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ABSTRACT

The study investigated the levels of identification that function in selected teacher groups and the relationship of those levels to best-liked teacher model and least-liked teacher model. The processes of identification under consideration were integrative, emulative, and reactive.

One hundred and twenty-five elementary, middle, and secondary teachers in a southern metro area participated. Using Osgood's Semantic Differential Technique, which consisted of sixteen semantic differential bi-polar adjective pairs on seven-interval scales, subjects responded according to images of Self, Best-Liked Teacher and Least-Liked Teacher.

Descriptive statistics involving mean, standard deviation, D score and t test were used in analysis—the D score as a measure of distance between the subject profiles, the t test for the significance of the difference between correlated means of self and best-liked teacher model and self and least-liked teacher model.

Findings revealed a close identification regarding self and best-liked teacher model for the whole group, for male and female, for elementary and secondary, and for most-experienced subsets on the process of integrative identification; a close identification regarding self and best-liked teacher model for the whole group, for male and female, and for least-experienced and most-experienced subsets on the process of emulative identification; and a close identification regard-
ing self and least-liked teacher model for females on the integrative process, for females and the whole group on the emulative process, and for secondary teachers on the reactive process.

The revealed identifications provide supportive evidence to the literature that the classroom teacher as a model serves not only as a strong motivation in the choice to teach, but also serves through personality traits and attributes as a mechanism for future behaviors in the classroom.

Because of this factor, classroom teachers should be made cognizant of their potential for influencing those under their care; educators and supervisors should identify affective role models through assessment of personality traits and attributes; and teachers should receive counseling to assist them in personality adjustment.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Why one teaches is a factor in how one teaches. In a sense, the real power of teaching lies in this understanding. Teachers who are clear about their motivation for teaching come to the classroom prepared to work with students in ways that are in harmony with the teacher's ideals and in a manner which is personally satisfying to the teachers.

One strong motivation for many teachers is their identification with early role models—parents, and especially teachers. As Margaret Mead says:

Those who really want to teach usually have had the good fortune of having encountered a good teacher whose enthusiasm for her subject caught their imagination and they have stood against all other life models provided by relatives and friends.

Research, particularly of the 1950's, suggests that former teachers are important in a young person's decision to teach. In an "Analysis of Factors Influencing the Decision to Become a Teacher," a study conducted in 1955 by Clarence Fielstra and published in the May 1955 Journal of Educational Research, men were influenced by their teachers more than twice as often as by their parents. The juniors and seniors in the same

study rated teachers twice as high as parents on a scale of importance in their decision to teach. Sixty-four percent named a teacher while only 15 percent named a family member in the study "News and Comments: Should Children Teach?" conducted by Benjamin Wright and published in the April 1960 Elementary School Journal. Isabel Wilcox and Hugo Beigel found that the example of a teacher was mentioned more frequently than family influence in the decision of 152 freshmen to teach. One freshman summarized the influence of the teacher in this statement:

When I was in school I became very friendly with one of my teachers. She seemed to be the nicest person I had ever met and had all the attributes which I hope that I will someday have. That is why I chose teaching.¹

Therefore, not only do future teachers identify with the role of teacher, but also many identify at an early age.

Teaching should be chosen as a profession not merely because of intellectual interest, but equally so on the basis of emotional needs discovered during such experiences cited. While this, in the writer's opinion, should be viewed favorably, the very presence of emotional or psychological involvement makes a study of the levels of identification inherent in one's decision to teach significant for teachers, for their supervisors, and for children. The "learned" reasons which influence the decision to teach, that is, the replies which teachers think are expected of them—"teaching is essential work," or "desire to help society," should be viewed as only one aspect of a teacher's profile. For teacher training programs and recruitment centers, an awareness of the adult formulation of the original, or underlying motive should have specific validity with respect to motivational configurations of

teachers.

Certainly, supervisors concerned with improvements in education cannot ignore the fact that in the end, improvements will depend largely on teachers' knowledge of self. More importantly, solutions to some of the more critical problems such as teacher "burnout," low teacher ratings, incompetent teachers, unmotivated teachers, and teachers not knowing why they are doing what they are doing, may be approached through those who teach. Since identification with early role model of teacher can influence the decision to teach and can effect certain behaviors in teachers, a study of the effects of the processes of identification on the classroom teacher has some practical importance for those who teach.

Teachers not only influence young people through direct training, but also through identification. For much of a teacher's behavioral repertoire is believed to be acquired through identification with the important teacher in that teacher's early life. More specifically, the point of identification with admired teacher, an early role model, as the origin of certain personal and role-oriented qualities perceived in the style and manner of teaching is crucial in understanding teachers, their approaches and their interpersonal and human relations skills to teaching.

A recurrent controversy is whether identification is best construed as a normal process of becoming like a significant other through social learning, or whether identification should be considered defensive behavior stemming from an interpersonal conflict. The researcher's own view is that some degree of similarity between the behavior of a subject and the object of identification does exist. This aspect of identification is emphasized by those who view identification as a developmental
process of social learning, and by those who measure identification empirically in terms of the real or perceived similarity between the object and the subject.

It would seem profitable to investigate how the teacher conceives her personal and role-oriented qualities formed through the processes of identification. For a key component in determining teacher effectiveness becomes the degree of identification associated with the student-teacher interaction. Thus, the present study is directed toward determining the levels of identification which appear to contribute to or distract from the perceived or inferred similarity between student and teacher.

Significance of the Study

The importance of exploring the levels of identification functioning in the classroom teacher can not be overemphasized. Teachers exert a profound influence on students, even to the point of causing particular individuals to re-orient their philosophy of life and adopt a new and usually more socially responsible vocational goal such as teaching. Proof that some teachers are more memorable than their subject matter is found in the fact that their personalities are often more firmly fixed in students' minds than the subject matter of their teaching. In fact, a teacher's personality and ideas are perceived and absorbed, and become the basis for future behavior.

The extent to which the teacher relates to the images of best-liked teacher or of least-liked teacher as objects of identification will determine whether her personal and role-oriented qualities contribute to the teaching/learning process. Further, the extent to which integrative, emulative, and reactive processes of identification relate to
these qualities determines the type of teaching personality brought to the classroom.

These perceptions point to the fact that there are levels of identification operative in those who teach. More importantly, these perceptions imply that a way to improve the educational process would be to examine these levels of identification present in teachers to see if teachers as models can serve as recruiters for effective teachers. By providing children with a particular kind of teacher-personality, it should be possible to influence the kind of people they will become. The impact of this idea is considerable.

If children experience more than the ideas expressed by a teacher, then what a teacher is actually like becomes fundamental to the educational process. Therefore, justification for this study is based on the premise that through a better understanding of the levels of identification between self and best-liked and self and least-liked teacher models that effect student-teacher interaction and the resultant identification processes, educators can facilitate a more meaningful, creative, and comprehensive educational experience for all students. Further, a study of the levels of identification between self and best-liked teacher and self and least-liked teacher of a selected teacher group—analyzed as to male, female; elementary, secondary; least-experienced and most-experienced—should provide valuable data for teachers, supervisors, and others concerned with education. For the classroom teacher has impact, not only on the decision to teach, but also on the personal and role-oriented qualities of those who teach.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to ascertain information regarding the
development of certain personality traits and behavioral attributes which effect teachers' interpersonal skills in the classroom. The evidence gleaned from prior research indicated that identification with the teacher has a persuasive influence on the student's development at both cognitive and affective levels. With students spending a large portion of their waking hours in the classroom, the teacher ultimately is considered a key figure not only in making the decision, but also in shaping behavior.

**Statement of the Problem**

This study was designed to investigate the effects of identification on one's decision to teach. More specifically, this study sought to determine the levels of identification that function in a selected group of teachers, and to determine if those levels are similar to best-liked teacher model or similar to least-liked teacher model. Therefore, the study generally sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the level of identification between self and best-liked teacher model and self and least-liked teacher model for a selected teacher group on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

2. What is the level of identification between self and best-liked teacher model and self and least-liked teacher model for male/female teachers on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

3. What is the level of identification between self and best-liked teacher model and self and least-liked teacher model for elementary/secondary teachers on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

4. What is the level of identification between self and best-liked teacher model and self and least-liked teacher model for least-experienced/most-experienced teachers on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

5. What is the level of identification between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of reactive
identification for selected teacher group?

6. What is the level of identification between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of reactive identification for male/female teachers?

7. What is the level of identification between self and least-liked teacher model for reactive identification for least-experienced/most-experienced teachers?

8. What is the level of identification between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of reactive identification for elementary/secondary teachers?

More specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Does the selected teacher group relate to best-liked teacher as early role model on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

2. Does the male or female teacher relate to best-liked teacher as early role model on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

3. Does the secondary teacher or the elementary teacher relate to best-liked teacher as early role model on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

4. Does the least-experienced teacher or the most-experienced teacher relate to best-liked teacher as early role model on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

5. Does the selected teacher group relate to least-liked teacher as early role model on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

6. Does the male or the female teacher relate to least-liked teacher as early role model on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

7. Does the secondary teacher or the elementary teacher relate to least-liked teacher as early role model on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

8. Does the least-experienced teacher or the most-experienced teacher relate to least-liked teacher as early role model on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

9. Does the selected teacher group relate to best-liked teacher as early role model on the process of reactive
identification?

10. Does the male teacher or the female teacher relate to best-liked teacher as early role model on the process of reactive identification?

11. Does the secondary teacher or the elementary teacher relate to best-liked teacher as early role model on the process of reactive identification?

12. Does the least-experienced teacher or the most-experienced teacher relate to best-liked teacher as early role model on the process of reactive identification?

13. Does the selected teacher group relate to least-liked teacher as early role model on the process of reactive identification?

14. Does the male teacher or the female teacher relate to least-liked teacher as early role model on the process of reactive identification?

15. Does the secondary teacher or the elementary teacher relate to least-liked teacher as early role model on the process of reactive identification?

16. Does the least-experienced teacher or the most-experienced teacher relate to least-liked teacher as early role model on the process of reactive identification?

Hypotheses

Based generally on the principles of identification theory, teacher personal, and teacher role-oriented qualities, the null hypotheses which this study seeks to test are:

1. There will be no significant difference between the measurable integrative process of identification of selected teacher groups and best-liked and least-liked teacher models.

2. There will be no significant difference between the measurable emulative process of identification of selected teacher groups and best-liked and least-liked teacher models.

3. There will be no significant difference between the measurable reactive process of identification of selected teacher groups and least-liked teacher model.
Definition of Terms

The definitions below related to identification are significant for this study:

1. **Identification** is a multifaceted concept viewed as the measured similarity between subject and teacher as model in the context of this study.

2. **Attitudinal identification** is an aspect of identification wherein the identifier has one or more persons whom he/she admired and respected sufficiently as early role models and therefore simulates their behavior, or one or more persons whom he/she envied as early role models and therefore does not simulate their behavior.

3. **Behavioral identification** is an aspect of identification wherein the identifier's behavior is somehow related to the behavior of the model. This relationship may exist operationally in three processes of identification:
   a. **Integrative identification**—a process motivated by the need to maintain one's general integration as developed through the incorporation of qualities of the early role model of teacher.
   b. **Emulative identification**—a process motivated by the desire to acquire the strengths needed in the specific role aspects of professional behavior.
   c. **Reactive identification**—a counter-identificatory process motivated by a revulsion or rebellion against qualities in the early role model or teacher.

Limitations of the Study

1. Conclusions and implications from the study are limited in their generalizability. Such generalizations should be made judiciously. Since the present study involved only one hundred and twenty-five elementary, middle, and secondary teachers assigned to locations in the Atlanta Public School System, generalizations to teachers at other levels and other systems should be made judiciously.

2. The instrument used in this study consisted of word pairs selected from a list reported by Osgood as having highly distinctive loadings for each factor. The investigator used descriptive adjective bipolar pairs from Osgood's list with seven-step scales on evaluation,
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1. Conclusions and implications from the study are limited in their generalizability. Such generalizations should be made judiciously. Since the present study involved only one hundred and twenty-five elementary, middle, and secondary teachers assigned to locations in the Atlanta Public School System, generalizations to teachers at other levels and other systems should be made judiciously.

2. The instrument used in this study consisted of word pairs selected from a list reported by Osgood as having highly distinctive loadings for each factor. The investigator used descriptive adjective bipolar pairs from Osgood's list with seven-step scales on evaluation,
potency, and activity factors. The bipolar pairs selected for this study may not be adequate or appropriate to judge any concepts other than the ones used in this study.

3. The adjective pairs reflecting personality traits and behavior attributes used in this study do not lend themselves to the prediction of teacher success or effectiveness in the classroom; the pairs indicate only that such personality traits and behavior attributes lend themselves to reflect teacher attitude and behavior.

