

PREDICTING TEACHING PROCESSES WITH THE
TEACHER PERCEIVER INTERVIEW,

by

David E. Jones, Jr.

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate 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:

David J. Parks, Chairman

Frederick C. Brieve

Wayne M. Worner

Albert L. Ayars

A. Pearre Johnston

Lawrence McCuskey

1978

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to his committee chairman, Dr. David Parks, whose personal interest and guidance made this study possible. Dr. Parks chaired a team of six of the most caring people anyone could possibly assemble.

A special word of thanks must be extended to the fifty-one teachers and six principals who so graciously gave of their time. The opportunity to observe these true professionals as they influenced the lives of so many young people was worth so much more than the results of this study.

The writer is indebted to his brother, , who prodded, cajoled and supported him through the years of this study.

Finally, the most profound gratitude goes to my dear wife who literally supported me much of the time. Her willingness to listen, her patience with a sometimes frustrated husband, and her constant encouragement really made this whole process possible.

Hopefully, this study will add significantly to the body of knowledge pertaining to the selection process, so that the personnel administrator may enhance his/her ability to predict teacher talent.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Significance of Study	7
Definition of Terms	10
Summary	12
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Introduction	14
Importance of the interview in selection of teachers	14
The Teacher Perceiver Interview	16
Historical development	16
TPI theme development	17
Validation studies	25
Teacher Performance Studies	35
Teacher characteristics and successful teaching	35
Summary	41
III. METHOD	42
Introduction	42
Sources of Data	42
Instrumentation	43
Data collection instruments	43
Teacher Perceiver Interview Guide description	43
Validity	43
Scoring TPI	45
Reliability	45
McDaniel's Observer Rating Scales	46
Procedures for Data Collection	49
Teacher Perceiver Interview	49
Observer rating scales	51
Past interview scores	51
Demographic data	51
Limitations of Study	52
Analysis of Data	52
Correlations	52
Step-wise regression	53
Factor analysis	53
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	54
Purposes	54
Descriptive Results	54
Results of Hypotheses Testing	56

Chapter		
V. CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS		68
Purposes		68
Conclusions		68
Discussion		71
Recommendations		73
.		
BIBLIOGRAPHY		74
APPENDICES		82
A. Description of the McDaniel <u>Observer Rating Scales</u> and Sample ORS Coding Sheet		83
B. Correlation Matrix for all Variables in Study		87

LIST OF TABLES

1.	A.	A Comparison Between SRI and the Present Investigator's Scores on Ten Randomly Selected Audio-Taped Interviews	46
	B.	Present Investigator Scores on Five Tapes Re-Scored Eight Months Later by Writer	47
2.		Inter-Rater Reliability Analysis Ratings on Six Dimensions of McDaniel's Observer Rating Scales by Expert Panel and Six Principals on Four Training Films	50
3.		Descriptive Statistics for all Variables Included in Study	55
4.		Correlation Between Principal Ratings and ORS and:	
	A.	Total TPI Scores	
	B.	Total Past Personnel Administrators' Interview Scores	58
5.		Summary of Step-Wise Regression Relating TPI to ORS Dependent Variable 1--Warmth	59
6.		Summary of Step-Wise Regression Relating TPI to ORS Dependent Variable 2--Enthusiasm	60
7.		Summary of Step-Wise Regression Relating TPI to ORS Dependent Variable 3--Variety	61
8.		Summary of Step-Wise Regression Relating TPI to ORS Dependent Variable 4--Individualization	62
9.		Summary of Step-Wise Regression Relating TPI to ORS Dependent Variable 5--Freedom	63
10.		Summary of Step-Wise Regression Relating TPI to ORS Dependent Variable 6--On-Task Activity	65
11.		Summary of Step-Wise Regression, Showing Only Significant Relationships Between Individual TPI Themes and ORS Dimensions	66
12.		Factor Analysis: Rotated Factor Matrix	67

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"Teacher recruitment and selection are the most important functions performed by the school administrator. The character of a school, the nature of its curriculum, and even its moral tone are largely set by the teachers" (Clifford, 1975:42).

For some thirty years prior to 1970, school districts recruited and selected teachers in a seller's market. Recruitment and selection methods focused on two areas: the candidate's availability and his or her possession of appropriate certification. Even the latter criterion had to be waived in some cases if classrooms were to be staffed (Gage, 1975). Hall (1964) noted that in 1962 there was no sign of relief in the shortage of teachers, and it was projected that matters would get worse. School districts were caught in a situation where a shortage of applicants presented great difficulty in filling existing vacancies and even prevented administrators from utilizing effective screening devices to find quality teachers.

Today, the market for teachers is radically different. Golladay (1976), in a report to the Congress of the United States, pointed to a declining school-age population and the consequent reduction of demand for new teachers as factors to reducing the teacher turnover rate. In 1973, two hundred thousand teachers were needed in the United States; in 1981, it is projected that only 145,000 new teachers will be required to staff the teaching force. The most

conservative estimates of teacher supply suggest there may be 281,000 newly qualified teachers in 1981. In slight contrast to Golladay's findings, Sivulich (1974) noted that by the end of the 1970's, secondary teacher supply may exceed demand by as much as three to four hundred percent, and elementary teacher supply may exceed demand by about two hundred percent.

The Research Division of the Norfolk Public Schools has projected that by 1982, the school system will experience an additional drop in enrollment of five thousand children. Population shifts from the inner city, declining birth rates, and increased enrollment in private schools are responsible for the decrease. To offset a larger drop, the Research Division projects an increase in the influx of United States Navy families to the Norfolk area due to the concentration of Navy programs. Also, with the additional special education teachers planned, indications are that the Norfolk Public Schools will approach a plateau of approximately 43,000 children in the early 1980's. Twenty-one hundred classroom teachers will be needed to staff the seventy schools. Considering the increase in numbers of teachers retiring annually (an increase of 10 percent was noted in the years between 1972 and 1976), plus normal attrition (deaths and resignations), nearly one hundred fifty new teachers must be contracted annually to maintain the number of teachers needed.

Given the surplus of teachers which continues to increase during the 1970's, personnel administrators may have access to greater numbers of more competent teacher candidates. Commenting on the ever increasing amount of criticism aimed at schools over education

results, Greer (1970) said that his primary objection to public education and teachers in general is that they basically have not changed, but rather do what always has been done.

Accountability for educational results has emerged as a very real public concern. Arend (1970) reported that accountability has been called for by a President of the United States, Congress, federal governmental agencies, state legislatures, universities preparing teachers, and local school boards and administrator groups. In a survey of state accountability activities, Hawke (1975) reported that thirty-seven states have legislation dealing with educational accountability or at least have documents related to their accountability activities. The most common activities undertaken have been needs assessments through testing and determination of desired outcomes or goals. To a personnel administrator, direct implications of accountability may be felt in the method used in selecting teachers. Merritt (1971) agreed with Clifford (1975) that by selecting competent teachers, school administrators have a greater opportunity to change the character of a school or to strengthen its curriculum.

According to a survey taken by The Educational Testing Service of New Jersey in July 1972, sixty-eight of seventy-five personnel directors in large school systems having 50,000 or more pupils reported that definite revisions of policy and evaluative measures in teacher selection were being made. These changes were based primarily on two factors: the pressures of federal courts and agencies on racial balancing of staff and a general oversupply of teachers. The report also stated that personnel specialists were having difficulty

interpreting performance ratings of applicants. A report of how the surveyed personnel persons selected teachers follows in Chapter II, but, generally, the group did conclude that the complex skills involved in teaching were not predictable by any known single selection measure.

References from student teaching and/or prior teaching assignments, college officials' references, transcripts of grades, and personal interviews by hiring officials have and still continue to be used in the selection process. Each factor mentioned above carries various weights in the school divisions' procedures. All sixty-eight divisions agreed that the scarcity of positions presented increased pressure for more refined and efficient selection measures (Deneen, 1972).

In summary, it seems apparent that with the current abundance of teachers, plus the threatened oversupply in the next decade, and increased public pressures for better quality teachers, there emerges at least one problem school administrators must deal with: More sophisticated (empirically based) screening and selection techniques must be devised to more efficiently predict teacher success in the classroom.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The major purpose of this study focused on the predictability by the Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI) of qualities deemed to be conducive to productive teacher-pupil relationships, as identified from scores on the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales (ORS) and observable in

classroom relationships. In addition, this study intended to determine whether former interview ratings by personnel administrators predict as well as TPI observable classroom teacher-pupil relationships as indicated by the McDaniel ORS. This former rating system, consisting of a five point scale (from poor to excellent), served as a summary of an interviewer's evaluation of the candidate. The resulting single score and the TPI total score for the same individual were compared as predictors of the McDaniel ORS scores.

The specific structured interview process used in this study was published by Selection Research, Incorporated (1972) and entitled Teacher Perceiver Interview. It consisted of questions about teaching, students, classroom practices and the individual being interviewed. Historical data and a more detailed review of the research reported by this company and independent researchers who have used this interview technique are presented in Chapter II. More details concerning the twelve life themes of TPI appear under the Definition of Terms.

It was reported by Selection Research, Incorporated that the Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI), in the hands of a trained and competent specialist, can be successful in predicting the willingness of teacher candidates to establish mutually favorable relationships with each student they teach. Primary aims of the company include the identification and development of talent. The meaning of talent in this case is that characteristic which a person may already have or may develop which facilitates his/her willingness to develop a personal relationship with each student taught (Miller, 1976).

The McDaniel Observer Rating Scales (1974) contain explicit descriptions of teaching processes and are used as tools for measuring observable teacher-pupil relationships. Developed by Ernest McDaniel at the Purdue University Educational Research Center, they reflect many of the dimensions of teacher classroom behavior cited from the research literature.

The following null hypotheses were formulated to study the problem:

Hypothesis 1

There is no statistically significant relationship between the total score recorded on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and each of the six dimension scores of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.

Hypothesis 2

There is no statistically significant relationship between the score on the past interview of personnel administrators and each of the six dimension scores of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.

Hypothesis 3

There is no statistically significant relationship between the score on each of the Teacher Perceiver Interview twelve life themes and each of the six dimension scores of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

According to Slaughter (1969) the personal interview continues to be the most widely used screening device. In reporting a survey of some 196 personnel executives representing a cross-section of small and large business and industrial enterprises across the country, Mary Miner (1976) found that 56 percent of the respondents considered the interview the most important aspect of the selection procedure.

Huddy (1968) stated that the interview has its greatest value in obtaining knowledge about the interviewee's own feelings and should not be dependent upon facts personnel people may obtain from transcripts, records, or other sources which are subject to distortion from personal prejudices. Schoff and Randles (1972) felt that the personal interview is the most important evaluation tool a school administrator can use in the hiring of faculty.

Acknowledging the fact that the interview has and continues to carry great weight in the selection of Norfolk Public School teachers, the problem which first needed to be addressed was to develop consistency among the six personnel interviewers in rating candidates from a valid and reliable set of criteria. The need for a program which would incorporate a structured or patterned interview process, ostensibly to develop consistency, was amplified by a study conducted by Grandgenett (1972). In this study, the ratings of ten judges (school administrators) were compared after they had conducted oral interviews with a group of teachers followed by

re-rating the same teachers on a video tape presentation. The teachers reported that each interview was different in content, atmosphere, and in the candidate's role expectation.

Grandgenett (1972) also reported that the lack of agreement among the judges in ranking the teacher candidates in both the interview and video-tape demonstration may have been significant enough to mask any treatment effect of the video-tape. As a result, the author recommends that school divisions develop valid and reliable criteria by which judges (personnel interviewers) might rate teacher candidates more consistently.

In further accentuating the need for consistency and reliability in interviewing, Holloman (1971) considers that the salvation of the interview is unlikely unless it can be shown that interviewers' judgments are other than random. Companies whose interviewers used patterned or structured interview guides experienced high (r .56 and .74) interrater reliability. Majestic (1971) agreed, and added:

. . . since selection of teachers is based on prediction, and accurateness of prediction hinges on theoretical assumptions about human behavior, we must examine these assumptions and test them in order to make them more adequate and to remove inconsistencies, thus improving our ability to predict. The whole process of selection of teachers with the interview rating carrying major weight, should be objective, defensible, and fair. (p. 9)

During the next five years, the Norfolk Public Schools Personnel Department will be using a structured interview process, one that hopefully will bring about much greater consistency in rating interviewed candidates by its six professional recruiters. The

significance of this study was to determine whether TPI could be considered a valid and reliable device for predicting teacher behavior. If so, TPI could then be used as a major tool for recruitment and employment of teachers.

