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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Who shall teach? For many years the writer has been concerned about the development of prospective teachers, and, like others, he has been faced with the question of what constitutes good teaching. The question still presses for an answer. "The search continues for a single generalized pattern of qualities or behaviors that characterize good teachers . . ."^1

That same quest is clearly basic to the work of educating those who would become teachers. It has led the writer to seek a way whereby a ray of light would be so cast that there would be brought into relief "qualities or behaviors that characterize good" prospective teachers. Refined further, the focus became centered upon prospective secondary-school teachers in their student-teaching performances, and the particular problem in this study was established.

The Problem

Can there be identified traits or qualities that discriminate between behaviors associated with best and poorest secondary-school student teachers as derived from their student-teaching performances?

---

The writer seeks answer through the eyes of student-teaching supervisors who have made comments about the student teachers they have observed. Specifically, this study focuses upon the comments of University of Illinois Supervisors of Student Teaching in Secondary Education. Their descriptions of strongest and weakest traits of more than 600 secondary-school student teachers selected by them as best and poorest student teachers provide the data.

Purpose of the Study

Manifestly, the major purpose is that of determining whether identification of discriminating traits can be made, but there are other purposes attending it: to provide direction for next steps in improving operations of those who work with student teachers; to uncover implications for immediate and long-range action and research in teacher-education institutions generally.

The complete research design is outlined at the close of this chapter. The statements of the problem and the purpose have been presented here to provide an understanding of the setting out which they grew and in which student-teaching must find an appropriate place.

The Nature of Teaching

There is little question that student teaching is but a wisp in a great field of elements. It is a particular stage in a part of pre-service experience called teacher-education. And teacher-education, a universe of a kind, is itself but a jot. What one wants a teacher to be is predicated upon a host of values: what one wants in the society in which the teacher will operate; what one
wishes the world to be; what one hopes the teacher can and will do in light of those particularized perceptions.

Nor is that all. The question about the nature of man asserts itself too. What one wants him to be is coupled with the question about what he is. Thus the meaning of teaching is born of a complex universe of values, purposes, and hope as well as efforts to be scientific in seeking out reality. A given culture seeks perpetuity through the training of its young by teachers who carry perceptions of citizenship which may be derived from the status quo. Such a definition of citizenship may be in conflict with the hope of philosophers, the insights of anthropologists, and the findings of psychologists.

... there is nothing inherently good or bad in a given teacher behavior, or set of behaviors, but, instead, that teacher behavior is good or bad, right or wrong, effective or ineffective, only to the extent that the behavior conforms or fails to conform to the particular value system, or set of objectives, defining (1) the activities expected of a teacher in a given community or culture, and (2) particularly the kinds of learnings (attainments) and methods of teaching to bring about these learnings, approved by the particular culture.2

It is sensitivity to the complexity illustrated above that yields remarks by educators about the distance to do in determining what good teaching is. Edwin Lee speaks of how little is known about the nature of good teaching and the personal qualities essential for it.3 Asahel C. Woodruff, Dean, College of Education, Brigham Young University, in his report as recorder of a thirty-four member dis-


cussion points up the same feeling of inadequate knowledge: "What are the components that make a good teacher? It is doubtful if they can be named with any real firmness or that we can describe the paths which produce those we can name." David G. Ryans has indicated too that "We do not know the qualities to look for in the 'effective teacher'."

Notwithstanding the complex nature of a problem that embraces whatever is or should be with regard to society and man, and notwithstanding the comments attesting the incompleteness of knowledge, teaching-judgments have been made. Operations essential to educating people everywhere have demanded them. T. M. Stinnet, Executive Secretary, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, points to the venerability of certification practices:

The practice of certification of teachers originated in ancient times, probably during the period of Solon in Athens (594 B.C.) in which the schools of Athens were made subject to state supervision. The teacher's certificate in modern usage probably originated during the Reformation. In early times religious orthodoxy and ability to maintain discipline were the only specified requirements. During the Middle Ages the practice was common for the Church to issue a certificate to those who were found to be orthodox in their religion and able to instruct children in the scriptures.


It is obvious that other varying degrees of informal and formal evaluating of teachers must have existed ever since teachers have been engaged in their work. This means that assumptions about quality of teaching have been involved too. Certainly as a pre-service teacher seeks entrance into a training program, both assumptions and judgments are made; as the teaching candidate progresses through his program to apprenticeship or practice (student teaching), and as he graduates from the preparation institution and then seeks and obtains a teaching position, judges play their role.

There have been various ways of describing what the assumptions or judgments are—including poetic endeavors to depict the purposes of teachers. Horace Mann exhorted the winning of "some victory for humanity." There have been statements about the scholar of the ages who gladly learn and gladly teach." Unfortunately, the poetic utterance which may very well be more accurate in capturing the spirit of an enterprise does not serve as a substitute for exact measurements to determine the elements of the enterprise. To say that teaching is the giving of self that others may grow and develop (which happens to be one of the major tenets in the writer's credo), is personally useful, but it does not provide a sieve through which discrete elements of the teaching process may be sifted and analyzed.

In the face of such a vast canvass—verily, the meaning of life itself—upon which to paint a portrait of teacher, it is no wonder that scholars, researchers, and practitioners have pleaded for more knowledge about teachers, all the while having to make decisions about them in the operational world.
The designs for securing more knowledge about good teachers and good teaching are many and varied. Tomlinson describes "Pioneer Studies in the Evaluation of Teaching" by a five-group classification of the researches before 1930 in order to show their diversity:

1. Studies which are based upon a survey of education experts, or of pupils . . .

2. Studies which are concerned with the pre-service performance of the subjects . . .

3. Studies which use pupil change as a criterion of teaching efficiency . . .

4. Studies which develop observational devices such as rating scales, score cards, check lists, and the like, or use such instruments in the appraisal of in-service teaching . . .

5. Studies which have a major concern in the development or use of professional knowledge or ability . . .

Tomlinson rightfully does not claim his groupings to be sharply exclusive, but they do serve admirably to point up the differing approaches. And the research continues.

With the growth in depth and breadth of scientific disciplines, particularly in behavioral-science techniques, there have come increased problems, because the advance of techniques for securing and studying of data have yielded enlarged dimensions of the subjects of study: the nature of learning, the needs of adolescence, factors affecting mental and emotional health, are but a few of the emergent areas whose disclosure has magnified the scope of research into teaching.

It is evident that even as individual researches continue along variations of the patterns already suggested (opinions of

---

experts and pupils, etc.), increasing attention is being given to research design itself. From the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness comes commentary indicative of such attention.

Research on teacher effectiveness requires measurement of teacher behaviors and characteristics, of the effects of teachers, and of the intervening variables, that is, such other factors as affect the variable under investigation. All three types of measurement constitute major tasks, since valid devices are not available for many of the pertinent variables.

The realization of a sound basis for programs of teacher selection, training, and supervision depends on the kinds of research to test the hypotheses which are set up... A variety of research strategies is desirable, some deriving from close contact with classroom situations and other direct teacher-pupil contacts, the observation of them, and careful analysis of data obtained in the classroom situations. 8

Walter S. Monroe also expresses the need for clarity and care in design and direction of research efforts. He emphasizes the necessity for examination of assumptions that are implied in the learning and teaching processes and for identification and understanding of them; this must take place before experiments, even those most rigidly controlled, can be meaningful. 9 Similarly, Jacob S. Orleans, in a discussion of "The Problem of Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness," points up the cruciality of selection of variables that have sound rationale, testing hypotheses for a variety of limiting variables and allowing for interrelationships among relevant variables. 10


Briefly, then, what has been indicated thus far is that research is being continued both to secure data about teachers and teaching and while so doing to test hypotheses in which the testing process may yield instrumentation and techniques. To put it in simple terms, research is being continued to secure data about teaching and data about how to secure data about teaching. Ryans makes the point in more explicit fashion and detail in referring to the beginning of the Teacher Characteristics Study and the researches engaged in by the staff since the founding of the project in 1948.\textsuperscript{11}

In the trend, if it may be so labeled, to develop more exact design in order to be more exact in focus upon isolated variables of teacher competence, researchers have not been neglectful of the immensity of the problem which this writer earlier described. Reference here is to the myriad values touched upon with regard to nature of society, culture, and man. Anent this, Levin makes a statement which the writer of this study feels is representative of currently engaged researchers and accompanies rather well an earlier quotation (see Footnote 8). Levin points out that there are principles which are basic if research into competence of teachers is to be productive. He says that research results alone do not determine the concept of a good teacher—that there are value judgments involved which are extrinsic to the research results.

Levin goes on to suggest that "operational definitions provide a precise meaning of competence," and "that a conceptual frame-

\textsuperscript{11}"The Investigation of Teacher Characteristics," \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 371-396.
work aids in setting up hypotheses relating variables of teacher behavior to certain antecedents and consequences of her (sic) classroom behavior. 12

With the emphasis thus given to explicitness in formation of design, it is well for writer and reader to be cognizant of the fact that study of teachers' competence has but one end, however many variables exist—namely, pupil change. The ultimate criterion (now commonly in the research language) of teacher competence or effectiveness is that of measured pupil change.

It follows that whether one is particularly concerned or interested in a particular phase of evaluation of teachers, one must look always at the pupils of the teachers for final assessment. This is a challenging perception because particular stages of teachers' developments have their own variables. For example, the writer is especially interested in the pre-service stage—the development of prospective teachers. To assess the effectiveness of the would-be teacher, he must be sensitive to the differences and relationships between the teacher "on-the-job," so to speak, and the teacher "before-the-job"; yet, the ultimate criterion is what happens to pupils, and presumably, this refers primarily to what happens to them under the direction of "regular" teachers—not teachers-in-training. Implications for this study will be treated later, but it is important here as an illustration of what is involved in establishing criteria of effectiveness by which any stage of teachers' development is to be judged. If running a mile were proved to be an

---

essential element in teaching effectiveness, it would be simple to eliminate any prospective teacher who could not run a mile; but if one is endeavoring to train the prospective teacher to run the mile (the teacher-education-program for mile-running), it is most likely that assessment (although directly in keeping with essential mile-running) of the prospective teacher must consider that he is in a state of becoming. Could it not be significant evidence if it indicates that the prospective teacher has improved his leg muscles, his breathing, and his co-ordination? It could be significant, of course, if the ratio of the particular level of development to the particular competency and the particular stage of the teacher-education program (far from graduation, close to graduation, etc.) could be determined. Suppose at the same moment of time, the particular prospective teacher is revealed to be unable to pace himself well (lack of self-concept, and lack of understanding although he has the knowledge about the length of a mile!) and consequently up to the moment has been able to complete only 800 yards in trials. On the other hand, there may be still other data to reveal that he has extraordinary determination. This, of course, implies that there have been opportunities for him to demonstrate this trait and that someone knew how to gather the evidence and did gather it. The question arises, too, whether the trait of determination with regard to running has to be gathered from running efforts or whether it may be inferred from the prospective teacher's determination in other enterprises.

The analogy could be extended, but it has performed its function of indicating what complications are involved in pre-service
evaluation even if an essential teaching competence were known. The basic problem of establishing that mile-running is an essential of teacher-effectiveness remains.

In keeping with the ultimate-criterion concept coupled with a reminder about keeping design as clean as possible, the writer would call attention to several items that are pertinent: (1) that the "... key to effective teaching is to be found in teacher behavior";\textsuperscript{13} (2) that the ultimate criterion itself has two major divisions of "Subsequent Life Behavior" and "Present Behavior" (referring to what happens to pupils after leaving the direct relationship with teachers and to what happens to them while in direct relations);\textsuperscript{14} and (3) that the essence of the research goal is the "relationship between observable teacher behaviors and pupil behavior produced by teacher behaviors."\textsuperscript{15}

This kind of perception underlies The Teacher Characteristics Study wherein

\begin{quote}
... it was assumed that a more valid and reliable procedure would be to employ judgments of trained observers regarding the children's responses to a teacher (pupil behavior) rather than to obtain from pupils judgments or opinions about their teachers.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

It is obvious that specific researches may make different attacks upon teaching effectiveness even when there is agreement about the ultimate criterion, even if there is agreement about the use of observers, and even if there is agreement that what is sought is the establishment of a possible criterion in the form of a hypoth-

\textsuperscript{13}"The Investigations of Teacher Characteristics," \textit{op. cit.}, p. 374.
\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 375.
\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 379.
\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., p. 385.
esis. Necessarily, the writer wishes to call attention to specific researches, but it would be well, first, to cap the discussion to date with a brief commentary about what has been its intent. The writer has endeavored to indicate briefly

1. That a great universe of values is involved in the consideration of what good teaching is

2. That there is testimony that the elements of effective teaching have not been determined

3. That judgments and descriptions of teaching have necessarily been employed, informally and formally, ever since teaching began

4. That varieties of research continue including emphasis on research design itself as scientific procedures have increased the scope of affective factors related to teaching.

It should not be presumed that all the researches to be touched upon here are directly a result of or related to the several groups already cited (Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness and the staff of The Teacher Characteristics Study), but there is no question that there has been impact. There are, of course, independent studies, growing out of particular needs and interests which have provoked teacher-educators to investigate the peculiar problems of their own work and thereby to contribute to the field as well. The writer's presentation in the chapters ahead is an example thereof. Again, although having been concerned with the problem of development of prospective teachers long before he heard of the groups referred to, and although stimulus for his own study came from sources of his own colleagues and his own work, the writer is indebted to the contributions made by those cited already and some to be commented upon ahead. (An interesting research might be de-
derived from that: "What effects are there of major researches upon workers in the same field who are not directly involved in the researches?")

As already indicated, the writer is interested in developing greater insight into prospective teachers' effectiveness. The particular focus upon student-teaching performances represented both the dimension of a phase of teacher-education which could be isolated and a vehicle by which a contribution could be made to accompany efforts of others who seek approaches and data about teacher characteristics and behaviors.

Many initial elements for design are possible in the kind of problem-attack suggested. One could select particular student teachers and examine their college records, talk with their instructors and counselors, observe them in their classrooms, test their pupils for particular achievements, and the like. One could select, in advance, particular categories of behaviors that seem significant, and ask experts to rate given groups of student teachers accordingly.

One could also build upon the outline of a potential organization of teachers' traits and abilities like that offered by Ryans who has suggested that the traits and abilities of teachers might be grouped into two categories:

. . . those having to do with the teacher's mental abilities and skills, his understanding of psychological and educational principles, and his knowledge of general and special subject matter to be taught, and (2) those qualities having to do with the organization of the teacher's personality, his personal adjustments, his effectiveness in maintaining good working relationships with pupils and other individuals, and the patterns of his interests.\(^{16}\)

\(^{16}\)Ibid., p. 372.
It would not be difficult to devise from those two categories a scheme for collecting data around one or more of their elements. However, not in disagreement with the categories above, but because of desire to try to test hypotheses about "personality" elements in relations with technical elements of prospective teachers, and because the germ of a design was emerging from his own teaching operations, the writer decided to begin without categories. In effect, there might be categories of personal-technical characteristics or behaviors which would emerge as non-divorceable.

The added stimulus of his own teaching operations referred to above is treated more fully in the chapter dealing with the origin of the study data, but it is necessary to call attention to it here because certain tentative research outcomes at The University of Illinois preceding the writer's involvement there are relevant to him as well as to the field.

Raymond E. Schultz and Merle M. Ohlsen report a research effort\(^{17}\) which stimulated the writer because of its methodology and direction. In essence, their work was an outgrowth of conditions reported by this writer in Chapter II. Of fundamental importance here is the fact that the design they used employed a free-choice mechanism by which supervisors of student teaching could describe student-teacher behaviors sans categories but within an over-all framework which required that the supervisors make their comments about best and poorest student teachers as determined by team judgments.

\(^{17}\)"How to Define a Good Teacher," \textit{The School Executive}, (July, 1954), pp. 46-47.
The number of subjects (student teachers) which were involved constituted 30 per cent of those in the program in all fields of teacher preparation for a period of four semesters including elementary and excepting those preparing to teach exceptional children. The strongest and weakest traits of the 326 student teachers thus judged to be best and poorest by the team judgments were described by the supervisors. The descriptions were categorized into three groups (personal traits, teaching techniques, and subject matter preparation) and chi-square procedures applied to identify "those traits for which the responses of best and poorest student teachers were significantly different." 18

Modest tables of the findings are presented and then informally summed up in this manner:

... it can be said that the poorest student teacher lacked imagination, showed little initiative and lacked a sense of responsibility. He exhibited emotional instability and had difficulty working with people. In the classroom he exhibited a general lack of understanding of the teaching-learning process.

The outstanding student teacher, on the other hand, was a creative person who had an abundance of initiative and enthusiasm. He had a genuine interest in his pupils and a positive attitude toward teaching. He was able to adapt to new or unforeseen situations. In his classroom, his work was well organized. This ability to organize and plan was combined with a good understanding of the teaching-learning process, a knowledge of his subject matter and a knowledge of teaching methods. He understood his students and was able to involve them in classroom activities in such a way as to promote and hold their interest. 19

The design intimated in that study was later adapted with modifications, aimed at different pursuits, and established with

18 Ibid., p. 46.
19 Ibid., p. 47.
more rigorous internal procedures by the writer. These are all detai­
tailed in the body of succeeding chapters. Most germane here is what under-girded the writer's final construction of design.

Having called attention to the references which admonish one to observe that good teaching comes from complicated context and to be sensitive to assumptions that may be inherent in contemplated research before it gets under way, the writer must per­
force account accordingly. He decided to look directly at student-
teaching performances without describing first what he believes man, society, and culture to be( ); there is an assumption, later va­
lidated, that the supervisors through whose eyes the writer is looking at student-teaching performances have a common and reasonable set of values. This is treated more fully subsequently as is another assumption: that good student-teaching is going on and that there are competent people to judge it. As Abelson puts it, "The basic source of judgment must rely upon the integrated consensus of the deliberations of good thinkers."

Finally, acceptable or better research design should recognize what others have done in order to note relationships, to help set up significant hypotheses in one's own study, and to allow future consumers or researchers to derive benefits from comparisons and contrasts. In addition to those already cited, other researches will be indicated as they relate to this study.

One such research of relevance at this point in the study is that of Alfred C. Jensen, "Determining Critical Requirements for

---

Teachers." It is presented here, not because it had direct influence upon the writer's design, but because it may have influenced the aims of studies like that of Schultz (Footnote 17 in this chapter); also, it is representative of the continuing endeavor which this writer has pointed to of developing research techniques, and its outcomes provide interesting kinship with those sought by this writer.

Jensen indicates that "One of the perplexing problems confronting education is how to identify and define the qualities or traits (abilities, attitudes, etc.) which contribute to teaching competence." He employs the critical-incidents approach (his contribution and relationship with the Teacher Characteristics Study) in his design which includes the training of observers and their gathering of evidence about teachers in action. In their gathering of 500 incidents, the observers were to observe the requirement that critical meant any "observable teacher behavior or activity that may make the difference between success and failure in teaching." The incidents were reviewed and categorized—three major categories of Personal Qualities Reflected by Reported Incidents, Professional Qualities Reflected ... and Social Qualities Reflected ... Descriptive statements related to the categories and to effective and ineffective teachers were drawn. The "Personal

---

22 Ibid., p. 82.
23 Ibid., pp. 82-83.
Qualities" statements are here presented in full with examples of those from the "Professional and Social Qualities."

### Personal Qualities Reflected by Reported Incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is alert, cheerful and enthusiastic</td>
<td>1. Is dull, bored, and shows lack of dramatic qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-control and good organization ability in midst of classroom demands</td>
<td>2. Loses temper, is impatient, disorganized, fault-finding, easily disturbed in face of classroom demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Likes fun and possesses a sense of humor</td>
<td>3. Is serious, too occupied for fun or humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recognizes and admits own mistakes graciously</td>
<td>4. Is unaware of, or fails to admit own mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is fair and impartial</td>
<td>5. Fails to maintain a fair, impartial, objective attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Is overcritical and suspicious, showing disapproval of child as a person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Qualities

| 1. Evidences a planned but flexible procedure anticipating individual needs and interests | 1. Shows rigidity |

### Social Qualities

| 1. Shows understanding and sympathy in working with pupils                 | 1. Makes threats, uses sarcastic remarks or in other ways, shows lack of sympathy for pupils |

---

24 Ibid., p. 84.
25 Ibid., p. 85.
The writer recognizes in Jensen's study the potentiality of the method employed. The use of trained observers to gather evidence from on-going teaching operations was therein uniquely manifested in terms of the "critical incidents." This writer's utilization of observers has a touch of similarity in that they too are "trained" albeit in different fashion. There are different kinds of "training": Jensen's group did not have the commonality of program-building and a number of other "family" operations which the writer later describes in connection with the reliability of the supervisors' (observers) judgments in his own study.

The writer sees another difference in that one of his intents is that one of the long-range implications of his own study will be that of furthering the "training" of observers (particularly those who work directly with student teachers). "... the findings of such studies of classroom observational techniques should naturally improve supervisory activities and teacher ratings."26

Of course, in any study involving observations of actions in classrooms, there will eventually be content analysis of the observations (whatever the means of recording the data) and eventual classification thereof. The classification into groupings in this study will be less broad than the three categories referred to about Jensen's study, but structuring is determined by purposes as well as whatever seems inherent in the substances undergoing classification.

26 Remmers, op. cit., p. 652.
The Emerging Design of the Study

In what has been substantially a chapter to provide a preface to his own design, the writer has called attention to the complexity inwrought in the nature of teaching and to the continuing efforts being made to unveil its substance through research. In approaching the description of his own effort, he must reaffirm his awareness that it is mandatory to be conscious of ones aims. Thus when Cogan points out that

\[ \ldots \text{the more commonly used criteria—the in-service ratings of the teacher and the opinions of experts as to the teacher's competence—both suffer from a major deficiency in that they are measurements taken at a point several steps removed from the criterion generally accepted as valid, i.e., pupil change}^{27} \]

there is sufficient relationship between the subjects of his criticism and the modus operandi in this study to use his statement as a touch-stone for sharpening the writer's intent. Understanding and agreeing that pupil change or growth is the ultimate criterion of a teacher's effectiveness, the writer is focusing upon prospective teachers during their sole opportunity in a pre-service time-point when their behaviors can cause change in pupils' behaviors. The writer has pointed out that he is focusing through the agency of supervisors of student teaching.

As shall be noted again, one of the outcomes sought is foundation for better instruments; consequently, the writer is employing a design which will lead to emergence of categories from the nature of the data rather than a design which assumes categories

---

at the outset into which the data must fit. Those categories or groupings of observed student-teacher traits can serve not only as findings in this study but as potential item-content for future instruments. As shall be seen, there is firm foundation for the supervisors' observations. Upon that foundation, the supervisors were free to employ perceptions which yielded behavioral descriptions rather than their having had to employ an already-established set of behavioral descriptions into which their perceptions had to fit.

Finally, the study is bounding the realm of operations to include only the period while the student-teachers were under direction of the teacher-education program.

The complete plan of the study is presented here.

The Problem

Are there traits or qualities that can be identified as discriminatory of the behaviors associated with best and poorest secondary school student teachers as derived from their student-teaching performances?

Purposes of the Study

To test certain hypotheses relevant to the problem stated and thereby point to immediate and long-range implications for action and research at The University of Illinois and other teacher-training institutions.

Hypotheses to be Tested

1. Elements of "personality" in prospective secondary school teachers, although not always clearly separate from technical
elements of competency, will often negate technical ability in student-teaching performance.

2. Some "personality" characteristics ostensibly developed within the training provided by the teacher-education program will nonetheless be revealed as weaknesses in student-teaching performances.

3. Traits or characteristics which discriminate between good and poor student-teaching performance will suggest an almost infinite variety of elements comprising teaching. However, there will be some traits ("personality" and technical) which will stand out as marking the difference between behaviors associated with good and poor teaching.

4. Some characteristics or traits will be clearly established as qualities that can be positively affected by educational processes.

5. Some traits or qualities often assumed to be fairly critical will be revealed to be non-affective or of little consequence insofar as distinguishing between good and poor student-teacher performances is concerned.

6. Attitudinal elements will likely be revealed as affective even when technical ability is being judged.

Scope of the Study

The best and poorest student-teachers in the University of Illinois program preparing secondary school teachers are the subjects whose performances in student teaching yielded the data.
The period covered by this study involves the five and one-half years from the second semester of the academic year, 1950-1951, through the second semester of the academic year, 1955-1956.

The Data

The primary sources in this study are the original records on file at The University of Illinois. The major data are the recorded (written) comments by university supervisors of student teachers about the student teachers they have had in their charge.

Other primary data are drawn from Office of Student Teaching Records: Minutes of Student-Teaching Staff Meetings; memoranda and directives; Staff Documents.

In addition, extensive conferences of the Head of Student Teaching and the writer were carried on for a two-year period and particularly during the months between Spring, 1957, and Fall, 1958. Conferences with Head Supervisors of Student Teaching in the secondary school fields were also held.

Methods and Procedures

Five principal steps are employed in the study:

1. Collection of data from the records.

2. Analysis of the content of the data (the statements of supervisors about the best and poorest student teachers that were descriptive of the strongest and weakest traits of each).

3. Classification of the traits into groupings according to results yielded by the content analysis of each statement in 2 above.

4. Tabulation of strongest and weakest traits of both best and poorest student teachers that appeared in each grouping; applying statistical procedure to determine whether distribution of the traits would yield differences between best and poorest student teachers beyond chance expectancy at a significant level.
5. Tabulation of frequency of mention of traits
   a. strongest traits of best student teachers
   b. weakest traits of best student teachers
   c. strongest traits of poorest student teachers
   d. weakest traits of poorest student teachers

Limitations of the Study

Manifestly the writer is confining the focus to teaching performance which is within the program of a teacher-education institution. Further, he is focusing only upon a particular time-point which is that of the student-teaching period.
In order for one to understand the raw data treated in this study, a brief description of their origin must be provided.

The University of Illinois student-teaching program prior to 1951 for the most part included student teaching which engaged the students in part-time experiences; notable exceptions were those in vocational agriculture and home economics. There had been much concern manifested by staff members that full-time student teaching (all day for a number of weeks) be established.

For approximately ten years educators participating in the teacher training program at The University of Illinois have discussed the possibility of setting aside a period of time in the preparation of teachers for a full time student teaching experience... In 1944, following the institution of the University Council on Teacher Education, the plan received renewed attention. Finally, by October, 1949, the College of Education, the University Council on Teacher Education, and every area committee of the Council, had approved the idea of instituting, not later than September, 1951, a professional semester for all secondary school areas... The professional semester provides the student opportunity to spend full time in a cooperating school while he does his student teaching.1

1"A Guide to Student Teaching" (mimeographed), Committee of Supervisors of Student Teaching, Robert Pingry, Chairman, Office of Student Teaching, College of Education, University of Illinois, April 1, 1952, p. 1.
It is noteworthy, too, that according to minutes of a meeting of Supervisors of Student Teachers, October 24, 1950, "... that several subject areas were planning to have some student teachers in schools outside of Champaign-Urbana next semester." 2

It is with the beginning of full-time student teaching and the impetus toward a greater number of off-campus student-teaching placements that increased stimulus for better evaluation of student-teaching performance also resulted. 3

Both the desire of the university staff and the involvement of an increasing number of co-workers in the student-teaching experience demanded careful definition of policies and procedures. The involvement of cooperating teachers and administrators in schools removed from the campus inevitably required clarity of values and criteria pertinent to number and kind of visits by university supervisors, responsibilities of cooperating teachers, student teachers, and administrators, and evaluating and reporting practices. These and others are described more fully in "A Guide to Student Teaching." 4

There are several other especially significant elements from the developments in the program which apply to the sources of the data in this study:

1. The Head Supervisor of Student Teaching in each subject area was to serve as the instructor in the area methods course which accompanied student teaching during the professional semester.

2Minutes of Supervisors Meetings on file, The Office of Student Teaching, 208 Gregory Hall, University of Illinois.


2. The supervisor in each subject area was to make a minimum of three one-half-day visitations to each student teacher during the six-weeks full-time student-teaching period. Generally, his visitation would involve his seeing the student-teacher in charge of two classes, conferring with him for an hour, and conferring with the cooperating teacher for an hour.

Those two items are called to attention because they indicate a structure which produces considerable depth of working relationship and consequent opportunity for insight between student teacher and university supervisor.

In essence, then, much work and time of the student-teaching staff in its own meetings were devoted to clarifying its own values and purposes in order to help clarify them with the cooperating agencies. During the years of 1950 and 1951 which included the establishment of the full-time student teaching for secondary school student teachers and the beginning of off-campus student-teaching, among the most significant preparations were these:

1. Workshop Conference with administrators of contemplated cooperating schools held on University of Illinois Campus, December 19, 1950. Purpose of the meeting was to have mutual assistance in defining "responsibilities of the schools and of the University and establish the necessary policies for developing the program."5

2. Visits to schools by head supervisors where recommended potential cooperating teachers were teaching. 6

3. Campus conference with all cooperating teachers of all areas.7

5Ibid., p. 1.

6Minutes of Student Teaching Staff meetings, op. cit., September, October, 1950.

7Ibid., September 19, 1950; December 7, 1950.
4. Workshop sessions with cooperating teachers of each area and the head supervisor of that area.

5. November, 1950, Supervisors' working draft of principles and policies to be incorporated into an eventual "Guide" was written.

6. February, 1951, June, 1951, and April, 1952, produced successive mimeographed editions of the "Guide" with the last date being a revised edition of the first edition. (As noted, the 1952 edition is referred to throughout this study.)

In keeping with the intensive planning by the student-teaching staff preceding and during the first year of full-time student teaching, the Head of Student Teaching felt it necessary to begin collecting data about student-teaching performances. Chief among the prompting needs were those of "desire to find out what is being done for our student teachers, what pointers we might get for our methods instruction and guidance, and to begin to get evidence about the new program." Significantly, the Executive Committee of the student-teaching staff recommended in September, 1950, that "... evaluation of student teachers' work be made by supervisors with such assistance as they may require..." and that there be included "a formulation of criteria for the evaluation of student teachers..." and that there should be explored the "... means of improving reports thereof to the placement bureau." Thus the several ends of sharpening both perceptions about student-teaching performance and the consequent reporting and using

---

8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
11 Ibid.
12 Minutes of Supervisors Meetings, September 28, 1950.
the results of reporting were joined with the program development needs already described.

The Head of Student Teaching created a form by which supervisors could begin recording observational data. Each head supervisor was asked to follow the directions given:

The "Best" and "Poorest" students will be chosen by groups of judges. Each head supervisor will call a meeting of all the supervisory staff in that area of preparation to select the top and bottom 15 percent of all the students on the basis of the following guides:

Top 15%—The Really Good People—the stars. This category should be reserved for those students who do a meritorious job in student teaching. However, they also should have displayed great teaching potential.

Bottom 15%—The Marginal Student—he may be successful if he is given special help on the job. He is good enough so we cannot say he should not be placed in a teaching position, yet we do have definite reservations about him. Of course, judges will include in this category those people who should not be recommended for certification.

Not only will these groups of judges select the top and bottom 15 percent, but they will also note why they selected each student for that particular category. In addition to noting the reason by each student's name, they will also define each student's greatest strength and most serious weaknesses.