**Assumptions of the Study**

1. Validation of the instrument was assumed on the basis of Osgood and Suoi's validation studies.

2. Processes of identification with the teacher as previously operationally defined, were accurately assessed by the instrument employed.

3. Teachers have sufficient knowledge to answer the questions presented based on semantic meaning and have had adequate contact with best-liked and least-liked teachers as early role models to permit equitable ratings.

**Theoretical Assumption**

In this study, the researcher set forth the idea that the relationship of identification with early role model of teacher has an impact on the decision to teach as well as on personal and role-oriented qualities of the teacher. There were three processes of identification—integrative, emulative, and reactive. Each was measured using the three dimensions of Osgood's Semantic Differential—evaluation, potency, and activity.

**Organization of Chapters**

Chapter I presented the rationale for the study, purpose of the study, statement of the problem, hypotheses, research questions, definition of terms, limitations and assumptions. Chapter II presents a
review of the literature covering the concept of identification, theories of identification, identification with teacher, techniques for assessing identification, and research studies. Chapter III presents sampling method for subjects, collection of data, development of instrument, reliability and validity, interpretation and treatment of data. Chapter IV gives a presentation and analysis of data. Chapter V presents the summary, findings, conclusions, discussion, implications, and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Teaching as a profession is a challenge which should call to its ranks the most promising young people. Of all professions, it claims the largest personnel. Presently, increased registrations in teacher-training institutions, better salaries, longer tenure, lower turnover, and increase in the number of parochial schools have resulted in a surplus of teachers. Decline in the birth rate and recent economic conditions have lowered the demand for teachers in the past several years, causing the number of unplaced teachers to be even greater. But, in spite of the indicated oversupply, permanent or cumulative, there are not too many competent teachers.

With a large oversupply of teachers quantitatively, there has been, for the first time in this country, an opportunity to select a more competent personnel. This, in turn, permits the development of a training program on a new and better level. No doubt the present economic situation has tempted various institutions of higher learning to accept almost any calibre of student. This practice cannot be justified in institutions that are training for vocations, particularly the teaching profession. A further increase in number of teachers may not be to the best interest of the profession. The quality rather than the quantity should be raised.
Further, the opportunity to select a more competent teaching personnel in turn permits the development of a selective device which purportedly discriminates good from poor teacher candidates. Employers for too long have depended heavily on information gathered during interviews with the candidates, records of performance in college (particularly student teaching), personal recommendations, and, when applicable, a record of the last teaching position held. This practice of selecting teachers for the classroom obviously cannot guarantee the hiring of competent teachers. A further hiring of incompetent teachers will not be in the best interest of society.

Business and industry have had, however, tremendous impact on the teaching profession, in that many possibly good teaching candidates have become interested in these facets of society instead of teacher education. Therefore, what is projected in terms of the status of the teaching profession just well may be as a 1974 Rand Corporation study concluded:

In sum, it appears that if and when the (teacher surplus) ends, the inertia in the system will lead to an almost immediate onset of a substantial and lengthy teacher shortage.1

Yet research using the approach of asking teachers of students why they became teachers, or why they are interested in becoming teachers has not been emphasized or conducted recently because of the over supply of teachers. The trend in research, instead, has resorted to using approaches that focus on teacher characteristics, motivation of students, behavioral objectives, teacher performance, classroom discipline,

accountability, and other educationally related issues.

Thus the need for substantive investigations in the area of teacher-student identification is great since available evidence suggests clearly that student identification with the teacher is, as aforementioned, a salient contributing condition for affective as well as cognitive learning. W. F. White reiterates this premise by stating that:

"....There have been voluminous attempts to correlate selected characteristics of teacher and students, but very little has been based on social learning theory and interpreted with constructs of identification."

The above observations set the parameters for the review of related literature for this study on the levels of identification obtained through the early role model of teacher, inherent in the choice to teach. Focus is on research investigations conducted from about 1923 to 1979. In 1979, J. Marc Jantzen did a survey, not applicable to a teacher shortage, which emphasized the enthusiasm of former teacher as influence in teaching.

Relevant to this study is the emphasis on the construct of identification as a basic element in teaching. The construct of identification has diversified descriptions and various theories. Though psychoanalytic theorists' frame of reference to the identification processes is the major thrust of this study, other theorists from the social learning and cognitive approaches to identification, which forms the basis of this study, reflects the importance of the psychological

---

childhood as the formation of the occupational motives of teachers. Thus, Chapter II gives an analysis of the following topics: 1) Concept of Identification, 2) Theories of Identification, 3) Identification with Teacher, 4) Techniques for Assessing Identification, and 5) Research Studies.

**Concept of Identification**

Since identification plays a significant part in the shaping of vocational interest, focus on the concept of identification in terms of its varied conceptual treatment is necessary. It is a generally accepted notion that individuals behave more like their parents, particularly in same sexed parent, than other adults at random. This behavior is learned, at least in part, and this type of learning is the social matrix from which the concept of identification is drawn. Descriptions of this term have been quite diverse. As W. S. Lair states:

> Much of the confusion arising as to the nature of identification has been due to the lack of agreement in describing what is meant by this term. Much of this difficulty arises from the failure to distinguish between the various forms which identification may take.¹

Lionel H. Lazowick's mediation theory of identification indicates that:

Identification usually implies a relationship between two persons—a subject and a model. Views of the nature of this relationship may be classified into three categories. The first represents those definitions which imply that the subject behaves as if he and the model were one and the same person. The second category of definitions is one in which

---

most definitions fall—imitation. The third category of definitions characterizes identification as a change in personality structure.¹

Lazowick's mediation theory of identification has not gone without criticism, however. For example, J. J. Wasterman insists that

A distinction be drawn between identification and a later process—that of putting one's self as identical with another person, in a period when "self" and others are already discriminated.²

Percival Symonds writes:

...identification takes place when one person copies another person. In this sense, identification is practically synonymous with imitation. Yet, there is a distinction between identification and imitation on the grounds that identification refers to the action of the entire personality while imitation is more restrictive in terms to referring to isolated skills or acts.³

In a more positive direction, the category of definitions characterizing identification as a change in personality structure is discussed by R. P. Knight, who bases his viewpoint on Sigmund Freud's treatment of the concept. Knight states that Freud:

Outlines the nature of this change in a discussion of personality development. In essence, where superego takes place of the parental functions, identification is said to have occurred. It is the accomplished fact, not the process (introjection or learning) which is referred to as identification.⁴

A review of the literature on the concept of identification reveals, still further, other various viewpoints. To the layman, identification is epitomized by the small boy who apes his father's gestures and mannerisms. To Sigmund Freud identification is:

A process involving three stages: 1) Primary identification in early childhood, a stage in which the infant is unable to distinguish between self and object (mother); 2) Anaclitic (or dependent) object choice; and 3) Loss or fear of loss of an object, and identification with the consequently abandoned object.¹

To these ideas, his daughter, Anna Freud, added the notion of identification as a function of fear of the aggressor, from which comes the phrase "aggressive" identification.

To Robert R. Sears identification is:

Role practice. Where the parent has provided food, warmth and emotional support, the child seeks periods of parent's absence to provide such gratification for himself through efforts at simulating the parent's behavior.²

Whereas to Albert Bandura identification is:

....observational learning. In the context of experimental psychology, observational learning tends to be known as imitation, but in personality theory, it is labelled as identification.³

Many writers in their treatment of the concept of identification propose still varied distinctions. To Freud and Sears, identification is the disposition to reproduce a wide variety of the model's behaviors,


whereas Bandura tends to see identification as the reproduction of behaviors from a variety of models. Bronfenbrenner says:

Identification is a term that has been used to refer to three orders of phenomena: 1) motive, which creates in the identifiers a desire to simulate the behavior of the model; 2) the resulting behavior; and 3) the process through which such motives and behaviors are learned.¹

Finally, because of such diversified descriptions and because of the hypothesized sources of influence involving only social systems and certain or their properties, it is probably useful to take note of Stoke's proposed comprehensive list of determinants of identification. He points out that factors influencing identification are:

The biological fact of sex and its predisposition to some forms of behavior; the social pressures upon children to identify with their own sex; the degree of affection accorded to the child by the person with whom identification is attempted; the degree of acquaintance which the identifier has with the identified person; the clarity of the role or the person with whom identification is attempted; the temperament of the child in relation to the person with whom identification is attempted; the existence of strong needs on the part of the child which conflict with or coincide with the requirements and pattern of the person with whom identification is attempted.²

Theory of Identification

To discuss the complex formulation of Freudian and neo-Freudian positions regarding identification in detail would be beyond the purview of the present study. The view presented here represents only major theoretical contributions considered relevant to the topic in question: the levels of identification inherent in the decision to teach.


The concept of identification's origin can be traced to an early essay written by Sigmund Freud in 1917. Urie Bronfenbrenner summarized Freud's theoretical position of identification as "the attachment of the libido to a person," which Freud postulated as an "emotional tie with an object." P. Slater made the poignant observation that:

Freud himself was not totally contented with his formulation, and died dissatisfied with it. For he recognized the versatility of identification which led to his extending and revising the original construct. Yet Freud elaborated on the point that identification was the endeavor to mold a person's own ego after the fashion of one who has been taken as a model.1

However, Albert Bandura stated that "...psychoanalytic theory has provided the most widely accepted explanation of the identification process." He and his associates of the psychoanalytic theory of identification have documented the relationship of identification to the condition of social learning. Within their framework, identification is:

...the occurrence of similarity between the behavior of a model and another person under conditions where the model's behavior has served as the determinative cue for the matching responses.2

Bandura and his associates further postulate that:

...observational learning is generally labeled to the tendency for a person to reproduce the action, attitudes, or emotional responses exhibited by real-life or symbolized models.3

---

3 Ibid.
However, Robert Liebert and Michael Spiegler summarized the basic features subsumed in the psychoanalytic literature. They outlined three distinct categories as:

a) Identification being a perceptual process whereby the individual matches and/or distinguishes objects or events in the external world.

b) Defensive identification, also called identification with the aggressor, referring to the active efforts of the child to become like the same sexed parent in order to resolve the Oedipus conflict.

c) Anaclitic identification meaning the child's desire to emulate his parents, so that he might gain approval and acceptance of warm and endearing parents.

Many theorists, using the psychoanalytic, social learning, and cognitive approaches to identification have attempted to clarify the construct of identification. Perhaps because of such psychoanalytic theorists as John Dollard, Neal E. Miller, P. Slater, Robert R. Sears, and Albert Bandura attempts to extend and clarify the formulations or because of the esoteric qualities of the psychoanalytic ideology, the resultant effect has been the appearance of a profusion of related theories.

For example, Neal E. Miller and John Dollard explained a learning-theory mechanism of identification which proposed that:

Copying discrete behavior is of prime importance. It is possible that a more detailed analysis would show that the mechanisms involved in copying are involved in that aspect of character or superego formation which the Freudians have described as identification.


2 Neal E. Miller and John Dollard, Social Learning and Imitation (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1941), p. 164.
From a learning standpoint, extrinsic reinforcement ultimately provides for the imitation of behavior. Jerome Kagen expressed the same basic theoretical framework. He concluded that:

The child consciously attempts to emulate the specific characteristics of a model deemed attractive whereby these behaviors become intrinsically rewarding. Through the act of emulation, for example, the identifee assumes that possessing the positive attributes of a successful model insures his own success.  

On the other hand, cognitive approaches to identification have stressed the developmental aspects of association with imitative behavior. This viewpoint of identification was posited by such cognitive-developmental scientists as Oval H. Mowrer, L. Kohlberg, Justin Aronfreed, and Jean Piaget. Their specific reference was made to the import of learning mechanisms at a cognitive or simple conditioning level, through the maturation process and its changes in cognitive processing of social and moral behaviors.  

This formulation differs from learning theory conceptually in that this may or may not directly lead to permanent response patterns of behavior. The theory, however, accepted the psychoanalytic position that "...the ego's judgement of perceived similarity between self and others are basic structural components of attitudes of identification." The major differences between Freudian and cognitive theories of identification as pointed out by Kohlberg are:

a) Identification is viewed as a cognitive-structural stage of more general imitative or social-sharing processes.  

