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ABSTRACT

The Self-concept and Self-actualization of University Faculty in Relation to Student Perceptions of Effective Teaching

by

A. Paul King, Doctor of Education

Utah State University, 1971

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between student ratings of university instructors and instructors' self-concept and self-actualization. During the academic year 1970-71, students rated faculty members teaching undergraduate courses from the "Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire". Instructors rated high or in the top three deciles were defined in this study as "good" or "effective" teachers, and those rated low or in the lower three deciles were defined as "poor" or "ineffective" instructors. Sixty-eight percent or 118 of the instructors in these categories submitted to two psychological tests--the "Index of Adjustment and Values" and the "Personal Orientation Inventory". These instruments were used to investigate the self-concept and self-actualization of university instructors.

From the IAV two main areas were considered or investigated--the self-acceptance and discrepancy between the real and ideal self. Analysis of variance scores showed that there was no difference between mean scores of good and poor instructors in relation to how they accepted themselves.
and how they viewed their real self in relation to their ideal self. Both groups showed congruency and a positive view of self.

When good and poor instructors were compared by an analysis of variance as to their self-actualization, again, there was generally no difference between the means. However, on three subscales (of twelve) the groups differed significantly (.02-.05). Good instructors scored higher in Self-Actualizing Value, Spontaneity, and Self Regard, or it might be said they are more self-willed, self-expressive, self-assertive, open, honest, and cognizant of their strengths and capabilities. Generally, poor instructors are just as self-actualizing (releasing of full capabilities and potentialities) as good instructors.

Other data which showed significant distinction between good and poor instructors was the descriptive data. This data showed that college affiliation and number of years of teaching seem unrelated to teacher effectiveness. However, sex, age, highest degree earned, rank, and years of formal education did make a difference in this study. Those instructors rated high by students were also those who were mostly female in sex, younger in age (average of 39 years), who had received a master's degree with an average of seven years of university education and a professional rank lower than a professor. Those instructors rated low by students were also those who were mostly male in sex, older in age (average of 46 years), who had a doctorate degree, eight years of university education, and a professional rank of professor.

From this study of university instructors rated high and low by students, and from the limited psychological testing, the following may be concluded: (1), When male university instructors terminate their formal education by a doctorate and arrive at the rank of professor
students perceive them to be less effective as teachers. (2), How a university instructor feels about himself, how congruent his real and ideal self are, and how well he accepts himself may not be related to his effectiveness or ineffectiveness. University instructors whether good or poor essentially view themselves the same. (3), How well a university instructor is actualizing his potentialities or has satisfied basic needs of safety, belongingness, love and self-esteem, may not be related to his effectiveness or ineffectiveness as a teacher. (4), University instructors appear to be more effective if they hold self-actualization values, are more spontaneous and possess a good self-regard; or in other words, they are more self-willed, self-expressive, self-assertive, honest, and cognizant of their strengths and capabilities. (5), Since good and poor instructors showed significant differences in the descriptive data but none in the self-concept inventory and only limited differences in the self-actualization inventory, then the use of the IAV and POI for university instructors is questioned because of their failure, generally, to differentiate.

From the above summary and conclusions the following recommendations are made: (1), Good instructors in this study could be investigated further to determine what they do specifically as teachers, in order to be rated high by students. (2), Further study needs to be conducted to determine more precisely if self-actualization is related to effective university teaching.
CHAPTER I
NATURE AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

... if the teacher would effectively fulfill his role as a teacher, he must constantly grow in greatness as a person. In deepest essence, a teacher can be no greater as a teacher than he is as a person. (Pullias and Lockhart, 1963, p. 44)

Background Information

Since 1891, numerous research studies have been conducted in order to identify "effective" teachers or to identify some consistent criteria that would measure "good" teachers. In attempts to identify criteria for teacher effectiveness many approaches have been tried and re-tried. Some studies have been based on "product criteria" or student gains, others on "process" or situational criteria, and much research has been done on the personality traits and/or behavior of teachers.

What are the findings and conclusions of these voluminous studies? The following are typical:

More than a half-century of research effort has not yielded meaningful, measurable criteria around which the majority of the nation's educators can rally. No standards exist which are commonly agreed upon as the criteria of teacher effectiveness. (Mitzel, 1960, p. 1481)

The notion of the "good teacher" so basic to study of teacher effectiveness turns out to be almost as vague and diffuse as the range of human experiences relative to teaching. (Ellena, Stevenson and Webb, 1961, p. 37)

And yet, with all this research activity, results have been modest and often contradictory. Few, if any facts are now deemed established about teacher effectiveness, and many former "findings" have been repudiated. (Biddle and Ellena, 1964, p. vi)

It seems evident that, even with hundreds of studies involving thousands of teachers, objective criteria for judging teacher effectiveness have not been consistent.
Need for the Study

Although "little is presently known for certain about teacher excellence" (Biddle and Ellena, 1964, p. 4), this does not diminish the importance of continued research, nor does it mean that researchers should give up in the hope of finding criteria to predict teacher effectiveness. Barr et al. (1961, p. 147), after summarizing seventy-five doctoral studies, suggested that more research is "needed to clear up many unresolved problems relative to the measure and prediction of teacher effectiveness ..." Biddle and Ellena have also noted:

The problem is not an idle one. The domestic science and world outlook both clearly demonstrate the urgent need for more and better education for all men. Of all societies, the free one depends most heavily on quality education for the fulfillment of its destiny. Thus, the teacher and the quality of his teaching are of paramount importance. (Biddle and Ellena, 1964, p. v)

The importance of determining some criteria from which to measure teacher effectiveness has increased, but what new approach or avenue of thought might a researcher take in order to attempt to establish objective criteria? Most research pertaining to the identification of teacher effectiveness has been conducted in what seems to be an "ad hoc" manner; that is, research instruments have been developed and character traits have been evaluated without the understructure of a particular theoretical frame of reference (Getzels and Jackson, 1963, p. 575-576). Ellena, Stevenson and Webb (1961, p. 31) have also noted that, "the older strategies ... clearly involved no systematic theory, and unfortunately, yielded virtually little useful information." The atheoretical approach may have been a basic reason why no criteria of effectiveness have been established; therefore, any further research needs to be based upon a definite theoretical structure.
Some recent research has attempted to attack the general problem of defining teacher traits that might be related to effectiveness from the theoretical reference of "self" or "third-force" psychology. Self psychology has become prominent because of the works of such men as Allport (1937, 1955, 1961), Maslow (1954, 1962), Rogers (1951, 1961), Lecky (1945), Jersild (1952, 1955), and Combs and Snygg (1949). This approach advocates that each person is a "unique" individual, and that one operates according to his self concept or perception. Behavior is in accordance with one's perception of himself and the world in which he lives (Combs and Snygg, 1949; Combs, 1965, p. 6-17).

This approach using the "self as instrument," or an approach based on what an individual is from "within" has shown some promise in defining criteria for effectiveness. Recently, under the direction of Arthur Combs, studies by Gooding (1964) and Usher (1966) have demonstrated that administrative and student ratings of teachers are related to, or consistent with, an observed perceptual structure. For example, those teachers who rated high with administrators and students had (1) accurate perceptions about what people are like, (2) perceptions of self leading to adequacy, and (3) accurate perceptions about the purpose and process of learning (Combs, 1965, p. 20). Other studies by Shafer (1962), Walker (1967), and Good (1968) have also shown a positive relationship between supervisory perceptions of prospective teachers and the teacher's self concept.

Statement of the Problem

Some research, then, has begun to support the idea that a criteria for evaluating teachers may be developed from the theoretical structure of "self" psychology. It may be possible to begin to measure teacher effectiveness by criteria of the nature of the "self", but evidence is
insufficient at the present to be definitely positive. The problem, then, is that there is a lack of research investigating the relationship between ratings of teachers and the teacher's self-structure. More specifically, is there a relationship between student ratings of university faculty members and faculty member's self-concept and self-actualization?

**Limitations and Definitions**

This study does not propose to establish definite objective criteria from which "effective" teaching may be defined. It merely investigates teacher "effectiveness" as defined by student ratings, in relation to how a teacher perceives himself as a person.

This study, then, is limited to: (1) student ratings of university faculty members as to their "effectiveness" in undergraduate classes. (Effectiveness in this study is limited to or defined as how college students perceive "good" teaching.) (2) the self-concept of university faculty members. (Self-concept is limited to or defined as the congruency of the "real" self and the "ideal" self and the acceptance of self.) And (3) the self-actualization of university faculty members. (Self-actualization is defined as the full use and exploitation of one's potentialities, capabilities or talents.)
CHAPTER II
RELATED RESEARCH

Past Studies of Teacher Effectiveness

Before reviewing current research concerning the self concept and teacher ratings, a further analysis of "older strategies" needs reviewing. Although the many atheoretical studies have not produced adequate criteria of teacher effectiveness, they are not without worth. The knowledge of what does not generally apply may in some respects, be as important as what does.

Mitzel (1960), in reviewing past research, has organized teacher evaluation measures into three categories: Product Criteria, Process Criteria, and Presage Criteria. Product Criteria involve student gains, results, or student changes in behavior. Criteria to measure this area will no doubt be investigated further because the technological world, in which we live, evaluates effectiveness by result or product. Howsam (1963, p. 15) says that the "result" criterion for judging teacher effectiveness is "ultimate," and the only defensible criterion. The approach of pupil gain as a criterion of teacher effectiveness, though, has its difficulties (Barr et al., 1961, p. 8). Fattu (1963, p. 25) has noted two reasons why studies in this area have produced no consistent criteria: (1) the difficulty of measuring pupil growth, and (2) the difficulty of determining precisely how much change can be attributed to a particular teacher.

However, much work has been done lately by Flanders (1964) in evaluating teacher verbal influence on student achievement. His study showed
that student achievement increased when teachers encouraged student initiative and provided freedom of participation. Flanders' studies show some possibility, especially in training teachers over a long period of time.

Process Criteria are those criteria that evaluate the teacher in terms of the situation, condition, climate, student-teacher interaction, or simply, teacher behavior. As of yet, though, "a general classification of teacher behavior appropriate to the study of effectiveness has not been advanced . . . " (Biddle, 1964, p. 12).

The third area, Presage Criteria, has been used to attempt to predict teacher effectiveness in terms of intelligence, adjustment, or character traits. Personality traits have been as legion as the investigators who have employed them (Mitzel, 1960). Ellena, Stevenson, and Webb (1961, p. 31) in their analysis of "Who's a Good Teacher?" noted that "there is no general agreement as to what constitutes the essential characteristics of a competent teacher." And Barr et al (1961, p. 8) in their review of seventy-five doctoral studies indicated that personality ratings generally have been "exceedingly unreliable," and that this "unreliability provides a substantial road block or a challenge to the researcher interested in this area of research."

