

TEACHERS' VIEWS OF WORK AS A  
CENTRAL LIFE INTEREST AND ITS  
RELATIONSHIP TO STUDENT RATINGS  
OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

Thesis for the Degree of Ed. D.  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
DENNIS LEE BRYAN  
1972

THESIS

LIBRARY  
Michigan State  
University

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Teachers' Views of Work as a Central Life Interest  
And Its Relationship to Student Ratings of  
Teacher Effectiveness.

presented by

Dennis Lee Bryan

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

Doctoral degree in Education, Curriculum

Troy L. Stearns  
Major professor

Date July 30, 1971

0-7639



~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ 25  
~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ 3  
~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ R60  
~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ 275  
~~58 \_\_\_\_\_~~ 158  
~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ R69  
~~58 \_\_\_\_\_~~ 346  
~~16 \_\_\_\_\_~~ 0  
~~18 \_\_\_\_\_~~ R

32 R  
~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ 325  
~~8 \_\_\_\_\_~~ 325  
~~2 \_\_\_\_\_~~ 81  
~~81 \_\_\_\_\_~~ R  
~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ 143  
~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ 263  
~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ 192

JUL 12 1999

JUL 12 1999





TEACHERS' VIEWS OF WORK AS A CENTRAL LIFE  
INTEREST AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO STUDENT  
RATINGS OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

By

Dennis Lee Bryan

The purpose of the study was to determine:

1. The extent to which selected junior and senior high school teachers view their work as a central life interest, and
2. To investigate the relationship between the central life interest score and the teacher's effectiveness as perceived by his students, and
3. To examine the relationship between the central life interest score and various background and demographic variables.

The study was conducted on the total population of 514 junior and senior high school teachers who in 1969 used the Student Reaction Center at Western Michigan University to obtain student ratings of their teaching effectiveness. Three research instruments were used. These were The Student Opinion Questionnaire, The Central Life Interest Inventory, and the Demographic Data Form. Student ratings

of the 514 teachers in the study were obtained from the Student Reaction Center. The Central Life Interest Inventory and Demographic Data Form were mailed to each teacher. From the 514 teachers solicited, 450 returned their questionnaires.

The statistical methods used varied depending on the hypothesis being tested. Responses on all instruments were summarized and punched on computer cards for statistical analysis. For hypothesis one, the percentage of teachers categorized as viewing work as a central life interest were determined. To test hypothesis two, Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients and point-biserial correlation coefficients were calculated to test for relationships between central life interest scores and student ratings. To determine the relationships between central life interest scores and each of the demographic variables the percentage of teachers in each category of the demographic variable who were classified as job oriented were calculated.

The statistical analysis led to the conclusion that the substantial majority of teachers studied did not view their work as a central life interest. Correlation analysis using number of job oriented responses and student ratings indicated that on nine out of the twelve questions comprising the student questionnaire, those teachers who did view their work as a central life interest received higher ratings by their students than teachers who did not view teaching as a central life interest.

The analysis of the data also provided evidence for the conclusions that a positive relationship exists between teachers' level of education and the extent to which work is viewed as a central life interest. A higher percentage of men view their work as a central life interest than do women, and a higher percentage of teachers from small towns viewed their work as a central life interest than did teachers from large towns.

TEACHERS' VIEWS OF WORK AS A CENTRAL LIFE  
INTEREST AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO STUDENT  
RATINGS OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

By

Dennis Lee Bryan

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

College of Education

1972

675667

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study reported here would not have been possible without the prolonged cooperation, goodwill and encouragement of many individuals. It is a great pleasure to acknowledge their aid.

I am grateful to the members of my advisory committee: Professors Troy Stearns (Chairman), William Walsh, Ernest Melby, and Grafton Trout, for their suggestions, encouragement and patience. I am especially grateful and indebted to my committee chairman, Troy Stearns, for his editorial assistance and continual support and encouragement.

Special acknowledgement is due Professor Frank Evans who assisted me regarding statistical analysis, Professor George O'Hearn who provided editorial assistance, and Mary Hegenbart who typed the final manuscript.

Above all, I thank my wife Ann for her patience, support and constant understanding.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	6
Rationale . . . . .	6
Definition of Terms . . . . .	8
Work as a Central Life Interest . . . . .	8
Central Life Interest Inventory . . . . .	8
Student Ratings . . . . .	8
Teachers . . . . .	9
Overview of Dissertation . . . . .	9
II. RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	10
Descriptions of a Profession . . . . .	10
Student Ratings of Teachers . . . . .	17
Work as a Central Life Interest . . . . .	23
III. HYPOTHESES AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	28
Population . . . . .	28
Instruments Used . . . . .	30
Student-Opinion Questionnaire . . . . .	30
Central Life Interest Inventory . . . . .	31
Demographic Data Form . . . . .	33

CHAPTER	Page
Hypotheses to be Tested . . . . .	33
Teaching as a Central Life Interest . . .	33
Relationships Between Central Life Interest and Student Ratings . . . . .	34
Relationships Between Central Life Interest and Demographic Variables . . .	34
Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis.	35
Data Collection . . . . .	35
Treatment of Data . . . . .	36
Statistical Analysis . . . . .	37
Scope and Limitations of the Study . . . . .	38
Summary . . . . .	39
IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS . . . . .	41
Teaching as a Central Life Interest . . . .	42
Relationships Between Central Life Interest and Student Ratings . . . . .	48
Relationships Between Central Life Interest and Demographic Variables . . . . .	51
Summary . . . . .	60
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	66
Summary . . . . .	66
Teaching as a Central Life Interest . . .	68
Relationships Between Central Life Interest and Student Ratings . . . . .	69
Relationships Between Central Life Interest and Demographic Variables . . .	69
Conclusions . . . . .	69
Discussion . . . . .	72





CHAPTER	Page
Implications for Further Research . . . . .	75
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	76
APPENDICES	
A. Student-Opinion Questionnaire . . . . .	80
B. The Central Life Interest Inventory . . . . .	82
Alterations of Inventory Wording . . . . .	82
Scoring Procedures for the Central Life Interest Inventory . . . . .	90
C. Demographic Data Form . . . . .	92
D. Letters to the Teachers and to the Principals . . . . .	95

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Total occupational involvement as a central life interest . . . . .	42
2. Comparisons of six applications of Dubin's central life interest inventory . . . . .	44
3. Number of teachers classed as job involved or non-job involved regarding the formal organizational aspect of work . . . . .	45
4. Number of teachers classed as job involved or non-job involved regarding the technological aspects of work . . . . .	46
5. Number of teachers classed as job involved or non-job involved regarding the general involvement aspects of work . . . . .	47
6. Number of teachers classed as job involved or non-job involved regarding the informal involvement aspects of work . . . . .	48
7. Product-moment correlations of the number of job oriented responses and student ratings . . . . .	49
8. Point-Biserial correlation of job orientation and student ratings . . . . .	52
9. Percent of job oriented teachers classified by educational level . . . . .	53
10. Number and percent of job oriented teachers who work a second job unrelated to education . . . . .	54
11. Number and percent of men and women teachers who view work as a central life interest. . . . .	56

Table	Page
12. The percentage of teachers at various ages who view work as a central life interest . . . .	57
13. Percent of job oriented teachers grouped by size of town . . . . .	59
14. Number of job oriented teachers and their perceived ability to change low student ratings . . . . .	61
15. Summary of acceptance and rejection statements for the hypotheses . . . . .	63

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

#### Introduction

Work has long been considered a central life interest for adults in most western societies. Weber<sup>1</sup> and Tawney<sup>2</sup> suggested that the present capitalistic system reinforces the moral and religious justification which Weber argues the reformation gave to work. Numerous researchers, including those cited here, have investigated man's relation to his world of work.

Results of these studies suggest considerable variation regarding how various occupational groups perceive their world of work. Dubin reported that for three out of every four industrial workers studied, work was not a central life interest as measured by a Central Life Inventory (C.L.I.) which he developed.<sup>3</sup> Ima conducted a similar study

---

<sup>1</sup>Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1930), p. 230.

<sup>2</sup>R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (New York: Harcourt Co., 1926), p. 81.

<sup>3</sup>Robert Dubin, "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers," Social Problems, III (January, 1956), 131.

designed to assess the extent to which lumber workers viewed their work as a central life interest. Of the 400 lumber workers studied, only fourteen percent or fewer than three out of twenty viewed their work as a central life interest.<sup>4</sup>

There are, however, occupations whose members view their work as a central life interest. Orzack studied professional nurses to determine the extent to which they view their work as a central life interest. The findings indicated that eighty percent, or four out of five of the 150 nurses studied, viewed their work as a central life interest. Orzack concluded:

It can hardly be assumed that professional nurses do not value their work. They may in fact consider it an end in itself. For the professional, work is the focal center of self identification and is both important and valued.<sup>5</sup>

Orzack's conclusion that professionals view their work as a central life interest has found support in other studies. Ranta conducted a study involving all of the 232 cooperative extension agents in the state of Michigan. Eighty-five percent, or slightly over four out of every

---

<sup>4</sup>Kenji Ima, "Central Life Interest of Industrial Workers" A Replication Among Lumber Workers" (unpublished Master's thesis, The Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, 1963), p. 62.

<sup>5</sup>Louis H. Orzack, "Work as a 'Central Life Interest' of Professionals," Social Problems, VII (Fall, 1959), 126.

five of the cooperative extension agents, viewed their work as a central life interest.<sup>6</sup>

The studies cited above suggest there is a marked difference regarding the extent to which members of various occupational groups view their work as being a central life interest. Members of occupational groups defined as professions seem to view work as a central life interest while members of non professions seem less inclined to see work as a central life interest.

To date, however, no similar studies have been made of the education profession to determine if their work is actually a major life interest. Even though Dubin's Central Life Interest Inventory promotes an objective measure of the extent to which a person immerses his personal life in his work and his work in his personal life, no systematic effort has been made to measure such "commitment" regarding junior and senior high school teachers.

The first concern of this study is to investigate the extent to which junior and senior high teachers view their work as a central life interest. A second concern of this study centers around the question: Do teachers whose work is not a central life interest tend to receive lower

---

<sup>6</sup>Raymond Ranta, "The Professional Status of the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1960), p. 87.

ratings by their students than teachers who view their work as a central life interest? The third concern is to examine how work as a central life interest is linked with various background and demographic variables.

Evidence that there might be a relationship between student ratings and the extent to which a teacher sees his work as a central life interest can be found in research related to reference groups and self image. It is generally believed that the professional gains his feelings of self worth from his on-the-job interactions with his fellow workers. Gross supported this when he stated, "Once in the group, the professional feels himself to be a part of the group to the extent that the group opinion of him is a significant control on his behavior and self concept."<sup>7</sup> This looking-glass concept of self was first proposed by Cooley who believed that the way one imagines himself to appear to another person is an essential element in an individual's concept of self worth.<sup>8</sup> A person tends to associate himself with those people and activities (reference groups) from whom he will realize positive, supportive feedback on which to build his self image. Sherif summarized his research on reference groups by saying:

---

<sup>7</sup>Edward Gross, Work and Society (New York: The Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1958), p. 77.

<sup>8</sup>C. H. Cooley, Human Nature and Social Order (New York: Scriber and Company, 1902), p. 64.



An individual's concern over social acceptance or rejection, his concern to prove himself a person who counts, his very conception of the kind of person he is, revolves in no small part around being somebody in the reference group of his choosing.<sup>9</sup>

Sherif went on to say that one strives to associate himself with and center his life's interest around people and activities from whom he will gain a positive self image.

For the teacher, there are two main groups within his world of work from whom he receives information about self. The opinion and actions of students is one source, and the opinion and actions of colleagues is the second. The teacher's picture of self worth can be influenced by his students' perceptions of him as well as by the perceptions of his colleagues. When denied positive feedback, the unsuccessful teacher probably tends to seek relationships outside his world of work. From these outside general relationships, he hopes to gain a positive picture of self worth. If this is the case, work may not be a central life interest for the unsuccessful teacher, but instead, only a means of obtaining money and time with which to pursue other activities of interest.

---

<sup>9</sup>Muzafer Sherif, Reference Groups (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 248.

