

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MEASURABLE PERSONALITY FACTORS OF STUDENT  
TEACHERS, COOPERATING TEACHERS, AND COLLEGE SUPERVISORS  
TO THEIR EFFECTS UPON SUCCESS IN STUDENT  
TEACHING EXPERIENCES

by

Darlene Ruth Sheppard Abram

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic  
Institute and State University in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
in  
Educational Administration

APPROVED:

---

Dr. Glen I. Earthman, Chairman

---

Dr. Jimmie C. Fortune

---

Dr. Mary Ann Lewis

---

Dr. Mary T. Christian

---

Dr. William McWhorter

May, 1982

Blacksburg, Virginia

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The support of the Hampton and Newport News, Virginia Public School teachers who served as cooperating teachers during the Fall Semester 1982 is greatly appreciated. Without the cooperation of the cooperating teachers, college supervisors and student teachers who took the time to complete the questionnaires, this study would have been impossible.

I am indebted to Committee Chairman and advisor, Dr. Glen I. Earthman, and committee members, Dr. Jimmie C. Fortune, Dr. Mary Ann Lewis, Dr. Mary T. Christian and Dr. William McWhorter, for their guidance and assistance in this research study. Also to Dr. Noma Bennett Anderson and Dr. Rose M. Ward who spent long hours reading and editing this research study.

For serving as a panel of experts, the researcher gives special thanks to the following persons who work and/or teach in the area of teacher education: Dr. William A. Bennie, Dr. Melvin E. Frazier, Dr. William D. Johnson, Dr. Mathews F. Allen, Dr. Annabel L. Sacks, Dr. B. Keith Eicher, and Dr. John W. Sykes.

The encouragement and financial support to continue my studies and this present research project come from the understanding and support of family members, of my parents, James and Maggie Sheppard, and of my husband, James Baker Abram, Jr., my children, James Baker Abram, III and Carmelita Michelle Abram. Their contribution has been inestimable.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Theoretical Framework . . . . .	5
Statement of The Problem . . . . .	8
The Hypotheses of the Study . . . . .	9
The Purpose of The Study . . . . .	9
The Delimitation of The Study . . . . .	10
The Significance of The Study . . . . .	10
The Definition of Terms . . . . .	11
The Organization of The Study . . . . .	13
II THE REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	15
Studies Concerning The Student Teaching Experience . . . . .	15
Studies Concerning Personality Factors of Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers and Their Relationship to Success in Student Teaching . . . . .	19
Studies Concerning Personality Characteristics of Student Teachers, College Supervisors, and Cooperating Teachers as Measured by <u>Cattell's</u> <u>Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	36
III THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .	44
The Population . . . . .	44
The Collection of Data . . . . .	46
The Processing of The Data . . . . .	49
The Research Design of the Study . . . . .	50
The Measuring Instruments . . . . .	52

Table of Contents (Continued)

Chapter	Page
<u>The Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire</u> . . . . .	52
<u>The Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form</u> . . . . .	56
IV PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	60
Description of the Sixteen Personality Factors . . . . .	61
Analysis of Data . . . . .	75
Summary of Data . . . . .	104
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	109
Summary of The Study . . . . .	109
Summary of The Findings . . . . .	111
Discussion of Findings . . . . .	113
Conclusions of The Study . . . . .	115
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	115
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	118
APPENDIX	
A The Pilot Study - Validation of the Student Teacher Evaluation Form . . . . .	124
B Letters From Panel of Experts . . . . .	138
C Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form and Criteria Information . . . . .	146
D Sixteen Personality Factor Scores for Males and Females - Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers . . . . .	155
E Letters to Cooperating Teachers, Informed Consent and Instructions . . . . .	163

Table of Contents (Continued)

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX	
F <u>The Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor</u> <u>Questionnaire, Answer Sheet and Grades for</u> <u>Student Teachers . . . . .</u>	168
G Rationale for Instrument Selection . . . . .	182
VITA . . . . .	186

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Percentages of Sten Scores in High (8-10), Low (1-3) and Mid (4-7) Ranges on <u>Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire</u> by <u>Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers</u> . . . . .	73
2 The Cooperating Teacher's Ratings on The Preparation of The Unit For Male Student Teachers - Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .	77
3 Analysis of Variance of The Preparation of The Unit Ratings Across Groups Created by McClain's Prediction of Success in Teaching . . . . .	78
4 The Cooperating Teacher's Ratings on The preparation of the Lesson For Male Student Teachers - Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .	79
5 Analysis of Variance of The Preparation of The Lesson Across Groups Created by McClain's Prediction of Success in Teaching . . . . .	80
6 The Cooperating Teacher's Rating on The Classroom Presentation for Male Student Teachers - Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .	82
7 Analysis of Variance of The Classroom Presentation Ratings Across Groups Created by McClain's Prediction of Success in Teaching . . . . .	83
8 The Cooperating Teacher's Rating on Professionalism for Male Student Teachers - Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .	84
9 Analysis of Variance of Professionalism Ratings Across Groups Created by McClain's Prediction of Success in Teaching . . . . .	85
10 The Cooperating Teacher's Rating on Overall (Cumulative) Evaluation for Male Student Teachers - Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .	87
11 Analysis of Variance of the Overall (Cumulative) Evaluation Across Groups Created by McClain's Prediction of Success in Teaching . . . . .	88

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
12 The Cooperating Teacher's Rating on The Preparation of The Unit for Female Student Teachers Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .	90
13 Analysis of Variance of The Preparation of The Unit Ratings Across Groups Created by McClain's Prediction of Success in Teaching . . . . .	91
14 The Cooperating Teachers' Rating on The Preparation of The Lesson for Female Student Teachers Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .	92
15 Analysis of Variance of The Preparation of The Lesson Across Groups Created by McClain's Prediction of Success in Teaching . . . . .	93
16 The Cooperating Teachers' Rating on Classroom Presentation for Female Student Teachers - Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .	95
17 Analysis of Variance of Classroom Presentation Ratings Across Groups Created by McClain's Prediction of Success in Teaching . . . . .	96
18 The Cooperating Teachers' Ratings on Professionalism for Female Student Teachers Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .	97
19 Analysis of Variance of Professionalism Ratings Across Groups Created by McClain's Prediction of Success in Teaching for Females . . . . .	99
20 The Cooperating Teachers' Ratings on the Overall (Cumulative) Evaluation for Female Student Teachers Means and Standard Deviations . . . . .	100
21 Analysis of Variance of The Overall (Cumulative) Ratings Across Groups Created by McClain's Prediction of Success in Teaching . . . . .	101
22 Correlation Coefficients for Cooperating Teachers' Ratings and College Supervisors' Ratings for Each Area and Overall (Cumulative) Score on The Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form . . . . .	103
23 Major Contributions of Items to Overall (Cumulative) Ratings of The Total Score . . . . .	133

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
24 Major Contributions of Items That Contribute Differently To The Overall (Cumulative) Ratings . . . . .	134
25 Percentage Contributions of Each Item to Overall (Cumulative) Ratings . . . . .	135
26 Sixteen Personality Factor Scores for Female Student Teachers . . . . .	156
27 Sixteen Personality Factor Scores for Male Student Teachers . . . . .	158
28 Sixteen Personality Factor Scores for Female Cooperating Teachers . . . . .	159
29 Sixteen Personality Factor Scores for Male Cooperating Teachers . . . . .	160
30 Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Mean Scores for Males - Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers . . . . .	161
31 Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Mean Scores for Females - Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers . . . . .	162



CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

Many professions require those desiring to become professionals to engage in supervised practice. Teaching is one of these professions. The supervised practice for those desiring to teach on the elementary, middle or secondary level, is called student teaching. Student teaching is that period of guided teaching during which the student takes increasing responsibility for the instruction of a given group of learners over an extended period of time. The experience is usually under the direct supervision of a classroom cooperating teacher (Bennie, 1972).

Student teaching is generally considered to be the most important phase of a teacher's professional preparation (Diamonti, 1977). Being the culmination of a student's training, its primary purpose is to provide the student teacher an opportunity to synthesize the educational theory and methods studied with practical experiences. During the student teaching experience the student teacher has an opportunity, under the guidance of mature educators, for continuous self-evaluation as a means of developing the skills and attitudes essential to successful teaching.

Henry and Beasley (1972) contend that student teaching is an emotional experience for the student teacher because of its nature, importance, and potential impact upon his career. Further, it is the

apex of the college years, testing the ability to perform that task which has been the goal for nearly four years and which is potentially his future livelihood.

Those responsible for administering student teaching programs have been perplexed by the variables which operate to determine successful and unsuccessful student teaching experiences. This continued concern has resulted, in part, from the fact that many student teachers with academic aptitudes which are considered more than sufficient for student teaching success at a level higher than the minimum of "C" have not been successful at a level that is commensurate with their ability. At the same time, the concern of directors and coordinators has resulted, in part, from those student teachers whose academic aptitudes would imply that they are not intellectually capable of successfully performing in the classroom, yet they successfully complete the student teaching experience at an "above average level" of performance.

Henry and Beasley (1975) contend that student teachers experience stress related to general teaching, their own personality, self-confidence, and "dynamic qualities in the classroom". Further, Coates and Thorensen (1976) and Sorenson and Halpert (1968) suggest that anxieties expressed by student teachers seem to focus on their relationships with college supervisors and cooperating teachers.

Biddle and Thomas (1968) suggest that student teachers react to "role pressure", the anxiety associated with fulfilling obligations and expectations of a new role.

Research on difficulties of student teachers (Henry, 1973) seems to show that the most serious problems are those of personality. Getzels and Jackson (1963) agree that the personality of the teacher is a significant variable in the classroom and suggest that some would argue that it is the most significant variable. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that the personality of the student teacher is also a significant variable in the classroom.

Bennie (1980) contends that personality is such an abstract phenomenon that it is extremely difficult to assess, particularly with respect to the teaching act. He further suggests that the factors that affect one person do not seem to affect another. Teacher personality is only one variable which interplays with various groups, teaching content and environment. However, it becomes even more complicated in student teaching since there are additional variables involved in the teaching role: temporary authority, supervisory personnel, and additional interpersonal relationships.

Research suggests that the problems of personality adjustments, as compared to other variables present in the classroom, are occurring most frequently between the student teachers and their cooperating teachers. Therefore, it appears that the personality factors have the greatest influence on the successful or unsuccessful student teaching experience.

The State of Virginia, as well as other states, considers student teaching as an important requirement for teacher certification. The Virginia State Certification Regulation requirements states:

"Student teaching shall be a learning experience encompassing all of the roles of the teacher, including experiences with exceptional individuals, including gifted and talented and those with handicapping conditions. In addition, the student's potential for teaching and certification shall be evaluated comprehensively during the student teaching assignment". (Certification Regulation for Teachers, 1982).

Therefore, in order for prospective teachers to meet state certification requirements the student teaching experience, as an important requirement, must be successfully completed. Successful completion of the student teaching experience for Virginia State Teacher Certification requires that the prospective teacher earns at least a passing grade in student teaching.

For the purpose of this study successful student teaching will be determined for those students who have earned at least the grade of "B". A "B" grade is an above average grade but within the reach of any student teacher who does a thorough, competent and imaginative job in the classroom and related programs of the school. It means that one can expect the student teacher to solve problems in discipline, classroom management and curriculum organization. The student's oral speech and written reports are without commonplace grammatical errors, the work is done with promptness, efficiency and accuracy, and arrival at school, classes and assigned activities is on time. The student avoids letting personal considerations interfere with accepted responsibilities during the student teaching period. The grade of "B" is equivalent to 3.00 to 3.50 on a 4.00 scale as measured by the Student Teacher Evaluation Form normally utilized by the School of Education at Hampton Institute for the evaluation of its student teachers.

In summary, research has indicated various factors as having influence on successful student teaching. Many educators and psychologists believe that personality factors are among those variables that can have influence on success in student teaching. Elmore and Ellette (1979) contend that teachers' personality characteristics are predominant influences on teaching practices and subsequent learning. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that personality factors could have influence on success in student teaching for it is believed that a person's performance and achievements are aspects of his total behavior. Therefore, it is also believed that the performance and achievements of the student teacher are determined and influenced by the dynamic processes of personality.

#### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework for the present study comes from the Cattell's Multivariate Factor Analysis Personality Theory (1959) and McClain's (1968) separate equation for male and female teaching success listed in Cattell (1970). A multivariate approach allows for the examination of the relationships among a large number of variables within one study. Accordingly, a number of subjects can be assessed on a large number of variables (Arndt, 1974).

Cattell defines personality as that which tells what a person will do (i.e. a response) when placed in a given situation. It focuses on the prediction of behavior, stressing that knowledge of personality is a necessary prerequisite for successful prediction.

Cattell submits that personality traits do not remain invariant over time and he has studied the degree to which a trait varies from time to time because of such influences as environmental demands, illness, anxiety states and modulating moods of the person being measured. He defines his unit of structure, the trait, as a factor or a cluster of variables that are correlated with one another. Hence, when one aspect of the trait is present in a certain degree, the person will show the other parts in a certain degree.

Cattell quantified personality traits from years of compiling observational data employing questionnaires and objective situational tests. He identified a set of sixteen traits. The sixteen traits as measured on the scales are listed below:

Factor	Low Score		High Score
A	Reserved	VS	Outgoing, Warm-Hearted
B	Less Intelligent	VS	More Intelligent
C	Affected by Feelings	VS	Emotionally Stable
E	Humble	VS	Assertive
F	Sober	VS	Happy-Go-Lucky
G	Expedient	VS	Conscientious
H	Shy	VS	Venturesome
I	Tough-minded	VS	Tender-minded
L	Trusting	VS	Suspicious
M	Practical	VS	Imaginative
N	Forthright	VS	Shrewd
O	Placid	VS	Apprehensive

Factor	Low Score		High Score
Q <sub>1</sub>	Conservative	VS	Experimenting
Q <sub>2</sub>	Group-Dependent	VS	Self-Sufficient
Q <sub>3</sub>	Undisciplined Self-Conflict	VS	Controlled
Q <sub>4</sub>	Relaxed	VS	Tense

McClain (1968) applied the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire to study the relationship between teacher characteristics and teacher effectiveness. His study identified those factors that relate to success and failure among men and women student teachers. One result of his work was the development of teacher success specification equations. His separate equations for male and female teaching success represent the second theoretical source for this investigation. The equations are as follows:

#### TEACHING SUCCESS SPECIFICATION EQUATIONS

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Teaching Success (Males)} = & .15A + .25B + .15C + .45G + .40H \\ & + .40(11-L) + .20(11-N) + .25Q_1 \\ & + .30(11-Q_4) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Teaching Success (Female)} = & .20A + .30B + .40E + .30F + .30H \\ & + .15M + .20(11-Q_3) \end{aligned}$$

McClain's (1968) analysis of rated success for a group of student teachers in America found significant association with G(.45), H(.39), L(-.38), Q<sub>1</sub>(.26), and Q<sub>4</sub>(-.31) for males; A(.22), B(.31), E(.39), F(.29), H(.31), and Q<sub>3</sub>(-.19) for females.

The theoretical foundations underlying this research study can be stated in the following proposition: Student teachers possess stable and unique personality need patterns that result in successful or unsuccessful student teaching experiences.

This theory does not purport to account for all of the determinants of successful or unsuccessful student teaching experiences, nor does it in any way deny that successful or unsuccessful student teaching experiences are influenced by factors other than basic personality needs. The theory merely suggests that certain dominant personality factors are usually important determinants in successful or unsuccessful student teaching experiences. Thus the presence of distinctive personality patterns in successful or unsuccessful student teaching experiences, if found, would tend to support this theory.

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In the Handbook of Research on Teaching, Getzels and Jackson (1963) stress the need for additional research on the relationship between personality characteristics and teaching success to determine specific and distinctive features of personality that are related to success in teaching. Although the literature suggests that there are many factors that could influence successful student teaching experiences, it is believed that the personality factors are among those variables that could have greatest influence on successful student teaching experiences. This research study was designed to address the following research question: Does congruence of measurable personality factors of



student teachers, cooperating teachers and college supervisors have an effect upon success in student teaching experiences?

#### HYPOTHESES

To examine the effectiveness of the congruence of measurable personality factors of student teachers, cooperating teachers, and college supervisors the following hypotheses were developed:

1. There will be no statistically significant difference between males predicted to succeed in student teaching and males predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping at the .01 level of significance.
2. There will be no statistically significant difference between females predicted to succeed in student teaching and females predicted not succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping at the .01 level of significance.
3. There will be no statistically significant difference between the college supervisors' and the cooperating teachers' ratings of those predicted to succeed in student teaching and those predicted not to succeed in student teaching at the .01 level of significance.

#### PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to examine selected personality factors of student teachers, their cooperating teachers and their college supervisors to determine if these factors could have significant influence on success in student teaching experiences. It was also the purpose of this study to provide personality data for student teachers,

cooperating teachers and college supervisors so that matching of personalities could be provided for the student teachers, their cooperating teachers and their college supervisors. If student teachers, cooperating teachers and college supervisors are matched in terms of their personality profiles, these personality matches will allow for the prediction of successful student teaching experiences.

#### DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

This research study is limited to selected personality factors of student teachers, cooperating teachers and college supervisors as measured by the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and the McClain's (1968) Teaching Success Specification Equations, that could have statistically significant influence on success in student teaching. Research studies indicate that there are many other factors that could influence success in student teaching such as methods of teaching, classroom management, and teacher effectiveness. However, these areas, according to Getzels and Jackson (1963), have been studied extensively and therefore have been purposefully deleted from this study.

The study is also limited to cooperating teachers in Hampton and Newport News, Virginia, Public Schools, the 1981 - 1982 Fall Semester Hampton Institute student teachers and their college supervisors.

#### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Success in student teaching is an important requirement for prospective public school teachers seeking teacher certification in the

State of Virginia. Quantitative data supporting success in student teaching will be needed if student teacher evaluations are to be utilized by public school personnel administrators and college supervisors to determine how successful the student teacher was in the classroom. Since teaching positions are not plentiful at the present time, employers can be extremely selective with regard to hiring new teachers. In addition to such quantitative data, it has been reported by researchers (Lamke, 1951, Getzels and Jackson, 1963, Crosthwaite, 1966, Bigelow, 1968, McClain, 1968, and Elmore and Ellette, 1979) that personality factors also play a major role in influencing success in student teaching. Therefore, this study is significant because it will determine whether or not the congruence of measurable personality factors of student teachers, cooperating teachers and college supervisors have an effect upon success in student teaching experiences; it will provide resulting data that can be used to aid in the placement of student teachers with cooperating teachers to enhance a successful student teaching experience; it can be replicated at other institutions of higher learning in order to examine the dynamics of personality and the student teaching experience; and finally it will contribute to the body of professional knowledge concerned with student teacher success and teacher education programs.

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of this investigation, the following definitions have been developed.

### COLLEGE SUPERVISOR

The designated faculty member of the teacher education institution who has the responsibility for supervising a number of student teachers in various public school assignments. He also provides consultant services to the student teacher and the cooperating teacher and serves in a liaison capacity between the public schools and the college in matters concerning student teaching (Bennie, 1972).

### COOPERATING TEACHER

The classroom teacher in the public schools who is given the responsibility of working directly with a student teacher (Bennie, 1972).

### PERSONALITY

A stable set of characteristics and tendencies that determine those commonalities and differences in the psychological behavior (thoughts, feelings, and actions) of people that have continuity in time and that may or may not be easily understood in terms of the social and biological pressures of the immediate situation alone (Maddi, 1972).

### PERSONALITY THEORY

A set of interconnected and logically, consistent assumptions, having the aim of explaining personality data (thoughts, feelings, and actions having continuity in time and over situations). The parts of a personality theory are the core statement (concerning the inherent nature that is unlearned and common to all), the periphery statement (concerning the life-styles that are learned and differentiate persons),

and the developmental statement (which explicates how expressions of the core lead, through interaction with the external, mainly social, environment, to the periphery (Maddi, 1972).

#### STUDENT TEACHER

A college student assigned to practice through observation, participation, and actual teaching, under the supervision of a certified public school teacher, as part of the pre-service teacher education program (Hoffman, 1979).

#### STUDENT TEACHING

One of the clinical experiences provided to many prospective teachers. It is a period of guided teaching during which the student takes increasing responsibility for the instruction of a given group of learners over an extended period of time. The experience is usually provided under the direct supervision of a classroom cooperating teacher (Bennie, 1972).

#### SUCCESS IN STUDENT TEACHING

An average grade of "B" (3.00 - 3.50) as measured by the Student Teacher Evaluation Form (Abram, 1981).

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The introduction, theoretical framework, statement of the problem, hypotheses (null), purpose of the study, delimitation of the study, significance of the study, definition of terms and the organization of the study are described in Chapter 1.

A review of related literature and research is presented in Chapter 2.

Methods and procedures, the population sample, measuring instruments, and the collection of data are presented in Chapter 3.

The analysis and validation of the null hypotheses are presented in Chapter 4.

A summary of the research, conclusions, recommendations for further research are presented in Chapter 5.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The present study has necessitated literature review in three related areas: (a) literature related to the student teaching experience, (b) literature related to the characteristics and personality factors of student teachers, cooperating teachers and college supervisors, and (c) literature related to the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire as an instrument to be employed in investigating personality characteristics of student teachers, cooperating teachers and college supervisors.

#### A. The Student Teaching Experience

According to Ryan (1971) schools have been in existence for over four hundred years, yet formal efforts to prepare teachers are relatively new. The preparation of teachers, during the Middle Ages, followed the method of apprenticeships. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries teacher education evolved beyond apprenticeship with the support of educational innovators and reformers such as John Sturm, Ignatius Loyola and Jean Baptiste de la Salle, the founder of the Order of the Brothers of the Christian Schools. Jean Baptiste de la Salle also laid the groundwork for our modern practice of student teaching. European reformers such as Johann Basedow, John Pestalozzi, Johann Herbart, and Friedrich Froebel also incorporated student teaching into the training of their teacher disciples (Johnson, 1968). The first

teacher-training institution in the United States was established in Vermont in 1823 (Ryan, 1971). In the late nineteenth Century, student teaching practices were influenced by the work of psychologist G. Stanly Hall. Hall's "child study" movement advocated that teacher trainees carefully observe learners for extended periods of time. These observations of children were then used as the basis for discussion and instruction. During this period, only elementary school teachers received professional teaching, and of course student teaching was a major part of it. It was not until the early 1900s that secondary school teachers who were trained in liberal arts colleges and universities engaged in student teaching (Ryan, 1971).

Ryan (1971) further stated that the authority for teacher certification was consolidated in state departments of education during 1920. Following this mandate, student teaching became a part of all teacher education programs. Many state departments are supported by several professional organizations, such as the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the Association of Teacher Educators. These organizations support both the development of student teaching and efforts to establish higher standards. When campus laboratory schools could no longer accommodate the increasing number of prospective teachers an expansion was made to the public school system. The expansion is generally known as the off-campus student teaching experience.

Today student teaching is a well established clinical experience provided to prospective teachers by college educational programs and



school systems. Conant (1963) and Cicirelli (1969) write of the very significant role cooperating teachers and university (college) supervisors assume in shaping the future behavior of student teachers. The student teacher should receive highly personalized guidance and diagnostic feedback on his performance from both his cooperating teacher and his university (college) supervisor. Bennie (1972) defines student teaching as a period of guided teaching during which the student takes increasing responsibility for the instruction of a given group of learners over an extended period of time. He agrees that the experience should be under the direct supervision of a classroom cooperating teacher. Tanruther (1973) suggests that educational programs schedule student teaching during the fourth year of college study as part of a bachelor's degree program.

The student teaching experience has been found to be the most important phase of a teacher's professional preparation (Goodlad, 1965; Hayes, 1966; Bennie, 1972; Diamonti, 1977; Hoy, 1977). For most prospective teachers, it is their first major experience in the public schools as a professional. Several writers have attempted to describe what is actually gained by student teachers during the student teaching experience. Lipke (1979) found student teaching to be an unpredictable element, especially in terms of benefits derived by both student teacher and cooperating teacher.

In 1967 Sorenson conducted a study to discover what is learned in student teaching. His findings were classified into the following nine categories: (1) the student teacher's relationship to his cooperating

teacher; (2) the importance of preparing lesson plans; (3) classroom control; (4) specific ways of conducting a class; (5) the importance of originality and variety in conducting the class; (6) the student teacher's bearing, manner, and appearance; (7) knowledge of subject matter; (8) administrative and clerical duties; and (9) knowledge of students' and individual differences.

Hoy (1977) studied the bureaucratic socialization of student teachers and concluded that the experience provides the prospective teachers with an understanding of the social situation of the classroom and the institutional milieu in which it is embedded. Cruickshank (1977) found that through the student teaching experience the future teacher attempts to identify and meet expectations which come from self, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, students, and society in general.

Hoy and Rees (1977) suggest that the prospective teacher get something from the experience in the school which is not included in formal courses. Waller (1967) first described this "elusive something", which is difficult to put in textbooks or to communicate in a lecture, as social insight.

