

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 126

TM 000 174

AUTHOR Davis, Junius A.  
TITLE Faculty Perceptions of Students: The Development of the Student Rating Form, Part 1.  
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.  
SPONS AGENCY College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.  
EFFECTIVE DATE FE-64-10  
PUB DATE Feb 64  
NOTE 33p.

DESCRIPTORS  
EFTS PRICE MF-\$0.65 PC-\$3.29  
DESCRIPTORS Academic Ability, Achievement Rating, \*College Faculty, \*College Students, Factor Analysis, Grade Prediction, Predictive Validity, \*Rating Scales, \*Student Characteristics, \*Student Evaluation, Student Teacher Relationship, Test Construction  
IDENTIFIERS \*Student Rating Form

## ABSTRACT

The development of a Student Rating Form to be used by faculty in systematically describing college students is outlined in this first of a series of reports concerned with faculty characterizations of students. The treatment is primarily historical, providing a basis for subsequent technical reports of analyses of faculty definitions of desirable student traits. Data presented includes a thematic analysis of free verbal descriptions by faculty of students, and the results of a factor analysis (suggesting 16 factors) of variables contributed by an early version of Student Rating Form. A complete list of student traits and a copy of the instrument are included. This scale consists of three sections. Part I determines the degree of contact between the faculty member and the student. Part II requires an evaluation of the student's general academic ability compared with those of his classmates, and ascertains his most significant characteristics. Part III provides an evaluation of the student on a number of traits, contrasting him with his classmates. Description of the development of SRF is available in TM 000 174. (Author/LH)

ED050126

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS

I. The Development of the Student Rating Form

Junius A. Davis, Developmental Research Division, ETS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION  
& WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED  
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR  
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF  
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-  
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-  
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

Research Bulletin

RB-64-10

February 1964

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE

Princeton, New Jersey

421000 v  
ERIC  
Full text provided by ERIC

## FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS

### I. The Development of the Student Rating Form

#### Abstract

The steps leading to the development of a Student Rating Form, an instrument for use by faculty in systematically describing college students, are outlined in this first of a series of reports concerned with faculty characterizations of students. The treatment is primarily historical, providing a basis for subsequent technical reports of analyses of faculty definition of desirable student traits. Data presented include a thematic analysis of free verbal descriptions by faculty or students, and the results of a factor analysis (suggesting 16 factors) of variables contributed by an early version of the Student Rating Form.

## FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS

### I. The Development of the Student Rating Form

#### Introduction

Over the last five decades there have been many attempts to establish the validity of various non-cognitive measures for predicting success in college. Many personal factors would seem to moderate level of academic achievement: e.g., interest in course work; drive or motivation, freedom from personal problems. Yet the fact that few, if any, substantial findings have been established is attested by reviews of the literature (Fishman & Pasanella, 1960; Harris, 1940; Stein, 1963) or by the fact that there are no widely accepted tools of this type in team with the old workhorses of past achievement and scholastic ability measures.

A number of errors or problems are implicit, however, in most of the past work. The most outstanding of these has been the tendency to restrict the criterion to that readily available, usually the first term or freshman average grade. Psychologists have too frequently devoted their time to the theory or construction of the predictor, the apparently more intriguing member of the predictor-criterion pair; much of the work not concerned with proving a pet notion is marked by urgent need (to establish ground rules for selection) or opportunism (to conduct studies utilizing easy-to-come-by data in the simple correlational design).

Two major factors have contributed to the launching of a series of studies in which the rating scales described herein have played a major part. The first has to do with confidence, of construct validity origin, in many of the carefully developed non-cognitive measures such as, for example, the

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, 1962). A second factor is the fresh interest and concern, pervasive among faculty and administration as well as admissions officers (e.g., Kenedy, 1962; McClelland, 1961), for identifying other qualities of promise beyond those reflected by achievement in high school or scholastic aptitude (because, if for no other reason, applicant pools and size restrictions have frequently afforded more than enough applicants qualified on these dimensions, and additional bases for selection must be employed). The most thoughtful reflection of this problem is to be found in Bender's (1960, pp. 52-73) report, upon his retirement, of the admissions problems at Harvard. Although some of this concern may stem from dismay in still finding misfits after such rigorous screening, or from real fears that restriction of admission to only the most intellectually talented will exclude future presidents or other world leaders, there is room for questioning the ability of grades to encompass all valued or valuable qualities.

In this context, the present series of studies was launched. The purpose of the broader research was to determine valued personal qualities beyond those reflected by the grade-point average, as an initial approach to broader definition of criteria. The present paper describes the development of the Student Rating Form, an instrument that employs language and concepts suggested by college faculty themselves and which has been utilized as the basic source of data concerning the nature and structure of faculty perceptions of students. The description, herein, is essentially historical, to provide a base for later papers more directly concerned with technical aspects.

### The Initial Survey of Faculty Opinion about Student Characteristics

Under the leadership of Henry Chauncey and David Saunders, and with the assistance of institutional representatives at eight institutions,<sup>1</sup> a preliminary survey of faculty opinion about students was initiated. Cooperative faculty members at each institution (and, in a few instances, administrators, counselors, coaching staff, etc.) were obtained through the institutional representative. Each institution was asked to provide, through these faculty members, free verbal descriptions of 48 students fitting into the categories outlined in Figure 1.

	Highly Desirable	Highly Undesirable
High Academic Performance	8	8
Average Academic Performance	8	8
Low Academic Performance	8	8

(48)

Figure 1

No rigorous procedures were applied in selecting faculty or defining either desirability or the levels of academic performance; the faculty members were asked to select students they knew well. The purpose at this stage was simply to produce a mass and a variety of verbal material, in a context of desirability apart from (or even contrary to) academic performance, from which concepts could be selected and more formal descriptive measures could be developed. From this, Saunders hoped to form "a distillation of

---

<sup>1</sup>Amherst, Caltech, Cornell School of Engineering, Dartmouth, MIT, RPI, Rutgers, and Stanford.

the opinions that occupy the minds of the college evaluators on the subject of desirability and undesirability in college students."<sup>2</sup>

A thematic analysis of this material was then conducted by Saunders, who attempted to list, with count of frequency of occurrence, adjectives or adjectival phrases that appeared in the descriptions. This resulted in some 330 items, listed as bipolar traits (e.g., "serious-not serious" or "willing to ask questions-unwilling to ask questions"), grouped into 15 categories; this material, with frequency of occurrence, is given in Appendix A.

