1967

The Relationship between Criteria for Admittance to the Teacher Education Program and Performance in Student Teaching at Central Washington State College

James Preston Koch
Central Washington University

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CRITERIA FOR ADMITTANCE TO THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM AND PERFORMANCE IN STUDENT TEACHING AT CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO

THE GRADUATE FACULTY

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE

MASTER OF EDUCATION

BY

JAMES PRESTON KOCH

JULY, 1967

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

_____

Gerald Gage, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

_____

Eldon E. Jacobsen

_____

Maurice L. Pettit

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Pat, Suzie, Kimmy, and John, without whose cooperation this research would not have been possible.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

Chapter I

Introduction

The majority of academic institutions specializing in teacher education employ some type of screening criteria to select students for their programs. These screening instruments may include such criteria as candidate interviews, cumulative grade point average, cumulative grades in teacher education courses and/or scores on various entrance examinations. Generally, each student seeking admittance to a teacher education program must achieve a certain standard of excellence on one or more of these criteria, as most institutions administer their screening criteria prior to acceptance into the teacher education program. In all probability, most academic institutions would agree that some type of screening device is desirable; however, few attempts have been made to utilize the relationship between screening criteria scores (whatever they might consist of) and later success or non-success in student teaching.

The primary intention of these screening selectors appears to be related to increasing or at least maintaining the competency level of teacher trainees.

Whether or not the intended purpose is accomplished is often unknown, possibly because of the few attempts that have been made to examine the relationship between teacher education

SCREENING CRITERIA AND SUCCESS OR NON-SUCCESS IN STUDENT TEACHING.

ON THIS BASIS, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THE IDENTIFIABLE RATIONALE IS RELATED TO THEIR USE AS PREREQUISITE CRITERIA ONLY.

THE CONTENT OF MOST SCREENING INSTRUMENTS RELATES TO THE IDENTIFICATION OF LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT IN SPECIFIC AREAS. THAT IS, THESE INSTRUMENTS ARE SELECTED UNDER THE SUPPOSITION THAT THEY INDICATE THE STUDENTS' CURRENT OR POTENTIAL ABILITY TO PERFORM CERTAIN TASKS SEEN AS IMPORTANT TO EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION.

ONE EXTENSION OF THE UTILITY OF THESE SCREENING CRITERIA WOULD SEEM TO BE RELATED TO PREDICTING SUCCESS OR NON-SUCCESS IN STUDENT TEACHING. IN THIS INSTANCE THE PREDICTION WOULD BE RELATIVE TO CERTAIN STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE AS INDICATED BY THE VARIOUS SCREENING CRITERIA AND THE ACCURACY WITH WHICH THEY PREDICT LATER GRADES ASSIGNED BY STUDENT-TEACHER SUPERVISORS.

LITTLE CONCRETE EVIDENCE HAS BEEN FORMULATED IDENTIFYING SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE AND MEASURABLE CRITERIA REGARDING THE PREDICTION OF STUDENT TEACHER COMPETENCY. GENERALLY, THE EVALUATION TASK IS ASSIGNED TO A STUDENT TEACHING SUPERVISOR WHO PRESUMABLY UTILIZED A COMBINATION OF HIS/HER OWN TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND ACADEMIC PREPARATION TO EVALUATE THE STUDENT TEACHER'S PERFORMANCE COMPETENCY. THIS SUGGESTS THAT THE

CRITERIA UTILIZED IN EVALUATING STUDENT TEACHERS VARIES FROM SUPERVISOR TO SUPERVISOR, AND PERFORMANCE IN THE AREAS OF COMPETENCY AS MEASURED BY THE QUALIFYING EXAMS MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE ANY RELEVANCE TO THEIR RATING.

OF MAJOR CONCERN IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT IS THE PROPOSITION THAT IF THE SCREENING CRITERIA WHICH ARE GENERALLY ADMINISTERED PRIOR TO ACCEPTANCE INTO THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM HAVE ANY PREDICTIVE UTILITY IN TERMS OF SUCCESS AS A STUDENT TEACHER, THEN PERFORMANCE IN THE AREAS MEASURED BY THE INSTRUMENTS MIGHT SERVE AS CRITERIA TO OBJECTIFY SUPERVISOR EVALUATIONS. THESE INSTRUMENTS WOULD THEN PROVIDE BOTH THE INSTITUTION AND THE PROSPECTIVE STUDENT TEACHER WITH A VALUABLE COUNSELING TOOL REGARDING PROBABLE LEVELS OF SUCCESS IN STUDENT TEACHING. AS SUCCESS IN STUDENT TEACHING IS INDICATIVE OF SUCCESS AS A TEACHER, PERHAPS THE MEAN OF THESE SCORES MIGHT BE HELPFUL IN THIS PREDICTION AS WELL.

THE UTILITY OF PREDICTING PROBABLE LEVELS OF SUCCESS IN STUDENT TEACHING BASED UPON ENTRANCE SCORES CAN BEST BE INTERPRETED AS GIVING THE TRAINING INSTITUTION, CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE (CWSC) IN THIS INSTANCE, AN EXCESS OF ONE ACADEMIC YEAR'S PREVIEW OF PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS OF ITS' CANDIDATES OVER PRESENT PROCEDURES. (AT PRESENT, STUDENT TEACHERS ARE NOT EVALUATED REGARDING STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE OF PERFORMANCE UNTIL THEY HAVE PRACTICALLY COMPLETED ACADEMIC PREPARATION FOR THE PROFESSION OF TEACHING.)

ON THE BASIS OF THIS SURVEY, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THERE IS LITTLE PERCEIVED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ENTRANCE SCORES AND SUCCESS IN STUDENT TEACHING. THIS WOULD SUGGEST THAT SOME OTHER CRITERIA SUCH AS ACADEMIC MAJOR OR PROFESSIONAL SEQUENCE COURSES ARE RELATED TO SUCCESS IN STUDENT TEACHING. THIS PROFICIENCY, HOWEVER, IS GENERALLY NOT CONFIRMED UNTIL THE END OF A CANDIDATES' STUDENT TEACHING ASSIGNMENT, WHICH MAY PRECEDE COLLEGE GRADUATION BY AS LITTLE AS ONE ACADEMIC QUARTER.

AT PRESENT, THE REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION TO THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM AT CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE CONSIST OF TWO GENERAL CRITERIA: SCORES ON THE TEACHER EDUCATION ENTRANCE TESTS ABOVE LOCAL MINIMUM STANDARDS AS DETERMINED FROM THE TEST NORMS AND AN ACCUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA) OF 2.00 FOR ALL COLLEGE LEVEL ACADEMIC WORK.

A CURRENT SURVEY OF INSTRUCTORS IMMEDIATELY INVOLVED IN THE TEACHER PROGRAM AT CWSC INDICATED THAT IN THEIR OPINION THE TEACHER EDUCATION TESTS BEST SERVE THE FUNCTION OF DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT THE CANDIDATE HAS SUFFICIENT BASIC SKILLS AS IDENTIFIED BY THE TEST CRITERIA FOR ADMITTANCE TO THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM.

Statement of Purpose

At this point, the entrance criteria have an unknown relationship with success or non-success in student teaching. The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the criteria for admittance into the teacher education program at CWSC and success or non-success in student teaching. Specifically, the purpose will be to identify the predictive utility of the teacher education entrance criteria as they relate to discriminating between levels of success in student teaching.

Since the criteria used for screening applicants to the program have a built in self-fulfilling "prophecy," that is, students below the cut off point never student teach and those above usually receive passing grades, it will be necessary to examine "success" as a rather arbitrarily defined criterion. Within this study students will be placed in three groups: those receiving A's, those receiving B's, and those receiving C's or less in student teaching.

It is the intention of the proposed study to examine the relationship between scores on the entrance criteria and the aforementioned levels of success in student teaching.

If the entrance criteria are realistically differentiating between levels of success, there should be significant differences

BETWEEN THE DIFFERENT SUCCESS GROUPS WITH REGARD TO PERFORMANCE ON THE VARIOUS ENTRANCE CRITERIA.

Scope of the Study

Methods and Procedures. The following information was obtained for each student completing a student teaching assignment during the academic year 1964-65 at Central Washington State College:

1. Overall - all college grade point average (GPA)
2. Teacher education sequence grade point average (SGPA)
3. Student teaching grade (STG)
4. Performance scores on the following pre-admittance tests of the teacher education program:
   A. Cooperative English Test - English Expression Form 1-C (Usage)
   B. Cooperative English Test - Reading Comprehension Form 1-C
   C. Washington Pre-College Spelling Test
   D. Cooperative Arithmetic Test Form A
5. Sex (male or female)
6. Quarter of student teaching assignment (fall, winter, or spring)
7. Level of academic preparation (in the study only two levels were used, level ONE to include grades from first through eighth and level TWO to include grades from ninth through twelfth)

Within the study, overall GPA, professional education sequence GPA, English usage, Spelling, Reading, and arithmetic scores were used as criterion variables. All information for each student was key-punched onto Globe No. 1 standard form 5081 80 space IBM cards.

Design of the Study. The following categories of student teachers were identified using a standard IBM card storing machine:

1. All student teachers, to include both elementary and secondary, male and female.
2. All male elementary student teachers.
3. All female elementary student teachers.
4. All male secondary student teachers.
5. All female secondary student teachers.
6. All male and female elementary student teachers.
7. All male and female secondary student teachers.
8. All elementary and secondary male student teachers.
9. All elementary and secondary female student teachers.

Within the nine groups, each level of success (A, B, or C) was compared with all other levels of success for each of the prediction variables.

Hypotheses to be Tested. For purposes of identification, the total number of grades per success category were as follows:

A = 151 B = 181 C = 27

Some individual records were dropped from the study because of incomplete performance information.

Hypotheses are herein presented as they relate to various groups of students. Each prediction variable will be separately introduced for each comparison group.

Hypothesis 1A. There is no significant difference between students (both male and female elementary and secondary) who receive A's, B's, or C's or less in terms of the prediction variable overall GPA.

Hypothesis 1B. There is no significant difference between students (both male and female elementary and secondary) who receive A's, B's, or C's or less in terms of the prediction variable of professional education sequence GPA.

Hypothesis 1C. There is no significant difference between students (both male and female elementary and secondary) who receive A's, B's, or C's or less in terms of the prediction variable of English usage.

Hypothesis 1D. There is no significant difference between students (both male and female elementary and secondary) who receive A's, B's, or C's or less in terms of the prediction variable of spelling.

HYPOTHESIS 1E. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (BOTH MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF READING.

HYPOTHESIS 1F. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (BOTH MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ARITHMETIC.

HYPOTHESIS 2A. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF OVERALL GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 2B. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 2C. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ENGLISH USAGE.

HYPOTHESIS 2D. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF SPELLING.

HYPOTHESIS 2E. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF READING.

HYPOTHESIS 2F. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ARITHMETIC.

HYPOTHESIS 3A. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (MALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF OVERALL GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 3B. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (MALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE.

HYPOTHESIS 3C. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (MALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ENGLISH USAGE.

HYPOTHESIS 3D. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (MALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF SPELLING.

HYPOTHESIS 3E. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (MALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF READING.

HYPOTHESIS 3F. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (MALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ARITHMETIC.

HYPOTHESIS 4A. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (FEMALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF OVERALL GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 4B. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (FEMALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 4C. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (FEMALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ENGLISH USAGE.

HYPOTHESIS 4D. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (FEMALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF SPELLING.

HYPOTHESIS 4E. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (FEMALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF READING.

