ABSTRACT

              A teacher assessment system is presented which holds
that there is no ideal teacher and that tc maximize the potential of
an individual during a teacher education program, each candidate must
be known as a unique person. This system has the following
characteristics: (1) design for administration through a central
office, and (2) need for a psychologist as director. Data files will
be maintained in a central locked office, with restricted access.
Initial assessment of the teacher will take into account the
following factors: (1) vision, hearing and speech, (2) academic
ability, (3) academic performance, (4) adjective self description
(ASD), (5) self-report inventory (SRI), (6) one-word sentence
completion (OWSC), (7) directed imagination (DI), (8) biographical
information (BIO), and (9) concerns of teachers. Final assessment
covers the following: (1) teacher evaluation form (TEF), (2) student
evaluation of teacher (SET), and (3) exit interview form. The primary
purpose of the entire system is the enhancement of the value of the
teacher education experience to the individual students who go
through the program. Other aspects of the system include services to
students, retention/termination decisions, services to faculty and
administration, and adjunctive research oriented procedures. (CK)

COMPREHENSIVE PERSONAL ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Donald J. Veldman

Teacher education should be a very personal process, in which a college student acquires the viewpoint, skills, and knowledge about human behavior that characterize the ideals of the teaching profession. Too often, teacher education is an impersonal routine; all students go through the same rituals, which are inappropriate -- in different ways -- for every one of them.

The central thesis of this system is that there is no "ideal teacher;" there are individual teachers who are making more or less use of their potential for exerting benign influences on children. To maximize the potential of an individual during a teacher education program, it is essential for the staff to know each candidate as a unique person, so as to tailor experiences in the program to fit individual needs and talents.

General personality characteristics, attitudes, and interests are quite well established by the end of the second decade of life. No teacher education program can hope to cause significant changes in such general characteristics. Rather, teacher education should seek to develop individual potentials for optimum performance in what is for most students a new role. This implies that "optimum performance" may be quite different in appearance for various students who complete the program. We are convinced that children benefit from exposure to a variety of teaching

I

"styles" -- that no one style is best for all children under all circum-

stances. We also believe that the best teachers are those who have

learned how to make the most of their own natural styles.

Unlike many psychological "screening" programs conducted by

colleges of education, the present system is designed to feed back

information about individual students to themselves and to the staff that

guides their progress through the institution's program. No "cutting

points" or "minimum standards" are used for mechanical selection of ap-

plicants. Nor is the system designed simply to "weed out" psychological

deviants. Of course, the data do afford the opportunity to identify

seriously disturbed individuals, but these are a very small proportion of

those entering a teacher education program, and would not warrant the

cost of the system if that were its only purpose.

A number of the assessment procedures are designed to put self-

descriptive summary information directly back into the hands of the stu-

dents. Teaching is a process of interaction between people, and the

potential teacher must have a thorough understanding of herself and her

impact on others if she is to interact effectively. Too much of

"psychological testing" involves subtle condescension toward the examinee,

who gets little if any information from the examiner about what his re-

sponses might mean. The data collected in this system are intended for

specific purposes directly beneficial to students, as well as to the

college of education in which they are enrolled.

Development of the System

The procedures we recommend here are the products of more than

a decade of overlapping research projects in the College of Education at

The University of Texas at Austin. Of course, no model program can be expected to fit the needs of every institution precisely. Our experiences with a wide variety of alternatives, however, have convinced us of the importance of each of these components, and of the practicality of the system as a whole.

Although most of the developmental work has been carried out in the context of large-scale research projects, the system is not designed for research purposes; it is designed to facilitate genuine personalization of the teacher education experiences of individual students. This does not mean that the system is of no use for research purposes; in fact, the quantitative data produced in operating the system are a fertile basis for a wide range of institutional and theoretical research, particularly in the area of student characteristics and behaviors.

