AN INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED PERSONALITY NEED-STRUCTURE, VALUE AND ATTITUDE CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENT AND COOPERATING TEACHERS IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

By

VAUD ANCIL TRAVIS, JR.

Bachelor of Science
Northeastern State College
Tahlequah, Oklahoma
1947

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1948

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate College of
the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1966

AN INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED PERSONALITY NEED-STRUCTURE, VALUE AND ATTITUDE CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENT AND COOPERATING TEACHERS IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

Concern for more realistic laboratory teaching experiences and the lack of adequate on-campus laboratory facilities has resulted in the moving of student teaching from the college campus into the public school classroom. Many administrative and "quality controls" are of necessity relinquished by the training institution by such a move. Quality controls are limited primarily to the selection and retention policies exercised by the training institution.

This study investigated three personality instruments to measure need-structure, value characteristics and attitudes to determine whether significant personality differences existed among the student and cooperating teachers who had been retained by the selection and retention procedures in current usage at the Oklahoma State University. Findings were interpreted in terms of (1) what characteristics were descriptive of the population resulting from the selection and retention policies in current usage, and (2) whether usage of the personality instruments might permit selective placement of student teachers for the crucial student teaching experience.

Grateful acknowledgment is expressed to those who contributed to the completion of the study. Particular appreciation is expressed to the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, Dr. Richard P. Jungers; to Dr. J. Paschal Twyman, whose advice and counsel was freely given in all phases of the study; to Drs. Solomon Sutker, Richard J. Rankin and

Mrs. Helen M. Jones, whose continued interest in the study was most encouraging.

The generous participation of the cooperating teachers of Perry, Stillwater, Oklahoma City, Tulsa and Ponca City public schools is gratefully acknowledged. The author is indebted to Mr. Ed Butler of the Oklahoma State University Computing Center for assistance in the statistical treatment of the data. The author wishes to express to his wife, Vivian Kelly Travis, sincere gratitude for her encouragement which made this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Table
I.	THE NATURE AND BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM.	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Background of the Problem.	2
	Purpose of the Study	9
	Definition of Terms.	10
	Objectives and Hypotheses.	12
	Scope of the Study	14
II.	RELATED LITERATURE.	17
	Occupational Choice.	17
	Selection of Prospective Teachers.	20
	Personality as a Criterion of Success.	22
	Personality Traits and Success in Teaching	29
III.	METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY.	33
	Setting of the Study	33
	Practices and Policies Governing Student Teaching. .	36
	The Study Population	37
	Instrumentation.	39
	Procedures Employed and Problems Encounterd in Data Collecting	53
	Statistical Analysis of the Data	57
IV.	FINDINGS.	61
	Summuary of Results.	61
V.	RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS.	76
	Review of the Purpose of the Study	76
	Conclusions.	77
	Recommendations.	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Composition of Student and Cooperating Teacher Groups by Grade Level	38
II.	Comparison of Norms for College Students and the Scores of Elementary Student Teachers on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.	63
III.	Comparison of Elementary Student and Cooperating Teacher Scores on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.	64
IV.	Comparison of the Lower Grade and Intermediate Grade Elementary Student Teacher Scores on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.	66
V.	Comparison of the Lower Grade and Intermediate Grade Cooperating Teacher Scores on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.	67
VI.	Comparison of the Lower Grade Elementary Student and Cooperating Teacher Scores on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.	69
VII.	Comparison of the Intermediate Grade Elementary Student and Cooperating Teacher Scores on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.	70
VIII.	Comparison of the M. T. A. I. Norms for Elementary Education Graduating Seniors with the Pre- and Post-Student Teaching M. T. A. I. Scores of the O. S. U. Elementary Student Teachers	72
IX.	Comparison of the Lower and Intermediate Grade Elementary Student Teachers on the Pre-, Post-, and Pre-Post-Student Teaching M. T. A. I. Discrepancy Scores	72
X.	Comparison Between Student Teacher Scores on the Personality Variables of the E. P. P. S. and S. I. V. and the M. T. A. I. Pre-test, Post-test, and Pre-Post-Test Score Changes	73
XI.	Intercorrelations for Student and Cooperating Elementary Teachers for the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.	75

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE AND BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Growing interest and concern by the lay public has been expressed throughout the United States about programs for the education of teachers. This interest, coupled with an increasing need for more and better qualified teachers, has brought reappraisal of teacher education programs by colleges and universities and by professional organizations. The focus of concern for many problems has been the directed teaching experience and the selection and retention procedures used with teacher candidates.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to survey the personality need-structure and value characteristics of a fall semester population of elementary student and cooperating teachers at Oklahoma State University. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (E. P. P. S.)[1] was used to measure personality need-structure and the Survey of Interpersonal Values (S. I. V.) to measure value characteristics. In addition, the study was designed to determine what attitudes were held by the student

---

[1] Hereinafter, the three instruments used in the study will be referred to as follows: the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule as the E. P. P. S.; the Gordon Survey of Interpersonal Values as the S. I. V.; and, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory as the M. T. A. I.

teachers and whether the attitudes changed significantly during the student teaching experience. Attitudes and attitude changes were measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (M. T. A. I.).

Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. Do the Oklahoma State University elementary student teachers differ significantly in need-structure, value and attitude characteristics from the national norms of college students?
2. Do the Oklahoma State University elementary student and cooperating teachers of the lower and intermediate grade levels differ significantly in need-structure and value characteristics?
3. Do the Oklahoma State University elementary student teacher attitudes change significantly during the off-campus laboratory teaching experience?

Background of the Problem

The directed teaching experience in teacher education, important since the beginning of the professional education movement in the United States,[2] has continued as the most universally approved curriculum offering used in preparing teachers.[3] All fifty states have directed

---

[2]John C. Flowers, Content of Student Teaching Courses Designed for Training of Secondary Teachers in State Colleges (New York, 1932), p. 1.

[3]L. O. Andrews, Student Teaching (New York, 1964), p. 3.

teaching as one of the minimum requirements leading to the issuance of a "regular certificate" to elementary teachers.[4]

Conant says:

> I have encountered no responsible group denying that practice teaching is an important part of a good program, though there is a great deal of difference of opinion about every other component.[5]

The lengthening of time provided for the student teaching experience attests to the increasing importance being attached to the directed teaching experience. According to Andrews:

> The time allocation has been increasing both within the school day and in the number of weeks. Many students receive full-day assignments, a practice which is generally advocated because of the added realism, and because of the greater opportunity for professional development.[6]

The desire for a more realistic laboratory teaching experience and the lack of adequate on-campus laboratory facilities has gradually moved student teaching into the public school classroom. The Flowers Report of 1948,[7] which demanded the actual classroom situation for the culminating laboratory teaching experience, contributed to the off-campus movement. Flowers argues that for theory and practice to be "wedded," the student must test and practice principles of teaching in an environment of public school classroom.

---

[4]W. Earl Armstrong and T. M. Stinnett, A Manual of Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association (Washington, 1961), p. 24.

[5]James B. Conant, "Teacher Certification: The Restricted State Approved Program Approach," New Developments, Research and Experimentation in Professional Laboratory Experiments (Cedar Falls, 1962).

[6]Andrews, p. 2.

[7]John G. Flowers and Others, School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education (Oneonta, 1948).

Growing enrollments in teacher education programs and the lengthening of the laboratory teaching experience have intensified the demand made upon staff, on-campus facilities and available resources. Since World War II the weight of numbers in teacher education has accelerated the movement off-campus.[8] In 1954, Downer reported that, "There are very few teacher education institutions today without some type of off-campus student teaching program."[9] In 1964, Andrews stated:

> The continuing shift to the use of off-campus public schools for student teaching is now so complete that most new teachers have had at least some of their experiences, and many have had all, in public schools, and have experienced many of the complex roles of a public school teacher.[10]

Off-campus teaching laboratories operated cooperatively with the public schools create problems of program control for the college. Many administrative and "quality controls" in the teaching laboratory are relinquished.[11] Daily supervision of the student teacher is in the hands of a "cooperating teacher."[12] These cooperating teachers

---

[8]Andrews, pp. 1-2.

[9]Effie M. Downer, "Provisions Made by Cities to Regulate and Facilitate Student Teaching," Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, Eds. Garold D. Holstine and Frank L. Steeves (Dubuque, 1954), p. 101.

[10]Andrews, p. 18.

[11]Esther J. Swenson and Robert C. Hammock, "Off-campus Laboratory Experiences: Their Growth, Importance, and Present Role in Teacher Education," Off-Campus Student Teaching, Eds. Morton S. Malter and Troy L. Stearns (Lock Haven, 1951), pp. 22-26.

[12]Helen M. Jones, "Whose Responsibility? The Student Teacher," The Oklahoma Teacher, XLI (Oklahoma City, 1960), pp. 10-11.

become the key persons[13] in guiding the student teachers in the off-campus laboratories.[14, 15] Rabin describes the cooperating teacher's position thusly:

> The supervising teacher's role is paramount. Time and time again, prospective teachers rate their direct experiences with supervising teachers as the most worthwhile part of their education toward becoming a certified teacher.[16]

Few practicing classroom teachers are adequately prepared for the role of the "cooperating teacher" or are oriented to the college teacher education program.[17] Most have had less academic preparation than their counterparts in the college or university classroom.[18] Steeves concluded, after studying the literature on student teaching from 1929 to 1950, that the "cooperating teacher" is seldom prepared for his work by any study of supervision.[19] Andrews estimates that over 200,000

---

[13]Helen Richards and Elizabeth Robinson, The Supervising Teacher, Ed. Ernest J. Milner (Dubuque, 1959), p. 26.

[14]Ernest J. Milner, "Providing for Differences: Environment," Concern for the Individual in Student Teaching, Ed. Aleyne C. Haines (Dubuque, 1963).

[15]Allen D. Patterson, "Participants Look at the Program," Off-Campus Student Teaching, Eds. Morton S. Malter and Troy L. Stearns. (Lock Haven, 1951), p. 87.

[16]Bernard Rabin, "Who are Supervising Teachers?" The Supervising Teacher, Ed. Earnest J. Milner (Dubuque, 1959), p. 2.

[17]Howard T. Batchelder, Richard E. Lawrence and George R. Myers, A Guide to Planning for Off-Campus Student Teaching, The Association for Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 11, 1959, p. 17.

[18]Edward L. Ruman and Dwight K. Curtis, "The Supervising Teacher in Future Teacher Education Programs," The Supervising Teacher, Ed. Ernest J. Milner (Dubuque, 1959), p. 111.

[19]Frank L. Steeves, "A Summary of the Literature on the Off-Campus Cooperating Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXVIII (March, 1952), p. 129.

cooperating teachers are needed every year and adds:

> Most of these teachers have a student teacher only once a year, and probably a majority have never had any course or planned in-service instruction in the supervision of a student teacher.[20]

In August of 1959, Davies conducted a survey of college problems and practices in off-campus student teaching programs. A seventy per cent return was received from the three hundred ninety-eight 1958-59 members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education which he had used as a sample. Among the chronic problems facing these teacher education institutions was the one of obtaining able co-operating teachers. Well over sixty per cent of the respondents listed the problems of identification and recruitment of competent cooperating teachers, with more than twenty-five per cent of the colleges naming these two problems among the most troublesome.[21]

Success in classroom teaching has not proved to be an adequate criterion for identifying cooperating teachers. As Flowers pointed out:

> It is not enough that the laboratory teacher who is responsible for guiding the experiences of the college student must be a master teacher in working with children. He must be equally competent in his understanding of the college student and in his ability to guide that student in working with children.[22]

---

[20] Andrews, p. 8.

[21] Don Davies, "A Survey of College Problems and Practices in Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs," Teacher Education and the Public Schools, Ed. C. M. Clarke (Dubuque, 1961), pp. 141-163.

[22] John C. Flowers, Recommended Standards Governing Professional Laboratory Experiences and Student Teaching (Oneonta, 1948), p. 79.

A statement of criteria used in selecting off-campus cooperating teachers at the University of Wyoming asserts, "not all superior teachers have the ability to work well in helping a novice become a teacher."[23]

From these studies it would appear that many schools have an insufficient supply of identified effective cooperating teachers. Faced with a short supply of able cooperating teachers, and without objective means of identifying effective new ones, colleges have allowed expediency to take priority over the implementation of sound educational theory. As Swenson and Hammock explained, "Often the urgency of a present need for places results in the use of personnel whether qualified or not."[24]

The essence of the problem was identified in the commentary of Lofthouse[25] when she pointed out that while educators recognize differences among children in the classroom they do not always recognize and accommodate differences that occur among student teachers. Elliott asserts that:

> The selection for a specific community is a two way process--some students need a particular kind of community or school, and some communities need a particular kind of student teacher.[26]

---

[23]C. M. Clarke, ed., Teacher Education and the Public Schools, (Dubuque, 1962), p. 144.

[24]Swenson and Hammock, p. 25.

[25]Yvonne Lofthouse, "A Rationale for Professional Laboratory Experiences," The Outlook in Student Teaching, Ed. Aleyne C. Haines, 1962, p. 144.

[26]Jane Griffith Elliott, "A Role Perception: The College Coordinator," Teacher Education and the Public Schools, Ed. C. M. Clarke (Dubuque, 1961), p. 51.

Brink emphasizes that, "If students are to derive maximum value from their teaching experiences it is obvious that careful selection of supervising teachers is of the upmost importance."[27]

Stratemeyer and Lindsey contend that, "Sound procedures in assigning student teaching situations can contribute to or negate such learnings."[28]

The critical relevance of these positions is that individual personality differences among student and cooperating teachers, coupled with the many variations in the environmental press of particular schools and classroom situations, have made the careful assignment of student teachers a practical necessity to insure the quality of the learning experience. Because of a chronic shortage of effective cooperating teachers, teacher education programs must then either lower the quality of their program in the directed teaching experience or limit the number and type of teacher candidates through selection and retention procedures to those candidates who can be adequately placed in available directed teaching stations.

Administrators of teacher education who are required to make decisions concerning the selection of teacher candidates need more objective techniques and instruments than the personal interview to predict which applicants have personality characteristics conducive to teaching success, and in addition, who can be efficiently prepared to

---

[27]William G. Brink, "Administration of Student Teaching in Universities which use the Public Schools," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXI (1945), p. 397.

[28]Florence B. Stratemeyer and Margaret Lindsey, Working with Student Teachers (New York, 1958), p. 123.

teach within the institutional limits set by the particular institution's staff, curriculum and physical facilities. It was to the foregoing need at Oklahoma State University that this study was directed.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate selected personality characteristics of student and cooperating teachers in the elementary teacher education program at Oklahoma State University. The investigation was made to determine whether two relatively new personality instruments, the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V. showed evidence of identifying personality similarities and/or disparities which might be significant for screening procedures in the elementary teacher education program at Oklahoma State University. The third instrument used in the investigation, the M. T. A. I., was used to investigate the change of attitudes toward teaching among the student teachers during the laboratory teaching experience.

Specifically, the current study was made to determine whether significant differences existed on scores made by the elementary student and cooperating teachers of Oklahoma State University during the fall semester of 1963-64 on the E. P. P. S., the S. I. V., and the M. T. A. I. Comparisons were made between student scores and national norms and between lower and intermediate grade level groups. An attempt was also made to establish correlations between the twenty-one purportedly independent variables of the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V. The study describes student and cooperating teachers in the study population in terms of the need-dimensions and value characteristics measured, as well

as the attitudinal change among the student teachers during the off-campus laboratory teaching experience to provide a basis for future field experimental study of the Oklahoma State University teacher education program.

Definition of Terms

Definitions of terms applicable to the present study are given below:

1. College Supervisor- A staff member of the college who regularly visits or observes student teachers usually, but not necessarily, in a specific field or in certain subjects and grade levels. He or she is ordinarily responsible for a limited number of courses, and devotes the major portion of his or her time to off-campus visitations and conferences.[29]

2. Cooperating School- A school used by the college to provide certain guided professional laboratory experiences for college students. This school is not administered, staffed, or under the legal jurisdiction of the college.[30]

3. Cooperating Teacher- An off-campus teacher into whose classes or activities are placed college students for the purpose of obtaining credit in student teaching.[31]

4. Intermediate Grades- The fourth, fifth, and sixth grades on the elementary school level.

5. Laboratory School- Any school, public or private, which a teacher education institution utilizes as a resource for professional laboratory experiences.[32]

---

[29]Garold D. Holstine and F. L. Steenes, "The Identification of Good Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences," Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, Eds. Garold D. Holstine and F. L. Steenes (Dubuque, 1954), p. 5.