HYPOTHESIS 4F. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (FEMALE ELEMENTARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ARITHMETIC.

HYPOTHESIS 5A. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL MALE AND FEMALE SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF OVERALL GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 5B. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL MALE AND FEMALE SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 5C. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL MALE AND FEMALE SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ENGLISH USAGE.

HYPOTHESIS 5D. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL MALE AND FEMALE SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF SPELLING.

HYPOTHESIS 5E. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL MALE AND FEMALE SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF READING.

Hypothesis 5F. There is no significant difference between students (all male and female secondary) who receive A's, B's, or C's or less in terms of the prediction variable of arithmetic.

Hypothesis 6A. There is no significant difference between students (all male secondary) who receive A's, B's, or C's, or less in terms of the prediction variable of overall GPA.

Hypothesis 6B. There is no significant difference between students (all male secondary) who receive A's, B's, or C's or less in terms of the prediction variable of professional education sequence GPA.

Hypothesis 6C. There is no significant difference between students (all male secondary) who receive A's, B's, or C's or less in terms of the prediction variable of English usage.

Hypothesis 6D. There is no significant difference between students (all male secondary) who receive A's, B's, or C's or less in terms of the prediction variable of spelling.

Hypothesis 6E. There is no significant difference between students (all male secondary) who receive A's, B's, or C's or less in terms of the prediction variable of reading.

HYPOTHESIS 6F. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL MALE SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ARITHMETIC.

HYPOTHESIS 7A. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL FEMALE SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF OVERALL GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 7B. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL FEMALE SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 7C. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL FEMALE SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ENGLISH USAGE.

HYPOTHESIS 7D. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL FEMALE SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF SPELLING.

HYPOTHESIS 7E. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL FEMALE SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF READING.

HYPOTHESIS 7F. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL FEMALE SECONDARY) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ARITHMETIC.

HYPOTHESIS 8A. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF OVERALL GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 8B. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 8C. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ENGLISH USAGE.

HYPOTHESIS 8D. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF SPELLING.

HYPOTHESIS 8E. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF READING.

HYPOTHESIS 8F. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ARITHMETIC.

HYPOTHESIS 9A. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF OVERALL GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 9B. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA.

HYPOTHESIS 9C. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ENGLISH USAGE.

HYPOTHESIS 9D. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF SPELLING.

HYPOTHESIS 9E. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES) WHO RECEIVE A'S, B'S, OR C'S OR LESS IN TERMS OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF READING.

Hypothesis 9F. There is no significant difference between students (all elementary and secondary females) who receive A's, B's, or C's or less in terms of the prediction variable of arithmetic.

Analysis of Results

An IBM computer t test, designed and maintained by the computer center of CWSC, was used to determine the significance of the mean difference between the success groups of A, B, and C or less with respect to the selection criteria.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

Within this section, it is the intention to present more than those research attempts which are specifically related to the proposed problem of predicting success in student teaching. The entire field of teaching competency and efficiency is exposed when one attempts to deal with a specific variable such as the prediction of success or non-success in student teaching on the basis or an educational program's screening criteria. Those which seem most relevant and related are herein presented.

Early History of Prediction

As early as 1906 Meriam foresaw the desirability of predicting teaching success. In an attempt to avoid subjective classroom evaluation techniques Meriam (1906) collected the academic records of 1,185 students of several "normal" schools. A comparison of teaching success, as judged by the teachers' principals, and school records, indicated a non-significant relationship between the two variables.

Whitney (1924) extended Meriam's idea of predicting teaching success by attempting to identify more concrete

PREDICTION VARIABLES. WHITNEY (1924) REPORTS LOW POSITIVE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TEACHING SUCCESS AND SUCH CRITERIA AS INTELLIGENCE TEST SCORES, OVERALL GRADE POINT AVERAGE, GRADES IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE COURSES, AND GRADES IN UPPER DIVISION COURSES. WHITNEY (1924) REPORTS A CORRELATION OF .23 BETWEEN GRADES OBTAINED IN STUDENT TEACHING AND RATINGS GIVEN IN ACTUAL TEACHING. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS RELATIONSHIP CAN BE INTERPRETED BY STATING THAT THE SCORES IN THE COMPLEX ACTIVITY OF "STUDENT TEACHING" CORRELATE POSITIVELY WITH MARKS IN THE COMPLEX ACTIVITY OF "REAL TEACHING." THIS FACT, HOWEVER, IS GREATLY REDUCED IN IMPORTANCE BY THE ABSENCE OF INFORMATION CONCERNING WHAT THESE TWO COMPLEX FUNCTIONS INCLUDE.

TIEGS (1928) ATTEMPTED TO DRAW TOGETHER OTHER VARIABLES OF POSSIBLE IMPORTANCE IN PREDICTING TEACHING SUCCESS. HE FOUND NEGATIVE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SUCCESS IN STUDENT TEACHING AND A CANDIDATE'S LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION, LETTERS OF APPLICATION AND/OR TEST PERFORMANCE. TIEGS (1928) RESEARCH DOES NOT SPECIFY HOW THE PREDICTION CRITERIA WERE WEIGHTED OR EVALUATED.

SODERQUIST (1935) ATTEMPTED TO FIND A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HIGH SCHOOL SUCCESS, AS DEFINED BY PARTICIPATION IN EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES AND LATTER SUCCESS IN ACTUAL TEACHING. HE REPORTED THAT NO SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP EXISTED

BETWEEN THESE TWO VARIABLES. SODERQUIST (1935) FAILED AS DID WHITNEY (1924) AND TIEGS (1928) TO EXPLICITLY DEFINE EITHER THE PREREQUISITE SKILLS OR THE SUCCESS CRITERION INVOLVED.

CERTAINLY IT IS POSSIBLE TO HAVE A CORRELATION AS HIGH AS .7 BETWEEN ANY VARIABLE AND EACH OF ANOTHER PAIR OF VARIABLES AND YET HAVE NO CORRELATION BETWEEN THE VARIABLES COMPRISING THE PAIR. THEREFORE, EVEN IF A HIGH CORRELATION WOULD BE FOUND BETWEEN STUDENT TEACHING SUCCESS AND ACTUAL TEACHING SUCCESS, THERE IS NO ASSURANCE A CORRELATION BETWEEN ANY VARIABLE(S) AND STUDENT TEACHING SUCCESS WOULD HOLD TRUE BETWEEN THOSE VARIABLES AND ACTUAL TEACHING SUCCESS.

BARR (1948) PRESENTS AN EXTENSIVE REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHED PRIOR TO 1948. HE IDENTIFIES AND COMPARES SEVERAL SUCCESS CRITERIA WITH VARIOUS PREREQUISITE SKILLS AND CITES THE NUMBER OF TIMES A SPECIFIC TYPE OF CORRELATION WAS FOUND PRIOR TO 1948, TOGETHER WITH THE SIGNIFICANCE OF EACH STUDY WITH REGARD TO THE RESULT REFLECTING EITHER POSITIVE (P), NEGATIVE (N), OR ZERO (Z) CORRELATION.

TWO PREREQUISITE SKILLS AND TWO COMPARATIVE CRITERION FROM BARR'S STUDY WHICH RELATE TO THE PRESENT RESEARCH ARE HEREIN PRESENTED.

	Criterion 1 Student Teaching Grades			Criterion 2 Overall College GPA		
	(P)	(N)	(Z)	(P)	(N)	(Z)
Methods and Procedures Courses	8	0	0	2	0	0
Skill in Reading	4	0	0	0	0	0

These results would indicate that methods and procedures courses are positively correlated with success in student teaching.

In another part of his research, Barr (1948) compared the English usage and reading sections of the Cooperative English Test with student teaching grades. The results indicated a low positive correlation between these variables and success in teaching. Here again, as with Whitney (1924), Tiegs (1928) and Soderquist (1935), Barr's results indicate a low correlated relationship between certain specified prerequisite skills and success in student teaching. The serious drawback of these studies is the inability to use the results for predictive purposes of students with similar profiles because the correlation is too low.

Some researchers, Best (1948), Tink (1960) and Fox (1961) have attempted to isolate variables related to factors which influence students to choose teacher education as an academic major. Best (1948) presents the position that the results of research in teacher choice are contradictory because there is no consistent pattern of choice ratings. He cites the various selection and admission standards that prevail in various teacher training institutions as a possible explanation of the inconsistent pattern of rating.

As an independent observation, Best (1948) supports the rather tentative position that rigid teacher trainee selection practices enhance the qualitative aspects of candidates regarding teaching skills. Within the context of this review of literature there appeared no evidence to support this position.

Tink (1960) presents four rating criteria which he found to be the most significant reasons for students selecting education as a major. The four criteria in order of ranked importance were as follows:

1. Teaching is interesting and satisfying.
2. Teaching is challenging and imaginative.
3. Teaching allows one to work with a favorite academic subject.
4. Teaching allows one to work with pupils.

In a similar but more extensive study, Fox (1961) examined seven criteria which he found greatly influenced the selection of Education as a major course of study. The criteria and their ranked order of importance were as follows:

1. Desire to work with children and adolescents.
2. Like for a particular academic subject.
3. Opportunity to move around in a field.
4. Increasing salary trend.
5. Vocational interest test scores.
6. Use as a stepping stone.
7. Membership in a Future Teacher of America (FTA) group.

On the basis of the apparent reversal of evidence regarding the reasons why students choose teacher education as presented by Fox (1961) and Tink (1960), it is possible that the explanation offered by Best (1948) of differing selection and admission policies may be tenable if the explanation is extended to include the different institutional philosophies, regarding the values of education, which students tend to incorporate as part of their own educational value system.

Nothern (1958) utilized a rather unique approach in contrast to Fox (1961) and Tink (1960) to examine the characteristics of teacher candidates.

Nothern (1958) compared male and female candidates with four other declared major groups on the following criteria:

1. ACE Psychological examination
2. BRS English test
3. High school grade point average
4. Cumulative college grade point average

The results of Nothern's research indicated that for males all four other groups scored significantly higher on the differentiating criteria. There was no significant difference between female teacher candidates and the other declared major groups with regard to the criteria. One would have to use extreme caution in generalizing the results of this study to the general population of male teacher candidates; however, one could say that there appears to be significant differences between male teacher education candidates and other declared major groups in regard to the aforementioned criteria. No other evidence in the literature was found to support this result, and replication of the study would seem to be imperative prior to using the results as predictive evidence. The study is seemingly further reduced in significance because Nothern (1958) did not examine the relationship between successful and non-successful teachers on the basis of their differentiating scores.

Ellis (1961) hypothesized that there was a significant difference between successful teachers and non-successful teachers on the following criteria: Overall college grade point average, grades in general education courses, grades obtained in student teaching, and grades in professional education sequence courses. Building principals, using their own success criteria, judged which teachers were successful and which were non-successful. A comparison of the success and non-success groups with Ellis' (1961) hypothesized differentiating criteria indicated a nonsignificant difference between groups. That is, the arbitrary criteria as defined by Ellis (1961) appeared not to be sensitive to the performance difference between successful and non-successful teachers, as judged by the teachers' building principals.

A contrasting explanation to that of Ellis' (1961) tentative position might relate to the criteria used by the building principals to differentiate between the two groups. That is, the experimental design may have contributed more to the refutation of the hypothesis than the differentiating criteria used. This explanation seems tenable considering that Whitney (1924) found a positive relationship between two of the criteria that Ellis (1961) used and teaching success.