In addition to the already presented factors that gave rise to research needs, it was thought that there might be long-range benefits accruing to public school administrators and to graduates of the University:

---

13 Exhibit A, p. 30.

14 Directions to supervisors by Head of Student Teaching, 1950.
EXHIBIT A

CONTRASTING CHARACTERISTICS OF EXTREME GROUPS IN STUDENT TEACHING

Teaching Field____________________

Please name ___ students in each category. Semester: ___19 -19

"Best" Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Reason for Choice of Student</th>
<th>Strongest Trait</th>
<th>Weakest Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. _________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. _________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. _________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. _________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. _________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. _________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. _________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. _________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Poorest" Students

| 1. _________________________ |                              |                |              |
| 2. _________________________ |                              |                |              |
| 3. _________________________ |                              |                |              |
| 4. _________________________ |                              |                |              |
| 5. _________________________ |                              |                |              |
| 6. _________________________ |                              |                |              |
| 7. _________________________ |                              |                |              |
| 8. _________________________ |                              |                |              |

Feel free to use the back of this sheet for additional comments.
School administrators in some of our best school systems are looking to University staff members for special help in selecting staff. Not only should we be trying to help these school people, but we should also be trying to screen out these outstanding people so that we can follow them up on the job and help them realize the kind of professional growth of which they are capable.\(^5\)

It is the written comments by university supervisors about the best and poorest student-teaching performances that provides the reservoir of data for this study. The period covered by this study embraces the spring semester of the 1950-1951 academic year to the spring semester of academic year 1955-1956 inclusive.

That, then, is the picture of context and mechanics that resulted in the raw data (supervisors' comments) to be utilized.

The description of context points to, but does not satisfy completely, the answer to the question that is inevitably raised next: what basic principles and purposes underly the student-teaching staff operations to insure a common threshold of perception among a variety of supervisors in a variety of subject-areas? And, if a reasonably "common threshold of perception" is indicated, what justification is there for accepting the consequences of the perceptions made as meaningful or definitive with regard to what good teaching (or poor teaching) is?

Examining the second question first, the writer would make these points explicit.

In the universe of a teacher-education program which patently includes a welter of affective elements, decisions must be made con-

\(^{15}\) Memorandum from Head of Student Teaching to Supervisors, October 25, 1950. Office of Student Teaching Records, University of Illinois.
stantly in terms of what good teaching is. Admittedly, this study is aimed at helping further knowledge about what good teaching is in order to improve teacher-education procedures. Loren R. Tomlinson, writing in 1955, points to "Pioneer Studies in the Evaluation of Teaching," and concludes his comments by saying that "While these early studies (before 1930) seldom produced conclusive results, they raised questions, explored various hypotheses, and pointed the way for future study of this important educational problem." 16

Other studies are indicated in the bibliography by this writer—all of whose existence attest the continuing efforts being made to determine the elements of good teaching. The point is that while the search for the definition of teaching is going on, teacher-education candidates are selected, trained, hired, and fired. All of these are critical judgments based upon the stuff of "good" teaching. Therefore, without intending to give the impression of dismissing the question lightly, the writer nonetheless would call attention to the dimensions of the universe involved here (The University of Illinois Teacher-Education Program) and say that within it, the consequences of perceptions are necessarily being accepted as meaningful, if not definitive, indications of what constitutes "good" teaching. There is no assumption here that the University of Illinois has cornered the market on truth and that the operational decisions are founded upon the "true" picture of good teaching and will be acceptable everywhere. Nor is there a sense of apology

---

dictating the statement. The quintessence of this discussion is that of making clear the boundaries involved in that a particular institution is under focus.

The earlier question of "common threshold of perception" among the supervisors who made the comments is a complex one. Three major elements comprise evidence of worth that the supervisors had common principles and purposes underlying their observations and comments:

1. At least one year of intensive work within staff meetings and with cooperating agencies in establishing bases for evaluating student-teachers for grading purposes and the like.\textsuperscript{17}

2. Directions by and discussions with the Head of Student Teaching with regard to the recording of comments.\textsuperscript{18} (See Footnote 13 also.)

3. Agreement resulting in publication of "Responsibilities of the Student Teacher."\textsuperscript{19}

Both Points 1 and 2 above have been touched upon, but they are worthy of reemphasis. In addition, it should be recognized that although staff members are employed for similar positions in terms of what they can bring with them as refreshing characteristics and points of view, their fitting into existing directions and values is also involved. Without dwelling upon the staff-selection criteria, the writer would simply indicate that the supervisors in the student-teaching program herein treated regarded student-teaching supervision as a major interest, had teaching experience in the subjects and levels in which they supervised, had either or both

\textsuperscript{17}Conference with Head of Student Teaching, July, 1958; also minutes.

\textsuperscript{18}Minutes of Supervisors Meetings.

\textsuperscript{19}"Guide," \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 9-10.
guidance and supervisory experiences and training, and were regular full-time staff members of the university. They possessed professional rank and the doctorate generally.20

Point 3, "Responsibilities of the Student Teacher," is here excerpted from the "Guide." These are highly pertinent as evidence of common bases among the supervisors. They are numbered as they appear in the "Guide."

1. To become acquainted with the appropriate supervisor of student teaching before the student teaching experience.

2. To apply for student teaching according to current University regulations.

3. To become familiar with the community in which he will do his student teaching and secure suitable living quarters prior to his beginning student teaching.

4. To seek help from his supervisor, cooperating teacher, and school administrator in defining his responsibilities in the school.

5. To provide worthwhile learning experiences for the pupils he teaches. This involves adequate planning and consultations with the cooperating teacher.

6. To become acquainted with his pupils early in his teaching experience.

7. To put in extra hours when the needs of the children indicate the advisability of his doing so.

8. To be prepared to take over the class at any time, even though his cooperating teacher would not expect him to take over the class without warning except in an emergency.

9. To meet promptly the responsibilities of his daily work.

20Appendix I provides the statement of "Qualifications of Head Supervisors" that was subsequently developed and recorded. Student Teaching Office Records, University of Illinois, 1952.
10. To participate in necessary out-of-class activities, such as supervising lunch room periods, supervising study halls, and meeting with extra-curricular groups.

11. To assist in managing physical conditions in the classroom.

12. To familiarize himself thoroughly with school routine, course offerings, and physical plant.

13. To take the initiative in seeking help from cooperating teachers whenever he needs it.

14. To evaluate his own work and study his progress objectively with the help of the cooperating teacher and the supervisor, yet not request evaluation in terms of a letter grade.

15. To study the work of the cooperating teacher as a scientific observer, always trying to determine why he did what he did.

16. ... plan worthwhile experiences (for himself) with the help of the cooperating teacher.

17. To demonstrate a professional attitude in all his contacts in the school and community.

18. To develop an understanding of the ethics of the profession. As an example, the student teacher must recognize the confidential nature of personal data and treat it as such.

19. To become acquainted with and adhere to the rules applicable to pupils and teachers in the school in which he is working.

20. To submit complete and accurate records and reports as requested by the cooperating school and the University.\(^{21}\)

It is impossible to specify how much time and effort were given to reaching clarity and agreement, but the available minutes of meetings during 1950-1951, the discussions this writer has had with Professor Ohlsen, Head of Student Teaching during the entire period covered by this study, and the tangible outcomes in terms

of sections of the "Guide" all testify to considerable mutual endeavor and agreement among the staff.

Finally, the writer's own experience provides additional testimony about the agreement in expectation and purpose of the staff. In May, 1955, and July, 1955, the writer spent several days with staff members and the Head of Student Teaching. These meetings were for mutual considerations as to the possibility of the writer's joining the staff as a supervisor of student teaching. One of the most impressive perceptions immediately forthcoming (and a weighty one in the writer's decision) was that of a unity of purpose and concept with regard to student teaching. Manifestly, this particular study was not envisaged by the writer at that time.

Then, when the writer joined the staff, he, too, was involved in the observations and recording of data. As a worker within that staff and not responsible for the administration of the program, he was in excellent position to test further the perception he had had as a visitor. Necessarily he worked as part of the judgmental teams (with his own assistants and colleagues). Again, he was not concerned with justifying a study; in fact, one might say that circumstances were highly favorable to resist or reject both the bases and practice of making comments as a supervisor if they did not make sense. The opposite was true and the writer found continuing evidence of both the worth of the practice described and the intense effort and concern of the staff to scrutinize evaluative procedures and to maintain operational agreement.

Thus from the evidence of minutes, discussion, staff guides for the cooperating teachers and student teachers, and ante-study
personal experience, the writer is confident that what was expected of student teachers was commonly defined and agreed upon. It is within that kind of context that the Head of Student Teaching called for identification of the best and poorest student teachers and with the guidance already indicated. (See pages 29 and 30.)

Notwithstanding the establishment of the fact that there were common underlying principles and values as well as clear and specific agreement about what was expected of student teachers, one may still raise a question as to whether or not the structure of selecting best and poorest student teachers (and the form for recording comments) was overly free or open. Whatever the answer, there would be tenable arguments that could be made in agreement or disagreement. In this writer's judgment, the major point involved here is whether or not there were competent judges operating in a framework of understanding. That point has been established. His own response to the second question is affirmative—that there was freedom to indicate strongest and weakest traits. In one sense, that is not germane to this study in that the purposes for gathering the data in the early 1950's, although related, were not to design the specific study engaged in here. More important is the subsidiary question of whether or not supervisors might miss much (despite agreement) because they were not directed to look for particular behaviors or competencies. The writer submits the ever-attendant possibility of omission—even when a closed system is used. However, there is a decided advantage in having a vast amount of raw data coming from an open-ended instrument. Where, as in this instance, the detailed focus has not been designed in advance, one of the
several outcomes may be the finding of clusters of student-teaching performance that point to next steps. An illustration exemplifies this potential value: if competent observers were instructed to look for a particular item like planning ability or a refined element thereof, there would be merit, of course—depending upon the purpose; if they were instructed, as in the described origin of the data here, to indicate outstanding behaviors of strongest and weakest student teachers, there would be much significance in the findings that planning was identified many times, a few times, or none.

It may be said that planning was an area of agreement among supervisors with regard to student-teacher evaluation. The aforementioned records, "Guide," and faculty meetings point to it. Again, within the framework of agreement, including both prior established values and seeking of strongest and weakest traits, the freedom to select the specific traits does not destroy the framework.

Finally, to suggest that absence of a completely closed system may be a limitation or weakness is to infer a different kind of study. There is no rejection of the idea that the potential limitations of this sort must be treated. They are more pertinent to the discussion in the next chapter describing the handling of the data and the succeeding chapter dealing with the results. The chapter just being concluded has described the origin of the data and established that the supervisors were competent and in agreement.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND ANALYSES OF SUPERVISORS' COMMENTS

A period of five and one-half years is covered by this study. During that time (spring semester, 1950, - spring semester, 1956, inclusive), 2198 student teachers were involved in these secondary education fields:

- Agriculture
- Art
- Commerce
- English
- Foreign Languages
- Home Economics
- Industrial Arts
- Mathematics
- Music
- Physical Education - Men
- Physical Education - Women
- Science
- Social Studies
- Speech

Of the 2198 student teachers, 24 Head Supervisors designated 631 as best and poorest. The total number of comments made by supervisors about the 631 thus designated amounted to 1746. Although three statements about each best or poorest student teacher were called for (strongest trait, weakest trait, reason for choice),* the "reason for choice" was omitted upon occasion. In other instance the "reason for choice" was identical to "strongest trait," and in still others it was useless. In initial tabulation, all comments were counted, but successive readings suggested use of only the comments that pointed directly at strongest or weakest traits. These totaled 1599, from which were garnered a list of the comments pointing directly to "strongest" and "weakest" traits. These totaled 1171. It should be noted here that comment as it refers to the

*See Exhibit A, p. 30.
final list employed would include one item (e.g., planning) or several items (e.g., "scholarship and initiative in taking leadership"). The final step in the first phase of examination of the supervisors' comments resulted in establishing 1589 traits or items to be categorized and treated statistically. Before proceeding with additional description of the methods employed in handling the data, the writer offers this summary of the brief description of the data just given.

1. Student teachers supervised .......... 2198
2. Student teachers selected as best or poorest ......................... 631
3. Total comments made .................. 1746
4. Final Usable comments referring to strongest or weakest traits .................. 1171*
5. Final traits or items derived from the 1171 comments ...................... 1589**

Procedures

It is evident that procedural efforts are already implied in what was described above. Although time-consuming, the first treatment of data was the relatively simple task of recording on master work sheets all of the comments the supervisors had made. The 1171 comments (#4 above) that resulted were essentially those which the supervisors had included under specific reference to strongest or weakest traits; practically the only judgmental factor for the writer lay in whether or not to include as a "strongest" or "weakest" trait an item listed as "reason for choice." In sum, the first step in procedure was primarily a mechanical one (with the exception noted) of collecting from the office files and then recording the supervisors' comments on Master List work sheets. The 1171 strongest and weakest traits thus derived mark the beginning

*Reproduced in entirety in Appendixes II and III.
**Reproduced in entirety in Appendix IV.
point of the second and major phase of procedure in this study.

The first step in this next stage consonant with the design of the study demanded content-analysis of those 1171 comments. Then procedures demanded classification after the content-analysis. Because the procedures may be of both interest and worth to others who may wish to approach related kinds of data, some detail is given of the 15 trials and "runs" in which the author engaged. It should be remembered that the aim in this phase of procedure was in itself the establishment of a design that would be groundwork for the larger design. In other words, the comments (supervisors' statements of "strongest" and "weakest" traits) were to be analyzed to see what inherent elements in their content would yield structure (groupings or categories) that would in turn be the foundation for the final analysis and interpretation — identification of items (traits) which discriminate between "good" and "poor" student-teaching performance.

As he approaches the description of specific steps in the trials and "runs," the reader will find it helpful to remember these points:

Master Lists of weakest and strongest traits (Appendices II and III), refer to the final lists of comments derived from the original sheets turned in by the supervisors. There is a total of 1171 such comments in the Master Lists.

As an example, the Master List of Weakest Traits begins this way:

1. reserve
2. over-confidence
3. careless
That is the way they appeared on the Master List at the time of the first run (the symbols "B" and "P" had not yet been put on). The traits reserve, over-confidence, and careless on that Master List of Weakest Traits meant that supervisors had indicated those as weakest traits of student teachers on their original sheets.

It is those Master Lists which are referred to in the first of the 15 trials now to be described.

1. The author went through the Master Lists of "weakest" traits by reacting to each comment as quickly as possible and writing (literally) each trait down on work sheets. Each work sheet was divided roughly into thirds, and as a "new" trait appeared, it was recorded at the top of a third of a work sheet. Whenever a trait seemed to be similar to one already recorded, it was written underneath the like trait on the work sheet. If it happened to be identical, a tally mark was made. Thus reserve headed the first third of the first work sheet; over-confidence the next third, careless the next, and so on. Then as traits like too quiet and introvert appeared as the author continued through the Master List, they were written down under reserve on the work sheet. When the trait reserved appeared, it was simply given a tally mark next to reserve on the work sheet. Traits that seemed to be like over-confidence were written down under over-confidence when they appeared. New work sheets were being created all this time, too, as different traits appeared. Reduced in scale, the work sheets had this appearance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reserve</th>
<th>over-confidence</th>
<th>careless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>too quiet</td>
<td>ego-centric</td>
<td>overly casual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introvert</td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

etc.

The same procedure was followed for the list of strongest traits.
Two effects of the procedure appeared; one, images of groupings (several remained throughout all of the runs and some were very cloudy); two, a sense of acquaintanceship—a "feel" of the items by the author. This unscientific element seemed quite significant and helpful.

2. The next step consisted of a very rapid scanning of each third of each work sheet and a very rapid jotting down on additional work sheets the very first word or phrase that came to mind as the author glanced at each section. Such words or phrases as insecure, reticent, colorless, too casual came about in the run through the "weakest" items—dependable, insightful, and the like in the "strongest."

3. The author then went through each Master List again by writing down or underlining a key word or words underneath each item on the list itself. Where duplications or similarities occurred, the newly-related item was numbered according to the number of the item to which it was related. About 70 clusters or groupings were thus tentatively derived.

4. The 70 groupings were compared with the terms of the first trial (#2) above to see if any clarification of terms could be obtained. This produced the first refinements as each of the two sets of groupings suggested a tentatively clearer term under which clusters of traits could be combined; in some cases a more inclusive term or a more specific term was derived.

5. Approximately 60 groupings resulted. Then each of the 60 categorical terms that headed the groupings (e.g., responsibility) was changed to a tentative question form (e.g., Does he accept responsibility?).

6. Satisfied that there were now emerging definite possibilities of headings under which the data could be classified, the writer then went through the original data (the office records on which the supervisors had recorded their comments) and accordingly placed before each item on the Master work sheet the appropriate symbol of "B" or "P" (Best or Poorest).

7. Using each question that had been obtained in #5 above, the author then went through the Master List
again by tallying alone. Under "Does he accept responsibility?" a tally mark was made each item that seemed related. The work sheets had this appearance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Does he accept responsibility?&quot;</th>
<th>No (weakest traits)</th>
<th>Yes (strongest traits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same thing was done for the list of "strongest" traits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Does he accept responsibility?&quot;</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. These sheets were then examined to determine how the pattern would develop for the eventual statistical treatment. Trial blocks were set up: e.g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Does he accept responsibility?</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>Yes 6</td>
<td>No 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>15 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combination of steps #7 and #8 resulted in further refining with the number of questions now reduced to about 55.

9. All of these work sheets were laid aside and new copies of the Master Lists of "strongest" and "weakest" traits were procured. Then the author and a colleague made a trial run through the complete Master Lists by repeating the procedure in #3 above—writing a key word or phrase (or underlining) under each item.

10. Author and colleague then examined the categorical terms that they had thus developed (e.g., responsibility) and made a trial run by tallying according to those categorical terms and by suggesting a question-form as they made the tallies.

11. The author, working by himself, took the latest list of categories and framed questions again. The resulting 48 questions were now employed as in #7 by working with the colleague again.

The author and colleague took turns reading (one from list of "weakest" traits, and the other from list of "strongest") items and tallying on question work sheets. Each trait that was not immediately agreed upon as belonging under a particular question was discussed until either a new question was phrased
or an old one re-phrased. If either of those actions did not satisfy, the trait was written down under the question that seemed most related instead of making a tally mark for it.

12. Working independently, the author took the trial sheets that had been used with his colleague and the trial sheets initially created by himself, re-framed the questions, and made another run through the entire list of the descriptions written by supervisors.

13. Then author and colleague worked together again. The author read the lists of traits and asked his colleague to indicate under which of the questions he thought that each trait belonged. Each indication by the colleague was compared with the author's most recent placement (#12). In the less than 10 per cent difference that occurred, they discussed the item involved and made a tentative placement. In this procedure there was again a re-phrasing or creation of questions. These were then checked with another colleague.

14. Working by himself, the author then made a final list of questions—35 in all—and numbered them.* Then the author and a different assistant went through the Master Lists of traits again and placed one of those question numbers above each item in the Master Lists.

15. For final re-checking, a different assistant read to the author each item on the Master Lists of traits and the item was recorded verbatim under the appropriate question.** Along with the item its Master List number and B or P was also recorded (Best or Poorest). This process thus forced re-examination of each item and question.

Manifestly, the placing of the trait items within the framework of particular questions is of paramount importance. Is each item (trait) correctly interpreted in the light of the supervisors' intent and then accurately assigned to an appropriately-couched question? "Appropriately couched" must mean here that the question is sufficiently descriptive to insure no doubt of its

*See pp. 46-47.
**Appendix IV.
MASTER LIST OF QUESTIONS

1. Is he sufficiently animated?
2. Is he responsible?
3. Does he show adequate self-confidence?
4. Does he understand students?
5. Is he emotionally stable?
6. Is he industrious?
7. Is he sincere—genuine?
8. Is he able to explain ideas skillfully?
9. Can he assess situations and react to others quickly?
10. Can he organize his thoughts and express his ideas clearly?
11. Is he imaginative and resourceful?
12. Does he have adequate speaking voice?
13. Is he able to maintain adequate control?
14. Is he able to identify and diagnose learning problems?
15. Does he possess adequate general knowledge?
16. Does he have initiative?
17. Does he have adequate knowledge of his subject matter?
18. Does he get along well with others?
19. Is he effective in leading discussions?
20. Is he mature?
21. Does he organize and plan well?
22. Is he flexible and open to ideas and advice?
23. Is he intelligent?
24. Does he show adequate forcefulness?
25. Does he have a clear-cut notion of what he is trying to do?
26. Does he have a likeable manner?
27. Is he persistent?
28. Is he warm and/or empathetic?
29. Is he other-centered?
30. Is he poised?
31. Are his physical traits satisfactory?
32. Does he exercise good judgment?
33. Is he interested in teaching?
34. Is he able to motivate students?
35. Do students like him?

meaning (even if there may be disagreement about its usefulness) and no distortion in terms of what it embraces.

As already indicated, the writer worked through 15 runs independently and with competent colleagues. Step 15 above resulted, of course, in a complete listing of all items under the questions into which the first classification run put them. That complete listing rather than just the final tallies is offered (Appendix III). Question 1 is given as an example, page 48.

Attention finally is directed to the mood, perhaps mode, that governed the reading and recording of the supervisors' trait-statements. Every effort, throughout all of the runs made, was one of the author's essaying to be as literal as possible. For example, if the supervisor had listed over-intensity as a weakness of a "best" student teacher, the author and/or colleague made judgment that this is an "emotional" item but could not go beyond the literal fact of its emotional framework. Obviously "over-intensity" could lend itself to many assumptions--many interpretations: in one
NO. 1. IS HE SUFFICIENTLY ANIMATED?

**Strongest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B. personality in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>B. enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>B. enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>B. dynamic quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>B. enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>P. enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>P. enthusiasm before class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>P. general enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>B. enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>B. enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>B. eagerness for teaching in all its aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>P. he is an eager beaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>P. he has zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>B. strong personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>B. classroom personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>B. enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weakest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B. reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>B. reticence in self-expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>B. lacks enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>P. lack of enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>B. too quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>B. reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>B. reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>P. introvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>P. lifeless—almost completely devoid of overt response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>B. shyness and lack of sparkle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>B. reserved manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>P. passiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>P. lack of enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>B. pretty quiet fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>P. appears tired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>B. seems to lack humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>B. little shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>B. lack of overt enthusiasm—has a serious countenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>B. slightly timid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>B. shyness with adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>B. seldom contributes (does not communicate well)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

273. B. classroom personality
274. B. personality—classroom manner
311. B. enthusiasm
316. B. enthusiasm
369. P. very uninhibited
379. P. enthusiastic
390. B. vibrant personality
395. B. enthusiasm in teaching
452. P. vivaciousness
455. P. sense of humor
476. B. eager
520. B. dynamic personality
559. P. enthusiasm
571. B. enthusiasm
594. B. contagious enthusiasm
595. B. enthusiasm
616. B. vivacious enthusiastic attitude
312. P. lacks enthusiasm
315. P. weak personality
335. P. rather placid
365. B. needs to appear less serious more often
374. P. lack of enthusiasm
395. P. lack of animation
398. B. timid
405. B. reserved
408. B. reserved
432. B. modest
449. B. timidity
451. B. modest
461. B. timidity
464. P. lacking in enthusiasm
466. B. a little diffident
467. B. might appear diffident
475. B. sense of humor
501. P. lack of enthusiasm before a group
510. P. no fire
521. B. tendency toward shyness
535. P. shyness
536. B. reserve and seriousness
538. P. shy
541. B. initial impression of being reserved
548. B. sometimes a bit too reserved.
instance, perhaps it was caused by a specific student's concern for grades; in another case, perhaps, the supervisor saw nothing else wrong to any degree and noted that the only fault was a tendency for the given student teacher to drive himself too hard. These are proper and important matters for speculation but not for categorizing. The salient and significant fact is that the supervisor indicated that this is a weakest trait of a best student teacher, and that it may be placed in the EMOTIONAL categorical question (#5).

The constant endeavor to be impersonal may be further illustrated by the author's utilization of a supervisor's comment which referred to "over-intensity" in a greater degree of specificity: "over-concern about performance"; this, too, was a "weak-est" trait of a "best" student teacher. This was placed in #5 also. One may wish to argue that some touch of "over-intensity" is a desirable characteristic. This is not moot here, however, because the supervisor has designated the item as a weakness. One may wish further to argue that "over-concern about performance" may be of different degree or kind of emotional involvement when compared with either the more nebulous "over-intensity" or "hot-tempered" both of which were also placed in the EMOTIONALLY STABLE question. One so arguing may extend his argument to say that the author has gone beyond his proclaimed effort to be objective in his acceptance and recording of the supervisors' statements. This possible argument is rejected by the author in that the question of degree (high or low on a stability scale) is not prohibitive in regard to determining relevance to propriety of labeling an item as "emotional."
Similarly, whether an item is a kind that differs from another in its emotional flavor and yet is placed in an admittedly rather wide embrace of a single category is not a tampering with literacy. Only one run-through of the data would have been necessary if the writer had not been concerned with the supervisors' meanings and had simply read into their comments whatever he wished them to mean.

In essence, then, the 15 trials and runs described resulted in the 35 categorical questions and item placements; the content-analysis and classification steps were completed. The second phase of procedure was done.

The third and final phase in the processing of the data was at hand. It involved four steps:

Step 1. Organization of all of the items appearing in each of the 35 groupings in a form that would permit the next step of applying statistical procedure. This was relatively simple, of course, because the design had established four clusters of related traits in each grouping:

a. strongest traits of best student teachers
b. weakest traits of best student teachers
c. strongest traits of poorest student teachers
d. weakest traits of poorest student teachers

As noted earlier, Trial "run" #15, page 45, every statement of a trait had been recorded verbatim under its particular question (grouping). Examination of Question (Grouping) 1, "Is He Sufficiently Animated?" will reveal that "animation" was referred to by supervisors 23 times as the strongest trait of best student teachers, 30 times as the weakest trait of best student teachers, 10 times as the strongest trait of poorest student teachers, and 16 times as the weakest trait of poorest student teachers.

Having completed that counting, it was simple to set up a four-celled table in this fashion.
Question 1. Is He Sufficiently Animated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This step of counting all of the items appearing in each question grouping and then setting up the four-celled work tables was completed and the stage was set for the statistical application.

Step 2. Statistical analysis by chi square was made to determine whatever chance expectancy might be involved in differences yielded by the distributions revealed in the tabulations of traits indicated in the four-celled work tables. Two techniques were considered:

a. \[ x^2 = \frac{\sum (f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t} \]

in which \( f_o \) represents the observed frequency in a single category, \( f_t \) the corresponding theoretical or hypothetical frequency, and in which the \( \sum \) indicates that the terms are to be summed for all categories.\(^1\)

b. \[ x_y^2 = \frac{(ad-bc - \frac{N^2}{2})^2 N}{(a+b)(c+d)(a+c)(b+d)} \]

Chi square for two-by-two contingency table for testing independence with Yates correction for continuity.\(^2\)

Several trials were made with the first formula (a.).

---


Later the writer elected to use the second technique because it proved to be a more precise test for this type of data.

An example follows of the application of the technique to Question 1 (the same question used for the example of the four-celled work table on the preceding page).

Question 1. Is He Sufficiently Animated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. \( ad = 368 \)
2. \( bc = 300 \)
3. \( ad - bc = 68 \)
4. \( \frac{N}{2} = 39.5 \)
5. \( ad - bc - \frac{N}{2} = 68 - 39.5 = 28.5 \)
6. \( (28.5)^2 = 812.25 \)
7. \( N \times 812.25 = 64167.75 \)
8. \( 53 \times 26 \times 33 \times 46 = 2091804 \)
9. \( x^2 = \frac{64167.75}{2091804} \)
10. \( x^2 = 0.0307 \)

In this result \( x^2 = 0.0307 \), the chance expectancy is far too high to regard "Animation" as a discriminatory trait-area.

The application exemplified for Question 1 was then made for each of the rest of the 35 four-celled work tables. The results were formed into a table of rank according to level of percent of significance. As shall be seen in the next chapter dealing with the findings, those questions above 25% level of significance are included with their chi square (0.0307 for
"Animation") but the per cent levels are not indicated because they are insignificant statistically.

Step 3. Tables of frequency were then created according to number of times the traits were mentioned.

a. Rank order according to frequency of mention of all traits

b. Rank order according to frequency of mention of strongest traits of best student teachers

c. Rank order according to frequency of mention of weakest traits of best student teachers

d. Rank order according to frequency of mention of strongest traits of poorest student teachers

e. Rank order according to frequency of mention of weakest traits of poorest student teachers.

Step 4. Description of findings.

Description of findings, of course, marks the end of procedures and the beginning of interpretations and conclusions. The next chapter takes up the results of the procedures just described and offers an analysis of the results as they are presented.
CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS, THEIR NATURE AND MEANING

The nature of the findings yielded by the content-analysis, classification, and statistical treatment is provocative. Table 1 provides the outcomes of the research at a glance. However, before one examines Table 1 and the succeeding tables, it is essential that he keep in mind the context in which the findings developed and the author's plan of presentation.

First, it must be remembered that the purpose of this study is that of identifying traits that discriminate between best and poorest student-teaching performance.

Second, one should understand that a trait which is not discriminatory does not mean that it is unessential or undesirable. As shall be seen, "knowledge of subject-matter," for example, does not discriminate between best and poorest student teachers. Assuredly, "knowledge of subject-matter" may be the difference between success and failure for a particular student teacher; certainly, too, a student teacher or teacher must have knowledge of subject matter. The point is that one cannot employ "knowledge of subject-matter" as a discriminatory item.

Frequency of mention of traits by supervisors is another matter altogether, and the distinction between frequency of mention and the discriminatory power of the same trait must be clear as the reader proceeds.
TABLE 1

RANK ORDER OF QUESTIONS ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Is he imaginative and resourceful?</td>
<td>22.953</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Does he organize and plan well?</td>
<td>19.697</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is he able to explain ideas skillfully?</td>
<td>17.613</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Is he effective in leading discussions?</td>
<td>15.964</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Is he mature?</td>
<td>12.600</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Is he able to identify and diagnose learning problems?</td>
<td>11.954</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Does he understand students?</td>
<td>10.605</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Can he assess situations and react to others quickly?</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Is he able to motivate students?</td>
<td>6.987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Does he have initiative?</td>
<td>6.629</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Does he exercise good judgment?</td>
<td>5.860</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Does he possess adequate general knowledge?</td>
<td>3.616</td>
<td>.06 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Does he have a clear-cut notion of what he is trying to do?</td>
<td>3.576</td>
<td>.06 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is he responsible?</td>
<td>3.489</td>
<td>.07 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Does he maintain adequate control?</td>
<td>2.537</td>
<td>.12 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Is he industrious?</td>
<td>2.191</td>
<td>.14 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does he show adequate self-confidence?</td>
<td>2.145</td>
<td>.15 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>( \chi^2 )</td>
<td>Level of Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Is he other-centered?</td>
<td>1.611</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Are his physical traits satisfactory?</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Does he have adequate knowledge of his subject matter?</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Is he sincere - genuine?</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Is he flexible and open to ideas and advice?</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Can he organize his thoughts and express his ideas clearly?</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Does he get along well with others?</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Does he show adequate forcefulness?</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Is he interested in teaching?</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Is he intelligent?</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Does he have a like-able manner?</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Is he poised?</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Is he persistent?</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is he sufficiently animated?</td>
<td>0.0307</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Does he have adequate speaking voice?</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Is he warm and/or empathetic?</td>
<td>0.0074</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is he emotionally stable?</td>
<td>0.00029</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Do students like him?</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In recognition of the value of what supervisors found as strongest and weakest traits, tables are presented to show the frequency of all items. Although these data are not required by the major purpose of this study, they add dimensions to the implications of the study.