The necessity for developing criteria in an interview process that will aid in a more accurate assessment of a candidate's ability to humanize instruction and his/her caring qualities is deemed important by the Norfolk School Board and the Virginia State Department of Education. This importance is reflected in the enactment of Standards of Quality for Public Schools in Virginia by the General Assembly of Virginia, 1976 (Revised), which empowers the State Board of Education (which prescribed a set of standards) to carry out certain objectives in the area of teacher classroom planning and management. In the area which concerns teacher performance, the state has mandated that the "teacher shall provide for the humanization of instruction in the classroom." To accomplish this, the Assembly suggested that each teacher shall achieve the following:

1. Know the academic strengths and weaknesses of each child, provide for different subject matter and learning experiences, and have different achievement standards for individuals with different abilities.
2. Know the home and community environment of each child.
3. Help each child to recognize his potential.
4. Understand and appreciate each child as an individual.

In addition, the Standards require that teachers in individualizing their instruction organize lessons to meet specific behavioral objectives, provide a favorable psychological environment

for learning, and periodically evaluate pupil progress. In short, Virginia (1976) views a humanized classroom as one which is well organized and has a climate created by the teacher which considers the nature and need of each growing, expressive, active, child and allows him/her to express ideas freely.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were included:

Structured or Patterned Interview--A standardized oral interview that utilizes only a directed style. It involves careful preparation of questions in areas to be covered and uses a manual of interview questions which are accompanied by a printed form to record the information uniformly. The patterned or structured interview process in this study is called the Teacher Perceiver Interview. The twelve theme areas of the Teacher Perceiver Interview Guide (1975) are:

Mission--A self-imposed goal to make a significant contribution to other people as indicated by the belief that students can grow and attain self-actualization.

Empathy--The apprehension and acceptance of the state of mind of another person and the phenomenon that provides the teacher feedback about the individual student's feelings and thoughts.

Rapport Drive--The teacher's ability to have an approving and mutually favorable relationship with each student.

Individualized Perception--The teacher's thoughts about the

interests and needs of each student and the effort made to personalize each student's program.

Listening--The ability of a teacher to listen to others with responsiveness and acceptance to the benefit of these speakers.

Investment--The capacity of a teacher to receive satisfaction from growth of students and not from his/her own performance.

Input Drive--The willingness of a teacher to constantly search for ideas, materials, and experiences to use in helping other people.

Activation--The capability of a teacher to stimulate students to think, to respond, to feel and to learn.

Innovation--The degree to which a teacher tries new ideas and techniques.

Gestalt--The drive by a teacher toward completeness, towards perfection, but with flexibility.

Objectivity--A teacher's response to the total situation, which would include getting the facts and understanding first, as compared to making an impulsive reaction.

Focus--The selection of activities in terms of models and goals as a teacher moves through life in a planned direction.

The McDaniels Observer Rating Scales (1974) contain nine dimensions for rating classroom teacher behavior. The following six were used in this study:

Warmth--The extent to which the atmosphere of the class is relaxed and comfortable; the degree to which the teacher maintains positive interpersonal relationships with pupils.

Enthusiasm--The interest level expressed by the teacher and students during class activities.

Variety--The extent to which the teacher uses a diversity of materials and activities.

Individualization--The degree to which the teacher provides students with different levels of work that are suited to their particular needs, interests and abilities, and the amount of individual assistance provided.

Freedom--The degree to which the teacher provides arrangements which facilitate independence and individual freedom.

On-Task Activity--The amount of student activity that is directed toward the accomplishment of instructional objectives.

SUMMARY

In the Norfolk City Public Schools, oversupply of teacher candidates, lower teacher turnover rates, decreases in student enrollment, and public pressures for better quality teachers have demanded a more defensible teacher selection procedure. It has appeared there was a lack of consistency and reliability in the interview techniques, hence, little predictability of the teaching process from interview scores. Since the personal interview has carried considerable weight in recruitment and selection of teachers, a method of standardizing the process was sought. The personnel division has been using the TPI, published by Selection Research, Incorporated, which purports to standardize interviewing and predict

a part of the teaching process which has been deemed so important both by the Norfolk School Board and the Virginia State Department of Education--a candidate's ability to humanize instruction. More specifically, this interview process has been alleged to identify teachers who are caring, warm, and who are willing to establish personal relationships with each child in his/her classroom.

Questions from this structured interview come from twelve life themes which, when coded or scored, indicate or predict talent in the teaching process.

This study determined statistical relationships between teacher scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview's twelve life themes and the six dimensions of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales. The McDaniel instrument measured classroom climate. Also, former ratings of personnel interviewers were compared with the same teacher's scores on the ORS.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The primary objective of this study focused on the use of the TPI to predict the willingness of teachers to establish productive relationships with students. The review of the literature includes: (1) studies comprising an historical review of the development of the Teacher Perceiver Interview; (2) studies which influenced TPI theme development (chiefly pupil rating studies); (3) validation studies using the current TPI as a predictive instrument; and (4) a brief review of studies identifying teacher characteristics for successful teaching.

INTRODUCTION

Importance of the Interview in Selection of Teachers

As has been previously stated, declining pupil enrollments, over-supply of teachers, and increased public pressures to improve the quality of teachers combine to provide a real dilemma to the school administrator charged with the selection of a very few teacher replacements.

The interview seems to be the major tool in the selection process. In a study of the employment practices in 208 school districts in Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska, Lasher (1972) revealed that the personal interview ranked number one in importance as an information gathering tool and was the most important factor in

selection.

George Redfern (1967) admitted there is a great need for more research in the field of personnel selection methods and suggested that the interview carry at least 50 percent weight in the final selection process.

May and Doerge (1972) conducted a survey of sixty-six personnel directors in sixty-four parish and two city school systems in Louisiana, and found that among thirteen informational items deemed important for teacher applicants, the personal interview ranked number one.

Murray (1947) considered one of the principal criticisms leveled at the interview was that its findings were highly subjective, as contrasted with the presumed objectivity of psychological tests. He further said that even though such interviewer judgments may necessarily be subjective, it did not follow that they must lack reliability and validity. Like the diagnoses of physicians, subjective judgments of trained interviewers were not necessarily wrong.

The above comments indicate that the interview may be considered one of the most important sources of information about a teacher candidate. A patterned or structured interview process, called the Teacher Perceiver Interview, copywritten by Selection Research, Inc., has been in use in the Norfolk Public Schools as a predictor of a candidate's willingness to establish productive relationships with students.

THE TEACHER PERCEIVER INTERVIEW

Historical Development

Donald Clifton and William Hall conducted studies at the University of Nebraska which were later to become the bases upon which the Perceiver would grow. Clifton and Hall were admittedly influenced by the writings of A. H. Maslow and Carl Rogers, though the product of over twenty years of research directed toward discovering a structured method for finding talented people belongs to them (Muller, 1976).

Clifton (1976), President of Selection Research, Inc., reported that the development of the process was essentially a trial and error procedure. Paper and pencil tests were attempted in an effort to identify talented teachers. Many of the Master's theses and Doctoral dissertations, such as those by Knapp (1955) and Gaeddert (1956) revealed that oral interviews were much more predictive than paper and pencil tests, even using the same questions.

From such studies under Clifton's direction (1976), an interview process which enabled the researcher to analyze thought patterns from their interviews grew out of the many tests, recordings, and surveys conducted with prospective teachers. Hence, from these experiments emerged the idea of life themes and "listen fors" or the suggested responses to the questions.

As a culmination of years of research, Clifton and associates (1976) wrote the first edition of the Teacher Perceiver Interview in 1971. From field tests in four major school districts, the second edition was developed. From 1971 until 1976, third and fourth (used

in current study) were developed, reflecting several years of training in the use of the instrument and minor revisions in the scoring procedure.

TPI Theme Development

The following studies provided the seed for the ultimate development of the twelve life themes the Teacher Perceiver Interview incorporates.

Singer (1954) attempted to discover whether concurrent use of sociometric techniques, audio-recorded ratings, and teacher peer ratings provided adequate measures of teacher success. He had administrators rate teachers; teachers were rated by fellow teachers (in the same physical plant); he rated teachers by listening to an audio-tape of a teacher's entire class period; teachers rated themselves; pupils rated teachers; and a confidential rating was obtained from each teacher's personnel file (this rating represented a consensus of all prior ratings received to the time of the study). Singer discovered that the most "successful" teachers (as revealed by prior ratings and current administrator evaluations) appeared to be more popular and held in higher esteem as friends by their fellow teachers and students than the least successful teachers. He found that social acceptance by a teaching staff and pupil acceptance were highly related to a teacher's "effectiveness" ("effectiveness" as rated by administrators).

Albert (1941) used pupil ratings of teachers in a San Antonio, Texas, high school to determine teacher effectiveness. Students

completed a questionnaire which revealed the teacher they liked best and who had done them the most good. Teachers and administrators gave comparative estimates of the pupil ratings of the teachers.

Albert arrived at the following conclusions:

1. Pupil rating of teachers is reliable, valid, practical and inexpensive.
2. Teachers can be benefited by pupil ratings.
3. Pupils are sufficiently consistent in their rating of a superior teacher.
4. Administrators cannot agree upon the characteristics of a superior teacher.
5. Administrators know very little of what pupils think of their teachers. (p. 374)

Symonds (1955) administered a questionnaire to students and principals on the effectiveness of their teachers. He asked students to rank their teachers on each of the following questions:

1. Which of your teachers makes the work more interesting?
2. Which of your teachers understands you best and likes you most?
3. Which of your teachers would you most like to have again next year?
4. Which of your teachers makes you most willing to study or participate in the work of the class?
5. Which of your teachers helps you most to learn?
6. Which of your teachers would you feel most like consulting on some personal matter for guidance and counseling?
7. Which of your teachers most makes you want to continue to go through school? (p. 305)

Correlation coefficients among the test items exceeded an average of .80.

Symonds (1955) observed seventeen of the thirty-two teachers who were the highest (10) and lowest (7) on the ratings while teaching. He asked the question, "Why is this teacher considered a good (or poor) teacher by the pupils or the principal?" "What is there about this teacher that makes him stand high (or low) in the regard of his pupils?" He discovered that the two extremes could be differentiated on this basis:

1. The superior teachers liked children; and the inferior teachers disliked children.
2. The superior teachers were personally secure and self-assured; while the inferior teachers were personally insecure and had feelings of inferiority and inadequacy.
3. The superior teachers were well integrated and possessed good personality organization; while the inferior teachers were personally disorganized. (p. 307)

Boardman (1936) asked high school students to consider all their teachers and indicate:

1. The teacher for whom they worked the hardest.
2. The teacher they liked the most.
3. The teacher who had the best order or discipline.
4. The teacher from whom they learned the most.
5. The teacher who they thought was the best and most efficient teacher. (p. 443)

The results indicated that pupil liking for their teacher was the largest factor in determining their judgments of teacher efficiency.

Hart (1934) reviewed high school seniors' responses to a questionnaire and summarized their reasons for liking "Teacher A" the best. The reasons generally listed were: is helpful with school work, explains lessons and assignments clearly and thoroughly, uses

examples in teaching, is cheerful, happy, good-natured, jolly, has a sense of humor, and can take a joke. Furthermore, "Teacher A" is human, friendly, companionable, being one interested in pupils, thus making work interesting and creating a desire to work. Consequently, classwork is a pleasure.

The reasons for not liking "Teacher Z" were: cross, crabby, grouchy, unsmiling, nagging, sarcastic, ill-tempered, and uncooperative. The questionnaire also asked information concerning "Teacher H", the teacher the students felt was their best teacher. About 80 percent of the students listed "Teacher A" as their "Teacher H".