Ryans' study (1964) may offer a beginning foundation in the personality domain. His research involved more than one hundred separate projects in about seventeen hundred schools, in which teachers were observed by a trained staff. The staff's primary concern was to observe and note, on rating forms, the "personal" and "social" behavior of teachers as related to the classroom situation. A factor analysis of the ratings identified interesting behavioral patterns of "effective" and "ineffec-
tive" teachers. According to the definitions of his study, "effective" teachers had the following patterns of personality:

- **Pattern X** warm, understanding, friendly versus aloof, egocentric, restricted teacher classroom behavior
- **Pattern Y** responsible, businesslike, systematic versus evading, unplanned, slipshod teacher classroom behavior
- **Pattern Z** stimulating, imaginative versus dull, routine teacher classroom behavior, (Ryans, 1964, p. 75).

"Ineffective" teachers were "self-centered, anxious, and restricted."

In his concluding remarks Ryans stated:

... there are some interesting suggestions here--some clues that may help to identify "good" and "poor" teachers if one is willing to accept the kind of definition employed in this research. Such a definition indicates that teachers are "good" if they rank very high among their colleagues with respect to such observable classroom behaviors as warmth and kindness, systematic and businesslike manner, and stimulating and original teacher behavior. (Ryans, 1964, p. 90)

**University Student Ratings of Faculty**

**Can Students Rate Faculty?**

Student ratings of university faculty present many controversial issues. Kent (1967, p. 61, 78) notes that many feel that students are not in a position to evaluate teachers. However, Howsam (1963, p. 16) says that pupil ratings have "remarkable consistency", and that "findings have shown that pupils are able to make more valid and reliable ratings of teachers than any other group, including administrators, supervisors, and experts." Kent, (1967, p. 79) contends that even if

... students cannot accurately assess an instructor's mastery of his subject matter ... they are perfectly capable of saying whether the instructor has presented the subject in an organized manner, whether he communicated it to them, and whether he seemed interested in it.

It seems only logical that the only real criterion of teacher effectiveness is the evaluation by students, for a philosophical note from Aristotle rings a significant tone.
Moreover, there are some arts whose products are not judged of solely, or best, by the artists themselves, namely those arts whose products are recognized even by those who do not possess the art; for example, the knowledge of the house is not limited to the builder only, the user, or, in other words, the master, of the house will even be a better judge than the builder, just as the pilot will judge better of a rudder than the carpenter, and the guest will judge better of a feast than the cook. (Aristotle, Politics, Bk. III, Ch. 11, In Benjamin Jowett, Aristotle's Politics, 1943, p. 148)

Another common objection to student ratings of professors is: "Students can't really evaluate a teacher until they've left college and gotten some perspective on what was really valuable to them" (McKeachie, 1969, p. 439). Drucker and Remmers (1951), however, in a study of selected alumni and students compared how students of 1948-49 and alumni of 1936 to 1939 rated the same instructors on the Purdue Rating Scale. Essentially the ratings were the same, showing that alumni's opinion of an instructor did not seem to change over the ten year period.

Student ratings also have been opposed because some feel that other variables have influenced the teaching, such as: student grade, age, sex, etc. Starrach (1934), Remmers (1930), and Kent (1967) have shown that student grades, sex and age have no relation to ratings of effectiveness or ineffectiveness. Kent (1967, p. 82), in reviewing past literature, notes that there seems to be two factors that have significant bearing on student ratings. Those factors were (1) the rater's class, in that graduate students generally gave higher ratings than undergraduates; and (2) the teacher's rank. Those of the rank of Instructor were generally rated lower than other ranks. However, Spencer and Dick (1965) and Spencer (1969c) found correlations between student opinion of a course (from the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire) and course grades.

Eble, in reviewing Hildebrand's and Wilson's study at the Davis Campus of the University of California, says:
In general, student ratings of best teachers showed only negligible correlations with academic rank of instructor, class level, number of courses previously taken in the same department, class size, required versus optional course, course in major or not, sex of respondent, class level of respondent, grade-point average, and expected grade in course. (Eble, 1970, p. 91)

Finally, there is a charge that student evaluations are merely popularity contests and sources of unhealthy competition. This may be if the college instructors make it so, but Eble (1970, p. 37) says that "various studies of student ratings suggest that popularity in it mere-tricious sense is not what students are after in asking for better teaching." He also notes that studies do not confirm "the suspicion that professors can win high ratings by easy grading and light assignments. 'Tough' teachers are commonly highly rated."

In summary, student opinion is of particular importance for information about a teacher's actual performance (Eble, 1970, p. 14); student ratings may be reliable (Rowland, 1970, p. 153) and have some validity (McKeachie, 1969, p. 440); however, because of the nature of college teaching, they may not be "entirely accurate and objective (Rowland, 1970, p. 157). It would be "foolhardy to regard student evaluations as a cure-all for the ills of higher education," but they may help solve some of the "current" problems connected with evaluating teacher effectiveness and improving the equality of undergraduate instruction. . . . (Kent, 1967, p. 83)

What Students Look for in University Faculty

The results of student ratings have produced many characteristics for "effective" instructors. Eble (1970, p. 9) feels that all investigations are not at variance, but provide reasonably consistent answers.

After an extensive study, Bousfield (1940) determined that students were
most concerned with pedagogical competency, and above all they desired fairness in an instructor. Coffman (1954), as a result of research at Oklahoma Agriculture and Mining College, came up with four factors of "effectiveness". Factor A was named "empathy", which included ability to arouse interest, humor, interpersonal relations, and tolerance. Factor B was identified as "organization." Factor C represented the teacher's personality; and his verbal fluency ranked last as Factor D. 

Cadzella (1968) determined that the most important criteria in describing an "ideal" professor (in rank order of importance) were: (1), Knowledge of subject (subject mastery); (2), Interest in subject (enthusiasm); (3), Flexibility (ability to meet student needs); (4), Daily and course preparations (well organized); and (5), Vocabulary (ability to explain clearly). The least important characteristics . . . were: (1), the professor as a writer; (2), as a participator in the community; and (3), as a researcher. 

Eble (1970, p. 9) describes superior instructors as having qualities of competence, caring, energy, imagination, and a sense of proportion. He notes that many years ago a University of Chicago study made by students and faculty "arrived at knowledge and organization of subject matter, skill in instruction, and personal qualities as the classes of attributes most important to the good teacher," and that "Julius Taylor, head of the Physics department at Morgan State, puts it in the form of an equation: 

\[ C_1 + C_2 + C_3 + E = \text{Effective Teaching; where } C_1 = \text{Competence, } C_2 = \text{Concern or Compassion, } C_3 = \text{Commitment, and } E = \text{Enthusiasm.} \]

Need for Theoretical Base

Even with all the research, terms such as "effective" and "good" are still relatively undefined and remain aloof in the subjective realm.
"Effective" teaching can be defined only in relation to the rating scales or subjective criteria. As pointed out in chapter one, this condition probably exists because of atheoretical approaches.

One concept that is consistently advocated in recent literature is a need for "a comprehensive theory to channel the research" (Mitzel, 1960). Getzels and Jackson (1963, p. 575-576) feel that any work toward defining teacher effectiveness must be done within the framework of a sound theory. Barr et al. (1961, p. 147) conclude from their study that there must be a clarification of an "acceptable theory of the nature and structure of teaching ability."

The foundation of this research project is the theory of "self" psychology, as before stated. Many behavioral psychologists are not in agreement with this psychology of the phenomenologists; however, "self" psychology has a firm foundation and much study and research has gone into it by noted men in the field.

**Self Psychology**

The psychology of the inner self, or as Allport (1968, p. 68) calls it: The psychology of "man seen as a being-in-process-of-becoming" has had a slow and turbulent beginning. It has gradually gained acceptance and momentum only since the late thirties (Purkey, 1970, p. 3-5). Real emphasis came as a result of the studies of Goldstein (1939), followed by the classical work of Maslow (1954, 1970 ed), as well as Prescott Lecky (1945, 1969 ed), and Gordon Allport (1937). Carl Rogers (1951, 1961) has also made notable contributions into this area, and one of his students, Rainy (1943) first coined the term: "self-concept". Jersild (1952, 1955) has been a pioneer in emphasizing self-psychology in teacher education. Combs and Snygg (1949, 1959 ed) in their book Individual
Behavior brought clarity of thought to the "phenomenal field" psychology. They declared that all behavior was dependent upon one's frame of reference, or that any individual behaves according to his viewpoint of the facts, his perception of himself, and the world in which he lives. All behavior, then, is consistent to one's perception of reality as one strives to maintain the enhancement of the self (Combs and Snygg, 1959, p. 16-22).

Similar views have been advocated by Lecky. He says that one's personality is an organization of values which will remain fairly consistent with one another. "Behavior expresses the effort to maintain the integrity and unity of the organization" (Lecky, 1969, p. 109). He further states:

The individual sees the world from his own viewpoint, with himself as the center. Any value entering the system which is inconsistent with the individual's valuation of himself cannot be assimilated; it meets with resistance and is likely, unless a general reorganization occurs, to be rejected. This resistance is a natural phenomenon; it is essential for the maintenance of individuality. (Lecky, 1969, p. 109)

The study of one's choices and selections, then, become an important part of understanding one's personality structure (Lecky, 1969, p. 77-78).

Frankl definitely feels that although,

Man is not free from conditions, be they biological or psychological or sociological in nature . . . he is, and always remains free to take a stand toward them. Man is free to rise above the plane of somatic and psychic determinants of his existence. . . . (Frankl, 1967, p. 3)

With this power of choice, it appears that an individual chooses his behavior in accordance as to how he views himself and the situation he faces (Combs and Snygg, 1959, p. 16-22). This center value system may be called the "self-concept" (Combs and Snygg, 1959, p. 126, 127, 146).

Raimy, (1943), who first defined the self-concept said that it is "what a
person believes about himself" (Combs and Snygg, 1959, p. 127). From various definitions of the "self" by many of the above authors, Purkey (1970, p. 7) has arrived at a composite definition of the "self". He says that it is "a complex and dynamic system of beliefs which an individual holds true about himself, each belief with a corresponding value." He also notes that the "self has a generally stable quality which is characterized by harmony and orderliness." Chris Argyris says that,

The individual's self-concept includes those aspects of the self of which the individual is aware. The more the individual enlarges his self-concept to include more aspects of his self, the greater the potential for the individual to understand and ultimately control his own behavior. (Argyris, 1964, p. 23)

One can see from this definition of the self-concept, that there is a self of which one may not be aware, and a self of which one is aware--a "real" self and a "perceived" self.