[30]Alex F. Perrodin, "The 1955 Yearbook," Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education, Ed. Alex F. Perrodin (Lock Haven, 1955), p. xii.

[31]Holstine and Steenes, p. 5.

[32]Perrodin, p. xi.

6. Lower Grades- The first, second, and third grades on the elementary school level.

7. Need- A need is a construct (a convenient fiction or hypothetical concept) which stands for a force (the physico-chemical nature of which is unknown) in the brain region, a force which organizes perception, apperception, intellection, conation and action in such a way as to transform in a certain direction any existing unsatisfying situation.[33]

8. Off-Campus Student Teaching- ...that which is conducted in the program of any school not defined as a campus school.[34]

9. On-Campus Student Teaching- ...is student teaching done in a campus laboratory school or in any other school administered and/or staffed by the college or university and over which the college or university exercises major legal authority.[35]

10. Professional Laboratory Experience- All those contacts with children, youth and adults (through observation, participation, and teaching) which make a direct contribution to an understanding of individuals and their guidance in the teaching-learning process.[36]

11. Professional Semester- Semester in which the student is enrolled for credit for the professional laboratory experience.

12. Student Teacher- A college student enrolled for credit in student teaching who will participate in supervised teaching in a laboratory classroom of learners.

13. Student Teaching- The period of guided or supervised teaching when the student assumes increasing responsibility for the work with a given group of learners over a period of consecutive weeks.[37]

---

[33]Henry A. Murray, Explorations in Personality (New York, 1938), p. 123.

[34]Perrodin, p. xi.

[35]Ibid.

[36]Ibid.

[37]Ibid.

Objectives and Hypotheses

The following seven objectives with ten accompanying null hypotheses structured the investigation. The study population used in testing the null hypotheses was composed of the female student and cooperating teachers who participated in the elementary education professional semester during the fall of 1963-64 school year. Personality need-structure variables were measured with the E. P. P. S; values with the six scales of the S. I. V.; and, attitudes with the M. T. A. I. The objectives and hypotheses were as follows:

1. To determine whether the elementary education student teachers of Oklahoma State University differ significantly from the test norms established for female college students on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.

   Hypothesis I. There will be no significant difference between the scores of elementary student teachers on each of the fifteen personality need-dimensions, and on each of the six value scales, and the college student norms for women on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.

2. To determine the similarities and disparities in the personality need-dimensions and value characteristics between the student and cooperating teachers in the elementary education program of Oklahoma State University.

   Hypothesis II. There will be no significant difference between the student and cooperating teachers on the scores of each of the fifteen need-dimensions and the scores on each of the six value scales.

3. To determine whether significant differences exist in the personality need-dimensions and value characteristics between the elementary student and cooperating teachers

of the lower grades and those of the intermediate grades.

> Hypothesis III. There will be no significant difference between the lower and intermediate grade elementary student teachers on the scores of each of the fifteen need-dimensions and the scores on each of the six value scales.
>
> Hypothesis IV. There will be no significant difference between the lower and intermediate grade cooperating elementary teachers on the scores of each of the fifteen need-dimensions and the scores on each of the six value scales.
>
> Hypothesis V. There will be no significant difference between the student and cooperating elementary teachers of the lower grades on the scores of each of the fifteen need-dimensions and the scores on each of the six value scales.
>
> Hypothesis VI. There will be no significant difference between the student and cooperating elementary teachers of the intermediate grades on the scores of each of the fifteen need-dimensions and the scores on each of the six value scales.

4. To determine whether the teacher attitudes of the elementary education student teachers of Oklahoma State University differ significantly from the norms established for elementary education graduating seniors on the M. T. A. I.

> Hypothesis VII. There will be no significant difference between the teacher attitudes, as measured by the scores of the post-student teaching administration of the M. T. A. I., of the elementary student teachers of Oklahoma State University and the M. T. A. I. norms for elementary education graduating seniors.

5. To determine whether significant change in teacher attitudes takes place among the student teachers during the off-campus laboratory teaching experience.

> Hypothesis VIII. There will be no significant change of teacher attitudes during the student teaching experience, as measured by score differences between the pre- and post-test administrations of the M. T. A. I.

6. To determine whether a significant difference in attitude change during student teaching exists between the student teachers of the lower and intermediate grades.

> Hypothesis IX. There will be no significant difference in attitude change between student teachers of the lower and intermediate grades as measured by the score changes on the M. T. A. I.

7. To describe the degree of association found between the fifteen need-dimensions, the six scales of value, and the pre- and post-test score changes on the M. T. A. I.

> Hypothesis X. There will be no significant correlation between the scores on each of the fifteen variables of the E. P. P. S. and the six variables of the S. I. V.

Scope of Study

While the problem under consideration in this study was general in nature and arose from a general need, the attack upon the problem was specific. The study surveyed certain personality characteristics to determine similarities or disparities among a particular group of elementary student and cooperating teachers. The study was designed to search for relationships which might exist between certain personality variables which might be significant for the elementary education program at Oklahoma State University. The problem was attacked in this specific manner because practicality precluded its attack on a wider scale. Since it was not possible in any one investigation to utilize all available and potentially useful factors or techniques, the study did not take into consideration other factors which might also have been related to selection and retention of students or to the student teaching situation.

Personality is an elusive concept and there are profound differences in definitions and in what is meant when the term is used. The proliferation of available "personality" instruments constructed to measure such attributes as attitudes, values, etc., has resulted in instruments which actually measure quite different aspects of these traits.

The present study was further limited to those students enrolled in the elementary education teaching block of the College of Education at Oklahoma State University and their cooperating teachers during the fall semester of 1963-64. Since it was desired that the subjects of the population be representative of the regularly planned block curriculum, special students enrolled for student teaching were excluded from the study. Because of significant differences reported between sexes in previous studies on the variables of the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V., the subjects of the study, both student and cooperating teachers, were limited to females.

Furthermore, student teachers in the population were limited to the students who were present at the class meetings at which the instruments were administered. The cooperating teacher subjects were limited to those teachers who were willing and did in fact complete and return the instruments to the investigator. When self-selection determines inclusion in a research sample, an element of bias is introduced which may affect research outcomes. Teachers who return questionnaires may differ from teachers on a critical variable from those who do not return them;[38] students who are conscientious about attending meetings

---

[38]Robert M. W. Travers, An Introduction to Educational Research (New York, 1958), p. 249.

may differ from those who do not. Where such bias is introduced, it is not possible to identify it, nor to separate it from the findings. In educational research, where the sample is comprised of the universe under study and the experimenter is dependent upon the "good will" of the subject for his participation in the study, the risk of such bias is always present.

Since the instruments included in the study are of a self-reporting nature, the study is also subject to those limitations inherent in this type of instrument. Limitations which may be imposed include deliberate faking, response styles, social desirability, and acquiesence.[39]

In drawing conclusions from this study, care must be exercised not to generalize to other populations. Generalizations may be unwarranted because of differences which could be found between these subjects in their particular environment and those found in other colleges and universities. However, a description of the population being studied in this particular college may provide a basis for further experimentation at Oklahoma State University or for further studies at other institutions.

---

[39]Leona S. Tyler, "Work and Individual Differences," Ed. Henry Borow, Man In a World at Work (Boston, 1964), p. 188.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

The literature and research findings which follow provide a general background for the present study. This larger context has been categorized as: occupational choice, selection of prospective teachers, personality as a criterion of selection, and personality traits and success in teaching.

Occupational Choice

The first step in the selection of students for teacher education is made in occupational decisions. In a summary statement of comprehensive theory of vocational choice in 1953, Super said that occupations require:

> ...a characteristic pattern of abilities, interests and personality traits, with tolerances wide enough, however, to allow both some variety of occupations for each individual and some variety of individuals in each occupation.[1]

The "tolerance" limits described by Super, when applied to teaching, are not completely within the control of colleges offering teacher education programs. Occupational decisions of prospective college students also play an important role by determining the particular students from which colleges may select their prospective

---

[1] D. E. Super, "A Theory of Vocational Development," American Psychologist, VIII (1953), pp. 185-190.

teacher candidates. In 1956, Roe[2] reviewed several studies regarding occupational choices, and found that from 53 to 70 per cent of college students had decided upon a vocation before entering college. The studies also indicated that of those who had made a decision before going to college, one-third selected the particular college because of their occupational choice.

The process of choosing an occupation has been described by Rosenberg in this way:

> It is possible to visualize the occupational decision process as a series of progressive delimitations of alternatives. A number of factors in the individual and in society operate to cut down the broad range of occupational possibilities available. The bases for elimination vary: some occupations are not socially appropriate for an individual occupying a certain social status; some occupations are not possible for an individual with certain values, attitudes, and personality characteristics.[3]

Rosenberg elaborated upon the importance of personality when he pointed out:

> Another factor which enters into the progressive delimitation of occupational alternatives is the degree of harmony between the behavioral requirements of the occupation and the personality structure of the individual.[4]

Roe also pointed out the relationship of personality structure to occupational choice through the use of occupations as a source of need satisfactions, she explains thusly:

> Occupations as a source of need satisfaction are of extreme importance in our culture. It may be that occupations have become so important in our culture just because so many needs

---

[2]Anne Roe, The Psychology of Occupations (New York, 1956), pp. 264-265.

[3]Morris Rosenberg, Occupations and Values (Gelncoe, 1957), p. 6.

[4]Ibid., p. 7.

> are so well satisfied by them. Whether the relationship is causal or not, and if so which is cause and which is effect, does not particularly matter. It is probably a sort of feedback arrangement anyway. What is important is that this relationship exists and is an essential aspect of the value of the occupation in the individual.[5]

Though a college may set high standards and can accept or reject any candidate, the selection will be limited to the qualifications of prospective students who make application for admittance.

> Although selection is usually looked upon as an institutional function, the character of the student body may be more directly affected by the kinds of students who select the college.[6]

High standards of selection may be achieved only when students with high qualifications apply for admission. However, as pointed out by Lofthouse:

> Selection is a two way process. The individual may choose to enter the profession, but the profession must insist on the privilege of ultimately accepting or rejecting any individual.[7]

It may be seen that the occupational decision of the student and subsequent choice of a preparatory institution provides a pool of prospective students for the University. From this pool the University then selects for admission by utilizing the particular screening devices currently in use at the institution.

---

[5] Roe, p. 33.

[6] Ruth A. Stout, "Practices for Selection in Teacher Education," Teacher Education: The Decade Ahead (Washington, 1955), p. 172.

[7] Yvonne Lofthouse, "Selection and Counseling: Avenues to Quality Control," The Outlook in Student Teaching, Ed. Aleyne C. Haines (Dubuque, 1962), p. 140.

Selection of Prospective Teachers

In 1946 the National Education Association reflected concern of the teaching profession for selection and recruitment of prospective teachers when it established the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards and made selection and recruitment one of the new Commission's responsibilities. In 1961 a committee, established by the Commission to make recommendations concerning selective admissions and retention policies in teacher education, took the following position:

> The profession must assume responsibility for identifying qualities that can be measured accurately enough to provide bases for evaluation. Instruments and procedures must be set up to ensure evaluation of each prospective teacher by competent personnel, self-evaluation by each student, and continuous analysis of the evaluation processes themselves.[8]

Wilk and Edson gave the following description of the role of selection and retention policies in the college:

> Through its program of selection and retention, each college controls the quality and characteristics of the teachers it provides for the schools. Such a program should be guided by policies derived from the purposes of the institution. The extent to which the institutional purposes are realized indicates the adequacies of the policies and procedures.[9]

The expansion of student teaching into the public school classroom has increased the interest of both public school and college officials in the effectiveness of selection and retention procedures.

---

[8] Margaret Lindsey, ed., New Horizons for the Teaching Profession, (Washington, 1961), p. 162.

[9] Roger E. Wilk and William H. Edson, The Journal of Teacher Education, XIV (1963), p. 308.

Public school officials are concerned with the selection of student teachers, because during practice teaching, these students become a part of the total school situation.[10] They interact with the community's children and with the school patrons just as permanent staff members.

The major responsibility for the selection of teachers entering the profession rests with teacher preparation institutions. Selection and retention procedures of teacher education programs commonly have sequential steps occurring at specific intervals. These steps begin with college admittance and culminate with recommendations for prospective employers and teacher certification.

> There seems to be substantial evidence...that where selective admissions and retention programs operate, a higher percentage of those initially admitted to the program complete it, and of those who complete it, a higher percentage enter teaching the following year.[11]

The role of the college in selecting teachers for the profession has been succinctly described by Lofthouse:

> To date, colleges have played by ear the dominant role in determining who shall become teachers. The college grants the initial admission, it permits entrance into the teacher education program, it approves the selection of a particular curriculum, and it grants permission for student teaching. It recommends the graduate for provisional and continuing certification. In addition, it submits credentials and recommendations to the employer and to the graduate school.[12]

---

[10] Aleyne C. Haines, "A Role Perception: The Student Teacher," Teacher Education and the Public Schools (Dubuque, 1961), p. 62.

[11] Ruth A. Stout, "Practices for Selection in Teacher Education," Teacher Education: The Decade Ahead (Washington, 1955), p. 247.

[12] Lofthouse, p. 141.

Personality as a Criterion of Selection

Difficulties in developing selection procedures by personality screening have arisen in part from two traditional beliefs in the lay public. The widespread assumption that anyone can teach has allowed for a wide variation in the attributes and characteristics of students demanding entrance into the teaching profession. Coincident with this assumption is a tradition which has persisted in many colleges, especially in state-supported institutions, that students who successfully satisfy the requirements for college entrance are also entitled to admittance into teacher education. However, Lofthouse asserted that:

> In no case should individuals feel that they are entitled to automatic acceptance into any teacher preparation program because they can meet the college's general academic requirements and because it is a state supported institution.[13]

The selection and retention policies for a specific institution are concerned with both student potential and institutional limitations. As pointed out by the N. C. T. E. P. S.:

> The desire to select those most likely to become teachers is an institutional value based upon the goals of the institution and the teacher education program, and the desire and need to maximize the effective use of staff, physical plant, community resources and budget.[14]

Implementing procedures are used to select an institution's applicants those students who can be provided the most effective

---

[13] Lofthouse, p. 141.

[14] Stout, p. 180.

learning experiences within the limits of the budget, staff and physical facilities. As Stout observed:

> If the same money is required to prepare an effective teacher as to prepare an ineffective one, it is not sound economy to spend our limited educational resources of time and money upon the latter rather than the former. It is even less sound to finance partial or full teacher preparation for individuals who then do not teach.[15]

The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards states:

> ...persons should be selected who can profit most from preparation and for whom success in teaching can be predicted rather than to spend limited educational resources of staff, facilities, and finance on persons whose predictions for success are doubtful.[16]

Selection and retention procedures are thus used not only to identify potentially able teacher candidates but also to discriminate between applicants to be accepted or rejected because of the institution's limitations. The number, quality and characteristics of available cooperating teachers act as a limitation of staff when selecting student teachers.

For many years, professional educators have realized that the teacher's personality is one of the most significant variables in the teaching-learning experience. Local school boards and administrators frequently list personality problems as an important reason for teacher failures, e.g., the teacher simply could not adjust to her role in the classroom and/or in the community. "Teaching demands special abilities

---

[15] Stout, pp. 242-243.

[16] Ibid., p. 165.

and qualities of personality not possessed in sufficient degree by all people."[17]

Recognition of the importance of personality variables can be seen by the many teacher education programs which list personality as a screening factor in the selection of both student and cooperating teachers. Such screening, however, has been of a limited and subjective nature, implemented primarily through the personal interview. Little evidence is found of teacher education administrators making personnel selections with the use of objective-type personality measuring instruments.