Drucker and Remmers (1951) were interested in testing whether students rate their teachers differently after they have been out of school awhile. Instructor ratings were received from 138 alumni and 251 students. The Purdue Rating Scale of Instructors was used and consisted of ten items. On each of the items no coefficient of correlation was smaller than .40 (between rating scale scores of current students and alumni). Drucker and Remmers concluded that there were positive relationships between the average rating of instructors by students and by alumni. In most instances, students, as well as alumni, remember that the best teachers were those that were the most concerned about them as individuals.

Maslow (1950, in his study on "self-actualizing" persons, selected several contemporary and historical individuals who apparently utilized their capacities to their fullest extent. The purpose of the study was to determine certain characteristics of self-actualizing people. Maslow found the following characteristics

to be typical of these people:

1. They have deeper and more profound interpersonal relationships with other people than other adults.
2. They have a fresh appreciation of the "basic goods" of life.
3. Each one shows in one way or another a special kind of creativeness.
4. They are problem-centered rather than ego-centered.
5. They accept others and themselves as they are.
6. They have a more efficient perception of reality and more comfortable relationships with it.
7. They exhibit a spontaneity of behavior and inner life (thoughts, impulses, etc.) and a lack of artificiality.
8. They can be solitary, and even seek to be alone at times.
9. They have stability in the face of misfortune. (p. 22)

Hill (1966) used a questionnaire to study the effect of humor on 1970 students at Crete, Nebraska. He concluded that there was a positive relationship between the amount students believed they learned from a given teacher and their perception of the use of humor by that teacher.

Rogers (1969) believes a teacher must possess empathy or be able to understand the feelings the student possesses to be effective. The teacher who can warmly accept and empathize with the feelings of fear and discouragement will have done a great deal toward setting the conditions for learning.

Brookover (1940) developed a rating scale to measure person-to-person interaction (that desire to operate on a one-to-one basis). Brookover found that teachers who have a high degree of

person-to-person interaction with their students tend to be rated high by these students; and students who maintained a high degree of person-to-person interaction with their instructors rate them high as teachers.

Drawhorne (1954) attempted to determine the degree of interaction between students and student teachers and teaching effectiveness as rated by the students. Drawhorne found high correlations between students' ratings of interaction and those of teacher effectiveness. This indicated that the relationship between student teacher and student is predictive of how a student will rate his student teacher on teaching effectiveness.

Webb and Nolan (1955) developed a rating scale for interest of the instructor in his subject, instructor's sympathetic attitude toward students, presentation of subject matter, sense of proportion and humor, self-reliance and confidence, personal peculiarities, and personal appearance. The teacher, his students, and a supervisor completed the rating form. A high correlation was found between the way a student views his teacher as a teacher and the way the teacher views himself.

Cogan (1956) studied the relationship between classroom behavior of teachers and the subsequent behavior of their eighth grade students. Cogan placed student behavior in two categories: student performance on required work; and student performance on self-initiated work. Students then responded to a survey containing specific questions reflecting their behavior. The student could make consistent distinctions between the behavior of different teachers. It was

concluded that the survey furnished reliable measures of teacher traits and of pupil productivity.

Dodge and Clifton (1956) had students rate their student teachers on a questionnaire which included the following:

1. Of the teachers you have now, choose three you like most.
2. Of the teachers you now have, choose three from whom you learn the most.
3. Of the teachers you now have, choose three from whom it is easiest to obtain help. (p. 369)

Weights were assigned to the choices and a Teacher-Pupil Rapport Score (TPR) was computed for each student teacher. Significant correlations were found when the TPR scores were related to sociometric scores, cumulative grade averages, and professors' estimates of future teaching ability when the student teachers were freshmen. They recommended additional research be done to devise an instrument which could identify characteristics similar to those the TPR identified and that could be administered to students prior to their senior year in college.

Winseman (1969) conducted a study to devise an interview which would predict activating vocational technical instructors. A modification of an instrument devised by Bonneau was used as in Instructor Aptitude Analysis (IAA). Winseman reached the following conclusions based on the study:

1. The IAA can predict activating vocational technical instructors.
2. The IAA can be scored objectively.
3. The reliability of the interview is highly satisfactory for measuring activating characteristics.

4. The degree to which an instructor views and applies praise and the extent to which he recognizes anger and how he copes with this emotion are significant in establishing an activating relationship with a student.

Lieske (1969) attempted to validate a process for identifying characteristics of activating teachers. A structured, audio-recorded interview and a card sort technique were utilized. The sample consisted of 150 teachers in five school districts. The instruments used in the study consisted of a teacher rating by the principal, a teacher rating by the students, and a thirty-two question interview administered individually to the teachers. From the responses a scoring manual was constructed to distinguish between high and low activating teachers. Weights were assigned to the interview from the scoring manual. Lieske concluded that the interview was reliable from an internal point of view and from an objective inter-scorer point of view and that the interview did accurately predict principal ratings of teachers.

In general, studies gauging pupil reactions to teachers have revealed strong relationships between "high" ratings given teachers and the seeming willingness of these teachers to establish relationships with students. Additional studies relating Maslow's self-actualizing people and child-centered teachers appear in a later section of this chapter.

It was the culmination of different studies such as those cited above that drew the Selection Research developers to the notion of life themes such as Empathy and Rapport as bases for further experimentation in the development of a predictive interview instrument.

Validation Studies

Using questions from a base of twelve life themes, SRI began a series of validation studies for its interview process in 1970.

Preuss (1972), in a study conducted at Concordia Teachers College in the 1970-71 school year, interviewed prospective teachers utilizing the Selection Research, Inc. process. Seventy-six of the prospective teachers were identified by their professors as likely to be effective teachers and twenty-four were identified as likely to be less effective teachers. It was concluded that the life themes of those students who were likely to be effective teachers were discernible and through the interview process could be identified. There was 93 percent agreement between the scores of professors' classification of each of the prospective teachers and the S.R.I. interview.

In the spring of 1974, student ratings of 142 teachers from Grove City, Ohio, were collected by Muller (1974). The teachers were divided into three groups:

Experimental Group I: Teachers new to the system and classified as "Recommended" by the Teacher Perceiver process.

Experimental Group II: Teachers new to the system and classified as "Not Recommended" by the Teacher Perceiver process.

Comparison Group: All teachers who had not taken the Teacher Perceiver Interview and were not new to the system.

Students of each of the teachers were randomly selected to rate each of the teachers--not less than nine, nor more than 19, rated each teacher. A one-way analysis of variance was run between student scores for teachers in Experimental Group I and those scores for

teachers in Experimental Group II. The analysis indicated that the difference was significant at the .01 level. The mean score for teachers in Experimental Group I was 140.6 and the mean score for teachers in Experimental Group II was 127.5. Teachers who were recommended because of their Teacher Perceiver Interview scores were superior in terms of student ratings than were teachers who were not recommended by the Teacher Perceiver Interview. A one-way analysis of variance was also run between the Experimental Group I and the Comparison Group. This yielded no significant difference. Note: The fact that no significant difference was noted between Experimental Group I (recommended teachers) and the Comparison Group (assumed to be successful teachers) probably was no surprise. The researcher may have strengthened his findings had he split the Comparison Group into two categories ("highly recommended" by the system's standard interview process and "not highly recommended").

Muller and Miller (1974) conducted a study with secondary teachers at a private high school in Alvernia, Illinois. Fifteen teachers were given the Teacher Perceiver Interview. From forty students were gathered two sets of ratings for these teachers. One set was gathered in the fall of 1973, when many of the teachers had just been hired, while the second set was obtained in April of 1974. Due to a small sample size, the Spearman Rho statistical technique was used. Correlation coefficients between TPI scores and the first student ratings was .58; second student ratings and TPI scores registered correlation coefficients of .75. Both correlation coefficients were significant at the .01 level. One conclusion

reached was that a significant positive relationship between the TPI and student ratings did exist for this particular school district.

The purpose of a study by Muller and Miller (1974) was to determine the effect of increased teacher talent upon students' self-concepts, and upon the teachers' perceptions of their own teaching environment. The measure of teacher talent was the Teacher Perceiver Interview; the measure of students' perceptions of a teacher was the three forms of the S.R.I. Teacher Perceiver Academy Questionnaire; the measure of a student's self-concept was the Self-Concept As A Learner (SCAL) Scale; and the measure of the school environment was the S.R.I. Teaching Environment Questionnaire. It was hypothesized that if the amount of teacher talent were increased, the student's perceptions of the teacher and student's self-concepts would also increase. It was further hypothesized that as teacher talent (measured by TPI) was increased, the teacher's perceptions of their work environment (measured by TEQ) would also increase. Early in 1974, sixteen teachers were given the Teacher Perceiver Interview resulting in an average score (out of a possible sixty) of 20.00. At the same time, the S.R.I. Teacher Perceiver Academy Questionnaire and the Self-Concept As A Learner Scale was administered to students of these teachers. The teachers also were given the S.R.I. Teaching Environment Questionnaire. During the spring and summer of 1974, many of the teachers left this school and replacements were hired. In the early winter of the next school year an assessment of the new staff (N = 17) was made using the same instruments. The average score for the new teachers on the Teacher Perceiver Interview was 33.24. This

difference was significant at the .01 level. During this time the students of these new teachers were given the S.R.I. Teacher Perceiver Academy Questionnaire and the Self-Concept As A Learner Scale. The new teachers were given the S.R.I. Teaching Environment Questionnaire. The conclusions from the data gathered were:

1. The increase in teacher's skill is related to an increase in students' self-reported self-concepts. The data support the hypothesis that self-concept of students will increase as teacher skill increases.

2. The student ratings of teachers on the S.R.I. Teacher Perceiver Academy Questionnaire increased on all forms from the 1973-74 school year to the 1974-75 school year.

3. The school environment as measured by the S.R.I. Teaching Environment Questionnaire changed significantly in a positive direction. (Muller, 1974:24)

In summary, a significant increase in teacher talent, as measured by the Teacher Perceiver Interview, occurred within the target school. Students' perception of their teachers increased from the first year to the second. The self-concepts of students increased significantly and proportionately to the increase in teachers' skill and the teachers' perceptions of their own environment increased measurably from the first year to the second.

In another study by Muller (1974) in a Lincoln, Nebraska, school district the criterion for selecting thirty-seven teachers was a student rating. In effect, percentile rankings of teachers' scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview (sixty questions) were compared to percentile rankings of scores from a student rating questionnaire. The TPI was administered to the thirty-seven prospective teachers, coded by local interviewers and all were later employed by the district.

The S.R.I. Teacher Perceiver Academy Questionnaire was given to students of the thirty-seven teachers in the study. Selection of teachers was viewed as a "hit" (successful selection) or a "miss" (unsuccessful selection). The median score for the TPI was set at 26.60 (out of a possible sixty), and the student rating questionnaire was set at the 50th percentile using that instrument's norm tables. With these definitions, a "hit" would be recorded if a teacher had student ratings at or above the 50th percentile and a Teacher Perceiver Interview rating at or above 26.6. A "hit" was also registered if a teacher had student ratings below the 50th percentile and a Teacher Perceiver Interview rating of below 26.6. All other combinations would be recorded as "misses." Using the Teacher Perceiver Interview the school district "hit" on 81 percent of the predictions made with regard to student ratings.

In Iowa, a three-year study (Muller, 1974) was conducted in an effort to determine if the Selection Research, Inc. process of predicting relationship-building characteristics in teachers was a valid process. Certain characteristics considered indicative of relationship-building were identified and put into three measuring instruments--a student rating, an administrator rating, and a peer rating. The following conclusions were reached on the basis of data collected:

1. The S.R.I. process of identifying teachers who are likely to be most successful in a given school district appeared to be reasonably successful. This is shown by the fact that of the 34 comparisons of ratings made by peers, administrators, and students, approximately 68 percent favored those groups who were most highly recommended by the S.R.I. process while less than 16 percent favored those groups who were not as highly recommended.

2. The S.R.I. process seemed to be most successful in identifying probable success in a district when the success is measured through student ratings. In eight of the 12 cases where comparisons were made on student ratings, the significant differences which existed favored those who were most highly recommended.

3. The S.R.I. service was a valuable process for school districts to use in selecting teachers if it is used in the manner for which it is designed.