Meyers (1981) and Hevener (1981) have described why the student teaching experience is such an important stage in the training of prospective teachers. Meyer suggests that the student teaching activities provide the prospective teacher opportunities to try their wings so that they will be able to make an easy transition from the "mind set" of a student to the status of a conscientious and capable

teacher. Hevener suggests the following reasons why student teaching is necessary for those planning to enter the teaching profession: (1) the intern is expected to student teach in order to meet state certification requirements, (2) to find out if he can teach successfully, (3) to discover if he wants to teach, (4) for the exposure to instructional and human-relations challenges which will severely test his pedagogical skills and his ability to absorb frustrations, (5) to meet situations that test his good judgment and ability to control his anger, (6) to try his physical stamina, (7) to gain experience in working with professional educators, (8) to gain experience in conferring with administrators and working closely with his supervising teachers; (9) to test his ability to work with his students' parents, (10) to test his ability to speak before a group, (11) to provide his mastery of his area of specialization, and (12) to allow the intern to feel the thrill of seeing his student progress.

It therefore appears that student teaching is the most significant phase of a prospective teacher's professional training. The above studies and related literature have discussed the evolution of the student teaching experience and its importance to the prospective teacher and teacher education programs.

#### B. Personality Factors of Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers and Their Relationship to Success in Student Teaching

Research has been conducted to relate success in student teaching experiences to personalities of student teachers and cooperating

teachers. This section of the review of literature will focus on some of these studies.

Percival M. Symonds (1947) in a classic study on the personality of the teacher suggested that the quality of personality must be taken into account in the selection of candidates for the teaching profession. He cited the following six personality factors as being essential for an individual who is to succeed as a teacher:

1. Every teacher should like teaching, and through their work should attain personal goals and satisfaction. A good teacher does not take up teaching for superficial reasons under economic pressure, or in order to escape from some less desirable form of work.
2. A good teacher should be personally secure and should have self-respect, dignity, and courage, as opposed to feelings of inferiority and inadequacy. The personally insecure teacher has difficulty with discipline and either becomes inept and ineffective or must maintain her status by bluff and swagger.
3. A good teacher must be able to identify herself with children. She must have social awareness, the capacity to enter into the feeling and interests of others, and to understand the motives and conflicts of others.
4. The competent teacher is emotionally stable. She is able to accept the aggression of boys and girls and their laziness, carelessness, slowness, and stupidity as well as their brightness, industry and efficiency.

5. The effective teacher should be free from anxiety. She should be free to experiment and to try out innovations in her teaching in the classroom.
6. A good teacher is not too self-centered, or selfish, but is able to give herself freely and without reserve to the needs and interests of her pupils.

Jarecke (1952) looked at evaluating teaching success through the use of the Teaching Judgement Test. Jareck's purpose was to design a test to evaluate some factors which contribute to the success of teachers on the secondary school level in relation to their performance in the classroom, associations with fellow teachers, association with administrators, contributions to the community and in relation to their overall efficiency as professional people. A survey was made of the factors of personality which seem to contribute to a teacher's personality. The factors of personality considered in this study were self-reliance, egocentric tendencies, anti-social attitude, depression, inferiority, sensitiveness, seclusiveness, egotism, feeling of abuse, fixity of ideas, sense of humor, cooperativeness and retaliation. Jarecke concluded that: (1) teaching experience seems to have a bearing on teaching success; (2) some unnamed factors, possibly stability, as measured by the special scoring of the Bernreuter Personality Inventory affected teaching success; (3) there seems to be a relationship between scholastic ability and teaching success as shown by the master's examination and teaching success as measured by the Teaching Judgment Test, (4) a relatively short test like the Teaching Judgment Test seem

to have some predictive ability for teaching success, (5) a situational test of the forced choice rating or ranking type is useful in measurement of teaching potential. Also that the work attitude of the teacher as a whole person affects teaching performance.

Ryans (1960), in his landmark study on the characteristics of teachers, identified certain types of teacher traits that were significantly related to teacher success. Attention was focused on the study of possible teacher behavior dimensions, these dimensions being conceptualized as generalizations which define teacher behavior variables in terms of clusters of relatively homogeneous behaviors. He stated that good teachers are those who are skillful in developing understanding of the world in which man lives, insightful with respect to the ways and means of stimulating intellectual appetites, capable of patience, understanding, and sincere feelings for others. Poor teachers are those that perpetuate ignorance, misunderstanding, and intellectual and cultural stagnation.

Getzel and Jackson (1963) also contend that the personality of the teacher is a significant variable in the classroom. Despite the importance of this variable and a great deal of research in this area, little is known about the nature of teacher personality, particularly in reference to differences between successful and non-successful teachers (DeBlasse, 1971).

In a recent study, Myers, Kennedy and Cruickshank (1979) examined the potential relations between selected teacher personality variables and self-reported problems experienced by teachers. They concluded that

the different personality traits of teachers appeared to be a logical focus for the better understanding and possible reduction of teacher problems. The results of the cononical analysis, which these researchers employed, suggested that relationships between teacher personality and problems profile do exist.

#### Personality of Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers

The above studies have attested to the importance of the relationship between personality and successful teacher performance. It therefore seems important for educational research to examine the personality of student teachers and cooperating teachers, the dynamics of their relationships, and the relationship between personality and successful student teacher performance. The following studies have investigated various aspected of these concerns.

Miller (1963) conducted a study on evaluating teaching personality before student teaching beings. This study attempted to find out what is being done, in the teacher preparation institutions of the nation, to identify and redirect students whose personality traits seem to limit their chances of success in the profession. Miller's returns showed that variety is the word for ways of evaluating and doing something about students' poor teaching personalities. The study also brought out the broad areas of agreement among those with responsibility for preparing good teachers. A majority of the respondents stated that they did have a procedure for identifying and redirecting education majors with teaching personality problems. It was done or was initiated by the instructor of the professional course, either freshman or sophomore

year. The number and proportion of students screened out or redirected seemed small.

Alden and Crosthwait (1966) conducted an experiment to determine whether personality differences existed among individuals who chose different teaching fields. There were 211 student teachers involved in this experiment. The Heston Personal Adjustment Inventory was administered to each of these students. The Heston Personal Adjustment Inventory evaluates six personality traits: analytical thinking, sociability, emotional stability, confidence, personal relations, and home satisfaction. The analysis led Alden and Crosthwait to conclude that little personality difference existed among individuals within the seven teaching field groups studied. Only one of the six traits was found to indicate significant differences among these groups. This trait was emotional stability.

Morgan and Woerdehoff (1969) investigated stability of student teacher behaviors and their relationship to personality and creativity factors. An attempt was made to determine if selected personality and creativity factors related to classroom behaviors of student teachers; and to determine if student teachers change in proportion of time spent in various classroom behaviors during the student teaching period. The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was used to measure the following ten personality factors: General Activity, Restraint, Ascendance, Sociability, Emotional Stability, Objectivity, Friendliness, Thoughtfulness, Personal Relations, and Masculinity. The Creativity Self-Rating Scale developed by Feldhusen was used to measure Gross



Creativity, Flexibility, and Ideational Fluency. The two instruments were administered to thirty-four (34) Purdue University student teachers. These students were observed and their classroom behaviors categorized during two visits by their college supervisors using the Interaction Analysis Record. By multiple regression four factors, Ascendance, Sociability, Masculinity, and Gross Creativity, were found to be the best predictors of student teachers' classroom behaviors.

When the two administrations of the Interaction Analysis Record were compared (during the first and last weeks of student teaching) by analysis of variance, no significant change was found.

It was concluded that the findings be regarded as tentative because of the small number of subjects and the exploratory nature of the study. The researchers suggested replication with a larger sample is needed to support findings.

Breiter (1975) conducted a research study on measured self-actualization and student teacher effectiveness for the purpose of examining the relationship between teacher effectiveness (performance) and the personal orientation of a specific group of student teachers. The students were given the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) during the quarter in which they were student teaching. They were then rated by their college supervisors and their classroom cooperating teachers on their classroom effectiveness while serving as a student teacher. The Teacher Performance Inventory (TPI) a performance inventory for student teachers, was used to obtain the ratings. The study did not find a relationship between the TPI as a measure of teacher effectiveness and

personality as measured by the POI at an acceptable level of significance.

Cruickshank and Kennedy (1977) investigated the usefulness of an Eriksonian Construct of ego identity in accounting for the success or failure of student teachers. Erikson asserts that the ability to consummate a firm positive ego identity during late adolescence (which normally involves reducing identity diffusion and resolving an acceptable psychosocial identity) is closely connected to the ability to put together an occupational identity and relate well to others in work or personal interaction (Erikson, 1963). The purpose of Cruickshank and Kennedy's study was to measure the relationship among ego identity diffusion and resolution and the classroom teaching behaviors displayed by student teachers. The results of this study supported the conclusion that the noncognitive, personality variables (Identity Diffusion and Identity Resolution) account for a significant part of the success of students in certain specific classroom teaching performance and in the student teaching course, generally. The study in terms of Erikson's theory indicated that (low) Identity Diffusion is more powerful in accounting for success in student teaching than Identity Resolution.

Klein (1978) studied the extent of the relationship between the personality variables of anxiety, sociability, emotional stability, responsibility, and introversion-extroversion of a group of student teachers to their level of success in achieving the objectives of self-paced, self-instructional modules. The results of the study indicated that the personality traits of introversion-extroversion and sociability were found to be related to achievement on the

self-instructional modules. The achievement of introverted and low-sociability subjects was greater than the achievement of their extroverted and high-sociability counterparts. While the study did indicate relationships between certain personality factors and achievement on the modules, it was not able to identify, through the multiple regression techniques, a combination of personality characteristics which could be useful in predicting achievement.

#### Attitudes and Perceptions about Student Teaching Success

Attitudes and perceptions are variables which contribute to the complex personality factor. The following studies examine attitudes and perceptions about successful student teaching.

Chabassol (1968) investigated the possession of certain attitudes as predictors of success in practice (student) teaching. In an attempt to determine whether three scales of attitudes, used with some success by other investigators in other areas might be of value in predicting success in practice (student) teaching. The findings were divided between male/female. Scores for the males on the rigidity in thinking scales were not significantly related to practice (student) teaching results, nor were any of the scores on the parental attitudes inventory significantly related to success in practice (student) teaching for these students. Of the eight sub-tests of the hostility scale, three were significant: one at the .01 level, one at the .02 level, and a third at the .05 level. The total score on this test was also significantly related to success in teaching at the .02 level of confidence. Findings for the female on the scale for measuring rigidity

in thinking, three of the four sub-test yield scores which were significantly related to teaching success, two of these being at the .01 level of confidence. Two of the three scales on the parental attitudes inventory were significantly related to practice (student) teaching.

Lowther (1970) examined successful and unsuccessful experiences of student teachers in secondary education. The purpose of this study was to investigate student teacher perceptions of successful and unsuccessful experiences in student teaching. The male and female student teachers in secondary education at the University of Michigan provided the data used in this study. The population consisted of 250 undergraduate senior year students who were teaching in twelve different junior and senior high schools in the Ann Arbor area. The academic areas represented included English, science, social studies, foreign languages, art and mathematics. The subjects were asked to respond anonymously to the following questions: "What is the most successful experience you have had so far this semester?"; and "What is the most unsuccessful experience you have had so far this semester?" The subjects produced 246 usable responses to the questions on successful experiences and 249 useable responses to the question calling for unsuccessful experiences.

Lowther found that students experienced feelings of success and satisfaction from those activities which involved them in active, personal relationships with individual or small groups of pupils in the classroom. Also that the criterion of success frequently used by student teachers was the amount of personal satisfaction the experience

provided, rather than the achievement of instructional objectives. Another assumption of the findings suggested that the nature of the relationship between the supervising teacher and student teacher has a direct bearing on the number and kinds of success in experiences. Finally, it is evident from the data presented in this study, that the student teacher is a participant in a wide variety of relationships in directed teaching, and the outcomes of these relationships may have meaning in terms of performance and mental health.

Barrows (1978) conducted a study on student teaching and success. The purpose of the study was to analyze the student teaching experience of men and to discover the meaning of success in student teaching. It was concluded that success in student teaching seemed to mean convincing one's cooperating teacher that one was capable of handling the children and being like the cooperating teacher in teaching style and commitment to teaching. The classroom manner of the male student teacher seemed more important in defining success than the substance of what he taught. Although program statements declared that creative teaching, a reflective experience, and development of an individualized teaching style were the marks of a successful student teaching experience, judged success did not depend on demonstrating any of these behaviors.

The cooperating teacher assumes a crucial role in determining the success of a student's student teaching experience. It is therefore important to investigate the relationship between the cooperating teacher's personality and the personality of the student teacher. The

following four studies have examined this relationship. Such investigation is rather recent in educational research.

Lewis (1976) looked at the effect of selected characteristics of vocational student teachers and their cooperating teachers on the final evaluation of the student teacher. Her findings revealed that student teachers were more likely to think of themselves as competent teachers when they had high scores for the personality factors, sociability and personal relations or when their scores on the Masculinity factor were similar to those of the cooperating teachers. Lewis found that cooperating teachers are more likely to assign higher evaluation scores to student teachers who have scores similar to their own for the personality factor, ascendance. Lewis also found that student teachers and cooperating teachers tend to agree with each other concerning the student teachers' performance if their scores on the personality factors, sociability and personal relations, were different. A final conclusion of Lewis' study was that evaluation scores are not influenced by the independent variables of sex, service area, age of the cooperating teacher, teaching experience of the cooperating teacher, or educational attainment level of the cooperating teacher.

Stelljes (1976) investigated whether selected personality factors of student teachers and cooperating teachers working together in the University of Northern Colorado's ten-week student teaching program could be identified as influencing success in student teaching. It was concluded that the student teachers and cooperating teachers were from the same population and that other factors, in addition to personality

characteristics, within the student teaching situation, influenced success in student teaching. No relationship could be attributed to sex or the Personal Orientation Inventory variables as predictors of success in student teaching as measured by the Student Teacher Perception Questionnaire.

Gates (1977) in an exploratory study of characteristics of student teachers and cooperating teachers and their relationship to success in student teaching examined the following question: "How much of the success in student teaching can be accounted for by focusing upon student teacher characteristics, cooperating teacher characteristics, or student teacher/cooperating teacher dyad compatibility characteristics?" The findings of this study indicated that it is possible to account for from 28% to 50% of variance in scores representing success by focusing upon student teacher educational values characteristics as measured by VAL-Ed, and upon student teacher/cooperating teacher dyad compatibility indices derived from FIRO-B and VAL-Ed.

Nightingale (1978) investigated the relationships among the congruity of perceptions of the cooperating teachers' role, student teacher anxiety, and performance. Nightingale posed three questions: (1) how much congruity is there between the perceptions held by the cooperating teacher and the student teacher in the role behavior of the cooperating teacher? (2) is there any relationship between the degree of congruity of the cooperating teachers' and student teachers' perceptions of the cooperating teacher's role and the anxiety experienced by the student teacher? (3) is there any relationship

between the degree of congruity of the perceptions and the student teacher's final evaluation? Nightingale's data inferred that there was no significant difference between the perceptions held by the cooperating teacher and the student teacher of the cooperating teacher's role; no significant relationship was found between the degree of congruity of the perceptions of the cooperating teacher's role and the anxiety experienced by the student teacher except in the sub-category area of professional attitudes; and there was no significant relationship between the congruity of the perceptions of the cooperating teacher's role within the dyad and the student teacher's final evaluations. Related findings showed that student teachers with high anxiety tend to disagree with their cooperating teachers' perceptions of their role; student teachers with low anxiety tend to agree with their cooperating teachers' perceptions of their role, and student teachers' and cooperating teachers' perceptual differences do not seem to affect the final evaluations of the student teacher.

The next studies concern the issue of matching student teachers and cooperating teachers with regard to their personalities.

#### Matching Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers

Buckley and Dickmann (1969) conducted a study on the personality of student teachers and supervising teachers. The purpose of the study was to determine whether a student teacher with less intellectual disposition (i.e., more practical, less theoretical) than his supervising teacher will show a greater change in anxiety level during the student teaching experience than a student teacher who is of higher



intellectual disposition (i.e., less practical, more theoretical) than his supervising teacher. The following two hypotheses were tested:

(1) If a student becomes less anxious during his student teaching experience, he is likely to be more practical (i.e., less theoretical) than his supervising teacher; and (2) If a student becomes more anxious during his student teaching experience, he is likely to be less practical (i.e., more theoretical) than his supervising teacher.

The Omnibus Personality Inventory, Form F, was administered to the student teachers and supervising teachers. The two hypotheses were not supported by the test results. Of the 44 student teachers 19 became less anxious, 11 had no change in anxiety, and 14 became more anxious.

Buckley and Dickmann concluded that although the results were inconclusive, research must be continued to find more appropriate ways to pair student teachers and supervising teachers than now exist. They further suggested that the pairing of student teachers and supervising teachers in too many situations depends on sheer random assignment of institutions with too little actually known or noted of the personality mix involved.

Leslie (1969) conducted a study on improving the student teaching experience through selective placement of student. The purpose of this study was to determine whether matching of student teacher and cooperating teacher would produce improved student teacher performance and attitude. Specifically, Leslie sought to compare the effects of the traditional method of student teacher placements to methods in which student teachers and cooperating teachers were matched on certain characteristics. Ninety subjects were randomly assigned to five

treatment groups, differing only in the extent to which the subjects were matched with cooperating teachers. Leslie also attempted to ascertain the essential elements or variables for matching and to ascertain whether the student teacher who is matched gains a superior attitude about teaching and senses a greater gain from the experience than does the student who is assigned in the normal fashion.

The basic method utilized by Leslie was to compare mean scores of student teacher performance or attitudes among the five groups. His major findings were: (1) the methods of matching invoked in this study, as a composite, did not produce superior results in terms of student teaching performance and attitude when compared to students placed in the traditional manner; (2) within group comparisons appeared to demonstrate the theoretical advantages of matching in general.

Trieber (1973) conducted a study on personality matching for student teacher development. The purpose of Trieber's study was to focus on the problem of matching the personality of the student teacher with that of the supervisor in order to produce a more effective future teacher. It also described and presented examples of personality types of supervising teachers and student teachers. Conflicts arising out of the various clusters were illustrated and utilized to point out the need for personality matching in the selection of student teachers for student teaching programs. Some of the personality types listed were energetic and creative supervisors, meek student teachers, rigid supervisors, submissive student teachers, contemptuous supervisors, and bored student teachers. From the discussion of each personality type

Trieber concluded that someone in authority should make an analysis of both student teacher and supervising teacher before the assignment of the student teaching period. He further suggested that the student teacher needs to be matched with a supervisor who can most help him develop. He further suggested that a very close evaluation of supervising teachers is essential. Trieber concludes that a better matching of personalities of student teacher and supervisor could well mean the difference between the stifling and the development of many of our student teachers.

The above review includes many studies which have examined the personality of teachers and student teachers as it relates to successful teaching. These studies have shown that personality is a multifaceted variable which relates significantly to successful teaching and successful student teaching. Given the importance of the relationship between the student teacher and cooperating teacher, it is interesting that only a few studies have examined the relationship between the cooperating teacher's personality and the personality of the student teacher. These few studies have suggested that the personality dynamics of this relationship may play a significant role in successful student teaching and the perceptions of these two groups. It is apparent that this topic has not been completely researched and therefore deserves further investigation. An even fewer number of studies have examined matching student teachers and cooperating teachers in terms of their personalities. These studies suggest that such consideration may create

a basis for successful student teaching. This too is a topic which deserves further investigation.

C. Personality Characteristics of Student Teachers,  
College Supervisors, and Cooperating Teachers as  
Measured by Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor  
Questionnaire

Getzels and Jackson (1963) contend that of all the psychological instruments developed in the Laboratory of personality Assessment and Group Behavior at the University of Illinois, only Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire has created noticeable activity among researchers in teacher personality. Further, this instrument has not been used nearly as extensively as have most of the other questionnaire-type tests. This section of the review of literature will discuss studies investigated utilizing the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. In addition, these studies will support the role of personality factors and their effects upon successful and unsuccessful classroom experiences.

Lamke (1951) compared the scores of ten (10) "good" teachers and eight (8) "poor" teachers on the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. The teachers were assigned to groups on the basis of a composite rating by their principal and two observers. The results of the study indicated that the two groups differed on three of the factor scores involved. Lamke's good teachers were above average and his poor teachers were below average on Cattell's source traits F (Surgency-Desurgency) and H (Parmia-versus Theoretical). Lamke's good teachers also were average or slightly below average on source trait N

(Shrewdness- versus - Naivete), while his poor teachers were far below on this trait. Lamke concluded that good teachers are approximately average in their tendencies to be polished, fastidious and cool, while poor teachers are definitely below average in these respects.

Another study utilizing the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire was conducted by Erickson (1954). With a population of 60 teachers he used scores on parts of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire correlated with nine different measures of teaching effectiveness. Among the 144 correlation coefficients, only 14 reached the .05 level of significance. Four of the factor scores yielded significant correlations (.05 level) with at least two of the nine effectiveness criteria. Erickson concluded that low correlations of the several temperament, personality, and achievement variables, as measured, with the nine estimates of teaching success and the three "composites" (composite estimates of teaching success) seemed to indicate that the relationship of these measures to teaching success as measured has not been definitely established.

Montross (1954) conducted a study utilizing 35 high school teachers. The scores on Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire were correlated with two composite ratings of success in teaching. The first was a summary of four ratings given by the principal and two outside raters during the subject's first year of teaching. The second included all the ratings made by the principal during the second year of teaching as well as those received during the first year of teaching. None of the correlation coefficients between

scores on the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and the first composite reached the .05 level of significance. Only one of the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire scores....Factor A (Cyclothymia versus Schizothymia) correlated significantly with the second composite ratings. Montross concluded that the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire failed to identify aspects of temperamental behavior as measured in the study.

McClain (1968) looked at the Sixteen Personality Factor scores and success in student teaching. The study was designed to extend the usefulness of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire for educators as an instrument for guidance and for the selection of teacher personnel (1) by identifying those scales of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire that are related to success and failure among secondary men student teachers and corresponding scales for women student teachers, and (2) by developing a specification equation for men and another for women which combine relevant scores on the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire in such ways that they will help differentiate the superior and the inferior student teachers at the high school level. The extremely significant differences in the scores resulting from the application of the specification equations to the ten scores of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire pointed out to the usefulness of these formulae in differentiating successful and unsuccessful student teachers. McClain further indicated that the study was based on the assumption that effectiveness in the complex teacher-pupil relationships calls for different personality

configuration for men and women, and the results confirmed this for the student teachers who were the subjects for this study. He further suggested that of the sixteen personality variables in the study, only three appeared in the specification equations for both men and women: A (warmth), B (intelligence), and H (venturesomeness); but of these three, only H was statistically significant for the women. Five factors entered the specification equation for men but not the one for women: G (conscientiousness), L (trust and adaptability), Q<sub>1</sub> (liberalism), Q<sub>4</sub> (freedom from tension), C (ego strength), and N (artlessness). All but C and N were statistically significant.

DeBlassie (1971) conducted a comparative study of the personality structures of persistent and prospective teachers. The purpose of DeBlassie's study was to determine whether personality differences existed between persistent teachers with undergraduate training in teacher education and prospective teachers with an undergraduate background in the liberal arts. The extent to which personality differences existed between the two groups was assessed by Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Sixteen Personality Factor Profiles were obtained for the two samples. The first consisted of a random sample of male and female S<sub>s</sub> who had an undergraduate major in teacher education and who, in addition had functioned as classroom teachers for at least three years. All of the S<sub>s</sub> in this group were pursuing a Master of Arts Degree in Teaching (MAT) at the time of the experiment. The second sample consisted of a group of male and female S<sub>s</sub> who had an undergraduate major in the liberal arts, and who had no

classroom teaching experience, but were enrolled in a master's degree program designed to prepare them to teach disadvantaged youth. This program was known as the Teacher Corps Program (TC). The two samples (MAT and TC) each consisted of thirty-two  $S_s$ , sixteen males and sixteen females for a total of sixty-four  $S_s$ .

Analysis of variance was used to compare the personality structures of the four subgroups, while the t-test was used to test the significance of the differences between any two groups on each of the personality factors which indicated significant F ratios. The study revealed that persistent teachers with undergraduate teacher training differed from prospective teachers with an undergraduate liberal arts background on the following factors: (1) Humble versus Assertive; (2) Toughminded; (3) Forthright versus Shrewd; and (4) Placid versus Apprehensive. The results of the study indicated a slight personality differences existed between persistent and prospective teachers.

Bell (1971) conducted a study on Personalities and Perceptions of Student Teaching. The purpose of the study was to identify the personality traits of both student teachers and cooperating teachers that were related to the student teachers' perception of the student teaching experience. Bell utilized the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire to measure the personality traits and the Purdue Student Teacher Opinionnaire to measure the perception of the student teaching experience. Seventy-six secondary student teachers were administered the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and the Purdue Student Teacher Opinionnaire; their cooperating teachers were



administered the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Through factor analyzing all scores Bell was able to determine which personality factors were related to higher opinions of the student teaching experiences. He also examined the relationships between student teacher and cooperating teacher personality differences and the student teacher's perception of student teaching.

Bell's results indicated that student teachers who were emotionally stable, humble, and shrewd expressed high opinions of the student teaching experiences. Further, they also expressed high opinions of the student teaching experience when the cooperating teachers were practical, conservative, and subdued.