That the attempt to separate (through the procedure shown in Figure 1) desirability from academic achievement was not entirely successful is shown by the analysis reported in Table 1. Each separate description was examined to determine if the student described represented the extreme of desirable or undesirable; of the descriptions available, only two were sufficiently ambiguous in this regard that a second independent rater disagreed on assignment within the two-fold classification. Among other data collected on students described for the study were SAT scores and most recent grade-point average. Point biserial correlations between the categorization of desirable vs. undesirable and these continuous variables were computed for each institutional group and are given in Table 1. It is apparent that grades were likely a factor in classification as to desirability: all but one of the seven coefficients are positive, and for two institutions the relationships are significant at the .01 level. That the instructions were carried out in a questionable

---

<sup>2</sup>Saunders, D. R. Unpublished working paper, 1967.

Table 1

Relationship ( $r_{pb}$ ) Between Desirable/Undesirable  
Classification and Indicated Variables

	<u>N</u>	<u>GPA</u>	<u>SAT-V</u>	<u>SAT-M</u>
Amherst	45	.46**	-.12	.10
Caltech	44	.13	-.26	-.43**
Cornell	48	.08	-.13	-.13
Dartmouth	38	-.02	-.26	-.09
MIT	42	.50**	.11	.14
RPI		(Insufficient Data)		
Rutgers	26	.19	-.17	-.25
Stanford	37	.31	-.17	-.03

\*\* Significant at .01 level.

Of passing interest, however, are the generally negative relationships (Table 1) between desirability and SAT. Though the faculty members were not provided SAT scores, the most reasonable explanation of the generally negative relationships between desirability and SAT is that faculty members recognize ability, but value students who do well in spite of mediocre ability, or dislike able students who perform poorly. At the least, it was apparently more difficult to find desirable students with low grade averages than to find desirable students with low SAT scores but high grade averages.

#### The Development of the Initial Experimental Rating Form

In 1959, a new researcher, John Ross, assumed responsibility for the project. Among other activities, Ross drew from the thematic categories 32 adjectives or adjectival phrases believed to be representative of the total material and added eight others suggested by Osgood's (1957) work. These 40 "traits" were arranged in a rating scale as bipolar items requiring rating on a seven-point scale. A copy of the resultant criterion instrument has been provided as part of a publication by Ross (1961), which describes his analyses of data collected with this instrument.

In brief, however, Ross returned to the eight colleges participating in the study, and, through the institutional representative, asked that faculty members use the form to provide evaluations of "interesting" students. Again, no rigorous controls in choosing the samples of faculty or students were employed, because of the practical necessity of involving cooperative faculty and the students of their choice whom they knew well enough, for one reason or another, to rate. This may mean the raters represented more student-centered than discipline-centered faculty (if such

a dichotomy may be drawn); but it certainly meant, as inspection of data showed, that students selected were frequently those highly visible because of significant accomplishment (e.g., winning a prominent or prestigious scholarship) or notoriety (e.g., conviction for murder). Nevertheless, descriptions or evaluations of these students were confined, by the rating form, to the more general but hopefully relevant traits therein.

Altogether, 149 faculty members at six of the eight colleges provided 597 sets of ratings of 462 different students (Ross, 1961). Taking a portion of ratings from one institution, Ross ran a principal components factor analysis; then, for three other groups separately, he conducted new factor analyses employing a pattern quartimax procedure in an attempt to fit the subsequent rotations into a frame of reference compatible with the first rotation. Ross' goal was not so much that of defining a structure for faculty perceptions of students, but of "(a) determining similarities between the analyses for different institutions, and (b) specifying a reference framework within which meaningful vectors... may be distinguished" (Ross, 1961, Appendix A, p. 1).

The entire body of data were made available to the writer in 1961, upon his assumption of direction of the project. The previous approach with these data was abandoned because, among other reasons, not only did the factor structure provided seem of little practical use, but also because the samples of faculty and students had not been so carefully drawn that erection of any defense of similarity or difference between the institutions seemed warranted. Toward this point it might be argued also that the relatively general nature of the traits, or their focus on broad personal qualities, would not be likely to differentiate the more subtle differences

among institutions where the distinctive values of faculty might be expected to consist of finer shadings of intellectual goals or qualities of intellectual functioning. Instead, it was decided to exploit the Ross data for whatever suggestions might be provided toward the determination of a structure for faculty perceptions of students, if, for no other purpose, the refinement of the rating device itself.

For the entire group of 597 sets of ratings, intercorrelations among the 40 items were computed.<sup>3</sup> These data are presented in Table 2. The matrix was factored and rotated to a Kaiser (1958) normal varimax solution. The relatively conservative criterion of achievement of a symmetrical distribution of residual values around zero was used to determine the number of factors.

Sixteen factors were found, of which the first eight, together accounting for 66.5% of the total variance, are relatively easy to interpret. Factor loadings for the items and contribution of each factor to the common variance are given in Table 3. The eight factors may be tentatively named, from inspection of items loading thereon, as (A) dependability, (B) originality, (C) likeableness, (D) gregariousness, (E) honesty, (F) (physical) strength, (G) independence, and (H) freedom from anxiety. Inspection of factor loadings on the remaining eight factors very tentatively suggest (I) motivation,

---

<sup>3</sup>Where an item had been marked "unknown," the scale mid-point had been inserted in place of the missing evaluation.



Table 3

Factor Loadings for the Forty Scale Items of Criterion Form on the Eight Factors  
(N = 597)