Sixteen schools in a county school district in Georgia, participated in a study by Coker (1975) to determine if central office administrators and the S.R.I. interview process agreed on teachers designated "outstanding" and "not outstanding" by those administrators. Central office administrators identified two teachers from each of the sixteen separate buildings who could be considered "outstanding." They also selected two each from each building deemed "not outstanding." The Teacher Perceiver Interview was administered to all sixty-four of the teachers and an analysis was made by a Perceiver Specialist. A Teacher Perceiver Trainer also coded each interview and a 90 percent agreement was reached between Trainer and Specialist.

The results indicated that the "outstanding" group scored higher in each of the twelve theme areas of the Teacher Perceiver Interview than the "not outstanding" group. The largest difference showed up in the Activation Theme and the smallest difference in the Focus Theme. Since the total score was significantly higher for the "outstanding" group than the "not outstanding" group at the .001 level ($F = 43.5$, $df = 1, 63$), it was concluded that the Teacher Perceiver Interview could identify differences between "outstanding" and "not outstanding" teachers as rated by local central office

administrators.

Ninety-nine teachers were involved in a study in Illinois (Muller, 1975), to measure the interrelatedness of three basic forms of evaluation--student ratings, administrator ratings, and teacher self-ratings. Eighteen hundred elementary students in grades four, five, six, and eight, and seventeen principals were asked to rate the ninety-nine teachers. The teachers also filled out self-evaluation forms. The instruments were based on the twelve life themes of the Teacher Perceiver Interview. The conclusions reached included the following:

1. There was no relationship (Spearman Rho correlation) between the self-ratings of teachers and ratings assigned by their principals.
2. When ratings were compared, including teacher self-ratings, student ratings, and principal ratings, agreement was likely between two of the three sets of ratings for each theme area, although the pairs varied between the themes.
3. Teachers knew better how they would be rated by their principals than by their students.
4. There was little relationship between teacher age, number of years' teaching experience, and the teacher's ability to predict how they would be rated by their principal or their students.
5. There was little difference between ratings for teachers with bachelor's degrees and teachers with master's degrees as they were rated by their principal and their students.
6. Teachers assigned ratings in the top two quartiles by students were better able to judge how they would be rated by the students than by teachers who were rated in the lower two quartiles. (Muller, 1975:30)

In summary, students and teachers should be included in the teacher evaluation process and instruments should be developed and used which facilitate this.

The objective in a study by Muller and Goodwin (1974) was to develop a procedure for selecting teachers who had the ability to build strong, positive relationships with students. Student ratings of teachers and principal ratings of teachers were the measurement instruments used in determining a high level of teaching ability. These rating devices utilized a Likert technique. The procedure for selecting teachers who would score high on the rating instruments was a structured teacher interview technique developed by the project researchers. The three instruments (the two rating instruments and the interview) were developed and validated by Selection Research, Inc., of Lincoln, Nebraska.

There were 101 teachers in the local district given the interview and their students and administrators were administered the rating devices. A trained analyst was used to conduct the interviews, project staff administered the student scale, and the principal completed the administrator ratings. To establish a baseline for comparison, the five-point rating scale the school was currently using to rate teachers was correlated to each of the criterion measures (student ratings and administrator ratings). Those correlations were:

1. Current five-point scale to student ratings, $r = -.03$.
2. Current five-point rating scale to administrator ratings, $r = -.04$.

The correlations between the interview process and the student and administrator ratings were:

1. Interview results to student ratings, $r = .44$.
2. Interview results to administrator ratings, $r = .23$.

In every case, the correlation between the current rating scale and the criterion measures and the interview score and the criterion measures favored that of the interview ratings. The increase in correlation in both cases was significant at the .05 level. General conclusions from the study were:

1. Criteria for teacher effectiveness used in this project were reliably and validly measured.

2. A process that includes a structured, low-stress interview scored by highly trained analysts can reliably and validly measure "successful" teachers (when compared to student reactions).

3. The selection interview used in this project predicted teacher success in terms of the student and administrator ratings at a significantly higher degree than can the current process used by the local school district. (1974, p. 15)

Selection Research Institute has conducted many validation studies of its Teacher Perceiver Interview process and for the most part have relied on student's reactions to test the predictability of the instrument to measure probable teacher success. Student ratings have consistently correlated highly with total TPI scores and some individual theme scores such as Activation. Relationships between teaching success and other single variables such as age, intelligence, experience, sex, self-ratings, or administrator ratings have been almost non-existent. It must be acknowledged that the ever present halo effect in those student ratings may have adverse effects on the validity of the reported studies. Certainly, more research needs to be accomplished using other than student rating devices to ascertain validity of the TPI process as a predictor of teacher success. One factor bears repeating. From the research completed to the date of this study, this selection interview (TPI) may predict teacher success

in terms of student and administrator ratings at a significantly higher degree than current unstructured interview processes used by many school districts.

TEACHER PERFORMANCE STUDIES

Teacher Characteristics and Successful Teaching

In this section, the writer, through a literature review, intended to become more specific about the use of the term "teacher performance." The reference herein was to teacher characteristics which attempt to identify successful teachers. The themes or dimensions of both the Teacher Perceiver Interview and the McDaniel Rating Scales have been brought together in the summary of the literature which follows.

To begin on a negative note, some educators (Guba, Getzels, 1955) have come to the conclusion that their research on predicting teacher success has failed to produce meaningful results. Others, like Hamachek (1968:204), have declared that "we do not know what the competent, or effective, or successful teacher is."

Pessimistic conclusions have been reached by still others into what behaviors constitute successful teaching. Goheen (1966) has stated that teacher behavior cannot be analyzed, and there are always those successful teachers who break all the rules.

Unfortunately, too many researchers of more than a decade ago took the above stances. Looking on the positive side, if one examines the research more closely, there are characteristics which are highlighted more often to discern "successful" teachers.

Flanders (1960) found that teachers who were able to adopt a range of roles were the most successful. That is, there are certain times and conditions to teaching which call for the teacher to adopt an authoritarian, a democratic, or a laissez faire role. Flexibility was consistent with good teaching and resulting student achievement. Several studies have shown "warmth" as a characteristic of successful teachers. Ryans (1964), Combs (1965), and Cogan (1958) reached pretty much the same conclusions in that "warm" teachers stimulated originality, produced greater interest, and were generally more successful in eliciting production from children. Citing research studies by Withall, Sears, Spaulding, Flanders, Anderson and Breever, Nicholas Anastasiow (1969) pointed out that the inclusion of the "warmth" dimension of teacher-child transactions in the classroom is based on the appeal that the teacher's acceptance-rejection of children should make a difference in how the child achieves.

Even though the results of many studies have yielded some positive findings, they have not been consistent. Anastasiow further pointed out that teachers who use total acceptance of the child and met individual differences of children's academic and social attainments were those whose personality characteristics show a balance between autonomy and love. He described the democratic teacher as one whose goals are child-oriented and vary with the type of child. Such a teacher would necessarily have to establish a personal relationship with each child.

Waetjen, et al. (1961) agreed with Anastasiow in principle, that the teacher's role in the classroom includes forming close

emotional relationships with each child in his/her classroom, transferring his/her ideal self-concept to the child. Another element agreed to by authors of the Waetjen document included the necessity for teachers viewing pupils differently--both in group interaction and individual conferences.

Brophy (1975) pointed out that recently there has been a convergence of findings showing that certain teacher characteristics are consistently related to measures of student learning gains; these include: (1) teacher enthusiasm, (2) warmth, (3) high level of complexity of teacher questions, and (4) task orientation. Willingness to change the curriculum to meet children's individual needs, frequency of student opportunity to respond as individuals, and frequent checking of seatwork have also been noted as high correlates to learning gain.

Rosenshine (1974) stated that the very few studies on teacher behavior affecting student outcomes contain the recognition that the present scientific base for teaching is primitive. What was lacking was research demonstrating an experimental or correlational connection between these teaching skills (many lists of which are available) and measures of change in pupil achievement and affect. He, like so many others, suggested more and improved research.

Among the "most promising" variables selected from the correlational literature of teaching competencies, the following nine were offered by Rosenshine (1974:150-153): (1) clarity of teacher's presentation, (2) variety of teacher-initiated activities, (3) enthusiasm of teacher, (4) teacher emphasis on learning achievement,

(5) avoidance of extreme criticism, (6) positive responses to students, (7) student opportunity to learn criterion material, (8) use of structuring comments by teacher, and (9) use of multiple levels of questions or cognitive discourse.

A study by Moody (1973) may exemplify the kind of research needed to supplement pupil and administrator ratings of TPI selected teachers. By comparing Teacher Perceiver Interview and Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory scores, he attempted to predict a teacher's willingness to establish a relationship with each student.

According to the authors of the MTAI, Cook, Leeds and Callis (1951), the attitudes teachers possess determine the quality of their teaching. Attitudes or expectations of teachers affect their pupils who in turn respond with a similar attitude toward their teachers. The authors of MTAI added that the attitudes of teachers are the result of interactions with students encompassing many factors, including academic standing, energy, social skills, personality traits and values. These shared attitudes then may become the key to the prediction of the social atmosphere a teacher will maintain in the classroom. The inventory, therefore, was designed to assess teacher attitudes and predict which teachers may be willing to establish mutually favorable relationships with individual students.

The forty-one teachers in the Moody study showed consistency in their scores on both tests, leading him to conclude that TPI and MTAI showed a positive relationship ($r (.01, 40) = .45$).

Sterchele (1973) attempted to describe the differences which may exist between child-centered and authoritarian teachers. The child-centered group was labeled so because of high Minnesota Teacher

Attitude Inventory (MTAI) scores. Authoritarian labeled teachers scored low on the MTAI. The study was also designed to determine which group of teachers was more self-actualized and specifically, which factors of self-actualization were significant as differences between these two groups. The two teacher groups were also given the Personal Orientation Inventory which enabled the researcher to further compare them and to conclude that the child-centered teachers were more self-actualized than the authoritarian. The child-centered also were found to be significantly different from the authoritarian teachers in that they scored much higher on three subfactors: (1) free expression of feelings; (2) self-acceptance, and (3) capacity for intimate contact (capability to form personal relations).

Agazarian, et al. (1972) offered an interesting prescription for the teacher (hopefully, self-actualized) who wanted to relate educational motivators to Maslow's hierarchy of needs. They follow in order: (1) survival--classrooms must communicate trust and autonomy; (2) security--teachers should promote experimentation and exploration in a stress-free climate; (3) affiliation--teachers must create a climate that communicates acceptance of people as autonomous and should not use the giving and withholding of love as motivators; (4) ego--achievement is rewarded with appropriate social recognition, and problem-solving skills gain social as well as material rewards; and (5) self-actualization--teachers must create a climate of constructive, cooperative interdependence--of trust and openness.

SUMMARY

The writer has attempted to cite the literature which relates to characteristics teachers may possess which provide personnel administrators further evidence in predicting the willingness of a teacher applicant to establish a mutually favorable relationship with each student in his/her charge. TPI themes, such as Individualized Perception, Rapport Drive, Activation and Innovation, resulted as specific themes developed by Selection Research Institute to reflect the general feeling of students about their more "effective" teachers. SRI validation studies have generally shown strong relationships between scores on interviews and students' ratings of teachers. One must not disregard possible tainting of such studies due to halo effects, pointing up the need for validation checks using other measuring instruments.

The McDaniel Observer Rating Scales (1974) have been here offered as a formulation of scales in which the dimensions (Warmth, Individualization, Enthusiasm, etc.) have also emerged from the literature cited. A summary of the dimensions of McDaniel's ORS may be found in Appendix A. The writer selected the ORS on the similarity between it and the TPI, both of which purport to indicate the tendency of a teacher to form close emotional relationships with children and to deal with each as an individual. A commonalty of terminology exists between TPI and ORS.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Introduction

The major purpose of this study focused on the predictability by the Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI) of qualities deemed to be conducive to productive teacher-pupil relationships as identified from scores on the McDaniel Observer Rating Scale (ORS) and observable in classroom relationships. In addition, this study intended to determine whether former interview ratings by personnel administrators predict as well as TPI observable classroom teacher-pupil relationships as indicated by the McDaniel ORS.