### Purpose of the Study

It is the purpose of this study to determine:

1. The extent to which selected junior and senior high school teachers view their work as a central life interest, and
2. To investigate the relationship between the central life interest score and the teacher's effectiveness as perceived by his students, and
3. To examine the relationship between the Central Life Interest score and various background and demographic variables.

The study was conducted on the total population of junior and senior high school teachers who in 1969 used the Student Reaction Center at Western Michigan University to obtain student reactions concerning their teaching effectiveness. The population, although not a random sample, will serve to provide evidence suggestive of the extent to which teachers view their work as a central life interest as well as suggesting directions for further research.

### Rationale

At only one place in the literature dealing with the occupation of teaching as a central life interest, is there any evidence indicating the extent to which junior high and high school teachers view their work as a central

life interest. An investigation of industrial arts teachers and their world of work was conducted by Nelson. The findings indicated that only seventy-six of the 230 industrial arts teachers studied (twenty-four percent) considered their work a central life interest.<sup>10</sup> In discussing his findings, Nelson suggested industrial arts teachers may not be representative of teachers in general. To accept industrial arts teachers as representative of teachers in general seems unjustified. This study provided evidence regarding the extent to which 513 junior and senior high school teachers view their work as a central life interest.

As shown in the review of literature, Dubin's Central Life Interest Inventory clearly differentiates between professions and non professions regarding the extent to which respective members view their work as a central life interest. Therefore, this study provided a test of whether teachers meet this criterion for consideration as a profession.

Evidence concerning the relationship between extent of job involvement as defined and measured by The Central Life Interest Inventory and teaching performance as measured by student opinion is of major interest to educators.

---

<sup>10</sup>Hilding E. Nelson, "Occupational Self-Images of Teachers: A Study of the Occupational Involvements and Work-Role Orientations of Michigan Industrial Education Teachers," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1962), p. 65.

Knowledge of factors which relate to teaching effectiveness is vital to the teaching profession. In an effort to isolate additional factors relating to teaching effectiveness, this study explored the relationship between the extent to which teachers view their work as a central life interest and their teaching effectiveness as seen by their students.

### Definition of Terms

#### Work as a Central Life Interest

Central Life Interest is a composite term reflecting the tendency to prefer social involvement as well as gain general satisfactions within one's world of work. It is indicated in this study by scores from Dubin's Central Life Interest Inventory.

#### Central Life Interest Inventory

This is a forty question inventory developed by Dubin to measure the extent one views his work as a central life interest.

#### Student Ratings

Student ratings are students' opinions about their teacher in reference to the following twelve areas: Knowledge of Subject; Clarity of Explanations; Fairness; Control; Attitude Toward Students; Ability to Stimulate Interest; Attitude Toward Subject; Attitude Toward Student Opinion;

Variety in Teaching Procedures; Encouragement of Student Participation; Sense of Humor, and Planning and Preparation.

Item thirteen on the Student Opinion Questionnaire was not used in this study because it involved categories of student response which were different from those used for the first twelve questions. Throughout the study reference is made only to the first twelve items on the Student Opinion Questionnaire. Student ratings are obtained by having students rate their teacher on a scale from one to five regarding each of the above areas.

### Teachers

Some 449 junior high and senior high school teachers who in 1969 used the Student Reaction Center at Western Michigan University to process student ratings of their teaching performance. The teachers represented all teaching areas and came from thirty-six different states.

### Overview of Dissertation

Chapter I provides an introduction to the problem and sets forth the purpose of the study. The related literature is reviewed in Chapter II. In Chapter III the hypothesis and procedures are listed. The data analysis and results are presented in Chapter IV, while Chapter V contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of this study.

## CHAPTER II

### RELATED LITERATURE

Past studies investigating work as a central life interest suggest that members of a profession tend more often than other occupational groups to view work as a central life interest. In order to examine occupational groups considered as professions, the first section of this chapter will review selected literature describing characteristics of a profession. The second section will be concerned with selected studies involving students as judges of teaching merit. The last section will review reported past studies that used Dubin's inventory to assess the extent to which various occupational groups view their work as a central life interest.

#### Descriptions of a Profession

The task of defining a profession is obviously not an easy one. The absence of any commonly accepted statement is testimony of that fact. The phrase "characteristics of a profession" does, however, provide some clue to the approach used by most writers in defining a profession. For "the term profession. . . clearly stands for something.

That something is a complex of characteristics."<sup>1</sup> Evidently this view is held by many people, for each person who attempts to define a profession approaches the task by describing or referring to the characteristics, attributes or criteria which symbolize a profession. Lieberman, for example, provided these criteria of a profession:

1. A unique, definite, and essential social service.
2. An emphasis upon intellectual techniques in performing its service.
3. A long period of specialized training.
4. An acceptance by practitioners of broad personal responsibility for judgments made and acts performed within the scope of professional autonomy.
5. An emphasis upon the service to be rendered, rather than the economic gain to the practitioners as the basis for the organization and performance of the social service delegated to the occupational group.
6. A broad range of autonomy for both the individual practitioners and for the occupational group as a whole.
7. A comprehensive self-governing organization of practitioners.
8. A code of ethics which has been clarified and interpreted as ambiguous and doubtful points by concrete cases.<sup>2</sup>

Gross provided six criteria of a profession. His list is quite comparable to the preceding one, but differs

---

<sup>1</sup>A. M. Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson, The Professions (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933), p. 284.

<sup>2</sup>Myron Lieberman, Education as a Profession (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955), pp. 1-7.

from Lieberman by giving more direct attention to the identity with one's colleagues. Gross' criteria and a brief explanation of each are as follows:

1. The Unstandardized Product--A professional activity is one in which general knowledge is applied to solve particular problems, each of which is different from all other such problems.
2. Degree of Personal Involvement--A special relation of confidence between professional and client is involved. Not only must a professional be technically competent but the client must respect and like him as a person. In addition to skill there is reputation.
3. Wide Knowledge of Specialized Technique--The professional is the man who knows. He has power precisely by virtue of being a repository of knowledge. The client is ignorant.
4. Sense of Obligation to One's Act--The Professional is expected to use only the best or the most efficient techniques and not merely the traditional or dramatic one. Attention is concentrated on the art or the technique and on doing as good a job as he can possibly do.
5. Sense of Identity with One's Colleagues--One mark of the professional is strong colleague consciousness. Such consciousness expresses itself in a concern as to who one's colleagues are and therefore in a set of admission qualifications. There are always examinations, special degrees and certificates, and often, experience requirements. Once in the group, the professional feels himself to be part of the group to the extent that the group opinion of him is a significant control on his behavior.
6. Essential to Welfare of Society--The professional's activities tend to be regarded as either vital to society or else involving a high degree of trust. The professional provides services which may be required at a moment's notice and which may be



essential to the health or the welfare of the individual asking for the service.<sup>3</sup>

When considering whether the performance of a job is professional, Yoder stressed the concept of continued learning as demonstrated by the desire for continued exchange of information and knowledge, and continued research and familiarity with literature. His criteria were as follows:

1. Professional performance usually reflects a formal and somewhat standardized training. . .
2. Professional performance implies a considerable area of widely accepted standard practice. . .
3. Professional performance presumes the regular, formalized exchange of information and experience among practitioners. . .
4. Professional performance implies a knowledge of and familiarity with a continually growing field of professional literature. . .
5. Professional performance reflects continued re-search. . .
6. Professional performance is guided by an accepted system of professional ethics and a strong sense of public responsibility. . .
7. Professional performance, finally, is earmarked by the most important distinctive characteristic of the professional--that suggested by the designation 'learned professions'--a continuing attitude of learning.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Edward Gross, Work and Society (New York: The Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1958), pp. 77-81.

<sup>4</sup>Dale Yoder, Personnel Management and Industrial Relations (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1956), pp. 25-26.

Powell, in looking at the status of adult education, suggested additional areas not directly included in the preceding references. First, he believed professionals should command certain levels of salaries. He also directed attention to professionals being in those fields which conserve and promote values cherished by society. Finally, he suggested that the locale of training is usually at the university level. Seven criteria which he believed were essential for a profession are:

1. A profession is a recognized and distinguishable discipline of learning, skill, research and practice, in a service useful to society.
2. Its philosophy, content and techniques are communicable through teaching.
3. Its roots of learning, training and research are on the university level and capable of recognition in the form of advanced graduate degrees.
4. Its practice tends toward the conservation and promotion of values explicitly cherished by the society within which it operates.
5. Its members are self-governing within their profession, and have control over standards of training, entrance and performance, and maintain ethical standards among themselves.
6. Its practitioners command salaries commensurate with those of other professions requiring equivalent training.
7. Its practice has authorized and publicly recognized relationships to related and to ancillary professions, to lay activities in its field and to volunteer services by lay people.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> John Walker Powell, Learning Comes of Age (New York: Association Press, 1956), pp. 202-203.

Leighbody summarized Powell's views when he answered the question, what makes a professional worker professional? Many of his criteria deal with work behavior in the professional organization. His do's and don'ts included the following:

The Professional Worker:

1. does not require close supervision or direction. He directs himself--he plans his own activities. He works independently.
2. does not regard himself as an employee, does not consider himself to be working for a boss. He regards his supervisors as fellow professional workers and they regard him in the same way.
3. does not work by the hour; he does not expect to adhere strictly to a minimum time schedule. He adjusts his working hours to meet the necessities and responsibilities of his duties, without thought to overtime or to a standard week.
4. does not expect to be paid by the hour. He expects the over-all sum for which he has agreed to perform his duties. This sum is based upon the responsibilities involved and the professional services rendered. It cannot be measured in hours. Professions whose members regularly demonstrate this are those where compensation is highest.
5. takes full responsibility for the results of his efforts and actions. He makes his own decisions and acts upon them. He may seek advice and counsel but he does not attempt to transfer responsibility for his own mistakes to others.
6. continually seeks self-improvement. He takes advantage of every opportunity to improve his knowledge and understanding in connection with his professional duties.
7. contributes to the skill and knowledge of the profession. He develops new ideas, plans and materials and gladly shares them with fellow workers.

8. is loyal to his fellow workers. He never gossips about them nor about those he serves.
9. avoids rumor and hear-say. He does not credit or repeat information received through the "grapevine." He secures information which is important to him directly from those authorized to release it.
10. belongs to and fully supports professional organizations. He advances himself and his profession through active membership and participation in local, state and national associations devoted to the furtherance of professional aims, enhancing the status of its members and disseminating useful information, as well as those technical societies specifically concerned with his phase of the profession.
11. adjusts his grievances through proper channels. He discusses them directly and privately with those authorized to make adjustments. He refrains from complaining and grumbling to others.
12. meets his professional obligations. He fulfills completely all agreements and obligations entered into with fellow workers, whether they are legal or moral obligations.
13. is sensitive to the problems of his fellow workers. He always considers the effect of his actions on the welfare of fellow workers.
14. does not advance himself at the expense of others. He strives for promotion and advancement in the profession only on the basis of superior preparation and worthy professional performance.
15. is proud of his profession. He always reflects to those outside the profession a pride and satisfaction in the work in which he is engaged.
16. desires to render a service. To improve men's welfare is the end toward which the professional worker devotes his career.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>G. B. Leighbody, "What Makes a Professional, Professional," (a speech quoted in an unpublished Doctoral Dissertation entitled, "The Professional Status of the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service," by Raymond Ranta, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1960), pp. 29-31.

These descriptions of a profession are statements of involvement of the professional with his clients, his colleagues and peers. Such involvement is exactly the domain of Dubin's Central Life Interest Inventory, used in this study to assess the extent to which teachers view their work as a central life interest.

### Student Ratings of Teachers

Student ratings of teachers were first reported in the education research literature circa 1923. There has been a steady increase in their use since that time. As student ratings of teachers have become more widely used, there have been those who have questioned the ability of the student to make unbiased judgments concerning a teacher's performance. Since the reliability of student opinion is crucial in this study, a review of research relating to student ratings is necessary.