Main and Hounshell (1973) conducted a comparative study of personality and behavior of science and non-science teachers. The study attempted to examine and compare science teachers. The purposes of the study were: (1) to try to discover if science teachers were different in terms of personality factors from other secondary non-science teachers; and (2) to compare those science teachers who were rated high on the Classroom Observation Scale with those who rated low on the Classroom Observation Scale. The personality factors of the two groups were compared by utilizing the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire scores. The science teachers that were the subjects of the study did show significant differences on some of the personality factors of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire from the comparison group of non-science teachers. The science teachers were found to be generally more reserved, calm, and mature than the teachers

in other disciplines. The science teachers, as a group, also appeared more serious and taciturn than other subject matter teachers. No significant differences were found when science teachers' scores on the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire were compared with certification level or science interest area. The findings of this research show that science teachers are a unique subgroup within the population of the study. The Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire was able to discriminate these differences.

Mattsson (1974) investigated the personality traits associated with effective teaching in rural and urban secondary schools. The study was an attempt to discover relationship between teacher personality traits as measured by the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and success in classroom teaching as measured by the Hoyt-Grim Pupil Reaction Inventory. The results of the study indicated that there was a distinct pattern of traits that appeared to be related to successful teaching in the medium city and an equally strong but nearly opposite pattern related to successful teaching in the small town school whose student body was comprised largely of farm children.

Stevens (1978) examined the relationships between prospective teacher selection and student teacher performance to determine if two selected instruments, (Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire General Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Selection Interview-Third Edition), and grade point averages used in teacher selection were significantly related to three selected criteria employed in ascertaining student teacher performance. Stevens found that two of

the predictive scores GTE and GPA, did not significantly correlate with supervisor or pupil evaluation. Also that the scores from the two predictive instruments, GTE and TSI, did not significantly correlate with one another.

The above studies present evidence that establishes Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire as an instrument capable of examining the relationship between personality and successful teaching. As Getzels and Jackson (1963) assert, Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire has created a great deal of educational research activity. This researcher feels that it is the instrument of choice for investigating the objectives of the present study, i.e. examination of the congruence among the personalities of student teachers, cooperating teachers and college supervisors.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter will present a detailed description of the research procedures and methods utilized in this investigation. Descriptions of the following areas will be included: (1) population, (2) procedures used in collecting the data, (3) statistical methods and procedures employed, and (4) rationale and instruments utilized.

#### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

##### The Population

This study is a descriptive survey of selected personality factors and selected dependent variables of the 1981 - 1982 Fall Semester student teachers, their cooperating teachers, and their college supervisors. A total of thirty student teachers, thirty cooperating teachers and thirteen college supervisors participated in the study. Therefore, a population total of seventy-three subjects were examined in this study. The thirty student teachers were enrolled in the following special areas: One in Art Education, one in Biology Education, four in Early Childhood Education, six in Elementary Education, four in Special Education, four in Human Ecology, one in Journalism, one in Mathematics, two in Music Education, and six in Physical Education. There were seven male students and twenty-three female students. Of the thirty student teachers two were white and twenty-eight were Black. The students were freshman students at Hampton Institute during the 1978-1979 school year.

Hampton Institute is a predominantly Black four year private liberal arts institution with an enrollment of 3,700 students of which 3,100 are undergraduates. Data available from entry requirements were: (a) Scholastic Aptitude Test scores (SAT); (b) California Achievement and the Otis Mental Ability test scores; (c) clearance with respect to health and physical fitness on the basis of a written report from the College Health Center; (d) clearance with speech and hearing testing from the Department of Communication Disorders; and (e) personal interviews. These data, however, will not be the primary data used in this study.

The student teaching assignments are not at random as is often the case. The placements are requested by the Coordinator of Student Teaching through the Director of Personnel at the local school board office. The assignments are made by the Director of Personnel and mailed to the Coordinator of Student Teaching. The Coordinator of Student Teaching along with the College Supervisors and the Committee for Off-Campus Student Teaching review the placements and changes are made in order to provide the best possible learning situation for the individual student teacher. The student teachers are given their placement assignments one week prior to the beginning of the student teaching experience. Also during this week the cooperating teachers are invited to the campus to attend the Student Teaching Orientation Program. The purpose of the Student Teaching Orientation Program is to provide the cooperating teachers the necessary instructions and materials needed to supervise and evaluate the student teachers and to

give them the opportunity to meet with their assigned student teacher and college supervisors in order to plan together for the student teaching experience.

The proper permission was obtained to conduct this study utilizing human subjects from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia and both public school systems. All subjects, cooperating teachers, student teachers, and college supervisors were asked to participate in this study.

#### The Collection of Data

The following procedures were used to complete this study. A separate meeting was held with the public school officials, the cooperating teachers, the college supervisors, the student teachers and the appropriate officials at Hampton Institute to discuss and explain the study. Suggestions on the most effective way of distributing and administering the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire was discussed. The following plan was proposed by the investigator:

1. That the initial materials necessary for the supervision and evaluation of student teachers, which include the Student Teacher Evaluation Form, be given to the cooperating teachers at the Student Teacher Orientation Program.
2. That the materials necessary for the completion of the study be mailed to the cooperating teachers following the first week of the student teaching experience. These materials will include:

- a. A cover letter explaining the proposed study;
  - b. An informal consent form;
  - c. Instructions for completing the Student Teacher Evaluation Form;
  - d. The descriptions of the competencies to be measured;
  - e. A self-addressed stamped envelope;
3. That the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire be administered to the student teachers in a controlled setting at Hampton Institute on a scheduled date and time.
  4. That the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire be administered to the cooperating teachers in a controlled setting at Hampton Institute on a scheduled date and time.
  5. That the Student Teacher Evaluation Form be completed by the student teachers at the end of the student teaching experience in a controlled setting at Hampton Institute at a designated date and time.
  6. That the materials necessary for the supervision and evaluation of the student teachers be given the college supervisors at the Student Teacher Orientation Program.
  7. That the same materials, listed in step 2, (a) through (e) for the cooperating teachers be mailed to the college supervisors.
  8. Additional information on the student teachers will be available to the investigator through the Office of Student Teaching.

Following the approval of the above proposed procedures the Student Teacher Evaluation Forms with other initial materials were given, in prepackaged form, to those cooperating teachers, student teachers and college supervisors attending the Student Teacher Orientation Program held at Hampton Institute prior to the beginning of the student teaching experience. The materials were mailed to those cooperating teachers and college supervisors not attending the Student Teacher Orientation Program. The cooperating teachers and college supervisors were asked to return the materials by December 11, 1981. The materials were returned to the Office of Student Teaching by the student teachers.

All student teachers were enrolled in Education 442-Seminar For Student Teachers. The seminar met every Thursday during the student teaching experience from four o'clock until six o'clock p.m. On the last seminar Thursday, the cooperating teachers were invited to attend. The Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire was administered to the student teachers in a controlled setting prior to the last Thursday Seminar. During the last Thursday Seminar the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire was administered to the cooperating teachers in a controlled setting at Hampton Institute. Those cooperating teachers not attending the Seminar were mailed the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire along with the instructions for completion and a self-addressed stamped envelope. They were asked to return the materials by December 18, 1981. After December 18, 1981, a follow-up telephone call was made to the cooperating teachers whose completed questionnaires were still outstanding. These



cooperating teachers were encouraged to complete their questionnaires and told that they would be picked-up by the investigator on December 22, 1981.

The Student Teacher Evaluation Forms were completed by the cooperating teachers and the college supervisors at the end of the student teaching experience and returned to the Office of Student Teaching along with the other initial materials.

The final evaluations used as a measure of success in student teaching was available to the researcher on the basis of her position at Hampton Institute. All cooperating teachers and college supervisors used the same evaluation form that is normally utilized by Hampton Institute for the evaluation of its student teachers.

#### Processing the Data

The Student Teacher Evaluation Forms (see Appendix C), were evaluated individually. This produced twenty-five variables for each of the student teachers.

The 16 scales of the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire for the student teachers and the cooperating teachers were hand scored by the investigator.

The computer services at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia and Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia were utilized to analyze and compare the data gathered by the instruments. Data for the appropriate hypotheses were punched on computer cards and

processed by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Computer Center.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

### Statistical Methods and Procedures

The purpose of this study was to examine selected personality factors and selected dependent variables of student teachers, their cooperating teachers, and their college supervisors to determine if congruence of these factors could have significant influence on success in student teaching experiences. The collection of data provided the following data:

1. Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Scores for the participating cooperating teachers;
2. Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Scores for the participating student teachers;
3. Overall (cumulative) evaluation scores for the student teachers given by their cooperating teachers;
4. Overall (cumulative) evaluation scores for the student teachers given by their college supervisors.

The statistical methods employed in the treatment of the data were designed to:

1. determine if there were significant differences between males predicted to succeed in student teaching and males predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping at the .01 level of significance.

2. determine if there were significant differences between females predicted to succeed in student teaching and females predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping at the .01 level of significance.

3. determine if there were significant differences in the college supervisors' and the cooperating teachers' ratings of those predicted to succeed and those predicted not to succeed at the .01 level of significance.

The first statistical procedure involved the Analysis of Variance, the subprogram from the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, (1975), to determine if significant differences existed between the means of the groups predicted to succeed and the groups predicted not to succeed. The .01 level of significance was chosen to identify the scales that significantly differentiated the groups.

The second and final statistical procedure was in conjunction with the first. The subprogram Analysis of Variance was employed to determine if there were significant differences in the college supervisors' and the cooperating teachers' ratings of the matched group of student teachers as compared to the unmatched group of student teachers. The college supervisors' ratings were utilized as independent measures. The mean score served as the basis for the comparison. The .01 level of significance was used to determine if the groups were statistically significantly different.

## INSTRUMENT EMPLOYED

To test the hypotheses under investigation, two instruments were selected. These instruments were: The Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (Raymond B. Cattell, 1949) and the Student Teacher Evaluation Form (Ja Arthur Jahannas, 1974).

## DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUMENTS

The Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire

The Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) was constructed by Raymond B. Cattell in 1949 (see Appendix F). It gives a measurement of sixteen functionally independent and psychologically meaningful personality factors. The personality factors measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire are not just unique to the test, but, instead, rest within the context of a general theory of personality. It is an objectively scorable test devised by basic research in psychology to give the most complete coverage of personality possible in a brief time. The test is designed for use with individuals aged sixteen and above.

The Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire can be scored by hand or by machine and various types of answer sheets are available. Ten to thirteen items are provided for each scale in Form A and Form B. The questions are arranged in a roughly cyclic order determined by a plan to give maximum convenience in scoring by stencil and to ensure variety and interest for the examinee. Cattell had characterized the Sixteen identified factors as follows: "They leave out no important aspect of the total personality; they are relatively

independent of each other; and they are all known to be important in the sense of having a wide influence on behavior" (1964).

The consistencies of the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire scales, that is, the agreement of the factor score within itself under some change of conditions, are given in all relevant ways. The first type of consistency to consider is reliability or the agreement of the factor score time. Reliability is further sub-divided into (a) dependability, i.e., short-term test retest correlations, and (b) stability, i.e., re-test after a long interval.

The validity of the test is concept (or construct) validity. The test questions are chosen as being good measures of personality factors, as these factors are represented in research analysis, Cattell (1964) has reported reliability and validity evidence for the sixteen factors measured by the instrument primarily in terms of factor loadings. However, factor/scale independence has been questioned by some research studies.

McClain (1968) in studying teacher personality found the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire to be characterized by its design as a comprehensive measure producing multiple dimensions of personality, and its scales not purely evaluative (i.e., psychologically "good" or "bad").

#### Rationale For Instrument Selection

There are large numbers of various personality tests on the market today. Many are widely used, while others are restricted to research. Several of the available instruments have been discussed and placed in

the Appendix of this study. Among these instruments are: The California Test of Personality, the Edwards Personality Inventory, the Eysenck Personality Inventory, the Omnibus Personality Inventory and the Guilford Personality Inventory.

The above listed personality inventories are clinically based inventories which aim at the alteration of behavior and were not selected for this particular study because the study is not concerned with the alteration of behavior.

The researcher selected Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire because it has as its focus of convenience the prediction of behavior. Also Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire can claim some generality beyond the measurement of questionnaires alone. The Sixteen Factors are recoverable from other kinds of data, notably observation of social behavior and description of pathological behavior. It also enables the researcher to determine the actual behavioral differences between people high and low on each of the factors. It demonstrates empirical evidence that an adequate peripheral theory of personality must be recognized in its concrete peripheral characteristics content concerning a number of areas of human functioning. One such area is concerned with culturally patterned values and beliefs regarding social roles and institutions. There are two content themes in this area: (1) the degree to which the person does or does not possess a set of values bearing on the regulation of personal, perhaps selfish goals and impulses (this is the matter of conscience); (2) the strength of commitment to the existing social

system, reflected in degree of tolerance for criticism of people acting in social roles, and of social institutions themselves.

Further, the Cattell's Sixteen Factor Personality Questionnaire was selected for this study based on the following:

1. It gives a measurement of sixteen functionally independent and psychologically meaningful personality factors.
2. It is an objectively scorable test that can be scored by hand or by machine.
3. It is not time consuming and it provides for interesting reading.
4. The questions are arranged in a roughly cyclic order determined by a plan to give maximum convenience in scoring by stencil and to ensure variety and interest for the examinee.
5. It has been proven to be a reliable test.
6. The validity of the test is concept (or construct). The test questions are chosen as being good measures of personality factors.
7. Its recommendation by Dr. Jimmie C. Fortune, Professor of Educational Research at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and by Dr. Norman Dohl, Professor of Education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, both of whom are considered authorities in their respective fields.

Finally, this instrument was selected because any present research with this instrument is backed up by nearly twenty years of extensive

work both theoretical and practical, by Cattell and other researchers (See Appendix G).

#### The Student Teacher Evaluation Form

The Student Teacher Evaluation Form was designed by Dr. Ja Arthur Jahannas, Professor of Education at Hampton Institute, in 1974. The form is three pages in length and consists of five broad areas each having a number of competencies required. These broad areas include the following: (1) preparation of the unit of instruction; (2) preparation of the lesson; (3) classroom presentation; (4) professionalism; and (5) overall evaluation. The student teacher's performance in each area is rated. The numerical value of the ratings are High.....Low, 4 to 0, respectively. For the purpose of this study the numerical values will be 4=4.00=A, 3=3.00=B, 2=2.00=C, 1=1.00=D, and 0=F. A separate space is provided for a narrative evaluation to discuss any area of the student teacher's performance which deserves special attention. The space is also used to record the recommendations and assistance the cooperating teacher and the college supervisors gave the student teacher for the improvement of his/her performance during the student teaching experience.

The cooperating teachers and the college supervisors rate the student teacher's performance in the classroom utilizing the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form. The ratings for each item is total generating an overall (cumulative) grade average for the student teacher. The two grade averages are computed to obtain a final grade for the student teacher. The student teacher's final grade is based



upon the average of the cooperating teacher's grade and the college supervisor's grade. Equal weight is given for each grade i.e., cooperating teacher's grade equals 50% and the college supervisor's grade equals 50%.

Students engaged in student teaching must earn an average grade of at least 2.00 on the 4.00 scale to pass student teaching. According to the 1982-1984 Hampton Institute College Catalog the grade of "C" indicates satisfactory achievement and the grade of "D" indicates work that is below average but meets the minimum requirement of course credit (except a course in the major course sequence where "C" is required). Student teaching is one of the courses in the major sequence where "C" is required for passing. A grade of "C" for a student teacher means that the student teacher has been deficient in one or more areas listed for a "B" grade. The areas listed for a "B," (see page 4), are all necessary for success in student teaching. They are the fundamentals and are worth whatever time and effort are necessary to accomplish them. Lack of success in any of these fundamentals is cause for serious concern. Any achievement below "C" level will be cause for removal from the student teaching program.

Although the Student Teacher Evaluation Form has been utilized by the School of Education at Hampton Institute for the evaluation of its student teachers since 1974, the form had not been validated in terms of its reliability and validity. To determine the reliability and validity of the Student Teacher Evaluation Form a pilot study was conducted

utilizing the procedures suggested by Dunkin and Biddle (1974) and Thorndike and Hagen (1974) was followed (See Appendix A).

The data generated from the Student Teacher Evaluation Form and the statistical procedures employed revealed that the Student Teacher Evaluation Form is valid in terms of its reliability and validity. First, measures of the same set of ratings, across the three raters, with the same measuring instrument revealed the same or similar results. These results implied that the Student Teacher Evaluation Form is reliable in terms of stability, dependability and predictability. Second, the measures obtained from the Student Teacher Evaluation Form appeared to be "true" measures of the items measured implying accuracy. Third, the error of measurement appeared to lean toward systematic variance which revealed that the scores tend to be all positive or all negative or all high or all low across raters and ratings.

In terms of validity there was unanimous agreement among the panel of raters that the form is indeed valid, in terms of its broad areas and related specific competencies (see Appendix A).

According to Kerlinger (1973) the content validity is the representativeness or sampling adequacy of the content of the measuring instrument. The content validation was guided by the question: Is the content of the Student Teacher Evaluation Form representative of the content of the items being measured? Content validation is basically judgmental. The items of the Student Teacher Evaluation Form were studied, each item being weighed for its presumed representativeness. Based on the findings of the authorities, it can be concluded that the

Student Teacher Evaluation Form is indeed valid in terms of its content.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

As previously stated the purpose of this study was to determine if the congruence of measurable personality factors of student teachers, cooperating teachers, and college supervisors have an effect upon success in student teaching experiences. The Cattell's Sixteen Factor Questionnaire was administered to the thirty (30) student teachers and their cooperating teachers. A total of sixty (60) questionnaires were administered to the two groups. The number of useable questionnaires returned equalled 100% of the questionnaires distributed and administered. The Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor raw scores and sten (standard) scores for the thirty (30) student teachers and the thirty (30) cooperating teachers are shown in Tables 26, 27, 28, and 29 in the Appendix D. The mean score for each of the groups for each factor are shown in Tables 30 and 31 in the Appendix D.

Cattell (1979) gives a description of the Sixteen Personality Factors in terms of low scores and high scores for each of the sixteen factors. To obtain the low score and high score for each factor the raw score for each factor was converted to a sten (standard) score which is shown next to the raw score on each of the tables. The low score will show a sten (standard) score of 1 to 3 and a high score will show a sten (standard) score of 8 to 10. A description of each of the sixteen factors will follow.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTORS

Factor A - Reserved VS Warmhearted

People who score low (a score [sten (standard)] of 1 to 3) on Factor A tend to be stiff, cool, skeptical, and aloof. They like things rather than people, working alone, and avoiding compromises of viewpoints. They are likely to be precise and "rigid" in their way of doing things and in their personal standards. On the other hand people who score high (score [sten (standard)] of 8 to 10) on Factor A tend to be goodnatured, easy-going, emotionally expressive, ready to cooperate, attentive to people, softhearted, kindly, and adaptable. They like occupations dealing with people and socially impressive situations, and they readily form active groups.

An analysis of Factor A revealed that 2 male student teachers scored high and none scored low on this factor; none of the male cooperating teachers scored high and 1 scored low. The other 5 males tested did not have scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified according to Cattell's high and low scores. Two female student teachers scored high and two scored low; three female cooperating teachers scored high and 3 scored low on this factor. The other 37 females tested did not have scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified according to Cattell's high and low sten (standard) scores.

Factor B - Less Intelligent VS More Intelligent

The person scoring low on Factor B tends to be slow to learn and grasp, dull, given to concrete and literal interpretation. The person

scoring high on Factor B tends to be quick to grasp ideas, a fast learner, intelligent. There is some correlation with level of culture, and some with alertness.

Factor B showed that none of the male student teachers scored high and that 3 scored low; two of the male cooperating teachers scored high and none scored low. The other 8 males tested did not have scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified according to Cattell's high and low sten scores. Four female student teachers received high scores and 5 received low scores; ten female cooperating teachers scored high and 1 scored low. Twenty-seven females did not score sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified according to Cattell's high and low sten scores.

#### Factor C - Affected by Feelings VS Emotionally Stable

The person who scores low on Factor C tends to be low in frustration tolerance for unsatisfactory conditions, changeable and plastic, evading necessary reality demands, neurotically fatigued, fretful, easily annoyed and emotional, active in dissatisfaction, having neurotic symptoms (phobias, sleep disturbances, psychosomatic complaints, etc.). On the other hand, the person who scores high on Factor C tends to be emotionally mature, stable, realistic about life, unruffled, possessing ego strength, better able to maintain solid group morale.

Factor C revealed that 3 of the male student teachers scored high and one scored low; one of the male cooperating teachers scored high and none scored low. The other 8 males tested did not receive scores

sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores. Three female student teachers scored high and 3 scored low on this factor; seven female cooperating teachers scored high and 1 scored low. Thirty-three of the 47 females tested did not receive scores high enough or low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores.

#### Factor E - Humble VS Assertive

Individuals scoring low on Factor E tend to give way to others, to be docile, and to conform. They are often dependent, confessing, anxious for obsessional correctness. Individuals scoring high on Factor E are assertive, self-assured, and independent-minded. They tend to be austere, a law to themselves, hostile or extrapunitive, authoritarian (managing others), and disregarding of authority.

Factor E revealed that one male student teacher scored high and 1 scored low; none of the male cooperating teachers scored high and only 1 scored low. The other 10 males tested did not receive scores high enough or low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores. For the 47 females tested, 3 student teachers scored high and 3 scored low; five cooperating teachers scored low and 3 scored high. The other 33 females did not score high enough or low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores.

#### Factor F - Sober VS Happy-Go-Lucky

Low scorers on Factor F tend to be restrained, reticent, and introspective. They are sometimes dour, pessimistic, unduly deliberate,

and considered smug and primly correct by observers. They tend to be sober, dependable people. High scorers on this trait tend to be cheerful, active, talkative, frank, expressive, effervescent, and carefree. They are frequently chosen as elected leaders.

Factor F revealed that one male student teacher scored high and 2 scored low; one male cooperating teacher scored high and 2 scored low. The other 7 males tested did not score high enough or low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores. One female student teacher scored high on this factor and 7 scored low; none of the female cooperating teachers scored low and only 1 scored high. The other 37 females tested did not score high enough or low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores.

#### Factor G - Expedient VS Conscientious

People who score low on Factor G tend to be unsteady in purpose. They are often casual and lacking in effort for group undertakings and cultural demands. People who score high on Factor G tend to be exacting in character, dominated by sense of duty, preserving, responsible, planful, "fill the unforgiving minute". They are usually conscientious and moralistic, and they prefer hard-working people to witty companions.

Factor G revealed that 5 male student teachers scored high and none scored low; two male cooperating teachers scored high on this factor and none scored low. The other 6 males tested did not receive scores high enough or low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores. Ten female student teachers scored high and none scored low; seven female cooperating teachers scored high and 1 scored low on this



factor. The other 29 females tested did not score sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores.

Factor H - Shy VS Venturesome

Individuals who score low on this trait tend to be shy, withdrawing, cautious, retiring, "wallflowers". They usually have inferiority feelings and tend to be slow and impeded in speech and in expressing themselves. Individuals who score high on Factor H are sociable, bold, ready to try new things, spontaneous, and abundant in emotional response. Their "thick-skinnedness" enables them to face wear and tear in dealing with people and grueling emotional situations, without fatigue.

Factor H revealed that none of the male student teachers scored high and none scored low; one male cooperating teacher scored high on this factor and 1 scored low. The other 11 males tested did not receive scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores. Four female student teachers scored high on this factor and 3 scored low; four female cooperating teachers scored high and none scored low. The other 36 females tested did not receive scores high enough or low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores.

Factor I - Tough-Minded VS Tender-Minded

People who score low on Factor I tend to be tough, realistic, "down-to-earth", independent, responsible, but skeptical of subjective,

cultural elaborations. They tend to keep a group operating on a practical and realistic "no-nonsense" basis. People who score high on Factor I tend to be emotionally sensitive, day-dreaming, artistically fastidious, and fanciful. They are sometimes demanding of attention and help, impatient, dependent, temperamental, and not very realistic. They dislike crude people and rough occupations.

Factor I revealed that 2 male student teachers scored high and none scored low; two male cooperating teachers scored high and none scored low, the other 9 males tested did not receive scores high enough or low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores. Four female student teachers scored high on this factor and 4 scored low; six female cooperating teachers scored high and 3 scored low. The other 37 females tested did not receive scores high enough or low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores.

#### Factor L - Trusting VS Suspicious

The person who scores low on Factor L tends to be free of jealous tendencies, adaptable, cheerful, uncompetitive, concerned about others, a good team worker. They are open and tolerant and usually willing to take a chance with people. People who score high on Factor L tend to be mistrusting and doubtful. They are often involved in their own egos and are self-opinionated and interested in internal, mental life.

Factor L revealed that 3 male student teachers scored low and none scored high; one male cooperating teacher scored low and none scored high. The other nine males tested did not receive scores high enough or low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores. Four

female student teachers scored high and 5 scored low on this factor; six female cooperating teachers scored high and 3 scored low on this factor. The other 29 females tested did not receive scores high enough or low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores.