SOURCES OF DATA

This study was conducted in the Norfolk Public Schools using fifty-one elementary teachers representing six elementary schools, grades "K" through six. The six schools were chosen by a consensus of three elementary supervisors who identified these building principals (out of fifty elementary schools in the city) as the most knowledgeable about their teachers and the instructional expertise of each.

Permission for the study was granted by the Director of Research of the school division with the provision that participating teachers and principals be volunteers and that all names would be coded and remain anonymous.

A letter was sent to each teacher and principal volunteer as a follow-up to individual visits by the researcher explaining the

purposes of the study, the participant's role, and a reassurance that interview codings and principal ratings would remain confidential. Only one of the teachers randomly selected in the six test schools refused to take part in the study.

INSTRUMENTATION

Data Collection Instruments

For the purpose of this study, the Teacher Perceiver Interview Guide (SRI, 1972) scores were chosen as predictors of teacher-pupil relationships. McDaniel's Observer Rating Scales (1974) were used to measure classroom environment, including the degree to which teachers establish relationships with their students.

Teacher Perceiver Interview Guide Description

The Teacher Perceiver Interview Guide (SRI, 1972) comprises a series of questions eliciting responses which are rated in terms of the teacher's mission, empathy, rapport drive, individualized perception, listening, investment, input drive, activation, innovation, gestalt, objectivity and focus (refer to SRI theme definitions in Chapter I). Selection Research, Incorporated, provided the criteria for scoring each teacher response by a trained interviewer.

Validity

According to Selection Research, Incorporated, a concurrent validity study was conducted by Bonneau (1956) to determine how well an interview could be used to predict the effectiveness of teaching as judged by the teacher's students. Teachers who were on the job in

several different schools were given the person-to-person interview. A scorer reliability study showed high agreement between trained analysts. Bonneau's results showed a product moment coefficient of .67 (significant at the .01 level) which tended to support the prediction of teacher effectiveness from the interview results. Another conclusion was that the thought patterns of teachers (in an oral interview) do indicate how they will interact with students.

Lieske (1969) concluded that the structured interview was highly effective in predicting elementary teachers who could activate student learning. Results from both student ratings and principals' evaluation scores showed significant positive correlations with the interview scores.

Winsman (1969) used the structured interview process to predict activating vocational teachers. Strong positive relationships resulted from the correlational study between the interview scores and student ratings. Students rated instructors on how well they liked the instructor, how much they thought they learned, and how easy it was to obtain meaningful help from instructors.

Warner (1969) reported a product moment coefficient of correlation of .92 between the interview analysis rating and the teacher effectiveness (pupil-teacher rapport) rating. Seventy teachers were interviewed at the conclusion of their senior year in the University of Nebraska's Teachers College and rated by administrators and students at the conclusion of their first year of teaching.

Studies such as these and others cited in Chapter II were the bases for the process. For the purposes of this study, the Teacher

Perceiver Interview appears to be a valid predictor of certain teacher-pupil interaction.

Scoring TPI

Three questions from each of the twelve life themes (thought patterns) were asked by the researcher in the fifty-one interviews for this study. Selection Research, Incorporated, provided the criteria for scoring each teacher response. In order to avoid a response set, one question related to each theme is asked before the next theme-related question is asked. For each question, a correct response (according to the scoring key), which may be paraphrased by the interviewee, is given a plus. An incorrect response is given a zero. The number of positive responses was obtained for each of the twelve themes and a grand total of pluses for all thirty-six questions was noted for each respondent.

To protect the confidentiality of the TPI, a copy of the interview was not included in the appendix.

Reliability

Interviewers using the TPI must be trained in order to obtain high levels of reliability among members of an interview pool. The researcher attended four three-day workshops in addition to coding several hundred interviews.

Ten randomly sampled audio-taped interviews (from the fifty-one teacher interviews) were presented to a registered representative of Selection Research, Incorporated, for scoring. A 90 percent agreement between SRI and the writer resulted (Table 1A).

TABLE 1A

A COMPARISON BETWEEN SRI AND THE PRESENT INVESTIGATOR'S SCORES
ON TEN RANDOMLY SELECTED AUDIO-TAPED INTERVIEWS
(Number of "Pluses" Out of a Possible 36)

Tape Number	SRI	Researcher	Difference	Percentage Agreement
003	26	21	05	86.11
010	13	16	03	91.67
015	08	09	01	97.22
018	04	03	01	97.22
022	12	10	02	94.44
028	19	23	04	88.89
030	09	10	01	97.22
032	24	20	04	88.89
041	03	02	01	97.22
049	13	11	02	94.44
				$\bar{X} = 93.33$

From the above ten audio-tapes, five were randomly chosen for rescoring eight months later by the same interviewer. Results (Table 1B) showed tapes to have had a 96 percent average score-rescore agreement.

McDaniel's Observer Rating Scales

Description. The McDaniel's Observer Rating Scales (1974) were designed as tools for research on instructional processes. Nine

dimensions of teacher behavior included in these scales for recording teaching behavior: (1) warmth, (2) enthusiasm, (3) clarity, (4) variety, (5) individualization, (6) feedback, (7) cognitive demand, (8) freedom, and (9) on-task activity. (p. 2) Six of the nine dimensions of teaching behavior were selected for use in this study. The dimensions felt to be more closely related to the TPI life themes were: (1) warmth, (2) enthusiasm, (3) variety, (4) individualization, (5) freedom, and (6) on-task activity.

TABLE 1B

PRESENT INVESTIGATOR SCORES ON FIVE TAPES
RE-SCORED EIGHT MONTHS LATER BY WRITER
(Number of "Pluses" Out of a Possible 36)

Tape Number	Researcher First Scoring	Researcher Second Scoring	Percentage Agreement
010	16	17	94.12
015	09	09	100.
018	03	03	100.
022	10	11	90.91
032	20	21	95.24
			$\bar{X} = 96.05$

Validity. According to McDaniel, The Observer Rating Scales have a high degree of construct validity. Further, each construct (warmth, enthusiasm, etc.) described so as to minimize ambiguity. The constructs were specified by providing definitions of the behaviors that lie at various points along the continuum. By describing these

behaviors, the possibility of projecting subjective interpretations into the dimensions was minimized. (p. 3)

In a 1976 concurrent validity study, McDaniel performed several analyses using the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale, the Meier and McDaniel Attitude Toward School instrument, and McDaniel's Observer Rating Scales. The scales were used in examining relationships between teaching behavior and changes in affective measures. In his findings, McDaniel reported that warmth, particularly as a teaching behavior, may play an important role in the emerging perceptions of students about themselves (1976). Similar observations were reported in Chapter II from studies by Withall, Sears, Spaulding, Flanders and Anastasiow. The writer feels more validation studies need to be accomplished with ORS.

Reliability. McDaniel (1974:3) reported that reliability coefficients were computed on ratings of the teaching behavior that appear in the training films. Each of four teachers was rated independently by nine observers on all nine dimensions. The observers were staff members who had participated in the development and exploratory use of the scales. Reliability coefficients were computed using analysis of variance procedures for an index of reliability among multiple judges. These reliability coefficients for six of the chosen dimensions were: warmth, .95; enthusiasm, .83; variety, .93; individualization, .91; freedom, .79; and on-task activity, .93.

Training for the use of the rating scales for this study consisted of two four-hour sessions in which the six elementary

principal raters viewed a series of four classroom films. After each of the first three films, the trainees rated the teaching samples using the training manual prepared by Ernest McDaniel at Purdue University. After comparing ratings with the scoring rationale provided in the manual, a period of discussion took place before the next film was viewed. The principals finalized the training process by using the fourth filmed teaching sample as a test. Inter-rater reliability analysis ratings on the six dimensions of ORS are included in Table 2. Using a method of estimating the reliability of observers who use ORS styled observation systems designed by Scott (1955), Gregory (1969) developed a computer program for calculating Scott's Coefficient of Observer Reliability. As illustrated in Table 2, a reliability coefficient for the entire rater group was found to be 0.88. This represents each principal trainee's agreement with each other and to the ORS panel of experts. (Note: The description of these scales is included in Appendix A.)

PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION

Data collection for this study included: (1) TPI audio-taped codings, (2) classroom observation ratings using McDaniel's Observer Rating Scales, and (3) past interview ratings by personnel administrators.

Teacher Perceiver Interview

The audio-taped patterned interviews (TPI), each ranging from forty-five minutes to an hour in length, were administered to each

TABLE 2

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY ANALYSIS RATINGS ON SIX DIMENSIONS OF
 MCDANIEL'S OBSERVER RATING SCALES BY EXPERT PANEL AND
 SIX PRINCIPALS ON FOUR TRAINING FILMS
 (Scott's Reliability Coefficients for all Possible Combinations of 7 Raters)

Panel	Principal 1	Principal 2	Principal 3	Principal 4	Principal 5	Principal 6
1.0000	0.9111	0.8796	0.8996	0.8958	0.8287	0.9171
0.9111	1.0000	0.6831	0.9299	0.8907	0.8272	0.8739
0.8796	0.8631	1.0000	0.8752	0.8678	0.9334	0.9011
0.8996	0.9299	0.8752	1.0000	0.8685	0.8325	0.8883
0.8958	0.8907	0.8678	0.8685	1.0000	0.8556	0.8683
0.8287	0.8272	0.9334	0.8325	0.8556	1.0000	0.8965
0.9171	0.8739	0.9011	0.8883	0.8683	0.8965	1.0000

Reliability coefficient for entire rater group is 0.8811.

teacher volunteer. The writer later coded (scored) the responses from the tapes on a TPI summary sheet and sent them to the Director of Research (Norfolk Public Schools).

Observer Rating Scales

McDaniel's Observer Rating Scales (1974) were used by six elementary principals who rated the volunteer teachers in their schools. Each teacher was observed for a period of one hour at prearranged times during which each was engaged in a planned lesson (such as a reading class) necessitating pupil-teacher interaction. The scales were recorded in private and results with teacher names sent to the Director of Research.

Past Interview Scores

Past oral interview ratings for each teacher in the experiment were furnished the Director of Research by the Director of Personnel. Prior to employment, personnel assistants filed a rating card which consisted of a five-point scale (Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent). The selected rating would then become one of the major criteria used in the selection of teachers. No standardized question format was ever used nor were applicants allowed much more than 25 percent of the interview time to answer questions about themselves or their views on teaching methodology.

Demographic Data

Six schools (four containing grades K through 3 and two K through 6) were selected from the fifty Norfolk public elementary

schools. All six principals and 99 percent of the teachers (fifty females, one male) randomly selected agreed to participate in the study. Since a system of crosstown busing accomplished racial mixing (approximately 50 percent black) in each school, each school represents a fair cross section of the low to middle class population in a city of 300,000.

LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

The following limitations of the study are noted:

1. The study is limited to six elementary schools and fifty-one elementary teachers within one school district, hence, limiting generalizability.
2. Even though hours of training time were spent emphasizing the observation and rating of teachers using the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales in only six areas (warmth, enthusiasm, variety, individualization, freedom, and on-task activity), principals may have modified their observation ratings due to prior knowledge of the teacher.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Correlations

Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients were calculated to determine if significant relationships existed between TPI total scores and any or all of the ORS scores. Similarly, Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients were calculated to determine if significant relationships existed between past interview scores

and any or all of the ORS scores.

Step-Wise Regression

Step-wise regression (multiple correlation) was chosen to determine if significant relationships existed between the observed classroom behavior (predicted) and the twelve independent variables of the TPI (predictor). Each observation dimension was examined independently in an attempt to determine if a significant relationship existed between it and the twelve TPI themes (Winer, 1971).

Algebraically:

$$Y_i = a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 \dots + a_{12} x_{12} \quad (i = 1 \text{ to } 6)$$

Y_i Observer Rating Scale scores

$a_0 \dots a_{12}$ Regression Coefficients

$x_1 \dots x_{12}$ TPI Themes

Factor Analysis

In an attempt to determine whether or not the twelve TPI life themes have any central domain of focus, the data gathered using this interview process on the fifty-one interviewees were submitted to a factor analytic procedure. It was felt that if the TPI Guide (1972) dealt with several disparate themes, several factors would emerge from the factor analysis procedure; on the other hand, if the Guide had any single dimensional focus, only one factor could be expected to surface.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Purposes

The primary purpose of this study was to determine to what extent the Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI) identified qualities deemed to be conducive to productive teacher-pupil relationships as measured by the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales (ORS). The second question of interest was the relationship between principal's ratings and past personnel administrator interview scores.