It has been found that student grades have little, if any, relationship to student's ratings of their teachers. Starrak conducted a study in which he administered a teacher rating scale to over 50,000 college students. The results of the study showed that the grades college students earn are not significantly related to the ratings given instructors.<sup>7</sup> Riley at Brooklyn College reported that

---

<sup>7</sup>J. A. Starrak, "Student Rating of Instruction," Journal of Higher Education, V (February, 1934), 88-90.

students with low scholastic standings, as a group, were only slightly more critical in their judgments of teachers than were those students holding high scholastic standings. This bias was not significant and amounted to only three or four points on a one hundred point scale.<sup>8</sup> Remmers also found that the relationship between a student's grade and his ratings of instructors was negligible. In addition, he found that pooled students' reactions are a more sensitive measure of change in teacher behavior than a single rating by a supervisor. Remmers also reported that ratings of teachers by students have a higher reliability than the usually accepted standards for the best educational and mental measurement tests.<sup>9</sup> Hudelson found a small but not significant correlation coefficient of .19 for students' ratings of college instructors and student grades given by their instructors.<sup>10</sup>

In a recent study, Ryan reported that "a reliable and useful instrument exists (Bryan's Student-Opinion

---

<sup>8</sup>John W. Riley, Bryce Ryan, and Marcia Lifshitz, The Student Looks at His Teacher (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1950), p. 85.

<sup>9</sup>H. H. Remmers, "The Relationship Between Students' Marks and Student Attitude Toward Instructors," School and Society, XXVIII (December 15, 1928), 759-760.

<sup>10</sup>Earl Hudelson, "The Validity of Student Ratings of Instructors," School and Society, LXXIII (April 28, 1951), 265-266.

Questionnaire) for measuring pupils' opinions of their teachers. This questionnaire has been used to change teacher behavior in at least two experiments."<sup>11</sup> McCall concluded in a study of teacher merit, "At last we have found judges of teaching skill, namely teachers' pupils, especially after they have been taught by the teacher for nearly a year."<sup>12</sup> In a recent study by Oliver the following statement was made.

Previous studies have tended to indicate that teachers are indeed sensitive to informational feed-back from students. It is also evident that students constitute a pool of reliable observers who are in a favorable position to observe changes in the behavior of their teachers, since they are present at all times.<sup>13</sup>

Bryan conducted a longitudinal study investigating the relationship between students' ratings of teachers and student learning. Two of the findings are pertinent to this study:

1. The image of a teacher held by his students usually has much in common with the image held by administrators and parents. This is so because

---

<sup>11</sup>Kevin Albert Ryan, "The Use of Student Written Feedback in Changing the Behavior of Beginning Secondary School Teachers," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1966), p. 7.

<sup>12</sup>W. A. McCall, Measurement of Teacher Merit, Bulletin No. 284 (Raleigh, North Carolina: State Department of Instruction, 1959), p. 29.

<sup>13</sup>Wilmot F. Oliver, The Relative Effectiveness of Informational Feedback About Supervisory and Student Reactions with Beginning and Experienced Vocational Teachers, Cooperative Research Project No. 66-8327 (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University, 1967), pp. 5-6.

administrators' and parents' opinions of a teacher are based to a great extent on student reactions to the teacher. It is therefore not surprising that ratings by high school students and by administrators reveal a substantial amount of agreement.

2. The image one group of students has of a teacher is usually very similar to that held by other groups of students. Almost without exception this is true of the several different groups of high school students currently studying the same subject under the same teacher.<sup>14</sup>

In 1935 Heilman and Armentrout had over 2,000 students rate forty-six college teachers on the Purdue Rating Scale. The reliability of these ratings by college students was approximately .75. They also reported that "factors of class size, severity of grading, student's interest in the course, the sex of the teacher and the maturity of the rater. . . cannot be said with certainty to have any effect upon the ratings."<sup>15</sup> In addition, Amotora found that even elementary students gave rather stable ratings. These students also evidenced good discrimination and agreement.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>Roy C. Bryan, Reactions to Teachers by Students, Parents and Administrators, Cooperative Research Project No. 668 (Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, 1963), 58-59.

<sup>15</sup>J. D. Heilman and W. D. Armentrout, "The Rating of College Teachers on Ten Traits by Their Students," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXVII (March, 1936), 197-216.

<sup>16</sup>Mary Amotora, "Teacher Ratings by Younger Pupils," Journal of Teacher Education, V (June, 1954), 149-152.



It might be well to note that Symonds found pupil ratings correlated positively with principal ratings for the same teachers.<sup>17</sup>

Boardman found a reliability of .81 for pupil rankings against .88 for supervisor ranking of these same teachers.<sup>18</sup> Davenport obtained similar reliabilities and concluded that "It can be said with a fair degree of confidence that pupils are competent to rate teachers and that their ratings are reliable and valid, and that the ratings of pupils have no deleterious effects on either pupil or teacher morale."<sup>19</sup>

Davenport also noted that pupils are the only competent judges of how much they like teachers. They are capable of rating the frequency of teaching practices, and that while such ratings are subjective, pupils form opinions quickly and do not tend to change them.

Douglas added to the evidence that student opinion is reliable. He reported in one experiment a coefficient

---

<sup>17</sup>Percival M. Symonds, "Characteristics of the Effective Teacher Based on Pupil Evaluations," Journal of Experimental Education, XXIII (June, 1955), 289-310.

<sup>18</sup>C. W. Boardman, "An Analysis of Pupil Ratings of High School Teachers," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVI (September, 1930), 440-446.

<sup>19</sup>Kenneth Davenport, "An Investigation of Pupil Ratings of Certain Teaching Practices," Studies of Higher Education, XLIX (January, 1944), 12.

of .89 between two sets of student ratings with a one-month spread between ratings.<sup>20</sup> Detchen also found "consistent agreement among the ratings of thirty-eight instructors by their classes."<sup>21</sup>

The review of the research relating to student rating of teachers further reveals that by about 1955 researchers had generally agreed that students from the sixth grade level on through college do, in fact, provide reliable and consistent ratings of teacher effectiveness. From 1955 to the present, the research involving student ratings appears to focus on the extent to which student ratings used as feedback to the teacher can effectively change teaching behavior. In summary, experiments conducted to date indicate that:

1. Students are keen judges of teaching.
2. As students become older, they change relatively little in their reactions to teachers.
3. Pupil ratings on most items are highly reliable.
4. The ratings of twenty-five pupils whether in junior or senior high school will produce reliabilities of from .74 to .90 on a majority of items, which is more reliable than the best standardized mental and educational tests available.

---

<sup>20</sup>Harl R. Douglas, "Rating the Effectiveness of College Instructions," School and Society, XXVIII (August 18, 1928), 192-197.

<sup>21</sup>Lily Detchen, "Shall the Student Rate the Professor?" Journal of Higher Education, XI (March, 1940).

5. Pupils showed more discrimination between teachers in their ratings than did administrators.
6. Pupil ratings can be both valid and reliable measures of pupil opinion if scientifically gathered.
7. There is very low correlation between students' marks, class size, sex of teacher, maturity of rater, and the ratings given by students.
8. The image of a teacher held by students usually has much in common with the image held by administrators and parents.
9. The image one group of students has of a teacher is usually very similar to that held by other groups of students.

It is reasonable to conclude that students can provide crucial data assessing the effectiveness of teachers' involvement in the profession of teaching.

#### Work as a Central Life Interest

In Chapter I, brief reference was made to studies which dealt with the extent various occupational groups viewed their work as a central life interest. The following is a review of reported studies that used Dubin's Central Life Interest Inventory in assessing the extent workers view their work as a central life interest.

Dubin, in a study of the central life interest of 491 semi-skilled industrial workers, hypothesized that the social world of urban man is subdivided into many segments of activity and interest. Man's world of work constitutes only one of these segments. Participation in work may be necessary in American society but may not be of central

life interest to the worker. Dubin concluded that for the industrial workers studied twenty-four percent, or fewer than one in four viewed their work as a central life interest. Dubin's findings also indicated that only ten percent of the industrial workers perceived their important primary social relationships taking place within their world of work.<sup>22</sup> After Dubin's findings were reported, a number of other researchers used the Central Life Interest Inventory to investigate the extent various occupational groups viewed work as a major life interest.

Ima conducted a study designed to investigate the extent to which 400 lumber workers viewed their work as a central life interest. The findings indicated that for the lumber workers studied, only fourteen percent, or less than three out of twenty, viewed their work as a central life interest. Only five percent of the lumber workers, or one out of twenty, perceived their important primary social relationships as part of their world of work. The other ninety-five percent preferred their primary interactions with their fellowman in ways unrelated to their world of work.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Robert Dubin, "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers," Social Problems III (January, 1956), 132-133.

<sup>23</sup>Kenji Ima, "Central Life Interest of Industrial Workers: A Replication Among Lumber Workers," (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, Eugene, 1963), pp. 60-63.

Nelson investigated the extent to which 230 junior high industrial arts teachers viewed their world of work as a central life interest. He found that only twenty-four percent saw their work as a central life interest. Only twelve percent perceived their important primary social relationships as part of their world of work.<sup>24</sup>

The three studies just cited follow the same general pattern indicating that for some occupational groups, work is not a central life interest as measured by Dubin's Central Life Interest Inventory. The industrial workers, industrial arts teachers and lumber workers studied derived over seventy-five percent of their general satisfactions from non-work connected experiences and social relationships rather than from situations involving their work roles. Dubin and Ima contended, on the basis of these findings, that work is necessary for the workers they studied, but it is not valued by them.

Members of all occupations, however, do not view their work as a minor life interest. Members of occupations which can be classified as professions tend as a group to view their work as a central life interest. Orzack found that professionals preferred work rather than non-work

---

<sup>24</sup>Hilding Nelson, "Occupational Self-Images of Teachers: A Study of the Occupational Involvements and Work-Role Orientations of Michigan Industrial Education Teachers," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1962), pp. 64-67.

settings as the environment for informal social relationships and general personal satisfaction. Orzack hypothesized that unlike the industrial worker and the lumber worker, professionals preferred the environment of their world of work as a source for important informal social relationships, as well as general satisfactions. Orzack administered the Central Life Interest Inventory to 150 registered nurses employed in public and private hospitals in a large midwest city. The results indicated that seventy-nine percent or four out of every five nurses studied saw their world of work as a central life interest. Orzack stated, "We may infer that these professional nurses are much more interested in their work than Dubin's factory workers were in theirs."<sup>25</sup>

Ranta conducted a study involving 232 cooperative extension service agents in the state of Michigan. The findings support Orzack's statement that work is a central life interest for professionals. Ranta found that of the 232 extension agents studied, eighty-five percent or over eight out of ten viewed their work as a central life interest.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>Louis H. Orzack, "Work as a 'Central Life Interest' of Professionals," Social Problems, VIII (Fall, 1959), 126.

<sup>26</sup>Raymond Ranta, "The Professional Status of the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1960), pp. 85-88.

From the results of these two studies it is suggested that unlike nonprofessionals, professionals do, in fact, view their work as a central life interest.

## CHAPTER III

### HYPOTHESES AND PROCEDURES

As indicated earlier, this study was undertaken to determine the extent to which junior high and high school teachers view their work as a central life interest, to examine how their work involvement was related to their teaching effectiveness, and to examine how work involvement was linked with various background and demographic variables. To answer these questions it was necessary to identify a suitable population of junior high and senior high teachers, choose appropriate measuring instruments and formulate the questions as testable hypotheses. This chapter will present a description of the population and instruments used in the study. A list of the hypotheses and a description of the procedures used for obtaining and analyzing the data will also be included.

#### Population

Ideally, in order to generalize about the central life interests of teachers, a sample of teachers known to accurately represent the over-all population of teachers in this country was needed. The identification of such a



sample was beyond the scope of the present study. A feasible source of teachers was available: teachers who had used the services of Western Michigan University's Student Reaction Center. For these teachers, students' perceptions of their teaching effectiveness were already available and their names and teaching locations were on file, permitting follow-up questionnaires to be sent. All data used in this study was solicited from 514 junior and senior high school teachers who had used the services of Western Michigan University's Student Reaction Center in 1969. One-third of the population (127 teachers) were junior high teachers while the remaining two-thirds (335 teachers) were high school teachers. All teaching areas were represented.