The Real and Ideal Self

One's self-concept has two images. The real self is what one is--the way a person or others regard his "abilities, status, and roles." The other is one's perception of "what he would like to become, his aspirations for himself." The ideal self-image plots the course and movement of an individual. It may be a wholesome and insightful cognitive map, closely geared to reality," or it may be "compulsive, compensatory, and unrealistic, blinding its possessor to his true situation in life" (Allport, 1969, p. 47). The ideal self, then, may become the "role self" (Rogers, 1962, p. 29), or the "pseudo self" (Jersild, 1955, p. 34-35). Rogers (1961, p. 232-241, 256-258) reports studies in which the more healthy a person becomes the less the discrepancy or incongruency between the perceived or pseudo self and the real or valued self. Or, to put the concept another way, the more congruent or whole one is (in relation to
the real and perceived self) the more "fully-functioning" one is (Rogers, 1962, p. 21-23). The concept of congruence of the real and perceived self may be diagramed thus,

![Diagram of congruence]

Allport (1937, p. 213-214) calls a fully-functioning individual a mature person, or one who has "self-objectification." This, he says, is:

... that peculiar detachment of the mature person when he surveys his own pretensions in relation to his abilities, his present objectives in relation to possible objectives for himself, his own equipment in comparison with the equipment of others, and his opinion of himself in relation to the opinion others hold of him. This capacity for self-objectification is insight. ...

Allport further quotes the old adage, "Everyman has three characters:

(1) that which he has,
(2) that which he thinks he has,
(3) that which others think he has."

And he adds,

Ideally, insight is to be measured by the ratio between the second item and the first, for what a man thinks he is in relation to what he really is provides a perfect definition and therefore an admirable index of his insight. ... the most practicable index of a man's insight becomes the ratio between the second and the third items--the relation of what a man thinks he is to what others ... think he is (Allport, 1937, p. 221, see also 1961 ed, p. 291).

The person who is more congruent is not only more open to his experiences, but accepts himself more--he has a positive self-concept, a positive self-regard (Rogers, 1961, p. 87-91, 103-124). The ideal self
in a congruent person sets goals in a wholesome, insightful way. Combs and Snygg (1959, p. 239-240) feel that "adequate" persons may be differentiated in three major characteristics: "(1) Adequate persons perceive themselves in generally positive ways. (2) Adequate persons are more capable of accepting and integrating their perceptions in the phenomenal field. (3) Adequate persons are capable of wide identification of self with others."

Flinders (1969, p. 90) has summarized many of the above concepts in the following cyclic form:

Theoretically, the person who perceives himself in greater reality and who has a wholesome, positive concept of self will be that person who releases his potential and becomes more successful in life pursuits.

**Self-actualization**

As noted before, Purkey (1970, p. 7) denied the self as not only an organized system of inner values, but also defines the self as a "dynamic" system. Man is a striving, moving, need fulfilling organism which seeks to enhance and protect the self. "... people are constantly trying to behave in a manner which is consistent with the way they view themselves"

Maslow's terminology for the central striving within man to release one's potentiality is "self-actualization" (Maslow, 1954, 1970 ed.). He defines his theory of man's motivation as "a holistic-dynamic theory" which "integrates or synthesizes" the "functionalist tradition of James and Dewey" with the "holism of Wertheimer, Goldstein, and Gestalt psychology, and with the dynamicism of Freud, Fromm, Horney, Reich, Jung, and Adler" (Maslow, 1970, p. 35). To Maslow, man's inner strivings are conditional to his needs. Man's basic needs are physiological, safety, belongingness and love, esteem and self-actualization (Maslow, 1970, 35-46. In the hierarchy of needs, as the lower ones are satisfied, one no longer feels a need for that area, and so feels needs in a higher category. Maslow clarifies this point by saying:

In actual fact, most members of our society who are normal are partially satisfied in all their basic needs and partially unsatisfied in all their basic needs at the same time. A more realistic description of the hierarchy would be in terms of decreasing percentages of satisfaction as we go up the hierarchy of prepotency (Maslow, 1970, p. 53-54).

The hierarchy of needs and growth towards full self-actualization may, then, be diagramed in the following way:

[Diagram of hierarchy of needs and growth towards full self-actualization]

Growth in Self-actualization
Maslow says further that,

Just as our tree needs food, sun, water from the environment, so does the person need safety, love, and respect from the social environment. . . . all trees need sunlight and all human beings need love, and yet, once satiated with these elementary necessities, each tree and each human being proceeds to develop in his own style, uniquely, using these universal necessities to his own private purposes. In a word, development then proceeds from within rather than from without, and paradoxically the highest motive is to be unmotivated and nonstriving, i.e., to behave purely expressively. Or, to say it in another way, self-actualization is growth-motivated rather than deficiency-motivated (Maslow, 1970, p. 134-35).

A self-actualizing person is one who, then, is releasing his potentialities, capabilities, or talents in a spontaneous way—in an "expressive" rather than "coping" way (Maslow, 1970, p. 135). What are other characteristics of self-actualizing people?

1. "They are people who have developed or are developing to the full stature of which they are capable."

2. They have a "more efficient perception of reality and more comfortable relations with it."

3. They have more acceptance of self, others and nature. "They can accept their own human nature in the stoic style, with all its shortcomings, with all its discrepancies from the real image without feeling real concern."

4. "Self-actualizing people can all be described as relatively spontaneous in behavior...", which "behavior is marked by simplicity and naturalness, and by lack of artificiality or straining for effect."

5. They "are in general strongly focused on problems outside themselves. . . . they are problem centered rather than ego centered."

6. They have "the quality of detachment; the need for privacy."

7. "One of the characteristics of self-actualizing people... is their relative independence of the physical and social environment."

8. "Self-actualizing people have the wonderful capacity to appreciate again and again, freshly and naively, the basic goods of life, with awe, pleasure, wonder, and even ecstasy. . . ."

9. "Those subjective expressions that have been called the mystic experiences... are a fairly common experience. . . ."

10. "They have for human beings in general a deep feeling of identification, sympathy, and affection in spite of the occasional anger,
impatience, or disgust . . .", which may naturally result in human affairs.

11. "Self-actualizing people have deeper and more profound interpersonal relations. . . ."

12. They "... may be said to be democratic people in the deepest possible sense."

13. "... these individuals are strongly ethical, they have definite moral standards, they do right and do not do wrong."

14. "... they do not laugh at hostile humor . . . or superiority humor . . . or authority-rebellion humor . . . characteristically what they consider humor is more closely allied to philosophy than to anything else."

15. All self-actualizing people are creative.


Also, self-actualizing people possess what Maslow has termed "synergy" (Maslow, 1965, p. 88-96). This is the ability to bring seeming opposites into a wholeness. For example, one who has synergy has an ability to rise above the dichotomy between selfishness and unselfishness, or to realize pleasure from the pleasure of other people.

One realizes or perceives or discovers that my good and your good, selfishness and unselfishness which we have always been taught to perceive as different from each other and mutually exclusive and even opposites, are really not so under the right circumstances (Maslow, 1965, p. 96).

From the above theory Maslow, for the purposes of this study, concludes:

Ideally . . . the strong boss would be, then, one who has all his basic needs gratified, that is, the needs for safety, for belongingness, for being loved, for prestige and respect, and finally for self-confidence and self-esteem. This is the same as saying that the closer a person approaches toward self-actualizing, the better leader or boss he is apt to be in the general sense of the largest number of situations (Maslow, 1965, p. 130-131).

If the word teacher were substituted for the word boss, then, theoretically the better teacher is the one who is self-actualizing. Is this so?
Research of "Effective Teaching" in Relation to the Self-concept and Self-actualization

What are some of the studies that have evolved out of this theoretical base—the psychology of the self? What research has investigated the use of the "self" in relation to teacher effectiveness? Under the direction of Arthur Combs, Goodyng (1964) and Usher (1966) have shown relationships between self perception and administrative and student ratings of teachers. Goodyng, in his study, had trained judges observe teachers from the teacher's perceptual point of view; that is, they were to "get inside" the teacher and see the world from the teacher's frame of reference. In this study those teachers that were subjectively rated "high" by administrators consistently possessed a certain perceptual structure as observed by trained judges. These teachers saw themselves and others as "able", "dependable", and "worthy", and they saw the teaching task as "freeing" and self-revealing.

Usher (1966) used essentially the same perceptual criteria as Goodyng, but, whereas Goodyng's population was limited to female elementary teachers, Usher used college faculty members. The only ratings that were significantly correlated with the perceptual criteria were ratings by students.

A study by Packer (1964) has placed some doubt on administrative ratings in relationship to teachers' self concept. Teachers were rated as "high" and "low" from a regular principal's rating form. This rating was then correlated with scores from An Index of Adjustment and Values, a self-concept instrument. Packer concluded: "As a result of the 'negative' relationship between principals' rating and teachers' self-others acceptance, serious doubt is cast upon the rating procedure . . . ."

However, other studies have shown a relationship between administrative ratings and teachers' self-concept. Shafer (1962) and Walker (1967)
received positive relationships between student teachers' self-concept and self-acceptance and ratings by their supervisors in the students' practice teaching. Good (1968) also found that prospective teachers who were rated "effective" by the teaching staff, had such perceptions (from objective tests) as: confidence in self, positive view of self, friendliness, trust in people, and a worthy self-image. Teachers rated as "ineffective" possessed a self of: doubt, lack of confidence and stability, anxiety, and a non-revealing nature.

Garvey (1970) conducted a study with one hundred and fifty Allegheny College student teachers, correlating their self-concept with their grades in student teaching. She found that the student teachers with the better grades had also higher self-concepts (from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale), especially in relation to identity. They also evidenced less confusion, uncertainty and conflict in self-perception, and demonstrated less similarity to patient or disturbed groups. And a study conducted by Esser (1969) has shown that elementary teachers in thirty schools with a strong concept were also evaluated by their administration in a positive manner.

Dandes (1966) investigated "relationships between psychological health and the attitudes and values of teachers related to effective teaching," and concluded that the results, "clearly indicate a significant relationship between measured psychological health and the specified attitudes and values. . . . The greater the psychological health, the greater the possession of attitudes and values characteristic of effective teaching." He concluded by saying: "... a large component of what makes an effective teacher seems to be the degree of which he is psychologically healthy or self-actualizing or fulfilling his unique
human potential." However, Dandes study may be held in question and may not be conclusive, for of the 223 volunteer teachers, only 128 test packets were usable for scoring. This is less than a sixty per cent return.

In a study of university instructors by Maslow and Zimmerman (1956) during 1943 to 1946, the researchers were able to conclude that student ratings agreed or could be equated with instructors who were defined as healthy, integrated, happy, at ease, and using one's capacities. Also, colleagues ratings were equated with the creativeness of the instructor, which Maslow has found in all subjects who are self-actualizing (Maslow, 1970, p. 170).

The above studies have generally shown that self-concept and self-actualization are related to various definitions of "effective" teaching. However, the empirical evidence is not conclusive, not completely consistent. Most of the above studies have been done with either elementary or student teachers, with little investigation of university faculty. Is there, then, a relationship between student ratings of university faculty and faculty member's self-concept and self-actualization scores?
CHAPTER III
PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE STUDY

Objectives

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between student ratings of instructors and instructors' self-concept and self-actualization. Generally, questions this study investigated were:

1. Is there a difference between good and poor instructors as to self-acceptance?
2. Is there a difference between good and poor instructors as to discrepancy between the real and ideal self?
3. Is there a difference between good and poor instructors as to self-actualization?
4. Are there differences between good and poor instructors in selected descriptive data (sex, college affiliation, age, years of university or college education, highest degree, rank, and years of teaching)?