#### Factor M - Practical VS Imaginative

Low scorers on Factor M tend to be anxious to do the right things, attentive to practical matters, and subject to the dictation of what is obviously possible. They are concerned over detail, able to keep their heads in emergencies, but are sometimes unimaginative. High scorers on Factor M tend to be unconventional, unconcerned over everyday matters, self-motivated, imaginatively creative, concerned with "essentials", often absorbed in thought, and oblivious of particular people and physical realities.

Factor M revealed that four male student teachers scored low on this factor and none scored high; one male cooperating teacher scored high and one scored low on this factor. The other 10 males tested did not receive scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores. Two female student teachers scored high and 10 scored low on this factor; three female cooperating teachers scored high and 6 scored low. The other 26 females tested did not receive scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores.

Factor N - Forthright VS Shrewd

Individuals who score low on Factor N have a lot of natural warmth and a genuine liking for people, are uncomplicated and sentimental, and are unvarnished in their approach to people. Individuals who score high on Factor N tend to be polished, experienced, and shrewd. Their approach to people and problems is usually perceptive, hardheaded, and efficient, and unsentimental approach to situations, an approach akin to cynicism.

On this factor 4 male student teachers scored high and 1 scored low; three male cooperating teachers scored high and 1 scored low. The other 4 males tested did not receive scores high enough or low enough to be classified by Cattell's low and high sten scores. Ten female student teachers scored high and 3 scored low on this factor; four female cooperating teachers scored high and 2 scored low. The other 28 females tested did not receive scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores.

Factor O - Placid VS Apprehensive

Persons with low scores on Factor O tend to be unruffled, with unshakable nerve. They have a mature, unanxious confidence in themselves and their capacity to deal with things. They are resilient and secure, but to the point of being insensitive of when a group is not going along with them, so they may evoke antipathies and distrust. Persons with high scores on Factor O have a strong sense of obligation and high expectations of themselves. They tend to worry and feel

anxious and guilt-stricken over difficulties. Often they do not feel accepted in groups or free to participate.

Factor 0 revealed that 1 male student teacher scored low on this factor and 1 scored high; two male cooperating teachers scored low and none scored high. The other nine males tested did not have scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's sten scores. Two female student teachers scored high and 5 scored low; three female cooperating teachers scored high and 8 scored low. The other 29 females tested did not have scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores.

#### Factor Q<sub>1</sub> - Conservative VS Experimenting

Low scorers on Factor Q<sub>1</sub> are confident in what they have been taught to believe, and accept the "tried and true", despite inconsistencies, when something else might be better. They are cautious and compromising in regard to new ideas. High scorers on Factor Q<sub>1</sub> tend to be interested in intellectual matters and to have doubts on fundamental issues. They are skeptical and inquiring regarding ideas, either old or new. Usually they are more well informed, less inclined to moralize, more inclined to experiment in life generally, and more tolerant of inconvenience and change.

Factor Q<sub>1</sub> revealed that 2 male student teachers scored low and none scored high; two male cooperating teachers scored low and none scored high. The other nine males tested did not have scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and

low sten scores. Four female student teachers scored high and 2 scored low; three female cooperating teachers scored low and 7 scored high. The other 31 females tested did not receive scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores.

#### Factor Q<sub>2</sub> - Group-Dependent VS Self-Sufficient

Individuals who score low on Factor Q<sub>2</sub> prefer to work and make decisions with other people and like and depend on social approval and admiration. They tend to go along with the group and may be lacking in individual resolution. Individuals who score high on Factor Q<sub>2</sub> are temperamentally independent, accustomed to going their own way, making decisions and taking action on their own. They do not dislike people, but simply do not need their agreement or support.

Factor Q<sub>2</sub> revealed that 2 male student teachers scored low and 1 scored high; two male cooperating teachers scored high and none scored low. The other 9 males tested did not have scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores. On this factor 1 female student teacher scored low and 3 scored high; three female cooperating teachers scored low and 5 scored high. The other 35 females tested did not have scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores.

#### Factor Q<sub>3</sub> - Undisciplined Self-Conflict VS Controlled

People who score low on Factor Q<sub>3</sub> will not be bothered with will control and have little regard for social demands. They are impetuous

and not overly considerate, careful, or painstaking. People who score high on Factor Q<sub>3</sub> tend to have strong control of their emotions and general behavior, are inclined to be socially aware and careful, and evidence what is commonly termed "self-respect" and high regard for social reputation.

Factor Q<sub>3</sub> revealed that 5 male student teachers scored high and 1 scored low; one male cooperating teacher scored high and none scored low. The other 6 males tested did not have scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten scores. Sixteen female student teachers scored high and 1 scored low; ten female cooperating teachers scored high and none scored low. The other 20 females tested did not have scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten (standard) scores.

#### Factor Q<sub>4</sub> - Relaxed VS Tense

Individuals who score low on Factor Q<sub>4</sub> tend to be sedate, relaxed, composed, and satisfied (not frustrated). In some situations, their oversatisfaction can lead to laziness and low performance, in the same sense that low motivation produces little trait and error. Individuals who score high on Factor Q<sub>4</sub> tend to be tense, restless, fretful, impatient, and hard driving. They are often fatigued, but unable to remain inactive. In groups they take a poor view of the degree of unity, orderliness, and leadership.

Factor Q<sub>4</sub> revealed that one male student teacher scored high and 2 scored low; one male cooperating teacher scored high and 1 scored low.

The other males tested did not have scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten (standard) scores. Two female student teachers scored high and 3 scored low on this factor; one female cooperating teacher scored low and 4 scored high. The other 37 females tested did not have scores sufficiently high enough or sufficiently low enough to be classified by Cattell's high and low sten (standard) scores.

Frequency tabulations for the percentage of scores falling within high - low, and mid-ranges, for each factor of Cattell's 16PF Questionnaire, for the male and female student teachers and for the male and female cooperating teachers reveal most scores falling within the mid-range (See Table 1).

The majority of male student teachers' scores fell within the mid-range on 11 of the factors. The majority of their scores fell within the high range on three factors, i.e. Factor G (Expedient VS Conscientious), Factor Q<sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-Conflict VS Controlled), and Factor N (Forthright VS Shrewd). The majority of male student teachers fell within the low range on one factor, i.e. Factor M (Practical VS Imaginative).

The majority of female student teachers' scores fell within the mid-range on 14 of the factors. The majority of their scores fell within the high range on one factor, i.e. Factor Q<sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-Conflict VS Controlled).

The majority of male cooperating teachers' scores fell within the mid-range on 15 factors. The majority of their scores fell within the high range on 1 factor, i.e. Factor N (Forthright VS Shrewd).



TABLE 1  
 PERCENTAGES OF STEN SCORES IN HIGH (8-10), LOW (1 TO 3)  
 AND MID (4 TO 7) RANGES ON CATTELL'S 16 PF  
 QUESTIONNAIRE BY STUDENT TEACHERS  
 AND COOPERATING TEACHERS

	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers	
	Male (7)	Female (23)	Male (6)	Female (24)
Factor A				
High	28.6	8.7	0.0	12.5
Low	0.0	8.7	16.7	12.5
Mid	71.4	82.6	83.3	75.0
Factor B				
High	0.0	17.4	33.3	41.7
Low	42.9	21.7	0.0	4.2
Mid	57.1	60.9	66.7	54.2
Factor C				
High	42.9	13.0	16.7	29.2
Low	14.3	13.0	0.0	4.2
Mid	42.9	74.0	83.3	66.7
Factor E				
High	14.3	13.0	0.0	12.5
Low	14.3	13.0	16.7	20.3
Mid	71.4	74.0	83.3	66.7
Factor F				
High	14.3	4.3	16.7	4.2
Low	28.6	30.4	33.3	0.0
Mid	57.1	65.2	50.0	95.8
Factor G				
High	71.4	43.5	33.3	29.2
Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7
Mid	28.6	56.5	66.7	66.7
Factor H				
High	0.0	17.4	16.7	16.7
Low	0.0	13.0	16.7	24.0
Mid	100.0	69.6	66.7	83.3
Factor I				
High	28.6	17.4	33.3	25.0
Low	0.0	17.4	0.0	12.5
Mid	71.4	65.2	66.7	62.5

Table 1 (Continued)

	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers	
	Male (7)	Female (23)	Male (6)	Female (24)
Factor L				
High	0.0	17.4	0.0	16.7
Low	42.9	21.7	16.7	25.0
Mid	57.1	60.9	83.3	58.3
Factor M				
High	0.0	8.7	16.7	12.5
Low	57.1	43.5	16.7	25.0
Mid	42.9	47.8	66.7	62.5
Factor N				
High	57.1	43.5	50.0	16.7
Low	14.3	13.0	16.7	8.3
Mid	28.6	43.5	33.3	75.0
Factor O				
High	14.3	8.7	16.7	12.5
Low	14.3	21.7	16.7	33.3
Mid	71.4	69.6	66.7	54.2
Factor Q <sub>1</sub>				
High	0.0	17.4	0.0	12.5
Low	28.6	8.7	33.3	29.2
Mid	71.4	73.9	66.7	58.3
Factor Q <sub>2</sub>				
High	14.3	13.0	33.3	20.8
Low	28.6	4.3	0.0	12.5
Mid	57.1	82.6	66.7	66.7
Factor Q <sub>3</sub>				
High	71.4	69.6	16.7	41.7
Low	14.3	4.3	0.0	0.0
Mid	14.3	26.1	83.3	58.3
Factor Q <sub>4</sub>				
High	14.3	8.7	16.7	4.2
Low	28.6	13.0	16.7	16.7
Mid	57.1	78.3	66.7	79.2

The majority of female cooperating teachers' scores fell within the mid-range on all of the 16 factors.

#### ANALYSIS OF DATA

The analysis of the data of the present investigation are presented by the three null hypotheses. The statistical analysis for each hypothesis is given with appropriate comparisons and remarks as a final part of each presentation.

#### HYPOTHESIS 1

1. There will be no statistically significant difference between males predicted to succeed in student teaching and males predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping at the .01 level of significance.

The first area of investigation was directed toward the differences between males predicted to succeed in student teaching and males predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping. The predicted to succeed/predicted not to succeed subgroups were matched the following ways: (1) McClain's Teaching Success Specification Equation for Males ( $.15A + .25B + .15C + .45G + .40H + .40(11-L) + .20(11-N) + .25Q_1 + .30(11-Q_4)$ ); and (2) the Cooperating Teacher's Ratings utilizing the Hampton Institute Student teacher Evaluation Form.

The statistical results are presented according to the separate criterion variables from the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form: (1) Preparation of Unit Instruction; (2) Preparation

of Lesson; (3) Classroom Presentation; (4) Professionalism; and (5) Cumulative Evaluation.

Ratings on the Preparation of Unit Instruction (UNIT)

Two groups were created for males - one, predicted to be successful and the second group, predicted not to be successful. The cooperating teacher rated the male student teachers on their ability to organize and present a unit of instruction by: (1) stating general objectives clearly; (2) describing expected learner behaviors as outcomes of instruction; (3) demonstrating consistency of specific objectives with general objectives; (4) arranging the unit of instruction in a logical learning sequence; and (5) determining resources necessary for unit instruction, e.g. instructional aids, resource persons, space, etc. The ratings for these two groups appear in Table 2. An analysis of variance reported in Table 3 shows that no significant difference was observed between the two groups on this rating.

Ratings on Preparation of the Lesson (LES)

Two groups were created for males, one group predicted to be successful and one group predicted not to be successful. Their cooperating teachers rated them on their ability to design sound lesson plans and to acquire and arrange instructional aids appropriate to lesson presentation. The ratings of these groups appear in Table 4. An analysis of variance reported in Table 5 shows that no significant difference was observed between the two groups on this rating.

TABLE 2  
THE COOPERATING TEACHER'S RATING ON THE  
PREPARATION OF THE UNIT FOR MALE  
STUDENT TEACHERS - MEANS AND  
STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Group	Group Size	Mean	Standard Deviation
McClain's Predicted to Succeed	4	21.00	3.56
McClain's Predicted not to Succeed	3	18.67	6.11

TABLE 3  
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE PREPARATION OF THE UNIT  
 RATINGS ACROSS GROUPS CREATED BY McCLAIN'S  
 PREDICTION OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING

Source	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	9.33	1	9.33	0.41*
Within Groups	112.67	5	22.53	
Total	122.00			

\*Not significant at  $p < .01$

TABLE 4  
THE COOPERATING TEACHER'S RATING ON THE  
PREPARATION OF THE LESSON FOR MALE  
STUDENT TEACHERS - MEANS AND  
STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Group	Group Size	Mean	Standard Deviation
McClain's Predicted to Succeed	4	7.75	0.50
McClain's Predicted not to Succeed	3	6.66	1.52

TABLE 5  
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE PREPARATION OF THE LESSON  
 RATINGS ACROSS GROUPS CREATED BY McCLAIN'S  
 PREDICTION OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING

Source	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	2.01	1	2.01	1.85*
Within Groups	5.47	5	1.08	
Total	7.48			

\*Not significant at  $p < .01$



Ratings on Classroom Presentation (PRES)

Two groups were created for males, one group predicted to be successful and one group predicted not to be successful. Their cooperating teachers rated them on their ability to: (1) set the stage for learning; (2) professional emage as presented in the classroom-classroom presence and poise; (3) give clear and explicit directions and instructions; (4) establish and maintain effective interaction with pupils e.g. encourages student expression and participation, handles responses in a positive manner, and demonstrates sensitivity to student needs; (5) provide assistance to student understanding; (7) speak clearly and project voice appropriately for instructional modes; (8) use questioning techniques to advantage of learning and instruction; (9) provide for evaluative feedback to enhance learning and instruction; and (10) implement effective lesson closure successfully. The ratings for these two groups appear in Table 6. An analysis of variance reported in Table 7 shows that no significant difference was observed between the two groups.

Ratings for Professionalism (PRO)

Two groups were created for males, one predicted to be successful and a second group predicted not to be successful. The cooperating teachers rated the males on how well they demonstrated (1) dependability and competency in performing teaching related task; (2) being punctual for their teaching assignments; and (3) establishing rapport with school personnel. The ratings for these two groups appear in Table 8. An

TABLE 6

THE COOPERATING TEACHER'S RATING ON THE CLASSROOM  
PRESENTATION FOR MALE STUDENT TEACHERS  
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Group	Group Size	Mean	Standard Deviation
McClain's Predicted to Succeed	4	44.00	7.39
McClain's Predicted not to Succeed	3	44.66	6.42

TABLE 7  
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE CLASSROOM PRESENTATION  
 RATINGS ACROSS GROUPS CREATED BY McCLAIN'S  
 PREDICTION OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING

Source	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	0.76	1	0.76	0.91*
Within Groups	246.66	5	49.33	
Total	247.42			

\*Not significant at  $p < .01$

TABLE 8  
THE COOPERATING TEACHER'S RATING ON PROFESSIONALISM  
FOR MALE STUDENT TEACHERS - MEANS AND  
STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Group	Group Size	Mean	Standard Deviation
McClain's Predicted to Succeed	4	7.25	0.95
McClain's Predicted not to Succeed	3	6.66	1.15

TABLE 9  
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PROFESSIONALISM RATINGS  
 ACROSS GROUPS CREATED BY McCLAIN'S PREDICTION  
 OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING

Source	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	0.58	1	0.58	0.53*
Within Groups	5.41	5	1.08	
Total	5.99			

\*Not significant at  $p < .01$

analysis of variance reported in Table 9 shows that no significant difference was observed between the two groups on this rating.

Rating of Cumulative Evaluation (I-25)

Two groups were created for males, one predicted to be successful and a second group predicted not to be successful. The cooperating teacher rated them on their overall performance across the preparation of the unit; the preparation of the lesson; the classroom presentation and professionalism. The ratings for these two groups appear in Table 10. An analysis of variance reported in Table 11 shows that no significant difference was observed between the two groups on this rating.

HYPOTHESIS 2

2. There will be no statistically significant difference between females predicted to succeed in student teaching and females predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping at the .01 level of significance.

The second area of investigation was directed toward the difference between females predicted to succeed in student teaching and females predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping. The predicted to succeed/predicted not to be successful subgroups were matched the following ways: (1) McClain's Teaching Success Specification Equation for Females ( $.20A + .30B + .40E + .30F + .30H + .15M + .20(11-Q_3)$ ); and (2) the Cooperating Teacher's Rating utilizing the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form.

TABLE 10  
THE COOPERATING TEACHER'S RATING ON THE OVERALL  
EVALUATION FOR MALE STUDENT TEACHERS  
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Group	Group Size	Mean	Standard Deviation
McClain's Predicted to Succeed	4	3.50	0.57
McClain's Predicted not to Succeed	3	3.33	0.57

TABLE 11  
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE OVERALL EVALUATION ACROSS  
 GROUPS CREATED BY McCLAIN'S PREDICTION  
 OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING

Source	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	0.04	1	0.04	0.14*
Within Groups	1.66	5	0.33	
Total	1.70			

\*Not significant at  $p < .01$



The statistical results are presented by the separate criterion variables: (1) Preparation of Unit Instruction; (2) Preparation of Lesson; (3) Classroom Presentation; (4) Professionalism; and (5) Cumulative Evaluation.

#### Preparation of Unit Instruction (UNIT)

Two groups for females were created, one predicted to be successful and a second group predicted not to be successful. The cooperating teachers rated them on their ability to organize and present a unit of instruction by: (1) stating general objectives clearly; (2) describing expected learner behaviors as outcomes of instruction; (3) demonstrating consistency of specific objectives with general objectives; (4) arranging the unit of instruction in a logical learning sequence; and (5) determining resources necessary for the unit instruction, e.g. instructional aids, resource persons, space, etc. The ratings for these groups appear in Table 12. An Analysis of Variance reported on Table 13 shows that no significant difference was observed between the two groups on this rating.

#### Preparation of the Lesson (LES)

Two groups were created for females, one predicted to be successful and a second group predicted not to be successful. The cooperating teachers rated them on their ability to: (1) design sound lesson plans; and (2) acquire and arrange instructional aids appropriate to lesson presentation. The ratings for these two groups appear in Table 14. An Analysis of Variance reported in Table 15 shows that no significant difference was observed between the two groups on this rating.

TABLE 12

THE COOPERATING TEACHER'S RATING ON THE PREPARATION  
OF THE UNIT FOR FEMALE STUDENT TEACHERS -  
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Group	Group Size	Mean	Standard Deviation
McClain's Predicted to Succeed	16	19.75	3.78
McClain's Predicted not to Succeed	7	19.42	3.82

TABLE 13

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE PREPARATION OF THE UNIT RATINGS  
ACROSS GROUPS CREATED BY McCLAIN'S PREDICTION  
OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING - FEMALE

Source	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	0.50	1	0.50	0.03*
Within Groups	302.71	21	14.41	
Total	303.21			

\*Not significant at  $p < .01$

TABLE 14  
THE COOPERATING TEACHER'S RATING ON THE PREPARATION  
OF THE LESSON FOR FEMALE STUDENT TEACHERS  
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Group	Group Size	Mean	Standard Deviation
McClain's Predicted to Succeed	16	6.43	1.41
McClain's Predicted not to Succeed	7	6.71	1.11

TABLE 15  
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE PREPARATION OF THE  
 LESSON ACROSS GROUPS CREATED BY McCLAIN'S  
 PREDICTIONS OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING  
 FEMALE

Source	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	0.37	1	0.37	0.21*
Within Groups	37.36	21	1.77	
Total	37.73			

\*Not significant at  $p < .01$

Classroom Presentation (PRES)

Two groups were created for females, one predicted to be successful and a second group predicted not to be successful. The cooperating teacher rated them on their ability to: (1) set the stage for learning; (2) present a professional image (classroom presence and poise); (3) give clear and explicit directions and instructions; (4) establish and maintain effective interaction with pupils by (a) encouraging student expression and participation, (b) handling student responses in a positive manner; and (c) demonstrating sensitivity to student needs; (5) provide assistance to student as needed; (6) use language at appropriate level for student understanding; (7) speak clearly and project voice appropriately for instructional modes; (8) use questioning techniques to advantage of learning and instruction; (9) provide for evaluative feedback to enhance learning and instruction; and (10) demonstrate effective lesson closure successfully. The ratings for these two groups appear in Table 16. An Analysis of Variance reported in Table 17 shows that no significant difference was observed between the two groups on this rating.

Professionalism (PRO)

Two groups were created, one group predicted to be successful and a second group predicted not to be successful. The cooperating teacher rated the two groups on their ability to demonstrate (1) dependability and competency in performing teaching related tasks; (2) punctuality for teaching assignments; and (3) establishing rapport with school personnel. The ratings for the two groups appear in Table 18. An

TABLE 16  
THE COOPERATING TEACHER'S RATING ON CLASSROOM  
PRESENTATION FOR FEMALE STUDENT TEACHERS  
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Group	Group Size	Mean	Standard Deviation
McClain's Predicted to Succeed	16	44.50	6.71
McClain's Predicted not to Succeed	7	41.57	6.24

TABLE 17  
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF CLASSROOM PRESENTATION  
 RATINGS ACROSS GROUPS CREATED BY McCLAIN'S  
 PREDICTION OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING -  
 FEMALE

Source	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	41.76	1	41.76	0.96*
Within Groups	909.71	21	43.32	
Total	911.47			

\*Not significant at  $p < .01$



TABLE 18  
THE COOPERATING TEACHER'S RATING ON PROFESSIONALISM  
FOR FEMALE STUDENT TEACHERS - MEANS  
AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Group	Group Size	Mean	Standard Deviation
McClain's Predicted to Succeed	16	6.93	1.12
McClain's Predicted not to Succeed	7	6.42	1.51

Analysis of Variance reported in Table 19 shows that no significant difference was observed between the two groups on this rating.

#### Cumulative Evaluation (I-25)

Two groups were created, one group predicted to be successful and a second group predicted not to be successful. The cooperating teacher rated them on their overall performance across the following areas: (1) the preparation of the unit of instruction; (2) the preparation of the lesson; (3) the classroom presentation; and (4) professionalism. The ratings for these two groups appear in Table 20. An Analysis of Variance reported in Table 21 shows that no significant difference was observed between the two groups on this rating.

#### HYPOTHESIS 3

3. There will be no statistically significant difference between the college supervisors' and the cooperating teachers' ratings of those predicted to succeed and those predicted not to succeed at the .01 level of significance.

The third area of investigation was directed toward the difference between the college supervisor' and the cooperating teachers' ratings of those predicted to be successful and those predicted not to be successful at the .01 level of significance. The hypothesis of the matching of supervisory ratings of the student teachers was not testable since 29 of the 30 pairs matched.

To examine the relationship between the cooperating teachers' ratings of the student teachers and the college supervisors' ratings of

TABLE 19  
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE PROFESSIONALISM RATINGS  
 ACROSS GROUPS CREATED BY McCLAIN'S PREDICTIONS  
 OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING - FEMALE

Source	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	1.26	1	1.26	0.81*
Within Groups	32.65	21	1.55	
Total	33.91			

\*Not significant at  $p < .01$

TABLE 20  
THE COOPERATING TEACHER'S RATING ON THE OVERALL  
EVALUATION FOR FEMALE STUDENT TEACHERS  
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Group	Group Size	Mean	Standard Deviation
McClain's Predicted to Succeed	16	3.43	0.72
McClain's Predicted not to Succeed	7	3.42	0.78

TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE OVERALL EVALUATION  
 RATINGS ACROSS GROUPS CREATED BY McCLAIN'S  
 PREDICTION OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING -  
 FEMALE

Source	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	0.00	1	0.00	0.001*
Within Groups	11.65	21	0.55	
Total	11.65			

\*Not significant at  $p < .01$

the student teachers, the cooperating teachers ratings on the Student Teacher Evaluation Form were correlated with the college supervisors' ratings using a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. This procedure provided a validation check for the ratings. These correlation coefficients are presented in Table 22. All of the five correlations were found to be significant at the  $p < .01$  level of significance.

The cooperating teachers' ratings for the Preparation of Unit Instruction (UNIT) area correlated significantly with the college supervisors' ratings ( $r=.53$ ).

The cooperating teachers' ratings for the Preparation of the Lesson (LES) area correlated significantly with the college supervisors' ratings ( $r=.61$ ).

The cooperating teachers' ratings for the Classroom Presentation (PRES) area correlated significantly with the college supervisors' ratings ( $r=.56$ ).

The cooperating teachers' ratings for the Professionalism (PRO) area correlated significantly with the college supervisors' ratings ( $r=.61$ ).

The cooperating teachers' ratings for the Overall (Cumulative) Evaluation (I25) correlated significantly with the college supervisors' ratings ( $r=.54$ ).

Although these correlations are significant ( $p < .01$ ) there is still enough absence of correlation to say that the ratings are not the same. Hence, cooperating teachers and college supervisors are looking at beginning teaching in a different way.