ITEM	h <sup>2</sup>	Factor Loadings															
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
<b>A. INDUSTRY</b>																	
29. Works steadily	.81	.81	.21	.26	.00	.09	.03	.14	.07	.04	.07	.03	-.02	-.06	-.03	.00	.02
24. Meets deadlines	.78	.81	.15	.20	.10	.13	.05	.05	.02	-.06	.05	.00	.04	.13	-.04	.00	-.06
38. Is self-disciplined	.88	.78	.23	.29	.05	.15	.13	.15	.03	-.01	-.05	-.01	.13	.01	.08	.09	.15
1. Thorough	.83	.78	.32	.23	.01	.07	.07	.12	-.02	.03	.10	.12	-.03	-.05	.07	-.05	.04
23. Performs to top of ability	.77	.78	.21	.22	.10	.06	.05	.08	-.05	.14	.03	.08	.02	.05	-.02	-.13	-.03
34. Industrious	.84	.74	.26	.30	.08	.15	.11	.10	-.07	.14	-.07	.07	.02	-.16	.03	.01	-.09
37. Completes undertakings	.71	.72	.19	.20	.08	.15	.10	-.03	-.02	-.04	.02	-.05	.02	.10	.05	.22	.06
39. Good on details	.67	.68	.36	.18	.06	.02	.08	.00	.01	-.05	.12	.00	.13	.03	.02	.07	.01
31. Likes work	.77	.67	.34	.25	.01	.16	.17	.01	-.12	.23	.04	.00	.10	-.07	-.07	.02	-.04
7. Performance improved	.46	.52	.17	.20	.01	.10	-.03	-.13	.11	.03	-.13	.04	-.03	.11	.05	-.06	-.10
<b>B. ORIGINALITY</b>																	
8. Imaginative	.93	.13	.52	.07	.13	.03	.04	-.02	.00	.01	-.17	-.09	-.04	.03	.08	-.07	-.02
6. Shows originality	.80	.17	.53	.12	.03	.07	.05	.06	.01	-.02	-.10	.01	.00	.01	-.03	.06	.03
16. Good at analyzing	.79	.35	.71	.07	.13	.10	.00	.04	.00	.03	.33	.10	.09	-.02	-.01	.03	.01
3. Deep	.71	.30	.72	.24	-.07	.18	.11	.06	.00	.13	.02	.19	.05	.06	.06	.09	.02
17. Good grasp of abstract and fundamental	.63	.30	.71	.06	.07	.06	.06	.05	.00	.10	.36	-.03	.06	.03	.00	-.05	-.02
30. Expresses himself well	.56	.26	.73	.16	.28	.06	.04	.02	-.09	.04	.06	-.03	.41	.04	.02	.01	.01
<b>C. COMPLIANCE</b>																	
21. Pleasant	.82	.13	.09	.03	.15	.15	.05	.02	.00	-.02	.00	-.04	.00	-.01	-.07	-.39	.40
20. Cooperative	.80	.03	.08	.04	.14	.23	.04	-.09	.01	.01	.07	.05	-.03	-.03	.06	.01	-.04
5. Willing to take direction	.76	.39	.68	.02	.02	.09	.04	-.06	.04	.01	.04	.08	.00	-.08	.03	.09	-.05
12. Psychologically healthy	.70	.30	.72	.37	.15	.08	.17	.12	.12	-.01	-.11	.12	.20	-.03	.00	.18	.01
14. Liked by faculty	.59	.35	.72	.56	.18	.12	.06	.10	-.02	.19	-.01	-.06	.00	.07	-.02	.11	.03
11. Has self-understanding	.71	.38	.78	.17	.09	.07	.14	-.01	-.10	.02	.04	.14	.30	.07	.02	.02	.03
<b>D. SOCIABILITY</b>																	
22. Gregarious	.64	-.01	.05	.12	.16	.00	.04	-.14	.04	.01	.01	.01	.01	.00	-.01	-.01	.01
32. Active	.77	.30	.45	.11	.13	.03	.29	.16	.01	-.03	-.11	.13	.08	-.04	.00	-.02	-.12
16. Potential leader	.72	.17	.38	.37	.13	.05	.14	.04	.11	.00	.00	.15	.13	.01	.06	.03	.19
<b>E. ETHICALITY</b>																	
15. Honest	.63	.25	.14	.13	.01	.12	.07	.05	.06	.04	.01	.04	.07	.02	.03	-.05	.01
15. Acts ethically	.75	.25	.15	.16	.00	.12	.01	.01	-.01	.00	.03	-.01	-.03	.00	.00	.15	.00
<b>F. STRENGTH</b>																	
33. Strong	.76	.30	.41	.15	.16	.11	.21	.14	.03	-.02	.11	.11	.10	-.05	.02	.04	.02
12. High stamina	.62	.35	.38	.29	.30	.03	.21	.09	-.01	.06	.13	-.01	-.03	.00	.03	-.03	.00
<b>G. INDEPENDENCE</b>																	
17. Independent	.68	.26	.16	.03	.02	.07	.12	.22	.17	.03	.07	.01	.01	.02	.02	.00	.01
<b>H. ANXIETY - FAMILY PRESSURE</b>																	
4. Low academic pressure from family	.25	.01	.03	.01	.00	.02	.00	.00	.00	.20	-.01	-.02	.02	-.01	.00	-.01	.07
12. Carefree	.46	-.11	.08	.08	.38	-.08	.00	.14	.13	.00	.11	-.00	.03	.07	.02	.05	-.02
<b>(MIXED ITEMS)</b>																	
2. Highly competitive	.62	.41	.34	-.03	.34	-.01	.15	.01	-.15	.00	.03	.38	-.05	.02	-.01	-.05	.00
9. Responsible	.61	.47	.21	.51	.05	.23	.05	.08	.03	.08	-.02	.03	.01	.10	.16	.06	.04
10. Dependable	.77	.53	.11	.49	.03	.17	.17	.08	-.02	-.00	-.01	-.03	.07	.08	.36	.03	.01
13. Neat	.49	.47	.14	.14	.09	.15	.08	.06	.01	-.00	-.08	.05	.17	-.05	.03	-.11	.06
25. Mature	.79	.48	.31	.53	.13	.12	.16	.16	.20	.03	.04	.16	.14	.10	.01	.00	.15
27. Is resourceful	.61	.41	.07	.22	.12	.15	.15	.05	-.02	.01	.04	.01	.02	-.03	-.04	-.02	.04
35. Respects college rules	.66	.43	.01	.44	.00	.37	-.03	.05	-.07	.17	-.04	-.09	.01	-.01	.04	.30	-.07
36. Great interest in chosen field	.53	.44	.37	.74	.03	.09	.02	.04	-.10	.40	.06	.01	.02	-.00	.00	.03	.00
Percent Contribution to Common Variance		31.5	20.4	18.0	7.4	5.5	3.0	2.6	2.7	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9

Note: Decimal points have been omitted.

(J) intellectual ability, (K) competition, (L) verbal fluency, (M) self-insight, (N) dependability, (O) maturity (?), and (P) leadership.<sup>4</sup>

Three research psychologists were then given the factor structure as described by the first eight factors (Table 3), together with cards listing separately each unused item from Saunders' original thematic categories. These judges were asked to assign each of these items to one of the eight clusters, or, in the absence of clear fit, to new cluster of their own choosing. The purpose, of course, included not only the matter of finding additional items for building up the eight factor scales, but also the delineation of additional areas in the event the original 40 items did not reasonably represent the total content of the original material.