Next, the reader should understand the plan of presentation—including a reminder about terms. Table 1, page 55, presents the sum of the findings: a rank ordering of the 35 questions according to their levels of significance (derived from chi square). Questions, it should be remembered, are the groupings into which all of the supervisors' trait-comments have been classified.

Following Table 1, the writer presents a series of discussions—one for each of the 35 questions. Each of these presentations includes the hitherto-described four-celled block that permitted the statistical test for significance. The block gives a graphic picture of the distribution of the given traits under consideration. An example employing a hypothetical grouping is given here:

**Question: Does He Read Many Good Books?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In that example, the strongest trait of 16 best student teachers was their reading of many books; the weakest trait of 3 best student teachers had to do also with reading of books (meaning they did not read enough books or did not read enough good books).
Continuing the reference to the hypothetical question, it is seen that the strongest trait of 5 poorest student teachers was their reading of books; the weakest trait of 13 poorest student teachers had to do with reading (not enough or not enough good books).

As each discussion and graphic representation of the traits is given, there will be two elements to govern the presentation of the author's interpretations: (1) the author's desire to share what he has acquired as a sense of the meanings of the items from his "living" with them, and (2) the author's intent to be as succinct as possible. The latter possibility is enhanced if the reader remembers the suggestions and cautions of the introductory passages just concluded. Their applicability will therefore not need to be repeated in each of the series of the forthcoming discussions.

Two final details will help in the examination ahead:

1. Question number. This term appears in several tables and refers to the number of the question (grouping of traits under one heading) as it appears in the "Master List of Questions." This numbering is retained because it is as suitable as any for a central reference; each question appears in different order in varying tables and it seemed advisable to keep a permanent number. In this chapter the series of discussions treats the questions in order of their discriminatory powers, but each is identified also with its Master List number. The term discriminatory, possibly discriminatory, or not discriminatory is used to identify the given grouping according to the results of the study described in Table 1.

2. (est.) This abbreviation for estimated appears in Table 1. It applies to the estimated placement of a question whose chi-square result lay between two Percentile Values indicated in the chi-square Distribution Table. For example, the Distribution Table shows that for one degree of freedom (applicable to the four-celled structure in this study), a
chi-square of 3.8 would be at the .05 level. The next lower level of significance in the table is the .10 level and would apply to a chi-square of 2.7 (one degree of freedom involved). Thus a chi-square of 3.6 (one degree of freedom) would fall on a line between 2.7 and 3.8 and between .10 level of significance and .05. The writer would therefore place 3.6 at about the 6% to 7% level.

Where (est.) has appeared, it does not mean that a wild guess has been taken.

Traits that Discriminate

Chief of all the traits that mark the difference between best and poorest student teachers are those grouped as imagination and resourcefulness. Table 1 reveals that it headed the list of the six groups of traits that were significant at a level of less than 1 per cent: Organization and planning, explaining, effective leading, maturity, and ability to identify and diagnose learning problems. The next five (significant at the 1 per cent level), were understanding of students, ability to assess quickly, initiative, and exercise of good judgment.

These 11 groups (hereinafter referred to as questions) are equally significant for all practical purposes. They may be regarded as truly discriminatory insofar as the results of this study are concerned. Chance does not account for them.

The next seven questions represent a "gray" zone, so to speak. They range from 6 per cent level of significance to 15 per cent with one question following at 25. One may view them as significant but with the caution that chance may account for the difference in from 6 to 15 cases out of 100, and in the one instance, 25 out of 100.
The remaining 17 of the 35 questions are demonstrably not discriminatory.

In recapitulation, as the reader proceeds to examine Table 1, he will note that the first 11 (numbers 1 to 11 inclusive) questions are the discriminatory ones—and as such represent the major findings of the study; those numbered in rank from 12 to 18 inclusive are regarded as possibly discriminatory (in the terms designated earlier); the remainder—those numbered 19 to 35 inclusive are not discriminatory. For them, no level of significance is given, for they are beyond .25.

The questions, now to be treated individually, are taken up in their order of per cent-level of significance. They retain their established question numbers.

**Question 11: Is He Imaginative and Resourceful?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order of significance: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi square: 22.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance: .001 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This grouping suggests a picture of a student teacher who is able to meet problems by responding with devices of his own. He likely senses the drama of which he is a part, recognizing unanticipated events as challenges rather than obstacles. The desire to experiment appears to be in his make-up, for he tries self-developed techniques and approaches in his teaching. Imaginative use of available resources and creation of new resources accompany his ability
to perceive a wide variety of organizations of learning experiences for the pupils.

As a personal quality, "imagination" extends beyond classroom operations. Whether or not a college program can educate a person to be imaginative and resourceful is an academic question; the significant question is one of how powers of imagination and resourcefulness that may be latent in reasonably selected individuals can be released.

Imagination and resourcefulness are not simple technical skills that one may acquire through training. The problem in teacher-education lies in providing ways in which prospective teachers can develop self-concepts and respect what they perceive in themselves. The turning loose of an individual's powers is preceded by honoring himself; it may be followed by learning ways to improve his use of them.

Thus the enabling of prospective teachers to find themselves and the provision of opportunities to "try themselves out" in pre-service situations is suggested. This does not mean that the future teacher has to see himself as a teacher first. That comes, but he has to come to grips with himself as a person first. The special implication for teacher-education is the releasing and nurturing the potential powers of the individual and then helping him employ them in sound ways for teaching purposes. There is no question that imaginative and creative teachers are needed. There is no question that teacher-preparation institutions have a responsibility.
Question 21: Does He Organize and Plan Well?

Rank order of significance: 2  
Chi square: 19.697  
Significance: .001 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organization and planning apply to classroom operations and to total self-management. Representative of the skills and behaviors involved are such items as budgeting of time, attention to routine and details, provision of materials, and preparations for carrying out plans.

Organization and planning are affected by attitudes; the clearer and dearer the purpose, the greater the drive to do what is necessary to accomplish it. This does not mean that skill in organization and planning is an automatic accompaniment of clear purpose. Skill in this area is basically one to be learned, and prospective teachers can learn it.

Efforts are made, of course, in teacher-education programs to help the prospective teachers develop planning and organizational skills—particularly in methods courses where the focus is upon specific teaching problems. Self-management is one of the outcomes sought in college education generally and is regarded as a sign of maturity.

The results that show 35 student teachers had their weakest traits in planning and organization certainly point to need for attention. There is no question about the teacher-education institution's having a responsibility, it is a question of what kind.
One element of that responsibility is that of digging into the causal factors; what makes persons plan well—what gets in the way. What are the minimum skills that can be used as cut-off points in decisions to give or deny candidates advancement in their professional program.

Question 8: Is He Able To Explain Ideas Skillfully?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to imagine a more crucial skill in classroom operations than are embodied in "explaining ideas." In this study, "skillful presentation," "presents material well," "ability to take over class in a truly professional way," "ability to put it across," were among the comments given as strongest traits. "Inability to focus," "sometimes a bit didactic," and "academic rather than practical in his approach" were among the weakest traits.

Obviously the explaining of ideas suggests possession of them, and seeing the teacher's relations between his and those of his pupils. Further, "explanation" points to methods by which ideas are defined or clarified. In essence, however, the process of explaining appears to be a technical skill. This does not mean that the process is a simple one but it does mean educative procedures can affect it and that prospective teachers can acquire the skill. How to establish precise signs of minimal competence by which to
judge the ability of teachers to "explain" is difficult. It is not
difficult, however, to gather evidence about candidates' ability
nor to provide ways of improvement. Laboratory-type situations are
called for within the teacher-education program. The teacher-in-
training must have opportunities to test his communication efforts
and to receive analysis.

Question 19: Does He Possess Leadership Quality or Skill?

| Rank order of significance: 4 |
| Chi square: 15.964 |
| Significance: .001 level |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership is manifested in many ways. The student teacher
may be effective in evoking discussion by pupils. He also pulls
others along by an ineffable dynamic quality; somehow he is given
the role of director of the enterprise by those with whom he works.
There is no question that, as viewed by the supervisors, student
teachers labeled as possessing strong traits of leadership are so
viewed in a variety of actions—from leading discussion effectively
to ability to lead people (in a general sense).

Implications for teacher-education institutions are ramified.
To set up highly refined statements of leadership as a general
quality and to try to use them as criteria to eliminate candidates
early in the teacher-education program would be a mistake. This
trait-area re-affirms the necessity for early laboratory operations
wherein the prospective teacher can work with pupils. There, the
trainee should be watched by insightful observers who can note leadership qualities or skills pertinent to him. Some people are able to lead others in so modest a temper that superficial witnesses are misled into thinking that there is no quality or skill present; other people lead in a personal manner which is more overt. The point is that much individualized flavor enters and that it is essential to identify it in context of operations with pupils. This can be done within teacher-education programs. Also, prospective teachers can learn techniques for the particular role of leading discussions effectively.

Question 20: Is He Mature?

Rank order of significance: 5
Chi square: 12.600
Significance: .001 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of the comments points to impossibility of student teachers' being regarded as both "poorest" and mature. In addition to frequent use of the term mature (and immature), supervisors pointed to "adolescent attitude," "random actions stemming from exuberance," and "immaturity in perception and social behavior" as weakest traits; "mature judgment" and "maturity in relationships with people" were included in strongest traits.

The meaning of mature applied to student teachers is affected by the assumptions held about student teaching. To the degree that teacher-educators regard student teaching as a "final test," their
dimensions of maturity will have proportionately sharper cutting edges. Student teachers will be compared with concepts about teacher who have matured. If student teaching is regarded as "testing" of learning–to–date with opportunity for learning more, the teacher–educators will be thinking in terms of a stage of development along a path leading to maturity.

The problem of determining a point along that path that student teachers should reach is not easily solved. The complexity is illustrated in the varying meanings connoted in the employment of the word: when it is said that someone is maturing, it often means that he is growing; when discussing an artist or a vegetable (1), to have one remark that he or it is mature, a sense of finality is associated—often meaning that the peak of growth is reached and that the subject has arrived at the fullest flowering that its organization intended.

These brief illustrations of language are important because of their implications in the education of teachers. Rigorous self-examination by those who must make judgments about prospective teachers is called for. They must ask: "Do we use maturity in judging candidates as though the candidates have reached the end of their growth? What concepts of maturity do we hold and what concepts about the function of the college program?

The writer's judgment is that professional schools are not struggling enough with the concepts of maturity and the attendant responsibilities involved insofar as their professional candidates are concerned. Another illustration may bring the point home. On occasion, an advisor of a teacher–candidate in whom he sees signs
of promise will combat rules, regulations, and protests of immaturity by colleagues in order to allow the candidate to reach the stage of freedom to operate (graduation, certification, etc.). The advisor has developed sensitivity to the meaning of mature at this time and to signs of maturing in terms of the given individual.

The point is that much more attention must be given to ways of cutting through often misleading behaviors of prospective teachers. The "silly, happy-go-lucky" youngster may be so full in his appreciation of richness of life that he goes about singing and bubbling over overtly. It may be that he does so at times when others are solemn and think that he should be solemn too. It may be also that the same youngster has creative energies, abilities, and seriousness of purpose. It is not unusual that such a youngster develops into a good teacher if someone has taken the time to perceive the more subtle signs of potential and has given that youngster time in which the potential can mature. It should be noted that the same youngster does need to learn respect for the perceptions of others (rules and regulations, appropriateness of solemnity, etc.). But the problem is one of not stifling the potential while increasing the development in other directions. The lesson for teacher-education institutions is one of learning to identify the potential of the prospective teachers. This is directly related to the concept of maturity held by those attempting to make the identifications.

The easy way out of this problem is to set up criteria for admission to teacher-education that pre-suppose maturity of the candidate. This is not satisfactory to the writer. Too many po-
tentially worthy and contributing members of the profession will be lost.

The writer has tried to indicate what the responsibility of the teacher-education institution is with regard to maturity. This is a step beyond the question of whether maturity lends itself to educative processes. That is self-evident if the question has now become one of determining the kind of educative processes that are needed.

Question 14: Is He Able to Identify and Diagnose Learning Problems?

Rank order of significance: 6
Chi square: 11.954
Significance: .001 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is another key-note technical skill that includes as strongest traits "ability to develop and use materials appropriate to different groups," "insight," "keen observer," and as weakest traits, "individual provisions," "lack of understanding in planning learning experiences," and "difficulty in analyzing weakness in individual students."

Obviously attitudes are coupled with the technical skill. The student teacher who identifies obstacles to learning wants to locate them. Some teachers can identify and diagnose learning problems with particular groups (slow learners, for example) because they want to work with those groups. The cause of the attitude will range from one's wanting to work with given groups because of a feel-
ing of mission, to discovery that one is better equipped to deal with a particular group.

The important question here is what kind of education will help the prospective teacher acquire the skill of identifying and diagnosing learning problems. One way to make secondary-school candidates sensitive is to expose them to youngsters of elementary-school level. They will rather quickly discover that teachers cannot assume the higher-order abstractions which secondary-school teachers readily employ in their language. They will be reminded of the symptoms of physical as well as psychological distresses that interfere with learning.

Another implication for the training program is that there should be increased co-operative teaching among psychologists and methods staff within a laboratory setting. Prospective teachers should see the effects of learning processes while acquiring theory and knowledge about them. This kind of setting under leadership of combinations of disciplines should include opportunity for the prospective teacher to test his attitudes and technical development. With the aid of guidance personnel, he can get some understanding of the nature and depth of his wanting to teach.

In addition to those implications for the college program, there is a research function suggested by the distribution of the supervisors' comments. Thirty of the best student teachers were indicated as having their strongest trait in this identification and diagnostic skill. How did they develop it? What factors contributed? It would not be difficult for staff members to get a modest sampling of their student teachers and begin investigation
of causal factors. The clues obtained would prove valuable without having to organize a major research involving hundreds of students and huge expenses in time and money.

Question 4: Does He Understand Students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order of significance: 7</th>
<th>Chi square: 10.605</th>
<th>Significance: .01 level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>Strongest Traits</td>
<td>Weakest Traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience with adolescents is a frequent reference point when it is observed that someone doesn't "understand kids." The lack of such experience is often a causal factor in the student-teacher's failure to understand his pupils; however, there is evidence that shows that some teachers who have had varying kinds of involvements with youngsters still do not understand them. Contrariwise, there are pre-service teachers who have had little contact with high school youths and yet intuitively perceive their nature.

The relation of the teacher-education program to the knowledge of adolescents that prospective teachers need is the point to be settled. Student teachers fail to translate their information about youth into action insights. Then when the neophyte teacher acquires knowledge that adolescents are often disturbed about their appearance or that they frequently are wondering about God, he does not see that this information applies to the gangly, pimple-faced boy who isn't responding to the lesson about paragraphing; or, a
teacher takes the same information and becomes so deeply sensitive to the growth problems of the young that he doesn't employ his information about the need of youngsters to have reasonable work tasks and boundaries in which to operate. In the latter case, the teacher becomes a sympathetic but ineffectual director of learning.

These brief illustrations of the complexity inherent in teaching teachers to understand others point to several undertakings in the training program. Early in the professional curriculum, there should be opportunity for involvement in actual teaching problems. One experiment that might very well be made is that of giving freshmen or sophomores the chance to serve as assistants to student teachers who are already engaging in conduct of classes. The younger college student will find it easier to communicate with his fellow college student than with professors or the critic teacher in terms of raising the "foolish" question—the question that reveals his own ignorance. Given a chance to play a small role (e.g., giving the assignment to one of the committees that the student teacher has organized), the freshman can get analysis from the student teacher without fear that a grade is involved. Most important, the younger member will have early experiences which will enable him to hear when the experts speak to him about the patience a teacher needs, or the ways in which adolescents bounce from literal acceptance of an idea to a deep feeling of idealism which causes them to challenge "reality."

The essence of this discussion is the emphasis that observation isn't enough. The prospective teacher needs more than the watching of an advanced peer struggle with problems; he needs to
participate so that his own threshold of knowledge and attitudes is involved. To spend several hours in an after-school session with pupils who didn't understand an explanation given in class is more conducive to insight for the young would-be teacher than is a statement by his youthful colleague that "after you left the ninth-grade history class, I had to spend two hours after school explaining the lesson again." And even that kind of statement in a context of some mutual work with the ninth-grade class is more insight-producing than a precept from a lecture or a book which indicates that teachers will often have to spend hours going over explanations or definitions for re-enforcement in the learning process. If such precepts come after, or at least concurrent with, the kind of experience suggested, they will have meaning. The precepts can be of enormous value in helping the prospective teacher intellectualize his experience and form principles of operation for himself.

**Question 9: Can He Assess Situations and React to Others Quickly?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order of significance: 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi square: 9.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance: .01 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peering into the scene of teachers or prospective teachers in action, one wonders how many of the better ones would be even much better if they possessed the attribute indicated here. The distinction between fair and average, between average and good,
between good and very good, and between very good and outstanding—whatever the realm of action—often seems to be dependent on some kind of ignition. Chronicles are replete with reference to "stepping into the breach," and "jumping to the rescue"; this is part of the kind of quality that is depicted here—namely, the almost osmotic, unvolitional embracing of a congeries of factors and automatic responding to them. The co-operating teacher must leave her charges and the student teacher steps in; a pupil responds to a question (by grimace, words, bodily movement) and the teacher includes with his own reaction a sense of the student's nature, what happened to him yesterday, and the nature of the rest of the class along with the topic under consideration.

The image intimated goes beyond the data admittedly. It is also deliberate. The writer would try to suggest thereby the deep feeling of significance and complexity that this area of performance provokes. It is his earnest judgment that much more can be done within teacher-education programs to nurture the quality inherent (however crudely depicted) in the area under consideration. Is it simply a marshaling of talents and knowledge in an equation of speed? Can one be taught to harness his resources quickly? Is this primarily a matter of selection of teaching candidates? Is science offering means of assistance in diagnosis? Reactions are tested in driver-education: the relation between seeing a need to stop and the application of brakes has been well tested and described. Are there both lessons and similar applications for techniques and program in the preparation of teachers? The writer hopes that the quality of quick reacting is not confined to grant at birth
Motivation of pupils involves a hook-up of the teacher's purposes and abilities with those of his charges. Stripped of finery, the basic ingredient in motivation is that of getting youngsters to value what they are asked or required to do. Succinct description of the essence of motivation will not make it less complex for teacher-education institutions to deal with. What do they need to do in order to develop future teachers' skill in motivating their subsequent pupils?

One of the first steps is getting the prospective teachers to understand their own motives. This is no mere play on words. Attention rightfully given in the preparation curriculum to what the teacher can do to inspire, interest, and provoke youngsters must be continued. There is notable lack, however, of realization that the teacher's motivation is an integral element in the enterprise. This is not to be construed to mean that "contagious enthusiasm" is the kernel—although this is an admirable symptom of what is involved. An illustration will help.

Teachers—new and old—are often in a quandry when the carefully-designed "kick-off" point in the lesson fails to stir up eager response, excitement. The result may be simply passive quietness or some overt "discipline" problem. The teacher engages in
some action to handle the "discipline" problem. What he does at this point may be analyzed in terms of technical criteria, but, important as this kind of analysis is, there is a greater need for analysis of what caused him to get to the stage of a discipline problem. The cause is not simply how he started the class, what words, what pictures, what definitions; these are decidedly significant and must be assessed. But the deeper cause to be plumbed is what was moving the teacher. Was he eager to display his prowess as a reader of poems and therefore used a favorite of his? The self-display performance motive is neither legitimate nor sound. Moving on the point of the "discipline" problem. Did some pupils talk while the teacher was reading the poem? Is there any question that this is undesirable behavior? Whatever the teacher does at this point, he must understand that his own perception, his own values, determine the naming of the behavior a discipline problem as much as the character of the behavior itself. It is possible that the particular students were sharing comments that were complimentary about the poem or the delivery. The many other possibilities cannot be discussed here. The major point is that the teacher will react in some way and he should understand what it is that prompts him to act. Is his action a consequence of feeling insulted because he was reading or is it a consequence of wanting his youngsters to be polite to any human beings? These are vastly different motives. In either of these cases, what he does may be wrong at the moment. But the identification of what went wrong in the process of handling the situation is not difficult to find out.
The point in this extended illustration is that teachers cannot wait for the specific moment of classroom action to have their own motives clarified and to recognize how related they are to those of the youngsters. The teacher-education program must conceive ways to further the self-insight depicted here. Science has much to offer in this respect. In addition to attitude and personality tests—the results of which must be discussed with the prospective teacher—the use of perception laboratories is called for.

The teacher in the example should use his reading ability but not to have an audience applaud him; he should use it to further something on the part of the pupils.

Question 16: Does He Have Initiative?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order of significance: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi square: 6.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance: .01 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Student Teachers | Strongest Traits | Weakest Traits |
|------------------|------------------|
| Best             | 7                |
| Poorest          | 2                |

This appears to be a kind of quality (initiative) that is notably absent in the poorest student teachers rather than notably present in the best ones. This is not a reliable assumption, but it is a valid one in that more supervisors said so about more "poorest" candidates than they did as strengths of "best" ones.

To many this quality may seem to be as innate as genes, but when one espies a student teacher whom he can describe as having initiative and then raises a question about how he "got that way," interesting conjectures are provoked. For example, the observer sees
a student teacher whom he describes no more discretely than to say he is a "self-starter." The observer then remembers that this is a young man who worked his way through college constantly forced by circumstances or parents to be a "self-starter." Sometimes parents have fostered initiative in their young through default—neglect; others have nurtured by example, wherein the temper of living in the home was such that "self-starting" becomes as natural to the young as the family customs in eating.

The quality of initiative is more than willingness to work, of course, although there is relationship. The vernacular "self-starter" term is highly appropriate. The student teacher who is without it and who is weak, may perform adequately in many counts, but so dissipates the energies of others by demanding their leadership that he lowers the productivity of all.

Whether initiative can be acquired through educative processes within a teacher-education curriculum is uncertain in the thinking of the writer. It may be a matter of selection rather than training. A perplexing problem yet remains, however, even if selection is the key process: how to identify it in pre-teaching phases of the teacher-education program. It is not difficult to note it in student-teaching operations if the observer spends a reasonable amount of time.

**Question 32: Does He Exercise Good Judgment?**

 Rank order of significance: 11  
Chi square: 5.860  
Significance: .01 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good judgment is revealed in a variety of ways. A student teacher who has it is able to distinguish between major and minor values; he does not act impulsively although he may act quickly. One who is weak in this factor may approve or accept behaviors and ideas indiscriminately.

It is not particularly difficult to determine whether good judgment is being exercised while classroom performance (or other operations) is going on. The complicating factor is the determination of suitability of given values upon which the judgment is based. For example, one may point out to a student teacher that good judgment was not employed in terms of the student-teacher's own values. Whether those were values in themselves suitable is another matter. This raises anew the old problem for teacher-education—in fact, a dual problem: what values can or should be requisite of its charges before they are granted professional degrees, and how does the teacher-education program see to it that the values are learned?

Despite the complexity in that query, the writer points out that selection of candidates for teaching programs is not the answer. Assessment would have to be made at the time of entrance into the program without the opportunity to test and develop judgment that could be provided within the curriculum. Therein lies the key—the establishment of judgmental opportunities. Prospective teachers should be involved in decision-making in their college classes, and in laboratories where they work with younger pupils. In both situations they must have careful analyses made about their values and judgments. College students must have close relationship with counselor-advisors who can talk about and push the students' de-
decisions in his personal problems up against other values. Judgmental opportunities are the key and careful guides and analyzers are the persons to turn it.

There is always a realistic feeling that the approach indicated here would be costly in time and money. This is no place to discuss all of the implications of that argument, but it should be pointed out that extraordinary amounts of time and money are being wasted insofar as teacher-education is concerned when candidates drop out, leave the profession, or fail in it. Furthermore, the establishment of certain physical facilities like one-way-glass rooms for observation would allow for viewing of groups of students in judgment-making operations. Group counseling offers promise that has not been much employed in teacher-education curricula. Science in terms of techniques for dealing with groups and in provision of facilities seems to offer avenues for getting at the individual's judgment through group media to a point where an individual advisor can take over.

The discussions just concluded have presented the 11 questions in which the differences between behaviors associated with best and poorest student teachers were not a result of chance.

The next seven questions are in the "gray zone" of discriminatory power. In the terms suggested earlier, the first 11 questions are discriminatory; the forthcoming "gray-zone" questions might be termed possibly discriminatory. They are in a range of per cent level of significance from .06 (est.) to .15 (est.) with one grouping at .25.
Again, it should be remembered that it is discriminatory power that is sought in this investigation. The "gray zone" involves trait-areas which in this study have proved to be less marked, because of chance expectancy, in their power to be regarded as discriminatory. The first of them is here presented.

Question 15: Does He Possess Adequate General Knowledge?

Rank order of significance: 12
Chi square: 3.616
Significance: .06 (est.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General knowledge incorporates scholarship not specifically identified as strength in the student-teacher's subject-matter field, general knowledge about society, and general experience not otherwise specified (lack of general experience, for example, that revealed one to be overly naive, might well be included).

It is interesting to note that weaknesses of best student teachers and strength of poorest student teachers were comparable in number. A potential implication that better student-teachers can be developed from those that are already good seems worthy of consideration. Clearly, it is within the realm of teacher-education institutions to promote development in this area. Expansion of

*It should be remembered that estimated refers to where the chi-square figure (3.616 in this case) falls on a line between standard points on chi-square tables .05, .10, .25, etc.
elective opportunities coupled with help by an advisor who knows the student well would be a positive step.

It is about time, too, that the question of majors and minors is explored thoroughly. Is there need for undergraduates to have one or two majors, or a major and several minors? Why not experiment with having teacher-education candidates take one major field. They could expand their knowledge in it and at the same time increase their opportunities to get significant taste in a wider variety of areas. Perhaps the addition of a minor field could be requisite for the Master's Degree.

Bold and imaginative thinking is called for and it should be accompanied by experiments in teacher-education curricula. There is, in the writer's judgment, too much talk presently about adding a fifth year to the undergraduate sequence when the possibilities within the four-year program have not been exploited.

Question 25: Does He Have a Clear-cut Notion of What He Is Trying To Do?

Rank order of significance: 13  
Chi square: 3.489  
Significance: .07 (est.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristic items included here are "sound philosophy of education," "maintains directions in activities," "extraordinary ability to keep sight of purpose," "confusion about function of a high school program," "inability to conduct class toward objectives."
The distribution indicates a preponderance of weakest traits of poorest student teachers insofar as this area of purpose is concerned.

To enable prospective teachers to develop "clear-cut notions of what they are trying to do," involves an invasion of two areas: concept of self and concept of school in society. Both of these elements of purpose lend themselves to educative processes although much yet needs to be done.

There is little question that this is a highly critical quality for a teacher to possess. He will be unable to withstand obstacles unless he is clear about where he is going and why. The understanding of self becomes increasingly significant for student teachers, for the practice period often represents the first genuine trial of his ideas, ideals, and abilities.

Question 2: Is He Responsible?

Rank order of significance: 14  
Chi square: 3.489  
Significance: .07 (est.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that many of the poorer student teachers possessed a sense of responsibility as a strong trait; it is also noteworthy that the lack of responsibility was a frequently mentioned weakest trait of the poorer group.

Responsibility as used here includes such qualities as are witnessed in one who puts duty above immediate appeal, who fulfills
professional obligations, and who "does not seek the easy way out."
The opposite is one who is superficial and casual; he may be forgetful or simply careless.

This is a significant item although not as discriminatory in terms of level of significance as the earlier treated groups. The aforementioned finding of responsibility as both strength and weakness of poor student teachers attests the need for sharper analysis before the student enters the student-teacher phase of his program.

That teacher-education programs can develop a sense of responsibility in its enrollees is a reasonable assumption. The writer recognizes that pre-entrance time into the college or university can afford evidence that could make responsibility a selective factor; however, the writer would rather think in terms of screening at some point within the program (advanced level in teacher-training, for example) after training opportunities and efforts have been made. A not-unrelated point is that prospective teachers must be apprised early of their being expected to demonstrate a sense of responsibility—and they must be granted opportunity and help to develop accordingly.

Question 13: Is He Able To Maintain Adequate Control?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order of significance: 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi square: 2.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance: .12 (est.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This area of performance, quite significant for practical purposes, is not as difficult to define as it is to create opportunities to test it. The writer here refers to the need for student teachers to have sufficient depth and continuity in their taking charge of classes to permit them to work "in and out of jams," so to speak. Control of a class is one of the areas about which student teachers are particularly concerned and it is one about which the writer has had many conferences with teachers during their first full year of employment. The writer has alluded to the fact that student teaching is a part of the teacher-education program and not simply a final test; furthermore, the student-teaching period is viewed positively—that it should be a successful experience together with its being a learning period. Consequently a delicate balance must be achieved between establishing a thoroughly challenging student-teaching experience and designing it so that it will not be destructive.

It is always a temptation to make absolute statements about the cruciality of particular elements of teaching; notwithstanding this self-observed caution, the writer would suggest that there is no other area of student-teaching performance that is more perplexing and critical. The implications for teacher-educators and program are many. One may suggest that highly refined and rigorous selective practices will enable the university faculty to have more confidence that candidates will have ability to handle control problems. Faculty-group judgments about the maturity and experience of the candidate will rather readily disclose the potential ability to keep control. This does not altogether satisfy the writer, how-
ever, because he believes that more can be done to help future teachers develop the ability. To this end, he would suggest increased opportunity for prospective teachers to work with pupils. In essence, more laboratory experience (early student teaching, if you will) in the undergraduate program which must include observation and analysis of the candidate by competent staff. If, during the sophomore year, for example, a prospective teacher has had a chance to take charge of high-school classes, and if he has analyses and conferences with a competent person, he will then be guided (and have time) to work upon ways of developing more firmness or varied techniques or manner of deportment.

The writer has spent time on this. Although "control" is not one of the 11 discriminatory trait-areas, it is significant in its relation to a weakness in the student-teaching period itself and because it points to needs in the teacher-education program totally. Colleges would do well to examine most rigorously the question of whether or not the student-teaching experience is too protective. Certainly, too, follow-up of first-year membership on a high-school staff would be especially helpful in the area of ability to control classes.

Question 6: Is He Industrious?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank order of significance: 16
Chi square: 2.191
Significance: .14 (est.)
Here again is seen an action and attitudinal kind of area. Willingness to work and actual productivity are involved. Two immediate notes are apparent: (1) none of the best student teachers lacked industriousness, and (2) many of the poor student teachers possessed industriousness as a strongest trait.

The second of those notes raises an interesting question. Do weak student teachers get as far as the student-teaching period because of their willingness to work with result that it is "hard to turn one down who tries very hard"? Or, does it mean that sheer force of industriousness enables a candidate to succeed in most of the demands that college makes before student teaching and that these demands are completely unrelated to the demands of face-to-face relations with pupils?