More specific hypotheses are contained in chapter 4 "Analysis of Data", as they relate to each subscore of the testing instruments.

Procedures

Population and Sample

Among populations used in educational research, one of the least tested for teacher effectiveness in relation to the self-concept and self-actualization has been university faculties. Therefore, this study involved university faculty members teaching undergraduate courses.

During Fall Quarter, 1970, four hundred and twenty-three faculty members were rated by their students in one class of the instructor's choice. Students rated their instructors according to Spencer's "Course
Evaluation Questionnaire" (CEQ). From this instrument Spencer (1969) has shown that there is no difference between instructor selected courses and classes chosen at random--there is substantial agreement across classes.

Only those instructors who were rated by students from this evaluation in the top three deciles (7, 8, 9) are in the bottom three deciles (0, 1, 2) actually became subjects for this study. Of the four hundred and twenty-three instructors evaluated, eighty-nine ranked in the top deciles (defined as good or effective teachers), and eighty-four ranked in the lower deciles (defined as poor or ineffective teachers). A total of one hundred and seventy-three instructors, then, became subjects for this study. Sixty-two faculty members responded to self-concept and self-actualization tests from those rated as "good," and from those rated as "poor" fifty-six responded. This represents a 69.7 percent return from good teachers and 66.7 percent return from poor teachers, or an average return of 68 percent.

Instrumentation

Instruments Used. The "Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire" (CEQ), was developed by Richard E. Spencer, University of Illinois. It is used to collect student attitudes toward a course and provide faculty members evaluative information about their teaching (Spencer, 1968). Spencer was very meticulous in developing a scale in which,

(1) the elements that the students respond to (i.e. the items) are known to differentiate among teachers; and (2) norms are developed of a sufficient number and dimension to adequately compensate for extraneous, but correlated variables affecting the ratings obtained, and provide useful interpretable comparisons (Spencer 1969b, p. 15).

This instrument was also designed to achieve reliability coefficients to exceed .90, which it consistently has. The CEQ is composed of 50
items, with 22 sets of paired items, each pair having a concept stated positively and negatively. These items have been factored and grouped into six areas: (1) General Course Attitude, (2) Method of Instruction, (3) Course Content, (4) Interest and Attention, (5) Instructor, and (6) Specific Items (Spencer, 1968). An example of this instrument and which specific items constitute the subscores are contained in Appendix A.

The instruments used in this study to test the self-concept and self-actualization were "An Index to Adjustment and Values" (IAV) and the "Personal Orientation Inventory" (POI). The IAV was developed mainly out of Allport's and Odbert's work (1936). These authors felt that just as elements are the building blocks for chemistry, and cells for biology, traits are the basic structural units of personality. Through their work, Allport and Odbert determined that there were some 18,000 terms or adjectives in the English language designating distinctive forms of personal behavior (Allport, 1937, p. 235, 303-304).

Some traits are secondary, some central, and "somewhat rarely a personality is dominated by one outstanding cardinal trait, to which other dispositions serve as merely subsidiary, congruent foci" (Allport, 1937, p. 341). Personality traits may be personal or common. Common traits are those aspects of personality in respect to which most people within a given culture can be profitably compared, and which can be put on a normal "bell" curve—have a normal distribution in a culture (Allport, 1937, p. 340-344). Allport (1961, p. 354) also says that traits are not some concoction of man in labeling, but if our fellow mortals did not have capacities and dispositions we would be unlikely to name them, or in other words,

Traits cannot be called forth by fiat; they must be discovered. The use of the same trait-name applied to any two different individ-
uals signifies merely that the dispositions of both fall within a range of comparable judgments" (Allport, 1937, p. 330).

From this psychological base with the 18,000 common trait-names, and from the works of Lecky, Snygg and Combs, and Rogers; Bills, Vance, and McLean (1951) developed an instrument with 49 trait-names which best described the self-concept, self-acceptance, and the congruency between the "real" and "ideal" self.

Tests of reliability have consistently scored above .80, or to the .001 level (Bills, Vance, and McLean, 1951). In 1958 and 1959 an "others" form, in addition to the "self" form, was developed; thus, increasing the validity (Bills, 1958, 1959). Mitchell (1962) factored the IAV and determined the following areas: (1) freedom from anxiety, (2) motivation for intellectual achievement, (3) offensive social conduct, (4) social poise and self confidence, (5) warm hearted attitude towards others, (6) impersonal efficiency, and (7) dependability.

The instrument used in this study which measured self-actualization was Shostron's "Personal Orientation Inventory" (POI) (Shostron, 1966). This instrument is based mainly on Maslow's work (1954, 1962), as well as Rogers (1951, 1961), and thus has good construct validity. It also discriminates well the self-actualizer from the non-self-actualizer (Shostron, 1966, Fox et al., 1968). Braun and LaFaro conducted an experiment in which they had groups of undergraduate students try to appear "good" or "well-adjusted" on the POI. They concluded that,

Apparently the values deemed to be those of self-actualizing persons are not those judged likely to create a good impression or to be indicators of good adjustment by the typical college student . . . (Braun and LaFaro, 1969)

Reliability coefficients of the POI subscales range from .55 to .85, which are at a level as high as most personality measures (Shostron, 1966,
The instrument consists of 150 pairs of alternative value judgments, and is scaled along two basic dimensions: the Time Competence Ratio, which measures a degree to which one is "present" oriented, and the Support Ratio, which measures whether reactivity orientation is basically toward others or self. The subscales are as follows: (1) self-actualizing value, (2) existentiality, (3) feeling reactivity, (4) spontaneity, (5) self regard, (6) self acceptance, (7) nature of man, (8) synergy, (9) acceptance of aggression, and (10) capacity for intimate contact (Shostrom, 1966). Klavetter and Moger (1967) found that self-actualizing people may be differentiated by the combination of Time Competence and Support Ratios and the self-actualizing values.

Besides the IAV and the POI, a descriptive questionnaire was used for two purposes: (1) to describe the sample of instructors, and (2) to determine if other variables might help describe good or poor teachers.

**Data Collection.** Both the IAV and the POI are self-scoring instruments. Rogers (1951) and Allport (1955, 1961) believe that self-reports are valuable and should be believed, for if we want to know about a person we should ask him directly. The actual administration of these instruments was conducted through college deans and/or department heads. The faculty members were given the packet of tests (as appears in appendix B) by their dean or department head and asked to participate in the evaluation. However, explanation was made that participation was not mandatory, nor was the information to be used for administrative purposes (determining rank, tenure, salary, etc.). The instructors returned the forms, in a sealed envelope, to the researcher directly, or through their department heads.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Participation and Return Rate

From a campus-wide faculty evaluation those instructors receiving top decile ratings (7, 8, 9) were defined for this study as effective or good teachers, and those receiving low decile ratings (0, 1, 2) were defined as ineffective or poor teachers. As a result of the evaluation eighty-nine were good teachers and eighty-four were poor teachers, or a total of one hundred and seventy-three became involved for statistical purposes in this study. Of the one hundred seventy-three instructors only one hundred and eighteen responded to instruments measuring the self-concept and self-actualization. The return of response for good teachers was 69.7 percent, for poor teachers 66.7 percent. However, five tests (three of good teachers, two of poor) were unscorable. The results herein, then, represent a 65 percent return.

An intensive follow-up program was conducted in an attempt to get faculty members to participate in the psychological testing. Reminder letters, telephone calls, and personal visits were all used. Although many refused to participate by filling out the instruments, they responded in other ways which may prove interesting. Following are extracts from two letters which seem typical of the reaction of faculty members which were rated high or defined as good teachers:

Dear Mr. King:

I would like to help with your doctoral project, but feel that I am unable to do so for the following reasons:
1) Even though you say that any reference to the data will be anonymous, you nevertheless ask for my name, department, sex, etc. This I feel is an invasion of my privacy.

2) Since, however, I do consider myself an academic person, and since, the demands on my time are fairly large, I feel that I scarcely can take out the time that it would take to complete the questionnaire. The sheer bulk of these questionnaires discourages me.

Dear Paul,

I will not answer the questionnaire because I consider it an invasion of privacy. I am aware of the need to arrive at a means of evaluating teachers, and I sympathize with the individual who, while attempting such an evaluation, is hampered by such recalcitrants as I. Nevertheless, I resent being expected to answer an "either/or" questionnaire when most of the answers must be neither "either" nor "or." Especially I resent the psychological probing which in several instances could be interpreted negatively regardless of the answer selected. I do not object to spending my time assisting a doctoral candidate when the assistance does not pry into my personal life, but this instrument is a prying one, a crowbar, and I refuse to be a crow.

From those rated low or defined as poor teachers the following were received as notes or written comments:

I am sorry but I can't get a feel for these questions. They do not permit me to give an answer that I'm satisfied with.

I consider this a colossal waste of time. I hope the results are of some use. Sorry I can't help being hostile when I look at these instruments.

What I think about myself is my business.

I feel a lot of the "information" requested is my private concern.

Sorry, Mr. King, I find the decisions this test calls for too hard to make, because several adjectives on the Index of Adjustment and Values as well as many of the general statements on the POI would have to be specified (or qualified) by the person taking the test, if an honest self evaluation were to result.

Another interesting analysis from those instructors refusing to participate was in relation to their college affiliation. As shown in
Table 1, from a Chi-square analysis, the proportion of poor teachers refusing was significantly (.05 level) higher from the College of Science than expected, and the proportion of good teachers refusing was significantly (.05 level) higher from the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Science than expected by chance.

Table 1. Chi-square analysis of university instructors refusing to participate in psychological testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College*</th>
<th>Good Instructors</th>
<th>Poor Instructors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3 (3.43)</td>
<td>4 (3.57)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>17 (12.73)</td>
<td>9 (13.27)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>4 (7.84)</td>
<td>12 (8.16)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 2  
Chi-square = 6.59 (p < .05)

*Instructors refusing from other Colleges were too negligible to consider in computation (less than 5).

Any other information for describing those who refused to participate is not available, and the above data may be insufficient or mixed enough to make difficult any conclusions or general reasons as to why many refused.

