55 55</td>
<td>60   50 30 40 20 10</td>
<td>50   50</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>50   10 60 40 30 20</td>
<td>55   30 55 40 20 10</td>
<td>30   40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>60   15 50 30 40 15</td>
<td>60   50 35 35 15 15</td>
<td>40   30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>60   30 50 10 30</td>
<td>60   40 20 40 10 40</td>
<td>40   30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>50   60 30 10 40</td>
<td>50   60 15 40 15 30</td>
<td>40   40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>40   40 60 10 20</td>
<td>35   55 35 55 20 10</td>
<td>30   30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>50   15 30 15 40 60</td>
<td>55   55 30 15 40 15</td>
<td>50   50</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>60   50 10 30 30 30</td>
<td>60   35 15 50 35 15</td>
<td>40   40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>60   35 35 50 20 10</td>
<td>55   55 40 30 10 20</td>
<td>40   40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>55   55 25 25 25 10</td>
<td>50   60 30 40 10 15</td>
<td>40   40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>55   55 15 15 30 40</td>
<td>60   50 15 15 30 40</td>
<td>40   40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>60   30 30 30 30 30</td>
<td>60   30 30 30 30 30</td>
<td>50   50</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>60   50 40 30 10 20</td>
<td>60   40 50 25 10 25</td>
<td>40   50</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>60   50 25 40 10 25</td>
<td>15   45 45 45 15 45</td>
<td>40   40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>50   60 20 20 20 40</td>
<td>50   60 25 10 25 40</td>
<td>40   40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>20   20 50 20 50 50</td>
<td>60   50 20 10 30 40</td>
<td>30   20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>60   50 40 20 20 20</td>
<td>55   55 40 20 20 20</td>
<td>40   40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>60   45 45 30 15 15</td>
<td>45   60 45 30 15 15</td>
<td>30   30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>20   10 30 50 50 50</td>
<td>60   50 25 25 25 25</td>
<td>20   30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>25   50 60 25 25 25</td>
<td>55   55 35 20 10 35</td>
<td>30   30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>50   60 20 20 20 10</td>
<td>50   50 30 50 20 10</td>
<td>50   40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>55   10 25 55 40 25</td>
<td>50   50 10 60 20 40</td>
<td>50   40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>60   50 40 30 15 15</td>
<td>60   50 40 30 15 15</td>
<td>50   50</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>40   10 40 40 20 60</td>
<td>55   49 15 30 15 15</td>
<td>30   40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>55   40 10 25 25 25</td>
<td>50   40 10 60 25 25</td>
<td>30   40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>60   30 50 30 10 30</td>
<td>60   25 50 25 25 25</td>
<td>20   30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>55   55 30 10 20 40</td>
<td>35   55 55 10 20 35</td>
<td>30   40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>55   15 35 15 55 35</td>
<td>55   55 20 20 20 40</td>
<td>20   20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Number</td>
<td>TAF Like</td>
<td>TAF Important</td>
<td>TAF III</td>
<td>T/CEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XVII--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>TAF Like&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>TAF Important&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>TAF III&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>T/CEF&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>50&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>b</sup>"F"--Fit rating, "C"--Compatibility rating.

<sup>c</sup>"TC"--Characteristics of the Teacher and the Teaching, "CC"--Characteristics of the Course, "TR"--Teacher rating, "CR"--Course rating.

<sup>d</sup>All scores have been raised to the next constant for inclusion in this table.
### TABLE XIX
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ALL VARIABLES:
COPING SYSTEMS INVENTORY, TEACHER ASSESSMENT FORM, AND TEACHER/COURSE EVALUATION FORM
N 137

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>5.0876</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>5.0146</td>
<td>1.1819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>3.2044</td>
<td>1.3940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>3.0803</td>
<td>1.3398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>2.0803</td>
<td>1.3232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>2.5182</td>
<td>1.1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAF</td>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>5.0401</td>
<td>1.4078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>3.8029</td>
<td>1.7057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>3.3613</td>
<td>1.3514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>3.1387</td>
<td>1.3622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>2.9161</td>
<td>1.2998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>2.7007</td>
<td>1.4406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAF</td>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>5.1387</td>
<td>1.1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>4.5912</td>
<td>1.3148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutistic</td>
<td>2.8942</td>
<td>1.3414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievist</td>
<td>3.0073</td>
<td>1.2602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personalistic</td>
<td>2.6241</td>
<td>1.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>2.7445</td>
<td>1.2443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAF III</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>3.5693</td>
<td>0.9239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td>3.6715</td>
<td>0.9402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/CEF I</td>
<td>Charac. of Teacher and Teaching</td>
<td>5.9270</td>
<td>1.1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/CEF II</td>
<td>Charac. of Course</td>
<td>5.6058</td>
<td>1.1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/CEF III</td>
<td>Teacher Course</td>
<td>3.6496</td>
<td>1.0332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2847</td>
<td>0.9922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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