Additionally, there is a pointed query for supervisors and others who make both observations and reports. Do they use industriousness as an item when at a loss to find anything else of note? This is not to suggest that industriousness is not present when they say that it is; nor is the writer implying that industriousness is not a highly essential element of the prospective teacher's make-up. Quite the contrary. The writer would suggest that the difference between a simply adequate teacher and a very good one is often the fact that the latter works hard. The point here is that educators—particularly supervisors and co-operating teachers in this context—must re-examine their observational and reporting techniques. They might well ask if they are "damning with faint praise," or "praising with faint damning" when they employ the term. What perception, and do the supervisors recognize
it, do the supervisors have? This is a significant question to which they might address themselves.

It would be amiss to end the discussion of this area without calling attention to the fact that industriousness is high on the list of items most frequently mentioned (see Table 2). Notwithstanding the questions that have been posed for supervisors, the fact is that educators look for industriousness and find it in teaching candidates. Prospective teachers should be made aware of this fact and they should be aided in developing the quality. There is no doubt that habits and attitudes of industry can be cultivated.

**Question 3: Does He Show Adequate Self-Confidence?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order of significance: 17</th>
<th>Chi square: 2.145</th>
<th>Significance: .15 (est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongest Traits</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weakest Traits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first characteristic of the grouping that strikes is the fact that both good and poor student teachers had confidence marked as an area of weakness. Remembering that there are skilled and understanding observers involved, one must accept the view that confidence is here regarded in terms of appropriateness to student teachers. In some instances, it is seen that good student teachers do not turn loose their own resourcefulness—don't trust themselves enough. Insecurity, of course, may stem from either accurate or inaccurate perceptions of one's not knowing enough.
These results have meaning for teacher-education programs. Much can be done. Confidence is usually born out of successful experiences; the facing and mastering of problems surely can be provided for in the training of the prospective teacher. As a part of the development, the subtle sense of optimism seems integral. Granted that there are confident teachers who may be of somewhat pessimistic temper, the writer wonders whether or not there might not be additional gain if the optimistic outlook were to be nurtured. Demonstrations in perception laboratories patently disclose that people see what they want to see. The writer would suggest that enabling student teachers to see that the problems they face are exciting challenges would help many to enjoy the profession and to stay in it. Without delving into the meaning of reality here, the writer would point out that being optimistic is not synonymous with unrealistic. There is no need to explore this note further, for the major point already alluded to is that of necessity for the teacher-education institutions to breed confidence by giving opportunity to candidates to solve problems and to teach them how to solve them. The related item of optimism could be nurtured too. One small way of assisting in the latter would be for the college instructional staff to reflect in its own demeanor both seriousness of purpose and positive manner in its apprehension of it as applied to worthiness and significance of teaching.
Question 29: Is He Other-centered?

Rank order of significance: 18
Chi square: 2.611
Significance: .25 (est.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One will readily note that weaknesses in this area were frequently designated. This grouping includes the opposites of other-centered behavior such as ego-centeredness and over-confidence. On the positive side, friendliness and "out-going" were prevalent.

Not only is this grouping within the "gray zone" of significance, as already indicated, but it seems inherently muddy as a categorical grouping. There is no question this quality is worthy of attention in teacher-education programs and in research. The point is that even if the statistical analysis suggested a clear-cut discriminatory power, much digging would still be needed to determine the possibility of employing "other-centeredness" as a criterion for prospective teachers. Further investigation is needed about whether all teachers within our culture should be "other-centered."

This is not a contradiction of the writer's findings. He calls attention to need for giving attention to this quality and then suggests understanding of it is not clearly established. What is being essayed here is a description of a caution both for himself and for others who feel strongly that other-centeredness is highly important. The findings in this study have merit in that weakness caused supervisors to call attention to other-centeredness.
It is not unworthy to speculate, too, that there is a possibility that prospective teachers may not necessarily be out-going, but they should not be "ego-centered" or "self-centered." Harold Reed makes a suggestion in the Journal of Experimental Education that is pertinent. In the study, "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Teaching Effectiveness and the Teacher's Attitude of Acceptance," he states:

A relationship beyond chance expectancy was to exist between the teacher's effectiveness in the classroom as evaluated by the students and that aspect of the teacher's personality, organization or attitude which permits him to be an accepting person.  

Although Reed is talking about teachers (not student teachers), his findings have bearing upon what needs to be examined. Should educators be more or less concerned about the signs of tendency to be ego-centered in the student-teacher level than later? If student teachers are ego-centered, will this become more fixed with consequence that they will be increasingly less accepting later? The point, again, is that further research is needed, but that teacher-education institutions should give the area of "other-centeredness" attention now. The means of giving attention are related to the earlier-described need for more laboratory operations in which the prospective teacher's personality and attitudes can be displayed and witnessed.

Not Discriminatory

This marks the beginning of the section of the groups of traits (Rank Items Numbers 19 to 35 inclusive in Table 1) which

121: (1953), p. 324.
could not be regarded as beyond chance expectancy. In the terminology suggested at the beginning of this chapter, they are designated as not discriminatory.

Although listed in the rank order in which they appeared in Table 1, the non-discriminatory groups of traits are all beyond the .25 level of significance and their ranking has no particular meaning. The first of the non-discriminatory groupings, Question 31, is presented here.

**Question 31: Are His Physical Traits Satisfactory?**

| Rank order of significance: 19 |
| Chi square: 0.970 |
| Significance: beyond .25 level |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongest traits included "appearance" and "attractiveness"; weakest traits included "appearance," "over-weight," "speech defect," and "effeminate characteristics."

Physical traits were called to attention with regard to poorest student teachers much more than they were in relation to best student teachers, particularly as strongest traits. The speculation is made that some of the poorer student teachers had little else to offer other than pleasing appearance; specific physical deficiencies like size and defective hearing appear to be causal factors in poor performance.

Generally, prohibitive physical traits can be well determined in advance of student teaching. There will continue to be
specific cases in which a prospective teacher with a pronounced physical handicap will be given a chance to perform. The writer (doubtless the reader) knows of partially-crippled prospective teachers for whom the odds for success did not appear favorable and yet whose other characteristics and record suggested worthiness of trial. In some instances the trial was successful and in others not.

The question of physical fitness is related to the area of physical traits—although in this study the physical traits referred primarily to obvious items. Anent physical fitness (which is inevitably allied with mental and emotional fitness) much investigation is needed. The strains of teaching are many, and conscientious teachers suffer extra stress because of their sensitivity to the many problems to be solved; teachers who are less conscientious or less prepared may likewise become worse in their frantic dissipation of energies to "keep up with the class." A sub-committee of the Advisory Educational Group of the Metropolitan's (Metropolitan Insurance Company) School Health Bureau makes this comment:

The subcommittee is of the opinion that further research is required to establish health criteria for entry into the teaching profession . . . (It is indicated) that those responsible for the selection of teachers are placing emphasis on academic achievement and intellectual ability. They have not fully appreciated the importance of physical fitness and mental and emotional health.2

Next in the considerations of the non-discriminatory items is the quality most frequently mentioned by supervisors.

**Question 17:** Does He Have Adequate Knowledge of His Subject Matter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although one cannot employ "knowledge of subject matter" as a peep-hole through which to view student teachers to distinguish the better from the poorer, it is obviously an essential. A non-discriminatory area may be at least as essential as a discriminatory one.

What lesson is to be derived from the distribution of the supervisors' comments about subject matter? One encouraging possibility is that teacher-education institutions are doing a reasonably satisfactory job of preparing its teachers academically as compared with other elements (resourcefulness, emotional health, etc.). However, the note that some of the better student teachers were inadequate in subject matter suggests additional examination of the meaning and nature of subject matter with which prospective teachers should be provided.

There is no doubt that this is a matter clearly within the province of the teacher-education program. Closer attention to how the subject matter of the teacher becomes operative in the classroom is one area for research action.
Question 7: Is He Sincere - Genuine?

Rank order of significance: 21
Chi square: 0.484
Significance: beyond .25 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within this grouping are found the positive elements of "sincerity and earnestness" and their opposites, "artificiality" and "apple-polishing."

Here again exists the possibility that a given characteristic may carry a person a long way. The indicated sincerity of some of the poorer student teachers suggests this. One may wonder, too, whether or not this attribute may be significant in long-range terms. Reference here is to the idea that sincerity of endeavor will lead to improvement. This proposition is not intended to suggest that sincerity can compensate for lack of knowledge, for example. There is evidence, however, that the sincere person will respond to criticism with positive results.

The distribution of comments shows that both best and poorest student teachers had "sincerity" marked as their outstanding quality. It is interesting to note that few were pointed out as lacking sincerity. The frequency as a strongest trait is significant. One possible research effort for teacher-educators is that of checking its candidates for this quality while they are in the teacher-education program and then following them to see if there is eventual relationship with post-graduate events: how long they stay in teaching; how they are viewed by colleagues and pupils.
More complex, but rewarding, would be the effort to see if there is relationship between sincerity in ways in which a person works with others and sincerity as applied to purpose or dedication for teaching.

Question 22: Is He Flexible and Open to Ideas and Advice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This grouping embraces willingness to take suggestions about one's self and about procedures; it includes the contrasting elements of defensiveness about criticism, stubbornness, and tendency to alibi or rationalize.

The chief lesson to be derived here lies in the fact that supervisors found the quality in both the better and poorer student teachers and as both strength and weaknesses. The obvious interpretation is that further attention must be given in the teacher-education program, and the writer points to an educative process rather than a selective one. It is difficult to assess wherein precisely the weaknesses in current programs are, but it is undeniably a lack within a teacher-education program if student-teachers are overly defensive and inflexible. This statement is made with emphasis because student-teaching must be a place for analysis; if the student teachers have not been helped to be receptive to the opportunities for sound criticism, the mother in-
stitution has responsibility. The pressures created by grading and credential needs contribute to student teachers' rigidity.

The writer strongly recommends that college staff examine carefully means for developing a professional air of colleagueship with the student teachers. Student teachers should feel that they are on the threshold of professional membership. Flexibility with their own pupils will be more likely if the student teachers can be open and receptive in operations with their own teachers and supervisors.

**Question 10: Can He Organize His Thoughts and Express His Ideas Clearly?**

**Rank order of significance: 23**  
Chi square: 0.338  
Significance: beyond .25 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As employed in this study, this grouping is essentially a technical ability of thought-and-word handling. It embraces English usage, vocabulary, verbal expression, report writing.

The writer was surprised when he finished the grouping and analysis to see that there was relatively little attention called to this area. This suggests that student teachers are competent in thought-and-word handling as used here. It is true that specific mention of this sort of competence is not often likely to be made without reference to context. The student teacher, for example, who does well in illustrating and explaining a discussion point to his pupils has technical language competence, but he would be de-
scribed more properly as having resourcefulness and ability to draw illustrations rather than simply having it said that he expresses himself well.

Although pleased about the aforementioned infrequency of use of this item by supervisors, the writer believes that it is worthy of further exploration. It should be said that the area of language competence is one to which teacher-education institutions do give considerable attention, and it is one that lends itself easily to institutional attention.

**Question 18: Does He Get Along Well With Others?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order of significance: 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi square: 0.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance: beyond .25 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As might well be assumed before examination of the data, one would find this operational area frequently mentioned. The necessity of the teaching (and student-teaching) situation leaves no alternative to face-to-face relationships of many kinds.

The grouping here includes a rather wide variety of action and specific factors contributing to the action: "working with people," "co-operation," "tactful," "courtesy," and similar items are involved; on the opposite side of the ledger, so to speak, weaknesses included "tactless," "difficulty in human relations," "sharp in reply to associates."
It is not particularly surprising to find that many of the poorer student teachers were designated as having an outstanding or strongest trait in this area. The ability to get along well with others is a factor that often enables one to compensate for weaknesses when judgmental operations of peers or superiors are involved. This is no indictment or making light of human relations skills. What is significant in the distribution is that few of the better student teachers were noted to be weak in this respect. This suggests that ability to get along well with others is something that good teachers have; having the ability does not make a good teacher.

The ability under discussion goes far beyond the classroom operations (if, indeed, all teacher functions do not). The profession (through the teacher-training institutions in particular) has a responsibility to insure that its members have tact, courtesy, and other elements which will enable them to relate effectively with others. Although it is not a discriminating quality, there is pointedness for teacher-education institutions wherein both educative and selective processes can be effective in regard to producing student teachers who can get along with others. Selection and screening, at some mid-point in the undergraduate program, implies that means for gathering evidence about prospective teachers' abilities to get along well with others must be carefully established. Finally, there needs to be additional research about what affective forces in person-person relationships are most crucial determinants or tend to be more crucial determinants of one's ability to get along with others.
Question 24: Does He Show Adequate Forcefulness?

Rank order of significance: 25
Chi square: 0.221
Significance: beyond .25 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a good example of the need for clearer exposition in behavioral judgments and descriptions. The writer does not object to the use of the term forcefulness; he is simply calling attention to the likelihood that this represents meaning in a term which does not easily lend itself to next steps of development (i.e., training people in it if they don't have it). Within this study, the grouping included the term itself (lack of forcefulness) as well as "lacks aggressiveness" and "positive approach."

It is clear that the element of forcefulness is noted as a weakness. If people are sufficiently forceful, they are not marked for it. If, as shall be seen, they possess some other attribute possibly related to it and which is more discrete, the trait is labeled in the latter term (leadership" is an example).

Because "forcefulness" appears often as a weakest trait, further consideration by supervisors and the teacher-education program must be given. More explicit description and more realization of what may be involved in "forcefulness" is needed. Does the candidate who speaks "without conviction" need speech training or does he need to feel more respect for himself? Does the intelligent prospective teacher who offers his resources only occasionally in a group problem need to become a dominating individual? Does he
need to dominate for a while in order to break his shell of reluctance and then later learn to temper his new-found self-projection?

These questions point to investigations and experimentations needed. Not enough attention is given to the transitory stages that may be a part of developing dynamic qualities. Participation in dramatics has changed individuals from shy to overt—sometimes with undesirable permanence. The point is that there are established agencies (dramatics, role-playing, psycho-therapy) that are not being utilized sufficiently.

Question 33: Is He Interested in Teaching?

| Rank order of significance: 26 |
| Chi square: 0.188 |
| Significance: beyond .25 level |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is included in this grouping is quite easy to surmise. "Desire to teach," "interest in teaching," "seriousness of purpose," and similar phrasings are contrasted with "lack of interest," "basically not interested in teaching," and "inability to decide what work he wants to do."

As might also be somewhat readily foreseen, the distribution of items falls most heavily in the "strongest traits" side.

A mixture of feelings arises as one notes the data about this area. Clearly "interest in teaching" is not a discriminating trait. In this study, in fact, more poorer student teachers were noted to possess the interest as a strongest trait than did the better student
teachers. Interest in teaching is basic and certainly one of the matters that college and university personnel should enable potential candidates to establish clearly for themselves. This may seem completely self-evident—"common-sense." Obviously, a "person ought to be interested in what he's doing or he should get out," is a phrase commonly applied. Educators of future teachers must keep in mind that their candidates' interest in teaching (however it is determined that the candidates possess it) is not to be confused with ability; they should make effort to help candidates achieve clarity of interest. Decidedly these are implications for the teacher-education institutions.

Question 23: Is He Intelligent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution in this grouping is self-evident, but the significance is not. That 19 of the poorer student teachers had intelligence as their strongest trait is provocative but not necessarily alarming. There is more significance in the fact that more of the best student teachers had intelligence as a strongest trait and that comparatively few of either best or poorest had intelligence called to attention as a weakest trait. Deep satisfaction is warranted by the disclosure that intelligence is not a draw-back to one's being a good teacher (student teacher)! In 29 instances in
this study, intelligence was the strongest trait of the better student teachers.

A highly interesting and difficult research implication is suggested for teacher-education purposes. Using intelligence as a constant, a sample of student teachers should be obtained. Then using a different variable for each pair of student teachers, a longitudinal study should be initiated. The purpose would be that of testing whether or not intelligence and interest in teaching proved a better predictor of successful teaching than intelligence and resourcefulness; or intelligence and maturity than intelligence and leadership. None of the variables are as refined as they need to be, but within a given institution, agreements could be established about the meanings for each as well as for the means of assessing intelligence as the common element. The outcomes cannot be anticipated here, of course, but such research efforts might be a starting point for a definition of T.I - Teaching-Intelligence.

Part of the stimulus for suggesting that intelligence should be the constant in the experiment is that the profession should push increasingly for intelligence as a requirement; at the same time, the profession should find out more about intelligence and what should accompany it. Intelligent teachers have been very good teachers and very poor teachers. Among the intelligent who have succeeded, are the accompanying qualities the same? Unearthing even rough clues would be a most significant contribution.
Question 26: Does He Have a Likable Manner?

Rank Order of significance: 28
Chi square: 0.133
Significance: beyond .25 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Pleasant manner," "likable personality," and similar descriptions are included in this grouping. The frequency as strongest traits of poorest student teachers dominates the distribution. One should find that prospective teachers have a pleasing manner; the significance is dependent upon the effect on pupils, co-workers, and community. Obviously there is no necessary connection between pleasantness and teaching ability—pleasantness does not substitute for knowledge and other requisites.

The major implication for teacher-education is in the need for sharpening perceptions and meanings. The identification of a characteristic like "manner" as a strongest trait of many poorest student teachers should prompt questions about whether or not the pleasantness has caused advisors to be superficial in analyses before the student entered the student-teaching phase. This does not mean that pleasantness is not a legitimate requisite of the prospective teacher, but, again, if serious consideration is to be given it, probing into its elements is demanded. If, for example, certain causes could be explicated, there would be greater worth for use than is true of the rather nebulous kind of quality represented in terms like manner and pleasant. It may be that health is a significant base to be disclosed. This would have genuine
merit in the consideration of candidates. The point is that no specific training procedure is suggested by the personal quality and the distribution of it.

**Question 30: Is He Poised?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most striking thing about this characteristic is its application as a strongest trait. In other words, there is little mention of poise when it is noticeably absent.

The fact that both poorest and best student teachers possess poise as a strongest trait prevents its use as a discriminating quality. What application there may be for structure of teacher-education programs rests in the consideration of classroom techniques. Poise is often exemplified when the student teacher is able to wait for pupils' responses, when he is calm generally. The reference to classroom techniques is made because as student teachers receive instruction in methods, they ought to be given practice in the handling of pupils' responses including recognizing that often the pupil needs time to think and to prepare the response.

This brief illustration is not offered as an all-inclusive representation of the meaning of poise. Assuredly, there are emotions and attitudes involved. Aspects of **poise** do lend themselves to the educative process as attested by the illustrations above.
Poise is a quality which is reflected in the kinds of operations indicated by the illustrations. Calmness is bred when one is certain of what is to be done next in an enterprise; thus, poise is both reflected in operations and conducive to good operations.

The problem of ascertaining cause and effect is worthy of effort to find an answer. Some people have an appearance of what is called poise which is natural to them and which is not a symbol of their being inwardly at ease; yet it stands them in good stead in the classroom, particularly as beginners in student teaching where the effect of the apparent security has a calming influence upon their pupils. Other student teachers have learned to wait for the pupils to quiet down or have learned not to rush into a whole series of abstractions. The emphasis in these several latter examples is upon the techniques that can be acquired.

Methods courses and other discussion opportunities provide places where the technical elements can be practiced. Practice is the term deliberately employed, for the learning to wait for responses of others is a habit that can be acquired through practice. The attitude of wanting to hear responses of others is involved, of course. There is evidence that the attitude may be developed through practice as a consequence of one's discovering that the operations and quality of the discussion are improved. It should be obvious that analysis and guidance in such practice must accompany the opportunity to practice.
Question 27: Is He Persistent?

Rank order of significance 30
Chi square: 0.041
Significances beyond .25 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Persistence," "perseverence," "drive," "no determination," and "personal motivation not always high," are among the comments included under this heading.

The oft-used phrase "bull-dog tenacity" comes to mind as one thinks of persistence. Accompanying it is the notion that persistence might distinguish "the sheep from the goats" insofar as student-teaching quality of performance is concerned. The distribution above does not support that notion as is readily seen.

Here again is an intriguing problem for teacher-educators. Do some student teachers reach the final stages of their preparation program because of perseverance? The supervisors were referring to on-going operations of the student teachers, and the focus, therefore, was on the enterprises therein—not upon whether or not the student teacher had persevered throughout his own college activities, obstacles, and the like. The question is raised, however, because it excites the possibility in research of seeing if there is relationship between "stick-to-itiveness" in life and a like quality in the teaching or student-teaching enterprise.

Like his colleagues in teacher-education, the writer regards persistence as an admirable and desirable quality for prospective
teachers to have—in fact, essential. The aforementioned intriguing note about this quality includes wondering how many prospective teachers have raised themselves from barely acceptable qualitative performance to good performance because of their persistence.

Another subtle element involved is that of the relation between one's having clear enough purpose (about teaching and about self) and finding satisfaction increasingly according to the degree or depth of persistence that one possesses. The writer refers to the complicated reciprocal aspect wherein purpose and persistence may reinforce each other while he raises a question of degree. A teacher may have ideals, for example, which prompt him to spend much "extra" time in effort to be helpful to students; weariness, or lack of recognition may prompt him to turn away from spending "extra" time in this wise; however, the conviction that the ideal is right stimulates him to continue the "extra" time expenditure above weariness or lack of recognition; the consequence is that he persists and finds a wealth of satisfaction in the aid he renders; the weariness vanishes and the lack of recognition is unimportant. The purpose (within the ideal) has become even clearer because of the persistence and in turn leads to greater determination.

Although, as indicated, the evidence in this study does not allow persistence to be used as a discriminatory trait, the value of the quality suggests that research into finer meanings of persistence may yield discriminatory elements. That funds and energies would be worthily employed in such research is unquestionable in view of the needs to get graduates into and keep them in teaching.
Question 1: Is He Sufficiently Animated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comments by supervisors which this grouping includes are many and varied. All have to do with what might be loosely called "spark" as evidenced in overt signs of varying degrees of specificity. On the positive side (strongest traits) are included "dynamic quality," "zip," "enthusiasm," "vivaciousness," "classroom personality," and the like. Opposites include "reserve," "reticence," "shyness and lack of sparkle," "lifelessness," "timidity," "diffident," etc.

The number of times that supervisors mentioned this trait—area is significant. The most significant aspect is the fact that many of the better student teachers were "too quiet," "too colorless," "too timid," etc. The suggestion growing out of this finding is certainly logical—namely, that those student teachers already classified as good would be still better if they were aided in developing more sparkle and more color.

There is no question that some individuals are by nature more colorful and more overtly enthusiastic and vivacious. It is not impossible, however, to enable individuals to become more dynamic within their own frame of established personality. Much work has been done, of course, through dramatics, music, and similar
expressive media to release or strengthen potentialities of overly modest, dull, or introvertive persons.

The implication for teacher-education curricula is fairly clear, then: early in the undergraduate program there should be diagnosis and prognosis with regard to this kind of "personality" feature. Guidance into appropriate activities like those suggested above could well enable more prospective teachers to further their own enjoyment in teaching by helping them to make their own classes more colorful and dynamic.

**Question 12: Does He Have Adequate Speaking Voice?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In many instances the item within the comment simply was indicative of a voice problem without specifying; i.e., the word *voice* was all that was indicated; in a few instances, "weak voice," "monotonous voice," and similar items were given.

Interestingly, and understandably, *voice* is not given attention unless it proves to be a weak factor; this indicates that *voice* is not properly an instrument of display performance but a tool. There can be little debate that it is a significant tool indeed, and also, that attention needs to be maintained in scrutiny of vocal quality of prospective teachers. Although not referred to in a great number of instances within this study, it is nonetheless dis-
turning that 15 of the better student teachers suffered in this respect.

Implications for the teacher-preparation program are obvious, for voice and speaking quality readily lend themselves to training procedures. One might suggest that in addition to existing practices (the requirement of at least one speech course is not uncommon), there could be further analysis of speech and voice factors that may be peculiar to teaching needs. The "good" voice according to some criteria for other situations may not be appropriate for teaching.

Question 28: Is He Warm and/or Empathetic?

| Rank order of significance: 33 |
| Chi square: 0.0074             |
| Significance: beyond .25 level |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This particular grouping has to do with warmth and "feeling for" youngsters on the part of student teachers. It includes items like "deep concern for youngsters," "liking for students," "concern for pupils," "sensitivity," "sympathetic attitude," and "almost contemptuous of students," "insensitive to need," "cold personality," and "too business-like."

This is a significant characteristic that applies about equally to the better and poorer student teachers. Thus the quality is not useful in the discriminating sense; however, the need for empathetic and warm people in the teaching profession seems to be
widely accepted, and the implication at the student-teaching level
appears to be pronounced.

How to develop such quality in the prospective teachers is
not a simple problem, certainly. The writer recognizes that se-
lective operations at or near the beginning point of the teacher-
education program is one answer. He suggests that earlier (than
present practices generally) exposure of the prospective teacher
to the teaching situation is called for. Further, the writer re-
commends that examples be provided by both university and co-
operating personnel who possess themselves the warmth and empathy
that is desirable. The guidance and inspiration that close as-
sociation with such models could furnish are a powerful agency to
influence prospective teachers.

Early exposure to pupils and having models of warm and
empathetic guides are jointly recommended for student teachers
because there is evidence of the influence of co-operating teachers.
Often, the student teacher has discovered the meaning of "putting
yourself in his place" as he has worked closely with a co-operating
teacher who has that faculty; furthermore, and most important of
all, he has discovered a depth about himself hitherto unreleased.
It would be much better, however, if the discovery and release came
earlier.

Emphasis is made that early exposure to pupils and associa-
tion with the kind of person represented in the foregoing example
must be joined. Student teachers who have reached the student-
teaching experience and then for the first time realized the
sensitivity in themselves and the relation with others are deprived
of greater insights into other aspects of teaching that would have come through an earlier awakening. The early studies of the nature of learning and of culture have much greater meaning when the student has empathy and warmth.

Equally important is the likelihood that many of the potential student teachers who have withdrawn before the student teaching period would have stayed in the program if the awakening and release described had taken place.

Question 5: Is He Emotionally Stable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Strongest Traits</th>
<th>Weakest Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Because reference to stability appears frequently as a weakness in both better and poorer student teachers within this study, there is worthiness of continued attention to it. The writer pointed to this area in an earlier chapter wherein he made clear that concern about "performance" and "over-intensity" could not be viewed as desirable as viewed here when supervisors point to them as weakest traits. That reminder is given because the writer wishes to re-emphasize the responsibility of the teacher-education institutions to guard against the eventual licensing of unstable persons.
Although much help can be given prospective teachers while in training—and should be—there is no doubt that screening and admittance practices must play a major role here. There is a dual purpose at stake here: protection of both the would-be teacher and his potential pupils.

There are two points involved in the implication for teacher-education: (1) increased effort must be made to use the data about teaching candidates which is available in both organized and informal fashion; (2) increased use of existing resources for therapy must be established.

All institutions have test and recommendation data which offer signs pertinent to the stability of given individuals. It is not an unusual experience for advisors to find evidence or suggestion in such prior data after some student has become seriously disorganized in personality—after some serious behavioral disorder is manifested. In addition, there have been many examples of informal assessment by instructors who have not been directly or closely connected with advising or screening of teaching candidates. They have noted peculiarities in the student's relationship with his classmates or signs of extreme stress in giving a report. Many of these kinds of data come out after the fact—after the student teacher and his pupils have suffered agonizing experiences. There is little excuse for not making the data available in systematic fashion.

The resources for therapy are plentiful—particularly in the large institutions where advanced instruction for guidance personnel, clinical psychologists, and the like is provided! It is a tragic
commentary indeed that little use is made of experts by their colleagues. The help of such competent people can be applied in several ways. Chief among them are the aid in spotting disorders or potential disorders and aid in giving therapy.

It is not implied that all students with signs of instability will be improved enough by therapy in time to qualify for student teaching. But the benefit to the individual and to the profession by being certain that he cannot go on is immeasurable.

The responsibility of teacher-education institutions is enormous and so is their culpability if pupils in the public schools are put under the direction of unstable teachers.

**Question 35: Do Students Like Him?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order of significance: 35</th>
<th>Chi square: 0.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>Strongest Traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lack of numbers in the distribution results in great part because liking by students is inferred in comments couched more directly and applicably to other groupings ("gets along well with others," for example). In the grouping under consideration, direct comments—"liked by kids" and "students liked him"—are involved.

There is some significance in finding that 11 of the 14 student teachers whose strongest traits were that students liked them are in the "poorest" classification. The major implication from this small sample is in the caution called to attention earlier in another context: teacher-education personnel must make certain
that they are not confusing a very desirable trait with such other essentials as effectiveness in leadership or that they are not glossing over deficiencies in areas of knowledge and the like.

Frequency Tables

The discussion of each of the trait-areas has been concluded. That exposition represented the results of this study in form and detail pertinent to the major purpose: the identification and meaning of trait-areas which discriminate between behaviors associated with best and poorest secondary school student teachers. The presentation included the implications for teacher-education of all the trait-areas whether they proved discriminatory or not.

Tables are forthcoming which offer the same groupings of data in a different organizational scheme: a rank ordering according to the frequency with which each grouping was mentioned. Five tables are necessary:

1. The number of times a given item was mentioned altogether—irrespective of whether it referred to best or poorest student teachers and irrespective of whether it was a strongest or weakest trait.

2. The number of times an item was mentioned as the strongest trait of best student teachers.

3. The number of times an item was mentioned as the weakest trait of best student teachers.

4. The number of times an item was mentioned as the strongest trait of poorest student teachers.

5. The number of times an item was mentioned as the weakest trait of poorest student teachers.

As shall be seen, the questions (groupings of traits) will appear in different rank order in the different tables.
Table 2, the first of the frequency tables, reveals that "subject matter" is the most frequently mentioned of all groups. This means, it is well to remember, that it appeared most often as a total of strongest and weakest traits applied to both best and poorest student teachers in this study. This attests its essentiality.

Examination of the other groupings in this table show that there is relatively little relationship between the number of times an item was mentioned and its discriminatory power as described in this study. Organization and planning and skillful explanation are the only two that in the 11 most-mentioned ranking that appeared in the group of 11 discriminatory items (Table 1, page 55).

TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No. of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Adequate knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Organization and planning</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Getting along well with others</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sufficient animation</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Likable manner</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Skillful explanation</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Open to ideas</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>No. of Times Mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quick reactions and assessment of situations</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Identification and diagnosing of learning problems</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Interest in teaching</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Other-centered</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Adequate general knowledge</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Imaginative and resourceful</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Effective discussion leadership</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Clear-cut notion of what he is trying to do</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Satisfactory physical traits</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Understanding of students</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Adequate speaking voice</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Organization of thoughts and clarity of expression</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Adequate control</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Motivation of students</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Poise</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Adequate forcefulness</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Impulsive judgments</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Liked by students</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The salient characteristic revealed in Table 3 is that there is wide distribution of the strongest traits among the best student teachers in this study. That "knowledge of subject matter," "organization and planning," and "explanation" head the list is not particularly surprising. The wide distribution of strongest traits suggests the variability in student teachers. There is no warrant of assumption, of course, that strength of an individual in one trait obviates his being strong in another.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No. of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Adequate knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Organization and planning</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Skillful explanation</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Getting along well with others</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Identification and diagnosing of learning problems</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Effective leadership</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Imaginative and resourceful</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sufficient animation</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Likeable manner</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quick reactions and assessment of situations</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Understanding of students</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Motivation of students</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Interested in teaching</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 reveals that "personality" weaknesses are chief among those found in the best student teachers. The areas of "color" (animation), "stability," "other-centeredness," and "self-confidence" head the list with "animation" a dominant first in rank.