Personality inventories have disclosed differences between students preparing for the various professions. Roe, in reviewing the literature, concluded that there are personality characteristics which differentiate between professional groups.[18] McClung reported in 1964 that "there are occupational personality 'types'" which can be isolated and described.[19] Holt[20] and Motl,[21] in studies using the E. P. P. S., found differences between counselors and other professional groups and graduate

---

[17]Stout, p. 164.

[18]Roe, p. 33.

[19]Joan S. Guilford McClung, "Dimensional Analysis of Inventory Responses in the Establishment of Occupational Personality Types," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV (1964), p. 2978.

[20]Fred D. Holt, "A Study of Change in Certain Personality Variables of Counselors in Training," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (1963), p. 3775.

[21]Carol Cowles Motl, "A Study of Personality Variables Among Counselor Education Majors, Counselors and Graduate Students in Administration, Curriculum, and Supervision as shown by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (1963), pp. 3779-3780.

students. Vineyard and others used the E. P. P. S. to compare the need structure of teacher education and pharmacy students and found significant differences.[22]

However, while mean scores may be indicative of differentiable profiles of abilities, interests and personality traits which characterize group profiles, individual profiles of workers in a given occupational group may vary widely from the group profile.[23, 24, 25, 26]

Roe has pointed out that:

> Differentiations have been shown, but the typical personality pattern is never a universal one for the members of any group. All predictions of occupational choice are necessarily probabilistic. If the predictions are made on the basis of personality alone, the probabilities must be small. Furthermore, in every occupational group there are persons who do not conform to the general pattern.[27]

---

[22]Edwin E. Vineyard, Ruby Drinkwater and Walter L. Dickinson, "Teacher Education and Pharmacy Students: A Comparison of Their Need Structures," The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XIII, (1962), pp. 409-413.

[23]Leona S. Tyler, "Work and Individual Differences," Man in a World at Work, Ed. Henry Borow (Boston, 1964), pp. 174-195.

[24]Donald E. Super and J. O. Crites, Appraising Vocational Fitness (Rev. ed., New York, 1962), Ch. 16, 17, 18.

[25]E. E. Ghiselli, "The Measurement of Occupational Aptitude," University of California Publications in Psychology, VIII (1955), pp. 101-216.

[26]D. K. Switzer, A. E. Grigg, J. S. Miller, and R. K. Young, "Early Experiences and Occupational Choice: A Test of Roe's Hypothesis," Journal of Counseling Psychology, IX (1962), pp. 45-58.

[27]Anne Roe, "Personality Structure and Occupational Behavior," Man in a World at Work, Ed. Henry Borow (Boston, 1964), p. 211.

The difficulties inherent in the trait approach to the study of personality preclude precise prediction in individual cases. Cronbach states that a trait is "a tendency to react in a defined way in response to a defined class of stimuli."[28] Cronbach further states:

> The trait approach describes responses as if they were general over a very large class of situations. 'Dominant,' 'paranoic-like,' and 'honest' describe responses independent of particular situations. Sometimes student X shows dominance, sometimes not. If we can find out what situations bring out dominant reactions--i.e., are equivalent for him--we can then hope to predict his behavior with some exactness.[29]

To describe an individual in descriptive terms such as dominant, submissive, orderly, etc., is seen to have some limitations. In particular, the lack of information concerning the situation with which the subject interacts places a severe limitation. Further, Cronbach points out:

> In using as a score the number of terms answered in a certain way, we make the assumption that more separate manifestations of a given trait mean a greater intensity or a larger amount of it. But is this necessarily true?[30]

However, despite the limitations for individual prediction utilizing the trait approach, Tyler points out its considerable usefulness:

> It is possible to compare group averages--to search for significant differences between males and females, successes and failures, schizophrenics and normals. It is possible to identify some of the factors producing differences between individuals by setting up experimental situations. It is possible to compare individuals or

---

[28] Lee J. Cronbach, Essentials of Psychological Testing (2nd ed., New York, 1960), p. 499.

[29] Ibid., p. 501.

[30] Ibid.

> groups on patterns of traits rather than on single characteristics. The identification and preliminary measurement of a trait often lead to a series of these supplementary investigations extending over a considerable period of time. As the work progresses, the trait becomes more and more clearly delineated.[31]

Tyler further pointed out that "correlational techniques and factor analysis methods based on them have shown us how to bring some semblance of order into this confused realm."[32] The trait approach is seen to provide an area for worthwhile research as long as care is exercised not to generalize indiscriminately to the individual case.

Studies designed to study the personality characteristics of teachers have found that teachers do not form one homogeneous occupational group, nor are teacher education students at all institutions preparing teachers alike. However, Morris, using the E. P. P. S., the Gordon S. I. V., and the Lang Scale of Motives for Teaching, found that apparent patterns of expressed needs appeared to be present when science teachers were compared with a general college population.[33]

Sternberg, compared the personality pattern of college students majoring in different fields and concluded that there are differences.[34] Vacek made the assumption that differences existed between students in different fields and sought to determine whether these differences

---

[31] Tyler, p. 174.

[32] Leona S. Tyler, The Psychology of Human Differences (2nd ed., New York, 1956), p. 165.

[33] Kenneth T. Morris, "A Comparative Study of Selected Needs, Values, and Motives of Science and Non-Science Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts (1964) pp. 2325-2326.

[34] Carl Sternberg, "Personality Trait Patterns of College Students Majoring in Different Fields," Psychological Monographs, LXIX (1955), pp. 1-21.

existed when the student entered college. Using the E. P. P. S., Vacek found that Industrial Arts freshmen could be differentiated from 5 of 7 other groups of freshmen from 8 major fields, and that all groups could be differentiated from college norms.[35]

Personality variances have been found between students who are enrolled for teacher education between different types of institutions and also between specific institutions of the same type. Kearney and Rocchio,[36] in a study of the effect of teacher education on the teacher's attitudes, found significant differences among the means of teachers on the M. T. A. I. who attended the liberal arts college, the teachers college or the university. Covington,[37] using the E. P. P. S., found significant differences between institutions. Tyler and Stout administered the M. M. P. I. to women at the University of California and at Pennsylvania State College and found differences between mean scores on several scales.[38] In a later study in which personality inventories

---

[35]William Lee Vacek, "Personality Variables of Freshmen College Majors with Emphasis on Industrial Arts," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (1963), pp. 1285-1286.

[36]Nolan C. Kearney and Patrick D. Rocchio, "The Effect of Teacher Education on Teacher's Attitude," Journal of Educational Research, IL (1956), p. 704.

[37]James D. Covington, "A Study of Selected Personal Characteristics of Entering Students," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (1963), pp. 3197-3198.

[38]Fred T. Tyler, "A Factorial Analysis of Fifteen M. M. P. I. Scales," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XV (1951), pp. 451-456.

were used to predict student-teaching success, Tyler concluded:

> Students may vary markedly in attitudes, beliefs, values, academic achievement, intelligence, and personality adjustment from institution to institution.[39]

Personality Traits and Success in Teaching

Detailed reviews of the literature concerned with personality traits and success in teaching have been published elsewhere and are readily available. A. S. Barr at the University of Wisconsin played a major role in the compilation of several of these reviews. He provided one of the most complete early summaries of investigations dealing with measurement and prediction of teaching efficiency in 1948,[40] followed by further reviews in 1949[41] and 1950.[42] The 1950 review also carried a critical analysis of the problem of teacher effectiveness. In 1952[43] Barr presented a 150 reference bibliography and discussed the trends in teacher effectiveness research prior to 1949. Studies cited include investigations of teacher personality. Cain, Michaelis

---

[39] Fred T. Tyler, "The Prediction of Student-Teaching Success from Personality Inventories," Publications in Education, XI (1954), p. 303.

[40] A. S. Barr, "Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations," Journal of Experimental Education, XVI (1948), pp. 203-283.

[41] A. S. Barr, "Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Success," Review of Educational Research, XIX (1949) pp. 185-190.

[42] A. S. Barr, "Teaching Competencies," Ed. W. S. Monroe, Encyclopedia of Educational Research (New York, 1950), pp. 1446-1454.

[43] A. S. Barr, "The Measurement of Teacher Characteristics and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency," Review of Educational Research, XXII (1952), pp. 169-174.

and Eurich[44] compiled a summary list under the title "Prognosis" in 1950. Domas and Tiedeman[45] also published a bibliography on "Teacher Competence" in 1950 which includes 1006 references dated from 1890 to 1949. In 1954, Marsh and Wilder,[46] reported a 52-year review of quantitative studies which had attempted to identify the "effective instructor." The reviewers examined more than 900 references and abstracted 360 for inclusion in the review.

Castetter, Standes and Fattu[47] organized, indexed and annotated 208 studies of teacher effectiveness covering the period from June 1950 through May 1955. In 1961, Barr[48] summarized 83 investigations at the University of Wisconsin on the measurement and prediction of teacher effectiveness. Getzels and Jackson[49] summarized the status of research regarding the teacher's personality and characteristics in 1963 and presented a 151 reference bibliography.

---

[44] L. F. Cain, J. U. Michaelis, and A. C. Eurich, "Prognosis" Ed. W. S. Monroe, Encyclopedia of Educational Research (New York, 1950), pp. 874-894.

[45] S. J. Domas and D. V. Tiedeman, "Teacher Competence: an Annotated Bibliography," Journal of Experimental Education, XIX (1950), pp. 101-218.

[46] J. E. Marsh and Eleanor W. Wilder, Identifying the Effective Instructor: A Review of the Quantitative Studies, 1900-1952, USAF Pers. Training Res. Cent. (Res. Bulletin, 1954, No. AFPTRC-TR-54-44).

[47] D. D. Castetter, L. S. Standee, and N. Fattu, Teacher Effectiveness: An Annotated Bibliography. Bloomington, Indiana: Institute of Educational Research, Indiana University, Bulletin 1954, I, No. 1.

[48] A. S. Barr and Others, Wisconsin Studies of Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness, A Summary of Investigations. (Madison, 1961).

[49] J. W. Getzels and P. W. Jackson, "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics," Ed. N. L. Gage. Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago, 1963).

Mounting evidence of the importance of the teacher's personality in the teaching-learning experience has enhanced the importance of identifying and understanding individual differences. The resulting change in emphasis was described by Melby and Ward thusly:

> Forty years ago it was thought that the problem of individual differences could be solved by varying rates of progress and by altering instructional materials and sometimes the organization of the schools. Today, educators know better. The problem is social, broadly human and psychological in character; the total culture of the community is involved; and for the learner, the self image is a determinate. The teacher's knowledge is less potent than is the impact of the teacher as a person. It is not alone what the teacher knows but what a teacher is that counts. Herein lies the challenge to teacher education.[50]

Michaelis in 1954 concluded after a study of success in student teaching with personality and attitude inventories that:

> There is need for a study of differences between primary and intermediate grade teachers. Differences in personality, attitude, and other factors may be found between teachers who work with beginners and those who work with other children. Such a study may yield findings that will make it possible to exercise more rigorous control in prediction studied.[51]

Studies using personality inventories between the secondary and elementary levels have disclosed differences. Lang[52] and Roberts[53] found significant differences between elementary and secondary teachers

---

[50]Ernest O. Melby and Ted Ward, "The Challenge of Individual Differences," Concern for the Individual in Student Teaching, Ed. Aleyne C. Haines (Dubuque, 1963), p. 14.

[51]John U. Michaelis, "The Prediction of Success in Student Teaching from Personality and Attitude Inventories," Publications in Education, XI (1954), p. 477.

[52]Gerhard Lang, "Teachers' Motives for Teaching," Clearinghouse, XXXIII (May, 1959), pp. 542-544.

[53]John Edward Roberts, "An Investigation of Selected Personality Variables Among Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (1963), pp. 2811-2812.

on the personality variables of the E. P. P. S. Beamer and Ledbetter[54] found that elementary teachers were more permissive and accepting than secondary teachers but less interested in social service.

Studies have also indicated differences within the elementary grades between lower and intermediate grade level elementary teachers. Garrison and Scott,[55] at the University of Georgia, found differences between the lower and upper elementary grades on the E. P. P. S. Southworth,[56] at Michigan State, investigating elementary majors stating a preference for early or late elementary grade levels also found differences on the E. P. P. S.

The literature and research findings reviewed in this chapter are indicative of identifiable personality dimensions which may permit discrimination of the characteristics of persons between a) occupations, b) preparatory institutions, c) subject-matter teaching fields d) secondary and elementary grade levels, and 3) lower and upper elementary grade levels. These findings should have implications for selection and retention policies.

---

[54]George C. Beamer and Elaine W. Ledbetter, "The Relations Between Teacher Attitudes and the Social Service Interest," Journal of Educational Research, L (1957), p. 665.

[55]K. C. Garrison and Mary H. Scott, "A Comparison of the Personal Needs of College Students Preparing to Teach in Different Teaching Areas," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXI (1961), pp. 955-964.

[56]Horton Coe Southworth, A Study of Certain Personality and Value Differences in Teacher Education Majors Preferring Early and Later Elementary Teaching Levels (Unpub. Ed. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Setting of the Study

Teacher education at Oklahoma State University is a part of the curriculum of five of the seven campus colleges. Elementary teachers are prepared in two of these five colleges, the College of Home Economics and the College of Education. The laboratory teaching experiences for both colleges however is conducted through the College of Education. The Director of Teacher Education for the University is responsible for providing facilities and administering the program of student teaching.

Selection and retention procedures used for teacher education at Oklahoma State University involves three formal steps:

1. Initial admittance to the University;
2. acceptance into the teacher education program; and,
3. admission to student teaching.

Student teachers included in the current investigation were selected for student teaching through University and College of Education screening procedures for teacher education. Screening begins with the initial application for admission to the University.

To gain admittance to the University, the students were required to be graduates of an "acceptable" high school. If they were

non-residents of Oklahoma, they were also required to present a transcript from their graduating high school showing a scholastic average of "C" or better.[1] Transfer students from other colleges were required in addition to present "acceptable" transcripts from colleges they had previously attended, be eligible to re-enter such institutions, and to present a statement of honorable dismissal. Non-resident transfers were required in addition to the above, to present a "C" scholastic average or better on their college transcripts.[2]

Regarding acceptance into teacher education, the Oklahoma State University Catalog for 1963-65 states:

> In order to be considered by a University Committee on Selective Admission to Teacher Education he must meet specific requirements in terms of grade point averages, health, and speech adequacy, and, in addition, he must score well enough on a battery of standardized tests to establish that he is a person of professional promise.[3]

The battery of standardized tests used in the evaluation of applicants for teacher education, consists of the Sequential Tests of Educational Progress covering five areas: Mathematics, Social Studies, Writing, Science and Essay.[4] Students must score at or above the

---

[1]Academic regulations governing initial entrance into the University have been changed since the admittance as freshmen of the students under study. Students seeking admittance as freshmen or as transfer students for the fall semester of 1963-64 would have additional requirements to meet for acceptance.

[2]Oklahoma State University Publications, Catalogue 1961-63, LVIII, No. 8, 1961.

[3]Oklahoma State University Publications, Catalogue 1963-65, LIX, No. 13, 1962, pp. 158-159.

[4]G. T. Stubbs, ed., Report of Teacher Education at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma (1962), p. 36.

fifteenth percentile on each of the tests or average "C" or better in college courses in the academic area in which the scores were below the fifteenth percentile in order to be admitted.[5] The evaluative test battery is administered and initial acceptance into teacher education is made usually during the sophomore year.

The interim period between acceptance into teacher education and admission to student teaching is used by the faculty and staff as a trial period for the student. During this period he must maintain his grade average, his health, and exhibit a record of "sound ethical and moral conduct."

Application for student teaching is made during the last semester of the junior year or the first semester of the senior year. This must be made, "one full semester before they expect to enroll in the professional semester."[6]

To gain admission to student teaching, an elementary education major must have a recommendation from advisor, and the approval of the department staff.

> For admission to student teaching, students must have a grade point average of 2.0 or above on all courses attempted, 2.5 in professional education courses, and 2.5 in the field of specialization. (The University uses a 4.0 scale with "C" as 2.0) Evidence of unethical or immoral conduct in a student's cumulative record would constitute reason to deny admission to an applicant. In addition, the names of applicants for admission to teacher education are sent to the Deans of Men and Women for identification of individuals these personnel administrators believe to be unsuited as prospective teachers.[7]

---

[5]Stubbs, p. 37.