Among the three judges, there was agreement that leftover items pertained to the following additional areas and could be identified as such: (1) intellectual ability; (2) academic performance; (3) intellectual curiosity; (4) open-mindedness; (5) social values; (6) planfulness, and (7) conformity. Clear statements of the first two, though prominent in Saunders' data, had been omitted from Ross' form because of the concern with qualities beyond these traits specifically.

It would seem more reasonable, in view of the emphasis faculty seem to place on scholastic achievement and ability characteristics, to incorporate these traits into any rating device and then control resulting measures

---

<sup>4</sup> Because of the availability of more definitive material from the revised rating forms, no interpretation of these factors is offered here. Those interested in such a discussion are referred to the third report in this series entitled "Structure of Faculty Perceptions of Students."

later through statistical means. Indeed, it would be impossible to examine faculty perception of students apart from their perception of ability and performance unless the latter is known.

Therefore, the revised rating form was drawn up with a first group of items from Saunders' analysis representing these two areas, as well as seven of the first eight areas suggested by the factor analysis (physical strength was dropped) and the five other areas identified by the judges. One additional area, that of cultural sophistication (and postulated by Trow (1960) to be of considerable theoretical importance), was also incorporated into the proposed revision. This yielded, then, 14 areas, each represented by the number of items shown in Table 4. Finally, those categories used in 15 or more instances in the original Saunders' material and not obviously represented in the new group of items were added (e.g., "sense of humor"). This yielded 79 items; one final item, designed to elicit general desirability or appropriateness of the student for the college, was added.

Each item was again cast as a bipolar trait; the decision was made, rather arbitrarily, to require rating on a five-point scale. In addition, each item was cast in a format with a provision for indicating no information or opinion. The direction of the "positive" end (left or right) for each item in sequence was chosen by a random means; items were so placed that the widest possible separation from related items might be achieved.

The resultant 80 items were pilot tested by submission to some 70 psychologists over the country, with instructions to use the form to rate a student they knew well and to comment on any difficulties. Approximately 50 such forms were completed and returned with a variety of comment, usually directed toward ambiguity of terms. Clarifications were attempted, or new

Table 4

Anticipated "Factors" and Number  
of Items Selected for Each

1. Academic Performance and Ability	6
2. Steady Work	6
3. Creativity	6
4. Cooperativeness	6
5. Gregariousness	6
6. Independence	3
7. Cultural Sophistication	5
8. Open-Mindedness	6
9. Intellectual Curiosity	6
10. Anxiety	5
11. Conformity	6
12. Planfulness	3
13. Ethicality	3
14. Altruism	6
(Additional Items, Unassigned)	<u>7</u>
Total	80

items substituted; the final form was then drawn up, with sections for identification of institution, rater, and student, and for describing the extent of contact between rater and student.

The final form, first employed in a round of studies beginning in 1962, is provided as Appendix B. This is the basic instrument employed in 1962-64 for the research studies that are described in subsequent reports in this series. These reports will be devoted to the definition of desirability separate and apart from academic ability and achievement, the structure of faculty perceptions of students drawn from factor analytic study of these items, correlates of the resultant perceptual dimensions, and technical characteristics of the rating form.

#### Limitations of the Student Rating Form

The structures that the resultant rating form encompasses, as well as their reliability and validity, will be dealt with in subsequent papers. There are several limitations, however, that are apparent from the information provided thus far.

The first has to do with the origin of the traits and the manner of soliciting the material. The reliance on faculty, though extremely meaningful in some senses, is nevertheless a reliance on lay judges, where impressionable opinions and relatively loose language may run rampant.

A second limitation is that focus on highly visible students at the very beginning of this series of studies may have emphasized the atypical or the extremes; the emphasis on personal qualities, rather than on dynamic systems of how people function (particularly, how they function intellectually

or academically), may have provided a value structure that some faculty at least would place secondary to other values concerning students or their growth. The traits may certainly have been different had faculty been asked, say, to describe what traits they attempted to create or stamp into students through their lectures and assignments or through their personal contact with students.

A third limitation stems from the nature of interpersonal contact between students and faculty, and the limitations that such a frame as that provided may impose on the specification of desirable qualities. Faculty may not be able to know many students very well in the limited range of situations afforded by the classroom or occasional conference or contact outside of class. For example, there is virtually no reference in the materials to growth or development over time. This may stem from the fact that few faculty get to know many students intimately over time.

A fourth limitation grows out of restrictions in the sample of institutions. A substantial segment of types and levels of institutions is omitted. For example, in interviews with faculty at a small church-related college, the writer noted frequent reference to qualities of Christian commitment, a concept not appearing as such in the data at hand. The Vassar studies (Brown, 1960), though highly similar in purpose and manner of solicitation of original material from faculty, produce concepts which fit stereotypes of female students (e.g., "social maturity"), but which are generally absent in the descriptions of males solicited by this study.

Finally, and in large part a function of the limitation that the scales are cast in the language faculty use, is the fact that the instrument produced is not a device for measuring criterion qualities in students, but rather a

vehicle for studying faculty preferences. It is, of course, a legitimate question to ask how well the faculty members may agree in their opinionable labels for specific students. But, by and large, the developed instrument may more appropriately be directed to the question of content and structure of faculty opinion about students than to the measurement of student characteristics.

References

- Bender, W. J. Report of the admission and scholarship committee, 1959-60. In Report of the President of Harvard College and the Reports of the Departments, 1959-60. Mass.: Harvard Univer., 1960.
- Brown, D. R. Non-intellective qualities and the perception of the ideal student. J. educ. Soc., 1960, 33, 269-278.
- Fishman, J. A., & Pasanella, Ann K. College admission-selection studies. Rev. educ. Res., 1960, 30, 298-310.
- Harris, D. Factors affecting college grades: A review of the literature, 1930-37. Psychol. Bull., 1940, 37, 125-166.
- Kaiser, H. F. The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. Psychometrika, 1958, 23, 187-200.
- Kenedy, J. G. Needed: the well-rounded college. New York Times, 1962, CXI, No. 38,046 (March 25), Mag. Sect. pp. 31, 124.
- McClelland, D. C. Encouraging excellence. Daedalus, 1961, 90, 711-724.
- Myers, Isabel B. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Manual. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1962.
- Osgood, C. E. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: Univer. Illinois Press, 1957.
- Ross, J. Progress report on the college student characteristic study: June, 1961. Research Memorandum 61-11. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1961.
- Stein, M. I. Personality measures in admissions. Research Monogr., 5. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963.
- Trow, M. Cultural sophistication and higher education. In Selection and educational differentiation. Berkeley, Calif.: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1960.