A total of fifty-one classroom teachers, randomly selected from six Norfolk City public elementary schools (which had been nominated for participation), comprised the population of this study. Each teacher had been interviewed by a personnel administrator and rated on a simple five-point scale from "Poor" to "Excellent." The TPI was administered to each of these teachers by the writer. A principal in each of the six schools identified teacher-pupil relationships with the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.

Descriptive Results

As shown in Table 3, the six dimensions measured by the principals resulted in a range of mean scores from 4.02 up to 4.59 (on a scale from 1 to 6), with standard deviations from 1.21 to 1.49. This Table also shows that the total Teacher Perceiver Interview Score registered a mean of 13.45 and a standard deviation of 6.21 for the thirty-six questions. Variables 8 through 19 represented the twelve

life themes from the TPI (three questions per theme) and showed a range of means from 0.53 for Listening to 1.75 for Activation. Standard deviations for the same themes ranged from 0.65 (Empathy) to 1.05 (Innovation). The Five-Point Rating Scale, shown in Table 3, revealed a mean of 3.90 and a standard deviation of 0.81 on the interview rating of past personnel administrators.

TABLE 3
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR ALL
VARIABLES INCLUDED IN STUDY

Rating Scale	Variable	Variable Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
	Warmth	1	4.12	1.49
McDaniel	Enthusiasm	2	4.20	1.46
(ORS)	Variety	3	4.31	1.35
(6-Point	Individualization	4	4.33	1.23
Rating Scale	Freedom	5	4.02	1.21
	On-task activity	6	4.59	1.28
	Total TPI Interview Score (36 Questions)	7	13.45	6.21
	Mission	8	1.14	0.87
	Empathy	9	0.82	0.65
	Rapport	10	1.08	0.84
	Individualized			
TPI Themes	Perception	11	1.31	0.91
(3 Questions	Listening	12	0.53	0.73
Per Theme)	Investment	13	1.24	0.99
	Input Drive	14	1.45	0.92
	Activation	15	1.75	0.93
	Innovation	16	1.06	1.05
	Gestalt	17	1.14	0.98
	Objectivity	18	0.96	0.89
	Focus	19	1.12	0.86
5-Point	Past Interview			
Rating Scale	Scores	20	3.90	0.81

Results of Hypotheses Testing

For the purposes of this investigation, the .05 level of significance was established for testing each hypothesis. The first two hypotheses pertained to the relationship between teacher scores received on the McDaniel ORS and ratings on TPI and former personnel administrator interviews.

Hypothesis 1

There is no statistically significant relationship between the total scores recorded on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and each of the six dimension scores of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.

A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was calculated to test hypothesis one. This analysis, summarized in Table 4, revealed statistically significant correlations between total TPI scores and each of the six dimensions of the McDaniel ORS. The highest correlations were registered in the Warmth and Enthusiasm dimensions.

Hypothesis 2

There is no statistically significant relationship between the scores on the past interviews of personnel administrators and each of the six dimensions of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.

The analysis of a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, summarized in Table 4 (column 2), revealed statistically significant correlations between the scores on the past interviews of

personnel administrators and two of the McDaniel ORS themes, Variety and Freedom (.34 and .33).

Hypothesis 3

There is no statistically significant relationship between the scores of each of the Teacher Perceiver Interview twelve life themes and each of the six dimension scores of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.

To test hypothesis 3, a step-wise regression analysis (multiple correlation) was employed by arbitrarily entering at the first step, the variable (life theme) with the highest correlation to each of the six dependent variables (dimensions of the McDaniel ORS). The correlation matrix in Appendix B, revealed that variable number 16 (Innovation) correlated most highly with Warmth. The resulting highest partial correlation, variable 19 (Focus), was then entered in step two of the process. At each succeeding step, the variable with the highest partial correlation was entered to determine if it would significantly change the percent of variability accounted for.

As shown in Table 5, Innovation and Focus accounted for most of the variability (44 percent) of the first ORS variable, Warmth. Since the rest of the variables were not significant at the .05 level, they were not included in the summary table.

Dependent variable two, Enthusiasm (Table 6), had two significant predictors--Innovation and Objectivity.

Dependent variable three, Variety (Table 7), was revealed to be more highly correlated with Innovation, Rapport and Objectivity.

The nine other possible predictors did not correlate significantly (at the .05 level).

TABLE 4

CORRELATION BETWEEN PRINCIPAL RATINGS AND ORS AND:
 A. TOTAL TPI SCORES
 B. TOTAL PAST PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS'
 INTERVIEW SCORES

McDaniel ORS	<u>Column 1</u> Total TPI Scores	<u>Column 2</u> Total Interview Scores of Past Personnel Administrators
1. Warmth	.71*	.21
2. Enthusiasm	.62*	.26
3. Variety	.51*	.34*
4. Individualization	.48*	.22
5. Freedom	.61*	.33*
6. On-task activity	.60*	.25

*($p. < .05$, $df = 50$)

Innovation and Objectivity were found to be significantly correlated with Individualization (Table 8). Again, ten other independent variables from TPI, although correlated, were not significantly so at the .05 level of confidence.

Table 9 reveals the mathematical relationship between the predictor variables of the twelve TPI themes and the ORS dependent variable, Freedom. Only Innovation, Objectivity and Focus significantly correlated, accounting for 42 percent of the variability.

TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF STEP-WISE REGRESSION RELATING TPI TO ORS
DEPENDENT VARIABLE 1--WARMTH

Step Number	Variable Entered Name	Entered Number	Multiple R	Multiple RSQ	Increase in RSQ	F Value to Enter or Remove	Degree of Freedom	Probability
1	Innovation	16	0.55	0.30	0.30	20.81	1.49	.0001
2	Focus	19	0.66	0.44	0.14	12.08	1.48	.0011

TABLE 6

SUMMARY OF STEP-WISE REGRESSION RELATING TPI TO ORS
DEPENDENT VARIABLE 2--ENTHUSIASM

Step Number	Variable Name	Entered Number	Multiple R	Multiple RSQ	Increase in RSQ	F Value to Enter or Remove	Degree of Freedom	Probability
1	Innovation	16	0.56	0.31	0.31	21.95	1.49	.0000
2	Objectivity	18	0.64	0.41	0.10	7.94	1.48	.0070

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF STEP-WISE REGRESSION RELATING TPI TO ORS
DEPENDENT VARIABLE 3--VARIETY

Step Number	Variable Name	Entered Number	Multiple R	Multiple RSQ	Increase in RSQ	F Value to Enter or Remove	Degree of Freedom	Probability
1	Innovation	16	0.52	0.28	0.28	18.62	1.49	.0001
2	Rapport	10	0.58	0.34	0.06	4.26	1.48	.0445
3	Objectivity	18	0.62	0.39	0.05	3.89	1.47	.0500

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF STEP-WISE REGRESSION RELATING TPI TO ORS
DEPENDENT VARIABLE 4--INDIVIDUALIZATION

Step Number	Variable Name	Entered Number	Multiple R	Multiple RSQ	Increase in RSQ	F Value to Enter or Remove	Degree of Freedom	Probability
1	Innovation	16	0.50	0.25	0.25	16.16	1,49	.0002
2	Objectivity	18	0.57	0.33	0.08	5.81	1,48	.0198

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF STEP-WISE REGRESSION RELATING TPI TO ORS
DEPENDENT VARIABLE 5--FREEDOM

Step Number	Variable Entered Name	Entered Number	Multiple R	RSQ	Increase in RSQ	F Value to Enter or Remove	Degree of Freedom	Probability
1	Innovation	16	0.51	0.26	0.26	16.77	1,49	.0002
2	Objectivity	18	0.60	0.35	0.10	7.42	1,48	.009
3	Focus	19	0.65	0.42	0.06	4.95	1,47	.031

The sixth and final dependent variable (On-task activity) was found to be significantly correlated with Mission, Objectivity and Investment, accounting for 48 percent of the variability (Table 10).

Table 11 presents the summary of the results of the step-wise regression analysis used in testing Hypothesis Three. Innovation was noted as being most highly correlated with every dependent variable of the ORS except On-task activity. Although Objectivity did not correlate as highly with each of the ORS variables, significant correlations were registered with each dimension except Warmth and Variety. Focus, Investment, Rapport and Mission each registered at least a single significant correlation with one of the ORS variables. The remaining predictors, Empathy, Individualized Perception, Listening, Input Drive, Activation and Gestalt were not significantly (.05 level) correlated with any of the six ORS dependent variables.

In an attempt to determine whether or not the twelve TPI life themes have any central domain of focus, the data gathered using this interview process on the fifty-one interviewees were submitted to a factor analytic procedure. It was felt that if the TPI Guide (1972) dealt with several disparate themes, several factors would emerge from the factor analysis procedure; on the other hand, if the Guide had any single dimensional focus, only one factor could be expected to surface. The factor analytical procedure used in this study employed squared multiple correlations as initial commonality estimates to replace unity in the principal diagonal of the original matrix. A varimax rotational procedure was then performed in order to clarify the solution. The factor analysis revealed that all twelve of the life theme areas from

TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF STEP-WISE REGRESSION RELATING TPI TO ORS
DEPENDENT VARIABLE 6--ON-TASK ACTIVITY

Step Number	Variable Entered Name	Entered Number	Multiple R	RSQ	Increase in RSQ	F Value to Enter or Remove	Degree of Freedom	Probability
1	Mission	8	0.480	0.23	0.23	14.69	1,49	.0004
2	Objectivity	18	0.62	0.38	0.15	11.73	1,48	.0013
3	Investment	13	0.69	0.48	0.10	8.80	1,47	.0047

SUMMARY OF STEP-WISE REGRESSION, SHOWING ONLY
SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INDIVID-
UAL TPI THEMES AND ORS DIMENSIONS

- A. U/31 = useful (significant correlation) plus percentage of variability accounted for
- B. Blank Space = correlation not significant at .05 level

Themes		McDaniel ORS					
		Warmth	Enthusiasm	Variety	Individualization	Freedom	On-task activity
TPI	Mission						U/23
	Empathy						
	Rapport			U/06			
	Individualized Perception						
	Listening						
	Investment						U/10
	Input Drive						
	Activation						
	Innovation	U/30	U/31	U/28	U/25	U/26	
	Gestalt						
	Objectivity		U/10		U/08	U/10	U/15
	Focus	U/14				U/06	
Total Variability Accounted for (%)		44	41	34	33	42	48

TPI Guide loaded on a single factor. Factor loadings ranged from a low of .224 to a high of .719, but no secondary factor was identified (Table 12). The themes having the highest factor loading were Individualized Perception and Innovation, while those having the lowest factor loadings were Listening and Objectivity.

TABLE 12
FACTOR ANALYSIS: ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

Variable	Factor Loading
1 Mission	0.418
2 Empathy	0.580
3 Rapport Drive	0.550
4 Individualized Perception	0.719
5 Listening	0.224
6 Investment	0.484
7 Input Drive	0.596
8 Activation	0.571
9 Innovation	0.699
10 Gestalt	0.569
11 Objectivity	0.295
12 Focus	0.593

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PURPOSES

The overall purpose of this study focused on the extent to which the Teacher Perceiver Interview identified qualities deemed to be conducive to productive teacher-pupil relationships as measured by the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales. Of secondary concern, this study addressed itself to the relationship between principal's ratings (using ORS) and past personnel administrator interview scores. Specifically, do relationships exist between predictor scores on personnel interviews, both past and current TPI, and principal's ratings of teachers as measured by the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the data presented in this study, the following conclusions appear to be warranted:

Hypothesis 1

There is no statistically significant relationship between the total scores recorded on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and each of the six dimension scores of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.

1. Since statistically significant positive correlations were registered between total TPI scores and McDaniel's ORS scores, the first hypothesis was rejected.