Cost/benefit considerations have played an important part in our choice of procedures. Wherever feasible we have made multiple uses of data, and have replaced wastefully expensive instruments with more economical devices. Computer techniques have been employed at a number of points in the system to keep costs within manageable limits.

Research projects which have materially aided in the development of the components of this system are:

Mental Health and Teacher Education, NIMH Grant 2M-6635

Teacher Personality and Behavior, USOE Contract OE 3-10-032

Computer Analysis of Personality, NIMH Grant 06823.

A very large number of faculty and graduate students at The University of Texas at Austin have contributed to the development of the components of this system. It is impossible to list them all, but the

principal authors will be credited as each instrument is described later in this manual.

List of Components

The following materials comprise the system. Copies may be obtained from the R & D Center for Teacher Education for examination, and inquiries about cooperative field-testing arrangements with teacher education institutions are encouraged.

Instruments

Identification-Locator Form (ILF)

Biographical Information (BIO)

One-Word Sentence Completion (OWSC)

Directed Imagination (DI)

Adjective Self-Description (ASD)

Self-Report Inventory (SRI)

Concerns of Teachers (COT)

Teacher Evaluation Form (TEF)

Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)

Exit Interview Questionnaire (EIQ)

Manuals

General system description (this document)

Student information pamphlet

Adjective Self-Description manual

·Self-Report Inventory manual

Concerns of Teachers manual

One-Word Sentence Completion manual

Directed Imagination manual

Student Evaluation of Teaching manual

Computer Programs (Fortran).

ASD & SRI scoring, screening, and report generator

SET scoring and report generator

One-Word Sentence Completion scoring and report generator

Supplementary Material

One-Word Sentence Completion normative data bank

Directed Imagination rating system

ASD Self vs. Ideal Teacher

Telephone Follow-Up Interview system

Bibliography of research reports

Administrative Features

The system is designed to be administered through a central office within a college of education. Usually the Dean's office will set up a special section for this purpose. Although some departments are normally more interested in this type of program than are other departments, the system should be viewed by both faculty and students as a central part of the entire teacher education program.

Staffing. A faculty-level director should be appointed to administer the program. For a variety of reasons, this person should be a psychologist -- preferably one with training and experience in the fields of counseling and individual assessment. For a teacher education program with an input of 1000 students per year, the central office staff should include at least two half-time counseling interns, a senior-level computer programmer familiar with psychological data-processing, two statistical clerks, and a secretary-receptionist.

Schedule of procedures. During the first week of the first semester (or quarter) of the program, each student enrolled in the introductory course fills out the ILF form, from which a "locator" data card is punched. These cards are checked against class rosters, and those of students who drop the course are removed from the file. Student Information pamphlets are also distributed at this time. Typical teacher education programs begin in the junior year with the first required course. There is no reason, however, why the initial assessment could not be carried out earlier.

During the first third of the initial course, the DI and OWSC instruments are given in one 50-minute class session, and the ASD, SRI, BIO, and COT instruments are distributed as take-home packets with a one-week return deadline. Absent students are individually contacted.

During the middle third of the initial semester, the SRI and ASD data are machine-processed and the computer-generated one-page reports are distributed to individual students. Copies of these reports are filed centrally, but the programs also produce lists of those ASD and SRI protocols that are unusual enough to warrant special attention. Central office personnel scan the OWSC, DI, and COT data for gross symptoms of psychological disturbance. Students are encouraged to make voluntary requests for individual interpretations of their data.

During the last third of the initial semester, the central office begins to call in particular students whose data appear to warrant individual counseling interviews. All files are checked to ensure that they are as complete as possible.

The final semester of most teacher education programs involves

a practicum experience -- student-teaching in a public school -- which
is the focus of ratings (using the TEF form) by the student's university
supervisor and public school cooperating teacher. Pupils taught by the
student fill out the SET forms, which are machine-scored. The student
gets a copy of the summary report before the end of the semester. The
Exit Interview Questionnaire is also completed by the student during this
period.