[6]Ibid., p. 121.

[7]Ibid., p. 36-37.

The advisor's recommendation and the requirement of staff approval provide implementing procedure to bring to bear upon the candidates the retention criteria of the selection policies.

Practices and Policies Governing Student Teaching

Oklahoma State University has no on-campus facilities for student teaching. The University depends upon the state public schools for physical facilities and upon practicing public school teachers for the immediate daily supervision of the student teachers' laboratory teaching. Arrangements for the placing of student teachers in particular school systems are made with public school administrators by designated University faculty members.[8] These arrangements are in the form of informal oral agreements and are not written contracts.

The selection of cooperating teachers and the assignment of elementary student teachers to particular classrooms is usually a joint decision between a University supervisor and the elementary principal of the building where the student teacher is to be placed. "The policy is to assign one student teacher to a local cooperating teacher during a semester."[9] During this semester, the student teacher spends full time in the cooperating school for eight of the last nine weeks of the professional semester. The last week of the semester, the student returns to the campus for a week of evaluation.

Oklahoma State University does not pay cooperating teachers for their services in supervising student teachers. It does, however, pay

---

[8]Stubbs, p. 117.

[9]Ibid., p. 123.

the Stillwater School District a lump sum for the privilege of using its schools for observation facilities.[10]

During the eight weeks off-campus, the student teacher is expected to perform all of the duties of the regular elementary classroom teacher. In some cases students will begin by observing a class and be inducted through a gradual increase in involvement in actual work with children. Other students may find they begin full-time teaching responsibilities the very first day they report to the cooperating school. Although the actual experiences will vary from situation to situation, student teachers are expected to follow the daily schedule of the cooperating teacher.

The Study Population

The study population was composed of all regularly enrolled female student teachers of Oklahoma State University, and the female cooperating elementary teachers who participated in the elementary education "student teaching block" of the College of Education, during the fall semester of 1963.[11] This population numbered one hundred and eleven student teachers and cooperating public school teachers of whom ninety-three became active participants. The cooperating public school teachers during the fall semester of 1963 were located in thirty-two elementary schools in five different school systems in Oklahoma. These

---

[10] Stubbs, p. 122.

[11] Limiting the study to females eliminated only two male student teachers and one male cooperating teacher from the study population.

teachers were employed as elementary classroom teachers in the communities of Oklahoma City, Perry, Ponca City, Stillwater and Tulsa, Oklahoma.

The population was divided into two groups: the student teachers and the cooperating teachers. Each of the two groups was stratified by grade level into the lower grades and the intermediate grades. The number of student and cooperating teachers by grade level are shown in Table I.

TABLE I

COMPOSITION OF STUDENT AND COOPERATING TEACHER GROUPS BY GRADE LEVEL

Grade Level	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers
Lower	36	20
Intermediate	20	17
Total	56	37

The three instruments used in the study, the E. P. P. S., the S. I. V., and the M. T. A. I., were administered to the 56 student teachers during the two-week period before they began their laboratory teaching assignments. Only 47 of the 56 pre-tested student teachers were available, however, to take the M. T. A. I. post-test following their return to campus from student teaching. Of these 47 students taking the M. T. A. I. post-test, 31 were lower grade and 16 were intermediate grade level student teachers.

Of the cooperating teacher group, only those teachers who completed and returned all instruments were included. Sixty-five per cent

of the fifty-seven cooperating teachers to whom instruments were mailed met this criteria.

Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study were the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (E. P. P. S.), the Gordon Survey of Interpersonal Values (S. I. V.) and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (M. T. A. I.). The instruments are discussed briefly in the following paragraphs.

Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

The E. P. P. S. was used to measure the personality need-structure variables of the student and cooperating teacher subjects in this study. Edwards designed this self-reporting instrument primarily for research and counseling purposes, to provide a quick and convenient measure of the magnitude of fifteen relatively independent "normal" personality variables.[12] Each variable is represented by nine statements most of which are used three times in a forced-choice format. In essence, the forced choice method allows the presentation of pairs of items that have been equated for preference value but which differentially discriminate on a need criterion. In an attempt to reduce respondent "faking", statements in each pair of the test statements have

---

[12]Allen L. Edwards, Revised Manual for the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (New York, 1959), p. 5.

been scaled for equal desirability or undesirability as an influencing factor in item selection.[13]

Barron, reviewing the E. P. P. S. in Buros' Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook, describes the test thusly:

> The schedule consists of 210 pairs of items in a forced-choice format, with items from each of the 15 scales being paird off twice against items from the other 14. In addition, 15 items are repeated in order to obtain an estimate of the respondent's consistency. The pairing of variables against one another thus yields an assessment of the relative strength of competing needs within the person; however, the relative strength of such needs in persons representative of the general population remains the basic point of reference.[14]

This objective-type inventory is published in the form of an eight page booklet, with an accompanying answer sheet, and contains 225 pairs of "A and B" statements. The testee is asked to select one of the two statements in each pair that best applies to himself. He indicated his choice by encircling the A or B item in each pair on the answer sheet. Scores on each of the fifteen E. P. P. S. variables can range from 28 to 0. The Edwards manual describes the scoring of the schedule as follows:

> If, in each of the comparisons, the subject has chosen the statement for a given variable as being more characteristic of himself than the statements for the other variables, his score on this particular variable would be 28. This is the maximum score that can be obtained from any given personality variable. In order to obtain a score of 0 for any given

---

[13]Allen L. Edwards, "The Relationship Between the Judged Desirability of a Trait and the Probability That the Trait Will Be Endorsed," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVII (1953), pp. 90-93.

[14]Frank Barron, "Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Review" in The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Ed. Oscar K. Buros (Highland Park, 1959), p. 114.

> variable, the subject would always have to regard the statements for this variable, as being less characteristic of himself than the statements for the other variables.[15]

A recognized source of expert opinion on established tests is Buros' Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook. In this reference, test experts, working independently, review currently published tests in production and use in this country. A promising test such as the E. P. P. S. usually receives reviews by several authorities. Judgments concerning the reliability of the E. P. P. S. from Barron[16], Shaffer[17] and Fiske[18] are included. Barron says it has satisfactory reliability. Shaffer says, "because the need scales are short, the modest reliabilities are not unexpected."[19] Fiske makes the following comments:

> From the published table of consistency scores, the median proportion of consistency response appears to be about .78. This is lower than that of some other inventories because the responses on this schedule are relatively free from the influence of social desirability, an effect which increases consistency of response.[20]

The reliability with the college normative group was checked by both the split-half method and test-retest procedures. Determination of the split-half reliability coefficients or "coefficients of internal consistency" for the 15 personality variables involved 1509 subjects.

---

[15] Edwards, p. 9.

[16] Barron, p. 116.

[17] Lawrence F. Shaffer, "Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Review," The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Ed. Oscar K. Buros (Highland Park, 1959), p. 119.

[18] Donald W. Fiske, "Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Review," The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Ed. Oscar K. Buros (Highland Park, 1959), p. 119.

[19] Shaffer, p. 119.

[20] Fiske, p. 119.

Coefficients were obtained by correlating the raw column scores for each variable. Internal consistency coefficients corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula varied from .60 for Deference to .87 for Heterosexuality among the fifteen personality variables.[21]

Test-retest reliability coefficients or "stability coefficients" involved a group of 89 students at the University of Washington. The E. P. P. S. was administered to these students twice with a one-week interval separating the testings. Reliability coefficients varied from lows of .74 for Achievement and Exhibition to a high of .88 for Abasement on the fifteen personality variables.[22]

Correlations with other scales have provided congruent validity for the E. P. P. S. The author reports significant coefficients of correlation between the E. P. P. S. variables and the Guilford-Martin Personnel Inventory and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale.[23]

Edwards defines the "manifest needs" associated with each of the fifteen E. P. P. S. variables as follows:

1. Achievement: To do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play.

2. Deference: To get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and do what is expected, to praise others, to tell others that they have done a good job, to accept the leadership of others, to

---

[21]Edwards, p. 19.

[22]Ibid., p. 19.

[23]Ibid., p. 21.

read about great men, to conform to custom and avoid the unconventional, to let others make decisions.

3. Order: To have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult task, to have things organized, to keep things neat and orderly, to make advance plans when taking a trip, to organize details of work, to keep letters and files according to some system, to have meals organized and a definite time for eating, to have things arranged so that they run smoothly without change.

4. Exhibition: To say witty and clever things, to tell amusing jokes and stories, to talk about personal adventures and experiences, to have others notice and comment upon one's appearance, to say things just to see what effect it will have on others, to talk about personal achievements, to be the center of attention, to use words that others do not know the meaning of, to ask questions others cannot answer.

5. Autonomy: To be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things, to be independent of others in making decisions, to feel free to do what one wants, to do things that are unconventional, to avoid situations where one is expected to conform, to do things without regard to what others may think, to criticize those in positions of authority, to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

6. Affiliation: To be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships, to make as many friends as possible, to share things with friends, to do things with friends rather than alone, to form strong attachments, to write letters to friends.

7. Intraception: To analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe others, to understand how others feel about problems, to put one's self in another's place, to judge people by why they do things rather than by what they do, to analyze the behavior of others, to analyze the motives of others, to predict how others will act.

8. Succorance: To have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal problems, to receive a great deal of affection from others, to have others do favors cheerfully, to be helped by others when depressed, to have others feel sorry when one is sick, to have a fuss made over one when hurt.

9. Dominance: To argue for one's point of view, to be a leader in groups to which one belongs, to be regarded by others as

a leader, to be elected or appointed chairman of committees, to make group decisions, to settle arguments and disputes between others, to persuade and influence others to do.

10. Abasement: To feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doing, to feel better when giving in and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way, to feel the need for confession of errors, to feel depressed by inability to handle situations, to feel timid in the presence of superiors, to feel inferior to others in most respects.

11. Nurturance: To help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness and sympathy, to forgive others, to do small favors for others, to be generous with others, to sympathize with others who are hurt or sick, to show a great deal of affection toward others, to have others confide in one about personal problems.

12. Change: To do new and different things, to travel, to meet new people, to experience novelty and change in daily routine, to experiment and try new and different jobs, to move about the country and live in different places, to participate in new fads and fashions.

13. Endurance: To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved, to work at a single job before taking on others, to stay up late working in order to get a job done, to put in long hours of work without distraction, to stick at a problem even though it may seem as if no progress is being made, to avoid being interrupted while at work.

14. Heterosexuality: To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite sex, to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex, to participate in discussions about sex, to read books and plays involving sex, to listen to or to tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited.

15. Aggression: To attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks about them, to criticize others publicly, to make fun of others, to tell others off when disagreeing with them, to get revenge for insults, to

> become angry, to blame others when things go wrong, to read newspaper accounts of violence.[24]

The concept of need used by Edwards in the E. P. P. S. draws its rationale from a theory of personal needs formulated by Henry A. Murray in which a need is defined as follows:

> A need is a construct (a convenient fiction or hypothetical concept) which stands for a force (the physico-chemical nature of which is unknown) in the brain region, a force which organizes perception, apperception, intellection, conation and action in such a way as to transform in a certain direction an existing unsatisfying situation.[25]

The original list of "manifest needs" by Murray and others[26] was used in fact to construct inventory type scales (e.g., the Psychological Test) to measure variables in the need system.[27] The system's "psychometric life" continued in the scoring scheme on the Thematic Apperception Test,[28] but "until the development of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, no really thorough going attempt had been made to measure most of the manifest needs in the Murray system by the inventory system."[29] Edwards used fifteen variables in the E. P. P. S. and assigned names to the variables used by Murray.[30]

---

[24] Edwards, p. 11.

[25] Henry A. Murray, Explorations in Personality (New York, 1938), p. 123.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Barron, p. 114.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid., p. 115.

[30] Edwards, p. 11.

Survey of Interpersonal Values

Gordon's Survey of Interpersonal Values (S. I. V.) was used to compare the relative importance of certain values held by the student and cooperating teacher subjects in this study. The S. I. V. is "designed to measure certain critical values involving the individual's relationship to other people or their relationship to him."[31] These values are measured on the basis of what the testee considers to be important.

The S. I. V. has six value scales on which "every item is keyed on its appropriate scale; no item is keyed on more than one scale."[32] These scales have been developed through the use of factor analysis and are defined by what high scoring individuals value. Gordon describes the structure of the Survey as follows:

> Forced-choice format is employed in the S. I. V. The instrument consists of thirty sets of three statements, or triads. For each triad the respondent indicates one statement as representing what is most important to him and one statement as representing what is least important to him. Within each triad, three different value dimensions are represented.[33]

The three statements in each of the triads has been equated for social desirability to reduce the likelihood of the individual's responding to the favorableness of the statement rather than to its degree of importance to him.

The Survey is published in the form of a combined question and answer form and contains thirty triads of statements. The subject is

---

[31] Leonard V. Gordon, SRA Manual for Survey of Interpersonal Values (New York, 1959), p. 3.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Ibid.

instructed to examine each set of statements in terms of picking the one statement of the three which is most important and the one of the remaining two statements which is least important. These choices are indicated by blackening the spaces next to the statement on the form, in the column marked M (for most) or in the column marked L (for least), whichever is appropriate. The remaining statement is left unmarked. A hand overlay stencil is used in scoring with each scale being scored separately.

The Survey manual describes the scoring:

> In the scoring of the S. I. V. each item is keyed on its appropriate scale in the following manner: if it had been marked 'most' it will receive a weight of 2, if unmarked a weight of 1, and if marked 'least' a weight of 0.[34]

The six scales of value for the S. I. V. are defined as follows:

1. Support: Being treated with understanding, receiving encouragement from other people, being treated with kindness and consideration.

2. Conformity: Doing what is socially correct, following regulations closely, doing what is accepted and proper, being a conformist.

3. Recognition: Being looked up to and admired, being considered important, attracting favorable notice, achieving recognition.

4. Independence: Having the right to do whatever one wants to do, being free to make one's own decisions, being able to do things in one's own way.

5. Benevolence: Doing things for other people, sharing with others, helping the unfortunate, being generous.

6. Leadership: Being in charge of other people, having authority over others, being in a position of leadership or power.[35]

---

[34] Gordon, p. 4.

[35] Ibid., p. 3.

Test-retest reliability coefficients were determined by Gordon for each of the S. I. V. scales using 79 college students, with a ten-day interval between administrations. Coefficients ranged from .78 to .89.[36] The Kuder-Richardson formula was used on a sample of 186 college students and estimated reliabilities ranging from .71 on the Recognition scale, to .86 on the Benevolence scale. While lower than the test-retest method, "This formula tends to yield underestimates of reliability obtained by other methods."[37]

Congruent validity is reported by the author through reasonable correlations of the S. I. V. with the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values[38] and the E. P. P. S.[39] The author reports several concurrent validity studies in various industrial and educational institution situations[40] and emphasizes the desirability of local research designed to develop local norms.

Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory

The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (M. T. A. I.) was used to measure certain attitudes found among the student teachers in the study population and to ascertain the changes in these attitudes which

---

[36] Gordon, p. 5.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid., p. 7.

[39] Leonard V. Gordon, "Research Briefs on Survey of Interpersonal Values," (Rev. ed., New York, 1963).

[40] Ibid.

took place during the off-campus laboratory teaching experience. Pre- and post-tests of the M. T. A. I. were used to identify attitudinal changes.

Known originally as the Teacher-Pupil Inventory, the M. T. A. I. was designed to measure:

> ...those attitudes of a teacher which predict how well he will get along with pupils in the inter-personal relationships, and indirectly how well satisfied he will be with teaching as a vocation.[41]

The initial reservoir of ideas incorporated into the M. T. A. I. resulted from an extensive search of the literature concerned with all phases of teacher-pupil relationships both in and out of the classroom. Test items to represent the ideas in the inventory were constructed in the form of opinion statements. These statements were constructed with children of elementary school age primarily in mind.[42]

The M. T. A. I. is composed of 150 items which the authors say measure attitudes toward five aspects of child development and education. These five aspects are:

1. Moral status of children in the opinion of adults, especially as concerns their adherence to adult-imposed standards, moral or otherwise. Example: 'Children should be seen and not heard.'