The Student Reaction Center located at Western Michigan University has been in operation for twenty years and has processed student ratings of over 8,000 teachers. Teachers using the services of the Center represent all fifty states. However, approximately seventy percent of these teachers were located in the mid-western states. The student reaction averages for the teachers in this study did not differ significantly from the norms established by the Student Reaction Center. There is no reason to believe that the teachers who used the Center in 1969 deviate markedly from teachers who have used the Center in other years.

### Instruments Used

Three research instruments were used in this study: The Student Opinion Questionnaire to measure student perception of teacher effectiveness, Dubin's Central Life Interest Inventory to ascertain the teachers' perceptions of work as a central life interest, and a questionnaire to obtain various demographic and background information.

#### Student-Opinion Questionnaire

The Student-Opinion Questionnaire was developed and reported by Bryan.<sup>1</sup> Final form of the questionnaire, (Form A, which was used in this study) was developed through a United States Office of Education Research Project involving over 7,000 junior high and high school teachers. The instrument consists of thirteen questions and is designed to be administered to a classroom of students. For each question the students rate their teacher on a five-point scale. A single class average can be obtained for each question as well as an average score for all questions combined. (For a copy of the Student-Opinion Questionnaire, Form A, see Appendix A., page 80.

The reliability of student ratings on this questionnaire was determined by Bryan, who found that for seventh

---

<sup>1</sup>Roy C. Bryan, Some Observations Concerning Written Student Reactions to High School Teachers, U. S. Office of Education Research Project No. 668, (Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, 1968), pp. 1-20.

through twelfth grade students in Michigan, the correlation of change-halves averages for each question ranged from .77 to .95.<sup>2</sup> Numerous research studies have used this questionnaire which is designed to produce a graphic profile of a teacher's effectiveness as perceived by his students.

### Central Life Interest Inventory

Dubin's inventory of workers' "central life interests" was developed and validated in his study of 491 industrial workers.<sup>3</sup> It has also been used by four other researchers: Orzack in a study of 150 professional nurses,<sup>4</sup> Ranta in a study of 232 Michigan cooperative extension agents,<sup>5</sup> Ima in a study of 400 lumber workers,<sup>6</sup> and Nelson in a study of 230 industrial arts instructors.<sup>7</sup> The Central Life Interest

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>3</sup>Robert Dubin, "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers," Social Problems, III (January, 1956), 131-141.

<sup>4</sup>Louis H. Orzack, "Work as a 'Central Life Interest' of Professionals," Social Problems VIII (Fall, 1959),

<sup>5</sup>Raymond Ranta, "The Professional Status of the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1960), pp. 1-185.

<sup>6</sup>Kenji Ima, "Central Life Interest of Industrial Workers: A Replication Among Lumber Workers," (unpublished Master's thesis, The Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, Eugene, 1963), pp. 1-45.

<sup>7</sup>Hilding E. Nelson, "Occupational Self-Images of Teachers: A Study of Occupational Involvements and Work-Role Orientations of Michigan Industrial Education Teachers," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1962), pp. 1-154.

Inventory consists of forty questions designed in composite to determine the extent one views work experience and the social relations involved with work as a central life interest.

Dubin classified work experience into the following four categories:

1. Formal involvements, which center around the formal organization of the institution.
2. Technological involvements, relating to the technological aspect of work behavior.
3. General involvements, which furnish personal satisfactions.
4. Informal group involvements, resulting in important primary social relationships.

Each question taps one of the above areas and is individually scored as a job oriented response, a non-job oriented response, or as an indifferent response. According to Dubin, each question represents an activity that has an approximately equal likelihood of occurring in connection with some aspect of the job or some place in the community outside the world of work. A score of "occupationally involved" or "non involved" may be obtained for each of the four above mentioned behavior sectors of the inventory. A total score may also be obtained from the summation of the four categories. (See Appendix B, page 90, for a copy of the Central Life Interest Inventory and scoring procedures.)

Dubin's original inventory was designed to assess the attitudes of persons working in factories and industry. Since the wording of some items which referred directly to "plant" or "shop" were not appropriate to teachers, the questionnaire was modified to change such references to "school." The questions thus modified are marked with an asterisk in Appendix B, page 82.

#### Demographic Data Form

The Demographic Data Form consisted of thirteen questions designed to gather data on background variables which could effect the extent teachers viewed their work as a central life interest. These variables included the teacher's sex, size of school, number of years teaching experience, level of education, etc. (See Appendix C, page 92, for the Demographic Data Form.)

#### Hypotheses to be Tested

The hypotheses to be tested in this study are listed below and are grouped according to the three central questions which the study seeks to answer.

#### Teaching as a Central Life Interest

- 1.1 The majority of junior high and high school teachers in this study view their work as a central life interest.

The following hypotheses are sub-questions related to hypothesis one and directly relating to the four categories

of work involvement found in the Central Life Interest Inventory.

- 1.2 The majority of teachers in the study view their formal organization involvements as a central life interest.
- 1.3 The majority of teachers in the study view the technological involvement in their work as a central life interest.
- 1.4 The majority of teachers in the study view general involvements related to work as a central life interest.
- 1.5 The majority of teachers in the study view their informal social involvements related to work as a central life interest.

Relationships Between Central Life Interest and Student Ratings

- 2.1 Teachers who view their work as a central life interest tend to be rated higher by their students than teachers who do not see work as a central life interest.

Relationships Between Central Life Interest and the Demographic Variables

- 3.1 A positive relationship exists between teachers' level of education and the extent to which they view work as a central life interest.
- 3.2 Teachers who regularly work on a second job not related to education have less job involvement with teaching than those who rarely hold such outside jobs.
- 3.3 A higher percentage of men will view their work as a central life interest than women.
- 3.4 A positive relationship exists between the extent of job involvement and teachers' ages.
- 3.5 A higher percentage of teachers from small towns (50,000 and under) will view their work as a central life interest than teachers from large towns (50,000 and up).

- 3.6 The majority of job oriented teachers in the study, if given low student ratings, will believe the ratings can be raised.

### Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis

#### Data Collection

This study focused on the 514 teachers who, in 1969, used the services of Western Michigan University's Student Reaction Center. For all of these teachers the records of their students' perceptions of their teaching effectiveness were already on file. These ratings, along with their addresses, were obtained.

Envelopes containing the Central Life Interest Inventory and the Demographic Data Form were labeled with each teacher's name and grouped according to the school where they taught. These packages of envelopes were sent to the school principals with the request they distribute the envelopes to the designated teachers and ask that each teacher complete the enclosed questionnaires and mail them back to the Student Reaction Center. Copies of the cover letter sent to the principals and the letter included with the questionnaires for the teachers are shown in Appendix D., page 95.

Four weeks later, a follow-up letter was sent to all teachers who had not as yet returned the completed questionnaires. These procedures resulted in the

exceptionally high return rate of eighty-nine percent. From the 514 teachers solicited, 450 returned their questionnaires. Only one of the returned questionnaires was found to be unusable, resulting in data from 449 teachers being used for this study.

#### Treatment of Data

The returned Central Life Interest Inventories were hand scored, using Dubin's procedures and the results coded on computer cards for each individual teacher. Information from the Demographic Questionnaire was also coded on the same card.

Student responses to the Student-Opinion Questionnaire for each of the teachers in the study were summarized and punched on computer cards. These summaries consisted of twelve individual mean scores. There was a mean score for each of the first twelve questions on the Student Opinion Questionnaire. The summary also included a single grand mean which was calculated as a mean of the twelve means combined. In all cases, student ratings from at least two classes taught by the teacher were used in calculating mean scores.

The coded responses to Dubin's Central Life Interest Inventory were then summarized for each teacher. These summaries consisted of the number of job oriented, indifferent, and non job oriented responses for each of the



four work involvement areas of the inventory. The summaries for each area were then evaluated against Dubin's scoring criteria and each teacher was scored as either job oriented or non job oriented. Each teacher was also scored as job oriented or non job oriented regarding each of the four work involvement areas of the inventory.

The total number of job oriented responses in each area and the grand total of job oriented responses were punched on computer cards for the actual statistical analysis to test the hypotheses.

#### Statistical Analysis

The method used in the analysis of the data depended on the hypotheses being tested. A description of the analysis performed to test each of the hypotheses follows.

1. Teaching as a central life interest.

To test hypothesis 1.1 through 1.5, the percentage of teachers categorized as job oriented in each of the four areas and the percentage of teachers categorized as total job oriented according to Dubin's criteria, were determined.

2. Relationship between central life interest and student ratings.

Two types of correlation coefficients were calculated to test this hypothesis. Pearson Product-moment correlation coefficients for the relation between the number of job

oriented responses in each area of job involvement and the student ratings on each question were calculated. The product-moment correlations between the total number of job oriented responses and the student ratings were also calculated.

Point-biserial correlation coefficients were also calculated, using as the dichotomous variable the coding of job or non-job oriented.

### 3. Relationships between central life interest and the demographic data.

To determine the relationships between central life interest and each of the demographic variables, the percentage of teachers in each category of the demographic variable who were classified as job oriented was calculated.

The following chapter will present the findings regarding the previously listed hypotheses.

### Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study will limit itself to an analysis of the extent to which junior high and high school teachers view their work as a central life interest and to the relationships between teachers' perceptions of work as a central life interest and student opinions of teachers. The study is further limited by including only those 449 teachers who in 1969 used the Student Reaction Center at Western

Michigan University to process student opinions about their teaching. The great majority of the 449 teachers were teaching in the midwestern states.

Significant findings noted in this study may suggest the existence of particular characteristics which relate in general to junior and senior high school teachers; however, direct application of results may be made only to the teachers in this study.

### Summary

All data used in this study was solicited from 514 junior and senior high school teachers. Three research instruments were used. These were The Student Opinion Questionnaire, The Central Life Interest Inventory and the Demographic Data Form. The Student Opinion Questionnaire and the Central Life Interest Inventory were judged for validity and reliability primarily on the findings of the antecedent studies which prompted this research.

Student ratings of the 514 teachers used in the study were already on file at the Student Reaction Center located at Western Michigan University. These ratings, along with the teachers' addresses, were obtained. The Central Life Interest Inventory and the Demographic Data Form were mailed to each teacher. Four weeks later, a follow-up letter was sent to all teachers who had not as

yet returned the completed questionnaires. From the 514 teachers solicited, 450 returned their questionnaires.

Responses on all instruments were summarized and punched on computer cards for statistical analysis.

The method used in the analysis of the data depended on the hypotheses being tested. For hypothesis one, the percentage of teachers categorized as job oriented according to Dubin's criteria were determined.

Correlation coefficients were calculated to test hypotheses two. To test hypotheses three, the percent of teachers in each category of the demographic variable who were classified as job oriented was calculated.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The hypotheses to be examined in this study have been stated in Chapter III. Briefly, the hypotheses fall within three broad categories. (1) Examination of the extent to which the junior high and high school teachers in this study view their work as a central life interest as measured by Dubin's Central Life Interest Inventory; (2) Assessment of the relationships between students' ratings of teachers and the extent to which teachers view their work as a central interest; (3) Analysis of the relationship between teachers who view work as a central life interest and demographic variables such as sex, age, number of years teaching, size of school, level of education and working at a second job unrelated to education.

The extent to which the 449 teachers in this study view their work as a central life interest will be examined on the basis of the frequencies with which they chose the classifications on Dubin's Inventory of occupationally involved, indifferent, or non occupationally involved.

Teaching as a Central Life Interest

Hypothesis 1.1 The majority of junior high and high school teachers in this study view their work as a central life interest.

Analysis of the teachers' responses on the Central Life Interest Inventory reveal that ninety-seven teachers (twenty-one percent) can be classified as job oriented, while 352 teachers (seventy-nine percent) exhibited a non job orientation using Dubin's criterion. Based on the observed distribution of choices, the hypothesis is rejected. The majority of teachers studied do not view their work as a central life interest. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Total occupational involvement as a central life interest.

Involvement	Number	Percent
Job involved	97	21
Non job involved	<u>352</u>	<u>79</u>
Totals	449	100

Orzack has indicated that the extent to which members of an occupation view their work as a central life interest is a valid indication of professionalism. The findings of this study regarding the low percent of teachers who view their work as a major life interest questions aspects of teachers' professionalism.