---

b) Accordingly, it is not uniquely dependent upon particular motives and ties only present in the early parent-child relationship.

c) Identifications are not totally fixed, irreversible or "internalized." Identifications are "solutions" to developmental tasks which may change in object or nature with new developmental tasks.1

This study focuses on the social learning approach which has been documented by the psychoanalytic theory of identification. In doing so, the contribution of Harry S. Sullivan, among the ranks of theorists, directly supposes the influence of social interaction, or the learning-theory mechanism of identification. Sullivan assigns a prominent role to significant others in the development of the entire individual self-system. He stresses:

During childhood, significant others provide both approval and disapproval to the child. The child is influenced not only by his image as reflected by others, but also by the emulative reflection of others.2

In an even more emphatic way, Sullivan contends that the self is the part of the personality which is born entirely out of the influence of significant others. Further, Don C. Dinkmeyer traces the influence of significant others upon the child's self-concept development. He writes:

The influence of significant others upon the child's self-concept development starts with the parents, then, the role of the teacher; the role of the teacher being of prime importance. For the teacher becomes proportionally more

---


important as she deviates from the pattern of self-reflection found in the home.1

Particularly relevant to the present study because of the social-learning thrust is Eric H. Erikson's contribution to identification theory. Erikson postulates:

The child passes through a period of "identity crisis." During this phase of life, the crucial issue becomes the freeing of parentally dependent superego, so that a more stable self-identity is formed. During the period of "identity diffusion," marked by extremes of subjective experiences, alternatives of ideological choice and potentialities of realistic commitment, the child embarks on a course of self-exploration through close interaction with existing milieu, and the significant others who play vital roles in it.2

Consequently, one of the most important significant others is the teacher with whom the child identifies.

Identification with Teacher

Originally, identification was applied by psychoanalysts to the acquisition of the superego by children through identification with their parents. However, research reveals that the concept is often applied indeed to ways in which students learn from teachers. Considering this conception, teachers can exert force on their students by somehow insuring that the student has positive attitudes or negative attitudes toward the teacher. Although the process of learning through identification is sometimes considered to be merely a special case of conditioning, a separate literature has grown up around identification with teacher. This literature reflects that in matters of taste,


appreciation, or values, where students cannot experience any logically compelling reason for considering something good or bad, right or wrong, the process of identification with teacher takes over.

Past research, however, pertaining to identification with the teacher has been meager and confused. P. R. Holmes found in the study "The Relationship of Overachievement and Underachievement in the Upper School Grades to Student Identification with the Teacher," published in American Psychology, 1961, contradictory evidence for his hypothesis that overachievers identify more with teacher figures than do normal achievers (those achieving at ability level) and these, more than underachievers. Analysis of this contradiction suggested that there are different kinds or identification with teacher figures. In fact, L. Vanderhost emphasizes that:

Previous investigation in the area of identification with teacher was virtually non-existent; however it would appear that the student, involved in a transference-like relationship with the teacher, the same way that he experienced drives toward or away from his parents.¹

A. H. Gardner in "A Developmental Study of Inferred Identification," 1967, attempted to deduce if there were actual age and sex differences when evaluating the self in reference to significant others, or in other words, to what extent do these independent variables influence the identification process. He measured attitudinal changes in regard to: 1) parents, 2) best friends, 3) best-liked teacher, 4) usual self, and 5) ideal self. For the present study, his findings in regard to best-liked teacher are of most consequence. His data revealed

significantly higher ratings by females to "Teacher I Like Best" across all grade levels. In addition, it was found that males do not change their ratings appreciably from the sixth grade, and that females rated teachers higher from the sixth to the twelfth grades. Gardner surmised that females exhibit a closer affinity to teachers than their male counterparts.

The teacher, however, as model is likely to engage the capacities for self-deception. When one thinks of himself as he once was, as a student, there is a tendency to reconstruct the self at the feet of a great teacher—some great man, or perhaps only a kindly and devoted one—someone who has infused inwardly a modest claim to merit. Joseph Adelson in an article of rare insight and sapience focused on some basic formulations of identification between learner and mentor. He maintained that:

There is something in us, something almost archetypal, that makes us feel that we achieve our maturity only after taking over the strength and wisdom of our teachers. For a teacher to serve as a model is at the very heart of teaching. Self-esteem may demand it. In childhood, the construct of identification provides the means through which needed restructuring or crystallizations of personality take place. ¹

Invariably, there are many types of influence, or many modes of connections that bind students and teachers to each other because of the pluralism in teaching. Adelson speaks of the teacher as marked by the qualities of power, energy, and commitment. This teacher's orientation is "narcissistic." Adelson states:

---

There is a narcissism which makes a hidden plea to the audience; it cries out: "Look how wonderful I am! Admire me! Love me!" There is narcissism which is vindictive and vengeful; it says: "I love myself. Who needs you?" There is also another and rarer form of narcissism which affects us quite differently from these. It is directed neither toward nor against the audience; it is autonomous, internally fed, sustaining itself beyond the observer’s response to it.  

It is the latter form of narcissism—ingenuous, autonomous which, when it is joined to other qualities, makes the teacher memorable. This orientation invites identification, that is, to share in its bounty, to seek its protection and care, or to join its omnipotence.

On the contrary, Adelson reports that the teacher may serve as a negative model. In this sense, students use the teacher as a lodestar, from which they sail away as rapidly as they can, seeming to say: "Whatever he is, I will not be. Whatever he is for, I will be against." Adelson says:

Teachers who exercise this power of revulsion are, in their own way, charismatic types; indeed, the teacher who is charismatically positive for some will be negative for others. He breeds disciples or enemies; few remain unmoved. If we follow a student’s development closely enough we generally discover both positive and negative models; the decision to be or become like someone goes hand in hand with a negative choice of identity and ideals.  

Adelson cited a variety of examples of how students, during the course of their academic training, can be adversely influenced by a teacher, which he considers to be a case of "identification with the aggressor." He additionally provided accounts of teachers who have the ability to impart a unique positive inspiration to their students. These are the effective educators who have the ability to combine the

1 Ibid., p. 414  
2 Ibid.
qualities of charisma, competence, and influence. Adelson recognized the importance of the construct, and challenged educational researchers to conduct investigations utilizing the identification paradigm, to establish a better understanding of its components.

E. E. Baughman and G. S. Welsh also recognized the need for research evidence which would help clarify the much-discussed phenomena of teacher characteristics and their concomitant influence in the classroom. They stated succinctly that:

How and to what extent, a teacher's characteristics affect the developing traits of pupils are questions that future empirical research will have to answer; at the moment we must argue primarily from theoretical propositions and anecdotal materials.¹

In examining theoretical propositions and anecdotal materials, Anna Freud provided a particular relevant descriptive case history, depicting the powerful influence teachers maintain, as identifying figures. She relates that:

...The master complained that the boy's behavior, if were blamed or reproved, was quite normal. When master, pupil and psychologist were together, the situation was explained. The boy's grimaces were simply a caricature of the angry expressions of the teacher and that, when he had to face a scolding..., he tried to master his anxiety by involuntarily imitating him. The boy identified himself with the teacher's anger and copied his expression as he spoke.... Through his grimaces he was assimilating himself to, or identifying himself with the dreaded external object.²

---


Consequently, to recapitulate from the few direct attempts to examine and analyze the process of teacher identification, it is evident that personality and behavioral characteristics attributed to the teacher are major influencing factors in the process. Accepting the evidence that teacher identification plays an important role in those who have chosen teaching as a career, a teacher's effectiveness can thusly be gauged by the degree of identification one is capable of eliciting.

**Techniques for Assessing Identification**

The measurement of identification, like the various theories of identification, contains many inherent problems as evident in the words of Heilbrun:

> Since no single identification theory is clearly established and the criterion measures employed in studies of identification are open often to serious criticism in themselves, it's clear that no single finding can stamp an identification measure as valid.  

Yet, some of the more prevalent techniques used in measuring identification include direct interview and objective tests. The interview by and large has been used to obtain a criterion with which one or more secondary measures can be correlated. This approach is highly subjective and liable to contain biases held by the interviewer. In view of this factor, literature reveals that the interview has been used somewhat extensively as a technique for assessing identification.

---

A study, "Patterns of Child Rearing," conducted in 1957 by Sears, Maccoby and Levin, used the interview to obtain information from three hundred and seventy-nine mothers and compared the data with indices of conscience formation of the child, enabling them to make inferences about parental identification. A study, "A Comparison of Direct and Fantasy Measures of Identification," conducted in 1957 by Bieri, Lobeck, and Galinsky and published in the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology in 1959, used the interview with ninety undergraduates to collect what they considered to be a direct measure of identification. They compared direct, indirect, and fantasy measures of identification. They used the interview as a direct measure and, relevant to the present study, Osgood's Semantic Differential as an indirect measure of perceived similarity. They concluded that a significant relationship exists between direct and indirect measures. Further, they indicated that identification measures may be viewed in relation to degrees of directness, meaning that "...the extent to which a person is aware of and focused upon reporting an aspect of his experience."

Along with the interview, the questionnaire and essay, most frequently employed beginning about 1950, are techniques for assessing identification. However, Benjamin Wright's study, "Identification and Becoming a Teacher," conducted in 1958, used the analysis of personal anecdotes from learning and teaching experiences to gain insight into identification and teaching. The Draw-a-Teacher Test, and Word Completion Form have also been used to assess identification.

Roderick Langston's study, "A Study of Attitudes toward Teaching as a Vocation," conducted in 1950, used the non-directive group discussions. The subjects were informed that discussion leaders wanted to
know exactly what the subjects thought about teaching as a career. The statements were then classified into a list of attitudes from which a questionnaire was developed and administered to groups of subjects.

The most popular devices for assessing identification, however, have been the more objective approaches. Included in this category are the Q-Sorts, Adjective Checklist, Semantic Differential, and various other questionnaires designed for the expressed purpose of comparing subject and model. The method generally consists of the subject answering the questionnaire as he perceives his model would. A comparison of scores provides an index of identification. Another method requires the subject to complete a questionnaire whereby he rates himself as well as his model to establish an identification level based on assumed similarity.

For the present study, Osgood's Semantic Differential Technique was the measuring device used for assessing identification. This technique consists of a series of bipolar scales, segmented into seven intervals which have the facility for quantifying connotative meaning associated with given concepts. The method required the subjects to complete questionnaires whereby they rated themselves as well as best-liked and least-liked teacher models to establish an identification level based on assumed similarity.

**Research Studies**

Such studies, investigating motives or reasons why people select teaching as their profession, have been conducted with three kinds of subjects: high school students, college freshmen--usually enrolled in an introductory course in education, and classroom teachers. Most
relevant to this study, however, are the studies conducted with experienced teachers as subjects such as Gerhard Lang's "Motives in Selecting Elementary and Secondary Teacher," 1958; J. L. Horton's "General Motives and Influences in Vocational Development," 1953; and Donald W. Robinson's "Analysis of Motives for the Choice of a Teaching Career," 1944.

Much of this research on motives for teaching has been conducted on a very peripheral level. Therefore, many investigations have elicited the "top-of-the-head" reasons, which consistently turned out to be idealistic, generally admired, and socially desirable in nature. Two of such reasons are "I like working with children" and "I want to serve society." Their subjects have not volunteered such reasons as "I want to control others," or "Teaching allows me to express hostility." Yet, such less idealistic and less socially acceptable reasons may have been factors operating in the decision to teach.

Therefore, there seems to be at least one basic difficulty with the cavalcade of studies that attempt to find out why people intend to become teachers or why they are teachers. They assume that the individual really knows what motivated him into teaching and that he is able to write it down briefly in the place provided for it. They assume that he can disentangle the knot of cultural and socio-economic factors from the psychological ones. They underestimate the complexity of motivation and assume that it can be broken down into a few factors such as "love of children or desire for security."

Generally, it has been taken for granted that such choices were made rationally and purposefully, that people understand their motives and that spontaneous answers given to questions about choice and
behavior are true and dependable. In fact, one of the first such investigations conducted for the purpose of discovering motives for teaching was made by David Newark in 1923 at Philadelphia Normal School. Out of the 666 students responding, 463 indicated that their reason for teaching was "wanted to teach." Such a statement, however, does not identify any specific reason for choosing teaching and characterizes the vagueness of the motivation of the candidates.

Several other studies were conducted with similar results. In 1926, S. D. Lee investigated the motives of 826 students enrolled at Jamaica Teachers Training College in New York City. From a prepared checklist of 25 motives, the students were requested to indicate their first, second, and third reasons, in order of the strength of the influence exerted by each, which led them to select teaching as a profession. Lee commented, "Many of the motives prominently mentioned were indicative of no real professional interest." In 1929, E. V. Hollis questioned 400 freshmen enrolled at Moorehead State Teachers College, Moorehead, Kentucky, and asked them to indicate why they should teach and why they really desired to teach. As a method of introducing students to a serious consideration of their vocational plans, this study represents an interesting approach and as the author concluded:

The group has chosen teaching for almost every reason known to human ingenuity, and for no reason at all. Apparently their being in teaching is more a matter of chance than of reasoned choice.

In 1929, E. Einhardt investigated the motives for teaching, using 400 freshmen at Eastern Illinois State Teachers College. He reported a

E. V. Hollis, "Why They Teach," Education Administration and Supervision 15 (1929): 76.
similar absence of professional interest. Of the 400 students, thirty percent indicated that the reason for their choice of teaching was to earn enough money to prepare for other occupations. Also, C. V. Valentine conducted an investigation in the four English universities at Birmingham, Leeds, Sheffield, and University of Newcastle-on-Tyne in 1933. The questionnaire used in this study asked students to rank their original motives upon entering training. Valentine reports that there was evidence that a liking for teaching and a genuine interest in education had developed during the period of professional training.