2. Discipline and problems of conduct in the classroom and elsewhere, and methods employed in dealing with such problems. Example: 'Pupils found writing notes should be severely punished.'

---

[41]Walter W. Cook, Carroll H. Leeds and Robert Callis, Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Manual (New York), p. 3.

[42]Carroll H. Leeds, "A Scale for Measuring Teacher-Pupil Attitudes and Teacher-Pupil Rapport," Psychological Monographs, LXIV (1950), p. 3.

3. Principles of child development and behavior related to ability, achievement, learning, motivation, and personality development. Example: 'The boastful child is usually over-confident of his ability.'

4. Principles of education related to philosophy, curriculum and administration. Example: 'Pupils should be required to do more studying at home.'

5. Personal reactions of the teacher, likes and dislikes, sources of irritation, etc. Example: 'Without children life would be dull.'[43]

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers on the M. T. A. I. They represent, rather, agreement or disagreement with specific attitude statements. Each item has five possible responses, these are: strongly agree; agree; undecided; disagree; and, strongly disagree. The maximum possible range of scores on the M. T. A. I. is from plus 150 to minus 150. Each response scored "right" has a value of plus one, and each response scored "wrong" has a value of minus one. Cook in describing the M. T. A. I. said:

> Individuals favoring a traditional, teacher-dominated orientation receive a negative score while those favoring a more progressive, student-centered approach receive positive scores.[44]

The M. T. A. I. has been found to possess reliability in the neighborhood of 0.90 as determined by the split-half procedure (Spearman-Brown corrected). The authors of the inventory reported a reliability

---

[43] Cook, Leeds and Callis, p. 10.

[44] Desmond L. Cook, "Emotional Emancipation in Adolescence," Journal of Teacher Education, XI (1960), p. 372.

coefficient of .93.[45] Michaelis[46] found a .89 with a hundred students at the University of California, Berkley. Hoyt and Cook[47] found reliability coefficients from .85 to .95.

The validity of the early forms of the M. T. A. I. as well as Form A which was used in this study are based on the following three assumptions:

1. It is assumed that the attitudes of pupils toward their teachers and school work are a reflection of their teachers' attitudes toward them and toward teaching procedures. Hence, if the attitudes of teachers and of pupils are reliably measured there should be a high relationship between them.

2. It is assumed that a principal who has worked with a group of teachers for some time can sense the emotional relationship between teacher and pupils and can discriminate reliability between teachers with good or poor rapport with their pupils.

3. It is assumed that an expert in the field of teacher-pupil relations can visit classrooms and, using methods as nearly objective as possible, judge reliably the social climate which prevails.[48]

Concurrent validity studies[49, 50] have shown a positive correlation coefficient of .60 and .63 respectively between inservice

---

[45]Carroll H. Leeds, "A Second Validity Study of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory," Elementary School Journal, LII (1952), p. 404.

[46]John U. Michaelis, "The Prediction of Success in Student Teaching from Personality and Attitude Inventories," University of California Publications in Education, XI (1954), p. 436.

[47]Cyril J. Hoyt and Walter W. Cook, "The Predictive Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Based on Pupil Attitude Toward School," Journal of Teacher Education, X (1959), p. 44.

[48]Cook, Leeds and Callis, p. 10.

[49]Leeds, 1950, p. 21.

[50]Leeds, 1952, p. 404.

teachers' M. T. A. I. scores and the combined criteria of pupils', principals' and experts' ratings of teachers.

Hoyt and Cook[51] reported a study of the predictive validity of the M. T. A. I. based on pupil attitudes toward school. Responses to a 50 item inventory of attitudes toward school by pupils of 67 teachers were correlated with their teachers' scores on the M. T. A. I. The teachers included 28 men and 39 women of intermediate grade level classes who were in their second or sixth year of inservice teaching. The teachers' scores were obtained early in the junior year of their teacher preparation program. The .38 correlation was comparable to the correlation of .46 and .31 reported in two studies by Leeds[52] between pupils' ratings and teachers concurrent M. T. A. I. scores for the samples of experienced teachers.

Other studies finding positive evidence of the M. T. A. I. validity include Sandgren and Schmidt,[53] Stein and Hardy,[54] and Day.[55] Studies providing conflicting validating evidence include Piana and

---

[51]Hoyt and Cook, p. 44.

[52]Leeds, 1952, p. 403.

[53]Duane L. Sandgren and Louis G. Schmidt, "Does Practice Teaching Change Attitudes Toward Teaching?" Journal of Educational Research, XXXXIX (1956), pp. 673-680.

[54]Harry L. Stein and James Hardy, "A Validation Study of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory in Manitoba," Journal of Educational Research, L (1957), pp. 321-328.

[55]Harry P. Day, A Study of the Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory as a Predictive Instrument in the Selection of Good Teaching Prospects from Among College Undergraduates (unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1956).

Gage[56] who concluded that the validity of the M. T. A. I. for teacher effectiveness will vary according to the values of the pupils interacting with the teacher. Scott and Brinkley,[57] at the University of Georgia, used the Classroom Personal Relations booklet (C. P. R.) as criteria and concluded that the M. T. A. I. had neither predictive nor concurrent validity.

Procedures Employed and Problems Encountered in Data Collecting

Student teaching during the fall semester of 1963-64 began on November 11, and was completed on January 10. The battery of personalith instruments used were administered to the student teachers during regularly scheduled "block" classes before the students left campus for teaching assignments. The battery consisted of the E. P. P. S., the S. I. V., and the pre-test of the M. T. A. I. Tests were completed by student teachers between October 30 and November 8. All three instruments were self-reporting inventories.

The class periods used in administering the test battery were fifty minutes in length requiring two separate meetings for students to complete the three instruments. The E. P. P. S., which requires forty to fifty minutes for completion, was given during one period, and the

---

[56] G. M. Della Piana and N. L. Gage, "Pupils' Values and the Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXXVI (1955), pp. 167-178.

[57] Owen Scott and Sterling G. Brinkley, "Attitude Changes of Student Teachers and the Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory," Journal of Educational Psychology, LI (1960), pp. 76-81.

S. I. V. and the M. T. A. I. were given during the other class period. The S. I. V. is brief and requires only fifteen or twenty minutes for completion while the M. T. A. I. usually requires twenty to thirty minutes.

Before the instruments were administered, the students were told that the research study was being conducted by the investigator to determine attitudes, values, and selected personality characteristics of the student in student teaching at Oklahoma State University. It was explained that the study was not concerned with the participants as individuals but with the student teachers as a group. Students were assured that scores of particular individuals would be held in confidence by the investigator and would not be available to supervising or cooperating teachers for evaluating or grading purposes. Since the investigator had worked with a few of the subjects in preparing confidential credential folders in the University Placement Services office, the students were also assured that test scores would not be available for use in placement activities.

To maximize returns from the practicing teachers the investigator had originally planned to visit each cooperating teacher during the month of October for the purpose of explaining the purposes and objectives of the study and to leave the instruments for completion at that time. A late finalizing of the student teacher assignments in November however precluded visits to each of the 32 schools by the investigator.[58] Cooperating principals and teachers were therefore

---

[58]A complete list of cooperating schools and teachers to which students had been assigned was made available to the investigator on November 14, three days after student teaching had begun.

informed of the study through the supervisory staff of the College of Education and through the cover letter which accompanied the personality instruments mailed to the cooperating teachers.

Two personality instruments were administered to the cooperating teachers. These were the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V. The instruments were mailed to each of the cooperating teachers by registered mail using the address of the elementary school where the teacher was assigned. Registered mail was used to insure prompt delivery of the instruments to the teachers and to stress the importance to each teacher of complying with the investigator's request.[59] Each set of instruments was accompanied by a self-addressed stamped envelope and a cover letter which explained the nature of the study and requested the teacher's cooperation.

To facilitate the acceptance of the instruments and to maximize the returns from the cooperating teachers, the investigator requested permission to send the cover letter on the College of Education's letterhead. Permission was refused because of the controversial nature of the fourteenth variable of the E. P. P. S. Permission was granted however, for the investigator to use his name in a typed letterhead over the heading of College of Education, Oklahoma State University.[60] Permission was also granted for the investigator to use the College of Education as a return mailing address.

---

[59]The instruments were mailed to the cooperating teachers on November 23, the day following the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. This event added an unknown factor which may have affected the receipt of the instruments by the cooperating teachers.

[60]A copy of the cover letter and the letterhead used are in the Appendix.

The fourteenth variable of the E. P. P. S. is Heterosexuality. In measuring variables on the E. P. P. S. a number of statements are constructed and placed in a forced-choice format. The testee is requested to pick which of two statements is more characteristic of what he likes, the one he likes best, or the one he dislikes less. An example is as follows:

A. I like to talk about myself to others.

B. I like to work toward some goal that I have set for myself.

Nine variously phrased questions are used in measuring variable fourteen. The questions employed in the measurement of this variable are used from two to four times as choices, with six of them appearing three times. They also vary in directness of inquiry from:

A. I like to engage in social activities with persons of the opposite sex.

B. I like to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex, to questions such as,

C. I like to kiss attractive persons of the opposite sex.

D. I like to become sexually excited.

Permission for full sanction of the mailing of the instruments was denied because of the nature of these questions.[61]

To assure cooperating teachers of the anonymity of their responses each set of instruments was assigned a number, and the number was placed on the answer sheet of each instrument. The numbering system was used to provide a means of identifying test scores without the

---

[61]The initial mailing caused sufficient concern in two schools for telephone calls to be made, one by a teacher to the College of Education office, and one from a grade school principal to the Academic Vice-President of the University.

teacher having to place her name on the answer sheet. The cover letter accompanying the instruments also assured the teachers that the responses would be held in strict confidence.

A follow-up letter was mailed on December 10 to the cooperating teachers who had not returned the instruments. Sixty-five per cent of the cooperating teachers completed and returned the instruments. A third letter was mailed on February 28 to all 58 teachers thanking them for their participation in the study.[62]

Statistical Analysis of the Data

All data collected were treated statistically in cooperation with the University Computing Center at Oklahoma State University. The Mann-Whitney U and the Kendall Rank Correlation Coefficient t (tau) were the nonparametric statistical tests employed to test for differences between the sample groups and the national norms for the E. P. P. S., S. I. V., and M. T. A. I.; for differences on pre- and post-test scores on the M. T. A. I.; and for degree of correlation between rank scores on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V. for the sample groups employed.

The more powerful parametric statistical tests such as the t test, or the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) were not regarded as feasible for the data because the use of parametric statistical tests require meeting stringent assumptions concerning the shape

---

[62]The letter is found in the Appendix.

of the population distribution. For the parametric t test:

> The observations must be drawn from normally distributed populations. These populations must have the same variance (or a known ratio of variance).[63]

An additional assumption which must be met for the use of parametric statistics is that the variables be measured at the interval scale level, which implies that order and known distances between scale values exist for the measuring instrument. Such an assumption permits the use of arithmetical operations on the scores. There is the further assumption that the observations must be independent, that is, the selection of one experimental unit for the study sample must in no way influence the probability of any other experimental unit being chosen. If such selection does influence other selection, the element of bias is introduced.

Nonparametric statistics require only independence of observations (unbiased sampling) and in some cases the assumption of an underlying continuous distribution of the variables. No assumptions need to be made concerning the shape of the population from which the sample is drawn, i.e., the statistics are "distribution-free." Further, nonparametric statistical tests have been developed which are appropriate for measurement at less than interval scale level. For example, tests exist for measurement requiring only classification into two or more mutually exclusive groups (nominal scaling) or for measurement which requires only that a greater-than (rank) relationship be established (ordinal scaling). In ordinal scaling, distance between scale points

---

[63]Sidney Siegal, Nonparametric Statistics (New York, 1956), p. 19.

is established but no information about the magnitude of the distance is available. Therefore, arithmetical operations upon the scores are inappropriate. Nonparametric statistics are also appropriate for small samples.

It was assumed that for this study the requirements for the use of parametric tests could not be met. The level of measurement achieved by the instrumentation employed is ordinal, that is, the data may be meaningfully ranked but the distances between ranks may not be specified. The Mann-Whitney U was employed because the data comprised two independent samples; the samples were small; it is appropriate for data of ordinal scale level; and a program was available at the University Computing Center.

> When at least ordinal measurement has been achieved, the Mann-Whitney U test may be used to test whether two independent groups have been drawn from the same population. This is one of the most powerful of the nonparametric tests, and it is a most useful alternative to the parametric t test when the researcher wishes to avoid the t test's assumptions, or when the measurement in the research is weaker than interval scaling.[65]

The power-efficiency of the Mann-Whitney test when compared to the most powerful parametric test, the t test, is 95.5 per cent as N increases, and is close to 95 per cent for moderate-sized samples.

The Kendall Rank Correlation Coefficient t (tau) is appropriate for the measurement of correlation with ordinal data, that is both variables may be ranked into ordered series. The coefficient t (tau) will yield a measure of the degree of association; further, the

---

[65]Seigal, p. 116.

coefficient may be used to determine the significance of the calculated association.

> The correlation coefficient itself represents the degree of association. Tests of the significance of that coefficient determine, at a stated level of probability, whether the association exists in the population from which a sample was drawn to yield the data from which the coefficient was computed.[66]

The power-efficiency of the Kendall Rank Correlation Coefficient t (tau) is 91 per cent, when compared to the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r).

The Mann-Whitney U was used to test for differences between the scores for the elementary student teachers and the national norms on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.; for differences between elementary student teachers and the cooperating teachers scores on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.; for differences between the lower grade and intermediate grade elementary student teacher scores on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.; for differences on the student teacher scores and the national norms of the M. T. A. I.; for differences between the pre-test and post-test scores of the student teachers on the M. T. A. I.

The Kendall rank correlation t (tau) was used to describe statistically the degree of association between the test variables on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V. The findings yielded by the two statistical tests were then used to examine each of the ten hypotheses.

---

[66]Seigal, p. 195.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This investigation was designed to survey selected personality characteristics of a fall semester population of elementary student teachers at Oklahoma State University and their cooperating teachers. Preceding the laboratory teaching experience the students had successfully passed the screening procedures used by the University to implement its selection and retention policies.

Three personality instruments were used in the study to measure need-structure, value characteristics and attitudes to determine whether significant personality differences existed among the student and cooperating teachers who had been retained by the selection and retention procedures in current usage. The null hypothesis form was used to test ten hypotheses. This chapter presents the findings of this treatment of the data and the implications of the findings for the hypotheses.

Summary of Results

In this section, results of the present study are summarized with the hypotheses that were tested. Also given are the types of statistical tests utilized in testing the various hypotheses.

Hypothesis I

There will be no significant difference between the scores of elementary student teachers on each of the fifteen personality need-dimensions, and on each of the six value scales and the college student norms for women on the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.

Statistical Test: Mann-Whitney U, Two-Tailed, transformed into z scores, see Table II.

Results: None of the fifteen personality need-dimensions or six value scales significantly differed from the college student norms for women.

Disposition of Hypothesis:

Null: Not rejected

Alternate: Not confirmed

Hypothesis II

There will be no significant difference between the student and cooperating teachers on the scores of each of the fifteen need-dimensions and the scores on each of the six value scales.

Statistical Test: Mann-Whitney U, Two-Tailed, transformed into z scores, see Table III.

Results: None of the fifteen personality need-dimensions or six value scales significantly differed between the student and cooperating teachers.

Disposition of Hypothesis:

Null: Not rejected

Alternate: Not confirmed

Hypothesis III

There will be no significant difference between the lower and intermediate grade elementary student teachers on the scores of each of the fifteen need-dimensions and the scores on each of the six value scales.

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF NORMS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS AND THE SCORES OF ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS ON THE E. P. P. S. AND THE S. I. V.