It is instructive to compare these results with previous central life interest applications. Previous investigators have used the Dubin Inventory in assessing the extent to which industrial workers, lumber workers, industrial arts teachers, professional nurses, and county extension agents viewed their work as a central life interest. In Table 2, on page 44, the results from these five studies are noted along with the results gained from this study.

In comparing findings from the six investigations, it is apparent that the job orientations of the junior high and high school teachers in this study are similar to industrial workers, lumber workers and industrial arts teachers, while being dissimilar to professional nurses or county extension agents.

Comparing junior high and high school teachers to extension agents and nurses, it becomes evident that teachers to a much lesser degree perceive their work as a central life interest. The lowest degree of job involvement for teachers seems to be in the general and informal sectors of their work. Regarding informal social involvements, it appears that over ninety percent, or nine out of ten, teachers prefer their informal social involvements be unattached to their world of work. On the other hand, forty-five percent of the nurses and fifty-two percent of the extension agents indicated that their informal social relationships are related in some way to their world of work.

Table 2. Comparisons of six applications of Dubin's central life interest Inventory.

CLI Total Scores and Sub-Scores	Industrial Workers	Ima Workers	Industrial Teachers	Profes- sional Nurses	Cooperating Extension Agents	Junior High School Teachers
	Dubin N = 491*	Ima N = 400*	Nelson N = 250	Orzack N = 150*	Ranta N = 251*	Bryan N = 449
Total CLI						
Job	24%	14%	24%	79%	85%	21%
Non-Job	76%	86%	76%	21%	15%	79%
Formal Organization						
Sector						
Job	61%	62%	67%	91%	94%	56%
Non-Job	39%	38%	33%	9%	6%	44%
Technological						
Sector						
Job	63%	54%	69%	87%	87%	67%
Non-Job	37%	46%	31%	13%	13%	33%
General Sector						
Job	15%	11%	23%	67%	77%	28%
Non-Job	85%	89%	77%	33%	23%	72%
Informal Sector						
Job	9%	5%	12%	45%	52%	8%
Non-Job	91%	95%	88%	55%	48%	92%

\*Hilding E. Nelson, "Occupational Self-Images of Teachers: A Study of the Occupational Involvements and Work-Role Orientations of Michigan Industrial Education Teachers," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962, Table of Comparisons, p. 70.



The highest degree of job involvement for teachers seems to be in the technological and formal sectors of their work. Sixty-seven percent of the teachers indicated that the technological involvements in their life are a part of their world of work. Fifty-six percent or just over half of the teachers indicated that the formal organization involvements in their life are in some way related to their work.

Hypothesis 1.2 The majority of teachers in the study view their formal organizational involvements as a central life interest.

Responses to the Central Life Interest Inventory indicate 250 teachers (fifty-six percent) view their formal organizational involvements as a central life interest. The hypothesis is supported. One may conclude that of the teachers studied, the majority do view their formal organizational involvements as a central life interest. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Number of teachers classed as job involved or non-job involved regarding the formal organizational aspects of work.

Involvement	Number	Percent
Job involved	250	56
Non job involved	<u>199</u>	<u>44</u>
Totals	499	100

Hypothesis 1.3 The majority of teachers in the study view the technological involvement in their work as a central life interest.

In Table 4 it may be noted that 303 teachers (sixty-seven percent) are classed as job involved while 146 teachers (thirty-three percent) are non-job oriented regarding technological involvements which are a part of their world of work. The hypothesis is supported. It is evident that the majority of teachers in the study view the technological involvements related to their work as a central life interest.

Table 4. Number of teachers classed as job involved or non-job involved regarding the technological aspects of work.

Involvement	Number	Percent
Job involved	303	67
Non-job involved	146	33
Totals	449	100

Hypothesis 1.4 The majority of teachers in the study view general involvements related to work as a central life interest

Only 120 teachers (twenty-eight percent) exhibited job involvement while 329 (seventy-two percent) were classed as non job involved regarding the general behavior sector. The hypothesis is not supported. The majority of teachers in the study do not view general involvements related to

work as a central life interest. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Number of teachers classed as job involved or non job involved regarding the general involvement aspects of work.

Involvement	Number	Percent
Job involved	120	28
Non job involved	<u>329</u>	<u>72</u>
Totals	449	100

Hypothesis 1.5 The majority of teachers view their informal social involvements related to work as a central life interest.

Observation of the study responses indicate that thirty-nine teachers (eight percent) view their informal involvements as job related, while 410 teachers (ninety-two percent) view their informal social involvements as non job related or taking place outside the world of work. Therefore, it is evident teachers in this study do not view their informal social involvements as a part of their world of work. The hypothesis is rejected. Table 6 summarizes the results of these analyses.

Table 6. Number of teachers classed as job involved or non-job involved regarding the informal involvement aspects of work.

Involvement	Number	Percent
Job involved	39	8
Non job involved	<u>410</u>	<u>92</u>
Totals	449	100

Relationships Between Central Life  
Interests and Student Ratings

Hypothesis 2.1 Teachers who view their work as a central life interest tend to be rated higher by their students than teachers who do not see work as a central life interest.

From examining the results of the correlation analysis using the number of job oriented responses, it is apparent that the above hypothesis is supported. Teachers who view their work as a central life interest tend to receive higher ratings by their students than teachers who do not. Examination of Table 7 on page 49 indicates that student ratings on nine out of the twelve questions on the Student Opinion Questionnaire correlated positively with total job orientation at the .05 level of significance. Of the twelve questions on the student questionnaire, only items six, nine and eleven did not correlate significantly with total job orientation at the .05 level.

Table 7. Product-moment correlations of the number of job-oriented responses and student ratings

Student Rating Questions	Central Life Interest Subsection				All Sectors Combined
	Formal Sector	Technological Sector	General Sector	Informal Sector	
SR1	0.068	0.095	0.107*	0.127*	0.149**
SR2	0.075	0.017	0.085	0.136**	0.118*
SR3	0.097	0.080	0.065	0.145**	0.146*
SR4	0.128**	0.080	0.105*	0.106*	0.150**
SR5	0.090	0.026	0.074	0.164*	0.136**
SR6	0.075	0.005	0.054	0.090	0.082
SR7	0.080	0.085	0.121*	0.159**	0.169**
SR8	0.064	-0.021	0.107*	0.185**	0.132**
SR9	0.021	-0.058	0.046	0.037	0.017
SR10	0.072	-0.016	0.100*	0.153**	0.119*
SR11	0.084	-0.057	0.061	0.135**	0.085
SR12	0.060	0.086	0.058	0.112*	0.121*
Average Student Rating for all Twelve Questions					
SR13	0.095	0.040	0.105*	0.160**	0.151**

\*r  $\geq$  .098 = .05\*\*r  $\geq$  .128 = .01

Teachers who were job oriented regarding general work involvements and informal work involvements were rated higher by students than teachers who were not. Student ratings on ten out of twelve questions correlated positively with informal work experiences. Five out of twelve items on the student rating scale correlated positively with job orientation regarding general work involvements. These correlations, though statistically significant, were small. However, the correlations do indicate that teachers who are job oriented regarding the general and informal aspects of their job receive higher ratings by their students than teachers who are not job oriented.<sup>1</sup>

There are two questions on the student questionnaire that indicated no significant correlation with job involvement. They were questions six and nine. It appears that no aspect of job orientation is related to either the teacher's ability to stimulate interest (question six) or the variety of teaching procedures employed (question nine).

From the summarized data in Table 7, page 49, it appears that teachers who view their work as a central life interest do tend to receive higher ratings from their students than teachers who do not. The data support the hypothesis.

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that even though hypothesis two was supported, the correlation coefficient is small and at best only ( $.27^2 = .04$ ) four percent of the variation in teaching effectiveness is related to job orientation. This suggests that many other important variables not measured here are related to teaching effectiveness.

The point-biserial correlation coefficients in Table 8 on page 52 represent the degree of relation between student ratings and job orientation, when job orientation is categorized as a dichotomous variable. Although the correlation patterns are similar to those in Table 7, the point-biserial coefficients are consistently smaller than the corresponding product-moment correlations. Also, fewer are significant at the .05 level. There are two possible reasons for this. First, when an essentially continuous variable is dichotomized, information is lost, and the resulting correlation coefficient is often reduced.

Second, Dubin's criterion for job orientation involves not only the number of job oriented responses, but also involves the number of indifferent responses. Consequently, there is not a direct one-to-one correspondence between the number of job oriented responses and a teacher being classified as job or non job oriented. It appears that the number of job oriented responses is a better indicator of job orientation than the score produced using Dubin's criterion.

#### Relationships Between Central Life Interest and the Demographic Variables

Hypothesis 3.1 A positive relationship exists between teachers' level of education and the extent to which they view work as a central life interest.

Table 8. Point-biserial correlation of job orientation and student ratings.

Student Rating Questions	Central Life Interest Subsection				Total Job Orientation
	Formal Sector	Technological Sector	General Sector	Informal Sector	
SR1	0.085	0.052	0.094	0.050	0.094
SR2	0.075	0.011	0.093	0.073	0.053
SR3	0.087	0.065	0.080	0.063	0.103*
SR4	0.125	0.075	0.128*	0.020	0.118*
SR5	0.079	0.005	0.078	0.085	0.088
SR6	0.067	0.008	0.082	0.035	0.027
SR7	0.086	0.031	0.135**	0.061	0.095
SR8	0.044	-0.010	0.114*	0.108	0.076
SR9	0.004	-0.021	0.038	-0.002	-0.005
SR10	0.052	-0.024	0.114*	-0.064	0.064
SR11	0.047	-0.043	0.064	0.062	0.035
SR12	0.074	0.063	0.107	0.022	0.108*
Average Student Rating for all Twelve Questions					
SR13	0.086	0.029	0.125	0.062	0.094

\*r  $\geq$  .10 = .05\*\*r  $\geq$  .132 = .01



All teachers were asked to indicate their level of education. Table 9 provides a summary of this data. Analysis of the data indicates that twenty-seven percent of the teachers with a M.A. degree or more view their work as a central life interest. By comparison, only seventeen percent of the teachers with a B.A. degree viewed their work as a central life interest. The hypothesis is supported.<sup>2</sup>

Table 9. Percent of job oriented teachers classified by educational level.

<u>Occupational Involvement</u>	<u>Level of Education</u>		
	Less than B.A.	B.A.+	M.A.+
Total Occupational Involvement	5%	17%	27%
Formal Occupational Involvement	100%*	51%	63%
Technological Occupational Involvement	100%*	68%	66%
General Occupational Involvement	50%	25%	29%
Informal Occupational Involvement	0%	8%	10%

\*Only two cases involved.

<sup>2</sup>The confidence interval at the .05 level was calculated for this proportion. The interval included the range .19 to .27. Since .17 is outside this range, .17 is significantly different from .27 at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 3.2 Teachers who regularly work on a second job not related to education have less job involvement with teaching than those who rarely hold such outside jobs.

Examination of the data presented in Table 10 indicates that only eighteen percent of the teachers who regularly work at a second job apart from their teaching, view teaching as a central life interest. By comparison, for teachers who rarely work at a second job outside of teaching, twenty-three percent view teaching as a central life interest. Eighteen percent is significantly different from twenty-three percent at the .05 level. The hypothesis is supported. Teachers who regularly work on a second job not related to education have less job involvement with teaching than those who rarely hold outside jobs.

Table 10. Number and percent of job oriented teachers who work a second job unrelated to education.

<u>Occupational Involvement</u>	<u>Work Outside of Teaching</u>		
	Regularly	Occasionally	Rarely
Total Occupational Involvement	(8) 18%	(15) 17%	(74) 23%
Formal Occupational Involvement	(25) 58%	(46) 53%	(181) 56%
Technological Occupational Involvement	(29) 67%	(62) 72%	(215) 67%
General Occupational Involvement	(14) 32%	(23) 27%	(83) 26%
Informal Occupational Involvement	(2) 4%	(3) 3%	(35) 10%

Hypothesis 3.5 A higher percentage of men will view their work as a central life interest than women.

The data as presented in Table 11, on page 56, indicate that seventy-one (twenty-seven percent) of the men viewed their work as a central life interest, while only twenty-six (fourteen percent) of the women viewed teaching as a major life interest.