APPENDIX A

Student Traits Extracted from Free Verbal  
Descriptions of Students by Faculty and Staff

Student Traits Extracted from Free Verbal Descriptions of Students by Faculty and Staff (Saunders, 1958)\*

Category I: GOALS

Item	Freq.	Item	Freq.
1. Has Personal goals	16	7. Able to direct interests	2
2. Personal goals practical	7	8. Personal objectives highly defined	13
3. Capable of self-direction	10	9. "Purposeful"	5
4. Able to plan	11	10. Little need to direct student	5
5. Able to make short range plans	1	11. Sets standards for self	2
6. Able to make long range plans	1		

Category II: INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND AND TRAINING

1. Imaginative	19	20. Able to respond to material	14
2. Original	7	21. Able to evaluate	1
3. Articulate	11	22. Able to apply material learned	9
4. Grasp of mechanics	1	23. Able to deal with details	9
5. Grasp of reading	1	24. Able to draw on formerly learned material	1
6. Grasp of writing	3	25. Able to summarize	1
7. Quick	15	26. Able to work without supervision	4
8. Intuitive	3	27. Good ability to judge	27
9. Alert	13	28. Penetration	3
10. Good memory	6	29. Depth	2
11. Tenacious	6	30. Able to deal with facts	5
12. Creative	4	31. Able to analyze	10
13. Exploratory	1	32. Able to grasp basic laws and concepts	11
14. Able to criticize	3	33. Able to organize	6
15. Able to follow reasoning	2	34. Able to make deductive inferences	4
16. Able to make decisions	6	35. Concise	1
17. Able to grasp the obvious	2	36. Able to think	10
18. Able to grasp the not-so-obvious	1	37. Able to synthesize	1
19. Able to deal with abstractions	6		

Category III: METHOD OF OPERATION

1. Logical reasoning	3	10. Thorough	11
2. Honest	37	13. Industrious	34
3. Trustworthy	8	14. Integrity	15
4. Reliable	17	15. Mannerly	10
5. Dependable	25	16. Impetuous	1
6. Serious	19	17. Systematic	4
7. Wary	1	18. Good study habits	8
8. Cautious	2	19. Patient	2
9. Careful	5	20. Truthful	3
10. Conscientious	23	21. Hopeful	1
11. Enthusiastic	22		

Category IV: ASPECTS OF "THIRST FOR KNOWLEDGE"

1. Investigates material for self	2	23. Strict adherence to deadlines	24
2. Open-minded	16	24. Large range of interests	29
3. Curious	17	25. Aggressive	4
4. Sensitive	8	26. Neat	3
5. Adaptable	19	27. Businesslike attitude	2
6. Flexible	4	28. Versatile	7
7. Objective	4	29. Forceful	8
8. Intense interest	12	30. Receptive	13
9. Positive	8	31. Desire to excel	4
10. Eager to learn	20	32. Energetic/hardheaded	1
11. Persistent	25	33. Outspoken	1
12. Follows through	13	34. Practical	4
13. Much initiative	10	35. Regular class attendance	12
14. High motivation	20	36. Great facility	2
15. Willing	9	37. Great self-discipline	16
16. Inspired	3	38. Low need for outside reassurance	3
17. Great self-control	2	39. Efficient	7
18. Optimistic	5	40. Good attitude	4
19. Idealistic	5	41. Mysterious	2
20. Adventurous	4	42. Great desire to learn skills	1
21. Resourceful	1	43. Good concentration	5
22. Desire to take advantage of opportunities	11	44. Reflective	1

\* Note: (1) Items shown for categories are those provided by Saunders. These should be viewed as representing a working frame of reference in thematic extrapolation, rather than any final structure.

(2) Frequencies shown indicate both positive and negative comment, though only the positive is labeled.

Category V: ASPECTS OF "WILLINGNESS TO LEARN"

Item	Freq.	Item	Freq.
1. "Teachable"	3	9. Willing to suspend judgment	2
2. Willing to go beyond letter of assignment	17	10. Willing to approach new material	2
3. Willing to ask questions	3	11. Willing to listen	6
4. Willing to expose self	6	12. Willing to take blame	10
5. Willing to take suggestions	12	13. Willing to take direction	4
6. Willing to seek help	7	14. Willing to "face reality"	6
7. Willing to work in a group	2	15. Willing to cope with necessary routine chores	4
8. Willing to take criticism	4		

Category VI: EMOTIONAL INTERACTION WITH LEARNING PROCESS

1. Able to cope with emergencies	7	8. High quality of standards set for self	1
2. Reacts favorably to assignments	7	9. Able to work in a group	18
3. Reacts favorably to exams	2	10. Grades unimportant in motivation	10
4. Able to perform under pressure	9	11. Able to plan time	27
5. Able to learn from experience	5	12. Low disposition to worry	7
6. Able to avoid making same mistakes	2	13. High adherence to goals	7
7. Able to learn from experience in one area and apply learning in another area	1	14. Able to work independently	13
		15. Utilizes full capacities	16

Category VII: OBSERVED RESULTS OF LEARNING PROCESS

1. High quality of thought	3	11. Good intellectual qualities consistently exhibited	15
2. Questions highly applicable	8	12. Interest in chosen field	11
3. High quality of work performed	10	13. Likelihood of later contribution to society	12
4. Much enjoyment exhibited	6	14. Responsibility toward education received	4
5. High quality of contribution to discussion	15	15. Own standards met to high degree	1
6. Work applicable	1	16. Able to distinguish essentials from incidentals	5
7. General effect on educational process positive	1	17. Good grades made with ease	5
8. Comprehension of "the meaning of an education"	5	18. Able to master new material	2
9. Effort well-directed	12	19. Able to apply knowledge	2
10. High intensity of effort	39		

Category VIII: NATIVE CAPACITY

1. High intellectual background	2	5. Superior IQ	45
2. High cultural background	1	6. Superior performance	95
3. Performance better than promise	60	7. Superior promise at entrance	19
4. Performance better than abilities	27	8. Superior ability	22