It is interesting to note that 18 best student teachers were regarded as overly self-centered while another 17 lacked confidence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No. of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sufficient animation</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Other-centered</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adequate self-confidence</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quick reactions and assessment of situations</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Adequate speaking voice</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Adequate general knowledge</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Open to ideas</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Organization of thoughts and clarity of expression</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Organization and planning</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Adequate knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Clear-cut notion of what he is trying to do</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Satisfactory physical traits</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Identification and diagnosing of learning problems</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Adequate forcefulness</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Skillful explanations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Getting along well with others</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Adequate control</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Understanding of students</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Impulsive judgments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Likable manner" and "getting along well with others" have a combined total of 79 in number of times mentioned. Obviously an enormous number of combinations could be made, but this one has relevance to where strength of poorest student teachers is often found. "Knowledge of subject matter," ranking second, (as the strongest trait of 37 poorest student teachers) points to the not unknown fact that knowledge of subject matter is not enough to insure one's being a good prospective teacher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No. of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Likable manner</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Adequate knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Industriousness</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Getting along well with others</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Interested in teaching</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Adequate general knowledge</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Liked by students</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Satisfactory physical traits</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Open to ideas</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Other-centered</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sufficient animation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Poise</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Organization and planning</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Skillful explanations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Organization of thoughts, clarity of expression</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adequate self-confidence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Motivation of students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Adequate control</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Identification, diagnosis learning problems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Imaginative, resourceful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Effective leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The weakest traits of the poorest student teachers in this study (Table 6) manifestly reflect a wide range for they are well-distributed. The weakness in "self-confidence," "responsibility," "organization and planning," which are the first three in rank of number of times mentioned, reflect personal attitudinal, and technical qualities.

Using "self-confidence" as an example, one may suggest that future efforts need to be made to explore causal forces and to ascertain what plateau of confidence is appropriate in the student-teacher status.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No. of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adequate self-confidence</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Organization and planning</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quick assessments, reaction</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Open to ideas</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Clear-cut notion of what he is trying to do</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sufficient animation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Adequate knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Skillful explanation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Adequate voice</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Adequate forcefulness</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Other-centered</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Imagination, resourcefulness</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Identification, diagnosis learning problems</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Satisfactory physical traits</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Getting along well with others</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Understanding of students</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Organization thoughts, clarity of expression</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Adequate control</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Effective leadership</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Industriousness</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Likable manner</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Interested in teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Motivation of students</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Adequate general knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Liked by students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Poise</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recapitulation

Because of the volume of data and discussion thereof in this chapter, it is well to note the essence of the findings again. The search for the trait-areas which may be regarded as discriminatory resulted in identification of 11 groupings. In abbreviated form they are recalled here:

1. Imagination and resourcefulness
2. Organization and planning
3. Explanation of ideas
4. Leadership
5. Maturity
6. Identification, diagnosis of learning problems
7. Understanding of students
8. Quickness in assessment, reaction
9. Motivation ability
10. Initiative
11. Exercise of good judgment

These discriminatory traits are the significant results. They suggest similarity with findings that have been made about teachers in the field. Montross reports that the good teacher is likely to possess a kind of fluency, speed, and dexterity as measured by objective instruments and correlated with ratings of teachers. Symonds reports that superior teachers are more self-assured and have more personal security than inferior ones; that the superior teachers are possessed of personal organization and that inferior ones tend to be personally disorganized.

---


Jones reports that

... good teachers would appear to be characterized as liking a rapid pace rather than a slow and deliberate one; they may be further characterized by a liking for quickness of action and production and efficiency. Good teachers appear to be higher academically.5

And Lamke suggests that

... it appears that good teachers are likely, more than poor teachers, to be gregarious, adventurous, frivolous, to have abundant emotional responses, strong artistic or sentimental interests, to be interested in the opposite sex, to be polished, fastidious and cool ... .

... that the poor teachers are likely, more than good teachers, to be sly cautious, conscientious, to lack emotional response and artistic or sentimental interests, have comparatively slight interest in the opposite sex, to be clumsy, easily pleased, and attentive to people.6

Obviously there is no one-to-one relationship among the findings reported in this study and those cited above. Furthermore, even as attention is called to the similarities, there must be an attendant reminder that student teaching, the focus in this study, is not necessarily found to be directly related to results in analyses of teachers on the job. There is unquestioned need for further efforts to determine relationship between this pre-service status and the in-service status. Bach has indicated that an assumption that student teaching and actual teaching are comparable


is highly questionable. Therefore, even if there are signs that "imagination and resourcefulness" in this study discriminate among student teachers and that any similar findings about in-service teachers are made, there is still need for pinning down the relations between the two points in time.

The discussions of the 11 discriminating behaviors associated with best and poorest student teachers in this study seem to hold similarity with those descriptions of teachers reported below by Singer, Jr.

The degree to which a teacher is successful in his verbal communication in a classroom apparently has definite bearing on his effectiveness as a teacher. The social competencies of oral interaction such as eliciting willing responses from students by constructive and encouraging comments; the degree to which co-operation is offered in class planning, activities, evaluation, and total learning process; the ability to take a joke and join in with class in a good laugh; being self-controlled in the midst of conflicting demands and never sounding angry, are pertinent to the success of the teacher.

Within the frame of this study, identification of 11 significant areas provides directions for further work and has bearing upon efforts which should be made in teacher-education programs as well. The nature of these efforts has been indicated as each trait-area was discussed. The final chapter offers the summary and conclusions as well as additional implications.

---


CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The complexity of teaching continues to demand research efforts to identify its elements. Increasingly, cooperative endeavors are being made to establish research design by which the dimensions of teaching effectiveness may be outlined. Particular attention is being given to means for gathering evidence based on the ultimate criterion—pupil change. Examination of teaching performance itself and of the behaviors of teachers in classroom operations represent focal points of researchers, too.

It is widely understood that value systems underlie judgments about teachers. Caution is indicated that plans for investigating teaching effectiveness must include appreciation of the settings in which the teaching is studied and the assumptions which are involved.

Teaching and teachers are not the same at all points along a continuum of time. Pre-service, early in-service, and later in-service time-points require consideration of their uniqueness. Their relation is not clear yet either. Research, therefore, must be aimed at both the elements within particular periods of time and at the relations of elements among the different periods of teaching and teacher development.
This study examines the particular moment of time known as the student-teaching period and focuses upon behaviors of secondary-school student teachers as witnessed and described by university supervisors. The strongest and weakest traits of the best and poorest student teachers are analyzed to reveal traits which discriminate between the behaviors associated with best and poorest secondary school student teachers during their student-teaching performance.

Eleven of 35 groups of traits are identified as discriminating:

(Abbreviated)
1. Imagination and resourcefulness
2. Organization and planning
3. Explanation of ideas
4. Leadership
5. Maturity
6. Identification, diagnosis of learning problems
7. Understanding of students
8. Quickness in assessment, reaction
9. Motivation ability
10. Initiative
11. Exercise of good judgment

Range and variety characterize the qualities thus identified as discriminating between the behaviors associated with best and poorest secondary school student teachers. Inherent personal characteristics, trainable technical skills, and attitudes are involved.

The implications for teacher-education personnel and programs of the findings do not preclude institutional responsibility for any of the qualities disclosed.

The frequency and distribution of the supervisors' descriptions of traits in the total of 35 groupings (Chapter V) give rise to discussion of their meaning and implications. The discussion re-affirms the note of responsibility in teacher-education institu-
tions and points up the need for a different concept of what 
educative processes mean.

The tendency to regard technical skills as the chief beneficiary of educative processes and less tangible elements of personality as subject only to diagnosis and selection is an inadequate and constricting perception. The field of vision must include consideration of new kinds of processes that may be educative in their consequences—particularly those which might be called "release-of-power," "self-understanding," and "transitional-development" processes. Examples of these are offered with respect to imagination and resourcefulness, ability to motivate, animation, and other personal kinds of qualities pertinent to teachers.

That a wider concept of educative processes is needed does not obviate the fact that qualities differ in their nature. It does appear easier to identify discrete "personality" items than to identify discrete "technical" items. Some traits may be primarily technical (skill in explaining, identifying and diagnosing learning problems, effective leading), but attitudes and emotions are involved. Stability, likability, personal "color" are more clearly "personality" items than the aforementioned skills are clearly technical. Discussion of differently-oriented concept about educative processes, however, suggests that even the primarily or almost-wholly personality traits can be approached through technical procedures newly conceived.
Conclusions

Hypotheses incorporated in the design of the study require examination now.

**Hypothesis 1**

Elements of "personality" in prospective secondary school student teachers, although not always clearly separate from technical elements of competency, will often negate technical ability in student-teaching performance.

The weakest traits of poorest student teachers are the most pertinent evidence. Table 6, page 123, shows that among the weakest traits of poorest student teachers mentioned 10 or more times, 13 of the 19 groups are primarily "personality" items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Rank</th>
<th>Trait-area (Abbreviated)</th>
<th>No. of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>self-confidence</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>stability</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>flexibility</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>animation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>initiative</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>forcefulness</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>other-centered</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>maturity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>imagination, resourcefulness</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>physical traits</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>getting along well with others</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manifestly physical characteristics have been included in this evidence. Using only two general classifications ("personality" and technical), the writer has included "knowledge of subject matter," "quick assessment and reaction," and "clear-cut
notion of what he is trying to do" among the technical. Attitudes are involved in two of those technical items, but to insure objectivity as far as possible in offering evidence relative to the hypothesis, the writer has not used as "personality" items those which have both technical skills and attitudes.

Conclusion: The hypothesis is well-supported by the findings.

Hypothesis 2

Some "personality" items ostensibly developed within the training provided by the teacher-education program will nonetheless be revealed as weaknesses in student-teaching performances.

Tables 4 and 6 reveal the weakest traits of both best and poorest student teachers. The first four trait-areas in frequency of mention for best student teachers are "personality" items:

- "animation" mentioned 30 times
- "stability" mentioned 21 times
- "other-centered" mentioned 18 times
- "self-confidence" mentioned 17 times

Weakest traits of poorest student teachers show

- "self-confidence" mentioned 28 times
- "responsibility" mentioned 27 times
- "stability" mentioned 24 times
- "flexibility" mentioned 17 times

At the University of Illinois, as elsewhere, efforts are made to assess, screen, and guide prospective teachers in terms of "personality" items (as the term is employed in this study). Tests (MMPI, particularly), guidance agencies, and an advisory system are structured to try to provide evidence and promote development of these kinds of characteristics. It should be clear that no direct attack is made on "animation," for example, in the sense that culture
or "charm" schools emphasize. All teacher-education institutions, however, seek to develop dynamic, confident, stable, prospective teachers.

The number of times the characteristics above were described by supervisors clearly demonstrates that there are weaknesses in the program.

Conclusion: The hypothesis is well-supported by the evidence.

Hypothesis 3

Traits or characteristics which discriminate between good and poor student-teaching performance will suggest an almost infinite variety of elements comprising teaching. However, there will be some traits ("personality" and technical) which will stand out as marking the difference between behaviors associated with good and poor teaching.

The 11 discriminatory trait-areas represent a range and variety when contrasted with each other: personal characteristics, technical skills, attitudes are revealed in such groupings as "imagination," "organization and planning," and "understanding of students." Furthermore, there is variety and range within a grouping. "Imagination," for example, is revealed in a variety of actions—in an approach devised for setting up materials for a given lesson, in creation of materials, in employing existing resources in a unique fashion.

Notwithstanding the variety among and within the groupings which point to an almost limitless number of elements within teaching, it is clearly established that the 11 trait-groupings are discrete and discriminatory. Page 129 of this chapter lists the dis-
criminatory traits derived from Table 1 which shows them to be significant at .001 to .01 level.

Conclusion: The hypothesis is well-supported by the evidence.

Hypothesis 4

Some characteristics or traits will be clearly established as qualities that can be positively affected by educational processes

The key in testing this hypothesis rests in the meaning of educational processes. The processes by which future teachers learn to organize and plan are far different from those which may develop their imagination and resourcefulness.

There is no question that the skills in planning, discussion leadership, identification and diagnosis of learning, and explaining can be learned under the auspices of existing educational processes. The frequency count of weakest traits showed that improvement is needed in those areas (Tables 4 and 6), but what is most germane here is that Tables 3 and 5 (strongest traits of best and poorest student teachers) show that some students have learned well. A sampling of those tables is offered:

Best student teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mentioned 38 times as strongest trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organization and planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skillful explanation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identification, diagnosis of learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poorest student teachers

- mentioned 8 times as strongest trait

organization and planning

- mentioned 4 times as strongest trait

skillful explanation

- mentioned 3 times as strongest trait

identification, diagnosis of learning

The significance in the case of the best student teachers is that the findings indicate that educational processes exist and that there is influence. The need for improvement (obviously few poorest student teachers could be strong in those same areas else those areas would not have proved discriminatory) does not mean that existing educational processes cannot affect the particular traits. The aforementioned evidence about best student teachers is indicative.

The extension of meaning of the hypothesis to focus upon the earlier-mentioned non-technical traits and characteristics ("personality" items as employed in the study) is not essential. The writer, however, would re-emphasize the note that educational processes should be re-defined, more widely conceived (see page 130 of this chapter). The evidence about the hypothesis as it stands is clear.

Conclusion: The hypothesis is supported by the evidence.

Hypothesis 5

Some traits or qualities often assumed to be fairly critical will be revealed to be non-affective or of little consequence insofar as their capacity to discriminate between good and poor student-teaching is concerned.
Table 1 will offer challenge or confirmation of one's beliefs about what qualities are significantly discriminating with respect to student-teaching performances.

The results of the study show that traits identified frequently as strongest and weakest were not necessarily discriminating. Table 2, from which the 10 most frequently mentioned traits are excerpted here, provides pertinent evidence.

**Traits Most Often Mentioned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Rank</th>
<th>Trait-area (Abbreviated)</th>
<th>No. of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>knowledge of subject</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>organization, planning</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>getting along well with others</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>animation</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>likable manner</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>industry</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>explanation</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>emotional stability</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>self-confidence</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those, "organization and planning" and "explanation" were the only two that proved discriminating. The highly-regarded and essential "knowledge of subject matter," "industriousness," "responsibility," and others given above did not prove discriminating.

Any assumption that the more often a given trait-area is mentioned the more likely it will lose potentiality for discriminating power is not supported by the evidence. "Organization and planning" and "explanation" are second and eighth respectively in frequency of mention and they are both discriminatory.

**Conclusion:** Evidence supports the hypothesis.
Hypothesis 6

Attitudinal elements will likely be revealed as affective even when technical ability is being judged.

In the considerations of the individual trait-areas (Chapter IV), the probing into their nature and meaning produced interpretations relevant to the hypothesis. Abbreviated excerpts are given here:

Organization and planning are affected by attitudes; the clearer and dearer the purpose, the greater the drive to do what is necessary to accomplish it.

Identification and diagnosis of learning problems - The student teacher who identifies obstacles to learning wants to locate them. Some teachers can identify ... problems with particular groups because they want to work with those groups. ... cause of attitude will range ... from a feeling of mission ... to discovery that one is better equipped to deal with a particular group.

Motivation of pupils is highly dependent upon the teacher's motivation. The desire to display a particular quality of his own (desire to perform for an audience) will often get in the way of seeing what the students need and what will provoke their giving value to what is intended as the enterprise.

Conclusion: The hypothesis is tenable.

Recommendations

The recommendations offered evolve from two sources in the development of the study: (1) the effects upon the writer of the demands created by the analytical and classification procedures; (2) the exploration of the nature and meaning of the findings.
Three kinds of recommendations stem therefrom: (1) those pointing to specific research and actions directly related to the discriminatory trait-areas identified in the study; (2) those pointing to increased professional insights for teacher-education personnel as well as particular research ends; (3) those pointing to long-range research.

Recommendations Related to the Discriminatory Traits

1. With regard to "imagination and resourcefulness," this assumption should be tested: the turning loose of an individual's power is preceded by his honoring of self; one design implication is the selection of, and subsequent experimentation with, currently enrolled students who are regarded as unimaginative. Designs that emerge from such efforts by teacher-education personnel would in themselves be valuable contributions to the profession.

2. In relation to "organization and planning," immediate efforts should be made to identify causal factors in currently-enrolled student teachers who organize and plan effectively.

3. In connection with "ability to explain," research effort should be made to establish signs of minimal competence in ability to explain; one design suggestion: selection of three groups of student teachers by application of gross criteria: poor explainers, fair explainers, good explainers; application of two questions to each group: (1) what may be said of the quality of the ideas which the student is seeking to explain, (2) to what degree does the student see relations between his ideas and those of persons to whom he is trying to explain them.
4. In consideration of "leadership," early laboratory situations should be provided in which prospective teachers receive acute analysis resulting in individual "norms" of leadership. This means that the individual student teacher must find out what his leadership forte is and then have it strengthened if need be; this necessarily involves laboratory situations which provide him with concrete involvements in working with pupils as well as with peers.

5. Pertinent to "maturity," teacher-education staffs should identify the assumptions about maturity that are operative in their institutions and the assumptions that are operative about student teaching (i.e., what do we mean when we say that someone is mature or immature? Is student teaching a final test as we practice it here or is what we actually do indicative of belief that student teaching is also a time for learning?) recommended also—no criteria for maturity at entrance point into program.

6. Regarding "identification and diagnosis of learning problems," experimentation should be devised to help prospective teachers identify their wants and attitudes; this is in reference to the assumption that teachers are better able to identify and diagnose learning problems when they want to do so and that knowledge and technical ability to do so is not enough. Small sample of current student teachers who perform well in this respect could be studied: are there identifiable factors that show why they do it well?

7. Concerning "understanding of pupils," trial groups of younger prospective teachers (freshmen--sophomores) should be given opportunity to serve as assistants to student teachers; concurrent
course work in nature of adolescence, nature of learning, etc., will have dimension of reality out of which the prospective teacher can evolve principles and understand precepts, psychological "laws."

8. Pointing to "quick assessment and reaction," experiments should be devised in which the prospective teacher is faced with constructed factors known to observers and which affect the test question to be asked or the test decision to be made; qualitative and quantitative analysis must follow.

Design might have these features:

A group of six persons (number is important only in terms of the factors desired) are instructed to ask for the prospective teacher for help in discussing planning for a field trip, a party, etc. A group member, in advance, prepares to give one overt sign of feeling (anger with his peers, puzzlement about purpose, weariness, etc.).

Each person is to give one verbal sign of depth of knowledge about the problem ("we said last week," "evidence shows that field trips are . . .," "if we'd go to the zoo we could stop for steaks at . . .," etc.).

These and any other kinds of signs could be built into the setting before the prospective teacher is called in to help. The orientation given here should be carefully prepared and noted.

If at all possible to have this kind of procedure take place within a room with one-way mirror, so much the better. In any case, critical moments might be devised at which time the physical elements as well as quality should be noted: how fast did the prospective teacher respond? how many ideas did he include in his response? what evidence (determined by the participants) was there that the prospective teacher was responding not only to the questioner but to the group members who did not ask at that time? what hypotheses or assumptions were tacit? where did he look—how?

This illustration could be extended in detail. The point is that there is need for scientific procedures to identify elements
involved in the ability to assess and react quickly. The physical sciences have contributions to make in this respect. Trained observers could apply the tone of this illustration to on-going classroom operations of the student-teacher. Several observers should be involved, because of the amount of data to watch and the need for reliability.

9. Relative to "motivation of pupils," early in the professional program, increased attention should be given to ways of enabling prospective teachers to understand their own motives. Consideration should be given to general context (understanding what motivates them in various situations) and contexts related to teaching (leading a class discussion, helping a committee, working with a group of junior high or high school youngsters, etc.). Perception laboratories should be involved, too, so that insight is gained into the effects of prior attitudes and dispositions.

10. Anent "initiative," teacher-education personnel should study the behaviors of prospective teachers (including student teachers) selected on the basis that they have initiative and then ask two questions:

   a. what elements in those behaviors seem to be major determinants?

   b. what provisions in our program are established to nurture such elements?

11. Applicable to "exercise of good judgment," teacher-education staffs should examine their courses to ascertain what judgment-making situations are provided for prospective teachers; then the staffs should evaluate what is done to help the prospective teachers who may have had judgmental opportunities. The intent here
is two-fold: assessment of program to see if genuine judgmental situations (the judgment makes a difference) are available, and establishment of procedures in which prospective teachers receive analysis. The latter can be enhanced considerably through the use of observers (in special one-way-mirror classrooms or in regular classrooms) for diagnostic purposes and through assistance of group-therapy personnel.

Recommendations Pointing to Insight of Teacher-Education Personnel and Research Ends

1. Studies similar to the writer's should be made in teacher-education institutions. Personnel involved will discover merit (or lack of it) in the descriptions they use, the dimensions of problems in assessments, and personally-needed techniques (varying from statistical to philosophic); the results additionally may correspond with this study and thereby add information to the field.

2. The discriminatory trait-areas identified in this study should be used in follow-up investigations to see if they have discriminatory power for teachers on-the-job.

3. Research efforts should be directed to finding out more about why "good" teachers stay in teaching with special focus on pre-determined elements (health, intelligence, etc.).

4. A follow-up should be made through student-teaching and the first year of teaching of student teachers selected as equally intelligent but individually different in selected variables (discriminatory traits from this study). Purpose: to test differences that the variables produce in combination with intelligence.
5. Teacher-education staffs should invite the co-operation of clinical psychologists, group-therapists, sociologists in diagnostic and therapeutic work with prospective teachers.

6. Efforts should be made to determine relationship between general health and personal-social qualities (pleasantness, affability, and the like).

7. In-service meetings of student-teaching supervisors should be held for the express purpose of instruction by expert colleagues in how to recognize signs of potential personality disorder in student-teachers through interview techniques.

In addition to the foregoing recommendations, the writer suggests actions for his own institution that will have implications for others as well.

8. Student-teaching staffs in particular, and pre-student-teaching course instructors generally, should examine the lists of weakest traits to make effort to determine wherein attention to these weaknesses has not been given and wherein it should be given.

9. Student-teaching clinics should be designed wherein student-teaching performances can be observed under laboratory auspices and wherein highly-trained observers can note refined examples of behaviors related to the discriminatory trait-areas.

10. Prospective secondary-school teachers should be allowed choice of having one major field plus electives or of following the prevailing pattern at the given institution.
Recommendations Related to Long-range Research

1. Emphasis has been given in this study to the need for development of instruments to reveal the potential of prospective teachers. There are at least three stages related to the professional life of the teacher: pre-teacher-education, teacher-education, and in-service stages. Equally patent is that fact that long-range longitudinal research is demanded to uncover the relationships among those stages. Research actions may be taken, however, which can aid current programs as well as the deferred goals of the research.

A pertinent plan is suggested here:

A. Using some or all of the discriminatory items that emerged from this study, college supervisors should select a number of students presently in the teacher-education program and make judgments accordingly. (That the students are "imaginative and resourceful" etc.) Then these steps should be taken:

(1) Checking of college records such as early personal statements by the student, early advisor ratings, entrance test results, to see what picture is revealed about the given students.

(2) Sample the views of people who knew and worked with the students before they entered college (teachers, counselors, and recorded data).

The purpose of this "backward" look is rather obvious—namely, the identification of early clues that point to the current estimate. From this kind of proceeding can emerge specific patterns of assessment and data-gathering to accompany the student in his teacher-education sequence.

2. A longer-range research effort is applicable again to both the writer's institution and others. The base of the research
effort would be the discriminatory items although all 35 might well be used in this exploration:

A. Employing the discriminatory items, research teams should ask a variety of judges to describe particular behavior of persons with whom they work most closely, e.g., imaginative and resourceful behavior.

(1) as high school students see it in their peers.
(2) as psychologists, guidance people see it in their counselees.
(3) as personnel managers see it in their workers.
(4) as teachers see it in their colleagues and students.

The purpose is to obtain raw stuff for potential test items that could be used at the pre-college entrance point for prospective teachers or students who might become prospective teachers.

B. Trial test items should be developed and then followed by the administration of them to high-school seniors who plan to teach. They should be followed through their teacher-education program.

3. Finally, further steps should be taken to take into account the varying conditions of locale in which teaching goes on. What is the meaning of a discriminatory trait in terms of where the teaching goes on? Imagination and resourcefulness represent a significant quality wherever the teaching occurs but what is its meaning applied to the tough, "jungle" school in contrast with the oft-labeled "naive," "nice," small-village school. The suitability and pertinence of individual temperaments of teachers in these school situations need refined research to disclose. The nature of resourceful, imaginative action as applied to those situations may be
of the same genre, but it is most important that specific dimensions and details be determined.

The kind of research recommended here could very well begin with the example employed (imagination and resourcefulness). The investigation would demand design to include the wide variety of schools typified above—a sampling design not difficult to establish.

The means of carrying out the research efforts would require teams who have time, money, and energy. The proposal envisaged is one wherein the sample school-communities would be visited at length and wherein several teachers would be followed extensively through many school days to note the imaginative, resourceful behaviors found in the peculiar contexts.

The writer hopes that the rude design above and the other suggestions emanating from this study will find favor in the thinking of others. He hopes, too, that the specific findings in the study will prove of merit in further action and stimulation for all who are interested in prospective teachers.


APPENDIXES
APPENDIX I

QUALIFICATIONS OF HEAD SUPERVISORS

1. Leadership ability in curriculum development procedures.
2. An understanding of the training curricula and the certification requirements.
3. An understanding of counseling procedures.
4. Ability to do research.
5. Ability to work with lay citizens in the community, teachers and administrators and see the inter-relationships between these individuals' roles.
6. Ability to help the student teacher and serve as a resource person in co-operating schools.
7. Ability to demonstrate effective teaching practices in the methods courses.
8. Eligible for an Illinois supervisory certificate for the field in which he supervises.
9. Hold a doctorate, with strong graduate preparation in education.
10. High scholarship in subject matter area and in professional education.
11. He should be able to help students develop a well-defined value system and to see the relationships between values and the school program.
APPENDIX II

WEAKEST TRAITS

B. 1. reserve
B. 2. over-confidence
B. 3. careless
P. 4. understanding of students
P. 5. lacks confidence
P. 6. avoids situations
B. 7. over-intensity
B. 8. occasional impatience
B. 9. apparent artificiality in vocal tone
P. 10. inability to focus, that is tends to deal with high-order abstractions and multiplicity thereof besides
P. 11. slowness in perceptions and reactions to others and their ideas
P. 12. malnutrition in own language development
P. 13. lack of assurance
B. 14. seeing a whole group
B. 15. individual provisions
P. 16. unimaginative
B. 17. voice
P. 18. irresponsibility and "apple polishing"
B. 19. sometimes expects too much of pupils
B. 20. lets herself get involved in too many activities
B. 21. needs to be a little warmer in understanding pupils
P. 22. lack of understanding in planning learning experiences
P. 23. procrastination, lack of self-discipline
P. 24. scholarship and taking initiative in leadership
B. 25. tends to be careless with accuracy of answers and other material
P. 26. may not be able to stand up under heavy load of teaching
B. 27. tendency to be intolerant of weaknesses of associates
B. 28. lack of self-confidence
B. 29. need for experience
B. 30. reticence in self-expression
P. 31. immaturity, lack of organizational ability
WEAKEST TRAITS—Continued

P. 32. lack of insight in learning situations
P. 33. defensive attitude
B. 34. probably low native intelligence
B. 35. impatience with weaknesses
B. 36. not entirely self-directing
P. 37. lacks forcefulness
P. 38. lacks self-confidence and emotional stability
B. 39. too informal with students
B. 40. too business-like
B. 41. lacks enthusiasm
P. 42. lacks subject matter
P. 43. lacks intelligence
P. 44. diffuse
P. 45. can't apply her theory
B. 46. needs more confidence
B. 47. needs more confidence
P. 48. almost contemptuous of students
P. 49. lack of interest
B. 50. sometimes fails to see the other person's side
B. 51. sometimes a bit didactic
P. 52. lack of confidence
P. 53. organization
B. 54. over-determined
B. 55. apparent lack of maturity
B. 56. vocabulary
P. 57. unforceful voice
P. 58. appearance
B. 59. may be too easy-going in classroom situations
B. 60. needs more easy give and take in social relations
B. 61. poor grammar and spelling
P. 62. rather positive, seems hard for her to be flexible
P. 63. lack of enthusiasm and initiative
P. 64. needs more confidence in her ability
B. 65. too quiet
P. 66. egotism
WEAKEST TRAITS—Continued

B. 67. reserved
B. 68. rapid speech
B. 69. reserved
P. 70. rapid speech
P. 71. introvert
P. 72. initiative
B. 73. weak in cultural knowledge
B. 74. slow moving
P. 75. avoided responsibility—fruit and smoke allergies which he used as escape mediums although classroom teaching good
B. 76. occasional random actions stemming from exuberance
B. 77. hesitates to turn loose her own resourcefulness
B. 78. occasional over-dramatization, creates impression of artificiality
P. 79. lacking in self-confidence coupled with technical deficiencies
P. 80. lifeless, almost completely devoid of overt response
P. 81. overly casual in professional responsibilities
B. 82. confusion about function of high school education
P. 83. voice and effeminate characteristics
P. 84. inability to conduct class toward objectives—not very smart
P. 85. attitudes and emotional adjustment
P. 86. lackadaisical, probably stemming from feelings of inadequacy
P. 87. misses too much—not perceptive enough
B. 88. lack of self-confidence, needs experience
P. 89. musicianship
P. 90. instability
B. 91. approving of things indiscriminately
P. 92. gets rattled
P. 93. worries too much
P. 94. forgetful and very slow
B. 95. difficulty in analyzing weakness in individual students
B. 96. tends to over-plan his work
P. 97. plans just enough to get by
WEAKEST TRAITS—Continued

P. 98. difficulty in anticipating people's problems
B. 99. shyness and lack of sparkle
B. 100. somewhat insecure, reflected in lack of authority
P. 101. not firm—not positive
P. 102. adolescent attitude—lack of maturity
B. 103. manner of presentation could be more forceful
B. 104. lack of warmth toward students
P. 105. disorganized approach
P. 106. lazy
B. 107. nervous tendency because of polio disability
B. 108. background
P. 109. lack of forcefulness
P. 110. poor English and background in subject
B. 111. relatively weak musical background
B. 112. personality for working in large groups
B. 113. lack of desire to teach
P. 114. lack of personality that can command respect of large groups
P. 115. personality dullness
P. 116. slowness in sizing up the situation and in dealing with problems
B. 117. some lack of confidence in himself
P. 118. seems to grasp subject matter to be presented without rationale for effect upon students
P. 119. ambivalence—tends to impose restrictions to excess at times in some students and to establish limits at other times with others
B. 120. difficulty in accepting any standard less than perfection
B. 121. reserved manner
P. 122. lacks skill in lesson presentation
P. 123. difficulty in human relations
P. 124. immature
P. 125. egotistical, own intelligence prevents working easily with others
B. 126. oral expression and explanation
B. 127. lacks knowledge
B. 128. uncertain about place of religion in schools
WEAKEST TRAITS—Continued