Variable	Elem. Stud. Teacher Means (N=56)	z scores
E. P. P. S.		
1. Achievement	12.21	0.777982
2. Deference	13.00	0.816717
3. Order	11.32	0.645872
4. Exhibition	14.39	0.313546
5. Autonomy	11.48	0.432801
6. Affiliation	17.32	0.502855
7. Intraception	18.20	0.135250
8. Succorance	12.46	0.297550
9. Dominance	12.86	1.318249
10. Abasement	15.73	0.788404
11. Nurturance	17.23	1.700000
12. Change	18.94	1.182624
13. Endurance	11.20	0.218598
14. Heterosexuality	12.75	1.747899
15. Aggression	10.89	0.836698
S. I. V.		
16. Support	17.46	0.855952
17. Conformity	13.12	1.278987
18. Recognition	11.62	0.859200
19. Independence	15.71	1.198172
20. Benevolence	21.09	0.882108
21. Leadership	10.92	0.464670

*.05 level of significance

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY STUDENT AND COOPERATING TEACHER SCORES ON THE E. P. P. S. AND THE S. I. V.

Variable	Elem. S. T. Mean (N=56)	Elem. C. T. Mean (N=37)	z scores
E. P. P. S.			
1. Achievement	12.21	15.15	0.837035
2. Deference	13.00	17.68	1.562221
3. Order	11.32	16.24	0.774136
4. Exhibition	14.39	11.53	0.668868
5. Autonomy	11.48	10.53	0.279941
6. Affiliation	17.32	16.74	1.000712
7. Intraception	18.20	18.16	0.766666
8. Succorance	12.46	11.34	0.934198
9. Dominance	12.86	11.37	1.184760
10. Abasement	15.73	15.03	1.353201
11. Nurturance	17.23	15.26	1.928730
12. Change	18.94	15.79	1.343968
13. Endurance	11.20	17.53	0.591312
14. Heterosexuality	12.75	8.26	1.301582
15. Aggression	10.89	9.39	1.265051
S. I. V.			
16. Support	17.46	17.61	1.235814
17. Conformity	13.12	20.11	1.337021
18. Recognition	11.62	10.50	0.273194
19. Independence	15.71	13.23	1.516372
20. Benevolence	21.09	19.63	1.338160
21. Leadership	10.92	8.50	0.557799

*.05 level of significance

Statistical Test: Mann-Whitney U, Two-Tailed, transformed into z scores, see Table IV.

Results: Deference (a need to get suggestions from others, to follow instructions and do what is expected, to conform to custom and avoid the unconventional, to let others make decisions) of the E. P. P. S. was significant at the .05 level. Intermediate grade student teachers checked this variable as being descriptive of themselves a significantly greater number of times than did the lower grade teachers.

Disposition of Hypothesis:

Null: Rejected

Alternate: Confirmed

Hypothesis IV

There will be no significant difference between the lower and intermediate grade cooperating elementary teachers on the scores of each of the fifteen need-dimensions and the scores on each of the six value scales.

Statistical Test: Mann-Whitney U, Two-Tailed, transformed into z scores, see Table V.

Results: None of the fifteen personality need-dimensions or six value scales significantly differed between the cooperating elementary teachers of the lower and intermediate grades.

Disposition of Hypothesis:

Null: Not rejected

Alternate: Not confirmed

Hypothesis V

There will be no significant difference between the student and cooperating elementary teachers of the lower grades on the scores of each of the fifteen need-dimensions and the scores on each of the six value scales.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF THE LOWER GRADE AND INTERMEDIATE GRADE ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHER SCORES ON THE E. P. P. S. AND THE S. I. V.

Variable	L. G. Mean (N=36)	I. G. Mean (N=20)	College Sample for Women - Mean (N=749)	z scores
E. P. P. S.				
1. Achievement	11.61	13.30	13.08	0.986098
2. Deference	12.92	13.15	12.40	2.433335*
3. Order	11.44	11.10	10.24	1.115848
4. Exhibition	14.19	14.75	14.28	1.911711
5. Autonomy	11.05	12.25	12.29	1.312862
6. Affiliation	17.78	16.50	17.40	1.528573
7. Intraception	18.17	18.25	17.32	0.471939
8. Succorance	13.28	11.00	12.53	0.175733
9. Dominance	12.50	13.50	14.18	0.960148
10. Abasement	15.86	15.50	15.11	1.097887
11. Nurturance	17.67	16.45	16.42	1.395994
12. Change	18.53	19.70	17.20	0.237170
13. Endurance	10.44	12.55	12.63	1.865627
14. Heterosexuality	13.30	11.75	14.34	1.701361
15. Aggression	12.25	10.25	10.59	1.090960
			College Women Mean (N=746)	
S. I. V.				
16. Support	18.08	16.35	17.8	1.285861
17. Conformity	13.08	13.20	14.2	1.888679
18. Recognition	11.89	11.15	12.1	0.344720
19. Independence	15.72	15.70	16.2	1.420610
20. Benevolence	20.94	21.35	18.4	1.226331
21. Leadership	10.22	12.20	11.4	0.157313

*.05 level of significance

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF THE LOWER GRADE AND INTERMEDIATE GRADE COOPERATING TEACHER SCORES ON THE E. P. P. S. AND THE S. I. V.

Variable	L. G. Mean (N=21)	I. G. Mean (N=17)	General Adult Sample Mean Women (N=4932)	z scores
E. P. P. S.				
1. Achievement	15.00	15.35	13.58	0.655789
2. Deference	17.90	17.41	14.72	0.886477
3. Order	16.38	16.06	15.59	0.934892
4. Exhibition	11.67	11.35	11.48	0.623817
5. Autonomy	11.095	9.82	12.10	0.680336
6. Affiliation	16.67	16.82	17.76	0.426822
7. Intraception	18.95	17.18	15.28	1.869785
8. Succorance	10.81	12.00	12.86	0.281671
9. Dominance	11.00	11.82	10.24	0.915432
10. Abasement	15.00	15.06	16.89	0.722315
11. Nurturance	15.19	15.35	18.48	0.461593
12. Change	15.81	15.76	15.99	0.534224
13. Endurance	18.00	16.94	16.50	1.133893
14. Heterosexuality	6.95	9.88	8.12	0.144841
15. Aggression	9.57	9.18	10.16	0.361157
			College Women Mean (N=746)	
S. I. V.				
16. Support	18.10	17.055	17.8	0.082117
17. Conformity	20.70	19.44	14.2	0.173809
18. Recognition	10.55	10.44	12.1	0.028968
19. Independence	12.70	13.83	16.2	0.380601
20. Benevolence	19.40	19.89	18.4	0.461593
21. Leadership	8.35	8.67	11.4	1.186884

*.05 level of significance

Statistical Test: Mann-Whitney, Two-Tailed, transformed into z scores, see Table VI.

Results: Two of the variables of the E. P. P. S. were found to be significant. Deference (see Hypothesis III) and Order (to have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting a difficult task, to have things organized) were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance. The lower grade cooperating teachers checked the variables of Deference and Order as characteristic of themselves a significantly greater number of times than did their lower grade student teachers.

Disposition of Hypothesis:

Null: Rejected

Alternative: Confirmed

Hypothesis VI

There will be no significant difference between the student and cooperating elementary teachers of the intermediate grades on the scores of each of the fifteen need-dimensions and the scores on each of the six value scales.

Statistical Test: Mann-Whitney U, Two Tailed, transformed into z scores, see Table VII.

Results: None of the fifteen personality need-dimensions or six value scales significantly differed between the student and cooperating teachers of the intermediate grades.

Disposition of Hypothesis:

Null: Not rejected

Alternate: Not confirmed

Hypothesis VII

There will be no significant difference between the teacher attitudes, as measured by the scores of the post-student teaching

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF THE LOWER GRADE ELEMENTARY STUDENT AND COOPERATING TEACHER SCORES ON THE E. P. P. S. AND THE S. I. V.

Variable	L. G. Student Teacher Mean (N=36)	L. G. Cooperating Teacher Mean (N=21)	z scores
E. P. P. S.			
1. Achievement	11.61	15.00	1.366260
2. Deference	12.92	17.90	1.969950*
3. Order	11.44	16.38	1.957777*
4. Exhibition	14.19	11.67	1.115848
5. Autonomy	11.055	11.095	0.554700
6. Affiliation	17.78	16.67	0.958035
7. Intraception	18.17	18.95	0.334323
8. Succorance	13.28	10.81	0.540964
9. Dominance	12.50	11.00	0.610170
10. Abasement	15.86	15.00	0.622799
11. Nurturance	17.67	15.19	1.697336
12. Change	18.53	15.81	1.315587
13. Endurance	10.44	18.00	1.746545
14. Heterosexuality	13.305	6.95	1.501201
15. Aggression	12.25	9.57	0.937581
S. I. V.			
16. Support	18.08	18.10	1.860881
17. Conformity	13.08	20.70	1.796548
18. Recognition	11.89	10.55	0.748203
19. Independence	15.72	12.70	1.420610
20. Benevolence	20.94	19.40	0.858840
21. Leadership	10.22	8.35	0.143838

*.05 level of significance

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF THE INTERMEDIATE GRADE ELEMENTARY STUDENT AND COOPERATING TEACHER SCORES ON THE E. P. P. S. AND THE S. I. V.

Variable	I. G. Student Teacher Mean (N=20)	I. G. Cooperating Teacher Mean (N=17)	z scores
E. P. P. S.			
1. Achievement	13.30	15.35	0.330289
2. Deference	13.15	17.41	0.492460
3. Order	11.10	16.06	0.227921
4. Exhibition	14.75	11.35	0.057936
5. Autonomy	12.25	9.82	0.341095
6. Affiliation	16.50	16.82	0.173809
7. Intraception	18.25	17.18	1.390477
8. Succorance	11.00	12.00	0.566946
9. Dominance	13.50	11.82	0.656650
10. Abasement	15.50	15.06	0.215410
11. Nurturance	16.45	15.35	0.525320
12. Change	19.70	15.76	0.449073
13. Endurance	12.55	16.94	1.417366
14. Heterosexuality	11.75	9.88	0.405555
15. Aggression	10.25	9.10	0.461593
S. I. V.			
16. Support	16.35	17.055	0.492365
17. Conformity	13.20	19.44	0.289682
18. Recognition	11.15	10.44	0.369274
19. Independence	15.70	13.83	0.380601
20. Benevolence	21.35	19.89	0.136862
21. Leadership	12.20	8.67	0.953959

*.05 level of significance

administration of the M. T. A. I., of the elementary student teachers of Oklahoma State University and the M. T. A. I. norms for elementary education graduating seniors.

Statistical Test: Mann-Whitney U, Two-Tailed, transformed into z scores, see Table VIII.

Results: No significant differences were found although a substantial number of scores were lower than the scores reported for the norms. Post-student teaching scores ranged from a +95 to a -34.

Disposition of Hypothesis:

Null: Not rejected

Alternate: Not confirmed

Hypothesis VIII

There will be no significant change of teacher attitudes during the student teaching experience, as measured by score differences between the pre- and post-test administrations of the M. T. A. I.

Statistical Test: Mann-Whitney U, Two-Tailed, transformed into z scores, see Table IX.

Results: No significant differences were found between the pre-student teaching and post-student teaching M. T. A. I. scores.

Disposition of Hypothesis:

Null: Not rejected

Alternate: Not confirmed

Hypothesis IX

There will be no significant difference in attitude change between student teachers of the lower and intermediate grades as measured by the score changes on the M. T. A. I.

Statistical Test: Mann-Whitney U, Two-Tailed, transformed into z scores, see Table IX; Kendall Tau, transformed into z scores see Table X.

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF THE M. T. A. I. NORMS FOR ELEMENTARY EDUCATION GRADUATING SENIORS WITH THE PRE- AND POST-STUDENT TEACHING M. T. A. I. SCORES OF THE O. S. U. ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS

Variable	N	z scores
1. Pre-test	36	0.037796
2. Post-test	31	1.085303

*.05 level of significance

TABLE IX

COMPARISON OF THE LOWER AND INTERMEDIATE GRADE ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS ON THE PRE-, POST-, AND PRE-POST-STUDENT TEACHING M. T. A. I. DISCREPANCY SCORES

Variable	L. G. Student Teacher Means		I. G. Student Teacher Means		z scores
1. Pre-test	N=20	56.81	N=16	57.45	1.164363
2. Post-test	N=16	40.61	N=15	38.63	0.771516
3. Pre-Post test Difference	N=16	16.77	N=15	17.25	1.347150

*.05 level of significance

TABLE X

COMPARISON BETWEEN STUDENT TEACHER SCORES ON THE PERSONALITY VARIABLES OF THE E. P. P. S. AND S. I. V. AND THE M. T. A. I. PRE-TEST, POST-TEST, AND PRE-POST-TEST SCORE CHANGES

Variable	Pre-Test M. T. A. I. z score	Post-Test M. T. A. I. z score	Score Change M. T. A. I. z score
E. P. P. S.			
1. Achievement	0.01006371	0.09293858	0.15038194
2. Deference	-0.13758514	-0.18985571	-0.07296245
3. Order	-0.14324739	-0.26985846	-0.11517736
4. Exhibition	0.00215650	0.04234423	-0.04243735
5. Autonomy	0.11938471	0.12954421	-0.00721681
6. Affiliation	-0.03019113	0.00403679	0.01657737
7. Intraception	0.16779257	0.14625890	-0.01532200
8. Succorance	-0.16436566	-0.18187496	-0.04719313
9. Dominance	0.23489658	0.22182318	0.02473121
10. Abasement	0.05089629	0.04827383	-0.01858499
11. Nurturance	-0.02804434	-0.06647503	-0.12201578
12. Change	0.04966869	0.19347768	0.19242517
13. Endurance	-0.09588544	-0.17727397	-0.06645961
14. Heterosexuality	0.00285267	0.01496055	0.09010701
15. Aggression	-0.01363425	0.02817363	0.01549514
S. I. V.			
16. Support	-0.22327210	-0.26284676	-0.15243423
17. Conformity	-0.16453504	-0.21716862	-0.04931716
18. Recognition	-0.08278399	-0.07698464	-0.10059092
19. Independence	0.00710262	0.04572394	0.08980237
20. Benevolence	0.15251371	0.16656086	0.01535915
21. Leadership	0.31966040	0.31030358	0.05670357

*.05 level of significance

Results: No significant differences were found between the student teachers of the lower and intermediate grades.

Disposition of Hypothesis:

Null: Not rejected

Alternate: Not confirmed

Hypothesis X

There will be no significant correlation between the scores on each of the fifteen variables of the E. P. P. S. and the six variables of the S. I. V.

Statistical Test: Kendall T (tau), see Table XI.

Results: No significant correlations were found between the variables of the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V.

Disposition of Hypothesis:

Null: Not rejected

Alternate: Not confirmed

TABLE XI

INTERCORRELATIONS FOR STUDENT AND COOPERATING ELEMENTARY TEACHERS
FOR THE E. P. P. S. AND THE S. I. V.
(N=93)

		Ach.	Def.	Ord.	Exh.	Aut.	Aff.	Int.	Suc.	Dom.	Aba.	Nur.	Chg.	End.	Het.	Agg.	Sup.	Con.	Rec.	Ind.	Ben.	Lea.
1.	Ach.	.--	.10	.15	-.05	.04	-.23	-.14	-.25	.07	-.17	-.23	-.15	.23	-.13	.05	-.08	.17	.10	-.02	-.22	.04
2.	Def.		.--	.33	-.21	-.14	-.01	.03	-.08	-.21	-.01	-.13	-.17	.30	-.37	-.24	.00	.37	.01	-.23	-.02	-.14
3.	Ord.			.--	-.23	-.15	-.12	-.15	.05	-.30	.08	-.11	-.26	.36	-.27	-.20	.05	.42	-.06	-.11	-.03	-.32
4.	Exh.				.--	.12	-.09	-.09	.08	.23	-.09	-.08	.15	-.28	.17	.08	-.02	-.31	.25	.04	-.14	.30
5.	Aut.					.--	-.28	-.01	-.19	.08	-.08	-.29	.21	-.23	.08	.23	-.07	-.21	-.11	.47	-.13	.03
6.	Aff.						.--	-.05	.13	.00	.06	.39	.00	-.17	-.04	-.23	.13	-.05	.02	-.21	.29	-.08
7.	Int.							.--	-.21	.03	-.03	.01	-.06	.09	-.13	-.12	-.19	.01	-.26	.05	.17	.12
8.	Suc.								.--	-.17	.09	.18	-.11	-.14	.12	-.03	.23	.00	.11	-.06	-.09	-.14
9.	Dom.									.--	-.26	-.09	.12	-.17	.09	.09	-.14	-.23	.09	.01	-.04	.37
10.	Aba.										.--	.14	-.15	-.04	-.17	-.11	.10	.08	-.03	-.06	.17	-.22
11.	Nur.											.--	-.08	-.11	-.06	-.23	.13	-.10	.02	-.20	.33	-.04
12.	Chg.												.--	-.32	.14	.12	-.17	-.19	-.11	.22	.03	.17
13.	End.													.--	-.29	-.09	.01	.43	-.11	-.14	-.07	-.16
14.	Het.														.--	.08	.03	-.30	.10	.13	-.13	.17
15.	Agg.															.--	-.08	-.16	.05	.22	-.17	.12
16.	Sup.																.--	-.19	.25	-.14	-.14	-.21
17.	Con.																	.--	-.18	-.14	-.04	-.31
18.	Rec.																		.--	-.34	-.20	.07
19.	Ind.																			.--	-.17	-.10
20.	Ben.																				.--	-.07
21.	Lea.																					.--

*.05 level of significance

CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

Review of the Purpose of the Study

The framework of the present study was based upon the examination of selected personality variables as possible criteria for selection and retention of students in a teacher education program. Also of concern was the use of personality variables as criteria for selective placement of students with particular cooperating public school teachers for the laboratory teaching experience. The major purpose of the study was to determine whether the measures of personality variables selected showed evidence of identification of personality similarities and/or disparities within or between the student population and the cooperating teacher population. The population of student subjects had already passed successfully through the screening procedures in current use.