Category IX: FAMILY AND PERSONAL BACKGROUND

1. Positive family influence	6	14. Student's own marriage stable	1
2. Family support of academic interests	1	15. Family values not reflected in student's own attitudes and plans	4
3. Family support of social interests	1	16. Family values positively directed	1
4. No pressure from family	3	17. Positive general family attitude toward student	9
5. No academic pressures	4	18. Great compliance with family's wishes	1
6. No emotional pressures	1	19. High degree of independence allowed at home	3
7. No financial pressures	1	20. No family upheavals or deaths during college years	1
8. No physical pressures	1	21. No physical handicap	4
9. No social pressures	2	22. Family financially secure	4
10. Low response to family pressure	1	23. Conditioning "unspoiled"	4
11. Positive response to family pressures	2	24. High physical status	10
12. Favorable attitude toward family	3		
13. Highly stable family	4		

Category X: PERCEPTION

<u>Item</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Freq.</u>
1. Able to appraise own abilities	6	6. Aware of social values	1
2. "At peace" with self	3	7. Aware of consequences of actions	1
3. High self-understanding	11	8. Aware of effect on others	6
4. Not now or formerly under psychiatric treatment	3	9. High understanding of needs of others	3
5. Able to handle self	1		

Category XI: POSITIVE VS. NEGATIVE ATTITUDES TOWARD

1. Social participation	1	10. Power	1
2. Rights of others	8	11. Independence	2
3. Needs of others	1	12. Self-improvement	6
4. Faculty and university	7	13. University rules	9
5. Intellectual material	1	14. Wishes of others	21
6. Challenge	13	15. Society's standards	6
7. Competition	14	16. Ethical values	10
8. Responsibility	9	17. Authority	10
9. Status	1		

Category XII: EMOTIONAL INTERACTION WITH SOCIAL PROCESS

1. Well-balanced personality	15	16. Neat	11
2. Strong personality	5	17. Clean	1
3. High strength of character	10	18. Refined	7
4. High social and moral resources	5	19. Good-natured, even-tempered	19
5. High level of maturity	28	20. Proud	7
6. Early maturity	17	21. Deep	4
7. Good ability to adapt to college	5	22. Courageous	13
8. High ego strength	3	23. Ambitious	15
9. Well-adjusted	15	24. Insightful	11
10. Firm convictions	11	25. Thoughtful	7
11. Good sense of humor	19	26. Warm	8
12. Much charm	4	27. Cheerful	4
13. Few idiosyncrasies	4	28. Relaxed	9
14. Affable; sociable	10	29. Tranquil	7
15. Responsible	7	30. Agreeable	17
16. Fairly	11	31. Kind	1
17. Literal	10	32. Independent	19
18. Highly organized	10	33. Frank	1
19. No need to stand out	11	34. Consistent	9
20. Unaggressive	21	35. Respectful	3
21. Stable	16	36. Courteous	10
22. Modest	18	37. Tactful	13
23. Straightforward	5	38. Well-mannered	10
24. Above-board	1	39. Polite	7
25. Pleasant	30	40. Possibly energetic	16

Category XIII: STATE OF MIND BROUGHT TO SOCIAL SCENE

1. Unofficial	10	14. Self-confident	20
2. Highly individualistic	4	15. Able to make non-academic decisions	2
3. Egalitarian	13	16. Sincere	20
4. Not self-centered	10	17. Interested in others	22
5. Much confidence in others	4	18. Tolerant	10
6. Gregarious	16	19. Cooperative	28
7. Unwilling to be taken advantage of	2	20. Broad horizons	3
8. Friendly	22	21. Appreciative	6
9. Willing to help others	15	22. Humane	1
10. Sympathetic	6	23. Self-critical	1
11. High social motivation	3	24. Principled	5
12. Little self-concern	21	25. Happy	2
13. Well-developed sense of social roles	4		

Category XIV: OBSERVED RESULTS OF SOCIAL INTERACTION

<u>Item</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Freq.</u>
1. Socially acceptable	49	15. Social group usually large	3
2. Well-liked by peers	54	16. Good effect on others	23
3. Well-liked by faculty	26	17. Friendships of high intensity	4
4. Extensive interpersonal relations	12	18. Participation in extracurricular activities	26
5. Degree of conformity	7	19. Versatile extracurricular interests	6
6. Respect inspired in others	24	20. Personal growth from interpersonal contacts	7
7. Effective in social contact	39	21. Rating as member of community	16
8. Easy interpersonal relations	7	22. Not easily influenced by others	8
9. Level of social development	2	23. Good conversationalist	6
10. Confidence inspired in others	8	24. Integration into campus life	4
11. Frequently a leader	15	25. Participation in athletics	10
12. Great leadership ability	33	26. Ability in athletics	6
13. Performance as a leader	30	27. Athletic performance	7
14. Intensity of social participation	9	28. Never drunk	7

Category XV: DISCIPLINARY RECORD

1. Good university disciplinary record	6	3. Good classroom deportment	1
2. No police record	3		

APPENDIX B  
Student Rating Form

## STUDENT RATING FORM

Name of Student \_\_\_\_\_ Class \_\_\_\_\_

Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Rater \_\_\_\_\_

Position or Rank \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Rating \_\_\_\_\_

**PART I**

***Extent of Contact with the Student:***

A. I have known the student for \_\_\_\_\_  quarters  semesters  years  
(no.) (indicate which)

B. *Present contact* (check and complete one)

The student is now in my class \_\_\_\_\_ with approximately \_\_\_\_\_ other students in his section.  
(course number) (no.)

(or)  The student is *not* now in one of my classes; my present contact with him is: \_\_\_\_\_  
(describe relationship)

C. I have become acquainted with the student through the following kinds of contacts (check all applicable):

- a  as a student in *one* class
- b  as a student in *more than one* class
- c  through review of assignments or performance on quizzes or examinations
- d  through observation or supervision of laboratory work
- e  through personal conference about academic work or interests
- f  through personal conference about matters other than academic work
- g  as an advisee
- h  through reactions of other faculty
- i  through observation in dormitory or campus activities
- other (describe) \_\_\_\_\_

D. With regard to the student's academic ability, interest, and performance, I feel I know him  
 extremely well  moderately well  not very well  not at all

E. With regard to how the student handles himself with other people, and particularly with his peers, I feel I know him  
 extremely well  moderately well  not very well  not at all

F. With regard to the student's *personal development* (his general maturity, aspirations, values, source of motivation, etc.), I feel I know him  
 extremely well  moderately well  not very well  not at all

PART II

Most Significant Characteristics of the Student

★ A. **Instructions:** First, please indicate your judgment of the student's general academic ability versus his performance in comparison with others in his class. Although one measure of these qualities is available from admissions tests and overall grade point average, your evaluation as a function of your particular recent experience with the student is desired here. Choose the one alternative in each of the three items below which best describes him.