Two hundred forty-eight college students from the College of the Pacific, Stockton, California, and forty-five members of Phi Delta Kappa from XI Chapter, Sacramento, California, participated in a study conducted in 1947 by L. Marc Jantzen on factors that influenced them in choosing teaching as a profession. Both groups were in close agreement in their ranking of the first three items: 1) interest in children and young people, 2) summers for study, travel, and relaxation, and 3) reasonable assurance of an adequate income. The author concluded that many of the reasons for lack of interest in teaching were apparent in the findings of this study, and that however unrealistic the planning and expectations of students toward a vocation, it was the attitude towards conditions under which teachers work that determines the available supply of qualified personnel in the educational profession.

Based on these studies mentioned at this point, one realizes that even after teachers or prospective teachers tell us that they are motivated to teach by the love of children, to earn enough money to prepare for other occupations, etc., there is but a vague idea as to how these motives expressed in specific qualities are involved in the teacher's
interaction with students, or in the teacher's basic attitude toward teaching. Too, we know even less about the origins of these motives.

In fact, Donald E. Super noted that:

Such factors as love of children, summers free, etc., are often claimed as the reason for vocational choice when some other reasons or motives are actually the fundamental reasons. It is necessary for vocational choice to satisfy an individual's needs of achievement, prestige, and other personal objectives. ¹

Anneliese Korner stated in "Origin of Impractical or Unrealistic Vocational Goals," that "it is a well established fact that vocational choice is often made in answer to a basic personality need within the individual."

One study made which points to the vocational choice made on the basic personality need within the individual was done by Isobel Wilcox and Hugo G. Beigel in 1943. They used a technique of asking freshmen enrolled in a teacher education course to write their answers to the following question: "What particular happening, experience, or occasion first turned your attention or thought toward teaching?" The students were enrolled in a state teacher's college in the New York metropolitan area which prepared students for work in elementary schools. With the limited analysis of student responses, several conclusions were drawn. It was seen that teaching was chosen not merely because of intellectual interest, but more frequently, on the basis of emotional needs or psychological needs.

The relevance of the psychological process of identification in childhood or the formation of the occupational motives of teachers is

suggested by the works of several investigators. The studies of Francis H. Austin and M. V. Seagoe have, for example, brought out the importance of parents and former teachers in young peoples' decisions to become teachers. Francis M. Austin's study, "An Analysis of the Motives of Adolescents for the Choice of the Teaching Profession," conducted in 1931 concluded that the strongest single influence of all is that of the adults with whom the children come into contact. The direct influence of relatives or teachers was the reason most often given at all ages. May V. Seagoe in her study (1942), "Some Origins of Interest in Teaching," concluded that personal motivation on the part of a teacher, either through direct advice or through acting as the personal ideal at the elementary school level was a significant factor contributing to potential teachers and their behavior in the classroom. Clarence Fielstra in the study, "An Analysis of Factors Influencing the Decision to Become a Teacher," conducted in 1955, summarized the findings to include the most pertinent and influential factor in causing the subjects to become teachers as being inspirational teachers.

Further, Richey and Williams' study, "An Analysis of Various Factors Associated with the Selection of Teaching as a Vocation." conducted in 1948, asked their high school students "Which person has been the greatest help to you in deciding the kind of work you want to do when you finish high school?" Half named their parents, about 10 percent named a teacher. However, in the Yale-Fairfield Study of 1956, among college students studying education, the balance between the influence of parent and teacher shifted. Senior women were found to be influenced by their parents only slightly more than by their teachers. Senior men were found to be influenced by their teachers more than twice as often as by their parents.
On the contrary, Isobel Wilcox and Hugo Beigel's investigation, "Motivation in the Choice of Teaching," in 1953, found that among first-semester freshmen, the example of a teacher was mentioned more frequently than "family influence." Thomas Ringness' study of "Relationship Between Certain Attitudes Toward Teaching Success," of 1952, revealed that the seniors mentioned teachers 59 percent of the time and parents only 27 percent as influences in the choice of teaching as a career. In fact, Ringness concluded that "the teacher as a recruiting agent for future teachers has been too much disregarded."

Indeed, the teacher has influence on prospective teachers. J. Marc Jantzen summarized in the March-April, 1981, Journal of Teacher Education, four surveys for 1946, 1949, 1951, and 1979 of college students who chose to go into teaching. Several items were especially designed for the 1940's in terms of the then teacher shortage and thus were not as applicable in 1978-1979. Of particular interest to the present study was the "enthusiasm of a former teacher" category which ranked fourth in the 1979 survey as the reason to become a teacher. This particular item rated 40% in 1946 and 1949, 52% in 1956, and 59% in 1979, thus a notable upward trend of significance. Jantzen advanced the generalization that current classroom teachers should realize their potential influence on prospective teachers among their pupils.

Understandably, H. A. Matora's study, "Similarity in Teacher and Pupil Personality," proposed in 1954 that students and their teachers shared similar personality traits. A series of scales were designed for rating teachers in personality categories by their peers. Accordingly, the students were rated by classmates, who were in turn rated by their teacher, using the scales. The results suggested that student person-
ality was imbued with certain traits which trace their origins to the teacher. Thus, it was noted that the wide-reaching influence of the teacher was evident and the teacher was an identifying figure.


Subjects imitate not only discriminate responses but also other behaviors, performed by the model. Children learn to imitate behavior exhibited by an experimenter-model, and a nurturant interaction between the model and the child enhance the secondary reward properties of the model and thus facilitate such imitative learning.

Barbara Sherman's study, "Teachers' Identification with Childhood Authority Figures," conducted in 1963, revealed that:

Motives for teaching originate in the interpersonal relations of childhood....The attitudes and behaviors of the teacher reflect some role which the teacher wants to play,

---

1 Albert Bandura and Aletha Huston, "Identification as a Process of Incidental Learning," *Journal of Educational Research* (February, 1962); 89.
feels she ought to play, or for some reason needs to play.¹

Further, Philip W. Jackson and Fred Moscovici’s study, "The Teacher-to-Be: A Study of Embryonic Identification with a Professional Role," published in *The School Review*, 1963, which surveyed whether students preparing to teach were already beginning to identify with the professional role of teacher, gave some indications of an embryonic identification with the teacher through the use of the Draw-A-Teacher Test.

Benjamin Wright’s study, "Identification and Becoming a Teacher," published in *The Elementary Journal*, 1959, involving the analysis of personal anecdotes from learning and teaching experiences helps to explain, essentially, the particular nature of findings or studies that direct one’s attention to the teacher’s interpersonal relations in childhood as an important source of the motives that will be served through teaching. Implicit in Wright’s work as in the present study, is the assumption that motives expressed in occupational behavior are largely derivatives of the motives underlying the need and desire to take on the qualities of significant others in early development.

The literature reviewed contained research on 1) concept of identification and its role in teaching as a profession, 2) theories of identification, 3) identification and the teacher, 4) methods of assessing identification, and 5) research studies. The studies reviewed were related to investigations mainly conducted from the early 1920’s to 1979, which were used to develop the rationale for the hypotheses. The

hypotheses were initially stated in Chapter I.

The absence of studies indicating specific levels of identification that function in those who have chosen teaching as a profession provides further importance for the investigator to pursue the identified problem. Osgood's Semantic Differential Technique as a tool allowed the researcher to measure not only similarity and degree of involvement, but also to examine the relationship between these measures. The method required the subject to complete a questionnaire whereby he rated himself as well as best-liked and least-liked teacher models to establish an identification level based on assumed similarity.
CHAPTER III
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to investigate the levels of identification inherent in one's decision to teach. More specifically, it sought to determine the levels of identification obtained through a relationship with the early role model of teacher, that function in those who teach. The hypotheses the study sought to test are:

1. There will be no significant difference between the measurable integrative process of identification of selected teacher groups and best-liked and least-liked teacher models.

2. There will be no significant difference between the measurable emulative process of identification of selected teacher groups and best-liked and least-liked teacher models.

3. There will be no significant difference between the reactive process of identification of selected teacher groups and least-liked teacher model.

Research Method and Procedures

The study, descriptive in nature, used a stratified random sampling of 125 elementary, middle, and secondary teachers. Since questions which generate answers that contribute to theory about educational concerns are many times answerable through the study of current conditions and existing relationships, the descriptive method of research was chosen. The descriptive method was felt to be appropriate by the researcher for examining ex post facto the levels of the processes of
identification present in selected teacher groups. The descriptive method was also felt appropriate for allowing the researcher to interpret the measured relationships between selected teacher groups and best-liked and least-liked teacher models.

Thus the researcher, in using the descriptive method, focused on reporting, describing, and analyzing the existing levels of identification by way of Osgood's Semantic Differential factors—evaluation, potency, and activity. The Semantic Differential is a series of bipolar scales, segmented into seven intervals which have the facility for quantifying connotative meaning associated with the given concepts of Self, Best-liked Teacher, and Least-liked Teacher. In order to measure the levels of identification, Osgood's Semantic Differential was the indirect measure or the perceived similarity aspect of identification.

Subjects were asked to rate themselves, their best-liked and least-liked teacher models on each of the Semantic Differential factors. There was a random ordering of the dimensions that subjects rated so as to reduce possible response sets in the ratings. The scores of perceived similarity of self to best-liked and least-liked teacher models were obtained and analyzed.

The descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation were computed. Also, a computation of the t test enabled the researcher to test the three hypotheses concerning the relationship between the independent variable of identification and the dependent variable of teacher as well as to assess the magnitude of the relationship. A "D" score was computed as a measure of distance between the subject profiles; the t test was computed to test the significance of the difference between the dependent or correlated means.
**Subjects**

The subjects for this study consisted of 125 teachers in the Atlanta Public School System, Atlanta, Georgia. Forty-seven were elementary teachers, 16 were middle-school teachers, and 62 were secondary teachers.

The Research Department of the Atlanta Public School System was contacted for the purpose of asking permission to conduct this study. A stratified random sampling of 43 schools was selected from the list of 127 elementary, middle, and secondary schools in the system. Thirty elementary schools, 4 middle schools, and 9 secondary schools were selected. Teachers were also selected using a stratified random selection procedure (see Appendix A). No efforts were made to distinguish race for the purpose of analysis. However, the study revealed the sample population to be 4% white and 96% black (see Appendix B). Seventy-seven percent of the respondents were female. These data reflected a predominant sample population of black, female teachers. The average number of years of experience of teaching was approximately 14 years (see Appendix C).

**Collection of Data**

The sampling process was conducted in the spring of 1982. After the samples of schools and teachers were selected, test packets were sent to the participating teachers. The packet included a letter (see Appendix D) to the teachers and three semantic differentials each composed of the same sixteen bipolar adjective pairs with seven interval scales (see Appendix E). Principals of the schools with teachers involved in the study were sent a test packet and a letter (see Appendix
F) apprising them of the nature of the study and the names of teacher participants in their schools. The researcher asked subjects to respond to the instrument at their earliest convenience and return them directly to her.

The task confronting each subject consisted of three basic segments: 1) filling out a biographical questionnaire, which sought the subject's sex, race, present school, number of years of teaching in the Atlanta Public School System, and total number of years of teaching experience (see Appendix G); 2) rating of self; and 3) rating of selected teachers in best-liked and least-liked teacher categories, utilizing the Semantic Differential. The estimated time to complete the scales was approximately ten minutes.

Subjects responded to each Semantic Differential according to images of self, best-liked teacher and least-liked teacher. Five bipolar adjective pairs represented each factor of evaluation, potency, and activity.

Development of the Instrument

Development of the instrument used for this study was based on the Semantic Differential Technique, developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum. In the present study, perceived similarity between teachers' rating of themselves and significant others according to the bipolar descriptors was the criterion to be measured. The Semantic Differential was selected as the measurement technique because it is a generalized technique, adaptive in its ability to answer a variety of research questions dealing with a subject's attitude. Seven-interval scales were used to produce a more robust measure of semantic meaning.

The fifteen bipolar scales used for this study are those pairs
reported by Osgood et al to have generally high evaluative loadings. These are shown in Table 1. Each of the three dimensions—evaluation, potency, and activity—was measured by five pairs. The positive and negative signs of the relationship between self and significant others made it possible for the subjects to be divided into two groups. Subjects checking the first, second, or third intervals on the scales were placed in a positive group. Subjects checking the fifth, sixth, or seventh intervals were placed in a negative group. Those scoring 4 were regarded as being in a neutral position.