TABLE 22  
 CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS' RATINGS  
 AND COLLEGE SUPERVISORS' RATINGS FOR EACH AREA AND  
 CUMULATIVE SCORE ON THE HAMPTON INSTITUTE  
 STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

Variable	Cases	r	p
UNIT	30	0.53	0.001
LES	30	0.61	0.000
PRES	30	0.56	0.001
PRO	30	0.61	0.000
I25	30	0.54	0.001

## SUMMARY OF DATA

## 1. For the Cattell's 16PF Questionnaire:

On Factor A (Reserved VS Warmhearted) 2 of 7 male student teachers received high scores and none received low scores; none of the 6 male cooperating teachers received high scores and 1 received low scores; two of the 23 female student teachers received high scores and two received low scores; and, three of the 24 female cooperating teachers received high scores and 3 received low scores.

On Factor B (Less Intelligent VS More Intelligent) none of the male student teachers received high scores and three received low scores; two of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and none received low scores; four of the female student teachers received high scores and 5 received low scores; and ten female cooperating teachers received high scores and 1 received a low score.

On Factor C (Affected by Feelings VS Emotionally Stable) 3 of the male student teachers received high scores and 1 received low scores; one of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and none received low scores; three of the female student teachers received high scores and 3 received low scores; and 7 of the female cooperating teachers received high scores and 1 received low scores.

On Factor E (Humble VS Assertive) one male student teacher received high scores and 1 received low scores; none of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and 1 received low scores; three female student teachers received high scores and 3 received low scores; and three of the female cooperating teachers received high scores and 5 received low scores.



On Factor F (Sober VS Happy-Go-Lucky) one of the male student teachers received high scores and 2 received low scores; one of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and 2 received low scores; one of the female student teachers received high scores and 7 received low scores; and one female cooperating teacher received high scores and none received low scores.

On Factor G (Expedient VS Conscientious) five male student teachers received high scores and none received low scores; two of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and none received low scores; ten of the female student teachers received high scores and none received low scores; and, seven of the female cooperating teachers received high scores and 1 received low scores.

On Factor H (Shy VS Venturesome) none of the male student teachers received high scores and none received low scores; one of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and 1 received low scores; four female student teachers received high scores and 3 received low scores; and, four of the female cooperating teachers received high scores and none received low scores.

On Factor I (Tough-Minded VS Tender-Minded) two of the male student teachers received high scores and none received low scores; two of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and none received low scores; four female student teachers received high scores and 4 received low scores; and, six female cooperating teachers received high scores and three received low scores.

On Factor L (Trusting VS Suspicious) none of the male student teachers received high scores and 3 received low scores; none of the

male cooperating teachers received high scores; one received low scores; four female student teachers received high scores and 5 received low scores; and, four of the female cooperating teachers received high scores and 6 received low scores.

On Factor M (Practical VS Imaginative) none of the male student teachers received high scores and four received low scores; one of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and one received low scores; two of the female student teachers received high scores and 10 received low scores; and, three of the female cooperating teachers received high scores and 6 received low scores.

On Factor N (Forthright VS Shrewd) four of the male student teachers received high scores and one received low scores; three of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and one received low scores; ten of the female student teachers received high scores and 3 received low scores; and, four of the female cooperating teachers received high scores and 2 received low scores.

On Factor O (Placid VS Apprehensive) one of the male student teachers received high scores and one received low scores; one of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and one received low scores; two of the female student teachers received high scores and five received low scores; and, three of the female cooperating teachers received high scores and eight received low scores.

On Factor Q<sub>1</sub> (Conservative VS Experimenting) none of the male student teachers received high scores and two received low scores; none of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and two received low scores; four of the female student teachers received high scores and

two received low scores; and, three of the female cooperating teachers received high scores and seven received low scores.

On Factor Q<sub>2</sub> (Group-Dependent VS Self-Sufficient) one of the male student teachers received high scores and two received low scores; two of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and none received low scores; three of the female student teachers received high scores and one received low scores; and, five of the female cooperating teachers received high scores and three received low scores.

On Factor Q<sub>3</sub> (Undisciplined Self-Conflict VS Controlled) five of the male student teachers received high scores and one received low scores; one of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and none received low scores; sixteen of the female student teachers received high scores and one received low scores; and, ten of the female cooperating teachers received high scores and none received low scores.

On Factor Q<sub>4</sub> (Relaxed VS Tense) one of the male student teachers received high scores and two received low scores; one of the male cooperating teachers received high scores and one received low scores; two of the female student teachers received high scores and three received low scores; and, one of the female cooperating teachers received high scores and four received high scores.

2. No significant differences were found among the cooperating teachers' ratings of the male and female groups of student teachers predicted to be successful and the males and females predicted not to be successful on the four broad areas and cumulative scores on the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form.

3. The majority of the student teachers and cooperating teachers' sten scores on Cattell's 16PF Questionnaire factors fell neither within the high or low range but between these two ranges, a mid-range.
  
4. The cooperating teachers' ratings on the four broad areas and the cumulative evaluation correlated significantly with the college supervisors' ratings for the 30 student teachers.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 5 includes a summary of the findings for each hypotheses. Conclusions and recommendations for future research are also included in this chapter.

#### SUMMARY

This research study was designed to address the following research question: Does the congruence of measurable personality factors of student teachers, cooperating teachers and college supervisors have an effect upon success in student teaching experiences?

The Cattell's Sixteen personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) was used to measure selected personality factors of the Fall Semester, 1982 Hampton Institute Student Teachers and their cooperating teachers. The obtained raw scores were calculated according to McClain's Predicted Teaching Success Specification Equations for males and females to determine a success measure for males and females. The Hampton Institute Student teacher Evaluation Form, which is normally used by the School of Education at Hampton Institute for the evaluation of its student teachers, was utilized as a second measurement instrument.

Twenty-five variables of ratings of the student teacher's performance in the classroom were obtained from the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form. The Evaluation Form includes the following broad areas: (1) Preparation of Unit Instruction; (2)

Preparation of Lesson; (3) Classroom Presentation; (4) Professionalism; and (5) Overall (cumulative) Evaluation. The cooperating teachers and the college supervisors rated the student teachers. The personality data was obtained from the student teachers' and cooperating teachers' responses on the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. A total of 30 student teachers' and cooperating teachers' responses on the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. A total of 30 student teachers, 30 cooperating teachers, and 13 college supervisors participated in this research study. This represented 100% of the student teaching population sample.

McClain's Predicted Teaching Success Specification Equations, based upon Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, and the scores from the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form were combined to identify male and female student teachers predicted to succeed in student teaching and those predicted not to succeed in student teaching.

#### HYPOTHESES

To examine the effectiveness of the congruence of measurable personality factors of student teachers, cooperating teachers, and college supervisors the following hypotheses were developed:

1. There will be no statistically significant difference between males predicted to succeed in student teaching and males predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping at the .01 level of significance.

2. There will be no statistically significant difference between females predicted to succeed in student teaching and females predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping at the .01 level of significance.

3. There will be no statistically significant difference between the ratings by the cooperating teachers and the college supervisors of those predicted to succeed in student teaching and those predicted not to succeed in student teaching at the .01 level of significance.

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Hypothesis 1 predicted no significant difference between males predicted to succeed in student teaching and males predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping at the .01 level of significance. As a result of this study, this null hypothesis was accepted. Statistical significant differences were not noted through the Analysis of Variance procedure when combined personality scores and student teaching ratings were compared.

Hypothesis 2 predicted no significant difference between females predicted to succeed in student teaching and females predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping at the .01 level of significance. As a result of this study, the null hypothesis was accepted. Statistical significant differences were not noted through the Analysis of Variance procedure when combined personality scores and student teaching ratings were compared.

Hypothesis 3 predicted no significant difference between the cooperating teachers' ratings and the college supervisors' ratings of

those predicted to succeed in student teaching and those predicted not to succeed in student teaching at the .01 level of significance. In view of the above it was determined that hypothesis 3, the matching of supervisors and student teachers based on personality, was not testable.

The relationship between the cooperating teachers' evaluation of the student teachers and the college supervisors' evaluation of the student teachers was examined by correlating the cooperating teachers' ratings with the college supervisors' ratings. Significant Pearson Product-Moment Correlations revealed congruence between the cooperating teachers' and the college supervisors' evaluations of the student teachers.

It appears from reviewing the data that no significant difference was found in this study between personality factors of student teachers and cooperating teachers, as measured by the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, success in student teaching as measured by the cooperating teachers' ratings on the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form and McClain's Predicted Teaching Success Specification Equations for male and female student teachers and cooperating teachers.

In summary, either there is no relationship between personality factors and success in student teaching or the rating scales were inadequate to pick up the differences. The results of the analysis of the data led to the acceptance of hypotheses 1 and 2. Hypothesis 3 was not testable.



## DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

As a result of this study, the following discussion of findings are made:

This study hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between males and females predicted to succeed in student teaching and males and females predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's Predicted Teaching Success Specification Equations. These hypotheses were accepted. Therefore, the variables of McClain's teaching Success Specification Equations do not appear to influence success in student teaching experiences. Perhaps there are other variables within the student teaching situation that have greater influence on success in student teaching experience than congruence of personality factors. It could be that the student teachers and cooperating teachers were compatible in terms of their teaching styles, classroom management and procedures.

In addition, even though the correlation between the college supervisors and cooperating teachers' ratings of the student teachers was significant, it was not very high. This finding suggests that since the cooperating teachers had had little experience in this role, and in using the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form, this could account for their ratings being higher than the college supervisors'. This finding implies that cooperating teachers should have additional inservice training on the use of the instrument.

The findings and conclusions of this study do not support the current literature concerning the effect of personality variables and

their relationship to success in student teaching. Perhaps variables not included in this present study such as age, race, test scores, grade point average, and grade point average in methods of teaching courses should be considered. How and to what extent these variables may affect success in student teaching were not established in this study.

The Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire does not consider persons whose scores fall within the mid-range on the various variables (i.e. from 4 to 7). However the majority of the student teachers' and the cooperating teachers' scores fell within the mid-range. This result suggests that the utility of the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire may be expanded and improved if the instrument is adapted to address persons with mid-range scores.

Finally, the 16 variables included on the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and the 25 variables included on the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form by no means take into account all of the observable variance in student teacher performance. It was not the intention of this research study to imply that these variables constitute the ultimate criteria of success in student teaching experience. These criteria do, however, represent useful criteria for future personality studies of student teaching success if the above discussed conditions, i.e. additional control variables and additional inservice training in the use of the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form, are addressed. Since Cattell's Sixteen personality Factor Questionnaire identified definite personality traits,

these variables are believed to be a basic foundation to any future educational research in personality.

### CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are based upon the findings of this research study:

1. It was concluded that the congruence of measurable personality factors of student teachers and cooperating teachers did not have an affect upon success in student teaching experiences. It was also concluded that other factors must exist, within the student teaching situation, which influenced success in student teaching.
2. In addition it was concluded that sex and the identified personality variables did not influence success in student teaching and therefore did not affect the final evaluations of the student teacher.
3. Finally, it was concluded that the significant correlations found in the ratings of the student teachers by the cooperating teachers and the college supervisors were not high enough to be considered as acceptable measures of success and therefore, they did not influence success in student teaching.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This line of investigation utilizing a small population and a limited number of dependent variables did not prove productive and further research utilizing this particular methodology is not

recommended. However, as a result of the findings of this research study, the following recommendations for further research are made:

1. This study did not find any differences between males and females predicted to succeed in student teaching and males and females predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping and the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form. The prime consideration in the placing of student teachers with cooperating teachers and at cooperating schools should not be based upon the personality traits of cooperating teachers and student teachers. As a result of the finding of this research study, it would not be prudent to place undue emphasis upon a personality match of cooperating teachers and student teachers. Maybe those who are responsible for the placement of student teachers, should give priority to other factors when considering the placement of student teachers. It may be that a diversion of personality will sometimes make for a diversity in the student teaching experience. It might be that differences may be found if further research is conducted utilizing a diversified sample. Such a diversified sample should consider additional variables, i.e. grade point averages, SAT scores, demographic variables, race, age, school system, number of years of teaching experience, number of student teachers and subject area. Such a study may prove productive.

2. Evaluations of student teachers by cooperating teachers and college supervisors are considered as major criteria in the teacher selection process by school personnel officers. Therefore, it is recommended that

further research be conducted to determine the impact of in-service training for cooperating teachers on the use of the measuring instrument and the evaluation of student teacher performance. This might be a significant factor in determining the reliability of the cooperating teachers' and the college supervisors' ratings of the student teacher's classroom performance.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Arndt, Jr., William B., Theories of Personality, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974.
- Bennie, William A., Supervised Clinical Experiences in the Classroom, New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1972.
- Biddle, B. M., and Thomas, E. J. (Eds.) Role Theory: Concept and Research, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Cattell, Raymond B., Eber, Herbert W., and Tatsuaka, Maurice M., Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.
- Cattell, Raymond B., Eber, Herbert W., and Tatsuaka, Maurice M., Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1974.
- Cattell, Raymond B. and Dreger, Ralph Mason, Handbook of Modern Personality Theory, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1977.
- Conant, James Bryant, The Education of American Teachers, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.
- Cronbach, Lee J., Essentials of Psychological Testing, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.
- Cronbach, Lee J., Essentials of Psychological Testing, New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970.
- Dunkin, Michael J. and Biddle, Bruce J., The Study of Teaching, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.
- Gage, N. L., Handbook of Research on Teaching, American Educational Research Association, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Henry, Marvin A. and Beasley, W. Wayne, Supervising Student Teachers the Professional Way: A Guide for Cooperating Teachers, Terre Haute, Indiana: Sycamore Press, 1975.

- Hevener, Jr., Fillmer, Successful Student Teaching: A Handbook for Elementary and Secondary Student Teachers, Saratoga, California: Century Twenty One Publishing, 1981.
- Johnson, James A., A Brief History of Student Teaching. DeKalk, Illinois: Creative Educational Materials, 1968.
- Kerlinger, Fred N., Foundations of Behavioral Research, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Maddi, Salvatore R., Personality Theories: A Comparative Analysis, Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1972.
- Meyers, D. Eugene, The Student Teacher on The Firing Line, Saratago, California: Century Twenty One Publishing, 1981.
- Nie, Norman, Hull, C. Hadlai, Jenkins, Jean G., Steinbrenner, Karen and Bent, Dale H., Statistical Package For The Social Sciences (SPSS), Second Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Ryans, David G., Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison and Appraisal, Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1960.
- Tanruther, Edgar M., Clinical Experiences in Teaching for the Student Teacher or Intern, New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1973.
- Thorndike, Robert L. and Hagen, Elizabeth P., Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Evaluation, New York: Wiley and Sons, 1961.
- Thorndike, Robert L. and Hagen, Elizabeth P., Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Evaluation, New York: Wiley and Sons, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Supervising Teacher, Thirty-Eight Yearbook, The Association for Student Teaching, Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, Co., Inc., 1959.

### Periodicals

- Aden, Robert C. and Crosthwait, Charles, "Teaching Field Choice and Student Teacher Personality", The Journal of Educational Research, Volume 59, Number 7, March, 1966.
- Bell, Michael L., "Personality and Perceptions of Student Teaching", ERIC, Bethesda, Maryland: Document Reproduction Service, ED 072 010, 1971.
- Biddle, B. M., "Teacher Roles", In Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Toronto: Macmillan, 1969.

- Bigelow, Gordon S., "Personality Factors and Independent Study", The Journal of Educational Research, Volume 62, Number 1, September, 1968.
- Breiter, Joan C., "Measured Self-Actualization and Student Teacher Effectiveness", Improving College and University Teaching, 23, Winter, 1979.
- Buckley, Richard D. and Dickman, Leonore W., "Student Teacher-Supervising Teacher: A Study in Personality", ERIC Bethesda, Maryland: Document Reproduction Service, ED 088 887, 1969.
- Chabassal, Davis J., "The Possession of Certain Attitudes as Predictors of Success in Practice Teaching", The Journal of Educational Research, Volume 61, Number 7, March, 1968.
- Cicirelli, Victor G., "University Supervisors' Creative Ability and Their Appraisal of Student Teachers' Classroom Performance: An Exploratory Study", The Journal of Educational Research, Volume 62, Number 8, April, 1969.
- Crosthwait, Charles, "Teaching Field Choice and Student Teacher Personality", The Journal of Educational Research, Volume 59, Number 7, March, 1966.
- Cruickshank, Donald R. and Kennedy, John J., "The Role of Significant Others During the Student Teaching Experience", Journal of Teacher Education, Volume XXVIII, Number 5, September-October, 1977.
- DeBlassie, Richard R., "A Comparative Study of the personality Structures of Persistent and Prospective Teachers", The Journal of Educational Research, Volume 64, Number 7, March, 1971.
- Diamonti, Michael C., "Student Teacher Supervision: A Reappraisal", The Educational Forum, Volume XII, Number 4, May, 1977.
- Elmore, Randy F. and Ellett, Chad D., "A Canonical Analysis of Personality Characteristics, Personal and Teaching Practices Beliefs and Dogmatism of Beginning Teacher Education Students", Journal of Experimental Education, 1979.
- Erickson, Harley E., "A Factorial Study of Teaching Ability", Journal of Experimental Education, 23: September, 1954.
- Getzels, J. W., and Jackson, P. W., "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics", In N. L. Gage (Ed), Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.



- Goodlad, J., "An Analysis of Professional Laboratory Experiences in the Education of Teachers", Journal of Teacher Education, Volume 16, 1965.
- Hoffman, Earl E., "Student Teaching's Legal Status Varies Widely Among States", Journal of Teacher Education, Volume XXX, Number 4, July-August, 1979.
- Hoy, Wayne K. and Rees, Richard, "The Bureaucratic Socialization of Student teachers", Journal of Teacher Education, Volume XXVIII, Number 1, January-February, 1977.
- Jarecke, W. H., "Evaluating Teaching Success Through the Use of the Teaching Judgement Test", Journal of Educational Research, 45: 1952.
- Karmos, Ann H. and Jacko, Carol M., "The Role of Significant Others During the Student Teaching Experience", The Journal of Teacher Education, Volume XXVIII, Number 5, September-October 1977.
- Lamke, T. A., "Personality and Teaching Success", Journal of Experimental Education, 20, 1951.
- Leslie, Larry L., "Improving the Student Teaching Experiences Through Selective Placement of Students", ERIC, Document Reproduction Service, ED 034 718, 1969.
- Lipke, Barbara S., "Give Your Student Teacher A Break", Journal of Teacher Education, Volume XXX, Number 2, March-April, 1979.
- Lowther, M. A., "Successful and Unsuccessful Experiences of Student Teachers in Secondary Education", Contemporary Education, 41, May, 1970.
- Main, C. and Houshell, P. B., "A Comparative Study of Personality and Behaviors of Science and Non-Science Teachers", Journal of Research in Science teaching, 10, 1973.
- Mattsson, Kenneth D., "Personality Traits Associated With Effective Teaching in Rural and Urban Secondary Schools", Journal of Educational Psychology, Volume 66, Number 1, 1974.
- McClain, Edwin W., "Sixteen P. F. Scores and Success in Student Teaching", The Journal of Teacher Education, Volume XIX, Number 1, Spring, 1968.
- Miller, Lebern N., "Evaluating Teaching Personality Before Student Teaching Begins", The Journal of Educational Research, Volume 56, Number 7, March, 1963.

- Montross, H. W., "Temperament and Teaching Success", Journal of Experimental Education, 23, 1954.
- Morgan, J. C. and Woerdehoff, F. J., "Stability of Student Teacher Behavior and Their Relationship to Personality and Creativity Factors", The Journal of Educational Research, 62, 1969.
- Morris, J. R., "The Effects of The University Supervisor on The Performance and Adjustment of Student Teachers", The Journal of Educational Research, 67 (8) April, 1974.
- Myers, Betty, Kennedy, John J. and Cruickshank, Donald R., "Relationship of Teacher Personality Variables to Teacher Perceived Problems", Journal of Teacher Education, Volume XXX, Number 6, November-December, 1979.
- Nicholson, Karen, "A Dyadic Model of Supervision for Elementary Education Student Teachers", Unpublished Paper Presented at the 1981 Meeting, Eastern Educational Research Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1981.
- Ryan, Kevin, "Student Teaching", The Teacher's Handbook, Scott, Foresman and Company, Glenview, Illinois, 1971.
- Sorenson, Garth, "What is Learned in Practice Teaching?", The Journal of Teacher Education, Volume XVIII, Number 2, Summer, 1967.
- Sorenson, Garth and Halpert, R., "Stress in Student Teaching", California Journal of Educational Research, 19, 1968.
- Symonds, Percival M., "Personality of the Teacher", The Journal of Educational Research, Volume 40, Number 8, May, 1947.
- Trieber, J. Marshall, "Personality Matching for Student Teacher Development", ERIC, Document Reproduction Service, ED 083 175, 1973.

#### Dissertation

- Barrows, Linda K., "Student Teaching and Success: A Field Study of Four Male Elementary School Student Teachers", Unpublished Dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1978.
- Benedict, Martha Gail, "Identification of Characteristics Which Differentiate Between The Most Effective and Least Effective Student Teachers of Elementary School Mathematics", Unpublished Dissertation, East Texas State University, 1977.

- Cibotti, Thomas M., "Conceptual Level As A Determinant of The Relationship Between The Cooperating Teacher and The student Teacher", Unpublished Dissertation, Boston College, 1977.
- Gates, George Dubson, "Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers: An Exploratory Study of Individual Characteristics, Compatibility, and Their Relationship to Success in Student Teaching", Unpublished Dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1977.
- Keech, Ray Robert, "The Relationship of Selected Teacher Characteristics To Teacher's Rationale on Grading", Unpublished Dissertation Abstract, Michigan State University, 1975.
- Klein, Dorothy S. R., "The Relationship Between Selected Personality Traits of the Teacher-Trainee and Achievement on Self-Instructional Modules", Fordham University, Dissertation Abstract, 1978.
- Lewis, Alice Jane, "The Effect of Selected Characteristics of Vocational Student Teachers and Their Cooperating Teachers on the Final Evaluation of the Student Teacher", The University of Tennessee, Dissertation Abstract, 1976.
- Nightingale, Norman W., "A Study of Relationships Among The Congruity of Perceptions of The Cooperating Teachers' Role, Student Teacher Anxiety, and Performance", Unpublished Dissertation Abstract, The University of Maryland, 1978.
- Stelljes, Connie S., "The Relationship of Selected Personality Factors of Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers to Success in Student Teaching", University of Colorado at Boulder, Dissertation Abstract, 1976.
- Stevens, Dorothy Jo, "A Study of Relationships Between Prospective Teacher Selection and Student Teacher Performance", Unpublished Dissertation, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1978.

APPENDIX A

## THE PILOT STUDY

Validation of the Student Teacher  
Evaluation Form

To determine the reliability and validity of the Student Teacher Evaluation Form a pilot study was conducted utilizing the procedures suggested by Dunkin and Biddle (1974) and Thorndike and Hagen (1974). The authors suggested the following: To obtain reliability measures of an instrument two or more observers should be placed in a single live classroom situation and observe the teacher simultaneously utilizing the instrument to be validated. The observers should have similar training on similar levels. To obtain content validity Dunkin and Biddle (1977) and Thorndike and Hagen (1974) suggested that a panel of authorities be selected to read the instrument to determine its content validity.

The Pilot Study Procedures

A meeting was held with the Director of Personnel for the Hampton Public School System to discuss the proposed pilot study, its purpose, and to secure permission to conduct the study utilizing some of the public school summer school teachers as subjects on a voluntary basis. Permission was granted and Kecoughtan High School in Hampton, Virginia was selected as the site for the pilot study. Arrangements were made to meet with the summer school principal. Meetings were held with the summer school principal and faculty to discuss the proposed pilot study, its purpose and to ask for volunteers. Ten teachers volunteered to participate in the study. Arrangements were made to have the observers visit their classroom twice per week for three weeks.

### The Observers

Ten teachers were asked to participate in the pilot study as raters. Two teachers were on the faculty at Hampton Institute, two were graduate students at Hampton Institute, one teacher from Virginia Beach Public School System, one from Norfolk Public School System, two from Hampton Institute Laboratory school and two from the Hampton Public School System.

### The Training Workshop for Participants

A one-day training workshop for the participants was conducted by the researcher at Hampton Institute. The workshop involved the following:

1. An overview of the proposed research study and the purpose of the pilot study.
2. A packet of materials consisting of the Student Teacher Evaluation Form and a detailed description of the competencies to be measured.
3. Following the explanation of the Student Teacher Evaluation Form the participants were given the opportunity to view a slide presentation entitled "Evaluating the Performance of Student Teachers" by Bell Howell.
4. For practice in the use of the Student Teacher Evaluation Form the participants observed a graduate class at Hampton Institute and rated the teacher utilizing the Student Teacher Evaluation Form.

5. A block of time was allowed for questions and discussion to ensure clarity.
6. The participants were given instructions as to time and place of daily meetings while on the school site.

#### Observation of Teachers

Three participants (observers), following the observation schedule prepared by the researcher, entered the classroom of one of the participating teachers at the beginning of the class and observed the teaching process for thirty minutes. The observers independently rated the participating teachers utilizing the Student Teacher Evaluation Form on the competencies observed. The observation schedule allowed for six teachers to be observed per half day.