Analysis of Self-Concept

The objective questions, #1 and #2, (Is there a difference between good and poor instructors as to self-acceptance? Is there a difference between good and poor instructors as to discrepancy between the real and ideal self?), were tested through the "Index of Adjustment and Values"
questionnaire. There are two forms to this instrument--the "self" form and the "others" form. Only the "self" form was used since the purpose of this study was to investigate how instructors perceive themselves, not how they perceive others. Four scores are available from the "self" form. These are: (1) Self Acceptance, (2) Real self or Self Concept, (3) Ideal self, and (4) Discrepancy between the real and ideal self. Specific hypotheses were formed in relation to each subscore. These were:

**Hypothesis #1.** There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to self-acceptance scores.

**Hypothesis #2.** There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to real self scores.

**Hypothesis #3.** There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to ideal self scores.

**Hypothesis #4.** There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to discrepancy scores.

**Self-Acceptance of Good and Poor Instructors**

Table 2 presents the analysis of variance and means for self-acceptance scores. Good instructors scored a mean of 183.73, while poor instructors' mean score was 187.85. The F-Test value shows no significant difference; therefore, hypothesis #1 is accepted--there is no difference between good and poor instructors as to self-acceptance scores.

Although the two groups did not differ significantly an analysis shows that poor teachers did score higher in self-acceptance than good teachers. Whether instructors are real or faking in this area is not determined in this study.
Table 2. Analysis of variance and means for self acceptance, comparing good and poor university instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>68,393.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>479.3</td>
<td>479.29</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental error</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>67,914.5</td>
<td>611.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor status</th>
<th>Treatment means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>183.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>187.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Real and Ideal Self or Good and Poor Instructors

Mean scores comparing good and poor teachers as to their real self are presented in Table 3. The means are almost identical and of no significant difference. Although mean scores for the ideal self show some difference (Table 4), again there is no significant difference between good and poor teachers.

Also from the IAV a discrepancy score is computed to show the incongruency between the real and ideal self. The lower this score, then, the more congruency, or less the discrepancy. As can be seen in Table 5 the mean scores differ somewhat with the good instructors receiving a lower mean score (29.39), but the F-test value shows no significant difference. The Null Hypotheses (#2, #3, #4) are all accepted.

In summation, there is no difference between good and poor instructors as to discrepancy between the real and ideal self--one group is just as well-adjusted and has just as wholesome outlook on life as the other group. Both effective and ineffective university instructors accept them-
selves as persons to the same degree, as tested from the "Index of Adjustment and Values." Figure 1 in graphic form also shows a summary of scores on the IAV.

Table 3. Analysis of variance and means for real self, comparing good and poor university instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>41,075.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental error</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>41,068.2</td>
<td>369.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor status</th>
<th>Treatment means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>198.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>198.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Analysis of variance and means for ideal self, comparing good and poor university instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>30,371.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental error</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30,370.1</td>
<td>273.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor status</th>
<th>Treatment means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>220.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>219.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Analysis of variance and means for discrepancy between real and ideal self, comparing good and poor university instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F test value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>22,225.7</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental error</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>22,145.7</td>
<td>199.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor status</th>
<th>Treatment means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>29.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>31.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Good Instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self acceptance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good instructors</td>
<td>183.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor instructors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real self-concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good instructors</td>
<td>198.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor instructors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal self-concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good instructors</td>
<td>220.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor instructors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy scores (Lower score means less discrepancy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good instructors</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor instructors</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Mean scores comparing good and poor university instructors on the four scales of the "Index of Adjustment and Values"
Analysis of Self-Actualization

Shostrom's "Personal Orientation Inventory" was used to measure whether there was a difference between poor and good instructors as to self-actualization (objective question #3). This inventory has ten sub-scales with two overall score ratios. Each of the twelve areas, then, became a basis from which to formulate hypotheses for self-actualization. These were:

Hypothesis #5. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to time ratio scores. Time ratio is the degree to which one is "present" oriented.

Hypothesis #6. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to support ratio scores. Support ratio shows whether reactivity orientation is basically toward others or self (inner).

Hypothesis #7. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to self-actualizing value scores. Self-actualizing value is that affirmation of a primary value of self-actualizing people.

Hypothesis #8. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to existentiality scores. Existentiality is the ability to situationally react without rigid adherence to principles.

Hypothesis #9. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to feeling reactivity scores. Feeling Reactivity is sensitivity of responsiveness to one's own needs and feelings.

Hypothesis #10. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to spontaneity scores. Spontaneity refers to the freedom to react spontaneously or to be oneself.

Hypothesis #11. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to self regard scores. Self Regard is the affirmation of the worth or strength of the self.

Hypothesis #12. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to self acceptance scores. Self-acceptance is that acceptance of self in spite of weaknesses or deficiencies.

Hypothesis #13. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to nature of man scores. Nature of Man is a view of the positive goodness of mankind.

Hypothesis #14. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to synergy scores. Synergy is the ability to be synergistic, to transcend dichotomies.
Hypothesis #15. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to acceptance of aggression scores. This scale is the ability to accept one's natural aggressiveness.

Hypothesis #16. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to capacity for intimate contact scores. This scale shows the ability to develop contactful intimate relationships with others.

Each of these hypotheses were tested by the Analysis of Variance. Table 6 shows the mean scores and F-test value of each sub-score of the inventory.

In all sub-scores there is no significant difference between mean scores of good and poor instructors, except in three areas. First, good instructors scored significantly (.02 level) greater in self-actualization value. The mean score of good teachers was 21.14, while that of the poor teachers was 20.07. This means that the effective instructors hold or affirm more to self-actualizing values. Examples of this value are:
(1) I live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values. (2) I live by values which are primarily based on my own feelings, rather than the feelings of others. (3) My moral values are self determined and not dictated by society. (4) For me work and play are the same. (5) I enjoy detachment and privacy. (6) I feel dedicated to my work. (7) It is better to be yourself. (8) I am able to risk being myself. (9) I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy or bliss.

The second area in which there was a significant difference was that of Spontaneity. Here the F-test value was 6.23 or significant beyond the .02 level of confidence. And again the more effective teachers showed the more spontaneity. This sub-score contains such items as: (1) I trust the decisions I make spontaneously. (2) I need not justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests. (3) Two people can get along
Table 6. Mean scores and F-test value for sub-scores of the POI, comparing good and poor university instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscore</th>
<th>Instructor Status</th>
<th>Treatment Mean</th>
<th>F-Test Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Competence</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17.42</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Incompetence</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>84.49</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>85.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>42.51</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Actualizing Value</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>5.719*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiality</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Reactivity</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>2.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>6.235*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Regard</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>4.725**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Acceptance</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Man</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>2.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Aggression</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Intimate</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>1.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant beyond .02
** Significant beyond .05

Note: In all sub-scores the total, treatments, and experimental error is 112, 1, and 111 respectively.
best if each person feels free to express himself. (4) Being myself is helpful to others. (5) I do not actively attempt to avoid embarrassment. Ineffective instructors scored themselves opposite on these items or indicated that they were fearful of expressing feelings behaviorally, while effective instructors tended to favor positively the items such as above.

Self regard was the third sub-score which showed a significant difference. A high score in this area means one has the ability to like one's self because of one's strengths as a person. A low score indicates low self worth. Good instructors in relation to poor scored high on the self regard subscale. Good teachers, then, responded to such items as: (1) I am not embarrassed by compliments. (2) I believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life. (3) It is not necessary for others to accept my point of view. (4) I am assertive and affirming. (5) It is a good idea to think about your greatest potential. (6) I can feel comfortable with less than a perfect performance.

Summary

In summary, poor instructors on a university level of teaching are just as self-actualizing as good instructors. There is generally no difference. All Self-actualizing Null Hypotheses are accepted, except #7, #10, and #11. From these hypotheses in this testing good instructors appear to be more self-willed, self-expressive, self-assertive, open and honest, and cognizant of their strengths and capabilities.

From a profile of mean scores (Figure 2) a summary is also presented. This profile is based on the standard scores for this inventory as contained in the Manuel. Any interpretation here must be done with extreme caution, for the norms of the POI were not established with university
Figure 2. Profile sheet for the personal orientation inventory
instructors, but mainly with clinical patients. According to the norms established, in the "time" and "support" ratios, both groups (good and poor instructors) were in the normal range, that is they were neither self-actualizing, nor were they non-self-actualizing persons.
Analysis of Descriptive Data

Selected descriptive data was also compiled on the university faculty members responding to the psychological testing. This was done in order to provide a description of the faculty instructors tested and to investigate other variables which might be tied up with effective or ineffective teaching on a university level. The descriptive data selected for investigation were: (1) Sex, (2) College Affiliation, (3) Age, (4) Highest Degree Earned, (5) Years of College or University Education, (6) Professional Rank, and (7) Years of Teaching Experience. Each of these areas also formed the basis from which hypotheses were formulated.

Hypothesis #17. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to Sex.

Hypothesis #18. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to College Affiliation.

Hypothesis #19. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to Age.

Hypothesis #20. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to Highest Degree Earned.

Hypothesis #21. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to Years of College or University Education.

Hypothesis #22. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to Professional Rank.

Hypothesis #23. There is no difference between good and poor instructors as to Years of Teaching Experience.

Sex

In Table 7 a Chi-square analysis of independence shows the relationship of sex to good and poor teachers. As this analysis indicates, significantly beyond the .05 level, female instructors tend to be rated higher by students than male instructors. The proportion of female teachers rated good was higher than expected by chance. Hypothesis #17 is rejected.
Table 7. Chi-square analysis of sex of good and poor university instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Good Instructors</th>
<th>Poor Instructors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45 (49.39)</td>
<td>49 (44.61)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17 (12.61)</td>
<td>7 (11.39)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 1  
Chi square = 4.04  (p < .05)

College Affiliation

When good and poor instructors were compared in College Affiliation the analysis showed no significant difference (Table 8). In other words, college affiliation did not make a difference as to whether students rated instructors high or low. The proportion of good and poor teachers from each college in this study was relatively what might be expected by chance.
Table 8. Chi-square analysis of college affiliation of good and poor university instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College*</th>
<th>Good Instructors</th>
<th>Poor Instructors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5 (4.81)</td>
<td>4 (4.19)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4 (7.48)</td>
<td>10 (6.52)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15 (13.90)</td>
<td>11 (12.10)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Life</td>
<td>8 (6.41)</td>
<td>4 (5.59)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Arts and Social Science</td>
<td>23 (19.78)</td>
<td>14 (17.22)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>2 (3.21)</td>
<td>4 (2.79)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5 (6.41)</td>
<td>7 (5.59)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 6  
Chi square = 7.29  (p < .30-.20)

*College of Engineering was eliminated from this analysis because so few participated (less than 5).

Age

The investigation of age difference between good and poor instructors is presented in Table 9. Mean ages were computed for the two groups and then compared with a t-test for differences. The mean age for good teachers was 39.49 years, while that of poor teachers was 46.17 years. The t-test showing the difference between the means was 2.995, which is significant at the .01 level. This analysis shows, as far as this study is concerned, poor teachers are older than good teachers. Hypothesis
#19 is rejected. This does not mean that all poor teachers are older, for some older teachers (60 years plus) were rated high by students. Proportionately, though, good teachers were younger by a mean of 6.58 years.

