

np:29.1

Mrs. McLeedy

— KANSAS STATE —
TEACHERS COLLEGE OF EMPORIA
BULLETIN • OF • INFORMATION

JUNE, 1944

EMPORIA, KANSAS

VOLUME 24, No. 6

STUDIES IN EDUCATION NUMBER
(Twenty-eighth of the Series)

A SELF-RATING SCALE FOR THE
ELEMENTARY TEACHER

By
 EDWIN J. BROWN
 and
 VIRGINIA M. O'REILLY



Published monthly by Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia. Entered as second-class mail matter at the post office at Emporia, Kansas, under the act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, act of October 3, 1917.

KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
OF EMPORIA

BULLETIN OF INFORMATION

STUDIES IN EDUCATION NUMBER
(Twenty-eighth of the Series)

A SELF-RATING SCALE FOR THE
ELEMENTARY TEACHER

BY
EDWIN J. BROWN
and
VIRGINIA M. O'REILLY

EMPORIA, KANSAS

Published by the College

PRINTED BY KANSAS STATE PRINTING PLANT
W. C. AUSTIN, STATE PRINTER
TOPEKA, 1944

20-2802

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PART ONE. INTRODUCTION	5
The Nature of the Study.....	5
History of Rating Scales.....	6
PART TWO. HOW TO USE THE SCALE.....	12
PART THREE. THE SCALE	13
Personal and Social Qualities of the Elementary Teacher, Methods and Principles	13
PART FOUR. ESTABLISHING THE SCALE.....	24
VALIDITY	24
PART FIVE. TABULATION TABLE OF FREQUENCIES.....	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY	31

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

This is not really an introduction, but a farewell, as with this issue the editor of *Studies in Education* for the past fourteen years, severs his relationship with the publication and with the college which fosters it, the Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia. After September 1, his address will be Dean, University College, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri. Although he goes to his new position with pleasurable anticipation, he leaves his old position as Dean, Graduate School, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, with regret. This is as it should be, it seems to him.

Studies in Education has a circulation of approximately twenty-five hundred. Reaching every university and college of any size in the country, as well as every city, village, and hamlet in Kansas, it has tried through the years, in its monograph form, to carry subjects which have a wide variety of appeal to those engaged in educational work.

The present issue, number twenty-eight, is prepared by its authors with the intent of aiding directly the elementary classroom teacher. Miss O'Reilly has been and is now an elementary classroom instructor. She is excellently trained, thoroughly experienced, capably efficient. Her contribution to this study has been the larger one.

EDWIN J. BROWN, *Editor*.

PART ONE

INTRODUCTION

THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

O wad some Power the giftie gie us
To see ourselves as ithers see us!

—*Robert Burns*

Since self-evaluation is essentially a problem of the elementary teacher, there is every reason to believe that the teacher must be given an opportunity to evaluate herself and her work by using some sort of a self-rating scale. Every professionally progressive and aspiring elementary teacher is eager to help ascertain the qualities that make for better teaching and for the highest development of her pupils, and will seek to attain those qualities. Therefore, it would seem that such a list of qualities should be placed in the hands of all teachers knowing, as all do, that "the race moves forward on the feet of little children" and that the inspiration for a desirable forward movement depends largely upon the teacher.

The objectives of this study have been: *first*, to determine both the desired personal and social qualities of the elementary teacher and the methods and principles employed by her to secure them; and, *second*, to classify these items into related groups upon the basis of their relation to the position. The next step has been to assemble these items into a unified and coherently organized scale of measurement against which the elementary teacher may rate herself. The very nature of this analytical process has tended to make necessary a complete evaluation of the elementary teacher's position and the essential characteristics desirable in the person who would hold the position.

The movement toward self-evaluation is at a standstill. It would seem that it needs a new impetus and a new emphasis. In a number of large and small cities, too, the movement has actually failed. Rating scales have been introduced, tried for a year or two, and then dropped as unsatisfactory. Nearly always they have been opposed by the teachers themselves. The basic reason for this failure has been the element of rating from above by an administrative officer. There is evidence to support the viewpoint that for a rating scale to be truly helpful, its chief element must be self-rating. For as E. C. Elliott says in his article on "How Shall the Merit of Teachers Be Tested and Recorded?": "The supervisor who is able with any degree of objective accuracy to evaluate the total working efficiency of a teacher with a result that will pass unchallenged by other supervisors has not revealed his identity." Improvement of teachers in service rests directly upon the initial step of self-criticism. Thus, rating scales to the present time have revealed an important defect in that they were nearly always an administrative scheme superimposed from above.