A significantly higher percentage of men than women view their work as a central life interest. The hypothesis is supported.

Regarding general occupational involvements, eighty-eight (thirty-three percent) of the men indicated that the general social relationships which were within their world of work constituted a central life interest, while thirty-two (seventeen percent) of the women viewed general occupational involvements as a central life interest.

A higher percentage of women viewed the technological aspects of their work as a central life interest than did men. Regarding technological occupational involvements, one hundred and seventy-four (sixty-six percent) of the men indicated that the technological aspects of their work constituted a central life interest, while one hundred and thirty-two (seventy percent) of the women viewed technological involvements connected with their work as a central life interest.

Only thirty (eleven percent) of the men viewed informal social relations connected with their work as being of a central life interest. Only ten (five percent) of the women indicated that the informal social relationships which were a part of their work constituted a central life interest.

Table 11. Number and percent of men and women teachers who view work as a central life interest.

<u>Occupational Involvement</u>	<u>Sex</u>	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Total Occupational Involvement	(71) 27%	(26) 14%
Formal Occupational Involvement	(157) 59%	(95) 51%
Technological Occupational Involvement	(174) 66%	(132) 70%
General Occupational Involvement	(88) 33%	(32) 17%
Informal Occupational Involvement	(30) 11%	(10) 5%

Hypothesis 3.4 A positive relationship exists between the extent of job involvement and teacher's age.

The data were analyzed to determine the number of teachers at each age level who viewed work as a life interest. Table 12, on page 57, summarizes the data by showing the percent of teachers at each age level who viewed work as a central life interest. On the basis of the results obtained

Table 12. The percentage of teachers at various ages who view work as a central life interest.

<u>Occupational Involvement</u>	<u>Age</u>				
	20-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41+
Total Occupational Involvement	52%	52%	66%	56%	60%
Formal Occupational Involvement	68%	60%	68%	72%	77%
Technological Occupational Involvement	23%	24%	46%	20%	24%
General Occupational Involvement	8%	8%	14%	8%	6%
Informal Occupational Involvement	20%	15%	36%	20%	19%

from the analysis of the data, the hypothesis was not supported. However, teachers between the ages of thirty-one and thirty-five view their work as a central life interest to a greater extent than do teachers from any other age grouping. Thirty-six percent of the teachers between the ages of thirty-one and thirty-five viewed their work as a central life interest, as compared with only twenty-one percent of all teachers in the study. It is evident that a significantly higher percentage of teachers from the age range thirty-one to thirty-five view their teaching as a central life interest than from any other age group. This suggests that there is a general increase in job orientation as teacher age increases until the age thirty-five. Then either their job commitment decreases or the more job oriented teachers have left the classroom to take non-teaching jobs.

Hypothesis 3.5 A higher percentage of teachers from small towns (20,000 and under) will view their work as a central life interest than teachers from large towns (50,000 and up).

All teachers in the study were asked to indicate the size of town in which their school was located. Table 13 on page 59, summarizes these data. Twenty-six percent of the teachers in towns 20,000 and under viewed their work as a central life interest as compared with only sixteen percent of the teachers from towns of 20,000 and over. The hypothesis is supported.

Table 13. Percent of job oriented teachers grouped by size of town.

Occupational Involvement	Size of Town				
	20,000 under	20,000 50,000	50,000 100,000	100,000 250,000	250,000 up
Total Occupational Involvement	26%	16%	16%	11%	18%
Formal Occupational Involvement	58%	54%	54%	44%	54%
Technological Occupational Involvement	68%	69%	68%	77%	59%
General Occupational Involvement	28%	24%	28%	11%	22%
Informal Occupational Involvement	11%	5%	9%	0%	6%

Hypothesis 3.6 The majority of job oriented teachers in the study if given low student ratings, will believe the ratings can be raised.

The data as summarized in Table 14, page 61, shows an overwhelming majority of the job oriented teachers indicated that if they were given low ratings by thier students, it would be a temporary situation and they would be able to change the ratings in a positive direction. Of the ninety-seven job oriented teachers, eighty-five (ninety percent) believed they could change low student ratings. In all four sectors of job involvement, the majority of teachers believed they could change low student ratings. The data clearly indicates the hypothesis is supported.

### Summary

Two major hypotheses and ten sub hypotheses were restated for study in this chapter. The first major hypothesis stating that the majority of junior high and high school teachers in this study view their work as a central life interest, was rejected. (See Table 15, page 63.) Analysis of the teachers' responses on the Central Life Interest Inventory indicated that the substantial majority of teachers studied, seventy-nine percent, did not view their work as a central life interest. When comparing junior high and high school teachers to industrial workers, lumber workers, industrial arts teachers, professional nurses and cooperating extension agents, only lumber workers had a



Table 14. Number of job oriented teachers and their perceived ability to change low student ratings.

<u>Occupational Involvement as a Central Life Interest</u>	<u>Judged wrong or deserve higher ratings</u>	<u>Don't Care</u>	<u>Am a Failure</u>	<u>Temporary, Can Change</u>
Total Occupational Involvement	5	0	9	85
Formal Occupational Involvement	16	0	27	209
Technological Occupational Involvement	14	2	28	262
General Occupational Involvement	6	0	14	100
Informal Occupational Involvement	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>35</u>
Totals	24	2	43	379

larger percentage of workers who did not view their work as a central life interest (see Table 2, page 44).

The second major hypothesis, stating that teachers who view their work as a central life interest tend to be rated higher by their students than teachers who do not, was supported. Correlation analysis using number of job oriented responses and student ratings indicated that on nine out of the twelve questions comprising the Student Questionnaire, teachers who view their work as a central life interest received higher ratings by their students than teachers who did not view work as a central life interest (see Table 8, page 52).

The summary of outcomes for all sub hypotheses and hypotheses dealing with demographic variables are presented in the following table (Table 15, page 63).

Table 15. Summary of acceptance and rejection statements for the hypotheses.

Number	Hypothesis Tested	Statement of Acceptance or Rejection
1.1	The majority of junior high and high school teachers in this study view their work as a central life interest.	Rejected--21% viewed work as a central life interest
1.2	The majority of teachers in the study view their formal organization involvements as a central life interest.	Accepted--56% view formal organization involvements as a central life interest.
1.3	The majority of teachers in the study view the technological involvement in their work as a central life interest.	Accepted--67% view techno- logical involve- ments related to work as a central life interest.
1.4	The majority of teachers in the study view general involvements related to work as a central life interest.	Rejected--28% view general involvements related to work as a central life interest.

Table 15. (cont.)

Number	Hypothesis Tested	Statement of Acceptance or Rejection
1.5	The majority of teachers in the study view their informal social involvements related to work as a central life interest.	Rejected--8% viewed informal social involvements related to work as a central life interest.
2.1	Teachers who view their work as a central life interest tend to be rated higher by their students than teachers who do not see work as a central life interest.	Accepted--rated higher on nine out of twelve questions on Student Questionnaire--at .05 level.
3.1	A positive relationship exists between teachers' level of education and the extent to which they view work as a central life interest.	Accepted--27% with M.A. viewed work as a central life interest while 17% with B.A. viewed work as a central life interest. Significant difference in proportions at .05 level.
3.2	Teachers who regularly work on a second job not related to education have less job involvement with teaching than those who rarely hold such outside jobs.	Accepted--Significant at .05 level.

Table 15. (cont.)

Number	Hypothesis Tested	Statement of Acceptance or Rejection
3.3	A higher percentage of men will view their work as a central life interest than women.	Accepted-- Significant at .05 level.
3.4	A positive relationship exists between the extent of job involvement and teachers' ages.	Rejected--
3.5	A higher percentage of teachers from small towns (20,000 and under) will view their work as a central life interest than teachers from large towns (20,000 and up).	Accepted--26% of teachers from towns 20,000 and under viewed work as a central life interest, while 16% from towns 20,000 and over did so.
3.6	The majority of job oriented teachers in the study if given low student ratings, will believe the ratings can be raised.	Accepted--90% believed they could change low student ratings of their teaching ef- fectiveness.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Summary

This study was undertaken to determine the extent to which junior and senior high school teachers view their work as a central life interest, and to investigate the relationship between central life interest scores and student ratings of teacher effectiveness. The relationship between various demographic data and central life interest scores was also investigated.

All data used in the study were solicited from 514 junior and senior high teachers who in 1969 used the services of Western Michigan University's Student Reaction Center. One-third of the population (127 teachers) were junior high teachers and the remaining two-thirds (335 teachers) were teaching in grades ten, eleven and twelve. All teaching areas were represented.

A review of the literature pertaining to the extent various occupational groups view work as a central life interest revealed considerable variation among occupational groups. There was very little evidence to indicate the extent to which junior and senior high teachers viewed their work as a central life interest.

The reviewed literature presenting descriptions of a profession provided many descriptors which identified teachers as professionals, and led to the hypothesis that teachers, like members of other professions cited in the literature, would view their work as a central life interest. The literature regarding student ratings of teachers indicated that student ratings are both valid and reliable assessments of teaching effectiveness and supported the use of student opinion as an indication of teaching effectiveness.

Dubin's Central Life Interest Inventory was chosen to measure the extent teachers viewed their work as a central life interest. This instrument was chosen because it had been used in six previous studies of a similar nature conducted with various professional and non professional occupational groups. The use of the same instrument for the population of junior and senior high school teachers allowed a direct comparison of results with previous studies of other occupational groups. To assess teacher effectiveness, Bryan's Student-Opinion Questionnaire was used. This instrument was chosen because of its high reliability and validity demonstrated in previous studies.

To test the set of hypotheses dealing with teaching as a central life interest (Hypotheses 1--1.5), the percent of teachers categorized as job oriented in each of the four job involvement areas and the percentage of teachers categorized as total job oriented according to Dubin's

criteria were determined. To test the relationship between central life interest and student ratings (Hypothesis 2.1), the Pearson product-moment and the point-biserial correlation coefficients were calculated. All correlations were checked for significance at the .05 level. To determine the relationships between central life interest and each of the demographic variables, the percentage of teachers in each category of the demographic variable who were classified as job oriented was calculated. Results were obtained from 449 teachers, ninety percent of the population.

The twelve hypotheses tested in the study and the results were as follows:

# 1. Teaching as a Central Life Interest

- 1.1 The majority of junior high and high school teachers in this study view their work as a central life interest. (not supported).
- 1.2 The majority of teachers in the study view their formal organization involvements as a central life interest. (supported).
- 1.3 The majority of teachers in the study view the technological involvement in their work as a central life interest. (supported).
- 1.4 The majority of teachers in the study view general involvements related to work as a central life interest. (not supported).
- 1.5 The majority of teachers in the study view their informal social involvements related to work as a central life interest. (not supported).



## 2. Relationships Between Central Life Interest and Student Ratings

- 2.1 Teachers who view their work as a central life interest tend to be rated higher by their students than teachers who do not see work as a central life interest. (supported).

## 3. Relationships Between Central Life Interest and the Demographic Variables

- 3.1 A positive relationship exists between teachers' level of education and the extent to which they view work as a central life interest. (supported).
- 3.2 Teachers who regularly work on a second job not related to education have less job involvement than those who rarely hold such outside jobs. (supported).
- 3.3 A higher percentage of men will view their work as a central life interest than women. (supported).
- 3.4 A positive relationship exists between the extent of job involvement and teachers' age. (not supported).
- 3.5 A higher percentage of teachers from small towns (20,000 and under) will view their work as a central life interest than teachers from large towns (50,000 and up). (supported).
- 3.6 The majority of job oriented teachers in the study if given low student ratings, will believe the ratings can be raised. (supported).

## Conclusions

The analysis of the data led to the following conclusions:

1. The majority of teachers do not view their work as a central life interest.

2. The majority of teachers view their formal organization work involvements as a central life interest. Put another way, the school is the most significant formal organization when judged in terms of standard organizational ties and bonds.
3. The majority of teachers believed that the school in which they worked provided the opportunities for desired behavior directly involving the technological aspects of their lives.
4. Only a small minority of teachers preferred the school and related teaching activities as a source of general personal satisfaction. The majority of teachers preferred to seek non-work connected experiences as the environment from which they obtained their general and personal satisfactions.
5. Almost all teachers preferred a non-work related environment as the setting for developing and experiencing informal social relationships.
6. Teachers who gain general satisfactions from and develop informal social relationships within their world of work, tend to be rated higher by their students than teachers who do not. Put another way, teachers who see their work as a central life interest tend to receive higher ratings by their students than teachers who do not.