System control. It is impossible to force students to respond
meaningfully to the assessment procedures, even if it were ethically
defensible to do so. By making the purposes of the assessment clear,
and by ensuring students' rights to confidential handling of their data,
a satisfactory degree of cooperation can be achieved. It is not suf-
ficient to assure the student that his data will not be misused; he must
also be made aware of the ways he will personally benefit from the pro-
gram. The Student Inforr tion pamphlet will help to achieve this.

Data files in the central office should be lockable, with
clearly restricted access. Raw data should be available only to the
central office professional personnel, and not to instructors or adminis-
trators. However, every student should have access at any time to his
own file in the central office.

Probably the most time-consuming and expensive aspect of a
system of this kind is the checking and follow-up of incomplete files,
including evaluative data from supervisors, as well as data from students.
Clearly communicated deadlines and processing procedures are essential.
We recommend that students be made aware that the assessment is neces-
sarily current, and that if they drop out of the program and return during
a later semester, their original data will have to be replaced.

It is virtually inevitable that a few students will adamantly refuse to provide data. Making the assessment procedures a requirement within the introductory course and thorough explanation of the purposes of the assessment will undercut most of the casual objections, but the student who genuinely wishes not to participate should be given a respectable "out," such as the writing of an essay detailing the logic and philosophical basis for his refusal.

Description of System Components

The assessment system is made up of two major sections, one administered as students enter the teacher education program, and the other during the final semester.

Initial assessment. Some of these procedures are most easily handled on a take-home basis, while others are best administered in large groups, and still others require scheduling by individual appointment. All data resulting from these procedures are filed centrally.

1. Vision, Hearing and Speech. This screening can often be accomplished by trainees in special education courses. The purpose is simply to detect gross deficiencies that might not appear in self-report records for various reasons.

2. Academic Ability. Virtually every college of education has access to the SAT or ACT scores of its students. These should be entered in the central file as relevant information of a unique kind.

3. Academic Performance. Many colleges of education require that students enrolled in teacher education achieve a particular minimum grade average. Even though this kind of requirement is debatable, up-to-date transcripts of all grades should be maintained in the student's

folder for information purposes.

4. Adjective Self Description (ASD). This instrument was developed by Veldman and Parker (1970) on the basis of a factor analysis of Gough's Adjective Check List (Parker and Veldman, 1961). It consists of 56 adjective self-rating items that are scored for seven major personality traits.

Item cards are processed by a computer program which can (1) punch raw-score cards for research uses, (2) print one-page interpretive reports, and/or (3) provide extreme-score screening summaries for central office use. Normative data are based on a large sample of students in teacher education. Students receive a copy of the computer-generated page report before the end of their initial semester in the program. An example report may be found in the Appendix.

5. Self-Report Inventory (SRI). This instrument was developed by O. H. Bown as an adjunct to counseling, and as a method for obtaining a standardized report of the respondent's view of his phenomenological world (Bown and Richek, 1967). It consists of 48 self-descriptive statements that are scored for eight topics.

Item cards are processed by a computer program that (1) punches raw-score cards for research purposes, (2) prints one-page interpretive reports, and/or (3) provides extreme-score screening summaries for central office use. Normative data are based on a large sample of students in teacher education. Students receive a copy of the computer-generated page report before the end of their initial semester in the program. (See Appendix for an example report.)

6. One-Word Sentence Completion (OWSC). Form 62 was design

to sample attitudes and feelings relevant to teacher education and for general personality assessment. The form contains 62 : rs to be completed with single-word responses. In a teacher education program these data serve two purposes: as a basis for idiographic study by a central system psychologist, and as a basis for scanning by personnel trained to detect gross symptoms of mental disturbance (severe evasiveness, anxiety, hostility, depression). The one-word response restriction permits optional scoring by computer (Veldman, Menaker and Peck, 1969). The Appendix contains an example of such a computer-generated report.