Seagoe (1957) found that prospective teachers rejected from a teacher education program on the basis of a faculty committee's recommendation and low scores on the Gowan Teacher Prognosis Scale tended to have higher verbal intelligence scores as measured by the Miller Analogies Test than those who were accepted.

It would appear that Ellis (1961) and Seagoe (1957) are examining different variables underlying the selection of education as an academic major, with the result that neither research attempt supports the other.

Initial career choices, suggests Kubie (1953) are determined neither by realistic knowledge of the field nor of oneself in relation to the field. Kubie supports the divergent position that career choice is based upon fantasies regarding the career. (Current educational practices would tend to partially support Kubie's position as there is little or no opportunity for students to experience the affective meaning of a given occupation.)

Miller (1955) suggests that students tend to select careers on the basis of modeling themselves after significant others. This position would tend to support Kubie's (1953) position of fantasy involvement, if one accepts the position that desiring to be like someone perceived as significant is related to a fantasy reaction.

MANY OF THE STUDIES REPORTED THUS FAR HAVE SEEMINGLY SUPPORTED THE POSITION THAT THERE ARE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TEACHER AND NON-TEACHER CANDIDATES AND BETWEEN SUCCESSFUL AND NON-SUCCESSFUL TEACHERS. THE SITUATION EXISTS, HOWEVER, WHEREIN ONE STUDY TENDS TO SUPPORT A GENERAL HYPOTHESIS AND ANOTHER TENDS TO RETURE THE SAME RELATIVE POSITION. (IT SEEMS APPARENT THAT ONE FACTOR UNDERLYING THIS CONTRADICTION OF EVIDENCE IS A LACK OF OPERATIONAL DEFINITION WITHIN THE RESEARCH DESIGNS. THAT IS, EACH STUDY APPEARS TO BE IN THE SAME GENERAL AREA OF CONCERN, BUT EACH APPEARS TO USE DIFFERENT PREDICTIVE CRITERIA, DIFFERENT SUCCESS CRITERIA, AND DIFFERENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA, WITH THE OBVIOUS OUTCOME OF CONTRADICTORY RESULTS.)

RELATIVE TO THIS POSITION, DURFLINGER (1963) PROPOSES THAT THE LACK OF REPLICATION OF STUDIES IS A SIGNIFICANT FACTOR IN ACCOUNTING FOR THE GREAT AMOUNT OF CONTRADICTORY EVIDENCE REGARDING THE PREDICTION OF TEACHER SUCCESS. HE SUGGESTS THAT SINCE NO TWO RESEARCHERS SEEM TO USE THE SAME SCREENING CRITERIA, SUCCESS CRITERIA, OR TO MAKE USE OF POPULATIONS THAT COULD BE JUDGED COMPARABLE, IT IS DIFFICULT TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER ANY GENUINE DIRECTIONS IN THE CURRENT FINDINGS MAY BE DETECTED.

Gowan (1955) previously noted this fact and reinforced it by suggesting that any reliability check on the predictive criteria of teacher trainees is hampered by the subjective nature of most success criterion rating techniques. (Subjective referring to authority figures such as building principals and training professors.) The tendency, suggests Gowan (1955), is for the ratings to measure the identification pattern of the rater, (for example, social relationship to the subject) rather than the performance effectiveness of the teacher.

Tiegs (1928) states that the evaluation of teaching success has consisted of taking a somewhat arbitrary list of factors, rather general in nature, and undefined either in general terms or in terms of the varying degrees in which evidence of them might be expected to manifest itself, and then guessing at what the answer should be.

Considering what Durflinger (1963) and Gowan (1955) are saying some thirty years subsequent to Tiegs (1928), perhaps Tiegs' position was still tenable.

Symonds (1955) in a more clinical orientation, suggests that the majority of work performed by the classroom teacher is not amenable to objective observation, hence the basic determinants are to be found in the personality structure of the teacher rather than in the performance behavior of the teacher.

Personality Factors as Predictors

Getzels and Jackson (1963) present a highly integrated and meaningful series of studies dealing with various methods of evaluating personality structure. It is the intention within this section of the review of literature to present the most relevant studies within each area.

Attitude

The instrument most widely used in measuring the teacher attitudes has been the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI).

Callis (1950), using a form of the MTAI, designed a study to examine the stability of certain attitudes of four select groups of subjects. The groups were as follows:

1. Controls - 57 first quarter juniors (CON).
2. Experimental - 175 first quarter juniors (EXA).
3. Experimental - 147 first quarter seniors (EXB).
4. Experimental - 137 beginning teachers (EXC).

Each group was tested twice, the control group 10 days apart and the three experimental groups six months apart.

The results indicated that:

1. All groups made significant changes in mean inventory scores.
2. The control group, EXA, and EXB showed an <u>increase</u> in mean score between testings.

3. THE EXC GROUP SHOWED A DECREASE IN MEAN SCORE BETWEEN TESTINGS.
4. THE EXA GROUP INCREASE WAS SIGNIFICANT AT THE .01 LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE.
5. THE EXC GROUP DECREASE WAS SIGNIFICANT AT THE .01 LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE.
6. THERE WAS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE CONTROL GROUP INCREASE AND EXB GROUP INCREASE.

IT WOULD APPEAR THAT TRAINING DURING THE JUNIOR YEAR AFFECTS A SIGNIFICANT AND POSITIVE CHANGE REGARDING THE ATTITUDE OF TEACHER TRAINEES TOWARD PUPILS. HOWEVER, THIS CHANGE SEEMS TO REVERSE ITSELF AFTER A SHORT PERIOD OF ACTUAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE. THIS EVIDENCE SUGGESTS THAT A POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD PUPILS IS STABLE DURING THE JUNIOR-SENIOR YEAR, BUT THEN CHANGES WHEN THE REALITIES OF TEACHING BECOME EVIDENT.

SEVERAL CONCLUSIONS SEEM APPARENT FROM THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH. FIRST, THE STUDENTS WHO SELECTED EDUCATION AS A MAJOR DID NOT APPEAR AWARE OF WHAT TEACHER-PUPIL RELATIONSHIPS CONSISTED OF AND SECONDLY, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THE TRAINING INSTITUTION WAS INSTRUMENTAL IN BUILDING A TEACHER-PUPIL "SET" FOR THE PROSPECTIVE STUDENT TEACHER.

THIRDLY, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THE TRAINING INSTITUTIONS ARE NOT COMMUNICATING THE REALITIES OF WHAT TEACHER-PUPIL RELATIONSHIPS ARE REALLY LIKE AS EVIDENCED BY THE SIGNIFICANT

DECREASE IN MEAN SCORE OF THE EXC GROUP.

VALUES, INTERESTS, FAVORED ACTIVITIES. TANNER (1954), USING THE ALLPORT-VERNON-LINDZEY STUDY OF VALUES, STUDIED TWO GROUPS OF EDUCATION STUDENTS, ONE LABELED AS SUPERIOR AND THE OTHER AS INFERIOR ON THE BASIS OF FACULTY RATINGS AND MTAI RESPONSES. FEMALES RATED AS SUPERIOR WERE SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER ON ECONOMIC AND HIGHER ON SOCIAL VALUES THAN THE INFERIOR FEMALES. NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE WAS REPORTED BETWEEN SUPERIOR AND INFERIOR MALES.

USING THE KUDER PREFERENCE RECORD, HEDLUNE (1953) REPORTS THAT GOOD TEACHERS, BOTH MALE AND FEMALE, TEND TO SCORE HIGHER ON THE PERSUASIVE CATEGORY THAN POOR TEACHERS. ASSESSMENTS OF GOOD AND POOR WERE OBTAINED BY OBSERVERS, SUPERVISORS, AND PUPIL JUDGEMENTS.

STRONG, (1943) IN DISCUSSING THE STRONG VOCATIONAL INTEREST BLANK, SUGGESTS THAT THE INSTRUMENT IS A MORE SIGNIFICANT DISCRIMINATOR OF DIFFERENT TEACHING FIELDS THAN IT IS OF ASSESSING GOOD OR BAD TEACHERS.

ADJUSTMENT NEEDS. MACLEAN, GOWAN & GOWAN (1955), IN AN EXTENSIVE STUDY INVOLVING 1,700 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EDUCATION STUDENTS, UTILIZED THE MINNESOTA MULTIPHASIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY (MMPI) AS ONE OF A BATTERY OF SCREENING TESTS. THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY INDICATED THAT BOTH MEN AND WOMEN EDUCATION MAJORS TENDED TO BE SLIGHTLY HIGH ON THE HYSTERIA,

Psychopathic Deviate, Schizophrenia, and Hypomania scales.

Hedlund (1953) found that good teachers tended to have lower MMPI Paronoia and Lie scores than poor teachers. The measures of good and poor were based upon composite ratings by the teacher's supervisor, an "expert" observer, the teacher's pupils, and on the quality of disciplinary control.

The majority of MMPI investigations reviewed thus far had as a goal the use of personality variables to discriminate between teaching success or non-success or good or poor teacher-pupil effectiveness. Few of the studies, however, have actually utilized their results for predictive purposes. That is, varifying the accuracy of a classification by using prediction variables. In support of this, Getzels and Jackson (1963) suggest that most studies stop after demonsrating a significant difference between "good" and "poor" teachers, or after reporting a significant correlation between concurrent personality and criterion variables.

Tyler (1954), in a critique of studies designed to predict teacher effectiveness, states that a significant difference between any two groups or the existence of a positive correlation between a criterion variable and a series of other variables gives no evidence regarding accuracy of classification or prediction. Tyler (1954) further stresses this point by suggesting that up to the time of Barr's (1948) review, there

HAD NOT BEEN A SINGLE COMPLETE INVESTIGATION CONCERNED WITH THE PREDICTION OF TEACHING EFFICIENCY.

PERSONALITY FACTORS. GETZELS AND JACKSON (1963) SUMMARIZE THE RESEARCH REGARDING THE PREDICTION OF TEACHING SUCCESS USING THE GUILFORD PERSONALITY INVENTORY BY SUGGESTING THAT THE RESULTS OF A LIMITED NUMBER OF INVESTIGATIONS TENDS TO ADD SUPPORT TO A PSYCHOLOGICALLY FAVORABLE PICTURE OF THE TEACHER. THAT IS, THE RESULTS TEND TO IDENTIFY THE GOOD TEACHER AS MORE EMOTIONALLY STABLE, FRIENDLY, PERSONABLE, ETC., THAN THE POOR TEACHER. THIS RESULT, SUGGESTS GETZELS AND JACKSON (1963), SHOULD COME AS NO SURPRISE IN MANY AREAS OTHER THAN EDUCATION.

PROJECTIVE TECHNIQUES. SYMONDS AND DUDEK (1956) SUGGEST THAT THE RORSCHACH IS A RELATIVELY INEFFECTIVE PREDICTIVE TOOL IN TERMS OF IDENTIFYING GOOD OR POOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS. THIS CONDITION IS NOT THE FAULT OF THE TEST ITSELF, BUT RATHER THE INABILITY TO DECIDE WHICH ASPECTS OF THE SUCCESSFUL TEACHER ARE IMPORTANT TO HIS SUCCESS.

OHLSEN AND SCHULTZ (1955), USING THE ADULT-CHILD INTERACTION TEST (ACI), FAILED TO FIND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GOOD AND POOR STUDENT TEACHERS AS JUDGED BY SUPERVISING TEACHERS. OHLSEN AND SCHULTZ (1955) CONCLUDED BY SPECULATING THAT THE RIGHT COMBINATION OF CONTENT ANALYSIS QUESTIONS MAY PROVE TO BE USEFUL IN SELECTING TEACHER-EDUCATION CANDIDATES.