7. Teachers with Master's degrees and above tend to view their work as a central life interest more often than teachers with less than a Master's degree. The level of education appears to have a bearing on the extent of involvement a teacher has with his work.
8. Teachers who regularly work at a second job unrelated to education view teaching as a central life interest less frequently than teachers who do not work at such jobs.
9. More men than women view their work as a central life interest.
10. Teachers between the ages of thirty-one and thirty-five view their work as a central life interest to a greater extent than teachers at any other age level.
11. Teachers from small towns (20,000 and under) view their work as a central life interest to a greater extent than do teachers from large towns (20,000 and over).
12. The overwhelming majority of teachers believe that if they were to receive low ratings by their students, they would have the ability to change student ratings in a positive direction.

### Discussion

The first basic assumption in this study was that teachers would view their work as a central life interest. Because teachers meet many of the descriptors of a professional and because two other professional groups had been found to view work as a central life interest, it was hypothesized teachers would do likewise. The results of this study show that teachers in general do not share the assumed characteristics of the professions with regard to their view of work as a central life interest. There may be a number of reasons why this was not the case.

The two sectors of the Central Life Interest Inventory on which teachers were not job oriented included the general involvement sector and the informal involvement sector. Both these sectors concern social relationships and general satisfactions which could be found within or outside the world of work. Teaching as an occupation may not offer opportunities favorable to the establishment of informal social relationships while on the job. Teaching may not provide the suitable rewards needed for developing and maintaining personal relationships on the job. Teachers spend the greatest proportion of their work time within individual classrooms and separated from the other staff. Teaching is usually an activity done in relative isolation, one teacher and one group of students. Also, teachers may have to go outside their world of work to receive

recognition and status. Teachers may receive very little feedback indicating their success or failures, causing them to seek general satisfactions outside their work.

The implication to educators is that if it is desirable to increase teachers' involvement in their job, the school must develop a feedback system which enables a teacher to adequately and frequently assess his successes. The school organization must change to enable teachers to work more as teams rather than individually.

The second basic assumption in this study was that teachers who viewed their work as a central life interest, would receive higher student ratings than teachers who did not. Analysis of the data supported this assumption. The assumption is based on the theory that students are good judges of teacher competence. Teachers who are rated high by their students see themselves as successful teachers and will value the work environment as a source of informal social relations as well as general satisfactions. The results of this study support this proposition.

It should be pointed out, however, that the correlations between job involvement and student ratings, though significant at the .05 level, indicate that only a small amount of variation in teacher effectiveness is related to job involvement. Many other important variables not measured here are also related to teaching effectiveness.

Educators should undertake research designed to isolate specific teaching behaviors which result in high student ratings of teacher effectiveness.

As part of the data analysis to determine the relationships between student ratings and central life interest scores, the total number of job oriented responses were correlated with student ratings. Higher and more extensive correlations were found using this method than by correlating the teachers classified as job oriented using Dubin's scoring procedures with student ratings. This would suggest that in future studies using Dubin's Central Life Interest Inventory, researchers might consider the possibility that the total number of job oriented responses is a better indicator of job orientation than Dubin's scoring methods.

The conclusion that the majority of teachers believe they could change low student ratings of their teaching effectiveness indicates that teachers both value student opinions as an indication teaching performance, as well as believe they have the ability to change student ratings. This implies that inservice and well as preservice teacher education programs could profitably use student ratings as a means of assessing teacher effectiveness, identifying successful and unsuccessful teaching behaviors, and improving teaching effectiveness.

### Implications for Further Research

The discussion above indicates further research might be conducted to determine:

1. If teachers could be more appropriately classed as "independent professionals," (working independently of their peers) as do professionals such as dentists and optometrists. A comparative study of Central Life Interest Inventory scores of such independent professionals is indicated.
2. The extent to which college professors view their work as a central life interest and the relation of these scores with student ratings.
3. The relative difference between assistant, associate and full professor regarding the extent to which each views his work as a central life interest.
4. What specific teaching behaviors are related to high or low student ratings of teaching effectiveness?
5. If school organizations that enable teachers to work together in teams cause teachers to view work as a central life interest.
6. The relationship of the decline in job involvement after the age thirty-five with selective promotion.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Carr-Saunders, A.M. and P.A. Wilson. The Professions.  
Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933.
- Cooley, C.H. Human Nature and Social Order. New York:  
Scriber and Company, 1902.
- Gross, Edward. Work and Society. New York: The Thomas  
Y. Crowell Company, 1958.
- Lieberman, Myron. Education as a Profession. New Jersey:  
Prentice-Hall Inc., 1955.
- Powell, John Walker. Learning Comes of Age. New York:  
Association Press, 1956.
- Riley, John W., Bryce Ryan and Marcia Lifshitz. The  
Student Looks at His Teacher. New Jersey: Rutgers  
University Press, 1950.
- Sherif, Muzafer. Reference Groups. New York: Harper and  
Row, 1964.
- Tawney, R.H. Religion and the Rise of Capitalism. New York:  
Harcourt Co., 1926.
- Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1930.
- Yoder, Dale. Personnel Management and Industrial Relations.  
New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.

### Periodicals

- Amotora, Mary. "Teacher Ratings by Younger Pupils,"  
Journal of Teacher Education, V (June, 1954).

- Boardman, C. W. "An Analysis of Pupil Ratings of High School Teachers," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVI (September, 1930).
- Davenport, Kenneth. "An Investigation of Pupil Ratings of Certain Teaching Practices," Studies of Higher Education, XLIX (January, 1944).
- Detchen, Lily. "Shall the Student Rate the Professor?" Journal of Higher Education, XI (March, 1940).
- Douglas, Harl R. "Rating the Effectiveness of College Instructors," School and Society, XXVIII (August 18, 1928).
- Dubin, Robert. "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interest' of Industrial Workers," Social Problems, III (January, 1956).
- Heilman, J. D. and W. D. Armentrout. "The Rating of College Teachers on Ten Traits by Their Students," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXVII (March, 1936).
- Hudelson, Earl. "The Validity of Student Ratings of Instructors," School and Society, LXXIII (April 28, 1951).
- Orzack, Louis H. "Work as a 'Central Life Interest' of Professionals," Social Problems, VII (Fall, 1959).
- Remmers, H. H. "The Relationship Between Students' Marks and Student Attitude Toward Instructors," School and Society, XXVIII (December 15, 1928).
- Starrak, J. A. "Student Rating of Instruction," Journal of Higher Education, V (February, 1934).
- Symonds, Percival M. "Characteristics of the Effective Teacher Based on Pupil Evaluations," Journal of Experimental Education, XXIII (June, 1955).

Unpublished Materials

- Ima, Kenji. "Central Life Interest of Industrial Workers: A Replication Among Lumber Workers." Unpublished Master's thesis, The Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, Eugene, 1963.
- Leighbody, G. B. "What Makes a Professional, Professional?" A speech quoted in an unpublished Doctoral dissertation entitled "The Professional Status of the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service" by Raymond Ranta. The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1960.
- Nelson, Hilding E. "Occupational Self-Images of Teachers: A Study of the Occupational Involvements and Work-Role Orientation of Michigan Industrial Education Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1962.
- Ranta, Raymond. "The Professional Status of the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1960.
- Ryan, Kevin Albert. "The Use of Student Written Feedback in Changing the Behavior of Beginning Secondary School Teachers." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., 1966.

Publications of the Government  
and Other Organizations

- Bryan, Roy C. Reactions to Teachers by Students, Parents and Administrators. Cooperative Research Project No. 668. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Some Observations Concerning Written Student Reactions to High School Teachers. U. S. Office of Education Research Project No. 668. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1968.
- McCall, W. A. Measurement of Teacher Merit. Bulletin No. 284. Raleigh, North Carolina: State Department of Instruction, 1959.

Oliver, Wilmot F. The Relative Effectiveness of Informational Feedback About Supervisory and Student Reactions With Beginning and Experienced Vocational Teachers. Cooperative Research Project No. 66-8527. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University, 1967.

## APPENDIX A

### Student-Opinion Questionnaire



## STUDENT-OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

(Form A)

Please answer the following questions honestly and frankly. Do not give your name. To encourage you to be frank, your regular teacher should be absent from the classroom while these questions are being answered. Neither your teacher nor anyone else at your school will ever see your answers.

The person who is temporarily in charge of your class will, during this period, collect all reports and seal them in an envelope addressed to Western Michigan University. Your teacher will receive from the University a summary of the answers by the students in your class. The University will mail this summary to no one except your teacher unless requested to do so by your teacher.

After completing this report, sit quietly or study until all students have completed their reports. There should be no talking.

Underline your answers to questions 1-13. Write your answers to questions 14 and 15.

### WHAT IS YOUR OPINION CONCERNING THIS TEACHER'S:

1. **KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT:** Does he have a thorough knowledge and understanding of his teaching field?  
Below Average      Average      Good      Very Good      The Very Best
2. **CLARITY OF EXPLANATIONS:** Are assignments and explanations clear?  
Below Average      Average      Good      Very Good      The Very Best
3. **FAIRNESS:** Is he fair and impartial in his treatment of all students?  
Below Average      Average      Good      Very Good      The Very Best
4. **CONTROL:** Does he keep enough order in the classroom? Do students behave well?  
Below Average      Average      Good      Very Good      The Very Best
5. **ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENTS:** Is he patient, understanding, considerate, and courteous?  
Below Average      Average      Good      Very Good      The Very Best
6. **ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST:** Is this class interesting and challenging?  
Below Average      Average      Good      Very Good      The Very Best
7. **ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT:** Does he show interest in and enthusiasm for the subject? Does he appear to enjoy teaching this subject?  
Below Average      Average      Good      Very Good      The Very Best
8. **ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT OPINIONS:** Are the ideas and opinions of students treated with respect? Are differences of opinion welcomed even when a student disagrees with the teacher?  
Below Average      Average      Good      Very Good      The Very Best
9. **VARIETY IN TEACHING PROCEDURES:** Is much the same procedure used day after day and month after month, or are different and appropriate teaching methods used at different times (student reports, class discussions, small-group discussions, films and other audio-visual aids, demonstrations, debates, field trips, teacher lectures, guest lectures, etc.)?  
Below Average      Average      Good      Very Good      The Very Best

(over)

10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION: Do students feel free to raise questions and express opinions? Are students encouraged to take part?

Below Average      Average      Good      Very Good      The Very Best

11. SENSE OF HUMOR: Does he see and share with students amusing happenings and experiences?

Below Average      Average      Good      Very Good      The Very Best

12. PLANNING AND PREPARATION: Are plans well made? Is class time well spent? Is little time wasted?

Below Average      Average      Good      Very Good      The Very Best

13. ASSIGNMENTS: Are assignments (out-of-class, required work) sufficiently challenging without being unreasonably long? Is the weight of assignments reasonable?

Much too light      Too light      Reasonable      Too heavy      Much too heavy

14. Please name two or more things that you especially like about this teacher or course.

15. Please give two or more suggestions for the improvement of this teacher or course.



APPENDIX B

The Central Life Interest Inventory

Alterations of Inventory Wording

Scoring Procedures for the Central  
Life Interest Inventory

# CENTRAL LIFE INTEREST INVENTORY

## DIRECTIONS

For each of the following statements, there are three possible answers. We would like you to read each statement and the answers very carefully.

After you have read the statement and the three answers under it, pick out the answer which comes closest to your own feelings about the matter. Place a check in the blank in front of this answer.

Sometimes, none of the answers will exactly fit your own ideas, but you can pick out the one which is closest to the way you feel and check it.

Please be sure to check only one answer to every statement. Do not skip any statement.