Subjects comprising the sample were fifty-six elementary student teachers from Oklahoma State University and thirty-seven cooperating elementary public school teachers employed in the Oklahoma City, Perry, Ponca City, Stillwater and Tulsa, Oklahoma school systems.

The instruments selected consisted of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the Gordon Survey of Interpersonal Values and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. The E. P. P. S. and S. I. V.

and initial or pre-teaching M. T. A. I. were administered to the student teachers prior to their leaving campus for the laboratory teaching. The post-student teaching M. T. A. I. was used to assess attitude change during the student teaching experience.

The E. P. P. S. and S. I. V. were self-administered by the cooperating teachers. The instruments were sent by registered mail to the cooperating teachers at the school where the teacher was employed. The cooperating teachers did not receive the instruments until student teaching had begun. Sixty-five per cent of the cooperating teachers completed and returned the instruments.

Statistical analyses were made to determine disparities between the elementary student teachers and the cooperating public school teachers. The student teacher and cooperating teacher groups were also divided by grade level into Lower and Intermediate grades and were analyzed for disparities on each of the variables. Student teachers were also compared with College Student Norms.

The Mann Whitney U was used to describe statistically the relationships among the groups of elementary student teachers, cooperating teachers and National College Norms. The Kendall rank correlation, T (tau) was used to describe statistically the degree of association between the test variables.

Conclusions

Significant differences were found on two of the ten hypotheses tested.

Hypothesis III

There will be no significant difference between the lower

and intermediate grade elementary student teachers on the scores of each of the fifteen need-dimensions and the scores on each of the six value scales.

Deference on the E. P. P. S. was found to be significantly different at the .05 level with the intermediate grade student teacher population exhibiting higher scores. When the two grade levels of student teachers were compared with their cooperating teachers, the intermediate grade student teachers more closely resembled their cooperating teachers. The z values of the intermediate grade student teachers and their cooperating teachers in no case approached a significant difference.

Hypothesis V

There will be no significant difference between the student and cooperating elementary teachers of the lower grades on the scores of each of the fifteen need-dimensions and the scores on each of the six value scales.

Deference and Order were found to be significant at the .05 level, with the cooperating teachers responding at a significantly higher level on both variables. The cooperating teachers are therefore characterized according to these research findings as manifesting a need to be: followers rather than leaders; supportive and complimentary of the efforts of others; and to be conventional. They also expressed the need to be neat, organized, and systematic in their daily teaching activities.

Finding of significant differences on the E. P. P. S. variables of Deference and Order between novice and experienced teachers on the elementary level are not unusual in view of related research findings. Such findings reveal that experienced teachers tend to score high on

Deference and Order.[1, 2] It is further suggested that high scores on Deference tend to be accompanied by high scores on Order indicating that Deference and Order co-vary positively.[3, 4, 5]

Allen stated that "Deference co-varies directly with Order and Endurance....Order and Autonomy are substantially related to Deference and strongly suggest that the notion of independence between these two pairs (Def-Ord; Def-Aut.) should be reconsidered."[6] Examination of Table X reveals that Deference-Order have a reported Kendall Tau correlation coefficient of .33; Deference-Autonomy of -.14. Neither approached a significant relationship. The r of .41 reported by Allen for Deference-Order is a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, which is not directly comparable to the Kendall Tau.

Allen also stated that Deference-Autonomy represent different ends of a continuum, and reported an r of -.40. The tabled (Table XI)

---

[1]Phillip W. Jackson and Egon G. Guba, "The Need Structure of In-Service Teachers an Occupational Analysis," The School Review LXV (1957), pp. 176-192.

[2]Kenneth Turner Morris, "A Comparative Study of Selected Needs, Values, and Motives of Science and Non-Science Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts XXIV (1963), pp. 2325-2326.

[3]Robert M. Allen, "An Analysis of Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Intercorrelations for a Local College Population," Journal of Educational Research LI (1958), pp. 591-597.

[4]Morris, p. 2326.

[5]Leonard V. Gordon, Research Briefs on Survey of Interpersonal Values, Manual Supplement Revised (Chicago, 1963), pp. 21-23.

[6]Allen, p. 596.

Kendall Tau in the present study for Deference-Autonomy is -.14. It is inconclusive at this time whether these two dimensions are independent.[7, 8]

Differences were reported by Southworth[9] on Abasement, Affiliation, Succorance and Nurturance with the early-grade elementary choice student teachers scoring higher when compared with later-grade choice student teachers. No significant differences on these variables were found in the present study. Differences also reported by Southworth on the variables of Achievement and Aggression, with the later-elementary choice student teachers scoring significantly higher were not supported by the present study.

Both Morris[10], Jackson and Guba[11] listed high scores on Endurance as typically occurring with high scores on Deference and Order. These findings were not confirmed in the present study. Endurance had the lowest mean among the E. P. P. S. variables for the lower grade student teachers.

The Gordon S. I. V. and the M. T. A. I. revealed no significant differences between any of the groups employed or between groups and norms.

---

[7]Allen, p. 596.

[8]Robert M. Allen, "Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Intercorrelations for Two Groups," The Psychological Record VII (1957), pp. 87-91.

[9]Horton Coe Southworth, A Study of Certain Personality and Value Differences in Teacher Education Majors Preferring Early and Later Elementary Teaching Levels, (Unpublished E.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1962.)

[10]Morris, p. 2326.

[11]Jackson and Guba, p. 189.

Findings on the instruments utilized within the present study do not suggest their use for screening processes for the selection of student teachers or for placement with particular cooperating teachers for the laboratory experience. Two contributing factors which may account for deficiencies in findings are (1) the crudeness of the measuring instruments and (2) the homogeneity of the sample population. If differences exist, the measurement employed may be at too gross a level to record them.

Rotter[12] stated that the basic problem for "strength of need" or "strength of value" theories such as underlie the E. P. P. S. and the S. I. V. is how to predict anything at all. As he explained:

> If a system included five instincts or needs and these are ordered on some metric system from high to low, does one act in the fashion to be predicted from his strongest or highest need?...The only sensible statistical or logical prediction in any specific instance, if no other variables are concerned, is that he would act in accordance with the higher need. This might still give fairly good prediction if only two variables are involved, but if 20 variables are involved and many of them are very close in value or 'strength' then the amount of error begins to increase. In fact it becomes a problem to predict even slightly above chance...[13]

Rotter also stated that personality tests may include three types of items: (1) what the individual did, (2) what the individual wished to do, and (3) what the individual expected. Such items are included non-systematically, with no rationale for the number or arrangement of each type.

---

[12]Julian B. Rotter, "Some Implications of a Social Learning Theory for the Prediction of Goal Directed Behavior from Testing Procedures," Psychological Review LXVII (1960), pp. 301-316.

[13]Ibid., p. 304.

Rotter stated that in the case of the E. P. P. S.:

> ...subjects are asked to state their preferences for different kinds of goals but there is no theoretical basis provided to allow one to make predictions about non test behavior from such preferences...In other words, it is not clear exactly what can be predicted or should be predicted from the test responses.[14]

Complication arises in the use of personality instruments as a result of discrepancies which may exist between test responses and actual behavior. Grisvold[15] reported that on the basis of a criterion measure, the Deference subscale does not predict an individual's conformity behavior. An individual who has a high need Deference score does not necessarily exhibit an equal need to conform when overt behavior is assessed. The criterion measure adopted was the Asch Method[16] where the subject is required to report which of three parallel lines is equal in length; one naive subject is placed in a group with three other subjects who have been "planted" and who will give incorrect answers.

Failure to procure other differences may be a function of the fact that the sample employed is homogeneous. This may be particularly true for the student teacher sample which had gone through (1) the self-selection process of vocational and institutional choice, and (2) the screening process of the University. Stern, Stein and Bloom[17] have applied the Murray concepts of alpha and beta press to the study of

---

[14]Rotter, p. 302.

[15]Darrell Gisvold, "A Validity Study of the Autonomy and Deference Subscales of the E. P. P. S.," Journal of Consulting Psychology XXII (1958), pp. 445-447.

[16]Asch, S. E., Social Psychology (New York, 1952).

[17]George G. Stern, Morris I. Stein and Benjamin S. Bloom, Methods of Personality Assessment (Glencoe, 1956).

educational institutions. The manner in which institutional press may mold the student was described in the following way:

> ...the types of tasks in which the student must engage, the typical relationships which prevail between faculty and student, the behavioral trends which are consistently permitted or encouraged, define the true purpose of the institution far more clearly than the overt verbalizations concerning programmatic objectives which may or may not have been translated into relevant activities.[18]

The authors further stated, "Implicit objectives are represented by the actual practices of the institution... Explicit objectives refer to formal statements of purpose... In come cases the latter are provided to impress rather than to implement."[19]

The use of policies of selection and retention in the teacher education programs may be criticized as setting limits upon the dynamic aspects of personality potential through providing a more homogeneous group of teachers for the American Public Schools. In reality, however, the most limiting factor for the selection of teacher personality may not be the teacher education institution policies of selectivity but the employment and retention policies of public school boards and administrators. Such local leadership operate within the specific community's mores and are regulated by the community's influencial minority. These policies may be seen as reflected in the cooperating teachers of the study sample.

Other factors contributing to homogeneity among the cooperating teachers were suggested by Jackson and Guba. Jackson and Guba[20]

---

[18]Stern, Stein and Bloom, pp. 39-40.

[19]Ibid., p. 75.

[20]Jackson and Guba, p. 190.

concluded that needs which are characteristic of teachers in general appear more prominently among experienced teachers. These characteristics may be regarded as the result of fundamental personality change; or, experienced teachers may be viewed as a residual group whose characteristics have resulted from the removal from the profession of those teachers with differing characteristics.

A conservative interpretation would appear to be in order for the findings of this study. The characterization of the student teacher population would include an Intermediate grade level student teacher population that differs not at all from veteran teacher groups on the measured variables, and a lower grade student teacher population which differs only on those variables which seem to derive from increasing age and teaching experience.

Recommendations

One of the problems facing institutions concerned with personality screening and placement has been the lack of research regarding the specific institution. Vital information needed from such research includes: the types of persons who make application for teacher education; the effect the program has upon the students who complete the training; and whether the personality characteristics of these graduates is a significant factor in determining their success or failure in teaching. Standardized instruments are needed which will differentiate between individuals whose characteristics have been identified as being associated with success within the scope of the goals, resources and facilities available to the college.

Criteria for selecting both student and cooperating teachers need to be developed. Limits of acceptable teaching personalities need to be defined in terms of measurable attributes. Before more objective methods of personality evaluation can be made, present instruments must be improved and new ones developed. Loevinger[21] in summarizing the predictiveness of individual tests stated that to date, the only tests which meet standards for individual prediction are those of general ability. Rotter[22] indicated that this viewpoint tends to reflect a consensus within psychology.

The design of the present investigation did not include the socio-economic backgrounds of the student and cooperating teachers. Equally important factors may be the socio-economic environment of the community and school as well as that of the pupils involved in the laboratory teaching classroom. The experience of teaching in a small school system may not be directly comparable to that in a city.

With respect to future research, it is recommended that age and experience of cooperating teachers be controlled, since this appears to be a critical variable in determining the qualities that characterize experienced teachers. Another area of importance not considered in the current study is the personality characteristics of the supervising teacher from the sponsoring institution.

The instruments utilized within this study, on the basis of the findings herein reported, are not useful for screening processes in

---

[21]Jane Loevinger, "Theory and Techniques of Assessment," Annual Review of Psychology, Ed. P. R. Farnsworth (Palo Alto, 1959), pp. 287-316.

[22]Rotter, p. 304.

the selection of student teachers or for placement of student teachers with particular cooperating teachers for the laboratory experience. An item analysis such as that performed by Gruber[23] might provide for greater discrimination between groups than the statistical procedures employed in this study.

A more systematic collection of data and related studies extending over a period of years is needed. A broad master plan of research adopted by the institution and acceptable to the participating school systems could provide for research in depth on specific problem areas involving quality controls in student teaching. Research performed during successive years would allow for validation of findings concerning characteristics of the student population attracted to and accepted for teacher education, for the development of institutional norms, and for detailed study of the off-campus student teaching experience.

---

[23]Joseph John Gruber, "Personality Traits and Teaching Attitudes," American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation Research Quarterly XXXI (1960), pp. 434-439.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Robert M. "An Analysis of Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Intercorrelations for a Local College Population." Journal of Educational Research, LI (April, 1958), pp. 591-597.

Allen, Robert M. "Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Intercorrelations for Two Groups." The Psychological Record, VII (Winter, 1957), pp. 87-91.

Andrews, L. O. Student Teaching. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Armstrong, W. Earl and T. M. Stinnett. A Manual of Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States. Washington: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association, 1961.

Asch, S. E. "Effects of Group Pressures upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments," Eds. G. E. Swanson, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley. Readings in Social Psychology, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, 1952.

Barr, A. S. "Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations." Journal of Experimental Education, XVI (June, 1948), pp. 203-283.

Barr, A. S. "Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Success." Review of Educational Research, XIX (June, 1949), pp. 185-190.

Barr, A. S. "Teaching Competencies." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Ed. W. S. Monroe. New York: Macmillan, 1950, pp. 1446-1454.

Barr, A. S. "The Measurement of Teacher Characteristics and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency." Review of Educational Research, XXII (June, 1952), pp. 169-174.

Barr, A. S. and Others. Wisconsin Studies of Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness, A Summary of Investigations. Madison: Dembar Publications, 1961.

Batchelder, Howard T., Richard E. Lawrence, and George R. Myers. A Guide to Planning for Off-Campus Student Teaching. The Association for Student Teaching (Bulletin No. 11), 1959.

Beamer, George C. and Elaine W. Ledbetter. "The Relations Between Teacher Attitudes and the Social Service Interest." Journal of Educational Research, L (May, 1957), pp. 655-666.

Brink, William G. "Administration of Student Teaching in Universities Which Use the Public Schools." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXI (October, 1945), pp. 394-402.

Cain, L. F., J. U. Michaelis, and A. C. Eurich. "Prognosis." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Ed. W. S. Monroe. New York: Macmillan, 1950, pp. 874-894.

Castetter, D. D., L. S. Standee, and N. Fattu. Teacher Effectiveness: An Annotated Bibliography. Bloomington: Institute of Educational Research, Indiana University, I (Bulletin No. 1), 1954.

Clarke, C. M. ed. Teacher Education and the Public Schools. 40th Yearbook, The Association for Student Teaching, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1961.

Conant, James B. "Teacher Certification: The Restricted State Approved Program Approach." New Developments, Research and Experimentation in Professional Laboratory Experiments. Compilers Curtis Nash and Yvonne Lofthouse, A.S.T. (Bulletin No. 22), 1964.