7. Directed Imagination (DI). This technique was developed to provide a sample of behavior in the most open of possible contexts. Respondents are asked to "Write four fictional stories about teachers and their experiences," and are allowed four minutes per story to do so. Research evidence (Veldman and Menaker, 1969) shows that these data can yield important information relevant to teaching behavior. In the assessment system, however, the stories are used for three other purposes: (1) as a basis for screening for minimum adequacy of handwriting and English usage, (2) as a basis for scanning by personnel trained to detect gross mental disturbance (severe anxiety, hostility, depression), and (3) for idiographic study by a central system psychologist.

8. Biographical Information (BIO). This form was not designed for scoring, although quantitative indices can be derived from many of the open-ended item responses. Its function in the assessment system, like that of the DI and OWSC, is to provide the system psychologist with background information in cases where idiographic study of a student is necessary.

9. <u>Concerns of Teachers</u>. This instrument was developed to
allow systematic determination of the student's position in the theoreti-
cal hierarchy of concerns of new teachers (Fulier, 1969). Six values
are produced in the scoring of responses to the instruction, "<u>List</u> the
things you are most concerned about now -- as a prospective teacher."
The six levels or stages of concern are:

     1. Where do I stand?

     2. How adequate am I?

     3. How do pupils feel about me?

     4. Are pupils learning what I'm teaching?

     5. Are pupils learning what they need?

     6. How can I improve myself as a teacher?

Together, they indicate the general level of the students' concerns, as
well as particular areas of difficulty they anticipate in their training.

Training for Idiographic Assessment .

An Assessment Training Kit is available from the R & D Center
which includes training manuals for idiographic (clinical) interpretation
of particular instruments (OWSC, DI, BIO, COT), as well as an overview
manual concerning synthesis of information from the battery. This kit
is designed for use by professionals responsible for individual test
interpretations such as those conducted by the central office psychologists
in this assessment system.

Final Assessment

In most teacher education programs the major activity during
the final semester is a practicum experience in a public school setting.

The amount of responsibility given to the student teacher and the amount of time spent in the classroom varies considerably, but the evaluative procedures outlined below will almost always be appropriate.

10. <u>Teaching Evaluation Form (TEF)</u>. This instrument was constructed to elicit evaluative information from those in the two supervisory roles usually found in association with practicum experiences: the supervising professor in the college of education and the cooperating teacher in the public school where the practicum takes place. To avoid idiosyncratic effects as much as possible, rating scales with labeled categories are used for recording quantified judgments, and a series of open-end questions are also used to elicit qualitative evaluations.

11. <u>Student Evaluation of Teacher (SET)</u>. This technique is based on a research instrument called the <u>Pupil Observation Survey Report</u> (POSR) (Veldman and Peck, 1963, 1964, 1969, 1970). The original instrument contained 38 items, which measured five empirically defined factor dimensions of student teacher behavior, as seen by the pupils they teach. The two most pertinent items for each factor were identified, reworded slightly, and assembled for the present instrument. Meaningful data can be obtained even from third grade pupils, if the items are read and explained to them by the proctor.

The student teacher receives a summary report of the responses of the pupils in the class he taught, and this report is often useful as a basis for discussion between the student and his supervisors. An example of such a computer-generated report may be found in the Appendix.

12. <u>Exit Interview Form</u>. The purpose of this instrument differs from those of all others in the battery. It is intended to systematically

elicit information which the college of education can use to evaluate the effects of its program on its students. It contains both quantitative and qualitative questions concerning student opinions about the program generally and personally, as well as their future plans with regard to the teaching profession.

If possible, the central office should arrange to obtain this form not only from students completing the program, but also from those who discontinue their training before completion.