A second striking defect is that the traits have been described in vague terms. The content of early rating scales has made use of single words or brief phrases. Teachers were to be rated on sympathy, tact, integrity, en-

thusiasm, adaptability, resourcefulness, sense of justice, loyalty, etc.; rarely have such schemes been made concrete enough so that two or more rating officers rating the work of the same teacher could visualize precisely the same group of qualities.

A third defect of rating forms has been the duplication and overlapping of many of the qualities, for example, *self-control* and *tact*, *judicial-mindedness* and *sense of justice*, etc.

The purpose of this scale has been to bring about improvement through self-rating. It is believed that this classification results in little or no overlapping of qualities. The scheme consists of several series of concrete questions, asking the teacher to rate herself on: "To what extent do I do thus and so?" Contrasted with the practice of using single words or brief phrases, the authors are resorting here to the scheme of asking concrete questions in sentence form. In the general construction of the scale the arrangement is such that it predicates an affirmative answer as the optimum response. The restriction to a definite "no" or "yes" in answering mentally each of the questions points specifically toward greater objectivity.

Only to the extent that this self-rating scale induces elementary teachers to become self-critical has it rendered a service to the profession and especially to the cause of teacher-rating. Undoubtedly many desirable traits are not included, and it is unquestionably true that each of the mentioned qualities is not thoroughly and completely analyzed. With these ideas in mind, it is submitted to the profession not as the *ne plus ultra* in self-rating scales but merely as a step in the right direction.

HISTORY OF RATING SCALES

The need for more exact methods of defining "teaching efficiency" has been evidenced in the general literature on school administration for a very long time, but the discussion of ways and means for measuring teaching efficiency dates back only a few years. No study has been found that bears at all directly upon the subject that was made before 1905, and no carefully devised rating scheme appeared before that of Elliott in 1912. This does not mean that city superintendents had not been trying to base their appointments and promotions upon merit before this time nor that they had not attempted to analyze teaching success. They had been doing both of these for some years, but merit had been merely estimated in terms of general impressions with no attempt at objective measurement.

In the indirect studies of teaching success, J. B. Sears¹ comments that W. F. Book, in 1905, and H. E. Kratz,² in 1907, sought to inquire into the elements of success among high-school teachers by making a study of the opinions of high-school pupils. This indirect method of approach was made from slightly different angles by Littler in 1914, who studied the failures of elementary-school teachers; by Moses in the same year, who studied the failure of high-school teachers; by Bullesfield in 1915, who studied causes of failures among teachers in cities of various sizes; by Anderson in 1917, who collected judgments on the relative importance of fifteen different factors; and by Colvin in 1918, who

1. J. B. Sears, "The Measurement of Teaching Efficiency," in *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 4, pp. 81-94 (September, 1929).

2. H. E. Kratz, *Studies and Observation in the Schoolroom*, Educational Publishing Company, Chicago, 1907, Chapter 5.

studied the most common faults of beginning teachers in high school. The questionnaire method characterizes most of these studies, each of which was intended to throw some light on the factors essential to success in teaching. The statistical treatment of much of the data collected in these studies was good, and the results are of some value in that they tend to confirm previous general impressions as to what are the weak points in the teaching process, and to offer some suggestions to those engaged in training teachers; but they are negative in their approach, and at best they do not add greatly to the knowledge of the real factors in teaching success.

A second group of studies has approached the subject from the standpoint of success rather than failure. These studies deal with the judgments of school people, and differ from those just mentioned not only in the point of attack but in the fact that they offer more thorough statistical treatment of the results. The first of these studies was made by Ruediger and Strayer in 1910, and was followed by those of Boyce in 1912 and 1915, Clapp in 1915, Anderson in 1917, Landsittel in 1917, Bradley and Moody in 1918, and Fordyce and Twiss in 1919.³ In all these studies the attempt is made to show the relation of certain individual factors in success to general merit. Different statistical methods are used by different studies, but all speak in terms of correlations.

In some cases the judgments on which these studies are based were made in answer to a questionnaire; in others they had been recorded in the form of school grades which, in most cases, are little different from general judgments. Each writer has chosen such terms as he believed would express clearly recognizable qualities of the teacher, or clearly recognizable factors in teaching efficiency. In these terms there is variation, both as to number and name, as well as in the matter of organizing the terms into main and subordinate divisions. Some express their findings in terms of correlations only, others convert their correlations into scores after the fashion of Elliott's analytical score card.⁴

If the results of these studies do not prove conclusively that teaching ability can be analyzed and expressed in objective terms they strongly suggest that it can be. The contribution of these studies is a contribution in method and technique on one side, and in actual analysis of teaching success on the other. During the period from 1915 to 1920, however, the interest in rating scales decreased materially as judged by the number of articles which have been written. The explanation for this fact is that rating scales have been more or less indefinite and unreliable. Furthermore, they have been used primarily to rate teachers rather than to improve their instruction.