#### Reliability of Instrument

The statistical methods employed in the treatment of data collected from the pilot study to determine the reliability of the Student Teacher Evaluation Form were (1) the Nonpar Correlation Coefficient and Test of Reliability using the following formula:  $\text{Variables} = I1 \text{ to } I25 / \text{Scale}$  (Test) =  $I1 \text{ to } I25 / \text{Model} = \text{Alpha} /$ ; and (2) the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient.

The results of the Nonpar Correlation Matrix selecting those items with a correlation of .8 and above of the 25 items were as follows: For item one, item 3 shows a correlation of .80, item 6 shows a correlation of .82 and item 10 shows a correlation of .85. For item 2, item 3 shows a correlation of .82, for item 3, item 4 has a correlation of .82 and

item 6 has a correlation of .83. Item 4 did not show a correlation of .8 and above with any of the other items. For item 5, item 6 had a correlation of .80; item 6 shows a correlation of .80 with item 14. Items 7, 8, 9, and 10 did not have a correlation of .8 and above. For item 11, item 12 shows a correlation of .85 and item 21 shows a correlation of .81. Items 12 and 13 did not show correlations of .8 and above. For item 14, item 16 shows a .83 correlation. For item 15, item 25 shows a .84 correlation. Items 16 and 17 did not show a correlation of .8 or above. For item 18, item 23 shows a correlation of .80, item 24, shows a correlation of .90 and item 25 shows a correlation of .83. For item 19, item 24 shows a correlation of .86. Items 20, 21, and 22 did not correlate with any of the items at .8 or above. For item 23, item 24 shows a correlation of .81. For item 24, item 25 shows a correlation of .84. Item 25 did not show a correlation of .8 or above with any of the above 24 items. (See table 1.)

The results indicate that those items showing .8 or above are items that contribute more to the overall ratings than the other items. They also appear to be more independent items than the other items.

Selecting those items with a correlation of .5 and below show that for item 1, item 15 shows a correlation of .48 and item 23 shows a correlation of .49. For item 2, item 15 shows a .37 correlation, item 16 shows a correlation of .44, and item 23 shows a correlation of .41. For item 3, item 19 shows a correlation of .47 and item 23 shows a correlation of .48. Showing the largest number of items having a correlation of .5 and below is item 4. Item 8 shows a correlation of



.34, item 9 shows a correlation of .38, item 11 shows a correlation of .38, item 13 shows a correlation of .34, item 15 shows a correlation of .42, item 18 shows a correlation of .42.

Items 15 and 18 are contributing more global to the overall ratings. Items 16 and 4 are judgemental items and are a little more difficult to observe than are the other items. The other items appear to contribute equally to the overall ratings and to a degree the similarities of the items overlap.

The numerical value of the ratings are High....Low 4 to 0 respectively. The Discrimination Index use of the scale analyzing only 3's and 4's of the items rated across raters reveal the following: For item 1, 1 of every 6 are 3's and 5 of every 6 are 4's; item 2, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 3, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 4, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 5, 1 of every 6 are 3's and 1 of every 5 are 4's; item 6, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 6 are 4's; item 7, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 6 are 4's; item 8, 1 of every 3 are 3's and 3 of every 6 are 4's; item 9, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 10, 1 of every 6 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 11, 1 of every 6 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 12, 1 of every 6 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 13, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 14, 1 of every 6 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 15, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 16, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 17, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 5 of every 6 are 4's; item 18, 1 of every 10 are 3's and 5 of every 5 are

4's; item 19, 1 of every 6 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 20, 1 of every 4 are 3's and 3 of every 5 are 4's; item 21, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; item 22, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 6 are 4's; item 23, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 6 are 4's; item 24, 1 of every 6 are 3's and 4 of every 5 are 4's; and for item 25, 1 of every 5 are 3's and 4 of every 6 are 4's.

To further test the instrument for reliability and validity a Pearson Correlation statistical procedure was employed on the data generated by the nine raters. The results of the test revealed the following. The twenty-five items were analyzed with the ninety cases. The data generated an overall mean score for the raters on the 25 items of 5.0 and 5.5 for the teachers. The overall standard deviations for the raters was 2.5 and 2.8 for the teachers.

The Correlation Matrix generated an item mean score of 3.8, a range score of 0.2 with 0.0 variance. Item variances show a mean score of 0.0, a range of 0.0 and 0.0 variance. Inter-Item Correlations show a mean score of 0.6, a range of 0.5 and 0.0 variance.

According to Kerlinger (1973) it is possible to approach the definition of reliability in three ways. One approach is epitomized by the question: If we measure the same set of objects again and again with the same or comparable measuring instrument, will we get the same or similar results? This question implies a definition of reliability in stability, dependability, and predictability terms.

A second approach is epitomized by the question: Are the measures obtained from a measuring instrument the "true" measures of the property

measured? This is an accuracy definition. Compared to the first definition, it is further removed from common sense and intuition, but it is also more fundamental. The above two approaches can be summarized in the words stability and accuracy.

There is a third approach to the definition of reliability, an approach that not only helps us better define and solve both theoretical and practical problems but also implies other approaches and definitions. We can inquire how much error of measurement there is in a measuring instrument. The two types of variance: systematic and random. Systematic variance leans in one direction: scores tend to be all positive or all negative or all high or all low. Error in this case is constant or biased. Random or error variance is self-compensating: scores tend now to lean this way, now that way. Error of measurement are random errors. They are the sum or product of a number of causes: the ordinary random or chance elements present in all measures due to unknown causes, temporary or momentary fatigue, fortuitous conditions at a particular time that temporarily affect the object measured or the measuring instrument, fluctuations of memory or mood, and other factors that are temporary and shifting.

The data generated from the Student Teacher Evaluation Form and the statistical procedures employed revealed that the form is reliable. First, measures of the same set of ratings, across the three raters, with the same measuring instrument revealed the same or similar results. These results implied that the Student Teacher Evaluation Form is reliable in terms of stability, dependability and predictability.

Second, the measures obtained from the Student Teacher Evaluation Form appeared to be "true" measures of the items measured implying accuracy. Third, the error of measurement appeared to lead toward systematic variance which revealed that the scores tend to be all positive or all negative or all high or all low across raters and ratings.

#### Validity of the Instrument

The Student Teacher Evaluation Form was tested for content validity. Dunkin and Biddle (1974) and Thorndike and Hagen (1974) suggested that a panel of authorities be selected to read the instrument to determine its content validity. A copy of the Student Teacher Evaluation Form, a copy of the description of the competencies to be measured along with a cover letter explaining the two forms and the need for validation were sent to the following selected authorities. These authorities were selected by the researcher based on the recommendation of the research committee and on their contributions to the field of education in general and their works on student teaching specifically: Dr. William A. Bennie, Professor of Education, The University of Texas at Austin; Dr. Melvin E. Frazier, Director of Field Experiences, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana; Dr. William D. Johnson, Professor of Education, The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Dr. Mathews F. Allen, Director of the School of Education and Psychology, Virginia Union University, Richmond, Virginia; Dr. Annabel L. Sacks, Director of Student Teaching, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia; Dr. B. Keith Eicher, Coordinator of Field Experiences, University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia; and Dr. John W.

TABLE 23

MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF ITEMS TO THE OVERALL  
RATINGS OF THE TOTAL SCORES

$r > .80$

ITEM	ITEMS
1	3, 6, 10
2	3
3	4, 6
4	0
5	6
6	14
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	12, 21
12	0
13	0
14	16
15	25
16	0
17	0
18	23, 24, 25
19	24
20	0
21	0
22	0
23	24
24	25
25	0

Items showing .8 and above contribute more to the overall ratings than the other items. They also appear to be more independent than the other items.

TABLE 24

MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF ITEMS THAT CONTRIBUTE  
DIFFERENTLY TO THE OVERALL RATINGS

$r \geq .50$

ITEM	ITEMS
1	15, 23
2	15, 16, 23
3	19, 23
4	8, 19, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24
5	8, 15, 19, 23, 24
6	0
7	15
8	13, 15, 16
9	10
10	13, 16, 19, 21, 23
11	0
12	0
13	23
14	0
15	16
16	17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25
17	0
18	0
19	0
20	0
21	0
22	0
23	0
24	0
25	0

Items under .50 are unique items and contribute differently to the overall ratings.

TABLE 25  
 PERCENTAGE CONTRIBUTIONS OF EACH  
 ITEM TO OVERALL RATINGS

ITEM	ITEM 25 Overall Ratings	PERCENTAGE
1	.64	40%
2	.52	21%
3	.60	36%
4	.47	22%
5	.59	34%
6	.79	62%
7	.60	36%
8	.53	28%
9	.65	42%
10	.55	30%
11	.77	59%
12	.76	57%
13	.77	59%
14	.79	62%
15	.84	70%
16	.48	23%
17	.69	47%
18	.83	68%
19	.76	57%
20	.70	49%
21	.74	54%
22	.75	56%
23	.71	50%
24	.84	70%

The percentage represents the contributions of each specific item to the overall ratings across both teachers and ratings.

Sykes, Director of Field Experiences, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

There was unanimous agreement among the raters that the form is indeed valid, in terms of its broad areas and related specific competencies. Their opinions were based upon the following characteristics of the form:

1. It includes all areas relevant to the assessment of the competency of a student teacher;
2. It is sufficiently comprehensive without being tedious to complete;
3. The form is self-explanatory;
4. The form uses behavioral terminology;
5. The directions for the form are exact which creates consistency across evaluations and evaluators;
6. The content covered by the evaluation form touches those areas considered important for an individual about to enter the classroom as a teacher;
7. The competencies are easy to relate to those the State Department of Education is considering.

According to Kerlinger (1973) the content validity is the representativeness of sampling adequacy of the content of the measuring instrument. The content validation was guided by the question: is the content of the Student Teacher Evaluation Form representative of the content of the items being measured? Content validation is basically judgmental. The items of the Student Teacher Evaluation Form were



studied, each item being weighed for its presumed representativeness. Based on the findings of the authorities, it can be concluded that the Student Teacher Evaluation Form is indeed valid in terms of its content.

APPENDIX B



THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712

*Department of Curriculum and Instruction*  
*Area Code: 512 471-5942*

November 25, 1980

Dr. Darlene S. Abram  
104 Saint Paul Court  
Hampton, Virginia

Dear Dr. Abram:

I don't know that my impressions of your evaluation instrument are sufficiently knowledgeable to add to the content validity of it; however, I am quite willing to give you my reactions. Please feel free to use any of my comments in any way which will be of help to you.

The instrument appears to cover the essential elements of the expectations of student teachers. At first glance, one might get the impression that some of the important aspects which employers look for are overlooked (e.g., classroom management, emotional stability, grooming, etc.) but careful examination of the form and a study of the accompanying clarifying memorandum reflects that these areas are indeed covered. One cannot demonstrate the teaching criteria reflected in the instrument without having adequate classroom management, for example, since that in itself is the result of careful planning, appropriate motivation, good rapport, and proper methodology. The personal elements of stability and grooming are also reflected in such items as "presents a professional image" and "establishes and maintains effective interaction with pupils".

It is important to emphasize that teachers and supervisors who complete the evaluation form for student teachers should pay careful attention to the descriptive data contained in the memorandum explaining the form, for it is easy to interpret criteria according to one's own whim or bias rather than to pay heed to the intended interpretation.

All in all, the form is a good one and much better than many which I have seen. Good luck to you in your research project.

Yours very truly,

William A. Bennie  
Professor

## INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY TERRE HAUTE, INDIANA 47809

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

(812) 232-6311

November 24, 1990

Darlene S. Abram  
194 Saint Paul Court  
Hampton, Virginia 23666

Dear Darlene:

In response to your request that I examine your student teaching evaluation form. I have examined the form and feel that there are no problems with the form.

You have "spelled" out the specific items you consider important for evaluation and in your direction have been exacting in what you meant. This is good! Far too often the teacher does not have a sense of direction or clarity for completion. Since many students and teachers are involved one is always concerned that there is consistency in the evaluation. This by your form and directions, provides this rather well.

Since your evaluation form is for secondary school use you have chosen well the types or items that are important.

While this form is different from the one our institute uses, your instrument is well designed and fits the need.

I have no objection to your using my name and comments in support of your study.

Wishing you well and if this reaches you before Thanksgiving have a pleasant holiday.

Sincerely,

Melvin E. Frazier  
Director of Field Experiences  
Department of Elementary Education

MEF/js

## THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

December 8, 1980

Dear Ms. Abram,

This is in response to your letter seeking remarks regarding the content validity of the "Student Teacher Evaluation Form" used at your school. First, the form has the problem all forms of this sort have, that is, the instrument is not the form, but the rater. What is really important is what is in the minds of the raters when they make the marks that you are asking them to make. This depends on a number of considerations. For example your coop teachers will rate your teachers much differently than your university supervisors will (about  $r=.4$ ). They will agree to some degree, but disagree about a number of other things. This problem can be decreased by careful training of your raters, but that is a long and very difficult undertaking.

The form employs a number of categories of items often found on such instruments and a number of items commonly found within categories. I'm not sure that all of these items are of equal worth. Are you summing? If so perhaps you need to consider weighting some are more important than others.

I suspect that the form is more useful for rating didactic teaching than heuristic teaching. Didactic teachers have clear objectives, logically sequenced development and affect closure, or try to. Other styles of teaching do not. For example, some teachers merely present their students with a rich environment and let each student find his own way to his own outcomes. Is this bad? It probably would be on your form. With regard to this problem, you might consider your items in terms of the descriptions of teaching styles presented by Joyce & Weil.

In short, I suspect that this form is valid for some supervisors working with some students using some forms of instruction. I do not know how to build a single rating instrument that is equally good for all supervisors and all lessons.

Sincerely,

Dr. William D. Johnson

(Retyped for clarity)



**VIRGINIA UNION UNIVERSITY**

1500 NORTH LOMBARDY STREET  
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23220

December 1, 1980

Ms. Darlene S. Abram  
104 Saint Paul Court  
Hampton, Virginia 23666

Dear Ms. Abram:

I am responding to your communication addressed November 18 to my predecessor, Dr. James S. Norman, who resigned his position here in July.

My reaction to your Student Teacher Evaluation Form is positive. It seems to me to be sufficiently comprehensive without being a tedious form to complete. I like your use of behavioral terms in articulating particular facets of the student teacher's performance being evaluated.

You of course have my permission to use this statement in support of your research study.

Sincerely yours,

Mathews F. Allen  
Acting Director  
School of Education  
and Psychology

MFA/gh



MEMBER: UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND



**School of Education**  
Office of Student Teaching • 1300 • 23062 • Norfolk, VA 23505

November 26, 1980

Darlene S. Abram  
104 Saint Paul Court  
Hampton, VA 23666

Dear Darlene:

Sorry to be so long in responding to your inquiry of November 18 regarding the content validity of your student teacher evaluation form.

All areas covered in the evaluation instrument are relevant to assessment of the competency of a student teacher. I would also like to see an area in the evaluation relating to personal attributes which seem to impinge rather importantly on success or failure in student teaching (e.g., sense of humor, ability to respond positively to suggestions and criticism, initiative, etc.).

The memorandum accompanying the evaluation form is a fine piece of work but I seriously question whether it would be read by the Cooperating Teachers. The evaluation form is self-explanatory and my personal philosophy is "keep it simple."

If I can be of any further help in this matter, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Annabel L. Sacks  
Director of Student Teaching

(Permission to quote granted)

University of Richmond, Virginia 23173

Department of Education

December 16, 1980

Mrs. Darlene S. Abram  
Coordinator of Student Teaching  
Hampton Institute  
Post Office Box 6618  
Hampton, Virginia 23668

Darlene,

You may wish to include in section 2, several of the items you have in section 1. It would be helpful to know for instance, if the student teacher is able to create specific objectives for daily lessons. Also, is there time for feedback during the daily lesson period. You may want to address in some fashion the need for a classroom teacher to meet the individual needs of his/her students (eg. PL 94-142). Can he/she write an IEP.

Generally the content covered by the evaluation form touches those areas considered important for an individual about to enter the classroom as a teacher. I believe you will find it easy to relate your competencies to those the State Department of Education is considering.

Sincerely,

B. Keith Eicher  
Coordinator of Field Experiences

BKE/mm





CHARTERED 1693  
COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA 23185

December 1, 1990

Ms. Darlene S. Abram  
104 Saint Paul Court  
Hampton, Virginia 23666

Dear Ms. Abram:

I feel the Student Teaching Evaluation form is basically valid.

I do feel that #E should be #4 under D. It seems to be more an attribute of A than as a specific competency.

The form seems to include the areas that should be evaluated in a student teaching program.

Sincerely yours,

John W. Sykes  
Director of Field Experiences

JWS/lc

APPENDIX C

HAMPTON INSTITUTE  
HAMPTON, VIRGINIA

Office of Student Teaching

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Cooperating Teachers

FROM: Darlene S. Abram  
Coordinator, Student Teaching

RE: Student Teaching Evaluation Form

Evaluation is an indispensable part of student teaching. It enables us to assist systematically the student in his development of teaching skills in the classroom situation. The Department of Secondary Education has developed the attached student teacher evaluation form. The intent of the form is to assist college supervising staff in determining the student teacher's progress and, in using the results of each evaluative visit, to improve the student teachers' learning and his instructional skills. It also is intended that the cooperating teacher use this form in providing on the spot evaluation of the same kinds of skills that college supervisors are looking for when they visit the classroom. The purpose for sharing the form with student teachers is to give them an idea of the expectancies we have in terms of their performance in the classroom. A brief explanation of some of the items on the student teacher evaluation form follows:

1. Preparation of Unit Instruction. We are interested here in how well the student teacher plans for instruction of a given unit. Certainly in good planning one needs to have an overview of expected behaviors as outcomes of instruction. Good planning is essential in achieving those behaviors. Therefore, it is important for the student teacher to have a notion of what to expect in order that appropriate ways of achieving these objectives may be designed.
  
- 1C. Demonstrates Consistency of Specific Objectives With General Objectives. Specific objectives stated in behavioral terms and operationalized are the ways by which we fulfill our general, broad purposes for learning and instruction. Obviously, then, specific objectives for learning should be related to our general objectives. Learning should be sequential and developmental, proceeding from the simple to the complex. Good unit planning capitalizes on learning sequences and lessons should be arranged such that prerequisite skills are developed prior to the next level of learning in hierarchial

arrangements. This should be evident in the overall plan of the student teacher's unit.

- 1E. Select The Appropriate Evaluational Techniques. The good student teacher must have some measures of the success with which he or she is meeting learner needs and changing learners' behavior, and developing skills and attitudes amongst learners. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the student teacher to select evaluational techniques that measure those things which indeed were a part of the instructional sequence and which can be measured with some degree of reliability in a time span which is practical.
- 1F. Determine Resources Necessary For Unit Instruction. Good instructional planning requires determining beforehand what kinds of things are essential to the proposed instruction and available for use in that instruction. The student teacher must determine what instructional aids (hardware - audio-visual equipment, software-supplies and materials) are necessary, which resource persons are available and useful, and how space in and outside of the classroom can best be arranged to facilitate instruction.
- 2A. Designs Sound Lesson Plan. A sound lesson should include all of the basic components for planning, that is, objectives, in the learning activities, the instructional resources available, the space in which instruction is to take place, the spatial arrangements, the specific learning activities that the teacher is to carry out, the specific learning activities that the students are to be engaged in, the time that is necessary for the sequencing of learning, the kind of evaluation in terms of learner gains, and instructional appropriateness, and any additional planning which will facilitate the lesson (such as, blackboard scheme, layout of bulletin boards, number of copies of handouts to be used, references to be provided to students).
- 2B. Acquires And Arranges Instructional Aids Appropriate To Lesson Presentation. Not only are we concerned with how well the student teacher designs the lesson plan, but we are also concerned with how well the student teacher brings together those materials that are supportive of the execution of his lesson plan.
3. Classroom Presentation
- 3A. Sets The State For Learning. Does the student teacher provide an overview of what will be presented or taught in his classroom for the student? Does he share the purposes of learning with students so that they can assist in their own learning? Does he relate today's lesson to previous learning?

Does he demonstrate to students that learning is an ongoing, integrated process? Does he provide for the transition between what was learned in previous lessons and what is to be learned in the current lessons? Also, does the student teacher command the attention of students and involve them early in his classroom presentation?

- 3B. Presents A Professional Image. Here, we are concerned with the professional image and the poise of the student teacher. Since the teacher is a model of behavior, he should exhibit good posture, good bearing, and good presence.
- 3C. Give Clear And Explicit Directions And Instructions. A major function of the teacher is to direct students into and through learning situations. This is best facilitated by clarity, precision, and conciseness in directions and instructions. Good directions and instructions are vital to efficient and economical (in terms of time) learning and instruction.
- 3D. Establishes And Maintains Effective Interaction With Pupils. Here we will consider three items and an overall evaluation.
1. Does the student teacher motivate student expression and participation? It is important that a student be actively involved in his learning. Active involvement in learning facilitates retention and serves as its own reinforcement.
  2. Handles student responses in a positive manner. Does the student teacher make the pupil comfortable with his expression and provide him with feeling of worth in terms of his participation in learning in the classroom.
  3. Demonstrates sensitivity to student needs. Does the student teacher demonstrate a knowledge of pupil developmental states by planning material appropriate for his classroom population based on diagnosed interests and abilities? Is the student teacher capable of diagnosing particular problems the students are having in academic and in social-emotional adjustments in the classroom? This serves as a basis for instructional planning for individual students.

These three items (1) encourages students expression and participation, (2) handle student responses in a positive manner and (3) demonstrate sensitivity to student needs, enable a student teacher to establish effective interaction with pupils and maintain that interaction throughout his student teaching experience.

- 3F. Uses Language At Appropriate Level For Student Understanding. This item should be self-explanatory.
- 3G. Speaks Clearly And Projects Voice Appropriately in Instructional Modes. The classroom teacher must overenunciate and articulate very distinctly in order that he may maximize his chances of being understood and thereby effecting learning as profitably as possible. It is also important that the student teacher projects his voice in such a way that if he is speaking to the entire class the class hears. If he is speaking to individuals he should be able to do that in a manner not to disturb other individuals. If he is speaking to particular groups he should be able to do that without disturbing other groups and interfering with their learning. He should also be able to set the mood and the tone of classroom learning through use of voice.
- 3H. Uses Questioning Techniques To Advantage of Learning And Instruction. The student teacher must be able to use direct questions which require specific responses and probing questions which encourages critical thinking and divergent thinking. Questioning is one of the most efficient "on-the-spot" evaluational techniques and skilled practice in its use enhances learning situations and makes learning active.
- 3I. Provides For Evaluational Feedback and Learning Instruction. Already the student teacher should have planned appropriate evaluational techniques. In the conduct of the lesson itself or at the conclusion of the lesson or the series of lessons, there must be the actual use of evaluational techniques such that the student teacher can determine learner changes in behavior and appropriateness and effectiveness of instructional strategies that have been used in the classroom.
- 3J. Effects Lesson Closure Successfully. A good lesson should give the student a sense of accomplishment and a sense of fulfillment. A good lesson should be finalized or concluded: in planning a lesson a student teacher should ensure that there are several possibilities for closure. Many times students will excite meaningful discussion or participation which is not a planned part of the lesson. When this is fruitful, it should be capitalized upon and still the student teacher should not lose perspective of overall directions for learning. It makes good sense to have at least two reasonable places where the lesson can be closed and give students still a feeling of accomplishment.

4. Professionalism
- 4A. Demonstrated Dependability And Competency Of Performing Teacher Related Tasks. Teachers are expected to perform tasks other than instructional tasks in the classroom. For example, they are often called upon to act as hall monitor, or study hall supervisor. There are also record-keeping duties associated with teaching, marking papers, preparation of bulletin boards, bus monitor--these kinds of things. The student teacher is expected to be dependable and capable in carrying out tasks which are noninstructional, but which teachers are required to perform.
- 4B. Is Punctual For Teacher Assignments. Promptness is essential to planning and executing instruction and teacher related tasks.
- 4C. Establishing Rapport With School Personnel. This item looks at the student teacher's ability to work effectively with colleagues in the teaching profession.

Overall Evaluation. This is a summation of the items above. Not all items will be encountered in any supervisor's visit to the classroom. Those which are observed should be tabulated in an overall evaluation. It is extremely difficult to design an evaluation instrument for a comprehensive, complex endeavor such as student teaching; therefore, in the comments section on this form supervisors and cooperating teachers are provided the opportunity to discuss items which may not be a part of the evaluation as they see it in Items 1 through 4. Also, when there are items which indicate serious needs on the part of the student teachers, or if we see exceptional potential in students, comments should be made. The supervisor and cooperating teacher will also let us know what kinds of assistance has been rendered to the student teacher so that we can see progress and growth; or the absence or inability on the part of students to grow and benefit from supervision in student teaching.