**TABLE 1**

CLASSIFICATION OF ADJECTIVES IN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Potency</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>- Boring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>- Bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>- Tensed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>- Exciting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>- Vague</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>- Weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>- Submissive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>- Resistive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm</td>
<td>- Lenient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>- Youthful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>- Passive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>- Static</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>- Slow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitable</td>
<td>- Calm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>- Unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability

Test-retest reliability data for the Semantic Differential have been obtained by Tannenbaum. Six concepts were judged against six evaluative scales by 135 subjects on two occasions separated by five weeks. Attitude scores were computed. The test-retest coefficient ranged from .87 to .93, with a mean correlation of .91. Divesta's study, "A Normative Study of 220 Concepts Rated on the Semantic Differential by Children in Grades 2 through 7," Journal of General Psychology, 1966, revealed similar results of reliability. The test-retest reliability reported by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum was .85 with immediate retest.

Validity

Osgood discussed examples of research which appear to support the validity of his technique. One noteworthy study, "Probability-Learning, the Statistical Structure of Concepts and the Measurement of Meaning," American Journal of Psychology, 1957, was conducted by C. M. Selley and S. J. Messick. Their study verified the precept that the Semantic Differential can be predictive. This was demonstrated when they used profiles of arbitrary concepts to assay connotative meaning. The validity of the Semantic Differential as a measuring device was investigated by Suci. He was able to show a significant correlation coefficient of .82 between semantic differential scores. A second testing session produced a correlation coefficient of .81, making it apparent that whatever the Thurstone scales measure, the semantic dif-
ferential measures just about as well.

Therefore, the writer accepts the consensual opinion that the Semantic Differential measures attitude components associated with an individual's subjective judgment pertaining to selected concepts.

**Interpretation**

Lionel M. Lazowick in "On the Nature of Identification," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1955, recognized that the Semantic Differential could be an effective tool for assessing identification. He derived a "D" value, which consisted of taking the sum of the squared difference from the scaled position for each concept rated by the subject and the subject's images of the model, and then finding the square root. Lazowick states, "...this D value may serve as an operational definition of identification; D being a measure of semantic similarity between subject and images of the model for a given concept."

Jane A. Kelly and L. H. Levy in "The Discriminability of Concepts Differentiated by Means of the Semantic Differential," *Educational Psychology Measurement*, 1961, reported the results of their study intending to support the validity of the D score and the psychological assumptions gleaned from it, the D score being the measure of distance between the subject profiles. Forty-six men and twenty-nine women undergraduates were presented with Semantic Differential profiles and a set of alternate pairs of concepts, with directions to choose which concept was represented. Their predictions were accurate, for as the number of correct responses increased, so did the concomitant size of the D statistic.

For the present study, the D value as described above will serve as an inferred, or more precisely as an indirect measure of identification,
mainly because the procedure involved in obtaining an identification value is somewhat disguised. This is also in accordance with the recommendation of Beri, Lobeck, and Galinsky as expressed in "A Comparison of Direct, Indirect, and Fantasy Measures of Identification," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1959. They considered the Semantic Differential to be an indirect means of assessing identification when the subject is not consciously aware of making a direct and deliberate comparison between himself and significant others.

The following guidelines were used in the interpretation of the scores:

1. Semantic Differential, evaluation dimension—a higher positive score indicated greater integrative identification between self and significant others. A low positive score reflected little integrative identification. Integrative identification is motivated by the need to maintain one's general personal integration as developed through incorporation of qualities of early authority figures, whereas, the evaluation factor measures the extent to which the stimulus (model) has positively or negatively reinforced the individual's response.

2. Semantic Differential, potency factor—A higher positive score of this dimension showed higher emulative identification between self and significant others. A low positive score reflected little emulative identification. Emulative identification is motivated by the desire to acquire certain needed strengths, thus causing a certain amount of efforts to be put into a response to a stimulus and changing one's adjustment to stimuli. Similarly, the potency factor denotes a description
of strength. It measures the amount of adjustment that is made or must be made to a stimulus, or perhaps the amount of effort which is put into a response to a stimulus.

3. Semantic Differential, activity factor—A higher activity score reflected high reactive identification between self and significant others. A low activity score reflected little reactive identification. Reactive identification is motivated by revulsion of a stimulus, whereby the activity factor refers to description of movement. It more specifically refers to the necessity or nonnecessity of making movement in adjusting to stimuli. It makes it necessary to change one's adjustment to stimuli.

To increase the sensitivity of the instrument, a scale of seven was inserted between each pair of terms, so that the subject would indicate the direction and the intensity of each judgment. The subject had the task of indicating for each item (pairing of a concept with a scale) the direction of his/her association and its intensity on a seven-step scale. The following example was included in the directions for the instrument.

CONCEPT
(Best-liked teacher)

Polar term X  _____ _____ _____ _____  Polar term Y
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Further, the scale position was defined for the subject in the instructions as:

(1) Extremely X  (7) Extremely Y
(2) Quite X  (6) Quite Y
(3) Slightly X  (5) Slightly Y
(4) Neither X nor Y; Equally X and Y
Therefore, the stage was set for the mediating processes to be measured by presenting the subject with a "concept" and with a series of bipolar scales. The subjects were asked to judge the concepts of Self, Best-liked Teacher, and Least-liked Teacher on scales consisting of word pairs to measure personal and role-oriented qualities. The rating was presented by complete instructions illustrating the type of ratings wanted, how the marks were to be made and the like. The concepts to be rated and the scales to be used were selected in light of the purpose of this study. Table 2 reflects the basic structure of the instrument used in this study. In responding to the instrument, the teacher was asked to mark an X between the bipolar adjective scales, while focusing attention on the concepts.

Figure 1 reflects, in using the semantic differential as a measure of identification processes, the major thrust of this study as it relates to the evaluation, potency and activity factors.

**Treatment of Data**

In order to test the hypotheses, it was necessary to devise methods to quantify the responses on the instruments (see Appendix H), used for the study. Teachers' responses to the semantic differential produced the following types of scores:

1. Three sub-scores based on responses to the concept "Self"
   a. An evaluation score
   b. A potency score
   c. An activity score

2. Three sub-scores based on responses to the concept "Best-liked Teacher"
### TABLE 2

**BIPOLAR PAIRS USED IN THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitable</td>
<td>Calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Youthful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm</td>
<td>Lenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Resistive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Submissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimistic</td>
<td>Pessimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>Boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Vague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>Tensed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 1. Identification Matrix for Selected Teacher Group and Best-Liked and Least-Liked Teacher Models on Each Dimension and Mean Scores.
a. An evaluation score
b. A potency score
c. An activity score

3. Three sub-scores based on responses to the concept "Least-
liked Teacher"
   a. An evaluation score
   b. A potency score
   c. An activity score

In scoring the instruments, values were assigned from "1" to "7"—one extreme to another. Response values for all items of each sub-score were totalled.

One statistical procedure was used to test the three hypotheses. The t test was computed to test the significance of the difference between correlated means of self and best-liked teacher and self and least-liked teacher. The D scores were computed as a measure of distance between the subject profiles. The D scores and the t scores, representing each concept, were compared with those of another group. The group variables were selected teacher group, male/female, secondary/elementary level, least-experienced/most-experienced.

A significance level of .05 was used for the t test. The level of significance indicated the magnitude of a test statistic which was necessary for the statistical null hypotheses to be rejected. If the statistical null hypotheses were rejected at the .05 level of significance, it indicated that the probability of the difference due to chance was .05 or less. The .05 level was selected because this value provides a stronger basis for hypothesis rejection and a more valid premise for drawing conclusions from the findings.
Chapter III presented a discussion of the sample population used in this study, the method used in selection of the sample population and in collection of data. The semantic differential was examined for: 1) advantages, 2) mechanics of use, and 3) the particular adjectives chosen for the concepts of Self as Teacher, Best-liked Teacher, and Least-liked Teacher. Treatment of data and development of the instrument were also discussed.

The statistical method of analysis, scoring procedures for the semantic differential and interpretation for each dimension used to measure each type of identification are included. Table 1 presented the adjectives under each classification. Table 2 presented an example of the basic structure of the instrument used for the study. The instrument's reliability and validity were assumed based on empirical data from research studies conducted by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum. The results of their studies support the semantic differential as both a valid and reliable instrument.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This study investigated the levels of identification inherent in the choice to teach. The purpose was to determine the difference in levels of identification that function in selected groups, and to determine the relationship of those levels to best-liked teacher model or least-liked teacher model. Table 3 presents a summary of that relationship of those levels to best-liked and least-liked teacher models.

Table 3

A SUMMARY OF THE RELATIONSHIPS OF SELF TO MODELS SHOWN TO BE SIGNIFICANT FOR SELECTED GROUPS ON PROCESSES OF IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>, Integrative, Emulative ,</th>
<th>Reactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selected Teacher Group</td>
<td>(125) Best/ Best/Least</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>( 96) Best/ Best/Least</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>( 63) Best/ Least</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>( 62) Best/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most-Experienced</td>
<td>( 39) Best/ Best/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>( 29) Best/ Best/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least-Experienced</td>
<td>( 28) Best/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More specifically, the study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. Are there differences in the level of identification between self and best-liked teacher model and self and least-liked teacher model for selected teacher group on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

2. Are there differences in the level of identification between self and best-liked teacher model and self and least-liked teacher model for male/female teachers on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

3. Are there differences in the level of identification between self and best-liked teacher model and self and least-liked teacher model for elementary/secondary teachers on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

4. Are there differences in the level of identification between self and best-liked teacher model and self and least-liked teacher model for least-experienced/most-experienced teachers on the processes of integrative and emulative identification?

5. Are there differences in the level of identification between self and least-liked teacher model on the processes of reactive identification for selected teacher groups?

6. Are there differences in the level of identification between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of reactive identification for male/female teachers?

7. Are there differences in the level of identification between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of reactive identification for elementary/secondary teachers?

8. Are there differences in the level of identification between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of reactive identification for least-experienced/most-experienced teachers?

Research Method and Statistical Procedure

The descriptive method of research was used for this study in order
to examine ex post facto the levels of identification existing in selected teacher groups. A semantic differential was used to gather data, from which D scores and t values for selected teacher groups between self and best-liked teacher and self and least-liked teacher were computed. The D score was computed to determine the distance between subject profiles and was used as a measure of semantic similarity between subject and model for selected teacher groups. The dependent t test was computed to determine the significance of mean score differences and D score differences.

**Subjects**

The subjects consisted of 125 teachers grouped as selected teacher group, and grouped according to sex (male and female), teaching levels (elementary and secondary), and teaching experience (least-experienced and most-experienced) to determine if either of the variables (sex, educational level and teaching experience) affected the level of identification functioning in the teacher.

**Purpose and Organization of this Chapter**

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze the data necessary for answering the research questions. The data are presented and analyzed for each selected teacher group according to the respective hypotheses.

**Presentation and Analysis of Data**

**For Hypothesis One**

Hypothesis One: There will be no significant difference between the measurable integrative process of identification of selected teacher groups and best-liked and least-liked teacher models.

Hypothesis One was concerned with integrative identification of
which the evaluation factor is a function. For each selected teacher group the mean score, D score and t-statistic were computed.

**Selected Teacher Group**

The mean scores (Table 4) on the process of integrative identification were 7.00 for self and best-liked teacher, and 15.45 for self and least-liked teacher. The D scores (Table 4) were 129.34 for self and best-liked teacher and 1206.16 for self and least-liked teacher. These mean scores and attendant D scores for selected teacher group indicated a closer identification between self and best-liked teacher model than between self and least-liked teacher model on the processes of integrative identification.

In order to ascertain if these mean differences are significant, the t test was applied. The t test yielded a t score of 1.99 for self and best-liked teacher model and a t score of 3.36 for self and least-liked teacher model. In order for the t score to be significant at the .05 level, the table value of 2.77 was required for selected teacher group. The computed t score for selected teacher group between self and best-liked teacher model indicated no significant difference in identification. A significant difference in identification between self and least-liked teacher model was found. Therefore, the null hypothesis for the measurable integrative process of identification was supported for selected teacher group and best-liked teacher model and rejected for selected teacher group and least-liked teacher model.

**Male/Female Teacher Groups**

The mean scores (Table 4) on the process of integrative identification were 7.49 for female teachers and best-liked teacher and 13.73 for female teachers and least-liked teacher. The mean scores were 5.36 for male teachers and best-liked teacher and 17.69 for male teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores (Table 4) were 2.65 for male
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Self/Best</th>
<th>Liked Teacher</th>
<th>Self/Least-Liked Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>D Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Teacher Group</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>129.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(125)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>129.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>69.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>60.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most-Experienced</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least-Experienced</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P < .05
teachers and best-liked teacher and 912.25 for male teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores were 129.07 for female teachers and best-liked teacher and 331.85 for female teachers and least-liked teacher. These mean scores and attendant D scores for both male and female teacher groups indicated a closer identification between self and best-liked teacher model than between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of integrative identification.