Services to Students

The primary purpose of the entire system is the enhancement of the value of the teacher education experience to the individual students who go through the program. Systematic feedback of the results of the evaluation procedures are incorporated at a number of points. Counseling services are available to any student at any time during the program on an entirely confidential basis with the explicit understanding that disclosures made by the student would not be entered in his general file without his permission.

During the first semester of the program, students receive computer-generated one-page summaries of their ASD and SRI protocols. During the practicum semester students also receive computer-generated summaries of the opinions of their pupils.

Interpretation of these summary reports could be left to the student in some cases, but we believe that to insure full understanding of the implications of the summary data, some help from trained interpreters is necessary. At least, the instructor in the course in which the initial assessment takes place should discuss the general purposes

and processes of the measurement methods. At best, confidential discussion with a counseling psychologist would be implemented for every student in the program.

At any time during the program any student should be able to ask for consultation with one of the system psychologists about his assessment results or about personal problems of any sort arising from his experiences in the teacher education program or elsewhere. The student would be guaranteed absolute confidentiality with regard to the content of such consultations.

Some students will undoubtedly seek consultation about the significance of their ASD/SRI machine reports out of "idle" curiosity. It should be recognized, however, that such "casual" contacts with certain students can be extremely important first steps toward seeking professional help with deeply buried emotional problems.

Where resources are available and sufficient administrative flexibility has been achieved, the assessment data can be used as a basis for genuine personalization of teacher education -- in which a unique program of experiences is designed for each candidate (Fuller, 1970). Even when this ideal cannot be implemented currently, the assessment data can be very useful to the students' supervisors, in consultation with the central system psychologists, as they try to anticipate individual needs of students within the framework of required coursework and practicum experiences.

Retention/Termination Decisions

Throughout the manuals which comprise this system the authors have tried to avoid the term "test." The reason for this is not simply

to avoid raising anxiety. The philosophy underlying the entire system

insists that the welfare of the individual student is just as important

as the welfare of the educational system in which he is to function.

"Cutting scores" and other types of pre-established criteria of adequacy

cannot be applied mechanically and impersonally without producing side

effects which may be worse than no evaluation at all.

The assessment data should be viewed as information about the

potential teacher; it has no pre-determined implications for decisions

regarding the student's destiny as a teacher candidate. Of course, it is

impossible for experienced observers of human behavior to avoid making

hypotheses about the implications of such information. The point, however,

is that the decisions should be made jointly by the professionals adminis-

tering the program and the student about whom the decisions are being made.

In practice, this means that when a system psychologist reviews

a student's data and develops the hypothesis that the student should not

continue in the teacher education program, he will discuss the entire

problem frankly and privately with the student. Surprisingly often, the

psychologist will find that the student has anticipated him -- even to

the point of exploring other career plans -- and is quite willing to dis-

continue teacher candidacy. Only rarely will a frank counseling approach

meet such resistance as to necessitate an enforced decision to terminate

a student.

The essential element in this approach is the honest belief on

the part of the system professionals that the purpose of the assessment

procedure is to maximize the welfare of the individual students in the

program. A cynical or mechanical attitude will quickly be communicated

to the students, and continuous effort is necessary to avoid such develop-

ments, especially during the initial stages of the introduction of the

system in a college of education.

Services to Faculty and Administration

Instructors in all college of education courses, including

supervisors of practicum experiences, can ask for consultation with central

office psychologists at any time with regard to particular students in

their charge. Although the psychologists would not reveal the student's

raw data directly, he would be able to discuss the assessment results in

general terms suited to the individual problem presented by the faculty

member.

The Exit Interview Questionnaire would be a primary source of

data for administrative evaluation of the total college program, as well

as particular features and innovations. When extended to include follow-

up beyond graduation, such data can be extremely important as a basis for

program modifications and re-allocation of resources.

Faculty members of any large institution are motivated to extend

empirically-based knowledge within their respective disciplines. The

data collected in the assessment program are particularly suited to

studies in the behavioral sciences, but will also offer many opportunities

to those in other fields. Use of assessment data for research purposes

usually can be accomplished easily without endangering the confidentiality

of individual student files.