Table 9. T-test of the difference between good and poor university instructors as to age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Status</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 107  T-test = 2.995  (p<.01)

Highest Degree Earned

Table 10 shows an analysis as far as degree status is concerned. In this area a significant difference beyond .001 is noted. Those instructors rated low by students unproportionately were also those who held Doctorate degrees, and those instructors rated high by students unproportionately hold Masters degrees. Hypothesis #20 is also rejected.
Table 10. Chi-square analysis of degree of good and poor university instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Good Instructors</th>
<th>Poor Instructors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>3 (2.69)</td>
<td>2 (2.31)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>33 (22.56)</td>
<td>9 (19.44)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>22 (32.76)</td>
<td>39 (28.24)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 2  
Chi square = 18.15  (p < .001)

Years of College or University Education

When Degree status is coupled with Years of College or University Education a meaningful consistency seems to develop. It seems proportionately that poor instructors have terminated their formal education with the Doctorate degree. Table 11 shows that through a t-test the means of good and poor instructors differ significantly (.002). Good teachers have had a mean of 7.00 years of university schooling, therefore, they have not received their doctorate degree, as also is illustrated from Table 10. Poor teachers, on the other hand, have been to school a mean of 8.35 years. Proportionately poor university teachers have terminated their formal education, then, with Doctorate degrees.
Table 11. T-test of the difference between good and poor university instructors as to years of college or university education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor status</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 99  
T-test = 4.09  \( (p < .002) \)

Professional Rank

Table 12 indicates the proportion of good and poor instructors in relation to university rank. A Chi-square analysis shows that a greater proportion of full professors are in the ineffective teacher category, and that the greater proportion of teachers who have the rank of instructor are in the effective category. As far as this study is concerned, proportionately the lower ranked teacher was rated higher by students, therefore, hypothesis #22 is also rejected.
Table 12. Chi-square analysis of rank of good and poor university instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Rank*</th>
<th>Good Instructors</th>
<th>Poor Instructors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>8 (5.20)</td>
<td>2 (4.80)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>20 (17.15)</td>
<td>13 (15.85)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>15 (13.51)</td>
<td>11 (12.49)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>10 (17.15)</td>
<td>23 (15.85)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 3
Chi square = 10.67 (p < .02)

*Graduate Assistants and Special Instructors were eliminated from this analysis because teachers in these categories were so few (less than 5).

Years of Teaching Experience

As to years of teaching experience good and poor instructors did not differ significantly. The mean years of teaching for good instructors was 10.82, whereas poor teachers have taught 14.12 years. The difference is not great enough to reject hypothesis #23. Table 13 shows the statistics for this area considered.
Table 13. T-test of the difference between good and poor university instructors as to years of teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor status</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom = 104  
T-test = 1.72  (p > .05)

Summary

University instructors rated high by students were proportionately greater or scored significantly different than poor instructors in selected areas. These areas were in relation to sex, age, degree, years of university education and professional rank. It appears from this study, that students rated those instructors higher who were mostly female in sex, younger in age (average of 39 years), who had a master's degree with an average of seven years of university education and a professional rank lower than a professor.

University instructors rated low by students were those who were mostly male in sex, older in age (average of 46 years), who had a doctorate degree with eight years of university education, and a professional rank of professor.

College affiliation and years of teaching experience had relatively little influence on whether a teacher was rated as effective or ineffective.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary
The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between student ratings of university instructors and instructors' self-concept and self-actualization. During the academic year 1970-71, students rated faculty members teaching undergraduate courses from the "Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire." Instructors rated high or in the top three deciles were defined in this study as "good" or "effective" teachers, and those rated low or in the lower three deciles were defined as "poor" or "ineffective" instructors. Sixty-eight percent or 118 of the instructors in these categories submitted to two psychological tests—the "Index of Adjustment and Values" and the "Personal Orientation Inventory". However, five tests were unscorable. The results from these tests represent a 65 percent return. These instruments were used to investigate the self-concept and self-actualization of university instructors. Those instructors wishing not to participate were significantly different, in that poor instructors were mostly from the College of Science, while good instructors were mostly from the College of Humanities. Other information does not appear to show any other differences between good and poor instructions as to why they refused to participate.

From the IAV or self-concept testing two main areas were considered or investigated—the self-acceptance and discrepancy between the real and ideal self. Analysis of variance scores showed that there was no difference between mean scores of good and poor instructors in relation to
how they accepted themselves and how they viewed their real self in relation to their ideal self. Both groups showed congruency and a positive view of self.

When good and poor instructors were compared by an analysis of variance as to their self-actualization, again, there was generally no difference between the means. However, on three subscales (of twelve) the groups differed significantly (.02-.05). Good instructors scored higher in Self-Actualizing Value, Spontaneity, and Self Regard, or it might be said they are more self-willed, self-expressive, self-assertive, open, honest, and cognizant of their strengths and capabilities. Generally, poor instructors are just as self-actualizing (releasing of full capabilities and potentialities) as good instructors. According to norms established by clinical patients for the POI, both groups illustrated normality, however, they are neither actualizing their potentialities nor are they non-actualizing them.

Other data which showed significant distinction between good and poor instructors was the descriptive data. This data showed that college affiliation and number of years of teaching seem unrelated to teacher effectiveness. However, sex, age, highest degree earned, rank, and years of formal education did make a difference in this study. Those instructors rated high by students were also those who were mostly female in sex, younger in age (average of 39 years), who had a master's degree, an average of seven years of university education and a professional rank lower than a professor. Those instructors rated low by students were also those who were mostly male in sex, older in age (average of 46 years), who had a doctorate degree, eight years of university education, and a professional rank of professor.
Conclusions

From this study of university instructors rated high and low by students, and from the limited psychological testing, the following may be concluded:

1. When male university instructors terminate their formal education by a doctorate and arrive at the rank of professor students perceive them to be less effective as teachers.

2. How a university instructor feels about himself, how congruent his real and ideal self are, and how well he accepts himself may not be related to his effectiveness or ineffectiveness as an instructor. University instructors whether good or poor essentially view themselves the same.

3. How well a university instructor is actualizing his potentialities or has satisfied basic needs of safety, belongingness, love and self-esteem, may not be related to his effectiveness or ineffectiveness as a teacher.

4. University instructors appear to be more effective if they hold self-actualization values, are more spontaneous, and possess a good self-regard; or in other words, they are more self-willed, self-expressive, self-assertive, honest, and cognizant of their strengths and capabilities.

5. Since good and poor instructors showed significant differences in the descriptive data but none in the self-concept inventory and only limited differences in the self-actualization inventory, then the use of the IAV and POI for university instructors is questioned because of their failure, generally, to differentiate. The original ranking by students on the CEQ is upheld, or the original designation by students as to whether the instructor was good or poor seems valid.
Recommendations

From the above summary and conclusions the following recommendations are made:

1. Good instructors in this study could be investigated further to determine what they do specifically as teachers, in order to be rated high by students. This could be done by:
   
   a. investigating their subscores on the "Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire", or
   
   b. investigating more specifically their teaching style, techniques, or personal mannerisms through other inventories, or
   
   c. gathering objective data through classroom observation, or
   
   d. investigating their rating scores in further faculty evaluation programs.

2. Further study needs to be conducted to determine more precisely if self-actualization is related to effective university teaching.
Speculation

Incidental results from this study showed that university instructors who are older, who have essentially terminated their formal education with a doctorate degree, and who have arrived at the rank of professor, generally are ineffective as teachers. This conclusion forms a foundation from which some speculation may be launched.

Although the above description represents mainly poor teachers, good teachers fell into this description also. Why do some good teachers remain effective even though they grow older, terminate their formal education with a doctorate, and are professors? Why is it that a higher proportion are ineffective after time and accomplishment? The answer seems to lie within the teacher himself. He, as the instrument for teaching, appears to be the focal point, the basis of his own effectiveness.

The teacher as a person is the core around which all other variables to teaching effectiveness revolve. Some teachers continue to grow as persons and remain alive and fresh and seem to possess a power which John Gardner calls "self-renewal." Many university instructors arrive at a point in which they seem to taper off in effective teaching. They cease to be challenged, cease striving for teaching excellence, and cease growing as a teacher and a person. They begin decaying.

When a teacher ceases to grow as a person, the "self as instrument" becomes less dynamic, less competent, and less caring for or interested in good teaching. Teachers are like prisms through which the light of knowledge and values of life are broken up and given color. If the prism is not clear and alive, knowledge will not appear to be fresh, vital and
relevant to the times and needs of students. Continuous growth as a person seems evident in teaching success.

How might university instructors, or any teacher for that matter, be a growing prism or instrument? The following seem vital to effective teaching:

First, teachers need growth in knowledge. They need to be open to and learning from life's experiences. No matter what the degree, position or accomplishment, they could always keep a disposition of humility which says, "I still can learn, understand and accomplish more." Teachers must be continuous learners, even in areas outside their own special discipline. Wide reading experiences, critical and creative thinking are good keys for staying alive as a teacher.

Second, teachers need growth in self-knowledge. John Gardner (1965, p.13) has said that "by middle life most of us are accomplished fugitives from ourselves". Honest and creative touring of mind and heart is adventuresome. It can produce (1), insightful imagination (2), re-vitalization and sensitivity to one's feelings, and (3), sympathetic understanding to the feelings and conduct of others. "Know thyself", in a continuous sense, is a must for effective teaching.

Third, teachers must grow in caring--caring about teaching and who they teach. University instructors, especially, must leave their ivory towers of exclusiveness, of research for self-edification, and become more humane in their interpersonal relationships. Upon the inquiry, "What makes your teacher a good teacher?" a student once responded, "He cares about us." Maybe good teaching could be summed up in this statement: a good teacher is one who cares.
LITERATURE CITED


Bousfield, W. A. 1940. Student ratings of qualities considered desirable in college professors. School and Society 51(1313):253-256.


### Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire

**Measurement and Research Division, Office of Instructional Resources, University of Illinois © by Richard E. Spencer**

#### Inside Course Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE CODE</th>
<th>NO DAE</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEPT</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td>0-294,55,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expected Grade in This Course

- [ ] A - Outstanding
- [ ] B - Very Good
- [ ] C - Good
- [ ] D - Satisfactory
- [ ] F - Unsatisfactory

#### Mark Your College

- [ ] Agric.
- [ ] Comm. A A
- [ ] Educ.
- [ ] Eng.
- [ ] F. App. Arts
- [ ] Home, Com.
- [ ] Illus.
- [ ] Las.
- [ ] Med.
- [ ] Mich.
- [ ] Dent.
- [ ] Vet.
- [ ] Med. Ed.
- [ ] Other

#### Respond to Your Instructor’s Directions

**MARK**

- If You Strongly Agree
- If You Agree Moderately
- If You Disagree Moderately
- If You Strongly Disagree

#### Sample Marks:

- a) SA A SD
- b) SA A SD
- c) A A SD
- d) SA A SD

#### Response Code

- Mark SA if you strongly agree with the item.
- Mark A if you agree moderately with the item.
- Mark D if you disagree moderately with the item.
- Mark SD if you strongly disagree with the item.