In order to ascertain if these mean differences are significant the t test was applied. The t test yielded a t score of 0.36 for male teacher group and best-liked teacher model and a t score of 2.53 for male teacher group and least-liked teacher model. The t test yielded a t score of 1.99 for female teacher group and best-liked teacher model and a score of 2.53 for female teacher group and least-liked teacher model. In order for the t score to be significant at the .05 level, the table value of 2.048 was required for males and 2.000 for females. The computed t score for male teacher group and best-liked teacher model (0.36) indicated no significant difference in identification. A significant difference (2.53) between self and least-liked teacher model in identification was found. The computed t score (1.99) for female teacher group indicated no significant difference in identification between self and best-liked teacher model. A significant difference in identification between self and least-liked teacher model was found. Hence, the null hypothesis for the measurable integrative process of identification was supported for male and female teacher groups and best-liked teacher model; rejected for female teacher group and least-liked teacher; and rejected for male teacher group and least-liked teacher model.

Elementary/Secondary Teacher Groups
As presented on Table 4, the mean scores on the process of integrative identification were 6.91 for elementary teachers and best-liked teacher and 15.12 for elementary teachers and least-liked teacher. The mean scores were 7.08 for secondary teachers and best-liked teacher and 15.69 for secondary teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores (Table 4) were 69.32 for elementary teachers and best-liked teacher and 603.90 for elementary teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores were 60.61 for secondary teachers and best-liked teacher and 604.71 for secondary teachers and least-liked teacher. These mean scores for both elementary and secondary teacher groups point to a closer identification between self and best-liked teacher model than between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of integrative identification.

In order to ascertain if these mean differences are significant, the t test was applied. The t test yielded a t score of 1.88 for elementary teacher group and best-liked teacher and a t score of 2.28 for elementary teacher group and least-liked teacher model. The t test yielded a t score of 0.67 for secondary teacher group and best-liked teacher model and a t score of 2.31 for secondary teacher group and least-liked teacher model. In order for the t score to be significant at the .05 level, the table value of 2.000 was required for both elementary and secondary teachers.

The computed t scores for elementary and secondary teacher groups indicated no significant difference in identification between self and best-liked teacher model and a significant difference in identification between self and least-liked teacher model. Thus, the null hypothesis for the measurable integrative process of identification was supported for both elementary and secondary teacher groups and best-liked teacher.
model and rejected for both elementary and secondary teacher groups and least-liked teacher model.

**Least-experienced/Most-Experienced Teacher Groups**

The mean scores (Table 4) on the process of integrative identification were 5.43 for least-experienced teachers and best-liked teacher and 16.36 for least-experienced teachers and least-liked teacher. The mean scores were 6.10 for most-experienced teachers and best-liked teacher and 14.92 for most-experienced teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores (Table 4) were 5.10 for least-experienced teachers and best-liked teacher and 65.91 for least-experienced teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores were 7.62 for most-experienced teachers and best-liked teacher and 329.48 for most-experienced teachers and least-liked teacher. These D scores for both least-experienced and most-experienced teacher groups indicate a closer identification between self and best-liked teacher model than between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of integrative identification.

In order to ascertain if these mean differences were significant, a t test was applied. The computed t scores were 2.12 for least-experienced teacher group and best-liked teacher model and 2.42 for least-experienced teacher group and least-liked teacher model. The computed t scores were 1.55 for most-experienced teacher group and best-liked teacher model and 2.24 for most-experienced teacher group and least-liked teacher model. In order for the t score to be significant at the .05 level, the table value of 2.052 was required for least-experienced teachers and 2.042 was required for most-experienced teachers. The computed t score for least-experienced teacher group showed a significant difference in identification between self and both best-liked and
least-liked teacher models. The computed t score for most-experienced teacher group showed no significant difference in identification between self and best-liked teacher model and a significant difference in identification between self and least-liked teacher model. Therefore, the null hypothesis for the measurable integrative process of identification was rejected for least-experienced teacher group and best-liked and least-liked teacher models; supported for most-experienced teacher group and best-liked teacher model; and rejected for most-experienced teacher group and least-liked teacher model.

**Presentation and Analysis of Data**

**For Hypothesis Two**

**Hypothesis Two:** There will be no significant difference between the measurable emulative process of identification of selected teacher groups and best-liked and least-liked teacher models.

Hypothesis Two was concerned with emulative identification of which the potency factor is a function. For each selected teacher group, mean scores, D scores, and t-statistic were computed.

**Selected Teacher Group**

The mean scores (Table 5) on the process of emulative identification were 8.59 for selected teacher group and best-liked teacher and 13.17 for selected teacher group and least-liked teacher. The D scores (Table 5) were 116.51 for selected teacher group and best-liked teacher and 701.17 for selected teacher group and least-liked teacher. These D scores for selected teacher group indicated a closer identification between self and best-liked teacher model than between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of emulative identification.

In order to ascertain if these scores are significant, the t test
was applied. The t test yielded a t score of 0.65 for selected teacher group and best-liked teacher model and a t score of 2.51 for selected teacher group and least-liked teacher model. In order for the t score to be significant at the .05 level, the table value of 2.77 was required for the selected teacher group. The computed t scores for selected teacher group reflected no significant difference in identification between self and best-liked teacher and least-liked teacher models. Thus, the null hypothesis for the measurable emulative process of identification was supported for selected teacher group and best-liked/least-liked teacher models.

Male/Female Teacher Groups

The mean scores (Table 5) on the process of emulative identification were 9.15 for female teachers and best-liked teacher and 19.07 for female teachers and least-liked teacher. The mean scores were 6.75 for male teachers and best-liked teacher and 16.37 for male teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores (Table 5) were 7.81 for male teachers and best-liked teacher and 267.03 for male teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores were 117.30 for female teachers and least-liked teacher. These D scores for both male and female teacher groups indicate a closer identification between self and best-liked teacher model than between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of emulative identification.

In order to ascertain if these mean differences are significant, the t test was applied. The t test yielded a t score of 1.15 for male teacher group and best-liked teacher model and a t score of 2.24 for male teacher group and least-liked teacher model. The t scores were 0.74 for female teacher group and best-liked teacher model and 1.46 for
## TABLE 5

**MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, D SCORE, AND t-VALUE FOR SELECTED TEACHER GROUPS ON EMULATIVE PROCESS OF IDENTIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Self/Best-Liked Teacher</th>
<th></th>
<th>Self/Least-Liked Teacher</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>D Score</td>
<td>t-Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selected Teacher Group</strong></td>
<td>(125)</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>116.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>( 96)</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>119.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>( 63)</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>76.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>( 62)</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>42.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most-Experienced</td>
<td>( 39)</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>26.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>( 29)</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least-Experienced</td>
<td>( 28)</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P* < .05
female teacher group and least-liked teacher model. In order for the t score to be significant at the .05 level, the table value of 2.048 was required for male teachers and 2.000 for female teachers. The computed t scores for both male and female teacher groups reflected no significant difference in identification between self and best-liked teacher model; a significant difference in identification for male teacher group between self and least-liked teacher model; and no significant difference in identification for female teacher group between self and least-liked teacher model. Thus, the null hypothesis for the measurable emulative process of identification was supported for both male and female teacher groups and best-liked teacher model; supported for female teacher group and least-liked teacher model; and rejected for male teacher group and least-liked teacher model.

**Elementary/Secondary Teacher Groups**

As shown on Table 5, the mean scores on the process of emulative identification were 8.29 for elementary teachers and best-liked teacher and 3.11 for elementary teachers and least-liked teacher. The mean scores were 8.89 for secondary teachers and best-liked teacher and 15.23 for secondary teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores were 76.72 for elementary teachers and best-liked teacher and 376.45 for elementary teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores were 42.39 for secondary teachers and best-liked teacher and 328.03 for secondary teachers and least-liked teacher. These D scores for both elementary and secondary teacher groups showed a closer identification between self and best-liked teacher model than between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of emulative identification.

In order to ascertain if these mean differences are significant,
the t test was applied. The t test yielded a t score of 2.00 for elementary teacher group and best-liked teacher model and a t score of 2.30 for elementary teacher group and least-liked teacher model. The t scores were 2.00 for secondary teacher group and best-liked teacher model and 2.31 for secondary teacher group and least-liked teacher model. In order for the t score to be significant at the .05 level, the table value of 2.000 was required for both elementary and secondary teachers. The computed t score for both elementary and secondary teacher groups indicated a significant difference in identification between self and best-liked and least-liked teacher models. Therefore, the null hypothesis for the measurable emulative process of identification was rejected for both elementary and secondary teacher groups and best-liked and least-liked teacher models.

Least-Experienced/Most-Experienced Teacher Groups

As presented on Table 5, the mean scores on the process of emulative identification were 5.25 for least-experienced teachers and best-liked teacher and 21.45 for least-experienced teachers and least-liked teacher. The mean scores were 5.57 for most-experienced teachers and best-liked teacher and 13.80 for most-experienced teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores (Table 5) were 3.46 for least-experienced teachers and best-liked teacher and 364.55 for least-experienced teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores were 26.34 for most-experienced teachers and best-liked teacher and 355.85 for most-experienced teachers and least-liked teacher. These D scores for both least-experienced and most-experienced teacher groups indicate a closer identification between self and best-liked teacher model than between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of emulative identi-
In order to ascertain if these mean differences are significant, the t test was applied. The t test yielded a t score of 1.75 for least-experienced teacher group and best-liked teacher model and a t score of 2.42 for least-experienced teacher group and least-liked teacher model. The t scores were 1.71 for most experienced teacher group and best-liked teacher model and 2.33 for most-experienced teacher group and least-liked teacher model. In order for the t score to be significant at the .05 level, the table value of 2.052 was required for least-experienced teacher and 2.042 for most-experienced teachers. The computed t scores for both least-experienced and most-experienced teacher groups revealed a significant difference in identification between self and best-liked teacher model. A significant difference in identification between self and least-liked teacher model was found. Hence, the null hypothesis for the measurable emulative process of identification was supported for both least-experienced and most-experienced teacher group and best-liked teacher model and rejected for both least-experienced and most-experienced teacher groups and least-liked teacher model.

Presentation and Analysis of Data for Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis Three: There will be no significant difference between the measurable reactive process of identification of selected teacher groups and least-liked teacher model.

Hypothesis Three was concerned with reactive identification of which the activity factor is a function. For each selected teacher group, mean scores, D scores and the t-statistic were computed.
The mean score (Table 6) on the process of reactive identification was 15.18 for selected teacher group and least-liked teacher model. The D score (Table 6) was 953.18 for selected teacher group and best-liked teacher. This D score for selected teacher group indicated a distant identification between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of reactive identification.

In order to ascertain if this mean difference is significant, the t test was applied. The t test yielded a t score of 7.16 for selected teacher group and least-liked teacher model. In order for the t score to be significant at the .05 level, the table value of 2.77 was required for selected teacher group. The computed t score for selected teacher group indicated a significant difference in identification between self and least-liked teacher model. Hence, the null hypothesis for the measurable reactive process of identification was rejected.

Male/Female Teacher Groups

The mean scores (Table 6) on the process of reactive identification were 19.76 for male teachers and least-liked teacher and 29.24 for female teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores (Table 6) were 379.35 for male teachers and least-liked teacher, and 593.74 for female teachers and least-liked teacher. These D scores for both male and female teacher groups indicated a low level of identification between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of reactive identification.

In order to ascertain if these mean differences are significant, the t test was applied. The t test yielded a t score of 2.41 for male teacher group and least-liked teacher model and a t score of 2.06 for female teacher group and least-liked teacher model. In order for the t
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Self/Best-Liked Teacher</th>
<th>Self/Least-Liked Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Teacher Group</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>12.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>12.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most-Experienced</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least-Experienced</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( P < .05 \)
score to be significant at the .05 level, the table value of 2.048 was required for male teachers and 2.000 for female teachers. The computed t scores for both male and female teacher groups indicated a significant difference in identification between self and least-liked teacher model. Therefore, the null hypothesis for the measurable reactive process of identification was rejected.

**Elementary/Secondary Teacher Groups**

As presented in Table 6, the mean scores on the process of reactive identification were 14.90 for elementary teachers and least-liked teacher and 17.37 for secondary teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores, Table 6, were 521.98 for elementary teachers and least-liked teacher and 565.19 for secondary teachers and least-liked teacher. These D scores for both elementary and secondary teacher groups showed a low level of identification between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of reactive identification.

In order to ascertain if these mean differences are significant, the t test was applied. The t test yielded a t score of 2.28 for elementary teacher group and least-liked teacher model and 1.84 for secondary teacher group and least-liked teacher model. In order for the t score to be significant at the .05 level, the table value of 2.000 was required for both elementary and secondary teacher groups. The computed t scores for elementary teacher group showed a significant difference in identification between self and least-liked teacher model. The computed t score for secondary teacher group showed no significant difference in identification between self and least-liked teacher model. Thus, the null hypothesis for the measurable reactive process of identification for elementary teacher group and least-liked teacher model was rejected;
for secondary teacher group and least-liked teacher model it was supported.