2. Indications were from the correlation between total TPI score and the Warmth dimension of ORS that the TPI may be helpful in predicting a characteristic of successful teaching deemed important by a consensus of educators cited in the literature review.

Statistically significant correlations between each dimension of the ORS and total TPI scores may indicate that as a structured interview process TPI may be helpful in predicting the willingness of teacher applicants to establish productive pupil-teacher relationships, assuming the McDaniel ORS is used as a classroom measuring instrument.

Hypothesis 2

There is no statistically significant relationship between the scores on the past interviews of personnel administrators and each of the six dimensions of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.

1. No statistically significant relationships were found between the scores on the past interviews of personnel administrators and four of the six McDaniel's Observer Rating Scales (Warmth, Enthusiasm, Individualization, and On-Task Activity).

2. Very low, but statistically significant, correlations were found between the scores on the past interviews of personnel administrators and the ORS dimensions Variety and Freedom.

By failing to reject the null hypothesis in four out of six dimensions, the writer has reservations about the utility of the "seat of the pants" interview as a predictor of the teaching process when using a classroom measuring instrument which purports to identify such qualities as Warmth, Enthusiasm, Individualization, etc.

Hypothesis 3

There is no statistically significant relationship between the scores of each of the Teacher Perceiver Interview twelve life themes and each of the six dimension scores of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.

1. The TPI life theme, Innovation was found to be statistically significantly correlated with all the McDaniel's ORS dimensions except On-Task Activity. From 25 to 31 percent of the variability was accounted for by innovation in each of the five ORS dimensions. Since this was the only theme with such consistently high correlations with ORS dimensions, one may consider TPI Innovation scores as acceptable a predictor of ORS measures as total TPI scores.

2. Statistically significant correlations were noted between TPI objectivity and four ORS dimensions (Enthusiasm, Individualization, Freedom and On-Task Activity) indicating a measure of predictability for each of these four ORS dimensions.

3. Six of twelve TPI themes (Empathy, Individualized Perception, Listening, Input Drive, Activation and Gestalt) failed to register statistically significant correlations with any of the

six dimensions of the ORS, which led to failure to reject the null hypothesis in those six themes.

DISCUSSION

Due to consistently high correlations registered between total Teacher Perceiver Interview scores and all the Observer Rating Scales dimensions, the writer believes the study to have provided evidence to support the use of TPI as an instrument to identify teachers who would be willing to establish mutually-favorable relationships with each student taught. A correlation coefficient of .71 between TPI total scores and the Warmth dimension scores of ORS would seem to support this premise. Researchers have linked this maintenance of positive interpersonal relationships with pupils to teacher "success" or teacher "effectiveness."

The importance of the finding revealed by the factor analysis that all twelve of the TPI themes loaded on a single factor is that these Guide dimensions do cluster about a single dimension, lending credence to the notion that the thirty-six question version of the interview process measures a common teacher characteristic across all twelve of its themes. Further research on the nature of what is being measured needs to be done. For instance, a factor analysis of the sixty question version of TPI may measure more than one teacher characteristic.

Former personnel administrators' interview scores showed little or no relationship to principals' ORS ratings, implying that single global measures are not necessarily predictors of the

teaching processes and should not be used. The Teacher Perceiver Interview process is certainly superior to the unstructured interview method formerly employed.

The score on the TPI theme Innovation may be considered a good predictor of all the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales measures used in the study except On-Task Activity. On-Task Activity was best predicted by Mission. Since Innovation and Mission account for from 23 to 31 percent of the variability in the six ORS dimensions, the interview process could be limited to these two themes, providing the ORS dimensions describe the kind of teacher desired by the school system. It is recommended, however, that further research be conducted on the predictive capability of the TPI prior to eliminating items or themes from the interview process.

The teacher performance criteria (humanistic person who individualizes his/her instruction) of the Virginia Standards of Quality appear to be reflected in the twelve Teacher Perceiver Interview life themes. The question remains, however, do teachers with these attributes contribute more to pupil growth than teachers who are more authoritarian and perhaps less willing to establish mutually-favorable relationships with students? The answer should be dealt with and may be found through further research, perhaps comparing student achievement scores from these teacher types.

Findings from this study indicate that the TPI is a useful measure of a teacher's relationship-building qualities. It is strongly felt by the personnel staff of the Norfolk Public Schools that TPI, as a major screening device, is defensible due to its

ability to identify the types of teachers currently valued by the Norfolk Public School Board--specifically, teachers who are willing to develop mutually-favorable relationships with each student they teach.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations resulted from this study:

1. Due to the limited generalizability of the study (relatively small number of teachers and schools sampled in only one school district), replications should be performed drawing from larger populations from a greater number of schools.
2. Future TPI studies should incorporate other classroom measuring devices for principal use to compare with ORS results.
3. Future studies should include either all sixty of the TPI questions or perhaps only twenty-four to compare theme relationships with classroom rating instrument dimensions.
4. Other TPI studies should use classroom measuring techniques by an unbiased panel (eliminating principal ratings).
5. Future studies should compare TPI scores of secondary teachers with classroom rating scores.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agazarian, Yvonne M. et al. Documenting Development, Philadelphia Humanizing Learning Program. Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1972.
- Albert, H. R. "An Analysis of Teacher Rating by Pupils in San Antonio, Texas," Educational Administration and Supervision, 27 (January, 1941), 367-374.
- Anastasiow, Nicholas J. "Impact of Teacher Characteristics in Teaching: The Interaction of Performance and Personality," Bulletin of the School of Education, Vol. 45:1-43, July, 1969.
- Arend, Paul J. "Teacher Selection: The Relationship Between Selected Factors and the Rated Effectiveness of Second Year Teachers." A report to the Baltimore County Board of Education, Towson, Maryland, January, 1973, p. 38.
- Boardman, C. W. "Analysis of Pupil Ratings of High School Teachers," Educational Administration and Supervision, 22 (November, 1936), 440-446.
- Bonneau, L. R. "An Interview for Selecting Teachers." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1956.
- Brookover, W. B. "Person-to-Person Interaction Between Teachers and Pupils and Teaching Effectiveness," Journal of Education Research, 34:272-87, December, 1940.
- Brophy, Jere E. and C. M. Evertson. "Teacher Education, Teacher Effectiveness and Developmental Psychology." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois, August 30-September 3, 1975.
- Clifford, Gerald F. Criterion and Techniques in the Recruitment and Selection of Teachers. ERIC Document ED 115601, May, 1975, p. 42.
- Clifton, Donald O. Interview granted Hudson F. Lasher, April 3, 1976.
- Cogan, M. L. "Theory and Design of a Study of Teacher-Pupil Interaction," Harvard Educational Review, 26:315-342, Fall, 1956.
- _____. "The Behavior of Teachers and the Productive Behavior of Their Pupils," Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 27, 1958.

- Coker, Homer. The SRI Teacher Perceiver Interview and Administrator Ratings in Carrollton, Georgia. Unpublished report prepared by Selection Research, Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska, 1975.
- Cook, W., C. H. Leeds, and R. Callis. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1951.
- Combs, A. W. The Professional Education of Teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.
- Deneen, James R., Lois C. Ferguson, and Susan Sherivin. "Teacher Selection: A Survey of Opinions and Attitudes of Personnel Directors in Large School Districts." Unpublished paper, Educational Testing Service, November, 1972.
- Dodge, G. W. and D. O. Clifton. "Teacher-Pupil Rapport and Student Teacher Characteristics," Journal of Educational Psychology, 47:364-371, October, 1956.
- Drawhorne, C. L. "Relationship Between Pupil and Student-Teacher Interaction and Pupil Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness," Educational Administration and Supervision, 40:283-296, May, 1954.
- Drucker, A. J. and H. H. Remmers. "Do Alumni and Students Differ in Their Attitudes Toward Instructors?," Journal of Educational Psychology, 43:129-143, March, 1951.
- Flanders, N. A. Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement: Studies in Interaction Analysis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1960.
- Gaeddert, W. "A Study of Student Responses in a Positive Reference Frame." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1956.
- Gage, N. L., ed. "Recruitment Selection and Retention." Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, Conference on Studies in Teaching, Panel 1, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March, 1975.
- Coheen, R. F. "The Teacher and the University," American Scientist, 54, 1966.
- Golladay, Mary A. "The Condition of Education." Report for the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Educational Statistics, 1976, p. 125.

- Grandgenett, Donald J. A Comparison of the Ratings Given Ten Teacher Applicants by Ten Public School Administrators After a Traditional Interview and a Video-Tape Teaching Demonstration. Omaha: Nebraska University, May, 1972.
- Greer, C. "Public Schools: The Myth of the Melting Pot," Phi Delta Kappan (1970), 84-102.
- Gregory, Thomas B. "A Computer Program for Calculation of Scott's Coefficient of Observer Reliability." Report Series No. 21, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, September, 1969.
- Guba, E. G. and J. W. Getzels. "Personality and Teacher Effectiveness: A Problem in Theoretical Research," Journal of Educational Psychology, 46, 1955.
- Hall, H. O. "Professional Preparation and Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Teacher Education (March, 1964), 72-76.
- Hamachek, D. E. "What Research Tells Us About the Characteristics of 'Good' and 'Bad' Teachers," Human Dynamics in Psychology and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968.
- Hart, F. W. Teachers and Teaching. New York: The Macmillan Book Company, 1934, 75-80.
- Hawke, Sharryl et al. "State Accountability Activities and the Social Studies: A Nationwide Survey, A Proposed Accountability Model and Some Guidelines." A report to the Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, 1975, p. 7.
- Hill, K. R. "Humor as an Aid to Learning." Unpublished Master's thesis, Lincoln: University of Nebraska, August, 1966, pp. 15-63.
- Holloman, Thomas D. "A Preliminary Look at Employment Interviewer's Proficiency at Combining Interformation Cues." Paper presented at Mid-western Psychological Association Convention in Detroit, Michigan, May 6-8, 1971.
- Huddy, James A., Jr. "The Employment and Evaluation Cycle in Education." A report to the Educational Service Bureau, Inc., Washington, D. C., 1968, p. 19.
- Knapp, D. R. "A Proposed Technique for the Selection of People who have Knowledge and Skills in Human Relations." Master's thesis, University of Nebraska, 1955.

- Lasher, Merle R. and Stanley Wade. "A Study of Teacher Employment Practices in Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska." Maryville, Missouri: Missouri State College, 1972.
- Lieske, G. R. "An Interview Process for Selecting Activating Teachers." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Lincoln: University of Nebraska, July, 1969, pp. 81-84.
- Majestic, Richard M. "Teacher Selection: The Quest for Quality." Paper presented to the American Association of School Personnel Administrators, New Orleans, Louisiana, October 19, 1971, pp. 7-9.
- Manual for Implementing Standard of Quality for Public Schools in Virginia, Richmond, Virginia: State Department of Education, Revised 1976, pp. 8-10.
- Maslow, A. H. "Self-Actualizing People: A Study of Psychological Health, Personality, Symposium Number One," Values in Personality Research. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1950, 11-34.
- May, Robert E. and Everett G. Doerge. "An Analysis of the Informational Items and Procedures Used in the Selection of Teachers in the Public School Systems of Louisiana: Final Report." Washington, D. C.: National Center for Educational Research and Development, November, 1972.
- McDaniel, Ernest. "Longitudinal Study of Elementary School Effects: Design, Instruments, and Specifications for a Field Test." ERIC Document ED 100945, Vol. 10, No. 5, May, 1976.
- _____. Manual for Observer Rating Scales. Indiana: Purdue Educational Research Center, April, 1974.
- Merritt, Daniel L. "Attitude Congruency and Selection of Teacher Candidates," Administrator's Notebook, No. 19 (February, 1971), 1-4.
- Miller, Jo Ann, Executive Coordinator, SRI, in an interview, Columbia, South Carolina, July 13, 1976.
- Miner, Mary G. "Selection Procedures and Personnel Records." A survey prepared for the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., No. 114, Washington, D. C., September, 1976, pp. 12-14.
- Moody, Walter E. "A Comparison of Teacher Perceiver Interview Guide and Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Scores With Supervision Ranking of Special Education Teachers." Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1973.