HAMPTON INSTITUTE  
HAMPTON, VIRGINIA 23368

OFFICE OF STUDENT TEACHING

## STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

NAME OF STUDENT TEACHER \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

COOPERATING TEACHER \_\_\_\_\_ SCHOOL \_\_\_\_\_

COLLEGE SUPERVISOR \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

<u>AREA</u>	<u>COMPETENCY</u>	<u>RATING</u>				
		High	-	-	-	Low
1. Preparation of Unit Instruction	A. <u>States general objectives clearly</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A
	B. <u>Describes expected learner behaviors as outcomes of instruction</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A
	C. <u>Demonstrated consistency of specific objectives with general objectives</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A
	D. <u>Arranges unit instruction in logical learning sequence</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A
	E. <u>Selects appropriate evaluational techniques</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A
	F. <u>Determines resources necessary for unit instruction. E.g., instructional aids, resource persons, space, etc.</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A
2. Preparation of Lesson	A. <u>Designs sound lesson plans</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A
	B. <u>Acquires and arranges instructional aids appropriate to lesson presentation</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A



Page 2  
Student Teacher Evaluation Form

<u>AREA</u>	<u>COMPETENCY</u>	<u>RATING</u>					
		High	-	-	-	Low	
3. Classroom Presentation	A. <u>Sets the stage for learning</u>	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
	B. <u>Presents a professional image - classroom presence and poise</u>	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
	C. <u>Gives clear and explicit directions and instructions</u>	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
	D. <u>Establishes and maintains effective interaction with pupils</u>	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
	1. <u>Encourages student expression and participation</u>	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
	2. <u>Handles student responses in a positive manner</u>	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
	3. <u>Demonstrates sensitivity to student needs</u>	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
	E. <u>Provides assistance to students as needed</u>	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
	F. <u>Uses language at appropriate level for student understanding</u>	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
	G. <u>Speaks clearly and projects voice appropriately for instructional modes</u>	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
	H. <u>Uses questioning techniques to advantage of learning and instructions</u>	4	3	2	1	0	N/A

Page 3  
Student Teacher Evaluation Form

<u>AREA</u>	<u>COMPETENCY</u>	<u>RATING</u>				
		High	-	-	-	Low
	I. <u>Provides for evaluational feedback to enhance learning and instruction</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A
	J. <u>Effects lesson closure successfully</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A
4. Professionalism	A. <u>Demonstrates dependability and competency in performing teaching related tasks</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A
	B. <u>Is punctual for teaching assignments</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A
	C. <u>Establishes rapport with school personnel</u>	4	3	2	1	0 N/A
5. Overall Evaluation		4	3	2	1	0 N/A

COMMENTS: (a) Discuss any areas of the student teachers' performance which may not be related through the above checklist. Also, comment on items which deserve special attention--a very low or high rating. (b) Use this space to record the recommendation and assistance you gave the student for improvement of his performance.

EVALUATED BY \_\_\_\_\_

Cooperating Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
College Supervisor

APPENDIX D

TABLE 26  
 SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR SCORES  
 FEMALE - STUDENT TEACHERS

S T	FACTORS															
	A R(S)	B R(S)	C R(S)	E R(S)	F R(S)	G R(S)	H R(S)	I R(S)	L R(S)	M R(S)	N R(S)	O R(S)	Q <sub>1</sub> R(S)	Q <sub>2</sub> R(S)	Q <sub>3</sub> R(S)	Q <sub>4</sub> R(S)
01	14(7)	11(8)	19(7)	11(5)	14(4)	17(9)	21(8)	12(4)	12(8)	16(7)	11(7)	2(1)	4(3)	8(5)	17(9)	9(4)
02	14(7)	9(6)	10(3)	9(1)	11(3)	16(8)	2(1)	16(7)	4(3)	6(2)	10(5)	10(5)	10(7)	11(6)	16(9)	16(6)
03	14(7)	7(4)	14(5)	8(4)	11(3)	20(10)	17(7)	17(8)	6(5)	8(3)	12(8)	8(4)	7(5)	9(5)	17(9)	16(6)
04	9(4)	8(5)	14(5)	13(6)	13(4)	12(6)	16(6)	19(10)	6(5)	13(6)	10(6)	9(4)	10(7)	8(5)	9(4)	11(4)
05	9(4)	12(9)	14(5)	12(6)	14(4)	12(6)	7(4)	10(3)	5(4)	15(7)	5(3)	7(3)	9(6)	9(5)	6(2)	18(7)
06	11(5)	5(2)	22(9)	18(8)	15(5)	18(9)	15(6)	11(4)	7(5)	10(4)	6(4)	15(8)	8(6)	6(4)	16(9)	10(4)
07	7(3)	10(7)	17(6)	8(4)	17(6)	15(7)	5(3)	10(3)	2(2)	12(5)	12(8)	9(4)	13(9)	8(5)	18(10)	16(6)
08	14(7)	5(2)	13(4)	11(5)	16(5)	17(9)	19(7)	16(7)	7(5)	8(3)	11(7)	13(7)	5(4)	12(7)	17(9)	14(5)
09	14(7)	9(6)	13(4)	7(3)	19(6)	18(9)	12(5)	19(10)	4(3)	10(4)	10(6)	12(6)	2(2)	6(4)	16(9)	15(6)
10	14(7)	4(1)	8(2)	14(7)	12(3)	10(5)	8(4)	15(6)	12(8)	10(4)	16(10)	14(7)	12(8)	6(4)	8(4)	18(7)
11	17(9)	11(8)	16(6)	18(8)	17(6)	16(8)	21(8)	15(6)	9(6)	19(9)	9(6)	6(3)	9(6)	10(6)	16(9)	10(4)
12	11(5)	7(4)	15(5)	11(5)	11(3)	13(6)	12(5)	14(6)	8(6)	5(1)	12(8)	11(6)	10(7)	4(2)	15(8)	11(4)
13	17(9)	9(6)	12(4)	8(4)	15(5)	15(7)	13(5)	16(7)	7(5)	13(6)	13(9)	15(8)	7(5)	14(8)	12(6)	18(7)

Table 26 (Continued)

		FACTORS															
S T	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>	
	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	R(S)	
14	11(5)	10(7)	20(8)	20(9)	16(5)	8(4)	24(10)	13(5)	8(6)	7(2)	5(3)	5(2)	10(7)	13(7)	12(6)	8(3)	
15	14(7)	8(5)	16(6)	8(4)	14(4)	16(8)	10(4)	17(8)	6(5)	8(3)	14(10)	11(6)	9(6)	14(8)	15(8)	14(5)	
16	7(3)	6(3)	20(8)	6(3)	6(1)	14(7)	6(3)	13(5)	6(5)	7(2)	12(8)	11(6)	9(6)	16(9)	14(7)	12(5)	
17	12(6)	10(7)	12(4)	14(7)	10(3)	16(8)	12(5)	14(6)	12(8)	18(8)	10(6)	10(5)	10(7)	7(4)	17(9)	10(4)	
18	14(7)	7(4)	14(5)	12(6)	16(5)	14(7)	18(7)	12(4)	10(7)	10(4)	4(2)	13(7)	11(7)	9(5)	16(9)	16(6)	
19	10(4)	5(2)	14(5)	12(6)	14(4)	14(7)	13(5)	10(3)	4(3)	10(4)	12(8)	10(5)	12(8)	7(4)	18(10)	15(6)	
20	13(6)	7(4)	13(4)	15(7)	11(3)	11(5)	17(7)	12(4)	10(7)	7(2)	9(6)	12(6)	9(6)	7(4)	12(6)	21(9)	
21	14(7)	12(9)	22(9)	12(6)	20(8)	14(7)	19(7)	10(3)	8(6)	7(2)	11(7)	11(6)	12(8)	13(7)	18(10)	9(3)	
22	14(7)	9(6)	17(6)	8(4)	14(4)	17(9)	21(8)	14(6)	4(3)	6(2)	13(9)	4(2)	7(5)	11(6)	16(9)	9(3)	
23	11(5)	8(5)	10(3)	17(8)	14(4)	12(6)	7(4)	17(7)	12(8)	12(5)	14(10)	12(6)	10(7)	12(7)	15(8)	19(8)	

S T - Student Teacher  
 R - Raw Score  
 S - Sten/Standard Score - Based on Norms for College  
 Students Female: Form A - Age: 20 years.

TABLE 27

SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR SCORES  
MALE - STUDENT TEACHERS

## FACTORS

S T	A R(S)	B R(S)	C R(S)	E R(S)	F R(S)	G R(S)	H R(S)	I R(S)	L R(S)	M R(S)	N R(S)	O R(S)	Q <sub>1</sub> R(S)	Q <sub>2</sub> R(S)	Q <sub>3</sub> R(S)	Q <sub>4</sub> R(S)
01	13(7)	7(4)	20(8)	12(5)	14(5)	16(8)	11(5)	10(6)	5(3)	10(4)	13(9)	9(5)	7(4)	11(6)	6(2)	13(6)
02	12(7)	7(4)	17(6)	13(5)	9(3)	19(10)	10(4)	8(5)	8(5)	49(1)	5(3)	5(3)	3(1)	9(5)	15(8)	7(3)
03	9(5)	5(3)	19(7)	17(7)	11(3)	16(8)	9(4)	16(9)	11(7)	9(4)	9(6)	10(6)	12(7)	13(7)	15(8)	16(7)
04	12(7)	6(3)	12(4)	5(1)	13(4)	18(9)	18(7)	16(9)	5(3)	5(1)	12(9)	9(5)	8(4)	15(8)	19(10)	12(5)
05	12(7)	8(4)	22(9)	18(8)	18(6)	14(7)	18(7)	8(5)	8(5)	8(3)	7(5)	7(4)	12(7)	10(6)	16(9)	14(6)
06	16(9)	9(5)	20(8)	11(4)	15(5)	16(8)	19(7)	9(6)	1(1)	11(5)	13(9)	7(4)	4(2)	5(3)	20(10)	5(2)
07	14(8)	5(3)	10(3)	17(7)	21(8)	15(7)	14(6)	13(7)	11(7)	5(1)	13(9)	15(8)	11(6)	5(3)	13(6)	20(9)

S T - Student Teacher

R - Raw Score

S - Sten/Standard Score - Based on Norms for College

Students Male: Form A - Age: 20 years.

TABLE 28  
 SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR SCORES  
 FEMALE - COOPERATING TEACHERS

FACTORS

C T	A R(S)	B R(S)	C R(S)	E R(S)	F R(S)	G R(S)	H R(S)	I R(S)	L R(S)	M R(S)	N R(S)	O R(S)	Q <sub>1</sub> R(S)	Q <sub>2</sub> R(S)	Q <sub>3</sub> R(S)	Q <sub>4</sub> R(S)
01	18(4)	11(9)	18(7)	15(7)	14(6)	13(6)	14(6)	11(4)	9(7)	14(6)	8(4)	6(3)	1(1)	12(7)	15(7)	12(5)
02	14(8)	9(7)	14(5)	5(3)	18(8)	14(6)	18(7)	11(4)	2(3)	11(4)	11(6)	7(4)	6(5)	9(5)	16(8)	9(4)
03	10(5)	7(5)	13(4)	14(7)	11(4)	17(8)	15(6)	11(4)	7(6)	14(6)	14(8)	7(4)	11(8)	13(7)	15(7)	10(4)
04	6(3)	9(7)	20(8)	6(3)	12(5)	20(10)	12(5)	12(5)	2(3)	8(3)	14(8)	2(1)	8(6)	14(8)	16(8)	8(4)
05	9(4)	7(5)	18(7)	6(3)	12(5)	12(5)	9(4)	16(7)	10(8)	6(2)	12(7)	15(8)	6(5)	12(7)	13(6)	17(7)
06	15(8)	11(9)	16(6)	10(5)	15(6)	12(5)	18(7)	17(8)	7(6)	12(5)	11(6)	8(4)	3(3)	6(3)	14(6)	11(5)
07	12(6)	10(8)	18(7)	16(8)	15(6)	14(6)	19(8)	14(6)	11(8)	13(5)	4(2)	11(6)	8(6)	8(4)	17(8)	15(6)
08	16(9)	6(5)	9(2)	11(6)	16(7)	14(6)	22(9)	18(8)	6(6)	18(8)	9(5)	14(7)	6(5)	8(4)	10(4)	16(7)
09	12(6)	9(7)	19(7)	14(7)	14(6)	15(7)	15(6)	7(2)	12(9)	15(6)	9(5)	12(6)	6(5)	6(3)	17(8)	11(5)
10	9(4)	10(8)	24(10)	5(3)	16(7)	15(7)	14(6)	18(8)	0(1)	16(7)	10(5)	4(2)	5(4)	11(6)	14(6)	8(4)
11	10(5)	8(6)	14(5)	12(6)	13(5)	14(6)	14(6)	12(5)	8(7)	10(4)	12(7)	6(3)	4(3)	15(8)	15(7)	11(5)
12	8(4)	9(7)	17(6)	10(5)	12(5)	18(9)	15(6)	8(3)	2(3)	15(6)	12(7)	11(6)	6(5)	14(8)	17(8)	6(3)
13	13(7)	11(9)	12(4)	11(6)	15(6)	11(4)	13(6)	13(5)	9(7)	16(7)	11(6)	12(6)	4(3)	12(7)	9(4)	17(7)

C T - Cooperating Teacher  
 R - Raw Score  
 S - Sten/Standard Score Based on age 30 years  
 General Population Female: Form A

TABLE 29  
 SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR SCORES  
 MALE - COOPERATING TEACHERS  
 FACTORS

C T	A R(S)	B R(S)	C R(S)	E R(S)	F R(S)	G R(S)	H R(S)	I R(S)	L R(S)	M R(S)	N R(S)	O R(S)	Q <sub>1</sub> R(S)	Q <sub>2</sub> R(S)	Q <sub>3</sub> R(S)	Q <sub>4</sub> R(S)
01	5(2)	8(6)	16(5)	12(5)	15(6)	13(5)	18(7)	11(7)	4(4)	20(9)	4(2)	10(6)	12(7)	11(6)	12(5)	13(7)
02	13(7)	10(8)	22(8)	15(7)	15(6)	15(6)	25(10)	9(6)	6(5)	7(2)	8(5)	4(3)	12(7)	11(6)	14(6)	5(3)
03	7(4)	10(8)	20(7)	13(6)	8(3)	18(8)	12(4)	16(10)	8(6)	12(5)	8(5)	6(4)	11(7)	16(9)	16(7)	13(7)
04	8(4)	8(6)	19(7)	9(4)	16(6)	20(10)	19(7)	14(8)	8(6)	10(4)	12(8)	16(9)	3(1)	6(4)	17(8)	10(5)
05	12(7)	9(7)	13(4)	2(1)	9(3)	16(7)	5(2)	12(7)	3(3)	8(5)	14(9)	10(6)	8(5)	16(9)	14(6)	22(10)
06	12(7)	9(7)	17(6)	9(4)	23(10)	15(6)	18(7)	8(5)	10(7)	10(4)	14(9)	6(4)	5(3)	10(6)	16(7)	14(7)

C T - Cooperating Teacher  
 R - Raw Score  
 S - Sten/Standard Score Based on age 30 years  
 General Population Male: Form A



TABLE 30

CATTELL'S SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR  
MEAN SCORES FOR FEMALES  
STUDENT TEACHERS - COOPERATING TEACHERS

FACTOR	FEMALE STUDENT TEACHER MEAN SCORE	FEMALE COOPERATING TEACHER MEAN SCORE
A	11.95	10.50
B	8.21	8.87
C	15.00	17.37
E	11.43	10.50
F	13.78	13.41
G	14.56	14.87
H	13.69	15.20
I	14.00	13.29
L	7.34	6.04
M	10.30	12.87
N	10.47	10.75
O	10.00	8.91
Q <sub>1</sub>	8.91	6.29
Q <sub>2</sub>	9.56	11.00
Q <sub>3</sub>	14.60	14.75
Q <sub>4</sub>	13.69	11.75

TABLE 31  
 CATTELL'S SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR  
 MEAN SCORES FOR MALES  
 STUDENT TEACHERS - COOPERATING TEACHERS

FACTOR	MALE STUDENT TEACHER MEAN SCORE	MALE COOPERATING TEACHER MEAN SCORE
A	12.57	9.50
B	6.71	9.00
C	17.14	17.83
E	13.28	10.00
F	14.42	14.33
G	16.28	16.16
H	14.14	16.16
I	11.42	11.56
L	7.00	6.50
M	7.42	11.16
N	10.28	10.00
O	8.84	8.66
Q <sub>1</sub>	8.14	8.50
Q <sub>2</sub>	9.71	11.66
Q <sub>3</sub>	14.85	14.83
Q <sub>4</sub>	12.42	12.83

APPENDIX E

HAMPTON INSTITUTE  
Hampton, Virginia 23668

Office of Student Teaching

December 9, 1981

Dear Cooperating Teacher:

I wish to thank you for accepting a student teacher to work with you this fall. It is hoped that the experience will be a challenging one for you and your student teacher.

I am conducting a research study this fall to determine if congruence of measurable personality factors of student teachers and cooperating teachers have an effect upon success in student teaching experiences. In order to complete the study I will need your help. I have enclosed in your packet of materials the following:

1. A copy of the Cattell's Sixteen Personal Factor Questionnaire.
2. One answer sheet.
3. One self-addressed stamped return envelope.
4. One set of instructions for the Cattell's Sixteen Factor Questionnaire.
5. One Informed Consent Form.

I am asking if you would please complete the requested information and return to me by December 18, 1981.

All responses will be confidential and will be used for this research study only.

I will appreciate your cooperation and support in this research study.

Sincerely,

Darlene S. Abram  
Coordinator, Student Teaching

HAMPTON INSTITUTE  
Hampton, Virginia 23668

INFORMED CONSENT

The research study to be conducted by Darlene S. Abram is a collaborative research project on the student teacher/cooperating teacher personality factors. The nature of the project has been explained to me. I understand that my participation is needed in order for the project to be successfully completed. I understand that the study includes the following:

Student Teacher

1. Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire
2. The Student Teacher Evaluation Form

Cooperating Teacher

1. Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire
2. The Student Teacher Evaluation Form

College Supervisor

1. The Student Teacher Evaluation Form

I further understand that all information is confidential and coded. Identity will not be revealed. Any questions about the project will be answered. On the basis of the above statement, I agree to participate in this project.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Participant's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Investigator's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Darlene S. Abram  
Office of Student Teaching  
Hampton Institute  
Hampton, Virginia 23668

## INSTRUCTIONS

## Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire

Inside the test booklet are some questions to see what interests you have and how you feel about things. On most items there are no "right" or "wrong" answers because people have the right to their own views. All you have to do is answer what is true for you.

A separate answer sheet has been provided for you. Write your name and the other information asked for on the answer sheet.

## EXAMPLES:

1. I like to watch team games.  
a. yes, b. occasionally, c. no.
2. I prefer people who:  
a. are reserved  
b. (are) in between  
c. make friends quickly
3. Money cannot bring happiness.  
a. yes (true)  
b. in between  
c. no (false)
4. Adult is to child as cat is to:  
a. kitten  
b. dog  
c. baby

In the last example there is a right answer--kitten. But there are very few such reasoning items.

When you begin the test start with number 1 and answer the questions. Keep these four things in mind:

1. Give only answers that are true for you. It is best to say what you really think.
2. Don't spend too much time thinking over each question. Give the first, natural answer as it comes to you. Of course, the questions are too short to give you all the information you might like, but give the best answer you can under the circumstances.
3. Answer every question one way or the other. Don't skip any.

4. You should mark the a or c answer most of the time. Mark the middle b answer only when you feel you have to, because neither a nor c seems to be right for you.

When you have completed the test, please enclose the test, answer sheet, personal data form, and the informed consent form in the self-addressed stamped envelope and return to me.

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX F





**FORM A**  
1967-68 EDITION R

# 16 PF

**WHAT TO DO:** Inside this booklet are some questions to see what interests you have and how you feel about things. On most items there are no "right" or "wrong" answers because people have the right to their own views. All you have to do is answer what is true for *you*.

If a separate answer sheet has *not* been given to you, turn this booklet over and tear off the answer sheet on the back page. Write your name and the other information asked for on the answer sheet.

First, read the four **EXAMPLES** below and mark your answers *on the answer sheet* where it says **EXAMPLES**. Fill in the box completely:

**EXAMPLES:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>1. I like to watch team games.<br/>a. yes, b. occasionally, c. no.</p>                                 | <p>3. Money cannot bring happiness.<br/>a. yes (true),<br/>b. in between,<br/>c. no (false).</p> |
| <p>2. I prefer people who:<br/>a. are reserved,<br/>b. (are) in between,<br/>c. make friends quickly.</p> | <p>4. Adult is to child as cat is to:<br/>a. kitten, b. dog, c. baby.</p>                        |

In the last example there *is* a right answer—kitten. But there are very few such reasoning items.

Ask *now* if something isn't clear.

When the examiner tells you, start with number 1 and answer the questions. Keep these four things in mind:

1. Give only answers that are true *for you*. It is best to say what you really think.
2. Don't spend too much time thinking over each question. Give the first, natural answer as it comes to you. Of course, the questions are too short to give you *all* the information you might like, but give the best answer you can under the circumstances.
3. Answer *every* question one way or the other. Don't skip any.
4. You should mark the *a* or *c* answer *most* of the time. Mark the middle *b* answer *only* when you feel you have to, because neither *a* nor *c* seems to be right for you.

**DO NOT TURN PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO**

1. I have the instructions for this test clearly in mind.  
a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
2. I am ready to answer each question as truthfully as possible.  
a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
3. I would rather have a house:  
a. in a sociable suburb,  
b. in between,  
c. alone in the deep woods.
4. I can find enough energy to face my difficulties.  
a. always, b. generally, c. seldom.
5. I feel a bit nervous of wild animals even when they are in strong cages.  
a. yes (true), b. uncertain, c. no (false).
6. I hold back from criticizing people and their ideas.  
a. yes, b. sometimes, c. no.
7. I make smart, sarcastic remarks to people if I think they deserve it.  
a. generally, b. sometimes, c. never.
8. I prefer semiclassical music to popular tunes.  
a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
9. If I saw two neighbors' children fighting, I would:  
a. leave them to settle it,  
b. uncertain,  
c. reason with them.
10. On social occasions I:  
a. readily come forward,  
b. in between,  
c. prefer to stay quietly in the background.
11. It would be more interesting to be:  
a. a construction engineer,  
b. uncertain,  
c. a writer of plays.
12. I would rather stop in the street to watch an artist painting than listen to some people having a quarrel.  
a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
13. I can generally put up with conceited people, even though they brag or show they think too well of themselves.  
a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
14. You can almost always notice on people's faces when they are dishonest.  
a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
15. It would be good for everyone if vacations (holidays) were longer and everyone *had* to take them.  
a. agree, b. uncertain, c. disagree.
16. I would rather take the gamble of a job with possibly large but uneven earnings, than one with a steady, small salary.  
a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
17. I talk about my feelings:  
a. only if necessary,  
b. in between,  
c. readily, whenever I have a chance.
18. Once in a while I have a sense of vague danger or sudden dread for reasons that I do not understand.  
a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
19. When criticized wrongly for something I did *not* do, I:  
a. have no feeling of guilt,  
b. in between,  
c. still feel a bit guilty.
20. Money can buy almost everything.  
a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
21. My decisions are governed more by my:  
a. heart,  
b. feelings and reason equally,  
c. head.
22. Most people would be happier if they lived more like their friends and did much the same things as others.  
a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
23. I occasionally get puzzled, when looking in a mirror, as to which is my right and left.  
a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
24. When talking, I like:  
a. to say things, just as they occur to me,  
b. in between,  
c. to get my thoughts well organized first.
25. When something really makes me furious, I find I calm down again quite quickly.  
a. yes, b. in between, c. no.