1. In *scholastic aptitude*, this student would stand (among others in his class)  
 high                       average or adequate                       low                       unknown
2. In academic course work, his *performance* is  
 outstanding                       average or undistinguished                       poor                       unknown
3. Compared with other students of similar ability, his *performance* is  
 better                       about as expected                       worse                       unknown

★ B. **Instructions:** The purpose of the next section is to obtain your description of the student in terms of some characteristics on which he may stand out from other students at this institution in a marked way.

In each item below, your task is to complete the sentence by checking the most appropriate answer. If neither of the two extreme alternatives which would complete the sentence fits this student, mark the box labeled "neither alternative accurate." If you have no knowledge or opinion of the student in the given area, you should check the box labeled "unknown."

1. With regard to *intellectual curiosity* and interest in ideas or unknowns, this student  
 has a genuine, spontaneous interest in intellectual activities  
 accepts course work in a relatively routine, matter-of-fact fashion  
 neither alternative above is accurate for this student                       unknown
2. In *academic work habits*, this student  
 prepares himself thoroughly and effectively  
 appears haphazard and disorganized  
 neither alternative accurate                       unknown
3. In terms of *creative ability and originality*, this student shows  
 keen originality and resourcefulness  
 stereotyped, unimaginative ways of thinking about a problem  
 neither alternative accurate                       unknown
4. *As an individual*, I find this student  
 extremely likable  
 very difficult to like  
 neither alternative accurate                       no opinion
5. In *relationships with his classmates* or in campus life, this student is  
 quite well-accepted, an active participant, and/or most effective with peers  
 devoid of skill in human relationships  
 neither alternative accurate                       unknown

**PART II (Continued)**

6. In *personal adjustment*, this student  
 appears extremely well-balanced and stable  
 has considerable personal difficulties  
 neither alternative accurate  unknown
7. In *capacity for self-direction*, this student  
 appears completely self-sufficient in organizing his work and daily life  
 leans heavily on others for guidance  
 neither alternative accurate  unknown
8. In personal qualities which affect learning and *ability to profit from experience*, this student seems  
 readily open and receptive to new ideas  
 unwilling or unable to consider new attitudes or viewpoints  
 neither alternative accurate  unknown
9. In terms of *compatibility with the cultural climate of college*, this student  
 takes the academic and intellectual life easily in stride  
 appears awkward or out-of-place among his more sophisticated peers  
 neither alternative accurate  unknown
10. With regard to *basic integrity*, this student  
 is thoroughly honest and straightforward  
 may not be completely honest  
 neither alternative accurate  unknown
11. With regard to *social values*, this student  
 shows keen interest in ethical principles and concern for the welfare of others  
 appears self-centered and does not show evidence of a sense of social responsibility  
 neither alternative accurate  unknown
12. In *planning for the future*, this student  
 seems to have a clear and realistic set of academic and vocational goals  
 appears confused and unsure of his interests and goals  
 neither alternative accurate  unknown

C. In a sentence or phrase, please state what you believe to be the most significant or descriptive characteristic of this student:

---

---

---

### PART III



**Instructions:** In this part, you are asked to rate the student on each of a number of traits, which are described by the two words or phrases defining the extremes of the scale. In rating the student, you should attempt to evaluate him against other members of his class.

If you feel the student is *very well described* by one end of the scale or the other, place a check mark (✓) in the box nearest the appropriate end, e.g.,

talkative      quiet

If you feel the student is *somewhat better described* by one end of the scale than the other, place a check mark in the second box from the appropriate end, e.g.,

irresponsible      responsible

or

irresponsible      responsible

If you cannot decide between the alternatives, or if you feel the student should be rated about half-way between the two extremes, place your check mark in the middle box, e.g.,

carefree      anxious

If you do not know enough about the student to rate him on any particular scale, place a check in the box to the right of the scales labeled "unknown," e.g.,

liberal      conservative

unknown



**Important:** Please remember that in this section you are to rate the student in comparison with his classmates in one of the foregoing ways on *every* item.

		1	2	3	4	5		unknown
1.	low academic performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	high academic performance	<input type="checkbox"/>				
2.	works steadily	<input type="checkbox"/>	works by fits and starts	<input type="checkbox"/>				
3.	low interest in chosen field	<input type="checkbox"/>	high interest in chosen field	<input type="checkbox"/>				
4.	unimaginative	<input type="checkbox"/>	imaginative	<input type="checkbox"/>				
5.	pleasant	<input type="checkbox"/>	unpleasant	<input type="checkbox"/>				
6.	solitary	<input type="checkbox"/>	gregarious	<input type="checkbox"/>				
7.	independent	<input type="checkbox"/>	dependent	<input type="checkbox"/>				
8.	culturally impoverished	<input type="checkbox"/>	culturally rich	<input type="checkbox"/>				
9.	flexible	<input type="checkbox"/>	rigid	<input type="checkbox"/>				
10.	lacks intellectual interests	<input type="checkbox"/>	has broad intellectual interests	<input type="checkbox"/>				
11.	worries a lot	<input type="checkbox"/>	selon worries	<input type="checkbox"/>				
12.	conforming	<input type="checkbox"/>	non-conforming	<input type="checkbox"/>				
13.	below average ability	<input type="checkbox"/>	above average ability	<input type="checkbox"/>				
14.	meets deadlines	<input type="checkbox"/>	does not meet deadlines	<input type="checkbox"/>				
15.	self-centered	<input type="checkbox"/>	interested in others	<input type="checkbox"/>				