**Least-Experienced/Most-Experienced Teacher Groups**

As shown in Table 6, the mean scores on the process of reactive identification were 20.00 for least-experienced teachers and least-liked teacher and 16.29 for most-experienced teachers and least-liked teacher. The D scores, Table 6, were 256.36 for least-experienced teachers and least-liked teacher and 406.16 for most-experienced teachers and least-liked teacher. These D scores for both least-experienced and most-experienced teacher groups indicated a low level of identification between self and least-liked teacher model on the process of reactive identification.

In order to ascertain if these mean differences are significant, the t test was applied. The t test yielded a t score of 2.40 for least-experienced teacher group and least-liked teacher model and a t score of 2.35 for most-experienced teacher group and least-liked teacher model. In order for the t score to be significant at the .05 level, the table value of 2.052 was required for least-experienced teachers and 2.042 for most-experienced teachers. The computed t scores for both least-experienced and most-experienced teacher groups indicated a significant difference in identification between self and least-liked teacher model. Consequently, the null hypothesis for the measurable reactive process of identification was rejected.

**Summary**

In order to answer the research questions, a semantic differential was used to gather data from which the mean scores, D scores, and t
scores were computed for each concept. The D scores were computed to measure the semantic distance between subject profiles and models on the three processes of identification. The independent t test was computed to test for the significance of the difference in mean scores. The group variables were selected teacher group (the whole sample) male/female, elementary/secondary, and least-experienced/most-experienced.

The testing of the hypotheses for each group yielded the following findings: Hypothesis One on the integrative process of identification was supported for selected teacher group (the whole sample), male, female, elementary, secondary, and most-experienced teacher groups and best-liked teacher model; supported for female teacher group and least-liked teacher model; and rejected for selected teacher group (the whole sample), male, elementary, secondary, least-experienced, and most-experienced teacher groups and least-liked teacher model.

Hypothesis Two on the process of emulative identification was supported for selected teacher group (the whole sample), male, female, least-experienced, and most-experienced teacher groups and best-liked teacher model; supported for female teacher group and least-liked teacher model; rejected for elementary and secondary teacher groups and best-liked teacher model; and rejected for male, elementary, secondary, least-experienced, and most-experienced teacher groups and least-liked teacher model.

Hypothesis Three on the process of reactive identification was supported for secondary teacher group and least-liked teacher model and rejected for selected teacher group (the whole sample), male, female, elementary, least-experienced, and most-experienced teacher groups and least-liked teacher model.
The obtained D scores of perceived similarity of self to best-liked and least-liked teacher models revealed a closer identification with best-liked teacher model than with least-liked teacher model. A high score for self and least-liked teacher model reflected a perception of dissimilarity between subject and least-liked teacher model, while a low score for self and best-liked teacher model reflected greater perceived similarity between subject and best-liked teacher model. Therefore, selected teacher groups had low D scores in perceiving themselves similar to best-liked teacher model and high D scores in perceiving themselves dissimilar to least-liked teacher model. The D value served as an operational definition of identification; D being a measure of semantic similarity between subject and model.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Since research reveals evidence of the importance of identification to the effectiveness, behaviors, personality and interpersonal skills of the classroom teacher, this study was designed to investigate the levels of identification in terms of perceived similarity between selected teacher groups and best-liked and least-liked teacher models as well as to determine if a significant relationship existed. The relevance of the psychological process of identification in the formation of the occupational motives of teachers directs one's attention to the teacher's interpersonal relations with his/her teacher model as an important source of the motives that will be served in teaching.

Therefore, the question that motivated this study was whether teachers show relation with best-liked and least-liked teacher models on the processes of integrative, emulative, and reactive identification. An important psychological question, however, concerns the depth of this commitment or the level to which it operates on a non-conscious or covert level. With respect to this question, the responses to a semantic differential by the subjects, a stratified random sample of teachers in secondary, middle, and elementary schools in the Atlanta Public School System, provided the data used to test the hypotheses of this study.
In Chapter I, the writer set forth a rationale for the investigation of the problem, the scope of the problem, and its hypotheses. Chapter II addressed the state of the topic through a review of the related literature under these rubrics: 1) Concepts of Identification, 2) Theories of Identification, 3) Identification with Teacher, 4) Techniques for Assessing Identification, and 5) Research Studies. Chapter III presented the research design employed in the conduct of this study: 1) Research Method, 2) Sampling Method for Subjects, 3) Collection of Data, 4) Development of Instrument (Reliability and Validity), and 5) Organization and Treatment of Data. Chapter IV presented and analyzed the data collected for this study for the purpose of answering the research questions. This chapter presents the interpretation of the major findings in the form of conclusions and implications. A summary, discussion, and recommendations provide closure for the study.

**Summary of Major Findings**

*From Analysis of Data*

Hypothesis One: There will be no significant difference between the measurable integrative process of identification of selected teacher groups and best-liked and least-liked teacher models.

1) D scores revealed a closer identification for selected teacher groups between self and best-liked teacher model than between self and least-liked teacher model.

2) The results of the t test indicated that on the process of integrative identification there was no significant difference in identification for selected teacher group, male, female, elementary, secondary, and most-experienced teacher groups regarding self and best-liked teacher model. There was also no significant difference in identification for the female teacher group regarding self and least-liked teacher model.

3) There was a significant difference for least-experienced teacher group and best-liked teacher model. A
significant difference for male, elementary, secondary, least-experienced, and most-experienced teacher groups regarding self and least-liked teacher model was found.

**Hypothesis Two:** There will be no significant difference between the measurable emulative process of identification of selected teacher groups and best-liked and least-liked teacher models.

1) D scores revealed a closer identification for selected teacher groups between self and best-liked teacher model than between self and least-liked teacher model.

2) The results of the t test indicated that on the process of emulative identification there was no significant difference in identification for selected teacher group, male, female, least-experienced, and most-experienced teacher groups regarding self and best-liked teacher model. There was also no significant difference in identification for the selected teacher group and the female teacher group regarding self and least-liked teacher model.

3) There was a significant difference in identification for male, elementary, secondary, least-experienced, and most-experienced teacher groups regarding self and least-liked teacher model.

**Hypothesis Three:** There will be no significant difference between the measurable reactive process of identification of selected teacher groups and least-liked teacher model.

1) D scores revealed a low level of identification for selected teacher groups between self and least-liked teacher model.

2) The results of the t test indicated that on the process of reactive identification there was no significant difference in identification for secondary teacher group regarding self and least-liked teacher model.

3) There was a significant difference in identification for selected teacher group, male, female, elementary, least-experienced, and most-experienced teacher groups regarding self and least-liked teacher model.

**Conclusions**

Based on the analysis of the findings of this study, the writer has drawn the following conclusions:
1. Analysis of selected teacher group on the processes of integrative and emulative identification, revealed that the selected teacher group achieved identification on the process of integrative identification with best-liked teacher model and on the process of emulative identification with both best-liked and least-liked teacher models. The writer concludes that selected teacher group achieved identification on the integrative process with best-liked teacher model, and on the emulative process with both best-liked/least-liked teacher models. Thus, behaviors of best-liked teacher in the integrative identification function in teachers; behaviors of both best-liked/least-liked teacher in the emulative identification function in teachers.

2. Analysis of male and female teacher groups on the processes of integrative and emulative identification revealed that both male and female teacher groups achieved identification with best-liked teacher model. The female teacher group was more ambivalent, since members of this group achieved identification with both best-liked and least-liked teacher models. The writer feels that the following conclusions are valid: 1) female teachers identify with both best-liked/least-liked teacher models on integrative and emulative processes; 2) sex is a discriminating factor in identification; 3) female teachers are cognizant of their attributes which are similar to least-liked teacher model; 4) males perceive themselves as most similar to their best-liked or favored teacher, i.e., as having the same "positive" attributes.

3. Analysis of elementary and secondary teacher groups on the processes of integrative and emulative identification revealed that both groups achieved identification with best-liked teacher model. Neither group, however, identified on the emulative process with best-liked teacher model. There was a difference between both self and best-liked and self and least-liked teacher model in the emulative process. The writer concludes that no distinction exists between elementary and secondary teachers in achieving identification in the integrative process, and therefore, teaching levels do not achieve identification through the emulative process with either best-liked or least-liked teacher model.

4. Analysis of teacher groups, organized on the basis of experience—least-experienced and most-experienced—on the processes of integrative and emulative identification, revealed that the least-experienced teacher group achieved identification only through the emulative process with best-liked teacher model, indicating an eagerness to follow courses of study and textbooks as an
expression of their need to submit to authority instead of to "cooperate" in the common enterprise of education. Analysis further revealed that the most-experienced teacher group achieved identification on both processes of integrative and emulative identification with best-liked teacher model. Both least-experienced and most-experienced teacher achieved identification through the emulative process with best-liked teacher model. This identification is revealed through emulating role-oriented qualities of best-liked teacher model. Thus, the writer concludes that role-oriented qualities of best-liked teacher in emulative identification function in teachers regardless of the years of teaching experience.

5. Analysis of selected teacher groups on the process of reactive identification, revealed that neither selected teacher group, male, female, elementary, least-experienced nor most-experienced achieved identification with least-liked teacher model. Hence, the writer concludes that teachers in these groups do not perceive any significant similarity between themselves and least-liked teacher model, i.e., the groups tend to reject those negative attributes associated with least-liked teacher model which are motivated by such reactive qualities as hate, disgust, revulsion, or rebellion.

6. However, the writer concludes that the secondary teacher group achieved identification through the reactive process with least-liked teacher model. This emphasis on qualities of the least-liked teacher model suggests that it may not be so much how the teacher carries out duties in the classroom that is being reacted against, as it may be the image of him/her as a person. Additionally, this emphasis suggests that the majority of teachers in this group are more concerned with subject matter than they are with personality behavior. In this case, teaching difficulties arise not so much in not knowing what to teach and how to teach it, but in the emotional difficulties that-

**Implications and Discussion**

The results of this study generally substantiate the postulation that teachers related to best-liked teacher model on integrative and emulative processes of identification. The extent to which the models' behaviors have come to influence the behaviors of the subjects for this
study is well illustrated by the results of the measures of the levels of identification present. Evidence from their ratings revealed that subjects perceive similarity of their personal and role-oriented qualities to those of their best-liked teacher models. Further, the results of the present study suggest that regardless of the quality of the model-child relationship, there were sufficient conditions for achievement of identification through the integrative, emulative, and reactive processes.

For example, a teacher may continue to identify with early role models through conforming behaviors in the classroom, a line of development in becoming and being a teacher. In another teacher, or possibly in the same teacher whom we see succumbing to early authoritative demands, we find him/her actively winning independence by emulating the qualities of an admired or envied teacher. We may also see through reactive identification, a teacher striving to become just the opposite of the identificatory figure or model.

While integrative and emulative identifications emphasize personal rewards found in conformity and independence, respectively, they are motivated primarily by need, fear of loss of love, admiration, and envy. Reactive identification emphasizes the personal reward found in oppositeness or rejection which is motivated by hate, disgust, and rebellion. The usefulness of this typology of identification for an investigation of the levels of identification inherent in those who teach, lies essentially in the motives for identification with learners.

The specification of the objects of these three kinds of identification does help in understanding the influence of identificatory motives in teaching. One may speculate that one reward the teacher
gains in becoming like the best-liked teacher model is the opportunity to create enjoyment for him/herself in the classroom, vicariously or symbolically, through expressive interaction with learners. Thus, it may be that the need to conform—a motive underlying integrative identification—involves the satisfaction of being a teacher as well as the satisfactions gained in the re-enactment of an expressive relationship with an admired teacher. It may be that the desire to obtain qualities of an admired professional model—a motive underlying emulative identification—is reflected in behaviors and attitudes.

However, that the professional role serves motives other than those associated with best-liked teacher model is suggested in secondary teacher group's reactive identification with their least-liked teacher model. For the secondary teacher group, the model of least-liked teacher for personal identity, the writer feels, is the embodiment of the stereotypical villain, the image of ineffectiveness in achieving the goals of teaching. In this instance, the negative or counter-identification may have been translated into a positive self-assessment and serves as a motivation to acquire personal qualities which counter the image or least-liked teacher.

The determination of the "right" personality through the judgments of what is liked and what is disliked about teachers is an approach that has a certain plausibility: a teacher who is liked probably is more effective in the classroom. The fact that learners may like a teacher for non-educational or even anti-educational reasons does not erase the fact that personality characteristics and qualities influenced through the construct of identification do affect teacher behaviors in concrete situations. These characteristics and qualities of the personality make
it possible to categorize the teacher as best-liked or least-liked, or make it possible to arouse favorable or hostile reactions in learners.