#### If Part II or III is to be used, Mark Here

##### Complete Sections Below According to Your Instructor’s Directions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Part II Items 51-75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Part III Items 76-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes

- I learn more when other teaching methods are used.
- It was a waste of time.
- Overall, the course was good.
- The textbook was very good.
- The instructor seemed to be interested in students as persons.
- More courses should be taught this way.
- The course held my interest.
- I would have preferred another method of teaching in this course.
- It was easy to remain attentive.
- The instructor did not synthesize, integrate or summarize effectively.
- Not much was gained by taking this course.
- The instructor encouraged the development of new viewpoints and appreciations.
- The course material seemed worthwhile.
- It was difficult to remain attentive.
- Instructor did not review promptly and in such a way that students could understand their weaknesses.
- Homework assignments were helpful in understanding the course.
- There was not enough student participation for this type of course.
- The instructor had a thorough knowledge of his subject matter.
- The content of the course was good.
- The course increased my general knowledge.
- The types of test questions used were good.
- Held my attention throughout the course.
- The demands of the students were not considered by the instructor.
- Uninteresting course.
- It was a very worthwhile course.
- Some things were not explained very well.
- The way in which this course was taught resulted in better student learning.
- The course material was too difficult.
- One of my poorest courses.
- Material in the course was easy to follow.
- The instructor seemed to consider teaching as a chore or routine activity.
- More outside reading is necessary.
- Course material was poorly organized.
- Course was not very helpful.
- It was quite interesting.
- I think that the course was taught quite well.
- I would prefer a different method of instruction.
- The pace of the course was too slow.
- At times I was confused.
- Excellent course content.
- The examinations were too difficult.
- Generally, the course was well organized.
- Ideas and concepts were developed too rapidly.
- The content of the course was too elementary.
- Some days I was not very interested in this course.
- It was quite boring.
- The instructor exhibited professional dignity and bearing in the classroom.
- Another method of instruction should have been employed.
- The course was quite useful.
- I would take another course that was taught this way.
Table I: CEQ Items by Sub-scores

01. General Course Attitude
   3. Overall, the course was good.
   2. It was a waste of time.
   20. The course increased my general knowledge
   34. Course was not very helpful.
   25. It was a very worthwhile course.
   11. Not much was gained by taking this course.
   49. The course was quite useful.
   29. One of my poorest courses.

02. Method of Instruction
   6. More courses should be taught this way.
   37. I would prefer a different method of instruction.
   27. The way in which this course was taught results in better student learning.
   48. Another method of instruction should have been employed.
   36. I think that the course was taught quite well.
   8. I would have preferred another method of teaching in this course.
   50. I would take another course that was taught this way.
   1. I learn more when other teaching methods are used.

03. Course Content
   30. Material in the course was easy to follow.
   28. The course material was too difficult.
   40. Excellent course content.
   44. The content of the course was too elementary.
   13. The course material seemed worthwhile.
   39. At times I was confused.
   19. The content of the course was good.
   26. Some things were not explained very well.

04. Interest and Attention
   7. The course held my attention.
   24. Uninteresting course.
   9. It was easy to remain attentive.
   14. It was difficult to remain attentive.
   22. Held my attention throughout the course.
   46. It was quite boring.
   35. It was quite interesting.
   45. Some days I was not very interested in this course.

05. Instructor
   5. The instructor seemed to be interested in students as persons.
   31. The instructor seemed to consider teaching as a chore or routine activity.
   12. The instructor encouraged the development of new viewpoints and appreciations.
   23. The demands of the students were not considered by the instructor.
18. The instructor had a thorough knowledge of his subject matter.
10. The instructor did not synthesize, integrate or summarize effectively.
47. The instructor exhibited professional dignity and bearing in the classroom.
15. Instructor did not review promptly and in such a way that students could understand their weaknesses.

06. Specific Items
21. The types of test questions used were good.
41. The examinations were too difficult.
42. Generally, the course was well organized.
33. Course material was poorly organized.
4. The textbook was very good.
16. Homework assignments were helpful in understanding the course.
17. There was not enough student participation for this type of course.
32. More outside reading is necessary.
38. The pace of the course was too slow.
43. Ideas and concepts were developed too rapidly.
Dear Faculty Member,

As a part of my Doctoral Study, it is necessary to collect certain data from the University Faculty. Would you please help by completing the enclosed instruments.

The data from these personality instruments will act as a corollary study to the campus-wide faculty evaluation program. The main purpose of this study is to more objectively define what makes a "good" teacher, as perceived by students. Also the information received may be of use to each faculty member if he wishes to understand more about himself as a person in relation to how the students see him as a teacher.

Your cooperation in this project is greatly desired for research purposes, and above all will not be used for administrative purposes. All information will be held in strict confidence by the researcher and destroyed after the study is completed.

If you have any problems or questions in regard to this study please contact me at ext. 7591 or Main #2.

Thanks so much,

A. Paul King
Administrative Assistant
for Faculty Evaluation

Please give the following information and read and follow all instructions to each test carefully before starting.

Name ____________________________ Dept. ______________________

Age ______ Sex ______ Rank ______

_______ Years of College or University education.

_______ Highest degree earned.

_______ Years of teaching experience.
"SELF" INSTRUCTIONS FOR INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT AND VALUES

There is a need for each of us to know more about ourselves, but seldom do we have an opportunity to look at ourselves as we are or as we would like to be. On the following page is a list of terms that to a certain degree describe people. Take each term separately and apply it to yourself by completing the following sentence:

I AM A (AN) ___________________________ PERSON.

The first word in the list is academic, so you would substitute this term in the above sentence. It would read--I am an academic person.

Then decide HOW MUCH OF THE TIME this statement is like you, i.e., is typical or characteristic of you as an individual, and rate yourself on a scale from one to five according to the following key.

1. Seldom is this like me.
2. Occasionally, this is like me.
3. About half of the time, this is like me.
4. A good deal of the time, this is like me.
5. Most of the time, this is like me.

Select the number beside the phrase that tells how much of the time the statement is like you and insert it in Column I on the next page.

EXAMPLE: Beside the term ACADEMIC, number two is inserted to indicate that occasionally, I am an academic person.

Now go to Column II. Use one of the statements given below to tell HOW YOU FEEL about yourself as described in Column I.

1. I very much dislike being as I am in this respect.
2. I dislike being as I am in this respect.
3. I neither dislike being as I am nor like being as I am in this respect.
4. I like being as I am in this respect.
5. I like very much being as I am in this respect.

You will select the number beside the statement that tells how you feel about the way you are and insert the number in Column II.

EXAMPLE: In Column II beside the term ACADEMIC, number one is inserted to indicate that I dislike very much being as I am in respect to the term, academic. Note that being as I am always refers to the way you describe yourself in Column I.

Finally, go to Column III; using the same term, complete the following sentence:

I WOULD LIKE TO BE A (AN) _______________ PERSON.

Then decide HOW MUCH OF THE TIME you would like this trait to be characteristic of you and rate yourself on the following five point scale.
1. *Seldom,* would I like this to be me.
2. *Occasionally,* I would like this to be me.
3. *About half of the time,* I would like this to be me.
4. *A good deal of the time,* I would like this to be me.
5. *Most of the time,* I would like this to be me.

You will select the number beside the phrase that tells how much of the time you would like to be this kind of person and insert the number in Column III.

**EXAMPLE:** In Column III beside the term ACADEMIC, number five is inserted to indicate the *most of the time,* I would like to be this kind of person.

Start with the word ACCEPTABLE and fill in Column I, II, and III before going on to the next word. There is no time limit. Be honest with yourself so that your description will be a true measure of how you look at yourself.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name ________________</th>
<th>Department ________________</th>
<th>&quot;Self&quot; Form ________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Columns</strong></td>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td><strong>II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. academic</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. acceptable</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. accurate</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. alert</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ambitious</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. annoying</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. busy</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. calm</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. charming</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. clever</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. competent</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. confident</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. considerate</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. cruel</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. democratic</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. dependable</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. economical</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. efficient</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. fearful</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. friendly</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. fashionable</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. helpful</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. intellectual</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. kind</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. logical</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

EVERETT L. SHOSTROM, Ph.D.

DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of pairs of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide which of the two paired statements most consistently applies to you.

You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet you have. Look at the example of the answer sheet shown at the right. If the first statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "a". (See Example Item 1 at right.) If the second statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "b". (See Example Item 2 at right.) If neither statement applies to you, or if they refer to something you don’t know about, make no answer on the answer sheet. Remember to give YOUR OWN opinion of yourself and do not leave any blank spaces if you can avoid it.

In marking your answers on the answer sheet, be sure that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Make your marks heavy and black. Erase completely any answer you wish to change. Do not make any marks in this booklet.

Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.

Before you begin the inventory, be sure you put your name, your sex, your age, and the other information called for in the space provided on the answer sheet.

NOW OPEN THE BOOKLET AND START WITH QUESTION 1.
1. a. I am bound by the principle of fairness.
b. I am not absolutely bound by the principle of fairness.

2. a. When a friend does me a favor, I feel that I must return it.
b. When a friend does me a favor, I do not feel that I must return it.

3. a. I feel I must always tell the truth.
b. I do not always tell the truth.

4. a. No matter how hard I try, my feelings are often hurt.
b. If I manage the situation right, I can avoid being hurt.

5. a. I feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.
b. I do not feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.

6. a. I often make my decisions spontaneously.
b. I seldom make my decisions spontaneously.

7. a. I am afraid to be myself.
b. I am not afraid to be myself.

8. a. I feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.
b. I do not feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.

9. a. I feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.
b. I do not feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.

10. a. I live by values which are in agreement with others.
b. I live by values which are primarily based on my own feelings.

11. a. I am concerned with self-improvement at all times.
b. I am not concerned with self-improvement at all times.

12. a. I feel guilty when I am selfish.
b. I don't feel guilty when I am selfish.

13. a. I have no objection to getting angry.
b. Anger is something I try to avoid.

14. a. For me, anything is possible if I believe in myself.
b. I have a lot of natural limitations even though I believe in myself.

15. a. I put others' interests before my own.
b. I do not put others' interests before my own.

16. a. I sometimes feel embarrassed by compliments.
b. I am not embarrassed by compliments.

17. a. I believe it is important to accept others as they are.
b. I believe it is important to understand why others are as they are.

18. a. I can put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
b. I don't put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.

19. a. I can give without requiring the other person to appreciate what I give.
b. I have a right to expect the other person to appreciate what I give.

20. a. My moral values are dictated by society.
b. My moral values are self-determined.

21. a. I do what others expect of me.
b. I feel free to not do what others expect of me.

22. a. I accept my weaknesses.
b. I don't accept my weaknesses.

23. a. In order to grow emotionally, it is necessary to know why I act as I do.
b. In order to grow emotionally, it is not necessary to know why I act as I do.