Muller, Gale. Interview granted Hudson F. Lasher, March 18, 1976.

_____. "Comparison of Recommended and Non-Recommended Teachers in Grove City, Ohio." Unpublished report prepared by Selection Research, Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska, 1974.

_____ and Jo Ann Miller. "Correlation of Teacher Perceiver Interview with Student Ratings in Alvernie, Illinois." Unpublished report prepared by Selection Research, Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska, 1974.

Muller, Gale. "Increase in Teacher Talent in Aurora, Illinois." Unpublished report prepared by Selection Research, Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska, 1974.

_____. "Teacher Perceiver Interview Score as a Predictor of Student Ratings in Lincoln, Nebraska." Unpublished report prepared by Selection Research, Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska, 1974.

_____. "Selection Research Project Evaluation: A Three Year Study." Unpublished report prepared by Selection Research, Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska, 1974.

_____. "Student Ratings, Administrator Ratings and Teacher Self-Ratings as Measures for Teacher Evaluation." Unpublished report prepared by Selection Research, Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska, 1975.

_____ and Mable Goodwin. "Project Empathy: Development of an Interview Procedure to Predict Student and Administrator Ratings of Prospective Applicants." Unpublished report prepared by Selection Research, Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska, 1974.

Murray, Robert N. "Validating the Patterned Interview," Personnel (January, 1947), p. 263.

Preuss, William. "Profile and Selection of Teacher Candidates in Seward, Nebraska." Unpublished report prepared by Selection Research, Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska, 1972.

Ralston, A. and H. S. Wilf. Mathematical Methods for Digital Computers. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Redfern, George B. "Desirable Policies and Procedures for Teacher Selection." Brooklyn, New York: New York City Board of Education, June, 1967.

Rogers, Carl. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.

- Rosenshine, Barak. "Teacher Competency Research," Competency Assessment, Research and Evaluation. A report of a National Conference, University of Houston, March 12-15, 1974, pp. 138-153.
- Ryans, D. A. "Research on Teacher Behavior in the Context of the Teacher Characteristics Study" in B. J. Biddle and W. J. Ellena, Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Schoff, John F. and Mary E. Randles. "Simulated Interviews for Teaching Positions Conducted by Student Teachers and Administrative Interns," Science Education (April/June, 1972), 227-230.
- Scott, William A. "Reliability of Content Analysis: The Care for Nominal Scale Coding," Public Opinion Quarterly, 19:321-325 (Fall, 1955).
- Selection Research, Incorporated. SRI Perceiver Academics Introductory Notebook. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1976.
- Selection Research, Incorporated. SRI Teacher Perceiver Interview Guide. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1972.
- Singer, A., Jr. "Social Competencies in Teaching," Journal of Experimental Education, 23 (December, 1954), 99-131.
- Sivulich, Stephen. "Teacher Replacement 1974," National Association of Secondary School Principals, No. 58 (December, 1974), 51-55.
- Slaughter, C. H. "A Proposed Screening Program for Elementary Teacher Candidates," Journal of Teacher Education (February, 1969), 343-346.
- Sterchele, Norman R. "A Investigation of Some Relationships Between Self-Actualization and Child-Centeredness Among Teachers." Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973.
- Symonds, P. M. "Characteristics of the Effective Teacher Based on Pupil Evaluations," Journal of Experimental Education, 23 (June, 1955), 289-310.
- Waetjen, Walter B., ed. Human Variability and Learning. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1961.
- Warner, Allin K. "A Structured Interview for Predicting Future Pupil-Teacher Rapport." Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1969.
- Webb, W. B. and C. Y. Nolan. "Students, Supervisor, and Self-Ratings of Instructional Proficiency," Journal of Educational Psychology, 46:42-46, January, 1955.

Winer, B. J. Statistical Principals in Experimental Design. 2nd ed.
New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Winseman, A. W., Jr. "An Interview Process for Selecting Activating Vocational Technical Instructors." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Lincoln: University of Nebraska, August, 1969.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF THE MCDANIEL OBSERVER RATING
SCALES AND SAMPLE ORS CODING SHEET

DESCRIPTION OF THE SCALES

The Observer Rating Scales provide an observation instrument for recording observed teaching behavior on nine dimensions:

1. Warmth. The extent to which the atmosphere of the class is relaxed and comfortable; the degree to which the teacher maintains positive interpersonal relationships with pupils.
2. Enthusiasm. The enthusiasm or interest level expressed by the teacher and students during class activities.
3. Clarity. The clarity of communication, instructions and expectations conveyed to the students.
4. Variety. The extent to which the teacher uses a variety of materials and activities.
5. Individualization. The degree to which the teacher provides students with different levels of work that are suited to their particular needs, interests and abilities, and the amount of individual assistance provided.
6. Feedback. The extent of communication to the student of information about the adequacy, acceptability, completeness or correctness of his response.
7. Cognitive Demand. The level of intellectual activity that the teacher expects from the student.
8. Freedom. The degree to which the teacher provides arrangements which facilitate independence and individual freedom.
9. On-Task Activity. The amount of student activity that is directed toward the accomplishment of instructional objectives.

Each dimension is described in a few brief paragraphs. The observer rates the teaching behavior on a scale from one to six. The six positions represent points along a continuum. These positions are defined by accompanying statements to assist the rater in selecting the appropriate point.

The scales are high inference scales. The rater must observe a wide range of behaviors, sense the impact on the students, and summarize the major thrust and intent. This task requires a delicate balance between objectivity and the intuitive perception of subtle meanings and connotations. For example, warmth may be indicated by the number of times a teacher smiles and praises his students, but it also includes less tangible qualities of empathy which must enter into the observer's rating. Appropriate ratings depend on attention to the teacher's behavior and a sensitive monitoring of both the pupils' and observers' own responses.

OBSERVER RATING SCALE

Coding Sheet

School _____ Teacher _____ Grade _____

Date _____ Time in _____ Time out _____

Observer _____

Complete the ratings at the end of the observation period. Circle the rating for each dimension.

1. wm. 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. enth. 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. cir. 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. var. 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. ind. 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. fdbk. 1 2 3 4 5 6

7. cog. 1 2 3 4 5 6

8. fr. 1 2 3 4 5 6

9. on-tsk. 1 2 3 4 5 6

APPENDIX B

CORRELATION MATRIX FOR ALL OF
VARIABLES IN STUDY

CORRELATION MATRIX FOR ALL VARIABLES

	Variable Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Warmth	1	1.000	0.735	0.578	0.612	0.565	0.611	0.710	0.495	0.493	0.357
Enthusiasm	2		1.000	0.472	0.768	0.634	0.675	0.624	0.356	0.352	0.459
Variety	3			1.000	0.866	0.708	0.700	0.512	0.303	0.223	0.452
Individualization	4				1.000	0.616	0.660	0.481	0.293	0.199	0.437
Freedom	5					1.000	0.573	0.612	0.339	0.257	0.351
On-Task Activity	6						1.000	0.593	0.480	0.198	0.289
Total TPI Scores	7							1.000	0.498	0.581	0.568
Mission	8								1.000	0.078	0.175
Empathy	9									1.000	0.460
Rapport	10										1.000

CORRELATION MATRIX FOR ALL VARIABLES (CONTINUED)

	Variable Number	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Warmth	1	0.416	0.217	0.413	0.454	0.409	0.546	0.385	0.304	0.532	0.209
Enthusiasm	2	0.408	0.164	0.258	0.320	0.361	0.556	0.373	0.436	0.363	0.255
Variety	3	0.425	0.132	0.243	0.221	0.271	0.525	0.194	0.359	0.328	0.341
Individualization	4	0.390	0.022	0.230	0.271	0.250	0.498	0.211	0.395	0.208	0.216
Freedom	5	0.323	0.260	0.246	0.458	0.430	0.505	0.251	0.427	0.400	0.330
On-Task Activity	6	0.406	0.173	0.470	0.295	0.211	0.420	0.396	0.439	0.424	0.250
Total TPI Scores	7	0.696	0.330	0.557	0.609	0.623	0.694	0.633	0.435	0.646	0.137
Mission	8	0.198	0.166	0.239	0.269	0.142	0.363	0.305	0.110	0.456	0.037
Empathy	9	0.365	0.074	0.404	0.267	0.350	0.395	0.257	0.091	0.498	0.118
Rapport	10	0.464	0.036	0.216	0.338	0.254	0.447	0.325	0.163	0.206	0.012
Individualized											
Perception	11	1.000	0.228	0.384	0.497	0.356	0.571	0.379	0.114	0.412	0.094
Listening	12		1.000	0.128	0.113	0.231	0.168	0.120	0.094	0.089	0.022
Investment	13			1.000	0.209	0.195	0.179	0.357	0.169	0.387	0.104
Input Drive	14				1.000	0.460	0.468	0.306	0.216	0.233	0.007
Activation	15					1.000	0.383	0.323	0.323	0.360	0.311
Innovation	16						1.000	0.382	0.238	0.324	0.031
Gestalt	17							1.000	0.212	0.359	0.134
Objectivity	18								1.000	0.084	0.272
Focus	19									1.000	0.218
Past Personnel											
Interview Scores	20										1.000

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**

PREDICTING TEACHING PROCESSES WITH
THE TEACHER PERCEIVER INTERVIEW

by

David E. Jones, Jr.

(ABSTRACT)

The major purpose of this study focused on the predictability by the Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI) of qualities deemed to be conducive to productive teacher-pupil relationships, as identified from scores on the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales (ORS) and observable in classroom relationships. In addition, this study intended to determine whether former interview ratings by personnel administrators predict as well as the Teacher Perceiver Interview observable classroom teacher-pupil relationships as indicated by the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.

Fifty-one teachers were randomly selected from six Norfolk Public elementary schools to test three hypotheses:

1. *There is no statistically significant relationship between the total scores recorded on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and each of the six dimension scores of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.*
2. *There is no statistically significant relationship between the scores on the past interviews of personnel administrators and each of the six dimensions of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.*

3. *There is no statistically significant relationship between the score on each of the Teacher Perceiver twelve life themes and each of the six dimension scores of the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales.*

The Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI) is a structured interview process published by Selection Research, Incorporated (1974), and contains questions from twelve theme areas: Mission, Empathy, Rapport Drive, Individualized Perception, Listening, Investment, Input Drive, Activation, Innovation, Gestalt, Objectivity and Focus.

The McDaniel Observer Rating Scales (ORS) was published by Ernest McDaniel at Purdue University (1974), and is a classroom climate rating instrument containing nine dimensions: Warmth, Enthusiasm, Clarity, Variety, Individualization, Feedback, Cognitive Demand, Freedom and On-Task Activity. (Note: The writer tested all dimensions except Clarity, Feedback and Cognitive Demand.)

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients of from .48 to .71 were registered between total TPI scores and each of the six ORS dimension scores. Hypothesis number one was rejected. Two ORS measures (Variety, .34 and Freedom, .33) showed a significant relationship with past personnel administrator ratings. The writer failed to reject null hypothesis two in the other four dimensions.

To test hypothesis three, a step-wise regression analysis was employed to determine if relationships existed between the twelve TPI themes and each of the six ORS dimensions. TPI Innovation registered significant correlations with all the ORS dimensions except On-Task Activity. TPI Objectivity correlated significantly

with all the ORS dimensions except Warmth and Variety. TPI Mission registered a significant correlation with one ORS dimension (On-Task Activity).

A factor analysis revealed that all twelve of the TPI life themes loaded on a single factor. Factor loadings ranged from a low of .224 to a high of .719, but no secondary factor was identified.

On the basis of the data presented in this study, the following conclusions appeared to be warranted:

1. Total TPI scores appear to be helpful in predicting certain characteristics of successful teaching as measured by the ORS process.

2. Past personnel administrator ratings indicated little or no predictability of the teaching process.

3. Indications were that codings on questions from TPI themes Innovation and Mission may collectively be as valid predictors of the relationship building qualities of candidates as total TPI scores. Similar predictions may be made from combining codings on questions from TPI themes Objectivity, Mission and Rapport.

4. TPI is a useful predictor of a teacher's willingness to develop mutually-favorable relationships with each student he/she teaches.