Adjunctive Research Oriented Procedures

Data obtained with the ASD, SRI, and SET instruments are punched

·on cards as a part of the process by which individual reports and a
screening summary are prepared. The scoring and report-generating pro-
grams for these instruments will also yield optional output of punch
cards containing scale scores for use in research studies of the popula-
tion of students participating in the program, including the development
of local norms for these instruments.

In addition, data from other components of the system can be
transferred to punch card form for research purposes. Demographic data
from the Biographical Information Form, Student Evaluation of Teaching,
Teacher Evaluation Forms, as well as entrance test scores and course
grades can all be coded and punched for particular research purposes.
Some of the special procedures developed at The University of Texas at
Austin are described below.

OWSC machine scoring. This instrument was originally designed
to yield data suitable for machine processing (Veldman, Menaker and
Peck, 1969), a'though in the basic assessment system it is scanned and
interpreted cl'nically. The 62 one-word responses can be punched into a
series of nine cards per subject, and a computer program is available to
match the responses to a dictionary of pre-coded word roots. The program
outputs punched scores and/or a verbal summary of each protocol. (See
Appendix for an example.)

DI rating. A system of rating scales has been devised for use
with the stories produced by the Directed Imagination method. An early
version of this procedure was successfully validated against a variety of
criteria relevant to teacher education (Veldman and Menaker, 1969). A
revision of the scales has been accomplished and a new manual for raters

is available from the R & D Center. The scales in this revised system are:

1. Amount of Content

2. Graphic Quality

3. Imaginative/Banal

4. Specific/General

5. Optimism/Pessimism

6. Lucid/Incoherent

7. Dynamic/Static

8. Educational/Other Content

9. Warm/Hostile

10. Active-Autonomous/Passive-Dependent

11. Adult/Child Focus

ASD Self vs. Ideal Teacher. Another experimental extension of the Adjective Self Description technique involves a re-administration of the ASD with instructions to describe the "ideal teacher" with the 56 adjectives. The obvious advantage of a page-report to the student based on this dual-protocol procedure is that the interpretations are directly relevant to the student's concerns about his own suitability for the teaching profession.

Telephone Follow-Up Interview System. This technique is described in a report by Newlove (1969). It is designed to obtain data economically from respondents scattered over a wide geographical area, retaining the advantages of the structured interview while avoiding the usual small percentage return associated with mailed questionnaires.

Bibliography. An extensive bibliography of research reports
and published articles concerning the development and applications of
the assessment techniques may be obtained from the R & D Center. Copies
of most of these reports are also available from the same source.

REFERENCES

Bown, O. H., & Richek, H. G.   The Bown Self-Report Inventory (SRI):   A
        quick screening instrument for mental health professionals.
        Comprehensive Psychiatry, 1967, 8, 45-52.

Fuller, F. F.   Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization.
        American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 207-226.

Fuller, F. F.   Personalized Education for Teachers: An introduction for
        teacher educators.   The R & D Center for Teacher Education,
        The University of Texas at Austin, 1970.

Newlove, B. W.   The telephone follow-up interview: A longitudinal research
        tool in teacher education.   Report Series No. 28.   The R & D
        Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin,
        1969.

Parker, G. V. C., & Veldman, D. J.   Item factor structure of the Adjective
        Check List.   Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1969,
        29, 99-113.

Veldman, D. J., & Peck, R. F.   Student-teacher characteristics from the
        pupils viewpoint.   Journal of Educational Psychology, 1963, 54,
        346-355.

Veldman, D. J., & Peck, R. F.   The influence of teacher and pupil sex
        on pupil evaluations of student teachers.   Journal of Teacher
        Education, 1964, 15, 393-396.

Veldman, D. J., Menaker, S. L., & Peck, R. F.   Computer scoring of
        sentence completion data.   Behavioral Science, 1969, 14, 501-
        507.