Teacher Characteristics Study. A monumental study conducted by Ryans (1960) represents the most extensive attempt to date to define the underlying characteristics of teachers. Of the several sets of characteristics studied, the one of greatest application to this current research relates to influences affecting choice of teaching and activities during childhood. Teachers who entered the profession because of its intellectual nature, or because they liked school, or because of a desire to perform a social service, tended to score rather high on most of the teacher characteristics. Teachers who entered the profession because they were advised to do so, or because of the desirable position, or favorable prospects for advancements, tended to score lower.

Teachers who reported having early teacher-like experiences tended to score higher on most of the scales than those teachers who did not have these experiences.

Cognitive Abilities. Research by Wolfle (1954), Clark and Gist (1938), Learned and Wood (1938), and Powell (1950) indicates that teachers on the whole have higher intellectual ability than the general population. Wolfle (1954) finds that while education majors score above the general population, they consistently score below other declared major groups, with regard to intellectual ability.

In a comprehensive study, Morsh and Wilder (1954) reviewed some 55 studies conducted between 1927 and 1952 in which intellectual ability was related to teaching effectiveness. The results of their review did not support finding a positive relationship between intellectual ability and teaching effectiveness.

Subsequent to Morsh and Wilder's work in (1954), there has been little research accomplished in this area.

Getzels and Jackson (1963) suggest that very little is known for certain about the nature and measurement of teacher personality, or about the relation between teacher personality and teaching effectiveness. Many of the investigations so far have not produced significant results. What is needed is research leading to the discovery of the characteristics of the effective teacher, and the specific and distinctive features of the effective teacher's personality.

The great chasm between a multiplicity of research relating to personality variables and the bare speck of significant and useful results is explained by Getzels and Jackson (1963) as a threefold problem.

First, is the problem of adequately defining the term personality. In general, it is defined in one of the following three ways: as the totality of a person's behavior (behavioral definition), of the responses made by others to the individual

AS A STIMULUS (SOCIAL STIMULUS DEFINITION), OR THE DYNAMIC ORGANIZATION WITHIN THE INDIVIDUAL THAT DETERMINES HIS UNIQUE BEHAVIOR (DEPTH DEFINITION). MOST RESEARCHERS OF TEACHER PERSONALITY FAIL TO IDENTIFY WHICH CATEGORY THEY ARE OPERATING WITHIN.

SECONDLY, THERE ARISES THE PROBLEM OF INSTRUMENTATION. OF THE LEGION OF PERSONALITY TESTS AVAILABLE, NO TWO APPEAR TO CONFIRM THE SAME RESULT. EACH TENDS TO EVALUATE PERSONALITY FROM A SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT ORIENTATION. SELF-REPORT INSTRUMENTS ARE LIKELY TO REPRESENT A BEHAVIORAL CONCEPT, RATING SCALES A SOCIAL STIMULUS CONCEPT, AND PROJECTIVE TESTS A DEPTH CONCEPT. TESTS APPEAR TO BE USED ON THE BASIS OF AVAILABILITY RATHER THAN ON RELEVANT PERSONALITY CONCEPTS.

THE THIRD AND MOST INTRANSIGENT OF THE DIFFICULTIES RELATES TO THE TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS CRITERION. TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS GENERALLY ENTERS INTO A CONSIDERATION OF TEACHER PERSONALITY AS SOME ESTIMATE OF RELATIVE SUCCESS IS NECESSARY. AT PRESENT OUR INABILITY TO DESCRIBE THE EFFECTIVE TEACHER TENDS TO NEGATE ANY ATTEMPT TO MAKE PREDICTIONS ABOUT PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING PRIOR TO THE CONDITION OF ACTUAL TEACHING.

IN THE EVENT MEANINGFUL PREDICTIONS COULD BE MADE, THEIR CONFIRMATION WOULD APPEAR DOUBTFUL AS THE MAJORITY OF RATINGS ARE UNRELIABLE. WANDT (1954) SUGGESTS THAT MANY

METHODS OF JUDGING CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE ARE TOTALLY IRRELEVANT TO CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE. WANDT'S INVESTIGATION DETERMINED THAT TEACHERS WHO GAVE HIGH RATINGS TO THEIR ADMINISTRATORS ALSO TENDED TO RECEIVE HIGH RATINGS FROM THEIR ADMINISTRATORS. ON THE BASIS OF WANDT'S RESEARCH, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THE LACK OF PREDICTIVE INSTRUMENTS AND PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVITY CRITERIA MAY SERIOUSLY INTIMIDATE THE TEACHER, WHO ON THE BASIS OF HIS/HER PROFESSIONAL AND/OR ETHICAL VALUE SYSTEM WOULD NOT RATE THEIR ADMINISTRATORS AS HIGH.

TWO OF THE OBSTACLES THAT INHIBIT EFFECTIVE AND MEANINGFUL RESEARCH IN THE AREA OF IDENTIFYING SUCCESSFUL TEACHER PERSONALITY TRAITS MIGHT ALSO BE APPLIED TO STUDIES IN THE AREA OF PREDICTING TEACHER SUCCESS; NAMELY, PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE SCREENING INSTRUMENTS AND THOSE SURROUNDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS CRITERION.

JOHNSON (1957) INDICATES THAT THE INADEQUACY OF THE RESEARCH LIES NOT SO MUCH WITH THE RESEARCH PER SE BUT WITH CERTAIN OF ITS UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS. IT IS RECOGNIZED THAT SELECTION AND TRAINING OF THE MOST EFFECTIVE TEACHERS FOR THE GUIDANCE OF OUR COMING GENERATIONS IS OF UTMOST SIGNIFICANCE, BUT THE MEANING OF "MOST EFFECTIVE" WOULD REQUIRE CONSIDERABLE DEFINITION. THIS MEANS THEN THAT ESTABLISHMENT OF THE VALIDITY OF ANY PREDICTIVE DEVICE FOR THIS PURPOSE IS DEPENDENT UPON THE

DEFINITION OF "TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS." VALIDITY IS MOST GENERALLY REDUCIBLE TO "CORRELATES WITH CRITERION," AND THE CHOICE OF "CRITERION" IS OFTEN UNSUPPORTABLE IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN EDUCATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORY. (E.G., THE FINDINGS OF WANDT (1954))

REMMERS, BARR, BECHDOLT, GAGE, ORLEANS, PACE AND RYANS (1953) EXPRESS THE CONVICTION THAT THE PRESENT CONDITION OF RESEARCH ON TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS HOLDS LITTLE PROMISE OF YIELDING RESULTS COMMENSURATE WITH THE NEEDS OF AMERICAN EDUCATION. THIS CONDITION HAS TWO SIGNIFICANT CHARACTERISTICS: DISORGANIZATION AND LACK OF ORIENTATION TO OTHER BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES. DISORGANIZATION RELATES TO THE CONDITION, AT PRESENT, WHEREIN RESEARCH TOO OFTEN PROCEEDS WITHOUT AN EXPLICITY THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, AND TOO OFTEN YIELDS TO THE TESTING OF MYRIADS OF ARBITRARY UNRATIONALIZED HYPOTHESES. THE MAJORITY OF STUDIES TOO OFTEN INTERACT LITTLE WITH EACH OTHER, DO NOT FALL INTO PLACE WITHIN ANY SYSTEMATIC SCHEME, AND CONSEQUENTLY ADD LITTLE TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE TEACHING PROCESS. THE SIMPLE FACT OF THE MATTER IS THAT, AFTER SOME 40 YEARS OF RESEARCH ON TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS, DURING WHICH A VAST NUMBER OF STUDIES HAVE BEEN CARRIED OUT, ONE CAN POINT TO FEW OUTCOMES THAT A SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS CAN EMPLOY IN HIRING A TEACHER OR GRANTING HIM TENURE, THAT AN

AGENCY CAN EMPLOY IN CERTIFYING TEACHERS, OR THAT A TEACHER EDUCATION FACULTY CAN EMPLOY IN PLANNING OR IMPROVING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

AT THIS POINT WE DO HAVE SKETCHY AND VAGUE IDEAS OF SOME OF THE UNDERLYING COMPONENTS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING; HOWEVER, WE DO NOT HAVE A COMPOSITE DESCRIPTION PROFICIENT ENOUGH TO MAKE ACCURATE PREDICTIONS REGARDING WHO WILL OR WILL NOT BECOME SUCCESSFUL TEACHERS. IN SHORT, WE HAVE NO UNIFIED MODEL OF THE EFFECTIVE TEACHER FROM WHICH WE CAN TRANSLATE TO THE TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS AND THE TEACHER TRAINEES. THE GREATEST DETERENT TO BUILDING THIS MODEL WOULD APPEAR TO BE THE LACK OF AGREEMENT OF WHAT THE EFFECTIVE TEACHER DOES WHEN HE/SHE IS BEING EFFECTIVE.

IN CONSIDERATION OF ALL OF THE AREAS OF RESEARCH HEREIN EXAMINED, THERE APPEARS TO BE NO REAL OR IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SEEMINGLY NAIVE PREDICTIVE ATTEMPTS OF MERIAM (1906) AND THE INTENDED SOPHISTICATED APPROACHES OF RYANS (1960) AND OTHERS WITH REGARD TO IDENTIFYING MEANINGFUL TEACHER SELECTION CRITERIA.

IN THIS STUDY THE BEHAVIOR THE TEACHER-TRAINING SUPERVISOR CONSIDERED RELEVANT TO SUCCESSFUL TEACHING WAS ASSUMED TO BE EVALUATED (REFLECTED) BY THE GRADE ASSIGNED IN STUDENT TEACHING. IT WAS THOUGHT THAT PERHAPS SOME OF THE MEASURES OBTAINED BY THE STUDENT PRIOR TO STUDENT TEACH-

ING MIGHT PREDICT WHAT THEY COULD BE EXPECTED TO DO IN STUDENT TEACHING AND MIGHT THEREFORE COME TO BE USEFUL AS SCREENING DEVICES, OR THE WEAKNESSES THEY INDICATE SHOULD BE ALLEVIATED BEFORE STUDENT TEACHING.

Chapter III

Results of the Study

The results of the study will be reported within this section in the same order in which the hypotheses were previously introduced.

The general hypotheses from which all others were derived states that there is no significant difference between students (both male and female elementary and secondary) who receive A's, B's, or C's or less in student teaching in terms of their overall GPA, professional education sequence GPA, and scores on the teacher education entrance tests.

Table 1 describes the method of presentation for all succeeding result tables. Tables 2, 3, and 4 show the results of the tests of significance relating to hypotheses 1A - 1F.

Tables 2, 3, and 4 indicated that there was a significant difference between the overall GPA's and professional education sequence GPA's of the A, B, and C or less groups. The confidence levels indicated that the difference between the A-B and A-C groups was more significant than the B-C group.