(I)*	(G)
If I received a promotion that meant moving to another city	I believe that
<u>my</u> friendships wouldn't make any difference in my moving.	<u>the</u> things I do away from my job are more important than anything else.
<u>I</u> would most dislike leaving my friends on the job.	<u>most</u> things are about equally important.
<u>I</u> would most dislike leaving my other friends.	<u>my</u> job is more important than anything else.

\*Key:

"Work Sectors"

(F) = Formal  
(T) = Technological  
(G) = General  
(I) = Informal

"Scoring"

(J) = Job Oriented  
(N-J) = Non-job Oriented  
(Ind) = Indifferent

<p>(F)</p> <p>I sometimes hope that</p> <p>— I'll get to be a more important member in my club, church or lodge.</p> <p>— I'll get a promotion at work.</p> <p>— such things won't ever bother me.</p>	<p>(I)</p> <p>I most like</p> <p>— talking with my friends about things that are happening.</p> <p>— talking about whatever my friends want to talk about.</p> <p>— talking shop with my friends.</p>
<p>(T)</p> <p>I most enjoy keeping</p> <p>— my things around the house in good shape.</p> <p>— my materials and work areas in the school in good shape. job*</p> <p>— my mind off such things.</p>	<p>(T)</p> <p>In my spare time</p> <p>— I often think up better ways of doing my job.</p> <p>— I just prefer to relax.</p> <p>— I often think about keeping my car in good shape.</p>
<p>(G)</p> <p>The most pleasant things I do are concerned with</p> <p>— the things away from work.</p> <p>— different things at different times.</p> <p>— things at work.</p>	<p>(F)</p> <p>If a job I know about was giving everybody trouble, and I heard that another school had solved this problem</p> <p>— I would tell the principal about it.</p> <p>— I wouldn't worry about things and would forget the whole matter.</p> <p>— I'm too busy to worry about the school's problems. company's*</p>

\*Words followed by asterisk show Dubin's original CLI wording.



<p>(I)</p> <p>I would rather take my vacation with</p> <p>__my family.</p> <p>__some friends from work.</p> <p>__by myself.</p>	<p>(G)</p> <p>I like to read</p> <p>__things about lots of different subjects.</p> <p>__things about my job.</p> <p>__things about what I most like to do.</p>
<p>(G)</p> <p>In order to get ahead in the world</p> <p>__I think you have to have a lot of luck.</p> <p>__I think you have to be well liked and known about town.</p> <p>__I think you have to be well liked where you work.</p>	<p>(I)</p> <p>When I am not around them, the people I miss most are</p> <p>__just people in general.</p> <p>__my friends around town.</p> <p>__my friends at work.</p>
<p>(T)</p> <p>I would enjoy taking classes to learn more about</p> <p>__my hobby or other interests</p> <p>__my job.</p> <p>__only something very special and important.</p>	<p>(I)</p> <p>I prefer to join a club or a lodge</p> <p>__where there are people from my neighborhood who are members.</p> <p>__where there are people from work who are members.</p> <p>__where the members come from all over.</p>

<p>(T) Moving ahead on the job</p> <p>is so important that I'm willing to spend all the time necessary to make contacts and pick up information about my work.</p> <p>is not so important that I would give up my time to make contacts and get information about my work.</p> <p>is not particularly important to me.</p>	<p>(F) I am happier if I am praised for doing a good job of something at work.</p> <p>something in an organization I belong to.</p> <p>anything, but it doesn't matter very much what.</p>
<p>(I) In my free time at work, I would rather</p> <p>talk shop with fellow staff members.</p> <p>talk about whatever comes up.</p> <p>talk about things not concerned with the school plant.</p>	<p>(G) When I am worried, it is usually about</p> <p>how well I'm doing on my job.</p> <p>just little things.</p> <p>the things that happen to me outside the school plant.</p>
<p>(I) It is more important to me that</p> <p>I be tops at my job and that my friends know this.</p> <p>I be good at other things (away from my job) and that my friends know this.</p> <p>things go smoothly whether or not my friends think I'm good at them.</p>	<p>(F) I would most hate</p> <p>missing a day's work.</p> <p>missing a meeting of an organization I belong to.</p> <p>missing almost anything I usually do.</p>

<p>(T)</p> <p>When I am doing some work, I usually try not to waste materials</p> <p>__ on my job.</p> <p>__ seldom; I don't worry about wasting materials.</p> <p>__ on a project at home.</p>	<p>(F)</p> <p>It is easier for me to take a bawling out</p> <p>__ from an officer of an organization I belong to in town.</p> <p>__ from a policeman.</p> <p>__ from my principal foreman.</p>
<p>(I)</p> <p>I get a bigger kick out of</p> <p>__ playing cards with the fellow staff members from school.</p> <p>work.</p> <p>__ playing cards only with people I can win from.</p> <p>__ playing cards at night with friends.</p>	<p>(T)</p> <p>Noise bothers me most</p> <p>__ when working at home.</p> <p>__ when working at school.</p> <p>plant.</p> <p>__ hardly ever.</p>
<p>(G)</p> <p>I hope my children can</p> <p>__ be sure to work at the same kind of job as mine.</p> <p>__ be sure to work at a different kind of job from mine.</p> <p>__ work at any job, I don't care what.</p>	<p>(T)</p> <p>When I am doing some work</p> <p>__ I am usually most accurate at home.</p> <p>__ I seldom think about being accurate.</p> <p>__ I am usually most accurate working at school.</p> <p>plant.</p>

<p>(I) I prefer to have as friends __ people who do not work at the same place I do.  __ different people according to what they're like.  __ people who work at my school company.</p>	<p>(T) I don't mind getting dirty __ while working at home.  __ at any time if I can wash up afterwards.  __ while working at school. company.</p>
<p>(F) I would much rather be a leader in  __ my faculty's recreation company's program.  __ my lodge.  __ any organization just so it's a good one.</p>	<p>(I) I prefer talking to  __ different people depending on what we talk about.  __ my neighbors.  __ the people here at work.</p>
<p>(T) If I have to work with some- one else, who is a slow worker, to get a job done  __ I am most annoyed on a job at school. plant.  __ I am most annoyed on a pro- ject where we are fixing up the church or our organization club-house. __ I am annoyed regardless of where we are working.</p>	<p>(I) It hurts me more if I am disliked  __ by the people at work.  __ by the people around town.  __ by anyone I know.</p>





<p>(G)</p> <p>I think that if I were suddenly to get a much better job</p> <p>__probably my life would change and be better in lots of ways.</p> <p>__probably my life would not change much except that I'd like it better.</p> <p>__I wouldn't know what would happen to my life.</p>	<p>(I)</p> <p>I would rather spend my evenings with</p> <p>__different people depending mainly on what we do.</p> <p>__my family.</p> <p>__people from work.</p>
<p>(T)</p> <p>If I get poor materials to work on</p> <p>__I am most annoyed when it slows me up at my work.</p> <p>__I just accept it as a matter of bad luck.</p> <p>__I am most annoyed when it makes me lose time on a project I am doing at home.</p>	<p>(F)</p> <p>I would prefer going to</p> <p>__a faculty dance. company</p> <p>__any dance depending upon the orchestra.</p> <p>__a dance at my lodge or other favorite organization.</p>
<p>(I)</p> <p>The people I can count on most when I need help are</p> <p>__almost any of my friends.</p> <p>__the friends I have around town.</p> <p>__the friends I have at work.</p>	<p>(G)</p> <p>I am most interested in</p> <p>__things about my job.</p> <p>__things I usually do around the house.</p> <p>__anything I happen to be doing at the moment.</p>



(G)	(I)
<p>I do my best work</p> <p>__ when I am on the job.</p> <p>__ when I work around the house.</p> <p>__ when I'm not bothered by people.</p>	<p>The people I would be most likely to borrow money from are</p> <p>__ the people I know around town.</p> <p>__ anyone who would lend it to me.</p> <p>__ people I know here in the school. plant.</p>



## CODING AND SCORING PROCEDURE FOR CLI QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Code each question for job, non-job, and indifferent response. In almost all instances the response category is self-evident. For the several instances where it is not, the categories are marked on the accompanying mimeographed reproduction of the original questionnaire.
2. Within each section of experience (Informal, Formal, Technological, General), sum the responses by code category.
3. Score as job oriented:
  - a. those who have at least 50% of responses in job category; and
  - b. those who have a total of 70% of their responses in the job or indifferent category, provided the proportion of job oriented responses was not less than 40%.
4. Combine all answers to all statements to secure a total score. The total score meets the same criteria as the individual sector scores, namely those listed under 3.
5. Since the questionnaire is designed to measure job orientation, the scores are dichotomized into job and non-job orientations, the latter including all individuals whose scores do not meet the criteria of 3.

6. The copy of the accompanying mimeographed reproduction of the original questionnaire is marked to indicate into which sector of experience each statement was included.

Robert Dubin

APPENDIX C

Demographic Data Form





## DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FORM

### DIRECTIONS

*In this part, please check the one blank in each question which is most appropriate in your case.*

---

Suppose it turned out that you were rated low by most of your students on the Student Opinion Questionnaire, which statement below tells best how you would feel about this? Maybe none of them describes your feelings exactly, but which one comes closest to how you feel? (Please check just one.)

☐ I would feel that the students who rated me low must have been judging me on the wrong things and that I actually deserved a higher rating than they gave me.

☐ It would not bother me because I care more about what people outside of school think of me and don't really care how I am rated by people in the school.

☐ I would feel that I was a failure because it is important to me what students in the school think of me and there is probably not much I could do to change their minds about me.

☐ I would think being rated low was only a temporary situation and that, if I had enough time, I would get a higher rating by my students than I have now.

---

The total student enrollment in my school is:

☐ less than 250

☐ 251-500

☐ 501-750

☐ 751-1,000

☐ over 1,000

---

My school is typically an:

☐ elementary school

☐ junior high school

☐ high school

---

How many years have you taught in public school (including this year)?	My school is located in a town of about what size:
<input type="text"/> years	<input type="text"/> 20,000 and under
What is your level of education?	<input type="text"/> 20,000-50,000
<input type="text"/> less than a bachelors degree	<input type="text"/> 50,000-150,000
<input type="text"/> hold a bachelors degree (May include work beyond)	<input type="text"/> 150,000-250,000
<input type="text"/> hold a masters degree (may include work beyond)	<input type="text"/> 250,000 and above
Are you presently in the process of taking educational course work?	I live in a town of about what size:
<input type="text"/> yes	<input type="text"/> 20,000 and under
<input type="text"/> no	<input type="text"/> 20,000-50,000
If you are, for what main purpose?	<input type="text"/> 50,000-150,000
<input type="text"/> to obtain a permanent teaching certificate	<input type="text"/> 150,000-250,000
<input type="text"/> to prepare for an educational administrative position	<input type="text"/> 250,000 and above
<input type="text"/> to improve my understanding of the learning process and become more skilled in working with kids	I live in the same town in which I teach.
<input type="text"/> to make me eligible for a higher rank on the pay scale	<input type="text"/> yes
	<input type="text"/> no



During the school year, do you work at any other non-educational occupation?

☐ regularly

☐ occasionally

☐ rarely

I am a:

☐ male

☐ female

My professional organization membership currently stands at:

☐ 1-3

☐ 4-5

☐ 6-7

☐ 8 and above

My age is:

☐ 20-25

☐ 26-30

☐ 31-35

☐ 36-40

☐ 41 and above

APPENDIX D

Letters to the Teachers and  
to the Principals

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY  
Student Reaction Center  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

During the current school year, you have, or will receive, a student-reaction report. In keeping with our policy of conducting research in this field, we hope that you can find several minutes to answer the enclosed questionnaire. Our concern is with trends involving hundreds of teachers and not with individual teachers or schools. The name of no teacher or school will be used.

A return envelope, addressed and stamped, is enclosed. A summary of our findings will be mailed to you. Your cooperation will be much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Roy C. Bryan  
Director of the  
Student Reaction  
Center





WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY  
Student Reaction Center  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Enclosed is a letter and questionnaire that we are sending to each teacher who has or will receive a student reaction report during the current school year.

We shall appreciate it if you will place in the mailbox of each teacher the materials bearing his name.

Sincerely yours,

Roy C. Bryan  
Director of the  
Student Reaction  
Center









MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293011033770