Veldman, D. J., & Menaker, S. L.   The Directed Imagination method for
        projective assessment of teacher candidates.   Journal of Educa-
        tional Psychology, 1969, 60, 178-187.

Veldman, D. J., & Peck, R. F.   Influences on pupil evaluations of student
        teachers.   Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 103-
        108.

Veldman, D. J., & Parker, G. V. C.   Adjective rating scales for self-
        description.   Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1970, 5,
        295-302.

Veldman, D. J.   Pupil evaluation of student teachers and their super-
        visors.   Journal of Teacher Education, 1970, 21, 165-167.

Appendix

Examples of Report Generator Output

1. Adjective Self Description

2. Self-Report Inventory

3. Student Evaluation of Teaching ·

4. One-Word Sentence Completion

SUMMARY REPORT OF ADJECTIVE SELF-DESCRIPTION FOR CODE 00011

RAW SCORES = 26 12 39 29 23 25 26

ON EACH OF THE SCALES BELOW. THE X MARKS YOUR SCORE.
THE ZEROS SHOW THE MIDDLE HALF OF A LARGE STUDENT GROUP.

                    SOCIAL ATTITUDE
                          X
       COLD 1........2........3........4........5 WARM
                                      000000

                    SOCIAL BEHAVIOR
                     X
COURTEOUS 1........2........3........4........5 ANNOYING
                 000000

                  PERFORMANCE HABITS
                                        X
  CARELESS 1........2........3........4........5 EFFICIENT
                              000000

                  SOCIAL ORIENTATION
                          X
  OUTGOING 1........2........3........4........5 RESERVED
                      0000000000

                 EMOTIONAL STABILITY
                          X
    SERENE 1........2........3........4........5 ANXIOUS
                      000000000

                IDEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION
                          X
 PRACTICAL 1........2........3........4........5 IDEALISTIC
                          000000

                 APPEARANCE AND CHARM
                          X
     PLAIN 1........2........3........4........5 ATTRACTIVE
                      0000000

SUMMARY OF SELF-REPORT INVENTORY FOR CODE 0R309M31

RAW SCORES =   16   13   22   6   17   12   16   15 117   47   99

ON EACH OF THE SCALES BELOW. THE X MARKS YOUR SCORE.
THE ZEROS SHOW THE MIDDLE HALF OF A LARGE STUDENT GROUP.

ATTITUDE TOWARD YOURSELF
                                X
NEGATIVE 1......2......3......4......5 POSITIVE
                               00000

ATTITUDE TOWARD OTHER PEOPLE
                          X
NEGATIVE 1......2......3......4......5 POSITIVE
                             00000

ATTITUDE TOWARD YOUNG CHILDREN
                                   X
NEGATIVE 1......2......3......4......5 POSITIVE
                            0000000

ATTITUDE TOWARD AUTHORITY FIGURES
                      X
NEGATIVE 1......2......3......4......5 POSITIVE
                            00000

ATTITUDE TOWARD YOUR WORK
                                X
NEGATIVE 1......2......3......4......5 POSITIVE
                             000000

ATTITUDE TOWARD LIFES UNCERTAINTY
                          X
NEGATIVE 1......2......3......4......5 POSITIVE
                            00000

ATTITUDE TOWARD YOUR PARENTS
                            X
NEGATIVE 1......2......3......4......5 POSITIVE
                             00000000

ATTITUDE TOWARD YOUR FUTURE
                          X
NEGATIVE 1......2......3......4......5 POSITIVE
                             00000

GENERAL OUTLOOK ON LIFE
                          X
NEGATIVE 1......2......3......4......5 POSITIVE
                            0000

EXPRESSION OF ATTITUDES
                    X
UNCERTAIN 1......2......3......4......5 INTENSE
                           0000000

RELATIVE SELF-OTHERS VALUATION
                          X
OTHERS 1......2......3......4......5 SELF

SUMMARY OF STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

TEACHER IDENTIFICATION = SLM F161

RAW SCORES = 375 381 244 350 231 388 375 263 294 281   381 378 253 322

    THE 16 STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS SAID THAT IT IS

VERY TRUE THAT THIS TEACHER IS ALWAYS FRIENDLY TOWARD STUDENTS.