P. 129. unimaginative
P. 130. lacks initiative, is overly dependent
P. 131. physical handicap
B. 132. lack of maturity
B. 133. sometimes too directive
P. 134. health—over-weight
P. 135. can't organize
P. 136. can't make up his mind
P. 137. academic rather than practical in his approach
P. 138. lack of confidence
B. 139. overly conscientious
B. 140. difficulty in staying on pupils' level
P. 141. apparently lacks interest in pupils
P. 142. passiveness
B. 143. slight nervousness
B. 144. slow
P. 145. subject
B. 146. poor voice quality
B. 147. defensive about criticism
B. 148. aloof and unaware of pupil limitations
B. 149. over-concern about performance
B. 150. verbal expression is poor
P. 151. lack of forcefulness
P. 152. stubbornness, slow to change
P. 153. lack of foresight and thoroughness in planning—tendency to stop at what is considered good enough
P. 154. inability to keep attention of class
P. 155. verbal expression is poor vocabulary and explanation
B. 156. tendency to go too fast
P. 157. speech ability
P. 158. lacks self-confidence and hesitates to assume leadership
B. 159. lack of forcefulness
B. 160. inflexibility
P. 161. lack of musical understanding
WEAKEST TRAITS—Continued

P. 162. lack of ability to analyze situation
P. 163. immaturity, tendency to be superficial
P. 164. resistantship and inability to concentrate and apply himself.
B. 165. personal motivation not always high
B. 166. lacks initiative, voice, and expression
B. 167. planning
P. 168. lack of initiative and ability to recognize fault
P. 169. inadequate class control
P. 170. emotional instability
B. 171. subject-matter weakness
P. 172. voice
P. 173. scholarship
P. 174. over-loads himself
B. 175. bit ego-centric
B. 176. not always challenges superior students
P. 177. inability to face up to her own limitations
P. 178. never achieves potential
B. 179. voice projection
B. 180. tendency to try to get by on personality
P. 181. personality—"smart alec"
P. 182. not dependable
P. 183. moody—lack of judgment
B. 184. tendency to get off the subject
P. 185. no sense of responsibility or determination
P. 186. lack of subject-matter preparation and understanding of children
P. 187. self-conscious and vain
P. 188. slow ponderous style
B. 189. overly dramatic
P. 190. insensitive to need
P. 191. organization
B. 192. too moderate in firmness
P. 193. irresponsible
P. 194. cold personality
WEAKEST TRAITS—Continued

P. 195. both absenteeism and weak voice

B. 196. enthusiasm and buoyancy may over-power less enthusiastic people

B. 197. voice at times

B. 198. lacks knowledge of lower economic groups

P. 199. monotonous voice

P. 200. lack of flexibility in meeting classroom situations

P. 201. lack of ability to recognize needs of adolescents and ways of involving them in learning experience

B. 202. lacks confidence to some degree

P. 203. is unaware of class or time passing

P. 204. personal relations

B. 205. experience (twice)

B. 206. lack of verbal fluency

B. 207. lack of experience in vocal music

P. 208. lack of ability to plan, organize and teach

P. 209. extreme self-consciousness and lack of musicianship

P. 210. no discernible interest in a broad program in music education

P. 211. basically not interested in teaching

B. 212. organization

B. 213. often talks around point

P. 214. can't think on her feet, lacks drive to do better

P. 215. only sees surface things to teach, lacks control

B. 216. over-sensitive to criticism

B. 217. tendency to be glib

B. 218. too much talk

P. 219. inability to lead discussion and communicate orally—insensitivity to learning potential in classroom situations

P. 220. confusion of purpose, insists in talking rather than teaching, lack of classroom control

B. 221. bit over-bearing

P. 222. inability to take hold

B. 223. tendency to adhere too closely to prepared plan

P. 224. only fair application of what he knows

B. 225. general appearance
WEAKEST TRAITS—Continued

B. 226. easy-going
B. 227. lacks initiative
P. 228. lacks confidence
P. 229. lacks initiative—inarticulate
P. 230. hot-tempered
P. 231. understanding of pupils
B. 232. perhaps little too sure of herself
B. 233. use of written and spoken English
P. 234. lack of sense of responsibility
P. 235. irritates people—smug air with others
B. 236. voice could be improved
P. 237. poor speech and lack of sympathy
P. 238. poor speech
B. 239. leading focused discussion
B. 240. does not always accept criticism objectively
P. 241. lacks practical ability
P. 242. personal appearance
B. 243. handling discussion situations
B. 244. lacks self-confidence
P. 245. lack of organization of work
P. 246. lack of imagination and enthusiasm as well as lack of knowledge of field
B. 247. specific method
P. 248. gives up easy, no imagination
B. 249. perfectionist
P. 250. tardiness and failure to assume extra-curriculum responsibilities
B. 251. tendency to act before full consideration
B. 252. lack of factual knowledge outside of the special field
B. 253. somewhat inflexible in adapting plans when classroom situation demands change on short notice
P. 254. lack of ability to teach
P. 255. tendency toward defensive attitude
P. 256. lack of drive
B. 257. pretty quiet fellow
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P. 258. emotional instability
P. 259. appears tired
P. 260. lack of confidence—possibly corrected in time
B. 261. voice a little soft at times
B. 262. too serious
P. 263. lack of clear knowledge of subject
P. 264. unable to adapt to change of plans
B. 265. some tendency to under-play personality development as a function of teaching
B. 266. occasional uncertainty as to what to do next
P. 267. lack of planning and direction
P. 268. gives impression of negative almost hostile attitude toward students; thus finds it difficult to set up effective learning situation
B. 269. tendency to lecture
P. 270. self-centeredness
B. 271. weak first impression
P. 272. impatience
B. 273. dramatic ability
P. 274. lack of attention to details
B. 275. too introspective, seems to lack humor
B. 276. pleasing personality, but takes too much time to get acquainted.
B. 277. voice a little weak—nasal
B. 278. does not appear to enjoy this class (poor one)
B. 279. needs practice in varying teaching devices
B. 280. tendency to attempt too much
B. 281. takes self too seriously
B. 282. use of English language
B. 283. little too dogmatic, makes too many decisions herself rather than developing ideas with her pupils
B. 284. attempts to take on more than she is able to do in a creditable manner
B. 285. little shy
B. 286. understanding nature of student difficulty
B. 287. lack of self-confidence
B. 288. organization
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B. 289. personally not as attractive on first acquaintance as others
B. 290. little slow in comprehending
B. 291. lack of over enthusiasm—has a serious countenance
B. 292. slightly timid
B. 293. may be a little pugnacious at times
B. 294. size
B. 295. slightly egotistical
B. 296. command of English
B. 297. defective hearing
B. 298. not completely sold on high school youngsters
B. 299. too aggressive
B. 300. shyness with adults
B. 301. seldom contributes—does not communicate very well
P. 302. lack of courage and confidence
P. 303. difficulty in explaining things to students
P. 304. cannot see his own weaknesses
P. 305. poor voice
P. 306. lacks initiative and force
P. 307. relationships with people
P. 308. lacks self-confidence
P. 309. lacks confidence in himself
P. 310. lacks confidence in using blackboard
P. 311. slowness and lack of adaptability
P. 312. lacks enthusiasm, interest, and imagination
P. 313. will not accept rules from teachers
P. 314. places social interest above teaching
P. 315. slow to sense need of moment—weak personality
P. 316. lacks self-confidence
P. 317. tends to be defensive—unreceptive of ideas of others
P. 318. lacks resourcefulness
P. 319. not aggressive enough
P. 320. not aggressive enough
P. 321. irresponsible
P. 322. ineffective leadership
P. 323. does little teaching or leading
P. 324. personality and appearance does not inspire people
P. 325. pupils lack confidence in him
P. 326. seems insincere
P. 327. lack of social sense
P. 328. nervous by emotional stresses
P. 329. does not face the truth about her shortcomings and tried to bluff her way on unfamiliar grounds
P. 330. I fear he is neurotic
P. 331. thinks rather slowly
P. 332. not very strong in subject matter
P. 333. lack of tact
P. 334. slightly pessimistic—somewhat timid
P. 335. rather placid
P. 336. lacks teaching sense
P. 337. leadership—not very attractive
P. 338. questionable judgment
P. 339. questionable judgment
B. 340. impatient
B. 341. takes lines of least resistance
B. 342. discussion too slow
P. 343. lack of confidence
P. 344. voice projection is weak
B. 345. insistence on own point of view
B. 346. lack of certain art techniques
P. 347. extremely independent—personality not out-going
P. 348. lack of drive
B. 349. works too hard
B. 350. gives some idea he is too confident
P. 351. weak in subject and preparation
P. 352. lacks diplomacy
P. 353. too confident
P. 354. taught as if he were teaching college students
B. 355. voice is weak
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B. 356. at times she expresses inability to distribute among most important and least important activities

P. 357. lack of emotional maturity

P. 358. inability to project into teaching situation

P. 359. lack of creative ability

B. 360. inexperience

B. 361. speaking voice

P. 362. attitudes

P. 363. weak in preparation

P. 364. personality

B. 365. needs to relax and appear less serious more often

P. 366. does not plan work—openly critical of others—antagonizes associates

B. 367. some rigidity

P. 368. speaks without conviction

P. 369. harangues at pupils

P. 370. easy-going to the point of doing little

B. 371. tendency to under-estimate herself

B. 372. takes herself a little too seriously

P. 373. lack of effort

P. 374. lack of enthusiasm

B. 375. little too naive

P. 376. poorly prepared for the class meeting

P. 377. easily influenced, lacks maturity

B. 378. initial impression of unfriendliness

B. 379. failure to get conclusions

B. 380. does not delegate responsibility

P. 381. discussions wander

P. 382. tendency to lecture on the factual

P. 383. lack of purpose and tries to cover too much—inadept at questioning

B. 384. English usage

B. 385. talks too much

B. 386. knowledge in agriculture

B. 387. tends to be autocratic
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P. 388. lacks knowledge in technical agriculture
P. 389. lacks aggressiveness and confidence
P. 390. lazy
P. 391. interest not in teaching
B. 392. might become too aggressive—too self-confident
B. 393. might easily develop over-emphasis upon academic aspects
B. 394. budgeting of time
P. 395. weak physical condition resulting in lack of animation
P. 396. not creative or sensitive to pupils' learning responses
P. 397. had not matured sufficiently—transferred too late from science
B. 398. timid
P. 399. careless
B. 400. a little difficulty in presenting material on high school level
P. 401. not professional in her attitudes
P. 402. lack of confidence in herself
P. 403. not mature
P. 404. too visionary
B. 405. reserved
B. 406. voice
B. 407. voice
B. 408. reserved
P. 409. uncertainty
P. 410. lack of background and understanding
P. 411. lack of confidence
B. 412. lack of subject-matter knowledge in some P.E. areas
B. 413. some moodiness
B. 414. lack of planning and slight degree of inflexibility
B. 415. slight degree of under-confidence
P. 416. criticizes too much
P. 417. inability to recognize purposes and needs
P. 418. difficulty in perceiving the job in terms other than mechanical
P. 419. considers Bob Elbrecht (self) too much
B. 420. tolerance
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B. 421. slight impatience with poor workmanship
P. 422. lack of forcefulness
P. 423. instability, sympathy, and understanding
B. 424. tendency to be too casual
B. 425. rapid speech
B. 426. tendency to be too deliberate at times
B. 427. difficulty in over-emphasizing philosophical approach
P. 428. failure to reduce ideas to level of practice
P. 429. reluctance to accept others' suggestions
P. 430. generally weak
P. 431. too inclined to agree with students—afraid to take initiative or strong leadership
B. 432. too modest
B. 433. lacks drive
B. 434. too many activities
B. 435. tactless
P. 436. voice—uses hearing aid
P. 437. lacks initiative
P. 438. stubborn
P. 439. fails to take and use suggestions
B. 440. forgetful
B. 441. may do too much organizing
P. 442. inconsistent
P. 443. lacks confidence
P. 444. not as forceful in teaching as might be
B. 445. general dress and appearance—does not present herself very well
B. 446. not very forceful
P. 447. doesn't know what to do—vacillates
P. 448. insecure
B. 449. timidity
B. 450. lack of self-confidence
B. 451. timidity
P. 452. unwillingness to examine ideas—lack of perspective
P. 453. lack of organizational ability
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P. 454. poor command of subject matter
P. 455. lack of positiveness, imagination and initiative
B. 456. impatient
P. 457. careless
B. 458. finding level of students at first
B. 459. over-confident attitude
B. 460. early lack of confidence
B. 461. timidity
P. 462. unstable nature
P. 463. poor judgment
P. 464. lacking in enthusiasm
P. 465. free speech habits
B. 466. a little diffident
B. 467. might appear diffident
P. 468. doesn't like work
P. 469. unstable—queer ways
P. 470. lacks self-confidence
B. 471. class lectures
P. 472. feels inferior
P. 473. lacks drive
B. 474. moves too slowly at times
B. 475. sense of humor
B. 476. enthusiasm tends to drive him too hard at times
P. 477. can't seem to realize she is teaching a group rather than a few individuals
P. 478. lack of initiative
B. 479. talks too much
B. 480. lack of ease
P. 481. personally offensive—unethical behavior
P. 482. socially and intellectually immature—not organized
B. 483. lack of self-confidence
B. 484. lack of aggressiveness
B. 485. lack of self-confidence
P. 486. inability to express himself
P. 487. absence of musicianship
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P. 488. inability to grasp situation and act on it
P. 489. inability to organize and carry through
B. 490. sometimes lacks experimental point of view
B. 491. sometimes insensitive to others' feelings
P. 492. lack of effort
P. 493. emotional instability
B. 494. impatient
B. 495. lacks farm experience
B. 496. ideals often too high—unwilling to compromise
B. 497. needs encouragement for best results
P. 498. not serious enough about responsibilities
P. 499. lack of confidence
P. 500. management of high school class
P. 501. lack of enthusiasm before a group
B. 502. makes too much emphasis on detail
P. 503. lack of tactfulness
P. 504. lack of tactfulness
B. 505. inability to decide what work he wants to do
B. 506. immaturity
B. 507. inability to deal with abstractions
B. 508. occasionally the ability to deal with people—he tends to fight others
P. 509. appears to lack adjustment to position of leadership
P. 510. no fire
P. 511. little tendency to be creative
P. 512. tendency to alibi and rationalize
P. 513. lack of planning and organizing ability
B. 514. forcefulness needed
B. 515. nervous mannerisms
P. 516. pupils do not respond to personality too well
P. 517. weak in subject—matter background—nervous mannerisms
B. 518. overly organized with pupils
P. 519. background
B. 520. not thorough enough or detailed enough in written work
B. 521. tendency toward shyness
B. 522. might seem to be over-concerned about teaching techniques being effective
P. 523. immaturity in perception and judgment and social behavior
P. 524. personal goals take preference over professional achievements
B. 525. on some occasion has been a little sharp in replies to associates and students
P. 526. lacks some ability to understand students' difficulties
P. 527. lacks sharpness and specificity in thinking and in teaching
B. 528. inexperience
B. 529. lack of drive
B. 530. inexperience
B. 531. tenseness
P. 532. lack of initiative and inadequate preparation
P. 533. lack of initiative
P. 534. personality and lack of preparation
P. 535. shyness
B. 536. reserve and seriousness
B. 537. lack of experience with younger children
P. 538. shy and hesitated to go ahead on her own
P. 539. satisfied with next to her best
P. 540. tendency to try to dominate
B. 541. initial impression of being reserved
B. 542. speech defect
P. 543. unreliable and an unsatisfactory attitude leading to failure in human relations—poor preparation also
P. 544. immaturity
P. 545. confusion of purposes
P. 546. inability to make teaching purposive
B. 547. slight tendency to always be the leader
B. 548. sometimes a bit too reserved
P. 549. unaware of scope of teaching, over-dash, over-simplifies the job
P. 550. insecure, feels he is unable
P. 551. instability, musicianship
B. 552. experience
APPENDIX III
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B.  1. leadership, poise
B.  2. personality in classroom
P.  3. classroom teaching good
B.  4. dynamic element in ability to react to students' comments and to relate them
B.  5. imagination—ability to perceive significant element in an enterprise
B.  6. extraordinary ability to keep sight of purpose and to weather mistakes
P.  7. intellectually of good quality; academically sound
P.  8. deep concern for youngsters
P.  9. good mind
B. 10. knowledge of content and personality
B. 11. ability to handle a junior high class and motivate them
P. 12. content knowledge
P. 13. interest in teaching and content preparation
B. 14. ability to teach reflectively, poise
B. 15. poise and classroom control
B. 16. organization and knowledge of subject matter
B. 17. poise
B. 18. insightfulness
B. 19. relations with pupils
P. 20. intelligence
P. 21. good clean young man
P. 22. popular with students; they like him even when he gave discipline, penalties
B. 23. stability, leadership ability
B. 24. stability, leadership ability
B. 25. stability, knowledge of subject matter
P. 26. apparent desire to teach; persistence
P. 27. sincerity of approach in teaching younger students
P. 28. high degree of musical qualification
B. 29. love of teaching
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B. 30. enthusiastic. Intelligent as a teacher and person
P. 31. earnestness
P. 32. patience
B. 33. classroom control
B. 34. mature attitude
P. 35. liking for and patience with students
P. 36. a most practical-minded individual
B. 37. concern for pupil needs and careful planning to use their interests for motivation
B. 38. excellent scholarship and organizational ability
B. 39. sincere interest and concern for interests and welfare of each pupil
P. 40. desire to have pupils reach high standards and solve own problems
P. 41. good scholarship ability
P. 42. social poise
B. 43. high quality workmanship
P. 44. friendliness
B. 45. working with people
B. 46. enthusiasm
B. 47. common sense
P. 48. general intelligence
P. 49. farm background
P. 50. working with groups
B. 51. judgment
B. 52. ability to work with others
B. 53. personality
P. 54. courteous
P. 55. persistent
P. 56. dependable, pleasant
B. 57. exceptional total integrity—ability, purpose, insight
B. 58. acute perception in ideas and activity
B. 59. insight and sensitivity to others and their ideas
B. 60. dynamic quality
P. 61. deep concern and desire to teach
P. 62. perseverance
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P. 63. dedication and ability to follow through
P. 64. intelligence and concern
B. 65. personality and professional ability
P. 66. background in French
B. 67. ability to present and explain material in an interesting yet precise way
B. 68. ability to develop and use materials appropriate to different groups
B. 69. good organizer. Carries responsibilities well
P. 70. skills in food production
P. 71. interest for welfare of individual pupils
P. 72. good professional attitude
B. 73. excellent in questioning to get discovery on part of pupils
P. 74. knowledge of subject
B. 75. maturity, enthusiasm, leadership, insight
B. 76. intelligence, sincerity, leadership, insight
B. 77. industry, sincerity, seriousness of purpose
P. 78. sympathetic approach, ability to establish rapport
P. 79. willingness to co-operate and to try procedures suggested by others
P. 80. aggressiveness in approach to student teaching; appearance of self-confidence; adequate music skills
B. 81. planning; hard-worker
P. 82. has intelligence and drive
B. 83. critical thinker; highly intelligent
B. 84. skillful presentation
P. 85. pleasant personality
P. 86. pleasant manner
B. 87. poise
P. 88. preparation
B. 89. knowledge of subject
B. 90. poise
P. 91. personality
P. 92. seriousness
P. 93. works hard
B. 94. personality
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B. 95. content and versatility
B. 96. ability to handle a class
P. 97. content knowledge
P. 98. appearance
B. 99. organization and presentation of material
B. 100. ability to work with slower students
P. 101. enthusiasm
P. 102. sensitivity
B. 103. efficiency and basic knowledge of field
B. 104. unpolished sincerity
B. 105. careful planning of his work
B. 106. systematic approach to all problems
P. 107. enthusiasm before class
P. 108. dependability and love of teaching
B. 109. understanding of people and reasons for their actions
B. 110. maturity, poise. fine social outlook. great interest in teaching
P. 111. sincerity. desire to do well, pleasant personality
P. 112. earnestness, general enthusiasm
B. 113. sincere interest and liking for students
B. 114. positive approach to presentations
P. 115. cooperation
P. 116. intellectual ability
B. 117. makes English a live subject
B. 118. accepts many responsibilities and carries them through
P. 119. cooperation
P. 120. industry
B. 121. enthusiastic leadership
B. 122. sincere classroom leadership
P. 123. pleasant manner
P. 124. pupil-teacher relationship
B. 125. sound attitude toward teaching; industry
B. 126. musical preparation; desire to teach well
B. 127. musicianship; grasp of subject matter
P. 128. desire to teach; industry
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P. 129. organization; planning and preparation for teaching
P. 130. thoroughness in planning and organization
B. 131. ability to lead students in ventures they regard as their own
B. 132. perception of effects of student experiences, and orientation toward philosophic basis for procedures
P. 133. good fellow, students like him
P. 134. demonstrates intelligence in handling abstractions; writes well and speaks quite well
B. 135. outstanding skill in presentation
B. 136. accepts any challenge and carries through skillfully
P. 137. self-confidence
P. 138. athletic ability
B. 139. willingness to work plus a good mind
P. 140. good nature
B. 141. able to stimulate thinking
B. 142. likes students
B. 143. objectivity
P. 144. likes kids
P. 145. likeable
P. 146. well-motivated
B. 147. classroom teaching, enthusiasm, adaptability
B. 148. classroom-teaching ability
B. 149. likes people; personality
B. 150. knowledge of farming and farm problems; adult work
B. 151. ability to lead a discussion
B. 152. use of variety of procedures
P. 153. healthy attitude
P. 154. ability to get along with the boys
P. 155. thoroughness and planning ability
P. 156. patience
P. 157. sincerity
B. 158. creative ability; originality
B. 159. understanding of pupils and their needs
P. 160. acceptable personality
P. 161. sincerity and earnest desire to teach
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B. 162. all-around ability
B. 163. mature
P. 164. poise
B. 165. friendly attitude and sympathy with pupils' point of view
B. 166. initiative and originality
B. 167. eagerness for teaching in all its aspects
B. 168. foresight, and thoroughness in meeting professional responsibility
B. 169. friendly, out-going; interest in pupils
P. 170. good in human relations with pupils
P. 171. dependability
P. 172. co-operative attitude
P. 173. good disposition
P. 174. eagerness to learn
B. 175. leadership
B. 176. leadership
P. 177. knowledge of subject—took suggestions
P. 178. knowledge of subject; cooperative attitude
B. 179. maturity, leadership, musicianship, intellect
B. 180. musicianship, leadership, intellect
B. 181. musicianship, imagination, and fresh approach to teaching
B. 182. intellect, musicianship, ability to analyze situations and actions
P. 183. good attitude; willingness to try
P. 184. willingness to work
P. 185. willingness to try
P. 186. pleasant personality
B. 187. ability to establish teacher-pupil rapport
B. 188. likeability—students liked him
P. 189. he is an eager beaver
P. 190. ability to get along with people. he was well liked by students and staff
B. 191. analysis of teaching, relationship with faculty, understanding of pupils
B. 192. relationships with faculty, school-community participation
P. 193. appearance
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P. 194. skill in presentation
B. 195. personality
B. 196. never gives up
B. 197. scholarship
P. 198. scholarship
P. 199. personality
P. 200. personality
B. 201. good knowledge of content & variety of presentation
B. 202. knows material and presents it well
P. 203. sincere desire to teach
P. 204. interested in students
B. 205. all-around ability
B. 206. sincerity of purpose
B. 207. pleasing personality
P. 208. good student
P. 209. ability to get along with people
P. 210. persistence
B. 211. intelligent, likes kids, understands kids
P. 212. works hard
B. 213. ability to put it across
P. 214. hard-worker
P. 215. sincerity, determination, concern for welfare of pupils
B. 216. her ability to value every student in the on-going activity and to make him feel his contributions are worthwhile.
P. 217. willingness to work hard to improve her teaching and the ability to take criticism
B. 218. poise, background, initiative, sincerity, voice
P. 219. background in subject
B. 220. effective organization of learning experiences and management of deportment
B. 221. good, original, and flexible lesson plans
B. 222. good subject-matter background that she adapts to student's level
P. 223. likes teaching and is interested in improving
P. 224. pupils like her as a person
STRONGEST TRAITS—Continued

P. 225. poise and self-confidence
B. 226. demonstration ability
P. 227. industry
B. 228. intelligent; natural ability to teach
B. 229. can manage large groups effectively
B. 230. musicianship, intelligent
B. 231. ability to motivate learners
P. 232. even disposition
P. 233. willingness to work; good attitude toward teaching
P. 234. preparation in band work
P. 235. preparation in string work; willingness to work
B. 236. teaches like a competent veteran
B. 237. knowledge of subject—and ability to adjust to pupils' needs when teaching
P. 238. he gets along quite well with students
P. 239. he has zip and initiative, moves along fast
B. 240. personality, mature judgment, flexibility
B. 241. patience, quickness to sense need for adjustment in lesson
P. 242. good skill analysis
P. 243. personality
B. 244. preparation for classes
B. 245. self-confidence
B. 246. relating past to present
B. 247. gets along with people
B. 248. forceful
B. 249. good judgment
B. 250. tactful
P. 251. friendly
P. 252. dependable
P. 253. forceful
P. 254. energetic
B. 255. socially minded, interested in people
B. 256. eager to learn, strong desire for teaching
P. 257. pleasant manner
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P. 258. interest in technical skills in art
B. 259. understanding of human relations
B. 260. strong personality and understanding of students
B. 261. ability to help students want to learn
P. 262. hard-worker
P. 263. hard-worker
B. 264. mature and accepts responsibility well
B. 265. comprehension and foresight in teaching
P. 266. good organization
P. 267. good organization
B. 268. creativity and classroom personality
B. 269. ability to think on her feet and take advantage of spontaneous opportunities for learning
B. 270. maturity, effective teaching practices
P. 271. background in subject field
B. 272. enthusiasm, musicianship, classroom virtuosity
B. 273. musicianship, classroom personality, flexibility
B. 274. musicianship, personality—classroom manner
P. 275. likeable personality
P. 276. determination, desire to be successful
P. 277. ability to get along well with other people
B. 278. understands pupils
B. 279. interest
B. 280. planning his teaching
B. 281. analytical and curious mind
P. 282. intelligence
P. 283. good fellow
P. 284. good citizen, willing worker, and is intelligent
B. 285. a thorough understanding of the subject and an interesting and pleasant manner in presenting skills
B. 286. ability to analyze and present skills
P. 287. sincere interest in teaching
P. 288. interest in children and teaching
P. 289. ability to use content to develop insights and concepts to stimulate thought
B. 290. respect for people and ability to analyze self
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P. 291. courtesy and patience
P. 292. sincerity of purpose
B. 293. mature, hard-worker, judgment, and scholarship
B. 294. relationship with people
B. 295. relationship with people
B. 296. dramatic ability
B. 297. dramatic ability, strong desire to teach
B. 298. inspires confidence, sound philosophy of education
B. 299. co-operativeness
B. 300. ability to inspire students
B. 301. mature judgment
B. 302. ability to present material and keep up interest
B. 303. business-like attitude and method of doing work. enjoys high school students
B. 304. intelligent understanding of students
B. 305. ability to use digressions as profitable learning experiences
B. 306. developing and directing exchange of ideas between students
B. 307. seeks out new teaching experience, wants responsibility
B. 308. goes all out to apply suggestions. terrific worker—never has an alibi
B. 309. resourceful and creative
B. 310. has many ideas, excellent manager
B. 311. enthusiasm and interest in teaching
B. 312. secure and mature, excellent manager
B. 313. confident leadership
B. 314. confident leadership
B. 315. musicianship
B. 316. enthusiasm
B. 317. understanding of youth
B. 318. relations with students
B. 319. manner of presentation
B. 320. thorough planning
B. 321. versatility
B. 322. determination
B. 323. intelligence which is applied to teaching
STRONGEST TRAITS—Continued

B. 324. excellent plans, ability to take suggestion
B. 325. has taught well under many adverse conditions
B. 326. fine personality, quick thinker, knows subject
B. 327. willingness to work, does everything ahead of time, plans work carefully
B. 328. quick thinker, keen observer, hard worker
B. 329. willingness to work, does everything ahead of time, plans work carefully
B. 330. quick thinker, keen observer, hard worker
B. 331. willingness to work, knowledge of psychology, fine personal appearance
B. 332. commanding appearance, ability to work
B. 333. willingness to work, pleasant, but firm, loves to work with kids
B. 334. intelligent, competent socially getting along with kids
B. 335. bright—liked by kids—warm
B. 336. intelligent, participates without talking
P. 337. tact and dependability
P. 338. effective leadership, forceful attitude
P. 339. determination
P. 340. persistence
P. 341. friendly
P. 342. hard—worker
P. 343. dependable
P. 344. conscientious
P. 345. enjoys high school students, yet can be firm
P. 346. liked by his class because of his sincerity
P. 347. liked by students
P. 348. highly cooperative
P. 349. social poise
P. 350. cooperative attitude
P. 351. willing and cooperative, pleasant manner of working with people
P. 352. intelligent and resourceful
P. 353. tries very hard, welcomes suggestions
P. 354. knowledge of subject
STRONGEST TRAITS—Continued

P. 355. knowledge of subject
P. 356. desire to teach
P. 357. appearance and determination
P. 358. personality and also real music talent
P. 359. writes in detail, keeps excellent notebooks
P. 360. attractive, persistent
P. 361. will come for help
P. 362. intelligent, exceedingly good talker in a field she knows
P. 363. pleasant personality, interest in children, willingness to work
P. 364. pleasant personality
P. 365. willingness to work, quick mind, fine appearance
P. 366. hard worker, above-average student
P. 367. above-average in knowledge of subject matter
P. 368. an apparent desire to teach
P. 369. very warm, effective working with students, very uninhibited, good cultured background
P. 370. likes high school kids, can work with them
P. 371. interested in becoming good teacher, sympathetic to kids
B. 372. intelligent, good teacher, sincere, poise
P. 373. pleasant
B. 374. analytical approach
B. 375. attractive leadership
P. 376. tremendous interest in teaching
P. 377. a worker
P. 378. he works hard and has initiative
P. 379. very hard worker and enthusiastic
B. 380. ability to generalize from experiences and apply generalizations to other teaching situations
B. 381. the above reason plus the ability to assume responsibility of various kinds easily and see projects through
P. 382. poise and appearance
P. 383. determination to become a good teacher
B. 384. effective planning and execution of plans
B. 385. self-confidence, works well with people—teaching adults
B. 386. ability to work with groups and individuals
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P. 387. ability to get along with people, good student
P. 388. farm background, knows farming
P. 389. conscientious
B. 390. vibrant personality, imaginative
B. 391. optimistic, attractive personality
P. 392. intelligent
P. 393. pleasant easy-going personality
B. 394. interest in students, excellent in presentation, thorough in preparation
B. 395. enthusiasm in teaching, ability and patience
B. 396. cooperating, interest in presentation
P. 397. desire to get along with people
P. 398. open to suggestions
P. 399. enthusiasm for teaching
B. 400. ability in listening to students and in summarizing contributions to focus upon basic principles or issues
B. 401. adaptability in making learning experiences in one situation applicable to and functional in other situations, senses capability of students for nature and extent of preparation and cooperation
P. 402. pleasant personality, slightly better than average academic ability
P. 403. willingness to accept suggestions, pleasant personality
B. 404. knowledge of subject matter
B. 405. ability to organize
B. 406. sincerity
P. 407. technical ability
P. 408. good appearance
P. 409. knowledge of subject matter
B. 410. thorough planning, senses pupil reaction and adjusts work accordingly, eager to learn
P. 411. speaks Spanish fluently, well poised before groups
P. 412. friendly, and willing to listen to criticism
B. 413. intelligent, understanding pupils
B. 414. outstanding leadership of his school pupils
B. 415. initiative and determination; resourcefulness
B. 416. initiative, resourcefulness, understands students
STRONGEST TRAITS—Continued