TABLE 1

GROUP TESTED

INTERACTION COMPARED

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
A_1 - B_1 - OVERALL GPA	---	---	*
A_2 - B_2 - SEQUENCE GPA	---	---	
A_3 - B_3 - ENGLISH	---	---	
A_4 - B_4 - SPELLING	---	---	
A_5 - B_5 - READING	---	---	
A_6 - B_6 - MATH	---	---	

* DENOTES A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON A SPECIFIC PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 2

ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY

AND SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHERS

A-B COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$A_1 - B_1$	4.999	264	$P < .001$ *
$A_2 - B_2$	5.973	264	$P < .001$ *
$A_3 - B_3$	2.818	264	$P < .05$ *
$A_4 - B_4$	1.120	264	$P > .05$
$A_5 - B_5$	1.117	264	$P > .05$
$A_6 - B_6$	-.372	264	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 3

ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY

AND SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHERS

A-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$A_1 - C_1$	4.537	122	$P < .001$ *
$A_2 - C_2$	5.922	122	$P < .001$ *
$A_3 - C_3$	-.734	122	$P > .05$
$A_4 - C_4$	1.232	122	$P > .05$
$A_5 - C_5$	.585	122	$P > .05$
$A_6 - C_6$	-.201	122	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 4

ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY

AND SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHERS

B-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$B_1 - C_1$	2.027	186	$P < .05$ *
$B_2 - C_2$	2.491	186	$P < .05$ *
$B_3 - C_3$	-1.071	186	$P > .05$
$B_4 - C_4$	.644	186	$P > .05$
$B_5 - C_5$	.047	186	$P > .05$
$B_6 - C_6$	.010	186	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

The results offer evidence for accepting null hypotheses 1A (male and female both elementary and secondary - overall GPA) and 1B (male and female both elementary and secondary - professional education sequence GPA) for the A-B, A-C, and B-C comparisons and null hypothesis 1C (male and female both elementary and secondary - English usage) for the A-B comparisons. Hypotheses 1D (male and female both elementary and secondary - Spelling), 1E (male and female both elementary and secondary - Reading), and 1F (male and female both elementary and secondary - Arithmetic) were not rejected by the A-B, A-C, or B-C comparisons.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 deal specifically with male and female elementary student teachers for the A-B, A-C, and B-C comparisons and relate to hypotheses 2A - 2F. Tables 5, 6, and 7 represent a breakdown of Tables 2, 3, and 4 to determine the loading factors of the highly significant $A_1 - B_1$, $A_2 - B_2$, $A_1 - C_1$, and $A_2 - C_2$ comparisons.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 indicated that for males and females at the elementary level the prediction variables of overall GPA and professional education sequence GPA were highly significant discriminators of student teachers performance for the A-B and A-C comparison groups. Overall GPA was not a good discriminator of performance between the

TABLE 5

ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY

STUDENT TEACHERS

A-B COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	
$A_1 - B_1$	4.372	169	$P < .001$	*
$A_2 - B_2$	5.754	169	$P < .001$	*
$A_3 - B_3$	2.035	169	$P < .05$	*
$A_4 - B_4$	1.100	169	$P > .05$	
$A_5 - B_5$	1.427	169	$P > .05$	
$A_6 - B_6$	.048	169	$P > .05$	

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 6

ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY

STUDENT TEACHERS

A-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$A_1 - C_1$	3.530	84	$P < .001$ *
$A_2 - C_2$	5.705	84	$P < .001$ *
$A_3 - C_3$	-.834	84	$P > .05$
$A_4 - C_4$	1.281	84	$P > .05$
$A_5 - C_5$	.541	84	$P > .05$
$A_6 - C_6$	-.124	84	$P > .02$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 7

ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY

STUDENT TEACHERS

B-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$B_1 - C_1$	1.185	123	$P > .05$
$B_2 - C_2$	2.260	123	$P < .05$ *
$B_3 - C_3$	-1.085	123	$P > .05$
$B_4 - C_4$	.628	123	$P > .05$
$B_5 - C_5$	-.206	123	$P > .05$
$B_6 - C_6$	-.166	123	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

B-C GROUPS; HOWEVER, PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA TENDED TO REACH SIGNIFICANCE AS A DISCRIMINATOR.

TABLES 5, 6, AND 7 REFLECTED THAT AT THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL OVERALL GPA AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA TEND TO BE GOOD PERFORMANCE DISCRIMINATORS FOR BOTH MALES AND FEMALES.

THE RESULTS OF TABLES 5, 6, AND 7 OFFER EVIDENCE FOR ACCEPTING NULL HYPOTHESIS 2A (ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY - OVERALL GPA) FOR THE A-B AND A-C COMPARISON AND NULL HYPOTHESIS 2B (ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY - PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA) FOR THE A-B, A-C, AND B-C COMPARISONS. EVIDENCE IS ALSO PRESENTED WHICH WOULD ALLOW ACCEPTANCE OF NULL HYPOTHESIS 2C (ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY - ENGLISH USAGE) IN TERMS OF THE A-B COMPARISON ONLY. HYPOTHESES 2D (ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY - SPELLING), 2E (ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY - READING), AND 2F (ALL MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY - ARITHMETIC) WERE SUPPORTED WITH REGARD TO THE A-B, A-C, AND B-C COMPARISONS.

TABLES 8, 9, AND 10 REPRESENT A FURTHER BREAKDOWN OF TABLES 5, 6, AND 7 TO INCLUDE ONLY MALE ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS. TABLES 8, 9, AND 10 DEAL SPECIFICALLY WITH HYPOTHESES 3A - 3F FOR THE A-B, A-C, AND B-C COMPARISONS.

Tables 8, 9, and 10 indicated that for males at the elementary level the prediction variables of overall GPA and professional education sequence GPA were significant discriminators of student teaching performance for the A-B and A-C comparisons. No prediction variable appeared to discriminate between the performance of the B-C comparison groups. The prediction variable of English usage was a significant discriminator of performance between the A-B comparison; however, the inconsistency of this variable as a performance discriminator would seriously detract from its' differentiating qualities.

Tables 8, 9, and 10 tend to give supportive evidence to the consistent discriminatory value of overall GPA and professional education sequence GPA between the A-B and A-C performance groups.

Evidence from Tables 8, 9, and 10 did not support hypotheses 3A (all male elementary - overall GPA) and 3B (all male elementary - professional education sequence GPA) for the A-B and A-C comparisons. Hypothesis 3C (all male elementary - English usage) was not supported by the A-B comparison but was supported by the A-C and B-C comparisons. Hypotheses 3D (all male elementary - Spelling), 3E (all male elementary - Reading), and 3F

TABLE 8

ALL MALE ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS

A-B COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	
$A_1 - B_1$	3.159	64	$P < .01$	*
$A_2 - B_2$	5.099	64	$P < .001$	*
$A_3 - B_3$	2.110	64	$P < .05$	*
$A_4 - B_4$	1.017	64	$P > .05$	
$A_5 - B_5$	.063	64	$P > .05$	
$A_6 - B_6$	-1.564	64	$P > .05$	

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 9

ALL MALE ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS

A-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	
$A_1 - C_1$	2.676	30	$P < .05$	*
$A_2 - C_2$	4.217	30	$P < .001$	*
$A_3 - C_3$	-.951	30	$P > .05$	
$A_4 - C_4$	1.605	30	$P > .05$	
$A_5 - C_5$	.733	30	$P > .05$	
$A_6 - C_6$	-1.478	30	$P > .05$	

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 10

ALL MALE ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS

B-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$B_1 - C_1$	.699	54	$P > .05$
$B_2 - C_2$	.768	54	$P > .05$
$B_3 - C_3$	-1.175	54	$P > .05$
$B_4 - C_4$	.983	54	$P > .05$
$B_5 - C_5$	.742	54	$P > .05$
$B_6 - C_6$	-.543	54	$P > .05$

(ALL MALE ELEMENTARY - ARITHMETIC) FOR THE A-B, A-C, AND B-C COMPARISONS WERE SUPPORTED, THEREBY REJECTING THE NULL HYPOTHESES THAT A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE DID EXIST BETWEEN THE PERFORMANCE GROUPS.

TABLES 11, 12, AND 13 DEAL SPECIFICALLY WITH FEMALE ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS FOR THE A-B, A-C, AND B-C COMPARISONS AND RELATE TO HYPOTHESES 4A THROUGH 4F. EVIDENCE FROM TABLES 11, 12, AND 13 INDICATED THAT NULL HYPOTHESIS 4A (ALL FEMALE ELEMENTARY - OVERALL GPA) WAS SUPPORTED ONLY BY THE A-B COMPARISON. THIS SUGGESTS THAT THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF OVERALL GPA WAS A BETTER DISCRIMINATOR OF STUDENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE BETWEEN THOSE WHO RECEIVED A'S OR B'S THAN IT WAS BETWEEN THOSE WHO RECEIVED A'S OR C'S. IT WOULD BE EXPECTED THAT THE GREATER THE SPREAD BETWEEN PERFORMANCE CATEGORIES (A, B, OR C), THE GREATER SHOULD BE THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PREDICTION VARIABLE AS A DISCRIMINATOR.

IN OTHER TABLES (TABLES 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, AND 9) THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF OVERALL GPA WAS A NEAR EQUAL DISCRIMINATOR OF PERFORMANCE BETWEEN THE A-B AND A-C GROUPS.

HYPOTHESIS 4B (ALL FEMALE ELEMENTARY - PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA) WAS NOT SUPPORTED BY THE A-B, A-C, OR B-C COMPARISONS.

TABLE 11

ALL FEMALE ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS

A-B COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	
$A_1 - B_1$	2.675	103	$P < .005$	*
$A_2 - B_2$	3.368	103	$P < .001$	*
$A_3 - B_3$	.343	103	$P > .05$	
$A_4 - B_4$	.118	103	$P > .05$	
$A_5 - B_5$	1.722	103	$P > .05$	
$A_6 - B_6$	.922	103	$P > .05$	

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 12

ALL FEMALE ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS

A-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$A_1 - C_1$	1.893	52	$P > .05$
$A_2 - C_2$	3.705	52	$P < .001$ *
$A_3 - C_3$	.133	52	$P > .05$
$A_4 - C_4$	-.350	52	$P > .05$
$A_5 - C_5$	-.312	52	$P > .05$
$A_6 - C_6$	1.566	52	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 13

ALL FEMALE ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS

B-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$B_1 - C_1$	.666	67	$P > .05$
$B_2 - C_2$	2.042	67	$P < .05$ *
$B_3 - C_3$	-.041	67	$P > .05$
$B_4 - C_4$	-.419	67	$P > .05$
$B_5 - C_5$	-1.175	67	$P > .05$
$B_6 - C_6$	.918	67	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

The results of Table 13 (female elementary - B-C comparison) accounts for the significance of professional education sequence GPA as a discriminator of the B-C comparisons in Tables 4 and 7. Table 10 (male elementary - B-C comparison) did not indicate results congrueous with Tables 4 or 7.

Hypotheses 4C (all female elementary - English usage), 4D (all female elementary - Spelling), 4E (all female elementary - Reading), and 4F (all female elementary - Arithmetic) were supported by the results of Tables 11, 12, and 13.

These results together with the results of Tables 8, 9, and 10 infer that at the elementary level the prediction variables of English usage, Spelling, Reading, and Arithmetic were not significant discriminators of performance between those who received A's, B's, or C's or less regardless of whether they are males or females.