Cook, Desmond L. "Emotional Emancipation in Adolescence." Journal of Teacher Education, XI (Sept., 1960), pp. 370-374.

Cook, Walter W., Carroll H. Leeds and Robert Callis. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1952.

Covington, James Donald. "A Study of Selected Personal Characteristics of Entering College Students." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (Part 5, 1963), pp. 3197-3198.

Cronbach, Lee J. Essentials of Psychological Testing, Second Edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Davies, Don. "A Survey of College Problems and Practices in Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs." Teacher Education and the Public Schools. Ed. C. M. Clarke, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1961, pp. 141-163.

Day, Harry P. A Study of the Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory as a Predictive Instrument in the Selection of Good Teaching Prospects from Among College Undergraduates. Unpublished Ed. D. Thesis, Florida State University, 1956.

Della Piana, G. M. and N. L. Gage. "Pupils' Values and the Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory." Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXXVI (March, 1955), pp. 167-178.

Domas, S. J. and D. V. Tiedeman. "Teacher Competence: An Annotated Bibliography." Journal of Experimental Education, XIX (December, 1950), pp. 101-218.

Downer, Effie M. "Provisions Made by Cities to Regulate and Facilitate Student Teaching." Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Eds. Garold D. Holstine and Frank L. Steeves, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1954, pp. 101-115.

Edwards, Allen L. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, Manual Revised. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1959.

Edwards, Allen L. "The Relationship Between the Judged Desirability of a Trait and the Probability That the Trait Will be Endorsed." Journal of Applied Psychology, XXXVII (No. 2, 1953), pp. 90-93.

Elliott, Jane Griffith. "A Role Perception: The College Coordinator." Teacher Education and the Public Schools. Ed. C. M. Clarke, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1961, pp. 46-53.

Fiske, Donald W. "Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Review." The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Ed. Oscar K. Buros, New York: Macmillan, 1950, p. 119.

Flowers, John G. Recommended Standards Governing Professional Laboratory Experiences and Student Teaching. Oneonta: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1948.

Flowers, John G. and Others. School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Oneonta: American Association of Teacher Colleges, 1948.

Gage, N. L. ed. Handbook on Research on Teaching. American Educational Research Association, Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.

Garrison, K. C. and Mary H. Scott. "A Comparison of the Personal Needs of College Students Preparing to Teach in Different Teaching Areas." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXI (No. 4, 1961), pp. 955-964.

Getzels, J. W. and P. W. Jackson. "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics." Handbook of Research on Teaching. Ed. N. L. Gage, Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963, pp. 506-582.

Ghiselli, E. E. "The Measurement of Occupational Aptitude." University of California Publications in Psychology, VIII (1955), pp. 101-216.

Gordon, Leonard V. SRA Manual For Survey of Interpersonal Values. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1960.

Gordon, Leonard V. Research Briefs on Survey of Interpersonal Values, Manual Supplement Revised. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1963.

Gruber, Joseph John. "Personality Traits and Teaching Attitudes." American Association for Health Physical Education and Recreation, Research Quarterly, XXXI (1960), pp. 434-439.

Haines, Aleyne C. "A Role Perception: The Student Teacher." Teacher Education and the Public Schools. Ed. C. M. Clarke, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1961, pp. 59-64.

Haines, Aleyne C. ed. Concern for the Individual in Student Teaching. 42nd Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1963.

Haines, Aleyne C. and Bernadene Schunk, eds. The Outlook in Student Teaching. 41st Yearbook, Association for Student Teaching, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1954.

Holstine, Garold D. and F. L. Steenes eds. Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. 33rd Yearbook, Association for Student Teaching, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1954.

Holt, Fred D. "A Study of Change in Certain Personality Variables of Counselors in Training." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (Part 5, 1963), p. 3775.

Hoyt, Cyril J. and Walter W. Cook. "The Predictive Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Based on Pupil Attitude Toward School." Journal of Teacher Education, X (No. 1, 1959), pp. 42-44.

Jackson, Phillip W. and Egon G. Guba. "The Need Structure of In-Service Teachers an Occupational Analysis." The School Review, LXV (Summer, 1957), pp. 176-192.

Jones, Helen M. "Whose Responsibility? The Student Teacher." The Oklahoma Teacher, XLI (May, 1960), pp. 10-11.

Kearney, Nolan C. and Patrick D. Rocchio. "The Effect of Teacher Education on the Teacher's Attitude." Journal of Educational Research, IL (May, 1956), pp. 703-708.

Lang, Gerhard. "Teachers' Motives for Teaching." Clearinghouse, XXXIII (May, 1959), pp. 542-544.

Leeds, Carroll H. "A Scale for Measuring Teacher-Pupil Attitudes and Teacher-Pupil Rapport." Psychological Monographs, LXIV (No. 6, 1950), pp. 1-24.

Leeds, Carroll H. "A Second Validity Study of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory." Elementary School Journal, LII (March, 1952), pp. 398-405.

Lindsey, Margaret, ed. New Horizons for the Teaching Profession. Washington: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1961.

Loevinger, Jane. "Theory and Techniques of Assessment." Annual Review of Psychology. Ed. P. R. Farnsworth (1959), pp. 10-11.

Lofthouse, Yvonne. "A Rationale for Professional Laboratory Experiences." The Outlook in Student Teaching, Ed. Aleyne C. Haines, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1962, pp. 138-145.

Malter, Morton S. and Troy L. Stearns, eds. Off-Campus Student Teaching. 30th Yearbook, Association for Student Teaching, Lock Haven: 1951.

Marsh, J. E. and Eleanor W. Wilder. Identifying the Effective Instructor: A Review of the Quantitative Studies. 1900-1952, U.S.A.F. Pers. Training Res. Cent. (Res. Bulletin, 1954, No. AFPTRX-TR-54-44).

McClung, Joan S. Guilford. "Dimensional Analysis of Inventory Responses in the establishment of Occupational Personality Types." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV (No. 7, 1964), p. 2978.

Melby, Ernest O. and Ted Ward. "The Challenge of Individual Differences." Concern for the Individual in Student Teaching, Ed. Aleyne C. Haines, 1963, pp. 3-15.

Michaelis, John U. "The Prediction of Success in Student Teaching from Personality and Attitude Inventories." Publications in Education. Berkley: University of California Press, XI (No. 6, 1954), pp. 415-484.

Milner, Ernest J. "Providing for Differences: Environment." Concern for the Individual in Student Teaching, Ed. Aleyne C. Haines, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1963, pp. 129-139.

Milner, Ernest J. ed. The Supervising Teacher. 38th Yearbook, Association for Student Teaching, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1959.

Morris, Kenneth Turner. "A Comparative Study of Selected Needs, Values, and Motives of Science and Non-Science Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV (Part 3, 1963), pp. 2325-2326.

Motl, Carol Cowles. "A Study of Personality Variables Among Counselor Education Majors, Counselors and Graduate Students in Administration, Curriculum, and Supervision as shown by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (Part 5, 1963), pp. 3779-3780.

Murray, Henry A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Oklahoma State University Catalog 1961-63, LVIII (No. 18, 1961).

Oklahoma State University Catalog 1963-65, LIX (No. 13, 1962).

Patterson, Allen D. "Participants Look at the Program." Off-Campus Student Teaching. Eds. Morton S. Malter and Troy L. Stearns, Lock Haven: Association for Student Teaching, 1951; pp. 82-120.

Perrodin, Alex F. ed. Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education. 34th Yearbook, Association of Student Teaching, Lock Haven: 1955.

Rabin, Bernard. "Who are Supervising Teachers?" The Supervising Teacher. Ed. Ernest J. Milner, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1959, pp. 1-11.

Richards, Helen and Elizabeth Robinson. "The Supervising Teacher in Teacher Education." The Supervising Teacher. Ed. Ernest J. Milner, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1959, p. 26.

Roberts, John Edward. "An Investigation of Selected Personality Variables Among Elementary, Secondary and Special Education Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (Part 4, 1963), pp. 2811-2812.

Roe, Anne. The Psychology of Occupations. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1956.

Roe, Anne. "Personality Structure and Occupational Behavior." Man in a World at Work. Ed. Henry Borow, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964, pp. 196-214.

Rosenberg, Morris. Occupations and Values. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.

Rotter, Julian B. "Some Implications of a Social Learning Theory for the Prediction of Goal Directed Behavior from Testing Procedures." Psychological Review, LXVII (No. 5, 1960), pp. 301-316.

Ruman, Edward L. and Dwight K. Curtis. "The Supervising Teacher in Future Teacher Education Programs." The Supervising Teacher, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1959, pp. 97-114.

Sandgren, Duane L. and Louis G. Schmidt. "Does Practice Teaching Change Attitudes Toward Teaching?" Journal of Educational Research, IL (January, 1957), pp. 673-680.

Scott, Owen and Sterling G. Brinkley. "Attitude Changes of Student Teachers and the Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory." Journal of Educational Psychology, LI (No. 2, 1960), pp. 76-81.

Shaffer, Lawrence F. "Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Review." The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Ed. Oscar K. Buros, New York: Macmillan, 1950, p. 119.

Siegal, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1956.

Southworth, Horton Coe. A Study of Certain Personality and Value Differences in Teacher Education Majors Preferring Early and Later Elementary Teaching Levels. Unpublished Ed. D. Thesis, Michigan State University, 1962.

Steeves, Frank L. "A Summary of the Literature on the Off-Campus Co-operating Teacher." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXVIII (March, 1952), pp. 129-137.

Stein, Harry L. and James Hardy. "A Validation Study of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory in Manitoba." Journal of Educational Research, L (January, 1957), pp. 321-338.

Stern, George G., Morris I. Stein and Benjamin S. Bloom. Methods of Personality Assessment, Glencoe: Free Press, 1956.

Sternberg, Carl. "Personality Trait Patterns of College Students Majoring in Different Fields." Psychological Monographs, LXIX (No. 403, 1955), pp. 1-21.

Stout, Ruth A. "Practices for Selection in Teacher Education." Teacher Education: The Decade Ahead. DeKalk Conference Report of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1955, pp. 242-250.

Stratemeyer, Florence B. and Margaret Lindsey. Working With Student Teachers. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958.

Stubbs, G. T., Chairman, University Council on Teacher Education. Report of Teacher Education at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma. Oklahoma State University, 1962.

Super, D. E. "A Theory of Vocational Development." American Psychologist, VIII (Feb., 1953), pp. 185-190.

Super, Donald E. and J. J. Crites. Appraising Vocational Fitness, Revised Edition, New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Swenson, Esther J. and Robert C. Hammock. "Off-Campus Laboratory Experiences: Their Growth, Importance, and Present Role in Teacher Education." Off-Campus Student Teaching, Eds. Morton S. Malter and Troy L. Stearns, Lock Haven: Association for Student Teaching, 1951, pp. 18-27.

Switzer, D. K., A. E. Grigg, J. S. Miller and R. K. Young. "Early Experiences and Occupational Choice: a Test of Roe's Hypothesis." Journal of Counseling Psychology, IX (1962), pp. 45-58.

Travers, Robert M. W. An Introduction to Educational Research. New York: Macmillan, 1958.

Tyler, Leona S. "Work and Individual Differences." Man in a World At Work. Ed. Henry Borow, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964, pp. 174-195.

Tyler, Leona S. The Psychology of Human Differences, Second Edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956.

Tyler, Fred T. "A Factorial Analysis of Fifteen M. M. P. I. Scales." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XV (1951), pp. 451-456.

Tyler, Fred T. "The Prediction of Student-Teaching Success from Personality Inventories." Publications in Education, Berkley: University of California Press, XI (No. 4, 1954), pp. 233-313.

Vacek, William Lee. "Personality Variables of Freshmen College Majors with Emphasis on Industrial Arts." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (Part 2, 1963), pp. 1285-1286.

Vineyard, Edwin E., Ruby Drinkwater, and Walter L. Dickinson. "Teacher Education and Pharmacy Students: A Comparison of Their Need Structures." The Journal of Teacher Education, XIII (December, 1962), pp. 409-413.

Wilk, Roger E. and William H. Edson. "Predictions and Performance: An Experimental Study of Student Teachers." The Journal of Teacher Education, XIV (September, 1963), pp. 308-317.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Vaud A. Travis, Jr.
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Dear Cooperating Teacher:

Increasing amounts of criticism of public education from a wide variety of sources has intensified the need for effective methods to select, recruit and educate more and better trained teachers. College programs of selection and retention control the quality and characteristics of the teachers provided for the schools.

The enclosed instruments are a part of a doctoral dissertation study being made by the writer to determine the data gathering effectiveness and predictive efficiency of these two instruments for the Oklahoma State University teacher training program. They are employed in a study of Oklahoma State University's student and cooperating elementary teachers. The survey group consists of the student and cooperating teachers for the fall semester of the 1963-64 school year.

As an OSU cooperating teacher, you are one of a small but influential group which can provide the needed information. It is believed that the University's training program and the teaching profession will be benefited by examining responses to studies of this kind.

All responses are for research purposes only and will be held in strict confidence. Because of the personal nature of some of the questions, answer sheets have been identified by number to avoid the necessity of identifying respondents by name. The value of this study will be greatly increased by your candid reactions and prompt consideration.

I would appreciate your completing the instruments and returning them in the enclosed stamped envelope as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Vaud A. Travis, Jr.

Enclosures

APPENDIX B

Vaud A. Travis, Jr.
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
Stillwater, Oklahoma

December 9, 1963

Dear Cooperating Teacher:

A few days ago you received a packet containing two instruments being used to gather data concerning the Oklahoma State University teacher training program. The instruments are a part of a doctoral dissertation study being made by the writer to determine the data gathering effectiveness and predictive efficiency of these two instruments.

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule has not been sufficiently researched to use with specific individuals for occupational placement but has shown evidence of differentiating between groups in selected occupations. The use of the instrument in the current study is not to find the "preferences," "opinions" or "reactions" of the "ideal teacher," but to determine whether the preferences on this particular standardized instrument will differentiate between groups, such as the primary grades and intermediate grades, etc. among the good teachers who serve as O. S. U. cooperating teachers. Significant differences could have important implications for college programs of selection and retention of prospective teacher candidates in their training programs.

As an O. S. U. cooperating teacher, you are one of a small but influential group which can provide the needed information. All responses are for research purposes only and will be held in strict confidence. The value of this study will be greatly increased by your candid reactions and prompt consideration.

I would appreciate your completing the instruments and returning them in the stamped envelope provided as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Vaud A. Travis, Jr.

sb

APPENDIX C

Vaud A. Travis, Jr.
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
Stillwater, Oklahoma

February 28, 1964

Dear Cooperating Teacher:

Please accept my appreciation for your participation in the recent study of students and cooperating teachers in the Oklahoma State University teacher training program. The two personality instruments which you were asked to complete and return were a part of a research study being made to determine the data gathering effectiveness and predictive efficiency of these two instruments. Your generous responses and candid reactions have provided information not available from any other source.

It is the writer's hope that from this study may come information fruitful for the improvement of the program under study.

Thank you again for your invaluable help.

Sincerely,

Vaud A. Travis, Jr.

lg

VITA

Vaud Ancil Travis, Jr.

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: AN INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED PERSONALITY NEED-STRUCTURE, VALUE AND ATTITUDE CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENT AND COOPERATING TEACHERS IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born at Osage, Oklahoma, August 25, 1924, the son of Vaud A., Sr., and Lorena Lewis Travis.

Education: Attended Bagley Elementary School in Tahlequah, Oklahoma; and graduated from Bagley High School in 1941; Active duty U. S. Army 1942-46; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Northeastern State College in June, 1947 with a major in chemistry; received the Master's degree from Oklahoma A. and M. College in August, 1948 with a major in Business Education; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in August, 1966.

Professional Experience: Teacher of Science in the schools of Pawhuska, Oklahoma from 1948 to 1950; owner Draughon's Business College, Muskogee, Oklahoma 1950-1962; Instructor, Muskogee Junior College, 1955-1962; Administrative Assistant, University Placement Services, Oklahoma State University, 1962-1965; Dean of College, Cameron State Agricultural College, Lawton, Oklahoma, 1965-1966.

Professional Organizations: National Education Association; Oklahoma Education Association; Phi Delta Kappa; Delta Phi Epsilon; Kappa Delta Pi