P. 417. intelligent, well-informed
P. 418. pleasant and dutiful
P. 419. gets along well with people
P. 420. dutifulness
B. 421. critical thinking, mature personality
B. 422. creativity
P. 423. poise and appearance
P. 424. scholarship and ability in critical analysis
B. 425. willing to work, very intelligent, wins people easily and wins confidence of students
P. 426. fine personality, good nature ability—meets people easily
P. 427. good personality, fair student, and may become a good teacher with experience
B. 428. getting students to generalize
B. 429. use of community resources
B. 430. understands students
P. 431. ability to interest students
P. 432. sincere and willing to learn
P. 433. has good ideas on motivation of students, made good use of maps
B. 434. ability to work with people
B. 435. friendly
B. 436. ability to work with people
B. 437. ability to plan
P. 438. ability to meet and work with people
P. 439. knows farm problems and work
P. 440. knowledge of farming
B. 441. ability to take over classes from critic in truly professional way
B. 442. ability to cooperate, to fit into situations, all due to personality and excellent planning
B. 443. understanding of pupils, teaching with a type of motivation that kept pupils working happily and profitably
P. 444. academic proficiency
P. 445. attractive in personality
P. 446. sincerity in performance of all teaching duties, analytical approach to pupil activities
STRONGEST TRAITS—Continued

B. 447. effective personality and subject background
P. 448. effective personality
B. 449. maturity in relationships with people
B. 450. creative ability
B. 451. cooperativeness and consideration for others
P. 452. vivaciousness, friendliness and cooperativeness
P. 453. attractive, pleasant person
B. 454. leadership, scholarship, initiative, abilities in several areas
P. 455. friendly, sense of humor, enjoys students
B. 456. ability to get along with people, professional maturity
B. 457. ability to get along with students
B. 458. classroom presentation
B. 459. drive, strong in content
P. 460. punctuality
P. 461. calm classroom manner
P. 462. appearance
P. 463. personality
B. 464. teaching methods, poise and self-confidence
B. 465. poise and adaptability, ability to work with others
P. 466. industry and effort
P. 467. self-confidence
B. 468. faculty in securing class participation
P. 469. ambition
B. 470. kindness to students
P. 471. organization
B. 472. sincere desire to learn
B. 473. ability to make practical application of knowledge to pupils' needs
P. 474. intellectually curious
B. 475. willingness to work purposefully
B. 476. excellent poise, eager, self-reliant, dependable and purposeful
B. 477. mature outlook, maintains direction in activities
P. 478. polite pleasant manner
P. 479. multiplicity of life experiences
STRONGEST TRAITS—Continued

B. 480. superior in all aspects of teaching
B. 481. superior in all aspects of teaching
P. 482. friendly—pleasant with all students
P. 483. highly cooperative—willing to work
B. 484. insightful, works hard
B. 485. good grasp of subject and ideas, works well with boys, can motivate
B. 486. planning, works hard, curious about his own teaching
B. 487. a forceful person, takes responsibility like a veteran
P. 488. has intelligence and drive
P. 489. hard worker, teaches in a workman-like way
B. 490. resourceful
P. 491. patience
B. 492. character and his influence on students
B. 493. keeps up interest in the class
P. 494. has a good mind (but does not live up to her ability)
P. 495. pleasing personality
B. 496. judgment
B. 497. hard work
P. 498. willingness to work
P. 499. willingness to work
B. 500. well-organized presentation
B. 501. sincerity and background
B. 502. acceptance by pupils
B. 503. insight
P. 504. acceptance by pupils
P. 505. background in subject
P. 506. acceptance by some athletes
P. 507. acceptance by some pupils
B. 508. perception of problems
B. 509. ability in group work
B. 510. excellent methods and ability to get along with students and faculty
B. 511. planning and sincerity
P. 512. friendliness
STRAONGEST TRAITS—Continued

P. 513. he works, tries
P. 514. friendliness and hard work
P. 515. controls class well
B. 516. professional attitude
B. 517. leadership and thoroughness
P. 518. sympathetic attitude
P. 519. sympathy and understanding
B. 520. ability to think on feet, skill in discussion, dynamic personality
B. 521. gearing activities to individual differences, skill in discussion
B. 522. excellent teacher-pupil relations, applications of modern methods
B. 523. excellent combination of personal and professional relations with pupils
P. 524. desire to teach, conscientiousness
P. 525. excellent subject-matter background
P. 526. conscientious, effective planning
P. 527. excellent thinking, self-analysis
B. 528. good judgment
B. 529. good thinker
B. 530. meticulous
B. 531. dependability
P. 532. conscientious
P. 533. interest in teaching
P. 534. strong personality
P. 535. pleasing personality
B. 536. ability to work with all types of people
B. 537. initiative and imagination
B. 538. ability to present material in interesting ways
P. 539. ability to get along with people
P. 540. personality that appeals to students
B. 541. enthusiasm for pupils and their growth
B. 542. poise, pleasant manner with others; seriously interested in teaching
P. 543. pleasant, comfortable manner with others
STRONGEST TRAITS—Continued

P. 544. desire to do well in everything
B. 545. knack for understanding children
B. 546. command of subject matter
B. 547. objectives, over-all picture, command of subject matter
B. 548. strength of purpose, desire to succeed
P. 549. pleasing personality
P. 550. friendliness, pleasing personality
P. 551. industry, command of subject
B. 552. anticipatory thinking
P. 553. sincere
B. 554. tracing thought process of students
B. 555. understanding of students
B. 556. planning
B. 557. knowledge of subject matter
P. 558. sincerity
P. 559. enthusiasm
P. 560. liked by students
B. 561. sincerity
B. 562. unusually good judgment
B. 563. good planning, really works
B. 564. wins the confidence of difficult students, good background, good personality
P. 565. likeable kid, loyal
P. 566. knows his chemistry
P. 567. very good student, knows theory of teaching well, works hard, over-size
B. 568. ability to handle students—interest in them (twice)
P. 569. accepts suggestions
P. 570. pleasant
B. 571. knowledge of subject—enthusiasm, works
B. 572. enthusiasm for teaching
P. 573. patient, pleasant, attractive personality
P. 574. subject matter, questioning
B. 575. sincere interest in each student. scholarship high
B. 576. unusual understanding of present realities and ability to communicate
B. 577. sincere interest in each student, high scholarship
P. 578. relatively good scholarship
P. 579. very cooperative
P. 580. the students like her (but didn't respect her as one of them socially)
B. 581. ability to put extreme intelligence to practical use; excellent musicianship
B. 582. industry, intelligence, ability to think
B. 583. intelligence, general musicianship
B. 584. personality, industry
P. 585. musicianship, intellect
P. 586. personality, ability to express himself on paper
P. 587. personality
P. 588. ability as vocalist
B. 589. personality
B. 590. hard work and originality in planning
P. 591. appearance
P. 592. sincerity of purpose
B. 593. understanding of pupils
B. 594. contagious enthusiasm
B. 595. enthusiasm
B. 596. ability to organize materials, teach effectively
P. 597. cooperation
P. 598. ability to get along with people
P. 599. desire to please
P. 600. knowledge of subject matter
B. 601. adaptability
B. 602. professional attitude
P. 603. friendliness
P. 604. persistence
B. 605. background of experience, and intelligence
B. 606. planning and organization
B. 607. planning
B. 608. ability to establish relations with pupils
B. 609. determination
STRONGEST TRAITS—Continued

P. 610. good appearance physically and good at small talk
P. 611. sincerity
P. 612. he tries
P. 613. sincerity
P. 614. pleasant fellow
B. 615. effective results in teaching influence of personality upon pupils very wholesome
B. 616. vivacious, enthusiastic attitude, subject-matter background excellent
P. 617. excellent background in subject matter
P. 618. general intelligence
B. 619. ability to handle student—interest in them
APPENDIX IV

NO. 1. IS HE SUFFICIENTLY ANIMATED?

Strongest Traits

2. B. personality in classroom 273. B. classroom personality
30. B. enthusiastic 274. B. personality—classroom manner
46. B. enthusiasm
60. B. dynamic quality
75. B. enthusiasm
101. P. enthusiasm
107. P. enthusiasm before class
112. P. general enthusiasm
121. B. enthusiastic
147. B. enthusiasm
167. B. eagerness for teaching in all its aspects
189. P. he is an eager beaver
239. P. he has zip
260. B. strong personality
268. B. classroom personality
272. B. enthusiasm

Weakest Traits

1. B. reserve
30. B. reticence in self-expression
41. B. lacks enthusiasm
63. P. lack of enthusiasm
65. B. too quiet
67. B. reserved
69. B. reserved
71. P. introvert
80. P. lifeless—almost completely devoid of overt response
99. B. shyness and lack of sparkle
121. B. reserved manner
142. P. passiveness
246. P. lack of enthusiasm
257. B. pretty quiet fellow
259. P. appears tired
275. B. seems to lack humor
285. B. little shy
291. B. lack of overt enthusiasm—has a serious countenance
292. E. slightly timid
300. B. shyness with adults
301. B. seldom contributes (does not communicate well)
312. P. lacks enthusiasm
315. P. weak personality
335. P. rather placid
365. B. needs to appear less serious more often
NO. 1. IS HE SUFFICIENTLY ANIMATED?—Continued

Weakest Traits—Continued

374. P. lack of enthusiasm
395. P. lack of animation
398. B. timid
405. B. reserved
408. B. reserved
432. B. modest
449. B. timidity
451. B. timidity
461. B. timidity
464. P. lacking in enthusiasm
466. B. a little diffident
467. B. might appear diffident
475. B. sense of humor
501. P. lack of enthusiasm before a group
510. P. no fire
521. B. tendency toward shyness
535. P. shyness
536. B. reserve and seriousness
538. P. shy
541. B. initial impression of being reserved
548. B. sometimes a bit too reserved
NO. 2. IS HE RESPONSIBLE?

Strongest Traits

56. P. dependable
69. B. carries responsibility well
108. P. dependability
118. B. accepts many responsibilities
136. B. accepts any challenge
168. B. thoroughness in meeting professional responsibilities
171. P. dependability
252. P. dependable
264. B. accepts responsibility well
284. P. good citizen
307 B. wants responsibility
308. B. never has an alibi
337. P. dependability
343. P. dependable

344. P. conscientious
381. B. ability to assume responsibilities of various kinds easily
389. P. conscientious
418. P. dutiful
420. P. dutifulness
460. P. punctuality
476. B. punctuality
487. B. takes responsibility like a veteran
524. P. conscientious
526. P. conscientious
531. B. dependability
532. P. conscientious
565. P. loyal

Weakest Traits

3. B. careless
6. P. avoids situations
18. P. irresponsibility
25. B. tends to be careless (with accuracy of answers)
75. P. avoided responsibility
81. P. overly casual in professional responsibilities
86. P. lackadaisical
94. P. forgetful
97. P. plans just enough to get by
153. P. tendency to stop at what is considered good enough
163. P. tendency to be superficial
178. P. never achieves potential
182. P. not dependable
185. P. no sense of responsibility
193. P. irresponsible
195. P. absenteeism
234. P. lack of sense of responsibility
250. P. tardiness and failure to assume extra-curricular responsibilities

274. P. lack of attention to details
314. P. places social interest above teaching
321. P. irresponsible
341. B. takes lines of least resistance
370. P. easy-going to the point of doing little
399. P. careless
401. P. not professional in her attitudes
424. B. tendency to be too casual
440. B. forgetful
457. P. careless
481. P. unethical behavior
498. P. not serious enough about responsibilities
539. P. satisfied with next to her best
543. P. unreliable
NO. 3. DOES HE SHOW ADEQUATE SELF-CONFIDENCE?

**Strongest Traits**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>P. appearance of self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>P. self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.</td>
<td>P. self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245.</td>
<td>B. self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312.</td>
<td>B. secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313.</td>
<td>B. confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314.</td>
<td>B. confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385.</td>
<td>B. self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391.</td>
<td>B. optimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464.</td>
<td>B. self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467.</td>
<td>P. self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476.</td>
<td>B. self-reliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weakest Traits**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>P. lacks confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>P. lack of assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>B. lack of self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>P. lacks self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>B. needs more confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>B. needs more confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>P. lack of confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>P. needs more confidence in her ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>B. hesitates to turn loose her own resourcefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>P. lacking in self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>P. feeling of inadequacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>B. lack of self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>B. somewhat insecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>B. some lack of confidence in himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td>P. lack of confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158.</td>
<td>P. lacks self-confidence and hesitates to assume leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.</td>
<td>B. lacks confidence to some degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.</td>
<td>P. lacks confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244.</td>
<td>B. lacks self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.</td>
<td>P. lack of confidence (possibly corrected in time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287.</td>
<td>B. lack of self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302.</td>
<td>P. lack of courage and confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308.</td>
<td>P. lacks self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309.</td>
<td>P. lacks confidence in himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310.</td>
<td>P. lacks confidence in using blackboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316.</td>
<td>P. lacks self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334.</td>
<td>P. slightly pessimistic—somewhat timid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343.</td>
<td>P. lack of confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371.</td>
<td>B. tendency to underestimate herself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389.</td>
<td>P. lacks confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402.</td>
<td>P. lack of confidence in himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411.</td>
<td>P. lack of confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415.</td>
<td>B. slight degree of under-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431.</td>
<td>P. afraid to take initiative or strong leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443.</td>
<td>P. lacks confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448.</td>
<td>P. insecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450.</td>
<td>B. lack of self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460.</td>
<td>B. early lack of confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470.</td>
<td>P. lacks self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472.</td>
<td>P. feels inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483.</td>
<td>B. lack of self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485.</td>
<td>B. lack of self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497.</td>
<td>B. needs encouragement for best results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499.</td>
<td>P. lack of confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550.</td>
<td>P. insecure—feels he is unable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO. 4. DOES HE UNDERSTAND STUDENTS?

Strongest Traits

109. B. understanding of people and reasons for their actions
159. B. understanding of pupils
191. B. understanding of pupils
211. B. understands kids
259. B. understanding of human relations
260. B. understanding of students
278. B. understands pupils
304. B. intelligent understanding of students
317. B. understanding of youth
413. B. understanding pupils
416. B. understands students
430. B. understands students
443. B. understanding of pupils
519. P. understanding
545. B. knack for understanding children
555. B. understanding of students
593. B. understanding of pupils

Weakest Traits

4. P. understanding of students
19. B. sometimes expects too much of pupils
120. B. difficulty in accepting any standard less than perfection
148. B. unaware of pupil limitations
186. P. lack of understanding of children
201. P. lack of ability to recognize needs of adolescents
231. P. understanding of pupils
249. B. perfectionist
354. P. taught as if he were teaching college students
404. P. too visionary
410. P. lack of understanding
421. B. slight impatience with poor workmanship
423. P. lack of understanding
NO. 5. IS HE EMOTIONALLY STABLE?  
(includes opposites of anxiety, patience, independence)

**Strongest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23. B.</th>
<th>stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. B.</td>
<td>stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. B.</td>
<td>stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. P.</td>
<td>patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. P.</td>
<td>patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156. P.</td>
<td>patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232. P.</td>
<td>even disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241. B.</td>
<td>patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291. P.</td>
<td>patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395. B.</td>
<td>patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491. P.</td>
<td>patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573. P.</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weakest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. B.</th>
<th>over-intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. B.</td>
<td>occasional impatience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. P.</td>
<td>may not be able to stand up under heavy load of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. B.</td>
<td>impatience with weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. P.</td>
<td>emotional stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. B.</td>
<td>over-determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. B.</td>
<td>needs more easy give-and-take in social relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. P.</td>
<td>emotional adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. P.</td>
<td>instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. P.</td>
<td>instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. P.</td>
<td>gets rattled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. P.</td>
<td>worries too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. B.</td>
<td>tends to over-plan his work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. P.</td>
<td>flighty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130. P.</td>
<td>overly-dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. B.</td>
<td>overly-conscientious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. B.</td>
<td>slight nervousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149. B.</td>
<td>over-concern about performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170. P.</td>
<td>emotional instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183. P.</td>
<td>moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209. P.</td>
<td>extreme self-consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230. P.</td>
<td>hot-tempered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258. P.</td>
<td>emotional instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262. B.</td>
<td>too serious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 272. P. | patience |
| 275. B. | too introspective |
| 328. P. | nervous and unstrung by emotional stresses |
| 330. P. | I fear he is neurotic |
| 340. B. | impatience |
| 349. B. | works too hard |
| 365. B. | needs to relax |
| 413. B. | some moodiness |
| 423. P. | instability |
| 441. B. | may do too much organizing |
| 442. P. | inconsistent |
| 456. B. | impatient |
| 462. P. | unstable nature |
| 469. P. | unstable—queer ways |
| 476. B. | enthusiasm tends to drive him too hard at times |
| 493. P. | emotional instability |
| 494. B. | impatient |
| 509. P. | appears to lack adjustment (to position of leadership) |
| 522. B. | might seem to be over-concerned about teaching techniques being effective |
| 531. B. | tenseness |
| 551. P. | instability |
NO. 6. IS HE INDUSTRIOUS?

Strongest Traits

77. B. industry 332. B. ability to work
81. B. hard worker 333. B. willingness to work
93. P. works hard 342. P. hard worker
120. P. industry 353. P. tries very hard
125. B. industry 363. P. willingness to work
128. P. industry 365. P. willingness to work
139. B. willingness to work 366. P. hard worker
183. P. willingness to try 377. P. a worker
184. P. willingness to work 378. P. he works hard
185. P. willingness to try 379. P. a very hard worker
189. P. he is an eager beaver 425. B. willingness to work
212. P. works hard 466. P. industry and effort
214. P. hard worker 475. B. willingness to work purposefully
217. P. willingness to work hard 483. P. willing to work
(to improve her teaching)
227. P. industry 484. B. works hard
233. P. willingness to work 486. B. works hard
235. P. willingness to work 489. P. hard worker
254. P. energetic 497. B. hard work
262. P. hard worker 498. P. willingness to work
263. P. hard worker 499. P. willingness to work
284. P. willing worker 513. P. he works, tries
293. B. hard worker 514. P. hard work
308. B. terrific worker 551. P. industry
327. B. willingness to work 563. B. really works
328. B. hard worker 567. P. works hard
329. B. willingness to work 571. B. works
330. B. hard worker 582. B. industry
331. B. willingness to work 584. B. industry
332. B. hard worker 590. B. hard work
335. B. willing worker 612. P. he tries

Weakest Traits

106. P. lazy 373. P. lack of effort
164. P. inability to concentrate and apply himself 390. P. lazy
                   468. P. doesn't like work
                   492. P. lack of effort
NO. 7. IS HE SINCERE - GENUINE?

**Strongest Traits**

27. P. sincerity of approach in teaching younger students  
31. P. earnestness  
57. B. exceptional total integrity  
76. B. sincerity  
77. B. sincerity  
92. P. seriousness  
104. B. unpolished sincerity  
111. P. sincerity  
112. P. earnestness  
113. B. sincere interest  
122. B. sincere  
157. P. sincerity  
161. P. sincerity  
215. P. sincerity  
218. B. sincerity  
292. P. sincerity of purpose  
346. P. (liked by his class) because of his sincerity  
372. B. sincere  
406. B. sincerity  
432. P. sincere  
446. P. sincerity in performance of all teaching duties  
472. B. sincere desire to learn  
474. P. intellectually curious  
501. B. sincerity  
511. B. sincerity  
533. P. sincere  
553. P. sincere  
558. P. sincerity  
561. B. sincerity  
575. B. sincere interest in each student  
592. P. sincerity of purpose  
599. P. desire to please  
603. P. sincerity  
611. P. sincerity  
613. P. sincerity

**Weakest Traits**

9. B. apparent artificiality (in vocal tone)  
18. P. "apple-polishing"  
78. B. occasional over-dramatization creates impression of artificiality  
180. B. tendency to try to get by on personality  
189. B. overly dramatic  
217. B. tendency to be glib  
326. P. seems insincere  
329. P. tries to bluff her way on unfamiliar grounds
## NO. 8. IS HE ABLE TO EXPLAIN IDEAS SKILLFULLY?

### Strongest Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>P. classroom teaching good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>B. professional ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>B. ability to present and explain material in an interesting yet precise way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>B. skillful presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>B. presentation of material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>B. presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>B. outstanding skill in presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>B. classroom teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.</td>
<td>B. classroom-teaching ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194.</td>
<td>P. skill in presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.</td>
<td>B. presents material well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213.</td>
<td>B. ability to put it across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.</td>
<td>B. demonstration ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.</td>
<td>B. natural ability to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236.</td>
<td>B. teaches like a competent veteran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270.</td>
<td>B. effective teaching practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285.</td>
<td>B. interesting and pleasant manner in presenting skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286.</td>
<td>B. ability to present skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302.</td>
<td>B. ability to present material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319.</td>
<td>B. manner of presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325.</td>
<td>B. has taught well under many adverse conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372.</td>
<td>good teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394.</td>
<td>B. excellent in presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396.</td>
<td>B. interest in presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426.</td>
<td>P. good natural ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441.</td>
<td>B. ability to take over class from critic in truly professional way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458.</td>
<td>B. classroom presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464.</td>
<td>B. teaching methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480.</td>
<td>B. superior in all aspects of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481.</td>
<td>B. superior in all aspects of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489.</td>
<td>P. teaches in a workman-like way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500.</td>
<td>B. well-organized presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510.</td>
<td>B. excellent methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522.</td>
<td>B. applications of modern methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538.</td>
<td>B. ability to present materials in interesting ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576.</td>
<td>B. ability to communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596.</td>
<td>B. teaches effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615.</td>
<td>B. effective results in teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weakest Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>P. inability to focus—that is, tends to deal with high-order abstractions and multiplicity thereof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>P. can't apply her theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>B. sometimes a bit didactic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>P. lacks skill in lesson presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>B. explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>P. academic rather than practical in his approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.</td>
<td>P. explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208.</td>
<td>P. lack of ability to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224.</td>
<td>P. only fair application of what he knows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241.</td>
<td>P. lacks practical ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247.</td>
<td>B. specific method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254.</td>
<td>P. lack of ability to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303.</td>
<td>P. difficulty in explaining things to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336.</td>
<td>P. lacks teaching sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379.</td>
<td>B. failure to get conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393.</td>
<td>B. might easily develop over-emphasis upon academic aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427.</td>
<td>B. difficulty in over-emphasizing philosophical approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430.</td>
<td>P. generally weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.</td>
<td>P. lacks specificity in teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO. 9. CAN HE ASSESS SITUATIONS AND REACT TO OTHERS QUICKLY?
(There is focus here on situations and ideas)

Strongest Traits

4. B. dynamic element in ability to react to students' comments
58. B. acute perception in ideas
59. B. insight and sensitivity to others and their ideas
182. B. ability to analyze situations and actions
216. B. ability to value each student in the on-going activity
   (and make him feel his contributions are worthwhile)
237. B. ability to adjust to pupils' needs when teaching
241. B. quickness to sense need for adjustment in lesson
269. B. ability to think on her feet and take advantage of
   spontaneous opportunities for learning
272. B. classroom virtuosity
305. B. ability to use digressions as profitable learning
   experiences
326. B. quick thinker
328. B. quick thinker
330. B. quick thinker
365. P. quick mind
400. B. ability in listening to students and in summarizing contri-
   butions to focus upon basic principles or issues
401. B. ability in making learning experiences in one situation
   applicable to and functional in other situations
410. B. senses pupil reaction and adjusts work accordingly
520. B. ability to think on feet
552. B. anticipatory thinking

Weakest Traits

11. P. slowness in perception and reaction to others and their ideas
14. B. seeing a whole group
74. B. slow-moving
87. P. misses too much—not perceptive enough
94. P. very slow
116. P. slowness in sizing up the situation and in dealing with
   problems
144. B. slow
156. B. tendency to go too fast
162. P. lack of ability to analyze the situation
189. P. slow, ponderous style
190. P. insensitive to need
196. B. enthusiasm and buoyancy at times may over-power less
   enthusiastic
203. P. unaware of class
214. P. can't think on her feet
218. B. too much talk
239. B. leading focused discussion
253. B. somewhat inflexible in adapting plans when classroom situation
   demands change on short notice
NO. 9. CAN HE ASSESS SITUATIONS AND REACT TO OTHERS QUICKLY?

Continued

Weakest Traits—Continued

269. B. tendency to lecture
290. B. little slow in comprehending
311. P. slowness and lack of adaptability
315. P. slow to sense need of moment
331. P. thinks rather slowly
342. B. discussion too slow
358. P. inability to project herself into teaching situation
382. P. tendency to lecture on the factual
385. B. talks too much
396. P. not sensitive to pupils’ learning responses
426. B. tendency to be too deliberate at times
471. B. class lectures
474. B. moves too slowly at times
477. P. can’t seem to realize she is teaching a group rather than a few individuals
479. B. talks too much
488. P. inability to grasp situation and act on it
NO. 10. CAN HE ORGANIZE HIS THOUGHTS AND EXPRESS HIS IDEAS CLEARLY?

**Strongest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>B. critical thinker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>P. writes well and speaks quite well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>P. writes in detail—keeps excellent notebooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>P. exceedingly good talker in a field she knows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>B. summarizing contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>P. ability to express himself (on paper)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weakest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>P. malnutrition in own language development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>P. diffuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>B. vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>B. poor grammar and spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>P. poor English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>B. oral expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>B. verbal expression is poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>P. verbal expression is poor—vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>B. lack of verbal fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>P. inarticulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>B. use of written and spoken English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>B. use of English language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>B. command of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>B. does not communicate very well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>B. English usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>P. free speech habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>P. inability to express himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>B. not detailed enough in written work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>P. lacks sharpness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO. 11. IS HE IMAGINATIVE AND RESOURCEFUL?

**Strongest Traits**

5. B. imagination—ability to perceive significant element in an enterprise  
68. B. ability to develop and use materials (appropriate to different groups)  
95. B. versatility  
152. B. use of variety of procedures  
158. B. creative ability and originality  
162. B. all-around ability  
166. B. originality  
181. B. imagination and fresh approach to teaching  
201. B. variety of presentation  
205. B. all-around ability  
221. B. original  
268. B. creativity  

**Weakest Traits**

16. P. unimaginative  
129. P. unimaginative  
246. P. lack of imagination  
248. P. no imagination  
279. B. needs practice in varying teaching devices  

309. B. resourceful and creative  
310. B. has many ideas  
321. B. versatility  
352. P. resourceful  
390. B. imaginative  
406. B. resourcefulness  
415. B. resourceful  
422. B. creativity  
429. B. use of community resources  
433. P. made good use of maps  
450. B. creative ability  
454. B. abilities in several areas  
480. B. superior in all aspects of teaching  
481. B. superior in all aspects of teaching  
490. B. resourceful  
537. B. imagination  
590. B. originality in planning  

312. P. lacks imagination  
318. P. lacks resourcefulness  
359. P. lack of creative ability  
396. P. not creative  
455. P. lack of imagination  
511. P. little tendency to be creative
NO. 12. DOES HE HAVE ADEQUATE SPEAKING VOICE?

Strongest Traits

218. B. voice

Weakest Traits

17. B. voice
57. P. unforceful voice
68. B. rapid speech
70. P. rapid speech
83. P. voice
126. B. oral expression
146. B. poor voice quality
157. P. speech ability
166. B. voice and expression
172. P. voice
179. B. voice projection
195. P. weak voice
197. B. voice at times
199. P. monotonous voice
236. B. voice could be improved

237. P. poor speech
238. P. poor speech
261. B. voice a little soft at times
277. B. voice a little weak—nasal
305. P. poor voice
344. P. voice projection is weak
355. B. voice is weak
361. B. speaking voice
406. B. voice
407. B. voice
425. B. rapid speech
436. P. voice
NO. 13. IS HE ABLE TO MAINTAIN ADEQUATE CONTROL?

Strongest Traits

11. B. ability to handle a junior high class
15. B. classroom control
33. B. classroom control
96. B. ability to handle a class
220. B. effective management of deportment
229. B. can manage large groups effectively
325. B. has taught well under many adverse conditions
333. B. firm
345. P. can be firm
515. P. controls class well
568. B. ability to handle students
619. B. ability to handle students

Weakest Traits

39. B. too informal with students
59. B. may be too easy-going in classroom situations
100. B. lack of authority
101. P. not firm—not positive
114. P. lack of personality that can command the respect of large groups
119. P. ambivalence—tends to impose restrictions to excess at times with some students and fails to establish limits at other times with others
169. P. inadequate class control
192. B. too moderate in firmness
215. P. lacks control
220. P. lack of classroom control
500. P. management of high school class
NO. 14. IS HE ABLE TO IDENTIFY AND DIAGNOSE LEARNING PROBLEMS?

**Strongest Traits**

18. B. insightfulness
57. B. insight
68. B. ability to develop and use materials appropriate to different groups
75. B. insight
76. B. insight
100. B. ability to work with slower students
132. B. perception of effects of student experiences
159. B. understanding of pupils' needs
191. B. analysis of teaching
222. B. she adapts to students' level
242. P. good skill analysis
246. B. relating past to present
265. B. comprehension in teaching
286. B. ability to analyze
289. P. ability to use content to develop insights and concepts and to stimulate thought
290. B. ability to analyze self
323. B. intelligence which is applied to teaching
324. B. keen observer
330. B. keen observer
380. B. can apply generalizations to other teaching situations
381. B. can apply generalizations to differing teaching situations
386. B. ability to work with groups and individuals
401. B. senses capabilities of students
424. P. ability in critical analysis
473. B. ability to make practical application of knowledge to pupils' needs
484. B. insightful
503. B. insight
508. B. perception of problems
521. B. gearing activities to individual differences
554. B. tracing thought process of students
581. B. ability to put extreme intelligence to practical use

**Weakest Traits**

15. B. individual provisions
22. P. lack of understanding in planning learning experiences
32. P. lack of insight in learning situations
95. B. difficulty in analyzing weakness in individual students
98. P. difficulty in anticipating people's problems
140. B. difficulty in staying on pupils' level
176. B. not always challenges the superior students
201. P. lacks ways of involving adolescents in learning experiences
219. P. insensitivity to learning potential in classroom situations
268. P. finds it difficult to set up effective learning situations
No. 14. Is he able to identify and diagnose learning problems?