These perceptions point to the importance of interpersonal skills in teaching. Understandably, interpersonal skills are teaching skills which many Georgia educators, particularly those responsible for the development of the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) for beginning teachers, have declared as essential to effective professional performance. The teacher's proficiency in creating a comfortable learning atmosphere, in demonstrating enthusiasm, warmth, patience and friendliness, in communicating concerns, and in managing the classroom environment affects students' behavior in positive ways. On the contrary, a teacher who does not effectively negate such interpersonal skills in the classroom affects students' behavior in negative ways and therefore could very well profit by personal counseling.

In this study, the subjects responded anonymously to scales comprised of such related personality characteristics and qualities thought by the writer to be representative of personal and role-oriented qualities influenced through identification with early teacher models. These personality characteristics and qualities in alignment with the TPAI and in the form of bipolar adjective pairs, were used to assess the personal interaction between subjects used in this study and their images of best-liked and least-liked teacher models on the factors of evaluation (integration), potency (strength), and activity (rebellion). An analysis of the findings provided information that students are predisposed—as are all of us—to feel attracted or repelled by traits and attributes of others. The extent to which these attributes are assimilated and motivate teachers' behaviors is a matter of significance.
Indeed, educational administrators and classroom teachers should be aware that the learner will usually feel attracted to a teacher with such behaviors as "understanding, friendliness, responsibility, or enthusiasm" and will usually feel repelled by a teacher with opposite behaviors. He or she starts early to identify with the role of the teacher with such behaviors and such behaviors are important not only as preparation for teaching, but also for performance in teaching.

Research reveals evidence of a teacher's behaviors being reflected in his/her students. It further indicates that the learner is the product of his/her perceptions. That is, partaking of the experiences provided in the classroom fosters the development or acquisition of certain behaviors. Learners tend to acquire their teachers' behavioral and personality patterns as a result of their perceptions. Thus, it is significant for positive role models to be emulated by prospective teachers, and it is thereby significant for classroom teachers to serve as positive role models for learners who may be influenced to become teachers.

This researcher is not ready to propose that teachers select teaching as a profession based on identification with early role models of teacher, or that the behaviors expressed in the classroom are representative of behaviors modelled from early teachers. It does suggest, however, that identification is an important motivating factor in choosing to teach and how one teaches.

This study of the development of personality attributes indicates that candidates bring personalities to teacher education institutions which have been influenced by early role models. For this reason, the
for those who teach and for those who train and supervise teachers.

Indeed, educational administrators and classroom teachers should be aware that the learner will usually feel attracted to a teacher with such behaviors as "understanding, friendliness, responsibility, or enthusiasm" and will usually feel repelled by a teacher with opposite behaviors. He or she starts early to identify with the role of the teacher with such behaviors and such behaviors are important not only as preparation for teaching, but also for performance in teaching.

Research reveals evidence of a teacher's behaviors being reflected in his/her students. It further indicates that the learner is the product of his/her perceptions. That is, partaking of the experiences provided in the classroom fosters the development or acquisition of certain behaviors. Learners tend to acquire their teachers' behavioral and personality patterns as a result of their perceptions. Thus, it is significant for positive role models to be emulated by prospective teachers, and it is thereby significant for classroom teachers to serve as positive role models for learners who may be influenced to become teachers.

This researcher is not ready to propose that teachers select teaching as a profession based on identification with early role models of teacher, or that the behaviors expressed in the classroom are representative of behaviors modelled from early teachers. It does suggest, however, that identification is an important motivating factor in choosing to teach and how one teaches.

This study of the development of personality attributes indicates that candidates bring personalities to teacher education institutions which have been influenced by early role models. For this reason, the
significance of certain personality behaviors to the teaching/learning processes should be recognized by administrators and supervisors of education. More importantly, the conclusions of this study point to the paramount need for administrators and supervisors to focus not only on teacher-student interactions as a key to the learning process in their methods of teacher selection, but also in their methods of teacher assistance, particularly if we are to improve the quality of education.

The findings of this study hint at the need for attention to the careful selection of candidates for teaching, to development of appropriate personality traits during the period of training, and to continued reassessment of personality behaviors displayed in the classroom.

Therefore, a look at the processes of selection of teachers and staff development is called for if the findings of this small study are verified in larger studies. An assessment center, staffed with personnel with psychological training, could be an approach for a restructured teacher training sequence; a counseling program for teachers would also be an approach leading to the improvement of education. In the latter instance, the supervisor, instead of attempting to demonstrate corrective devices should perhaps listen to the teacher’s problems and give the teacher freedom to explore her difficulties and to gain insight as to the part she plays in her teaching. Administrators might establish a counseling program whereby teachers could talk out some of their personal inadequacies, problems, and conflicts, and through the help of a counselor secure assistance in solving them.

Recommendations

Within the framework of this study’s limitations to generalize, the specification of best-liked teacher and least-liked teacher as salient
identificatory objects led to the following recommendations:

1. Age was not a component of this study, nor was the academic background of the teachers. These might be important factors and should be considered for future research.

2. Teachers, especially of the same sex as their students, can often inspire a learner to achieve and rescue a student from certain failures; hence, there is a crucial need for more male teachers. Efforts should be made by prospective teachers and teacher education institutions to recruit more males into the teaching profession.

3. A study should be conducted to determine the relationship between identification with best-liked and least-liked teacher models and teaching success.

4. There is good reason to believe that education would be improved by making it possible for teachers to receive personal counseling rather than to take refresher courses. This suggestion is posited on the belief that the greatest lift that can be given to education is through the improvement of the personalities of teachers.

5. To know what the adult formulation of the original motives is in teaching, personality tests already at hand should be used and new ones developed which will have specific validity with respect to trait configurations of effective teachers. Together, these methods will provide the signpost which will be valuable in finding and stimulating those students whose personalities augur well for future success in teaching.

6. Classroom teachers at the elementary, middle, and secondary school levels should be made cognizant of their potential for recruitment that they might exercise through in-service activities.

7. Educators of teacher education institutions and supervisors of teaching personnel should through assessment of personality traits and attributes be able to identify effective role models. If the role model is positive, reinforcement should be provided; if the role model is negative, corrective measures should be implemented to counteract negative behaviors in the classroom.

8. The scales (bipolar adjective pairs) represent the interpersonal skills of the TPAI. Given such factors, it will be possible to select those specific scales which best represent interpersonal skills in future research for identifying personality traits and
attributes of positive and negative teacher models.

9. Evaluation of the instrument against the criteria of best-liked and least-liked teacher models should be the subject of future research because such evidence as the semantic differential yields quantitative data which are presumably verifiable in the sense that other investigators can apply selected sets of scales to equivalent subject and obtain essential information.

10. Possibly we could get a clearer perspective of both best-liked and least-liked teacher models through students' perceptions of their teachers; hence, a study should be made utilizing students to establish personal and role-oriented qualities categorizing best-liked and least-liked teacher models on processes of identification.

These recommendations are made in hopes that they may encourage future research which would help narrow the information gap between teacher identification theory and application. The present researcher acknowledges that research has been impeded by the fact that there is no unitary phenomenon of identification which is based on exacting contingencies, and thereby making quantification difficult at best. However, ignoring an area which appears to be vital to education does not allow for the development of new techniques or philosophies for effective teaching. Therefore, the data collected based on the above recommendations would be valuable in further understanding the factors that contribute to teaching efficiency and would serve as valuable guides in the pre-service and in-service predictions of teacher competency.
APPENDICES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamsville</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beecher</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benteen</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattahooche</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier Heights</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connally</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craddock</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodds</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Atlanta</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Hills</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grady</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Park</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herndon</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphries</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Jerome</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mays</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pryor Street</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragsdale</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusk</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaton</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomasville</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toomer</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Atlanta</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Manor</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1

ATLANTA SCHOOLS IN SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamsville</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beecher</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benteen</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattahooche</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier Heights</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connally</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craddock</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodds</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Atlanta</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Hills</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grady</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Park</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herndon</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphries</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Jerome</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mays</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pryor Street</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragsdale</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusk</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaton</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomasville</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toomer</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Atlanta</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Manor</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
DESCRIPTION OF SELECTED TEACHER POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 125</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
NUMBER OF YEARS TAUGHT BY PARTICIPATING TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>In Atlanta</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Total Years Taught</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Educator:

The purpose of the enclosed questionnaire is to secure information on your attitude toward teachers. I realize that your schedule may be very demanding; however, I appreciate your willingness in taking a few moments of your time to provide information which I need. The information will be incorporated in a doctoral study. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated and your identity will be kept in strict confidence.

Please return the enclosed questionnaire today.

Sincerely,

Ora Lee Thomas
C. L. Harper High School
### MY BEST-LIKED TEACHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## MYSELF AS A TEACHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rating 1</th>
<th>Rating 2</th>
<th>Rating 3</th>
<th>Rating 4</th>
<th>Rating 5</th>
<th>Rating 6</th>
<th>Rating 7</th>
<th>Rating 8</th>
<th>Rating 9</th>
<th>Rating 10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dynamic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*good, tensed, vague, exciting, boring, pessimistic, weak, submissive, resistive, lenient, youthful, passive, static, fast, calm, unpleasant*
### Appendix E

#### MY LEAST-LIKED TEACHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Antonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td>pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excitable</td>
<td></td>
<td>calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast</td>
<td></td>
<td>slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dynamic</td>
<td></td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td></td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mature</td>
<td></td>
<td>youthful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firm</td>
<td></td>
<td>lenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td>resistive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td>submissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>pessimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td>boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calm</td>
<td></td>
<td>exciting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vague</td>
<td></td>
<td>clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td>tensed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Principal:

The teachers whose names are listed below have been randomly selected as subjects for a research project in your school. Attached is a copy of approval from Research and Evaluation for doctoral research in the Atlanta Public School System. Also a copy of the instrument is included for your perusal.

Respectfully,

Ora Lee Thomas
C. L. Harper High School
# BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Present School

Number of years I have taught in the Atlanta Public Schools

Total number of years of my teaching experience
PLEASE READ BEFORE ANSWERING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of the following questionnaire is to collect information on your attitude toward self and others. You will be requested to rate your Best-liked and Least-like teacher models. Following this, you will be asked to rate yourself on one of the scales.

Please fill in the biographical statements. The following pages contain detailed instructions on how to answer the questionnaire.

NOTE

When finished with the questionnaire place it back in the envelope provided and return it. The information collected will be kept in the strictest confidence, only to be used in this research and with the understanding that no names will ever be mentioned in the study.

Please answer all questions in the questionnaire.

Go on to the next page.
INSTRUCTIONS

On the following pages you will be asked to rate your Best-liked/Least-liked teachers and on the last page you will be asked to rate yourself. Answer the questions as best you can and please answer all items.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the subject that you are rating is EXTREMELY FAIR, you should place your check-mark to one end of the scale like so:

fair /\: \:\:\:\:\:\:\\ unfair

If you feel that the subject that you are rating is EXTREMELY UN-FAIR, you should place your check-mark to the other end of the scale as follows:

fair \:\:\:\:\:\:\\ /\: \:\\:\:\:\:\ unfair

If you feel that the subject is related QUITE CLOSELY to one end or the other (but not extremely) you should place your check-mark like so:

strong \:\:\:\:\:\:\\ /\: \:\\:\:\:\:\ weak

OR

strong \:\:\:\:\:\:\\ \:\:\\:\:\:\:\ /\: \:\\:\:\:\ weak

If you feel that the subject is only SLIGHTLY related to one end or the other (but not quite neutral) you then place the check thusly:

happy \:\:\:\:\:\:\\ /\: \:\\:\:\:\:\ sad

OR

happy \:\:\:\:\:\:\\ \:\:\\:\:\:\:\ /\: \:\\:\:\:\ sad

If you feel NEUTRAL about the subject in relation to these terms then place your check-mark as follows:

fast \:\:\:\:\:\:\\ /\: \:\\:\:\:\:\ slow
IMPORTANT:

1) Place the check-mark in the middle of the space.
2) Do not leave out any scales.
3) Never put more than one check on a single space.

Work at your own pace, but do not puzzle over individual items.

You should answer with your first impression, while giving careful attention to the items as you work.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN THIS TASK.
March 29, 1982

Ms. Ola Lee Thomas
2455 Ovidia Circle, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dear Ms. Thomas:

Your proposal entitled "The Attitude of Childhood Authority Figure of Teacher as an Influencing Factor in Choosing Teaching as a Career" has been reviewed and approved by the Research Screening Committee of the Atlanta Public Schools. You may proceed with your study as described in the proposal.

I extend to you my best wishes for the successful completion of your graduate program.

Sincerely,

Carolyn L. McCutcheon
Curate S. McCutcheon, Ph.D.
Research Associate

Note: The title was changed after the date of this communication; however, the major focus of the study remained the same.
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