26. With the same hours and pay, it would be more interesting to be:  
**a. a carpenter or cook,**  
**b. uncertain,**  
**c. a waiter or waitress in a good restaurant.**
27. I have been elected to:  
**a. only a few offices,**  
**b. several,**  
**c. many offices.**
28. "Spade" is to "dig" as "knife" is to:  
**a. sharp, b. cut, c. point.**
29. I sometimes can't get to sleep because an idea keeps running through my mind.  
**a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.**
30. In my personal life I reach the goals I set, almost all the time.  
**a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.**
31. An out-dated law should be changed:  
**a. only after considerable discussion,**  
**b. in between,**  
**c. promptly.**
32. I am uncomfortable when I work on a project requiring quick action affecting others.  
**a. true, b. in between, c. false.**
33. Most of the people I know would rate me as an amusing talker.  
**a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.**
34. When I see "sloppy," untidy people, I:  
**a. just accept it,**  
**b. in between,**  
**c. get disgusted and annoyed.**
35. I get slightly embarrassed if I suddenly become the focus of attention in a social group.  
**a. yes, b. in between, c. no.**
36. I am always glad to join a large gathering, for example, a party, dance, or public meeting.  
**a. yes, b. in between, c. no.**
37. In school I preferred (or prefer):  
**a. music,**  
**b. uncertain,**  
**c. handwork and crafts.**
38. When I have been put in charge of something, I insist that my instructions are followed or else I resign.  
**a. yes, b. sometimes, c. no.**
39. For parents, it is more important to:  
**a. help their children develop their affections,**  
**b. in between,**  
**c. teach their children how to control emotions.**
40. In a group task I would rather:  
**a. try to improve arrangements,**  
**b. in between,**  
**c. keep the records and see that rules are followed.**
41. I feel a need every now and then to engage in a tough physical activity.  
**a. yes, b. in between, c. no.**
42. I would rather mix with polite people than rough, rebellious individuals.  
**a. yes, b. in between, c. no.**
43. I feel terribly dejected when people criticize me in a group.  
**a. true, b. in between, c. false.**
44. If I am called in by my boss, I:  
**a. make it a chance to ask for something I want,**  
**b. in between,**  
**c. fear I've done something wrong.**
45. What this world needs is:  
**a. more steady and "solid" citizens,**  
**b. uncertain,**  
**c. more "idealists" with plans for a better world.**
46. I am always keenly aware of attempts at propaganda in things I read.  
**a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.**
47. As a teenager, I joined in school sports:  
**a. occasionally,**  
**b. fairly often,**  
**c. a great deal.**
48. I keep my room well organized, with things in known places almost all the time.  
**a. yes, b. in between, c. no.**
49. I sometimes get in a state of tension and turmoil as I think of the day's happenings.  
**a. yes, b. in between, c. no.**
50. I sometimes doubt whether people I am talking to are really interested in what I am saying.  
**a. yes, b. in between, c. no.**

51. If I had to choose, I would rather be:  
 a. a forester,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. a high school teacher.
52. For special holidays and birthdays, I:  
 a. like to give personal presents,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. feel that buying presents is a bit of a nuisance.
53. "Tired" is to "work" as "proud" is to:  
 a. smile. b. success, c. happy.
54. Which of the following items is different in kind from the others?  
 a. candle. b. moon, c. electric light.
55. I have been let down by my friends:  
 a. hardly ever.  
 b. occasionally,  
 c. quite a lot.
56. I have some characteristics in which I feel definitely superior to most people.  
 a. yes. b. uncertain, c. no.
57. When I get upset, I try hard to hide my feelings from others.  
 a. true. b. in between, c. false.
58. I like to go out to a show or entertainment:  
 a. more than once a week (more than average),  
 b. about once a week (average),  
 c. less than once a week (less than average).
59. I think that plenty of freedom is more important than good manners and respect for the law.  
 a. true. b. uncertain, c. false.
60. I tend to keep quiet in the presence of senior persons (people of greater experience, age, or rank).  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
61. I find it hard to address or recite to a large group.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
62. I have a good sense of direction (find it easy to tell which is North, South, East, or West) when in a strange place.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
63. If someone got mad at me, I would:  
 a. try to calm that person down,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. get irritated.
64. When I read an unfair magazine article, I am more inclined to forget it than to feel like "hitting back."  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
65. My memory tends to drop a lot of unimportant, trivial things, for example, names of streets or stores in town.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
66. I could enjoy the life of an animal doctor, handling disease and surgery of animals.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
67. I eat my food with gusto, not always so carefully and properly as some people.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
68. There are times when I don't feel in the right mood to see anyone.  
 a. very rarely,  
 b. in between,  
 c. quite often.
69. People sometimes warn me that I show my excitement in voice and manner too obviously.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
70. As a teenager, if I differed in opinion from my parents, I usually:  
 a. kept my own opinion,  
 b. in between,  
 c. accepted their authority.
71. I would prefer to have an office of my own, not sharing it with another person.  
 a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
72. I would rather enjoy life quietly in my own way than be admired for my achievements.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
73. I feel mature in most things.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
74. I find myself upset rather than helped by the kind of criticism that many people offer one.  
 a. often, b. occasionally, c. never.
75. I am always able to keep the expression of my feelings under exact control.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.

76. In starting a useful invention, I would prefer:  
 a. working on it in the laboratory,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. selling it to people.
77. "Surprise" is to "strange" as "fear" is to:  
 a. brave, b. anxious, c. terrible.
78. Which of the following fractions is not in the same class as the others?  
 a.  $\frac{3}{7}$ , b.  $\frac{3}{9}$ , c.  $\frac{3}{11}$ .
79. Some people seem to ignore or avoid me, although I don't know why.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
80. People treat me less reasonably than my good intentions deserve.  
 a. often, b. occasionally, c. never.
81. The use of foul language, even when it is not in a mixed group of men and women, still disgusts me.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
82. I have decidedly fewer friends than most people.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
83. I would hate to be where there wouldn't be a lot of people to talk to.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
84. People sometimes call me careless, even though they think I'm a likable person.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
85. "Stage-fright" in various social situations is something I have experienced:  
 a. quite often,  
 b. occasionally,  
 c. hardly ever.
86. When I am in a small group, I am content to sit back and let others do most of the talking.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
87. I prefer reading:  
 a. a realistic account of military or political battles,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. a sensitive, imaginative novel.
88. When bossy people try to "push me around," I do just the opposite of what they wish.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
89. Business superiors or members of my family, as a rule, find fault with me only when there is real cause.  
 a. true, b. in between, c. false.
90. In streets or stores, I dislike the way some persons stare at people.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
91. On a long journey, I would prefer to:  
 a. read something profound, but interesting,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. pass the time talking casually with a fellow passenger.
92. In a situation which may become dangerous, I believe in making a fuss and speaking up even if calmness and politeness are lost.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
93. If acquaintances treat me badly and show they dislike me:  
 a. it doesn't upset me a bit,  
 b. in between,  
 c. I tend to get downhearted.
94. I find it embarrassing to have praise or compliments bestowed on me.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
95. I would rather have a job with:  
 a. a fixed, certain salary,  
 b. in between,  
 c. a larger salary, which depended on my constantly persuading people I am worth it.
96. To keep informed, I like:  
 a. to discuss issues with people,  
 b. in between,  
 c. to rely on the actual news reports.
97. I like to take an active part in social affairs, committee work, etc.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
98. In carrying out a task, I am not satisfied unless even the minor details are given close attention.  
 a. true, b. in between, c. false.
99. Quite small setbacks occasionally irritate me too much.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
100. I am always a sound sleeper, never walking or talking in my sleep.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.

101. It would be more interesting to work in a business:  
 a. talking to customers,  
 b. in between.  
 c. keeping office accounts and records.
102. "Size" is to "length" as "dishonesty" is to:  
 a. prison, b. sin, c. stealing.
103. AB is to dc as SR is to:  
 a. qp, b. pq, c. tu.
104. When people are unreasonable, I just:  
 a. keep quiet,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. despise them.
105. If people talk loudly while I am listening to music, I:  
 a. can keep my mind on the music and not be bothered,  
 b. in between,  
 c. find it spoils my enjoyment and annoys me.
106. I think I am better described as:  
 a. polite and quiet,  
 b. in between,  
 c. forceful.
107. I attend social functions only when I have to, and stay away any other time.  
 a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
108. To be cautious and expect little is better than to be happy at heart, always expecting success.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
109. In thinking of difficulties in my work, I:  
 a. try to plan ahead, before I meet them,  
 b. in between,  
 c. assume I can handle them when they come.
110. I find it easy to mingle among people at a social gathering.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
111. When a bit of diplomacy and persuasion are needed to get people moving, I am generally the one asked to do it.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
112. It would be more interesting to be:  
 a. a guidance worker helping young people find jobs,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. in charge of efficiency engineering.
113. If I am quite sure that a person is unjust or behaving selfishly, I show that person up, even if it takes some trouble.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
114. I sometimes make foolish remarks in fun, just to surprise people and see what they will say.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
115. I would enjoy being a newspaper writer on drama, concerts, opera, etc.  
 a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
116. I never feel the urge to doodle and fidget when kept sitting still at a meeting.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
117. If someone tells me something which I know is wrong, I am more likely to say to myself:  
 a. "That person is a liar,"  
 b. in between,  
 c. "Apparently that person is misinformed."
118. I feel some punishment is coming to me even when I have done nothing wrong.  
 a. often, b. occasionally, c. never.
119. The idea that sickness comes as much from mental as physical causes is much exaggerated.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
120. The pomp and splendor of any big state ceremony are things which should be preserved.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
121. It bothers me if people think I am being too unconventional or odd.  
 a. a lot, b. somewhat, c. not at all.
122. In constructing something I would rather work:  
 a. with a committee,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. on my own.
123. I have periods when it's hard to stop a mood of self-pity.  
 a. often, b. occasionally, c. never.
124. Often I get angry with people too quickly.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
125. I can always change old habits without difficulty and without slipping back.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.

126. If the earnings were the same, I would rather be:  
 a. a lawyer,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. a navigator or pilot.
127. "Better" is to "worst" as "slower" is to:  
 a. fast, b. best, c. quickest.
128. Which of the following should come next at the end of this row of letters: xooooxooooxx?  
 a. oxxx, b. oox, c. xooo.
129. When the time comes for something I have planned and looked forward to, I occasionally do not feel up to going.  
 a. true, b. in between, c. false.
130. I can work carefully on most things without being bothered by people making a lot of noise around me.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
131. I occasionally tell strangers things that seem to me important, regardless of whether they ask about them.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
132. I spend much of my spare time talking with friends about social events enjoyed in the past.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
133. I enjoy doing "daring," foolhardy things "just for fun."  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
134. I find the sight of an untidy room very annoying.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
135. I consider myself a very sociable, outgoing person.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
136. In social contacts I:  
 a. show my emotions as I wish,  
 b. in between,  
 c. keep my emotions to myself.
137. I enjoy music that is:  
 a. light, dry, and brisk,  
 b. in between,  
 c. emotional and sentimental.
138. I admire the beauty of a poem more than that of a well-made gun.  
 a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
139. If a good remark of mine is passed by, I:  
 a. let it go,  
 b. in between,  
 c. give people a chance to hear it again.
140. I would like to work as a probation officer with criminals on parole.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
141. One should be careful about mixing with all kinds of strangers, since there are dangers of infection and so on.  
 a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
142. In traveling abroad, I would rather go on an expertly conducted tour than plan by myself the places I wish to visit.  
 a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
143. I am properly regarded as only a plodding, half-successful person.  
 a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
144. If people take advantage of my friendliness, I do not resent it and I soon forget.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
145. If a heated argument developed between other members taking part in a group discussion, I would:  
 a. like to see a "winner,"  
 b. in between,  
 c. wish that it would be smoothed over.
146. I like to do my planning alone, without interruptions and suggestions from others.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
147. I sometimes let my actions get swayed by feelings of jealousy.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
148. I believe firmly "the boss may not always be right, but always has the right to be boss."  
 a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
149. I get tense as I think of all the things lying ahead of me.  
 a. yes, b. sometimes, c. no.
150. If people shout suggestions when I'm playing a game, it doesn't upset me.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.

151. It would be more interesting to be:  
 a. an artist,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. a secretary running a club.
152. Which of the following words does not properly belong with the others?  
 a. any. b. some. c. most.
153. "Flame" is to "heat" as "rose" is to:  
 a. thorn, b. red petals, c. scent.
154. I have vivid dreams, disturbing my sleep.  
 a. often,  
 b. occasionally,  
 c. practically never.
155. If the odds are really against something's being a success, I still believe in taking the risk.  
 a. yes, b. in between. c. no.
156. I like it when I know so well what the group has to do that I naturally become the one in command.  
 a. yes. b. in between, c. no.
157. I would rather dress with quiet correctness than with eye-catching personal style.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
158. An evening with a quiet hobby appeals to me more than a lively party.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
159. I close my mind to well-meant suggestions of others, even though I know I shouldn't.  
 a. occasionally, b. hardly ever, c. never.
160. I always make it a point, in deciding anything, to refer to basic rules of right and wrong.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
161. I somewhat dislike having a group watch me at work.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
162. Because it is not always possible to get things done by gradual, reasonable methods, it is sometimes necessary to use force.  
 a. true, b. in between, c. false.
163. In school I preferred (or prefer):  
 a. English,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. mathematics or arithmetic.
164. I have sometimes been troubled by people's saying bad things about me behind my back, with no grounds at all.  
 a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
165. Talk with ordinary, habit-bound, conventional people:  
 a. is often quite interesting and has a lot to it,  
 b. in between,  
 c. annoys me because it deals with trifles and lacks depth.
166. Some things make me so angry that I find it best not to speak.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
167. In education, it is more important to:  
 a. give the child enough affection,  
 b. in between,  
 c. have the child learn desirable habits and attitudes.
168. People regard me as a solid, undisturbed person, unmoved by ups and downs in circumstances.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
169. I think society should let reason lead it to new customs and throw aside old habits or mere traditions.  
 a. yes. b. in between, c. no.
170. I think it is more important in the modern world to solve:  
 a. the question of moral purpose,  
 b. uncertain,  
 c. the political difficulties.
171. I learn better by:  
 a. reading a well-written book,  
 b. in between,  
 c. joining a group discussion.
172. I like to go my own way instead of acting on approved rules.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.
173. I like to wait till I am sure that what I am saying is correct, before I put forth an argument.  
 a. always,  
 b. generally,  
 c. only if it's practicable.
174. Small things sometimes "get on my nerves" unbearably, though I realize they are trivial.  
 a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
175. I don't often say things on the spur of the moment that I greatly regret.  
 a. true, b. uncertain, c. false.



176. If asked to work with a charity drive, I would  
a. accept,  
b. uncertain,  
c. politely say I'm too busy.
177. Which of the following words does not belong with the others?  
a. wide. b. zigzag, c. straight.
178. "Soon" is to "never" as "near" is to:  
a. nowhere, b. far, c. away.
179. If I make an awkward social mistake, I can soon forget it.  
a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
180. I am known as the type of person who almost always puts forward some ideas on a problem.  
a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
181. I think I am better at showing:  
a. nerve in meeting challenges,  
b. uncertain,  
c. tolerance of other people's wishes.
182. I am considered a very enthusiastic person.  
a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
183. I like a job that offers change, variety, and travel, even if it involves some danger.  
a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
184. I am a fairly strict person, insisting on always doing things as correctly as possible.  
a. true, b. in between, c. false.
185. I enjoy work that requires conscientious, exacting skills.  
a. yes, b. in between, c. no.
186. I'm the energetic type who keeps busy.  
a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.
187. I am sure there are no questions that I have skipped or failed to answer properly.  
a. yes, b. uncertain, c. no.

(End of test.)



EXAMPLES

- 1. I like to watch team games.  
a. yes, b. occasionally, c. no.
- 2. I prefer people who:  
a. are reserved,  
b. (are) in between,  
c. make friends quickly.
- 3. Money cannot bring happiness.  
a. yes (true),  
b. in between,  
c. no (false).
- 4. Adult is to child as cat is to:  
a. kitten, b. dog, c. baby.

ANSWER SHEET: THE 16 P. F. TEST, FORM A

1  a  b  c  
 2  a  b  c  
 3  a  b  c  
 4  a  b  c

NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
 First Middle Last  
 SEX \_\_\_\_\_ AGE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Write M or F) (Nearest Year)

RAW SCORE

FB

1	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	26	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	51	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	76	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	101	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	126	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	151	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	176	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c
2	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	27	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	52	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	77	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	102	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	127	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	152	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	177	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c
3	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	28	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	53	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	78	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	103	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	128	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	153	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	178	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c
4	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	29	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	54	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	79	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	104	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	129	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	154	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	179	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c
5	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	30	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	55	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	80	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	105	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	130	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	155	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	180	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c
FILL IN THE BOX COMPLETELY. ERASE ENTIRELY ANY ANSWER YOU WISH TO CHANGE.															
6	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	31	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	56	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	81	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	106	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	131	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	156	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	181	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c
7	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	32	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	57	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	82	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	107	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	132	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	157	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	182	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c
8	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	33	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	58	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	83	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	108	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	133	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	158	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	183	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c
9	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	34	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	59	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	84	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	109	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	134	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	159	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	184	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c
10	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	35	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	60	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	85	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	110	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	135	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	160	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	185	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c
11	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	36	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	61	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	86	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	111	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	136	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	161	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	186	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c
12	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	37	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	62	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	87	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	112	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	137	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	162	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	187	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c
13	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	38	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	63	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	88	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	113	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	138	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	163	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	END OF TEST	
14	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	39	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	64	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	89	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	114	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	139	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	164	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c		
15	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	40	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	65	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	90	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	115	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	140	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	165	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c		
16	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	41	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	66	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	91	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	116	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	141	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	166	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c		
17	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	42	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	67	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	92	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	117	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	142	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	167	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c		
18	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	43	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	68	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	93	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	118	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	143	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	168	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c		
19	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	44	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	69	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	94	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	119	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	144	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	169	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c		
20	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	45	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	70	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	95	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	120	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	145	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	170	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c		
21	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	46	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	71	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	96	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	121	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	146	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	171	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c		
22	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	47	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	72	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	97	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	122	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	147	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	172	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c		
23	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	48	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	73	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	98	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	123	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	148	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	173	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c		
24	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	49	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	74	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	99	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	124	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	149	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	174	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c		
25	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	50	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	75	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	100	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	125	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	150	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c	175	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> c		

Do not write here.

NORMS USED:

- HS
- Coll
- Gen Pop
- A
- B
- A + B
- M
- F
- '61-'62
- '67-'68

A

B

C

E

F

G

H

I

L

M

N

O

Q<sub>1</sub>

Q<sub>2</sub>

Q<sub>3</sub>

Q<sub>4</sub>

FG

HAMPTON INSTITUTE  
HAMPTON, VIRGINIA

GRADES FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

I. Standards for a "B" grade

A "B" grade student teacher is the kind of person that Hampton Institute is proud to recommend as a beginning teacher. It is an above average grade but within the reach of any student teacher who does a thorough, competent and imaginative job in the classroom and related programs of the school. It means that we can expect him to solve his problem in discipline, classroom management and curriculum organization. His oral speech and written reports are without commonplace grammatical errors. His work is done with promptness, efficiency and accuracy. He arrives at school, classes and assigned activities on time. He avoids letting personal considerations interfere with accepted responsibilities during the time of his student teaching. To particularize a "B" grade student will have succeeded in all of the following:

1. Knowledge of subject will be adequate in the judgment of cooperating teacher, center supervisor, and area coordinator.
2. An appropriate variety of techniques will be used. They will reflect knowledge of adolescents and of the psychology of learning.
3. Teaching aides such as bulletin boards, trips, models, movies, slides, filmstrips, cartoons, maps and many others should be used to advance the work of the class.
4. Pupil relations and classroom management will be efficient and democratic.
5. Personal qualities of a high calibre are needed--good appearance, ability to get along well with others, maturity in social, educational, and personal affairs, cooperation, dependability, English usage, good attitude toward teaching and toward pupils.
6. Lesson plans will be carefully made for each lesson taught. They will be handed to the cooperating teacher and discussed with him before they are to be taught.
7. Student teachers will quickly include taking attendance, helping with classroom activities, observing and helping with the curricular activities of the school, and attending teacher's meetings as a part of their normal teaching experience.

Grades for Student Teachers  
Page 2

II. Standards for an "A" grade

A student teacher may be awarded an "A" grade when we can confidently say he is fully capable of beginning his first years of teaching in a highly successful manner. His work as a student teacher will be OUTSTANDING. His teaching has vitality and enthusiasm. He will have met all of the provisions of the "B" grade in a superior manner. In addition, he shall do at least one superior long term project.

In his beginning teaching he will have demonstrated a high order of social effectiveness with all the people his work concerns. His relationships should show a liking and concern for the personalities of others. He is a teacher; he is a teacher in the public schools, the welfare of all of those whose lives he touches is of concern to him. The quality of sensitivity to the needs of others and to the worth of all people can be developed. It is a demonstrated growth in human relationships that is reflected in an "A" grade. The student teacher must accept responsibility for continuous development of his personality and his relationship to others.

III. The "C" and lesser grades

A "C" for a student teacher means that he has been deficient in one or more areas listed for a "B" grade. The areas listed for a "B" are all necessary for success in teaching. They are the fundamentals and are worth whatever time and effort are necessary to accomplish them. Lack of success in any of these fundamentals is cause for serious concern. Any achievement below "C" level will be cause for removal from the student teaching program.

IV. The cooperating teachers and the college supervisors rate the student teacher's performance in the classroom utilizing the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form. The ratings for each item is total generating an overall (cumulative) grade average for the student teacher. The two grade averages are computed to obtain a final grade for the student teacher. The student teacher's final grade is based upon the average of the cooperating teacher's grade and the college supervisor's grade. Equal weight is given for each grade i.e., cooperating teacher's grade equals 50% and the college supervisor's grade equals 50%.

Grades for Student Teachers  
Page 3

Students engaged in student teaching must earn an average grade of at least 2.00 on the 4.00 scale to pass student teaching. According to the 1982-1984 Hampton Institute College Catalog the grade of "C" indicates satisfactory achievement and the grade of "D" indicates work that is below average but meets the minimum requirement of course credit (except a course in the major course sequence where "C" is required). Student teaching is one of the courses in the major sequence where "C" is required for passing. A grade of "C" for a student teacher means that the student teacher has been deficient in one or more areas listed for a "B" grade. The areas listed for a "B," (see page 4), are all necessary for success in student teaching. They are the fundamentals and are worth whatever time and effort are necessary to accomplish them. Lack of success in any of these fundamentals is cause for serious concern. Any achievement below "C" level will be cause for removal from the student teaching program.

APPENDIX G

## RATIONALE FOR INSTRUMENT SELECTION

There are large numbers of various personality tests on the market today. Many are widely used, while others are restricted to research. Several of the available instruments are discussed in this section as described by Thorndike and Hagen (1977).

The California Test of Personality provides percentile scores on personal adjustment and social adjustment that have showed distributions and give meaningful information about patterns of adjustment only in rare cases. The evidence on validity presented in the manual appear to be incomplete and misleading in places.

Edwards Personality Inventory consists of true-false items and the subject is to report how others would describe him rather than to give his self-concept. Reliabilitis of many scales are low and there is no validity information and no statement regarding intended uses of the instrument.

Eysenck Personality Inventory is a short scale measuring two broad traits, Extraversion and Neuroticism. However, the validation available connects the test with many psychologically interesting variables, but not with practical criteria.

Omnibus Personality Inventory is a collection of 385 true-false statements organized to lead to scores reflecting temperament and attitude. The scales relate to such matters as autonomy, impulse, control, intellectual interests, masculinity, and social introversion which this study is not concerned with.

In finding behavioral data upon which to perform factor analyses, Guilford and his associates (Guilford, 1959; Guilford and Aimmerman, 1956) collected together the items from a number of tests of personality that were already in common use. These tests had, by and large, been constructed along rational, theoretical lines, rather than by some empirical clustering procedures like factor analysis.

The above personality inventories are clinically based inventories which aim at the alteration of behavior and were not selected for this particular study because the study is not concerned with the alteration of behavior.

The researcher selected Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire because it has as its focus of convenience the prediction of behavior. Also Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire can claim some generality beyond the measurement of questionnaires alone. The Sixteen Factors are recoverable from other kinds of data, notably observation of social behavior and description of pathological behavior. It also enables the researcher to determine the actual behavioral differences between people high and low on each of the factors. It demonstrates empirical evidence that an adequate peripheral theory of personality must recognize in its concrete peripheral characteristics content concerning a number of areas of human functioning. One such area is concerned with culturally patterned values and beliefs regarding social roles and institutions. There are two content themes in this area: (1) the degree to which the person does or does not possess a set of values bearing on the regulation of



personal, perhaps selfish goals and impulses (this is the matter of conscience); (2) the strength of commitment to the existing social system, reflected in degree of tolerance for criticism of people acting in social roles, and of social institutions themselves.

**The three page vita has been  
removed from the scanned  
document. Page 1 of 3**

**The three page vita has been  
removed from the scanned  
document. Page 2 of 3**

**The three page vita has been  
removed from the scanned  
document. Page 3 of 3**

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MEASURABLE PERSONALITY FACTORS OF STUDENT  
TEACHERS, COOPERATING TEACHERS, AND COLLEGE SUPERVISORS  
TO THEIR EFFECTS UPON SUCCESS IN STUDENT  
TEACHING EXPERIENCES

by

Darlene Ruth Sheppard Abram, Ed.D.

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this investigation was to examine selected personality factors of student teachers, their cooperating teachers and their college supervisors to determine if these factors could have significant influence on success in student teaching experiences as measured by the Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form. Accordingly, the aims of this investigation were to investigate personality trait differences between males predicted for success and males predicted not to succeed based upon McClain's grouping; and females predicted for success and females predicted not to succeed based upon McClain's grouping. The theory base for this investigation was drawn from Cattell's Multivariate Factor Analysis Personality Theory (1959) and McClain's (1968) separate equation for male and female teaching success.

There were 30 Fall Semester Hampton Institute student teachers, and 30 cooperating teachers, representing 100% of the student teaching population, that completed the questionnaire. Thirty cooperating teachers and 13 college supervisors completed the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form. The subjects were grouped according to

McClain's Predicted Teaching Success Specification Equations for Males and Females.

The hypothesis that there would be no significant difference between males predicted to succeed in student teaching and males predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping was accepted. The hypothesis that there would be no significant difference between the females predicted to succeed in student teaching and females predicted not to succeed in student teaching based upon McClain's grouping was accepted. The hypothesis that there would be no significant difference between the supervisors' (college supervisor) and the cooperating teachers' ratings for those predicted for success and for those predicted not to succeed was not testable.

The results suggested that this was an unusually homogeneous group of student teachers and cooperating teachers. Also that the student teachers' prediction scores based upon McClain's grouping and the Hampton Institute Student Teacher Evaluation Form and the college supervisors' ratings produced no significant difference. This tends to imply that other factors or variables present in the student teaching environment influenced success in student teaching.