Continued

Weakest Traits—Continued

286. B. understanding nature of student difficulties
354. P. taught as if he were teaching college students
400. B. a little difficulty in presenting material on high school level
417. P. inability to recognize needs
428. P. failure to reduce ideas to level of practice
458. B. finding level of students at first
526. P. lacks some ability to understand students' difficulties
NO. 15. DOES HE POSSESS ADEQUATE GENERAL KNOWLEDGE?

### Strongest Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>B. excellent scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>P. good scholarship ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.</td>
<td>B. scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198.</td>
<td>P. scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208.</td>
<td>P. good student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218.</td>
<td>B. background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293.</td>
<td>B. scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366.</td>
<td>P. above-average student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369.</td>
<td>P. good cultured background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387.</td>
<td>P. good student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402.</td>
<td>P. slightly better-than-average academic ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417.</td>
<td>P. well-informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421.</td>
<td>P. scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427.</td>
<td>P. fair student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444.</td>
<td>P. academic proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454.</td>
<td>B. scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479.</td>
<td>P. multiplicity of life experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501.</td>
<td>B. background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564.</td>
<td>B. good background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567.</td>
<td>P. very good student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575.</td>
<td>B. scholarship high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576.</td>
<td>B. unusual understanding of present realities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577.</td>
<td>B. high scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578.</td>
<td>P. relatively good scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605.</td>
<td>B. background of experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weakest Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>P. scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>B. need for experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>B. weak in cultural knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>B. needs experience(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>B. background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>B. lacks knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>P. scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198.</td>
<td>B. lacks knowledge of lower economic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205.</td>
<td>B. experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252.</td>
<td>B. lack of factual knowledge outside of the specific field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360.</td>
<td>B. inexperience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375.</td>
<td>B. little too naive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410.</td>
<td>P. lack of background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519.</td>
<td>P. background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528.</td>
<td>B. inexperience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530.</td>
<td>B. inexperience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537.</td>
<td>B. lack of experience with younger children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552.</td>
<td>B. experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NO. 16. DOES HE HAVE INITIATIVE?

**Strongest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>B. initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>B. initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>P. initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>B. seeks out new teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>P. initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>B. initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>B. initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>B. initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>B. initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weakest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>P. initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>B. not entirely self-directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>P. initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>P. initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>P. lacks initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>B. lacks initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>P. lacks initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>P. inability to take hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>B. lacks initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>P. lacks initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>P. lacks initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>P. lacks initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>P. lacks initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>P. lack of initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>P. lack of initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>P. lack of initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>P. hesitated to go ahead on own</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO. 17. DOES HE HAVE ADEQUATE KNOWLEDGE OF HIS SUBJECT MATTER?

**Strongest Traits**

7. P. academically sound  
10. B. knowledge of content  
12. P. content knowledge  
13. P. content preparation  
16. B. knowledge of subject matter  
25. B. knowledge of subject matter  
28. P. high degree of musical qualification  
43. B. high quality workmanship  
49. P. farm background  
66. P. background in French  
70. P. skills in food production  
74. P. knowledge of subject  
80. P. adequate musical skills  
89. B. subject matter  
95. B. content  
97. P. content knowledge  
103. B. basic knowledge of field  
126. B. musical preparation  
127. B. grasp of subject matter  
138. P. athletic ability  
150. B. knowledge of farming and farm problems  
177. P. knowledge of subject  
178. P. knowledge of subject  
179. B. musicianship  
180. B. musicianship  
181. B. musicianship  
182. B. musicianship  
201. B. good knowledge of content  
202. B. knows material  
219. P. background in subject  
222. B. good subject-matter background  
232. B. musicianship  
234. P. poor preparation in band work  
235. P. preparation in string work  
237. B. knowledge of subject  
258. P. interest in technical skills in art  
271. P. background in subject field  
272. B. musicianship  
273. B. musicianship  
274. B. musical qualifications—musicianship  
285. B. a thorough understanding of his subject  
296. B. dramatic ability  
297. B. dramatic ability  
315. B. musicianship  
326. B. knows subject  
331. B. knowledge of psychology  
354. P. knowledge of subject  
355. P. knowledge of subject
NO. 17. DOES HE HAVE ADEQUATE KNOWLEDGE OF HIS SUBJECT MATTER?  

Continued

Strongest Traits—Continued

388. P. farm background—knows farming
404. B. knowledge of subject matter
407. P. technical ability
409. P. knowledge of subject
411. P. speaks Spanish fluently
439. P. knows farm problems and work
440. P. knowledge of farming
459. B. strong in content
485. B. good grasp of subject (and ideas)
505. P. background in subject
525. P. excellent subject-matter background
546. B. command of subject matter
547. B. command of subject matter
551. P. command of subject-matter
556. P. knows his chemistry
557. B. knowledge of subject matter
567. P. knows theory of teaching well
571. B. knowledge of subject
574. P. subject matter
581. B. excellent musicianship
583. B. general musicianship
585. P. musicianship
588. P. ability as a vocalist
600. P. knowledge of subject matter
616. B. subject-matter background excellent
617. P. excellent background in subject matter

Weakest Traits

25. B. accuracy of answers and other material
42. P. lacks subject matter
79. P. technical deficiencies
89. P. musicianship
110. P. background in subject
111. B. relatively weak musical background
145. P. subject
161. P. lack of musical understanding
171. B. subject-matter weakness
186. P. lack of subject-matter preparation
207. B. lack of experience in vocal music
209. B. lack of musicianship
246. P. lack of knowledge of the field
263. P. lack of clear knowledge of subject
273. B. dramatic ability
332. P. not very strong in subject matter
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NO. 17. DOES HE HAVE ADEQUATE KNOWLEDGE OF HIS SUBJECT MATTER?
Continued

Weakest Trails—Continued

346. B. lack of certain art techniques
351. P. weak in subject
386. B. knowledge in agriculture
388. P. lacks knowledge in technical agriculture
397. P. had not matured sufficiently in English
412. B. lack of subject-matter knowledge in some P.E. areas
454. P. poor command of subject matter
487. P. absence of musicianship
495. B. lacks farm experience
517. P. weak in subject-matter background
NO. 18. DOES HE GET ALONG WELL WITH OTHERS?

**Strongest Traits**

4. B. dynamic element in ability to relate to students
19. B. relations with pupils
44. P. friendliness
45. B. working with people
50. P. working with groups
52. B. ability to work with others
54. P. courteous
78. P. ability to establish rapport
79. P. willingness to co-operate
115. P. co-operation
119. P. co-operation
124. P. pupil-teacher relationship
149. B. likes people
154. P. ability to get along with the boys
170. P. good in human relations
172. P. co-operative attitude
178. P. co-operative attitude
187. B. teacher-pupil rapport
190. P. ability to get along with people
191. B. relationship with faculty
192. B. relationship with faculty, school-community participation
209. P. ability to get along with people
238. P. he gets along quite well with students
247. B. gets along with people
250. B. tactful
277. P. ability to get along well with other people
291. P. courtesy
294. B. relationship with people
295. B. relationship with people
299. B. co-operativeness
318. B. relations with students
334. B. competent socially getting along with kids
337. P. tact
348. P. highly co-operative
350. P. co-operative attitude
351. P. willing and co-operative
370. P. can work with high school kids
385. B. works well with people—teaching adults
387. P. ability to get along with people
396. B. co-operative
401. B. co-operation
419. P. gets along well with people
426. P. meets people easily
434. B. ability to work with people
436. B. ability to work with people
438. P. ability to meet and work with people
442. B. ability to co-operate
451. B. co-operativeness
452. P. co-operativeness
NO. 18. DOES HE GET ALONG WELL WITH OTHERS?—Continued

Strongest Traits—Continued

456. B. ability to get along with people
457. B. ability to get along with students
465. B. ability to work with others
483. P. highly co-operative
509. B. ability in group work
510. B. ability to get along with students and faculty
522. B. excellent pupil-teacher relations
523. B. excellent combination of personal and professional relations with pupils
536. B. ability to work with all types of people
539. P. ability to get along with people
579. P. very co-operative
597. P. co-operation
598. P. ability to get along with people
608. B. ability to establish relations with pupils

Weakest Traits

27. B. tendency to be intolerant of weaknesses of associates
112. B. personality for working with large groups
123. P. difficulty in human relations
204. P. personal relations
307. P. relationships with people
333. P. lack of tact
352. P. lacks diplomacy
366. P. openly critical of others—antagonizes associates
416. P. criticizes too much
420. B. tolerance
435. B. tactless
503. P. lack of tactfulness
504. P. lack of tactfulness
508. B. occasionally the ability to deal with people. he tends to fight others
525. B. on some occasions has been a little sharp on replies to associates and students
543. P. an unsatisfactory attitude leading to failure in human relations
NO. 19. IS HE EFFECTIVE IN LEADING DISCUSSIONS?

**Strongest Traits**

1. B. leadership
14. B. ability to teach reflectively
23. B. leadership ability
24. B. leadership ability
73. B. excellent in questioning to get discovery on part of pupils
75. B. leadership
76. B. leadership
121. B. leadership
122. B. classroom leadership
131. B. ability to lead students in ventures they regard as their own
141. B. ability to stimulate thinking
151. B. ability to lead a discussion
175. B. leadership
176. B. leadership
179. B. leadership
180. B. leadership
306. B. developing and directing exchange of ideas between students
313. B. leadership
314. B. leadership
338. P. effective leadership
375. B. leadership
414. B. outstanding leadership
428. B. getting students to generalize
454. B. leadership
468. B. faculty in securing class participation
517. B. leadership
520. B. skill in discussion
521. B. skill in discussion
574. P. questioning

**Weakest Traits**

219. P. inability to lead discussion and communicate with class orally
243. B. handling discussion situations
322. B. ineffective leadership
323. P. does little teaching or leading
337. P. leadership
381. P. discussions wander
383. P. inadequate at questioning
NO. 20. IS HE MATURE?

Strongest Traits

34. B. mature attitude  
75. B. maturity  
110. B. maturity  
163. B. mature  
179. B. maturity  
240. B. mature judgment  
264. B. mature  
270. B. maturity  
293. B. mature  
312. B. mature  
421. B. mature personality  
449. B. maturity in relationships with people  
456. B. professional maturity  
477. B. mature outlook

Weakest Traits

31. P. immaturity  
55. B. apparent lack of maturity  
76. B. occasional random actions  
(stemming from exuberance)  
102. P. adolescent attitude—lack of maturity  
124. P. immature  
132. B. lack of maturity  
163. P. immaturity  
357. P. lack of emotional maturity  
377. P. lacks maturity  
403. P. not mature  
482. P. socially and intellectually immature  
506. B. immaturity  
523. P. immaturity in perception and social behavior  
544. P. immaturity
NO. 21. DOES HE ORGANIZE AND PLAN WELL?

Strongest Traits

16. B. organization
37. B. careful planning to use pupils' interest for motivation
38. B. organizational ability
69. B. good organizer
81. B. planning
88. P. preparation
99. B. organization
103. B. efficiency
105. B. careful planning of his work
106. B. systematic approach to all problems
129. P. organization; planning and preparation for teaching
130. P. thoroughness in planning and organization
155. P. thoroughness and planning ability
168. B. foresight
220. B. effective organization of learning experiences
221. B. good and flexible lesson plans
244. B. preparation for classes
265. B. foresight
266. P. good organization
267. P. good organization
280. B. planning his teaching
303. B. business-like method and attitude of doing work
310. B. excellent manager
312. B. excellent manager
320. B. thorough planning
324. B. excellent plans
327. B. does everything ahead of time—plans work carefully
329. B. does everything ahead of time—plans work carefully
384. B. effective planning and execution
394. B. thoroughness in preparation
401. B. extensive preparation
405. B. ability to organize
410. B. thorough planning
437. B. ability to plan
442. B. excellent planning
471. P. organization
486. B. planning
511. B. planning
517. B. thoroughness
526. P. effective planning
530. B. meticulous
556. B. planning
563. B. good planning
596. B. ability to organize materials
606. B. planning and organization
607. B. planning
NO. 21. DOES HE ORGANIZE AND PLAN WELL?—Continued

Weakest Traits

20. B. lets herself get involved in too many activities
23. P. procrastination, lack of self-discipline
31. P. lack of organizational ability
53. P. organization
105. P. disorganized approach
135. P. can't organize
153. P. lack of foresight and thoroughness in planning
167. B. planning
174. P. overloads himself
191. P. organization
203. P. unaware of time passage
208. P. lack of ability to plan and organize
212. B. organization
245. P. lack of organization of work
267. P. lack of planning
276. B. takes too much time to get acquainted
280. B. tendency to attempt too much
284. B. attempt to take on more than she is able to do in a creditable manner
288. B. organization
351. P. weak in preparation
353. P. weak in preparation
366. P. does not plan work
376. P. poorly prepared for the class meeting
383. P. tries to cover too much
394. B. budgeting of time
414. B. lack of planning
434. B. too many activities
453. P. lack of organizational ability
482. P. not organized
489. P. inability to organize
513. P. lack of planning and organizing ability
522. B. not thorough enough
532. P. inadequate preparation
534. P. lack of preparation
543. P. poor preparation
NO. 22. IS HE FLEXIBLE AND OPEN TO IDEAS AND ADVICE?

**Strongest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>B. willingness to try procedures suggested by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>B. desire to teach well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>B. adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>P. eagerness to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td>P. took suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217.</td>
<td>P. ability to &quot;take criticism&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223.</td>
<td>P. is interested in improving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240.</td>
<td>B. flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256.</td>
<td>B. eager to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273.</td>
<td>B. flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308.</td>
<td>B. goes all out to apply suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324.</td>
<td>B. ability to take suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353.</td>
<td>P. welcomes suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361.</td>
<td>P. will come for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398.</td>
<td>P. open to suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403.</td>
<td>P. willingness to accept suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410.</td>
<td>B. eager to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412.</td>
<td>P. willing to listen to criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432.</td>
<td>P. willing to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442.</td>
<td>B. ability to fit into situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465.</td>
<td>B. adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486.</td>
<td>B. curious about his own teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569.</td>
<td>P. accepts suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601.</td>
<td>B. adaptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weakest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>P. defensive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>P. rather positive, seems hard for her to be flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>B. sometimes too directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>B. seems to be defensive about criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.</td>
<td>P. stubbornness, slow to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>B. inflexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td>P. resistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168.</td>
<td>P. lack of ability to recognize faults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td>P. inability to face up to her own limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.</td>
<td>P. lack of flexibility in meeting classroom situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216.</td>
<td>B. over-sensitive to criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223.</td>
<td>B. tendency to adhere too closely to prepared plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240.</td>
<td>B. does not always accept criticism objectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255.</td>
<td>P. tendency toward defensive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264.</td>
<td>P. unable to adapt to changes of plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.</td>
<td>B. cannot see his own weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313.</td>
<td>P. will not accept rules from teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317.</td>
<td>P. tends to be defensive, unreceptive to ideas from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329.</td>
<td>P. does not face the truth about her shortcomings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367.</td>
<td>B. some rigidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414.</td>
<td>B. slight degree of inflexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429.</td>
<td>P. reluctance to accept others' suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438.</td>
<td>P. stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439.</td>
<td>P. fails to take and use suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452.</td>
<td>P. unwillingness to examine ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490.</td>
<td>B. sometimes lacks experimental point of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496.</td>
<td>B. unwilling to compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512.</td>
<td>P. tendency to alibi and rationalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518.</td>
<td>B. overly-organized with pupils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO. 23. IS HE INTELLIGENT?

Strongest Traits

7. P. intellectually of good quality
9. P. good mind
20. P. intelligence
30. B. intelligent as a teacher and person
48. P. general intelligence
57. B. ability
58. B. acute perception
64. P. intelligence
76. B. intelligence
82. P. intelligence
83. B. highly intelligent
116. B. intellectual ability
134. P. demonstrates intelligence in handling abstractions
139. B. a good mind
179. B. intellect
180. B. intellect
211. B. intelligence
228. B. intelligence
230. B. intelligence
281. B. analytical and curious mind
282. P. intelligence
284. P. intelligent
334. B. intelligent
335. B. bright

336. B. intelligent
352. P. intelligent
362. P. intelligent
372. B. intelligent
380. B. ability to generalize from experiences
381. B. ability to generalize from experiences
392. P. intelligent
395. B. ability
413. B. intelligent
417. P. intelligence
421. B. critical thinking
425. B. very intelligent
480. B. superior (in all aspects of teaching)
481. B. superior (in all aspects of teaching)
488. P. has intelligence
494. P. has a good mind
527. P. excellent thinking (self-analysis)
529. B. good thinker
582. B. intelligence; ability to think
583. B. intelligence
585. P. intellect
605. B. intelligence
618. P. general intelligence

Weakest Traits

34. B. probably low native intelligence
43. P. lacks intelligence
84. P. not very smart

507. B. inability to deal with abstractions
527. P. lacks specificity in thinking (and in teaching)
NO. 24. DOES HE SHOW ADEQUATE FORCEFULNESS?

**Strongest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>B. positive approach</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>P. forceful attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>B. forceful</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>B. a forceful person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>P. forceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weakest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>P. lacks forcefulness</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>P. not aggressive enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>B. manner of presentation</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>P. speaks without conviction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>could be more forceful</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>P. lacks aggressiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>P. lack of forcefulness</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>P. lack of forcefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>P. lack of forcefulness</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>P. not as forceful in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching as might be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>B. too moderate in firmness</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>B. not very forceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>P. lacks force</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>P. lack of positiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>P. not aggressive enough</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>B. lack of aggressiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>514</td>
<td>B. forcefulness needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO. 25. DOES HE HAVE A CLEAR-CUT NOTION
OF WHAT HE IS TRYING TO DO?

Strongest Traits

6. B. extraordinary ability to keep sight of purpose
and to "weather mistakes"
36. P. a most practical-minded individual
40. P. desire to have pupils reach high standards
and solve own problems
57. B. purpose
132. B. orientation toward philosophic basis
for procedures
298. B. sound philosophy of education
476. B. purposeful
477. B. maintains direction in activities
547. B. objectives, over-all picture

Weakest Traits

82. B. confusion about function of a high school education
84. P. inability to conduct class toward objectives
118. P. seems to grasp subject matter without rationale for effect upon students
128. B. uncertain about place of religion in schools
136. P. can't make up his mind
184. B. tendency to get off the subject
210. P. no discernible interest in a broad program in music education
213. B. often talks around the point
215. P. only sees surface things to teach
220. P. confusion of purpose, insists in talking rather than teaching
265. B. some tendency to under-play personality development as a function of teaching
266. B. occasional uncertainty as to what to do next
267. P. lack of direction
383. P. lack of purpose
404. P. too visionary
409. P. uncertainty
417. P. inability to recognize purposes
418. P. difficulty in perceiving the job in terms other than mechanical
447. P. doesn't know what to do—vaillates
452. P. lack of perspective
496. B. ideals often too high
502. B. makes too much emphasis on detail
545. P. confusion of purposes
549. P. unaware of scope of teaching, over-simplifies the job
NO. 26. DOES HE HAVE A LIKEABLE MANNER?

**Strongest Traits**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>B. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>P. good clean young man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>B. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>P. pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>B. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>P. pleasant personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>P. pleasant manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>P. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>B. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>P. pleasant personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>P. pleasant manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>P. good fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>P. good nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td>P. likeable personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.</td>
<td>B. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>P. acceptable personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>P. good disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186.</td>
<td>P. pleasant personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188.</td>
<td>B. likeability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195.</td>
<td>B. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.</td>
<td>P. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.</td>
<td>P. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.</td>
<td>B. pleasing personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240.</td>
<td>B. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243.</td>
<td>P. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257.</td>
<td>P. pleasant manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275.</td>
<td>P. likeable personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283.</td>
<td>P. good fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326.</td>
<td>B. fine personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333.</td>
<td>B. pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351.</td>
<td>P. pleasant manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358.</td>
<td>P. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363.</td>
<td>P. pleasant personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364.</td>
<td>P. pleasant personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373.</td>
<td>P. pleasant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>391.</td>
<td>B. attractive personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393.</td>
<td>P. pleasant, easy-going personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402.</td>
<td>P. pleasant personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403.</td>
<td>P. pleasant personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418.</td>
<td>P. pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425.</td>
<td>B. wins people easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426.</td>
<td>P. fine personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427.</td>
<td>P. good personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428.</td>
<td>B. wins people easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442.</td>
<td>B. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445.</td>
<td>P. attractive in personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447.</td>
<td>B. effective personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448.</td>
<td>P. effective personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453.</td>
<td>P. pleasant person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463.</td>
<td>P. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478.</td>
<td>P. polite, pleasant manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495.</td>
<td>P. pleasing personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534.</td>
<td>P. strong personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535.</td>
<td>P. pleasing personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542.</td>
<td>B. pleasant manner with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543.</td>
<td>P. pleasant comfortable manner with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549.</td>
<td>P. pleasing personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550.</td>
<td>P. friendliness, pleasing personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564.</td>
<td>B. good personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565.</td>
<td>P. likeable kid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570.</td>
<td>B. pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573.</td>
<td>P. pleasant attractive personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584.</td>
<td>B. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585.</td>
<td>P. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587.</td>
<td>P. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589.</td>
<td>B. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614.</td>
<td>P. pleasant fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615.</td>
<td>B. personality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weakest Traits**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>P. personality dullness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271.</td>
<td>B. weak first impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324.</td>
<td>P. personality does not inspire people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>364.</td>
<td>P. personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378.</td>
<td>B. initial impression of unfriendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481.</td>
<td>P. personally offensive (phys.?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534.</td>
<td>P. personality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strongest Traits

26. P. persistence
55. P. persistent
62. P. perseverance
63. P. ability to follow through
80. P. aggressiveness in approach to student teaching
82. P. drive
118. B. carries through responsibilities
136. B. carries through skillfully
196. B. never gives up
210. P. persistence
215. P. determination
276. P. determination
322. B. determination

339. P. determination
340. P. persistence
357. P. determination
360. P. persistent
381. B. sees projects through
383. P. determination
415. B. determination
459. B. drive
469. P. ambition
488. P. drive
544. P. desire to do well in everything
548. B. strength of purpose—desire to succeed
604. P. persistence
609. B. determination

Weakest Traits

165. B. personal motivation not always high
185. P. no determination
214. P. lacks drive to do better
248. P. gives up easily
256. P. lack of drive

348. P. lack of drive
433. B. lacks drive
473. P. lacks drive
489. P. inability to carry through
529. B. lack of drive
NO. 28. IS HE WARM AND/OR EMPATHETIC?

Strongest Traits

8. P. deep concern for youngsters
35. P. liking for students
37. B. concern for pupil needs
39. B. sincere interest and concern for interests and welfare of each pupil
61. P. deep concern
64. P. concern
71. P. interest for welfare of individual pupils
78. P. sympathetic approach
102. P. sensitivity
110. B. fine social outlook
113. B. liking for students
142. B. likes students
144. P. likes kids
165. B. sympathy with pupils' point of view
169. B. interest in pupils, friendly
204. P. interested in students
211. B. likes kids
215. P. concern for welfare of pupils

216. B. her ability to make every student feel his contributions are worthwhile
288. P. interest in children
303. B. enjoys high school students
333. B. loves to work with kids
335. B. warm
336. B. participates with talking
345. P. enjoys high school students
363. P. interest in children
369. P. very warm
370. P. likes high school kids
371. P. sympathetic to kids
394. B. interest in students
400. B. sincere interest in students and in their learning progress
470. B. kindness to students
518. P. sympathetic attitude
519. P. sympathy
541. B. enthusiasm for pupils and their growth
568. B. interest in students
575. B. sincere interest in each student
577. B. sincere interest in each student

Weakest Traits

21. B. needs to be a little warmer in understanding pupils
40. B. too business-like
48. P. almost contemptuous
50. B. sometimes fails to see the other person's side
104. B. lack of warmth toward students
141. P. apparently lacks interest in students
148. B. aloof
190. P. insensitive to need

194. P. cold personality
237. P. lack of sympathy
268. P. gives impression of negative—almost hostile—attitude toward students
298. B. not completely sold on high school youngsters
369. P. harangues at pupils
423. P. sympathy
491. B. sometimes insensitive to others' feelings
NO. 29. IS HE OTHER-CENTERED?

**Strongest Traits**

165. B. friendly attitude
169. B. out-going
251. P. friendly
255. B. socially-minded, interested in people
290. B. respect for people
341. P. friendly
397. P. desire to get along with people
412. P. friendly

435. B. friendly
451. B. consideration for others
452. P. friendliness
455. P. friendly
482. P. friendly—pleasant with all students
512. P. friendliness
514. P. friendliness
603. P. friendliness

**Weakest Traits**

2. B. over-confidence
66. P. egotism
125. P. egotistical, own intelligence prevents working easily with others
175. B. a bit ego-centric
181. P. personality—smart aleck
187. P. self-conscious and vain
221. B. bit over-bearing
232. B. perhaps little too sure of herself
235. P. irritates people—smug air with others
270. P. self-centeredness
281. B. takes self too seriously
283. B. little too dogmatic, makes too many decisions herself rather than developing ideas with pupils
293. B. may be a little pugnacious at times
295. B. slightly egotistical

299. B. too aggressive
327. P. lack of social sense
345. B. insistence on own point of view
347. P. extremely independent—personality not outgoing
350. B. gives an idea he is too confident
353. P. too confident
372. B. takes herself a little too seriously
380. B. does not delegate responsibilities
387. B. tends to be autocratic
392. B. might become too aggressive—to self-confident
419. P. considers B—Al—(self) too much
459. B. over-confident attitude
524. P. personal goals take preference over professional achievements
540. B. tendency to try to dominate
547. B. slight tendency to always be the leader
NO. 30. IS HE POISED?

**Strongest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>B. poised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>B. poised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>B. poised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>B. poised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>P. social poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>E. poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>E. poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>E. poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td>P. poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218.</td>
<td>E. poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.</td>
<td>P. poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349.</td>
<td>P. social poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372.</td>
<td>B. poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382.</td>
<td>P. poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411.</td>
<td>P. well poised before group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423.</td>
<td>P. poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461.</td>
<td>P. calm, classroom manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464.</td>
<td>B. poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465.</td>
<td>B. poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476.</td>
<td>B. excellent poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542.</td>
<td>B. poised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weakest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>480.</td>
<td>B. lack of ease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO. 31. ARE HIS PHYSICAL TRAITS SATISFACTORY?

**Strongest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>P. appearance</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>B. attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>P. appearance</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>P. appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>E. fine personal appearance</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>P. good appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>B. commanding appearance</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>P. appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>P. appearance</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>P. attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>P. attractive</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>P. appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>P. fine appearance</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>P. good appearance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weakest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>P. appearance</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>B. defective hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>P. effeminate characteristics</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>P. appearance does not inspire people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>B. nervous tendency because of polio disability</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>P. not very attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>P. physical handicap</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>P. weak physical condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>P. health—over-weight</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>P. uses a hearing aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>B. general appearance</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>B. general dress and appearance—does not present herself very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>P. personal appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>B. personally not as attractive on first acquaintance as later</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>B. nervous mannerisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>B. size</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>B. nervous mannerisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>B. speech defect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO. 32. DOES HE EXERCISE GOOD JUDGMENT?

**Strongest Traits**

| 47. | B. common sense |
| 51. | B. judgment |
| 143. | B. objectivity |
| 249. | B. good judgment |
| 293. | B. judgment |
| 301. | B. mature judgment |
| 374. | B. analytical approach |
| 446. | P. analytical approach to pupil activities |
| 496. | B. judgment |
| 528. | B. good judgment |
| 562. | B. unusually good judgment |

**Weakest Traits**

| 91. | B. approving of things indiscriminately |
| 183. | P. lack of judgment |
| 251. | B. tendency to act before full consideration |
| 338. | P. questionable judgment |
| 339. | P. questionable judgment |
| 356. | B. at times she expresses inability to distribute energy among most important and least important |
| 377. | P. easily influenced |
| 431. | P. too inclined to agree with students |
| 463. | P. poor judgment |
| 523. | P. immature judgment |
NO. 33. IS HE INTERESTED IN TEACHING?

**Strongest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>P. interest in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>P. apparent desire to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>B. love of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>P. desire to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>P. dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>P. good professional attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>B. seriousness of purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>P. love of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>B. great interest in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>P. desire to do well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>B. sound attitude toward teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>B. desire to teach well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>P. desire to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>P. well motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.</td>
<td>P. healthy attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.</td>
<td>P. earnest desire to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167.</td>
<td>B. eagerness for teaching in all its aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183.</td>
<td>P. good attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.</td>
<td>P. sincere desire to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206.</td>
<td>B. sincerity of purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223.</td>
<td>P. likes teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.</td>
<td>P. good attitude toward teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256.</td>
<td>B. strong desire for teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276.</td>
<td>P. desire to be successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279.</td>
<td>B. interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287.</td>
<td>P. sincere interest in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288.</td>
<td>P. interest in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297.</td>
<td>B. strong desire to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311.</td>
<td>B. interest in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356.</td>
<td>P. desire to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368.</td>
<td>P. an apparent desire to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371.</td>
<td>P. interested in becoming a good teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376.</td>
<td>P. tremendous interest in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383.</td>
<td>P. determination to become a good teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399.</td>
<td>P. enthusiasm for teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516.</td>
<td>B. professional attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524.</td>
<td>P. desire to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533.</td>
<td>P. interest in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542.</td>
<td>B. seriously interested in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572.</td>
<td>B. enthusiasm for teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602.</td>
<td>B. professional attitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weakest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>P. lack of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>P. attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>B. lack of desire to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211.</td>
<td>P. basically not interested in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278.</td>
<td>B. does not appear to enjoy this class (poor one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362.</td>
<td>P. attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391.</td>
<td>P. interest not in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505.</td>
<td>B. inability to decide what work he wants to do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO. 34. IS HE ABLE TO MOTIVATE STUDENTS?

**Strongest Traits**

11. B. ability to motivate a junior high class  
37. B. uses pupils' interests for motivation  
117. B. makes English a live subject  
231. B. ability to motivate learners  
261. B. ability to help students want to learn  
289. P. ability to use content to develop insights  
298. B. inspires confidence  
300. B. ability to inspire students  
302. B. ability to keep up interest  

425. B. wins the confidence of students  
431. P. ability to interest students  
433. P. has good ideas on motivation of students  
443. B. teaches with a type of motivation that kept pupils working happily and profitably  
485. B. can motivate  
492. B. has influence on students  
493. B. keeps up interest in the class  
564. B. wins the confidence of difficult students  
615. B. influence of personality upon pupils very wholesome

**Weakest Traits**

154. P. inability to keep attention of the class  
325. P. pupils lack confidence in him  

516. P. pupils do not respond to personality too well  
546. P. inability to make teaching purposive
**NO. 35. DO STUDENTS LIKE HIM?**

**Strongest Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>P. popular with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188.</td>
<td>B. students liked him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190.</td>
<td>P. he was well liked by students and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224.</td>
<td>P. pupils liked her as a person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335.</td>
<td>B. liked by kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346.</td>
<td>P. liked by his class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347.</td>
<td>P. liked by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502.</td>
<td>B. acceptance by pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504.</td>
<td>P. acceptance by pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506.</td>
<td>P. acceptance by some athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507.</td>
<td>P. acceptance by some pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540.</td>
<td>P. personality that appeals to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560.</td>
<td>P. liked by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580.</td>
<td>P. the students like her</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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