Tables 14, 15, and 16 are the counterpart of Tables 5, 6, and 7 in that they deal with both male and female secondary student teachers. Analysis of the secondary level of student teaching performance is herein presented in order to examine the reliability of the various prediction variables for both secondary and elementary levels. Later tables, 17 through 20, will independently

TABLE 14

ALL MALE AND FEMALE SECONDARY

STUDENT TEACHERS

A-B COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$A_1 - B_1$	2.577	93	$P < .01$ *
$A_2 - B_2$	2.504	93	$P < .01$ *
$A_3 - B_3$	1.967	93	$P < .05$ *
$A_4 - B_4$	.495	93	$P > .05$
$A_5 - B_5$	.008	93	$P > .05$
$A_6 - B_6$	-.928	93	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 15

ALL MALE AND FEMALE SECONDARY

STUDENT TEACHERS

A-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	
$A_1 - C_1$	6.477	36	$P < .001$	*
$A_2 - C_2$	2.788	36	$P < .01$	*
$A_3 - C_3$	.543	36	$P > .05$	
$A_4 - C_4$	-.975	36	$P > .05$	
$A_5 - C_5$	.237	36	$P > .05$	
$A_6 - C_6$	.138	36	$P > .05$	

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 16

ALL MALE AND FEMALE SECONDARY

STUDENT TEACHERS

B-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$B_1 - C_1$	5.337	61	$P < .001$ *
$B_2 - C_2$	1.513	61	$P > .05$
$B_3 - C_3$	-.006	61	$P > .05$
$B_4 - C_4$	-1.621	61	$P > .05$
$B_5 - C_5$	.235	61	$P > .05$
$B_6 - C_6$	.896	61	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

EXAMINE THE RELIABILITY FACTOR FOR BOTH MALES AND FEMALES. TABLES 14, 15, AND 16 DEAL SPECIFICALLY WITH HYPOTHESES 5A THROUGH 5F.

CONTRARY TO TABLES 5, 6, AND 7 (MALE AND FEMALE ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS), TABLES 14, 15, AND 16 REFLECT THAT AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF OVERALL GPA WAS A VERY SIGNIFICANT DISCRIMINATOR OF PERFORMANCE FOR ALL COMPARISONS (A-B, A-C, AND B-C). THIS RESULT WOULD THEN SUPPORT NULL HYPOTHESIS 5A (ALL MALE AND FEMALE SECONDARY - OVERALL GPA) FOR THE A-B, A-C, AND B- C COMPARISONS.

THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA SIGNIFICANTLY DISCRIMINATES BETWEEN THE A-B AND A-C COMPARISONS BUT NOT THE B-C COMPARISON. THIS RESULT WOULD SUPPORT NULL HYPOTHESIS 5B (ALL MALE AND FEMALE SECONDARY - PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA) FOR THE A-B AND A-C COMPARISONS; HOWEVER, THE RESULTS OF THE B-C COMPARISON DID NOT SUPPORT NULL HYPOTHESIS 5B.

HYPOTHESIS 5C, WHICH RELATES TO THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ENGLISH USAGE (ALL MALES AND FEMALES SECONDARY) WAS NOT SUPPORTED BY THE A-B COMPARISON; HOWEVER, THE A-C AND B-C COMPARISONS DID SUPPORT HYPOTHESIS 5C.

Hypotheses 5D (all male and female secondary - Spelling), 5E (all male and female secondary - Reading), and 5F (all male and female secondary - Arithmetic) were given support by the results of Tables 14, 15, and 16.

Tables 17, 18, and 19 represent a breakdown of Tables 14, 15, and 16 to include only male secondary student teachers and deal specifically with hypotheses 6A through 6F.

Tables 17, 18, and 19 reflect that the prediction variable of overall GPA was a significant discriminator of performance for the A-B, A-C, and B-C comparisons. This result is similar to that reflected in Tables 8, 9, and 10 (male elementary student teachers) except for the B-C comparison. A combining of the two sets of data (Tables 8, 9, and 10 and Tables 17, 18, and 19) would suggest that for males at either the elementary or secondary level the prediction variable of overall GPA was a significant discriminator between those who obtain A's, B's, or C's in student teaching. It should be noted, however, that the B-C interaction comparison was statistically weaker than the A-B and A-C interaction comparison.

The results of Tables 17, 18, and 19 offer support in favor of the null hypothesis 6A (all male secondary - overall GPA) for the A-B and A-C comparisons. The B-C comparison did not support null hypothesis 6A.

TABLE 17

ALL MALE SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHERS

A-B COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$A_1 - B_1$	2.895	52	$P < .05$ *
$A_2 - B_2$	2.087	52	$P < .05$ *
$A_3 - B_3$	1.903	52	$P > .05$
$A_4 - B_4$	.028	52	$P > .05$
$A_5 - B_5$	.816	52	$P > .05$
$A_6 - B_6$	.410	52	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 18

ALL MALE SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHERS

A-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$A_1 - C_1$	4.737	22	$P < .001$ *
$A_2 - C_2$	1.850	22	$P > .05$
$A_3 - C_3$	2.034	22	$P > .05$
$A_4 - C_4$	-1.480	22	$P > .05$
$A_5 - C_5$	.219	22	$P > .05$
$A_6 - C_6$	.079	22	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 19

ALL MALE SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHERS

B-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$B_1 - C_1$	3.859	32	$P < .001$ *
$B_2 - C_2$	.898	32	$P > .05$
$B_3 - C_3$	.841	32	$P > .05$
$B_4 - C_4$	-1.603	32	$P > .05$
$B_5 - C_5$	-.017	32	$P > .05$
$B_6 - C_6$	-.222	32	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

The prediction variable of professional education sequence GPA was a significant discriminator of performance for the A-B comparison only. This result is contrary to that presented in Tables 8, 9, and 10 (male elementary student teachers) as at that level the same prediction variable had a higher significant discriminatory value for both the A-B and A-C comparisons. A combining of Tables 8, 9, and 10 and Tables 17, 18, and 19 would suggest that for the prediction variable of professional education sequence GPA the discriminatory sensitivity between those who receive A's, B's, or C's in student teaching was greater at the elementary level than at the secondary level. Again, it is to be noted that this result has more application for the A-B and A-C comparisons than the B-C comparison.

Results of Tables 17, 18, and 19 support null hypothesis 6B (male secondary - professional education sequence GPA) for the A-B comparison only.

Hypotheses 6C (male secondary - English usage), 6D (male secondary - Spelling), 6E (male secondary - Reading), and 6F (male secondary - Arithmetic) were supported by the results of Tables 17, 18, and 19 for the A-B, A-C, and B-C comparisons.

Table 20 indicates that for female secondary student teachers the prediction variable of overall GPA was the most significant discriminator for the A-B comparison. This result was consistent with the result of Table 11 (female elementary student teachers) which suggested that for the A-B comparison, overall GPA was a significant discriminator at both the elementary and secondary levels.

Hypothesis 7A (female secondary - overall GPA) was not supported by the A-C comparison. Hypotheses 7B (female secondary - professional education sequence GPA), 7C (female secondary - English usage), 7D (female secondary - Spelling), 7E (female secondary - Arithmetic) were supported by the results of Table 20 for the A-B comparison.

Tables 21, 22, and 23 represent a combining of male student teachers at both the elementary and secondary levels for the A-B, A-C, and B-C comparisons. These tables deal specifically with hypotheses 8A through 8F. They represent in essence a synthesis of Tables 8, 9, and 10 and Tables 17, 18, and 19.

Tables 21, 22, and 23 indicated that the prediction variables of overall GPA and professional education sequence GPA were significant discriminators of performance for the A-B and A-C comparisons. This result would support null

TABLE 20

ALL FEMALE SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHERS

A-B COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$A_1 - B_1$	2.040	39	$P < .05$ *
$A_2 - B_2$	1.856	39	$P > .05$
$A_3 - B_3$	1.719	39	$P > .05$
$A_4 - B_4$	1.186	39	$P > .05$
$A_5 - B_5$	-.756	39	$P > .05$
$A_6 - B_6$	-1.726	39	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

NOTE: THE FEMALE SECONDARY T TESTS A-C AND B-C COULD NOT BE RUN BECAUSE ONLY ONE PERSON OBTAINED A C, THUS MAKING THE COMPUTER FORMULA INVALID.

TABLE 21

ALL MALE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY

STUDENT TEACHERS

A-B COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	
$A_1 - B_1$	3.820	118	$P < .001$	*
$A_2 - B_2$	4.518	118	$P < .001$	*
$A_3 - B_3$	2.95	118	$P < .01$	*
$A_4 - B_4$	.815	118	$P > .05$	
$A_5 - B_5$	.607	118	$P > .05$	
$A_6 - B_6$	-1.079	118	$P > .05$	

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 22

ALL MALE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY

STUDENT TEACHERS

A-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	
$A_1 - C_1$	3.523	54	$P < .01$	*
$A_2 - C_2$	3.822	54	$P < .001$	*
$A_3 - C_3$	-.832	54	$P > .05$	
$A_4 - C_4$	1.275	54	$P > .05$	
$A_5 - C_5$	.879	54	$P > .05$	
$A_6 - C_6$	-1.322	54	$P > .05$	

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 23

ALL MALE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY

STUDENTS TEACHERS

B-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$B_1 - C_1$	1.433	88	$P > .05$
$B_2 - C_2$	9.26	88	$P > .05$
$B_3 - C_3$	-1.117	88	$P > .05$
$B_4 - C_4$	.817	88	$P > .05$
$B_5 - C_5$	.584	88	$P > .05$
$B_6 - C_6$	-.804	88	$P > .05$

HYPOTHESES 8A (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES - OVERALL GPA) AND 8B (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES - PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA) FOR THE A-B AND A-C COMPARISONS. THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ENGLISH USAGE WAS A SIGNIFICANT DISCRIMINATOR OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE A-B COMPARISON ONLY. THIS RESULT SUPPORTS NULL HYPOTHESIS 8C (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES - ENGLISH USAGE) FOR THE A-B COMPARISON ONLY.

NULL HYPOTHESES 8D (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES - SPELLING), 8E (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES - READING), AND 8F (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES - ARITHMETIC) FOR THE A-B COMPARISON AND 8C (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES - ENGLISH USAGE) THROUGH 8F (REFER TO ABOVE DESCRIPTIONS) FOR THE A-C COMPARISON WERE REJECTED. NULL HYPOTHESES 8A (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES - OVERALL GPA), 8B (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES - PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA), AND 8C THROUGH 8F (REFER TO ABOVE DESCRIPTIONS) FOR THE B-C COMPARISON WERE REJECTED.

TABLES 24, 25, AND 26 REPRESENT A SYNTHESIS OF ALL FEMALE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHERS AND RELATE SPECIFICALLY TO HYPOTHESES 9A THROUGH 9F.

TABLES 24, 25, AND 26 INDICATED THAT THE PREDICTION VARIABLES OF OVERALL GPA AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE

GPA WERE SIGNIFICANT DISCRIMINATORS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE A-B AND A-C COMPARISON ONLY. THIS RESULT WOULD TEND TO SUPPORT NULL HYPOTHESES 9A (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES - OVERALL GPA) AND 9B (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES - PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA) FOR A-B AND A-C COMPARISONS.

THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA WAS A SIGNIFICANT DISCRIMINATOR OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE B-C COMPARISON. THIS RESULT WOULD SUPPORT NULL HYPOTHESIS 9B (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES - PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA) FOR THE B-C COMPARISON; HOWEVER, THE INCONSISTENT MANNER IN WHICH THIS PREDICTION VARIABLE SIGNIFICANTLY DISCRIMINATED BETWEEN PERFORMANCE WITHIN THE B-C COMPARISON SERIOUSLY DETRACTS FROM THE RELIABILITY OF ITS' DISCRIMINATORY VALUE.