VERY TRUE THAT THIS TEACHER KNOWS A LOT ABOUT THE SUBJECT.

RATHER FALSE THAT THIS TEACHER IS NEVER DULL OR BORING.

RATHER TRUE THAT THIS TEACHER EXPECTS A LOT FROM STUDENTS.

RATHER FALSE THAT THIS TEACHER ASKS FOR STUDENTS OPINIONS BEFORE MAKING

VERY TRUE THAT THIS TEACHER IS USUALLY CHEERFUL AND OPTIMISTIC.

VERY TRUE THAT THIS TEACHER IS NOT CONFUSED BY UNEXPECTED QUESTIONS.

RATHER TRUE THAT THIS TEACHER MAKES LEARNING MORE LIKE FUN THAN WORK.

RATHER TRUE THAT THIS TEACHER DOESNT LET STUDENTS GET AWAY WITH ANYTHING

RATHER TRUE THAT THIS TEACHER OFTEN GIVES STUDENTS A CHOICE IN ASSIGNMEN

PAIRED ITEMS SUGGEST THAT THIS TEACHER IS

        VERY FRIENDLY AND CHEERFUL.

        VERY POISED AND KNOWLEDGEABLE.

        RATHER LIVELY AND INTERESTING.

        QUITE FIRM AND DEMANDING.

        RATHER DEMOCRATIC IN PROCEDURE.

IN GENERAL. THIS CLASS HAS A FAVORABLE OPINION OF THIS TEACHER.

SUMMARY REPORT ON OWSC PROTOCOL FROM STUDENT 3863 F3901
****

AVERAGE RESPONSE LENGTH WAS 5.47 CHARACTERS. (PERCENTILE = 2)

RESPONSES REPEATED ON 12 OTHER STEMS. (PERCENTILE = 70)
        GOOD   HAPPY   LIKE   SPOILED   OK
        DISLIKE   MANY

POPULAR RESPONSES WERE GIVEN TO 18 STEMS. (PERCENTILE = 42)

RESPONSES CODED AS EVASIVE. (QUARTILE = 2)
     37. STUDENTS PEJECT *BAD* TEACHERS.

TOTAL NEGATIVE AFFECT COUNT WAS 17. (PERCENTILE = 98)

RESPONSES CODED FOR HOSTILITY. (QUARTILE = 4)
      5. MOST MEN ARE *FICKLE* .
     13. MOST ADOLESCENTS ARE *SPOILED* .
     17. MOST PEOPLE MY AGE ARE *SILLY* .
     32. I *OFTEN* GET ANGRY.
     35. MOST CHILDREN ARE *SPOILED* .
     52. MOST ADULTS ARE *UNJUST* .
     57. I DONT LIKE TO THINK ABOUT *MARRIAGE* .
     58. MOST TEACHERS ARE *POOR* .

RESPONSES CODED FOR ANXIETY. (QUARTILE = 3)
     22. MY MIND IS *CLUTTERED* .
     44. I AM EASILY *UPSET* .

RESPONSES CODED FOR DEPRESSION. (QUARTILE = 4)
      4. I FEEL *ALONE* IN A CROWD.
     26. MY FATHER IS *SICK* .
     28. MY LIFE HAS BEEN *EMPTY* .
     36. I *DISLIKE* MYSELF.
     40. I NEVER *CAN* TO GET WHAT I WANT.
     51. I *CRACK* WHEN PUT UNDER PRESSURE.
     60. MY PROBLEMS ARE *MANY* .