**PART III (Continued)**

		1	2	3	4	5		unknown
16.	lacks originality	<input type="checkbox"/>	shows originality	<input type="checkbox"/>				
17.	cooperative	<input type="checkbox"/>	uncooperative	<input type="checkbox"/>				
18.	not active in campus life	<input type="checkbox"/>	active in campus life	<input type="checkbox"/>				
19.	honest	<input type="checkbox"/>	dishonest	<input type="checkbox"/>				
20.	socially immature	<input type="checkbox"/>	socially mature	<input type="checkbox"/>				
21.	intellectually immature	<input type="checkbox"/>	intellectually mature	<input type="checkbox"/>				
22.	not eager to learn	<input type="checkbox"/>	eager to learn	<input type="checkbox"/>				
23.	tense	<input type="checkbox"/>	calm	<input type="checkbox"/>				
24.	conventional	<input type="checkbox"/>	individualistic	<input type="checkbox"/>				
25.	poor grasp of abstract	<input type="checkbox"/>	good grasp of abstract	<input type="checkbox"/>				
26.	self-disciplined	<input type="checkbox"/>	not self-disciplined	<input type="checkbox"/>				
27.	not altruistic	<input type="checkbox"/>	altruistic	<input type="checkbox"/>				
28.	good at analyzing	<input type="checkbox"/>	poor at analyzing	<input type="checkbox"/>				
29.	likable	<input type="checkbox"/>	not likable	<input type="checkbox"/>				
30.	not a leader among peers	<input type="checkbox"/>	leader among peers	<input type="checkbox"/>				
31.	self-directing	<input type="checkbox"/>	influenced by others	<input type="checkbox"/>				
32.	personal goals vague	<input type="checkbox"/>	personal goals clear	<input type="checkbox"/>				
33.	willing to ask questions	<input type="checkbox"/>	not willing to ask questions	<input type="checkbox"/>				
34.	not interested in ideas	<input type="checkbox"/>	interested in ideas	<input type="checkbox"/>				
35.	unhappy	<input type="checkbox"/>	happy	<input type="checkbox"/>				
36.	low need to stand out	<input type="checkbox"/>	high need to stand out	<input type="checkbox"/>				
37.	must work hard for grades	<input type="checkbox"/>	takes good grades with ease	<input type="checkbox"/>				
38.	thorough	<input type="checkbox"/>	haphazard	<input type="checkbox"/>				
39.	status-centered	<input type="checkbox"/>	not status-centered	<input type="checkbox"/>				
40.	shallow	<input type="checkbox"/>	deep	<input type="checkbox"/>				
41.	willing to take direction	<input type="checkbox"/>	not willing to take direction	<input type="checkbox"/>				
42.	introverted	<input type="checkbox"/>	extroverted	<input type="checkbox"/>				
43.	acts ethically	<input type="checkbox"/>	acts unethically	<input type="checkbox"/>				
44.	socially naive	<input type="checkbox"/>	sophisticated	<input type="checkbox"/>				
45.	open-minded	<input type="checkbox"/>	closed-minded	<input type="checkbox"/>				

PART III (Continued)

		1	2	3	4	5		unknown
46.	does not read widely	<input type="checkbox"/>	reads widely	<input type="checkbox"/>				
47.	poor self-understanding	<input type="checkbox"/>	good self-understanding	<input type="checkbox"/>				
48.	orthodox in behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	unorthodox in behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>				
49.	intellectually slow	<input type="checkbox"/>	intellectually quick	<input type="checkbox"/>				
50.	industrious	<input type="checkbox"/>	lazy	<input type="checkbox"/>				
51.	little concern for welfare of others	<input type="checkbox"/>	high concern for welfare of others	<input type="checkbox"/>				
52.	not creative	<input type="checkbox"/>	creative	<input type="checkbox"/>				
53.	stable	<input type="checkbox"/>	unstable	<input type="checkbox"/>				
54.	not liked by peers	<input type="checkbox"/>	liked by peers	<input type="checkbox"/>				
55.	low need for reassurance	<input type="checkbox"/>	high need for reassurance	<input type="checkbox"/>				
56.	low motivation to achieve	<input type="checkbox"/>	high motivation to achieve	<input type="checkbox"/>				
57.	fair-minded	<input type="checkbox"/>	prejudiced	<input type="checkbox"/>				
58.	unrealistic in outlook	<input type="checkbox"/>	realistic in outlook	<input type="checkbox"/>				
59.	negative family influence	<input type="checkbox"/>	positive family influence	<input type="checkbox"/>				
60.	accepts majority values	<input type="checkbox"/>	rejects majority values	<input type="checkbox"/>				
61.	performs below ability	<input type="checkbox"/>	performs to top of ability	<input type="checkbox"/>				
62.	completes undertakings	<input type="checkbox"/>	does not complete undertakings	<input type="checkbox"/>				
63.	pessimistic	<input type="checkbox"/>	optimistic	<input type="checkbox"/>				
64.	not intellectually versatile	<input type="checkbox"/>	intellectually versatile	<input type="checkbox"/>				
65.	affable	<input type="checkbox"/>	cold	<input type="checkbox"/>				
66.	does not work well with others	<input type="checkbox"/>	works well with others	<input type="checkbox"/>				
67.	principled	<input type="checkbox"/>	unprincipled	<input type="checkbox"/>				
68.	values unlike those of faculty	<input type="checkbox"/>	values like those of faculty	<input type="checkbox"/>				
69.	open to new experience	<input type="checkbox"/>	not open to new experience	<input type="checkbox"/>				
70.	not a serious student	<input type="checkbox"/>	a serious student	<input type="checkbox"/>				
71.	argumentative	<input type="checkbox"/>	placid	<input type="checkbox"/>				
72.	has few idiosyncrasies	<input type="checkbox"/>	has many idiosyncrasies	<input type="checkbox"/>				
73.	low intellectual curiosity	<input type="checkbox"/>	high intellectual curiosity	<input type="checkbox"/>				
74.	ill at ease in college culture	<input type="checkbox"/>	at home in college culture	<input type="checkbox"/>				
75.	low respect for human dignity	<input type="checkbox"/>	high respect for human dignity	<input type="checkbox"/>				

(continued on next page)

**PART III (Continued)**

	1	2	3	4	5		unknown					
76.						modest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	arrogant	<input type="checkbox"/>		
77.						generally objective in forming opinions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	generally not objective in forming opinions	<input type="checkbox"/>
78.						humorless	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	good sense of humor	<input type="checkbox"/>
79.						low level of physical energy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	high level of physical energy	<input type="checkbox"/>
80.						the kind of student this institution <i>should</i> admit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	the kind of student this institution <i>should not</i> admit	<input type="checkbox"/>