NULL HYPOTHESES 9A (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES - OVERALL GPA), 9B (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES - PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA), 9C (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES - ENGLISH USAGE), 9D (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES - SPELLING), 9E (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES - READING), AND 9F (ALL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FEMALES - ARITHMETIC) FOR THE A-B AND A-C COMPARISONS WERE NOT SUPPORTED BY THE RESULTS OF TABLES 24, 25, AND 26. NULL HYPOTHESES 9A

TABLE 24

ALL FEMALE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY

STUDENT TEACHERS

A-B COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	
$A_1 - B_1$	3.146	144	$P < .005$	*
$A_2 - B_2$	3.898	144	$P < .001$	*
$A_3 - B_3$	1.002	144	$P > .05$	
$A_4 - B_4$	.580	144	$P > .05$	
$A_5 - B_5$	.902	144	$P > .05$	
$A_6 - B_6$	.233	144	$P > .05$	

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 25

ALL FEMALE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY

STUDENT TEACHERS

A-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	
$A_1 - C_1$	2.561	66	$P < .05$	*
$A_2 - C_2$	4.104	66	$P < .001$	*
$A_3 - C_3$	.192	66	$P > .05$	
$A_4 - C_4$	.005	66	$P > .05$	
$A_5 - C_5$	-.329	66	$P > .05$	
$A_6 - C_6$	1.523	66	$P > .05$	

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

TABLE 26

ALL FEMALE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY

STUDENT TEACHERS

B-C COMPARISON

PREDICTION VARIABLE	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
$B_1 - C_1$	1.162	96	$P > .05$
$B_2 - C_2$	2.231	96	$P < .05$ *
$B_3 - C_3$	-.276	96	$P > .05$
$B_4 - C_4$	-.307	96	$P > .05$
$B_5 - C_5$	-.770	96	$P > .05$
$B_6 - C_6$	1.455	96	$P > .05$

* SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ACHIEVED GROUPS ON PREDICTION VARIABLE.

AND 9C THROUGH 9F (REFER TO ABOVE DESCRIPTIONS) WERE NOT SUPPORTED BY THE RESULTS OF TABLES 24, 25, AND 26.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS. 1. THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF OVERALL GPA SIGNIFICANTLY AND CONSISTENTLY DISCRIMINATED BETWEEN THE PERFORMANCE OF THE A-B AND A-C COMPARISONS FOR MALES AND FEMALES AT BOTH THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY LEVELS OF STUDENT TEACHING.

2. THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA SIGNIFICANTLY AND CONSISTENTLY DISCRIMINATED BETWEEN THE PERFORMANCE OF THE A-B AND A-C COMPARISONS FOR MALES AND FEMALES AT THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL. AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL, THIS PREDICTION VARIABLE DID NOT CONSISTENTLY AND/OR SIGNIFICANTLY DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THE A-C OR B-C PERFORMANCE GROUPS FOR MALES OR FEMALES.

3. THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF ENGLISH USAGE DID OCCASIONALLY SIGNIFICANTLY DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THE PERFORMANCE OF THE A-B AND A-C COMPARISONS (REFER TO TABLES 2, 5, AND 8); HOWEVER, THE LACK OF A DISCRIMINATORY PATTERN WOULD TEND TO NEGATE THESE PERIODIC SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES.

4. THE PREDICTION VARIABLE OF SPELLING FAILED TO SIGNIFICANTLY DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THE PERFORMANCE OF THOSE WHO ACHIEVED A'S, B'S, OR C'S IN STUDENT TEACHING WHETHER THEY WERE MALES OR FEMALES AT EITHER THE ELEMENTARY OR SECONDARY LEVEL.

5. The prediction variable of Reading failed to significiantly discriminate between the performance of those who achieved A's, B's, or C's in student teaching whether they were males or females at either the elementary or secondary level.

6. The prediction variable of Arithmetic failed to significantly discriminate between the performance of those who received A's, B's, or C's in student teaching whether they were males or females at either the elementary or secondary level.

Chapter IV

Summary, Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

Within this study, the writer has attempted to examine the screening criteria employed prior to acceptance into the teacher education program as possible discriminators of performance as reflected by achieved grades during student teaching.

It was intended that the study herein presented might provide both the institution and its candidates predictive information regarding probable levels of success in student teaching.

Summary of the Methods

The present study consisted of all students, with complete profiles of information, who completed a student teaching assignment at Central Washington State College during the 1964-65 academic year.

Information regarding sex, level of student teaching assignment, overall GPA, professional education sequence GPA, and teacher education screening scores were obtained through, and with the assistance of, the Assistant Dean of Instruction. All data was categorized and key punched on standard 80 space IBM cards. Analysis

of results were computed by IBM 1620 computer, utilizing a standard t test which was provided by the computer center at Central Washington State College.

For purposes of analyses, students were divided into one of three groups based on their achieved grade (A's, B's, and C's or less) in student teaching. A further breakdown into various groups, each with an A-B, A-C, and B-C comparison, was made. The breakdown into groups was as follows:

1. All male and female elementary and secondary student teachers.
2. All male and female elementary student teachers.
3. All male elementary student teachers.
4. All female elementary student teachers.
5. All male and female secondary student teachers.
6. All male secondary student teachers.
7. All female secondary student teachers.
8. All elementary and secondary male student teachers.
9. All elementary and secondary female student teachers.

Tables 2 through 26 were constructed to indicate the results of the above comparisons.

Summary, Conclusions and Discussion

1. The prediction variable of overall GPA was a highly significant discriminator of performance between those who achieved A's, B's, or C's or less as related to the A-B and A-C comparisons for males and females at both the elementary and secondary levels of student teaching.

2. The prediction variable of professional education sequence GPA was a significant discriminator of performance between those who achieved A's, B's, or C's or less with regard to male elementary and secondary and female elementary student teachers, for the A-B and A-C comparisons. The same predictor discriminated between achieved B's and C's for female elementary teachers only.

3. The prediction variable of English usage discriminated between the performance of male elementary student teachers who received either A's or B's.

4. The prediction variables of Spelling and Reading and Arithmetic never discriminated between those who received A's, B's, or C's or less in student teaching for any comparison group.

5. No prediction variable was found to reliably discriminate between the performance of those who achieved A's, B's, or C's or less in student teaching for any comparison group.

Conclusions and Discussion

The following conclusions seem to be warranted by the findings of this study:

1. The prediction variable of overall GPA could be used as a predictor of relative success for prospective male and female elementary and secondary student teachers.

2. The prediction variable of professional education sequence GPA could be used as a predictor of relative success for prospective male and female elementary and male secondary student teachers.

3. The prediction variables of English usage, Spelling, Reading, and Arithmetic could not be used with any degree of reliability for the purpose of predicting probable levels of success in student teaching.

4. The superior value of overall GPA as a predictor of relative success in student teaching would warrant its application as a screening and selection criterion variable before entering student teaching.

This criterion may be a useful performance variable insofar as we can imply that success in the activity of student teaching is related positively to success as a teacher. This relationship is complicated by the knowledge that a criterion or criteria of success-

FUL TEACHING HAS NOT BEEN AGREED UPON. SINCE THE GRADES IN STUDENT TEACHING ARE THE RESULTS OF SUPERVISORY JUDGEMENTS RATHER THAN OBJECTIVE MEASUREMENTS, AND SINCE SUCCESS AS A TEACHER IS USUALLY EVALUATED THE SAME WAY, ERRORS IN JUDGEMENT OR HONEST DIFFERENCE OBVIOUSLY ARE IMPORTANT AND CONTAMINATE ANY STUDIES OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TWO. EVEN IF THE CORRELATION BETWEEN STUDENT TEACHING GRADES AND SOME RATING OF TEACHING SUCCESS WAS AS HIGH AS .70, AND IF STUDENT TEACHING GRADES CORRELATED .70 WITH ONE OF THE CRITERIA HEREIN INVESTIGATED, THIS STILL GUARANTEES NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RATING OF TEACHING SUCCESS AND THE SPECIFIC CRITERION.

WHILE IN PRACTICALITY, THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY POINT TO SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ENTRANCE CRITERIA AND STUDENT TEACHING PERFORMANCES, THEY MAY IN ACTUALITY BE IN NO WAY RELATED TO IDENTIFYING SUCCESSFUL OR NON-SUCCESSFUL TEACHING PATTERNS. THESE RESULTS MAY THEN BE BASED ON A PECULIAR SET OF PERFORMANCE GRADES AS DETERMINED BY A PECULIARLY BIASED GROUP OF SUPERVISORS. HOWEVER, THE CONFIDENCE LEVELS FOR MOST COMPARISONS WOULD SUGGEST THAT SOME OF THE CRITERIA HAVE TREMENDOUS DISCRIMINATORY VALUE REGARDING DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN PERFORMANCE LEVELS, BUT SUGGEST OR RECOMMEND NOTHING REGARDING WHAT THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PERFORMANCE GROUPS ARE. ANY RECOMMENDATION AND/OR

CONCLUSION MUST THEREFORE BE CONSIDERED WITH THESE LIMITATIONS IN MIND.

5. THE SUPERIOR VALUE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE GPA AS A PREDICTOR OF RELATIVE SUCCESS FOR THE A-B AND A-C COMPARISONS IN REGARD TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY MALES AND ELEMENTARY FEMALES WOULD WARRANT ITS APPLICATION AS A SCREENING AND SELECTION PREDICTOR VARIABLE.

THE USEFULNESS OF GPA IN SEQUENCE COURSES AS SCREENING CRITERIA IN THE TEACHER EDUCATION IS LIMITED SINCE THE STUDENT MUST BE ACCEPTED, OR SHOULD BE, PRIOR TO HAVING COMPLETED OVER HALF OF THE DIDACTIC PART OF HIS PROGRAM. IT IS REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT DURING THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SEQUENCE COURSES THE STUDENT MAY BE EXPOSED TO FEELINGS, ATTITUDES, ETC., OF THE SUCCESSFUL TEACHING PRACTICES WHICH HE MAY INCORPORATE QUITE APART FROM HIS INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE RECORD. THAT IS, THE STUDENT MAY BE UNSUCCESSFUL IN TERMS OF HIGH CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE YET BE HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL IN GAINING SKILLS WHICH BRING HIM SUCCESS AS A STUDENT TEACHER. PERHAPS THIS MIGHT EXPLAIN THE APPARENT CLOSE IDENTITY BETWEEN THE B AND C STUDENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE GROUPS. (NO PREDICTION VARIABLE EVER DISTINGUISHED BETWEEN THESE TWO PERFORMANCE LEVELS.)

To be of maximum usefulness, we need devices which will screen at the beginning rather than the middle of a training program. Further research might indicate whether or not these sequence grades are useful in screening for graduate programs in education.

6. The negligible value of the English usage, Spelling, Reading, and Arithmetic prediction variables as predictors of relative success in student teaching for males and females at either the elementary or secondary levels would indicate that their application as screening and selective criteria is without justifiable and defensible cause.

As previously cited in Chapter I, instructors closely associated with the teacher education program perceived the entrance tests as determinants of whether or not the candidate has sufficient basic skills within the criteria to be admitted to the program. Other areas of application of the tests were cited; however, the aforementioned criteria was chosen most often (refer to Table 27). Since students who do not pass the entrance criteria are not allowed to enter the program, it would seem obvious that the institution is in essence making a prediction that these particular candidates will not be successful student teachers. In consideration of the non-discriminatory nature of the entrance

CRITERIA IN REGARD TO PERFORMANCE CATEGORIES IN STUDENT TEACHING, IT WOULD SEEM INAPPROPRIATE TO REFUSE A STUDENT ADMITTANCE TO THE PROGRAM BECAUSE OF ONE OR MORE DEFICIENCES ON THE ENTRANCE CRITERIA. THIS CONCLUSION WOULD APPEAR MORE REALISTIC WHEN ONE CONSIDERS THAT NO RESEARCH HAS BEEN DONE IN TERMS OF PERMITTING STUDENTS DEFICIENT ON THE ENTRANCE CRITERIA TO STUDENT TEACH AND THEN COMPARING THEIR PERFORMANCE WITH THOSE WHO WERE ADMITTED WITH SCORES ABOVE THE MINIMUM STANDARDS.