24. a. Sometimes I am cross when I am not feeling well.
b. I am hardly ever cross.
25. a. It is necessary that others approve of what I do.
   b. It is not always necessary that others approve of what I do.

26. a. I am afraid of making mistakes.
   b. I am not afraid of making mistakes.

27. a. I trust the decisions I make spontaneously.
   b. I do not trust the decisions I make spontaneously.

   b. My feelings of self-worth do not depend on how much I accomplish.

29. a. I fear failure.
   b. I don't fear failure.

30. a. My moral values are determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.
   b. My moral values are not determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.

31. a. It is possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.
   b. It is not possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.

32. a. I can cope with the ups and downs of life.
   b. I cannot cope with the ups and downs of life.

33. a. I believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.
   b. I do not believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.

34. a. Children should realize that they do not have the same rights and privileges as adults.
   b. It is not important to make an issue of rights and privileges.

35. a. I can "stick my neck out" in my relations with others.
   b. I avoid "sticking my neck out" in my relations with others.

36. a. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is opposed to interest in others.
   b. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.

37. a. I find that I have rejected many of the moral values I was taught.
   b. I have not rejected any of the moral values I was taught.

38. a. I live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.
   b. I do not live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.

39. a. I trust my ability to size up a situation.
   b. I do not trust my ability to size up a situation.

40. a. I believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.
   b. I do not believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.

41. a. I must justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.
   b. I need not justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.

42. a. I am bothered by fears of being inadequate.
   b. I am not bothered by fears of being inadequate.

43. a. I believe that man is essentially good and can be trusted.
   b. I believe that man is essentially evil and cannot be trusted.

44. a. I live by the rules and standards of society.
   b. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.

45. a. I am bound by my duties and obligations to others.
   b. I am not bound by my duties and obligations to others.

46. a. Reasons are needed to justify my feelings.
   b. Reasons are not needed to justify my feelings.
47. a. There are times when just being silent is the best way I can express my feelings.
   b. I find it difficult to express my feelings by just being silent.

48. a. I often feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
   b. I do not feel it necessary to defend my past actions.

49. a. I like everyone I know.
   b. I do not like everyone I know.

50. a. Criticism threatens my self-esteem.
   b. Criticism does not threaten my self-esteem.

51. a. I believe that knowledge of what is right makes people act right.
   b. I do not believe that knowledge of what is right necessarily makes people act right.

52. a. I am afraid to be angry at those I love.
   b. I feel free to be angry at those I love.

53. a. My basic responsibility is to be aware of my own needs.
   b. My basic responsibility is to be aware of others' needs.

54. a. Impressing others is most important.
   b. Expressing myself is most important.

55. a. To feel right, I need always to please others.
   b. I can feel right without always having to please others.

56. a. I will risk a friendship in order to say or do what I believe is right.
   b. I will not risk a friendship just to say or do what is right.

57. a. I feel bound to keep the promises I make.
   b. I do not always feel bound to keep the promises I make.

58. a. I must avoid sorrow at all costs.
   b. It is not necessary for me to avoid sorrow.

59. a. I strive always to predict what will happen in the future.
   b. I do not feel it necessary always to predict what will happen in the future.

60. a. It is important that others accept my point of view.
   b. It is not necessary for others to accept my point of view.

61. a. I only feel free to express warm feelings to my friends.
   b. I feel free to express both warm and hostile feelings to my friends.

62. a. There are many times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.
   b. There are very few times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.

63. a. I welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.
   b. I do not welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.

64. a. Appearances are all-important.
   b. Appearances are not terribly important.

65. a. I hardly ever gossip.
   b. I gossip a little at times.

66. a. I feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.
   b. I do not feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.

67. a. I should always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
   b. I need not always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.

68. a. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
   b. I do not feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
69. a. I already know all I need to know about my feelings.
   b. As life goes on, I continue to know more and more about my feelings.

70. a. I hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.
   b. I do not hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.

71. a. I will continue to grow only by setting my sights on a high-level, socially approved goal.
   b. I will continue to grow best by being myself.

72. a. I accept inconsistencies within myself.
   b. I cannot accept inconsistencies within myself.

73. a. Man is naturally cooperative.
   b. Man is naturally antagonistic.

74. a. I don't mind laughing at a dirty joke.
   b. I hardly ever laugh at a dirty joke.

75. a. Happiness is a by-product in human relationships.
   b. Happiness is an end in human relationships.

76. a. I only feel free to show friendly feelings to strangers.
   b. I feel free to show both friendly and unfriendly feelings to strangers.

77. a. I try to be sincere but I sometimes fail.
   b. I try to be sincere and I am sincere.

78. a. Self-interest is natural.
   b. Self-interest is unnatural.

79. a. A neutral party can measure a happy relationship by observation.
   b. A neutral party cannot measure a happy relationship by observation.

80. a. For me, work and play are the same.
   b. For me, work and play are opposites.

81. a. Two people will get along best if each concentrates on pleasing the other.
   b. Two people can get along best if each person feels free to express himself.

82. a. I have feelings of resentment about things that are past.
   b. I do not have feelings of resentment about things that are past.

83. a. I like only masculine men and feminine women.
   b. I like men and women who show masculinity as well as femininity.

84. a. I actively attempt to avoid embarrassment whenever I can.
   b. I do not actively attempt to avoid embarrassment.

85. a. I blame my parents for a lot of my troubles.
   b. I do not blame my parents for my troubles.

86. a. I feel that a person should be silly only at the right time and place.
   b. I can be silly when I feel like it.

87. a. People should always repent their wrongdoings.
   b. People need not always repent their wrongdoings.

88. a. I worry about the future.
   b. I do not worry about the future.

89. a. Kindness and ruthlessness must be opposites.
   b. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposites.

90. a. I prefer to save good things for future use.
   b. I prefer to use good things now.

91. a. People should always control their anger.
   b. People should express honestly-felt anger.
92. a. The truly spiritual man is sometimes sensual.
   b. The truly spiritual man is never sensual.

93. a. I am able to express my feelings even when they sometimes result in undesirable consequences.
   b. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.

94. a. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel bubbling up within me.
   b. I do not feel ashamed of my emotions.

95. a. I have had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.
   b. I have never had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.

96. a. I am orthodoxly religious.
   b. I am not orthodoxly religious.

97. a. I am completely free of guilt.
   b. I am not free of guilt.

98. a. I have a problem in fusing sex and love.
   b. I have no problem in fusing sex and love.

99. a. I enjoy detachment and privacy.
   b. I do not enjoy detachment and privacy.

100. a. I feel dedicated to my work.
     b. I do not feel dedicated to my work.

101. a. I can express affection regardless of whether it is returned.
      b. I cannot express affection unless I am sure it will be returned.

102. a. Living for the future is as important as living for the moment.
      b. Only living for the moment is important.

103. a. It is better to be yourself.
      b. It is better to be popular.

104. a. Wishing and imagining can be bad.
      b. Wishing and imagining are always good.

105. a. I spend more time preparing to live.
      b. I spend more time actually living.

106. a. I am loved because I give love.
      b. I am loved because I am lovable.

107. a. When I really love myself, everybody will love me.
      b. When I really love myself, there will still be those who won't love me.

108. a. I can let other people control me.
      b. I can let other people control me if I am sure they will not continue to control me.

109. a. As they are, people sometimes annoy me.
      b. As they are, people do not annoy me.

110. a. Living for the future gives my life its primary meaning.
      b. Only when living for the future ties into living for the present does my life have meaning.

111. a. I follow diligently the motto, "Don't waste your time."
      b. I do not feel bound by the motto, "Don't waste your time."

112. a. What I have been in the past dictates the kind of person I will be.
      b. What I have been in the past does not necessarily dictate the kind of person I will be.

113. a. It is important to me how I live in the here and now.
      b. It is of little importance to me how I live in the here and now.

114. a. I have had an experience where life seemed just perfect.
      b. I have never had an experience where life seemed just perfect.

115. a. Evil is the result of frustration in trying to be good.
      b. Evil is an intrinsic part of human nature which fights good.
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116. a. A person can completely change his essential nature.
   b. A person can never change his essential nature.

117. a. I am afraid to be tender.
   b. I am not afraid to be tender.

118. a. I am assertive and affirming.
   b. I am not assertive and affirming.

119. a. Women should be trusting and yielding.
   b. Women should not be trusting and yielding.

120. a. I see myself as others see me.
   b. I do not see myself as others see me.

121. a. It is a good idea to think about your greatest potential.
   b. A person who thinks about his greatest potential gets conceited.

122. a. Men should be assertive and affirming.
   b. Men should not be assertive and affirming.

123. a. I am able to risk being myself.
   b. I am not able to risk being myself.

124. a. I feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.
   b. I do not feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.

125. a. I suffer from memories.
   b. I do not suffer from memories.

126. a. Men and women must be both yielding and assertive.
   b. Men and women must not be both yielding and assertive.

127. a. I like to participate actively in intense discussions.
   b. I do not like to participate actively in intense discussions.

128. a. I am self-sufficient.
   b. I am not self-sufficient.

129. a. I like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.
   b. I do not like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.

130. a. I always play fair.
   b. Sometimes I cheat a little.

131. a. Sometimes I feel so angry I want to destroy or hurt others.
   b. I never feel so angry that I want to destroy or hurt others.

132. a. I feel certain and secure in my relationships with others.
   b. I feel uncertain and insecure in my relationships with others.

133. a. I like to withdraw temporarily from others.
   b. I do not like to withdraw temporarily from others.

134. a. I can accept my mistakes.
   b. I cannot accept my mistakes.

135. a. I find some people who are stupid and uninteresting.
   b. I never find any people who are stupid and uninteresting.

136. a. I regret my past.
   b. I do not regret my past.

137. a. Being myself is helpful to others.
   b. Just being myself is not helpful to others.

138. a. I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy or bliss.
   b. I have not had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of bliss.
139. a. People have an instinct for evil.
   b. People do not have an instinct for evil.

140. a. For me, the future usually seems hopeful.
   b. For me, the future often seems hopeless.

141. a. People are both good and evil.
   b. People are not both good and evil.

142. a. My past is a stepping stone for the future.
   b. My past is a handicap to my future.

143. a. "Killing time" is a problem for me.
   b. "Killing time" is not a problem for me.

144. a. For me, past, present and future is in meaningful continuity.
   b. For me, the present is an island, unrelated to the past and future.

145. a. My hope for the future depends on having friends.
   b. My hope for the future does not depend on having friends.

146. a. I can like people without having to approve of them.
   b. I cannot like people unless I also approve of them.

147. a. People are basically good.
   b. People are not basically good.

148. a. Honesty is always the best policy.
   b. There are times when honesty is not the best policy.

149. a. I can feel comfortable with less than a perfect performance.
   b. I feel uncomfortable with anything less than a perfect performance.

150. a. I can overcome any obstacles as long as I believe in myself.
   b. I cannot overcome every obstacle even if I believe in myself.
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