THIS DISCUSSION DOES NOT PRECLUDE THE USE OF THESE TESTS TO IDENTIFY WEAKNESSES PERCEIVED AS UNDESIRABLE IN STUDENT TEACHERS AND CONSEQUENTLY TO USE THESE RESULTS TO DIRECT THE STUDENT INTO PROGRAMS FOR IMPROVEMENT. RATHER IT SIMPLY IS INTENDED TO POINT OUT THAT UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES CRITERIA LABELED AS ENTRANCE TESTS MAY IN REALITY BE SCREENING INSTRUMENTS.

IN COMPARISON WITH BARR'S (1948) SUMMARY OF STUDIES RELATED TO PREDICTING GRADES IN STUDENT TEACHING, THE RESULTS OF THIS RESEARCH RELATE TO HIS IDENTIFICATION OF METHODS AND PROCEDURES COURSES AS BEING MORE OFTEN RELATED POSITIVELY TO GRADES IN STUDENT TEACHING THAN OTHER LESS SIGNIFICANT CRITERIA.

Recommendations

The writer has attempted to identify the predictive utility of certain screening criteria used at Central Washington State College. The intended goal was to aid the institution in selecting successful prospective teachers and to guide the student into areas of probable success. Any recommendations must, therefore, be applicable specifically to the teacher education program at Central Washington State College.

1. An attempt should be made to identify finer discriminations within the grades assigned for student teaching. A fractionated grading scale would allow a direct comparison between student teaching grade, overall GPA, and/or professional education sequence GPA.

2. An attempt should be made to utilize areas of the Washington Pre College Test Battery which might relate to predicting educational success. Here again, the fractionated grading system would blend with the Washington Pre College Tests for a more discriminatory evaluation.

3. Eliminate the screening and selective criteria determined as inappropriate by this study and replace them with more reliable instruments. The incorporation of any new criteria should beaccompanied by a research design intended to maintain constant evaluation of the program.

TABLE 27

CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATING PURPOSE OF TEACHER EDUCATION TESTS

PLEASE RANK EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS IN THE ORDER WHICH YOU BELIEVE BEST DESCRIBES THE PURPOSES OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION TESTS AT CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE.

2(1), 2(2)*	1. THEY SHOULD BE USED FOR PURPOSES OF ELIMINATION OF THE MOST UNLIKELY CANDIDATES FROM THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM.
3(1), 5(2)	2. THEY SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MEANS OF DECIDING WHO SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE ADMITTED TO THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM.
0,0	3. THEY SHOULD BE USEFUL FOR PREDICTING SUCCESS IN STUDENT TEACHING.
1(1), 0	4. THEY SHOULD BE USEFUL IN PREDICTING LATER TEACHING SUCCESS.
13(1), 4(2)	5. THEY SHOULD BE USEFUL FOR DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT THE CANDIDATE HAS SUFFICIENT BASIC SKILLS IN ARITHMETIC, GRAMMAR, READING, ETC., TO BE ADMITTED TO THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM.
4(1), 7(2)	6. THEY SHOULD BE USEFUL IN PREDICTING THE STUDENT TEACHER'S ABILITY TO USE THE SKILLS LISTED IN ITEM #5 IN THE CLASSROOM.
	7. OTHER (PLEASE DESCRIBE). 4 (IDENTIFY WEAK AREAS)

* DENOTES THE NUMBER OF FIRST AND SECOND CHOICES FOR EACH CRITERION.

(POSSIBLY AN EVALUATION WHEREIN A COMPARISON IS MADE BETWEEN AN ENTRANCE SCORE AND THE PERFORMANCE OF THAT SKILL DURING STUDENT TEACHING).

4. INVOLVE TEACHING SUPERVISORS MORE INTIMATELY TO THE PROCESS OF IDENTIFYING THE VARIABLES, BEHAVIOR, CONDITIONS, ETC., WHICH COMPRISE SUCCESSFUL TEACHING.

5. IDEALLY A CONTINUED ATTEMPT SHOULD BE MADE TO ARRIVE AT A POINT WHEREIN THE INSTITUTION CAN IDENTIFY POTENTIALLY SUCCESSFUL TEACHERS, THE STUDENT CAN IDENTIFY AREAS OF PROBABLE SUCCESS, AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS IN THE FIELD CAN OBJECTIVELY RELATE TO BOTH THE INSTITUTION AND ITS STUDENTS THE REQUISITES OF SUCCESS AND THE PITFALLS OF FAILURE.

GENERAL SUMMARY

THE MULTIPLICITY OF RESEARCH IN THE AREA OF ATTEMPTING TO IDENTIFY THE CRITERIA INVOLVED IN SUCCESSFUL TEACHING CONTAINS BUT A MINIMAL AMOUNT OF PREDICTIVE APPLICIABILITY. EVIDENCES WHERE CITED APPEAR CONTRADICTORY AND NON-SUPPORTIVE OF ONE ANOTHER. AS GETZELS AND JACKSON (1963) PREVIOUSLY POINTED OUT, FEW RESEARCH DESIGNS DEAL WITH COMPARABLE ATTRIBUTES OF TEACHING, HENCE ANY INTER-RESEARCH COMMONALITY IS IMPOSSIBLE TO ACHIEVE. WHAT APPEARS TO

REMAIN ARE MANY INDEPENDENT STUDIES EACH REVEALING A FACET OF A COMPLEX ENDEAVOR BUT UNABLE TO ACCUMULATE IN ANY APPRECIABLE AND SIGNIFICANT DESIGN.

Barr, A. S. The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency. J. Exp. Educ., Vol. 16. 1948.

Best, J. W. A Study of Certain Selected Factors Underlying the Choice of Teaching as a Profession. J. Exp. Educ., 1948. Vol. 17, pp. 201-259.

Callis, R. Change in teacher-pupil attitudes related to training and experience. In N. L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNalley. 1963. pp 506-526.

Clark, C. D., & Gist, N. P. Intelligence as a factor in occupational choice. Amer. Social Rev., 1938. Vol. 3, pp 683-694.

Durflinger, G. W. Recruitment and Selection of Prospective Elementary and Secondary School Teachers. Review of Educ. Res. Vol. 33, No. 4, 1963, pp 355-368.

Ellis, J. R. Relationships Between Aspects of Preparation and Measures of Performance of Secondary Teachers of the Social Studies. J. Educ. Res. Vol. 55, 1961. pp 24-28.

Fox, J. W. Factors Influencing the Career Choice of Prospective Teachers. J. Teacher Educ. Vol. 12, 1961. pp 427-432.

Getzels, J. W. & Jackson, P. W. The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N. L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNalley, 1963. pp 506-576.

Gowan, J. C. Prediction of teaching success: Rating by authority figures. Calif. J. of Educ. Res. Vol. 6, 1955. pp147-152.

Hedlund, P. A. Cooperative study to predict effectiveness in secondary school teaching. In. N. L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNalley, 1963. pp506-576.

Johnson, G. B. Jr. An experimental technique for the prediction of teacher effectiveness. J. of Educ. Res. Vol. 50. 1957. pp 678-689.

Kubie, L. S. Some Unsolved Problems of the Scientific Career. Amer. Scientist. Vol. 42, 1954. pp 104-112.

Learned, W. S. & Wood, B. D. The Student and his Knowledge. In N. L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNalley, 1963. pp 506-576.

MacLean, J. S., Gowan, May S., & Gowan, J. C. A teacher selection and counseling service. J. Educ. Res., 1955, Vol. 48, pp 669-677.

Meriam, L. L. Normal School Education and Efficiency in Teaching. Teach. Coll. Educ., 1906. No. 1.

Miller, H. Role Awareness as an objective of group work in teacher education. J. Teacher Educ., Vol. 6. 1955. pp 128-133.

Morsh, J. E. & Wilder, Eleanor W. Identifying the effective instructor: A review of quantitative studies. In N.L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNalley, 1963. pp 506-576.

Nothern, E. F. How Well do Prospective Teachers Compare With Students Preparing to Enter Other Occupations? J. Teacher Educ., 1958, Vol. 9, -- 387-396.

Ohlson, M. M. & Schultz, R. E. Projective Test response Pattern for best and poorest student teachers. Educ. Psych. Measmt., 1955. Vol. 15, pp18-27.

Powell, H. F. Characteristic differences in certain attributes of teachers in various teaching fields. In N. L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNalley, 1963. pp 506-576.

Roemmers, H. H., Barr, A.S., Bechdolt, B. V., Gage, N.L., Orleons, J.S., Pace, C.R., and Ryans, D.G. Second Report of the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness. J. of Educ. Res., Vol. 46, 1953, 641-658.

Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of teachers. In N. L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNalley. 1963. pp 506-576.

Seagoe, May V. A Follow-up of 314 Students Whose Fitness for Teaching was Questioned. J. Educ. Res., Vol. 50, 1957. pp 641-653.

Soderquist, H. O. Participation in Extracurricular Activities in High School or College and Subsequent Success in Teaching Adults. Sch. & Soc., Vol. 42. 1935. pp 607-608.

STRONG , E. K. , JR. VOCATIONAL INTERESTS OF MEN AND WOMEN. IN N. L. GAGE (ED.) HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON TEACHING. CHICAGO: RAND MCNALLEY. 1963. PP 506-576.

SYMONDS, P. M. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EFFECTIVE TEACHER BASED ON PUPIL OBSERVATIONS. J. EXP. EDUC., VOL. 23. 1955. PP 289-310.

SYMONDS, P. M., & DUDEK, STEPHANIE. USE OF THE RORSCHACH IN THE DIAGONOSIS OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS. J. PROJ. TECH. 1956. VOL. 20, -- 227-234.

TANNER, W. D. ,JR. PERSONALITY BASES IN TEACHER SELECTION. IN N. L. GAGE (ED.) HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON TEACHING. CHICAGO: RAND MCNALLEY. 1963. PP 507-576

TIEGS, E. W. AN EVALUATION OF SOME TECHNIQUES OF TEACHER SELECTION. IN N. L. GAGE (ED.) HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON TEACHING. CHICAGO: RAND MCNALLEY. 1963. PP 398-439.

TINK,T.J. FACTORS RELATED TO STUDENTS CHOOSING OR NOT CHOOSING TEACHING AS A VOCATION. IN G. W. DURFLINGER, RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF PROSPECTIVE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS. REVIEW OF EDUC. REV. VOL. 33, NO. 4, 1963. PP 355-368.

TYLER, F. T. THE PREDICTION OF STUDENT TEACHING SUCCESS FROM PERSONALITY INVENTORIES. IN N. L. GAGE (ED.) HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON TEACHING. CHICAGO: RAND MCNALLEY, 1963. PP 506-576.

WANDT, E. A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES OF CONTRASTING GROUPS OF TEACHERS. EDUC. PSYCHOL. MEASMT. 1954. VOL. 14, -- 418-422.

WHITNEY, F. L. THE PREDICTION OF TEACHING SUCCESS. JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH MONOGRAPHS., 1924, NO. 6.

WOLFLE, D. AMERICA'S SOURCES OF SPECIALIZED TALENT, IN N. L. GAGE (ED.) HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON TEACHING. CHICAGO: RAND MCNALLEY. 1963. PP 506-576.