In the May, 1920, issue of the *Elementary School Journal*, H. O. Rugg⁵ presented a rating scale which marks a distinct step forward. It contains sixty-seven important questions relating to five essential phases of a teacher's work, namely, skill in teaching, skill in the mechanics of managing a class, teamwork qualities, qualities of growth and keeping up-to-date, and personal and social qualities. This study emphasized the fact that there are two separate and distinct features of the ordinary rating form, and that the first function of his study was self-improvement through self-rating. The secondary use to be

3. Sears, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

4. Sears, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-95.

5. Harold O. Rugg, "Self-Improvement Through Self-Rating, a New Scale for Rating Teachers' Efficiency," in *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 20, pp. 670-84 (May, 1920).

made of the scale was that of rating persons in numerical order, comparing them, in the process, with five other groups of individuals. Each of the latter groups are of different qualities: (1) the best that the rater has ever known, (2) the poorest he has ever seen or known, (3) a representative of the average, (4) a person midway between the best and the average, and (5) the person midway between the poorest and the average. Although the scale can be used by supervisors to distinct advantage, its most important use as described by Rugg is "self-improvement of teachers through self-rating." It is interesting to note that this use of rating scales has usually been objected to on the ground that self-analysis by a teacher leads to self-consciousness and inefficiency. The position is definitely taken that self-analysis is very essential to effective progress in the improvement of teaching. A supervisory or teaching device which records only a gross fact, such as "efficiency" or "inefficiency" on a teacher's part, is interesting but not very significant.⁶

The device becomes genuinely valuable when careful analysis reveals the causes of "efficiency" or "inefficiency" and suggests remedial measures.

William L. Connor,⁷ writing in the *Journal of Educational Research*, gives a scale study in which the gist of the whole list of questions is reduced to terms of pupil activity. The study gives a unique slant in thus using the work activity of the pupils themselves to measure the teacher.

The Duluth rating system for teachers was made during the school year of 1921-'22. The system has a twofold purpose. It is organized to recognize and reward teacher merit, and it also pertains to the improvement of the work which the teacher is doing. It seeks to set up situations in which a frank, open appraisal of the situation's work may lead to its appreciative consideration and thence from this premise to a discussion of methods by which it may be improved.⁸

Rose A. Carrigan has given to the profession a score card in which the following are the main headings: (1) evidence of adequate teacher-preparation, 140 points; (2) the atmosphere of the background or workshop, 250 points; (3) the work accomplished, 375 points; (4) the child, 375 points.⁹

J. W. Crabtree wrote a very good article in which he discussed the rating of teachers. He presented a rating card to be utilized by both the supervisor and the teacher; his object was to have the pertinent and common elements be the points of contact between the two individuals.¹⁰

H. A. Bone formulated a scale for aiding the teacher to evaluate her own work. The scale is divided into main headings as follows: (1) relation of the classroom teacher to the pupils as judged by results, (2) relation as a member of the school faculty, (3) relation as a member of the community.¹¹

Bertha Y. Hebb, in 1925, published a very comprehensive work consisting,

6. William S. Gray, "Rating Scales, Self-Analysis, and the Improvement of Teaching," *School Review*, Vol. 29, pp. 49-57 (January, 1921).

7. William L. Connor, "A New Method of Rating Teachers," *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 1, May, 1920, pp. 181-88.

8. "The Duluth System for the Rating of Teachers," *Board of Education Publication*, June 9, 1922, pp. 2-3. Duluth, Minnesota.

9. Rose A. Carrigan, "Rating of Teachers on a Basis of Supervisory Visitation," in *Journal of Educational Method*, Vol. 2, pp. 48-55 (September, 1922).

10. J. W. Crabtree, "Rating of Teachers," in *Proceedings of the National Education Association*, Vol. 53, pp. 1165-67 (1915).

11. H. A. Bone, "Criteria by Which a Teacher May Measure Her Work," in *High School Quarterly*, Vol. 7, pp. 153-55 (April, 1919).

illustratively, of self-rating cards in which long lists of qualifications were itemized. The organization was not good, but the lists were quite complete in making contact with the field.¹²

A very good self-rating scale for the teacher was devised by Franklin B. Dyer. The scale primarily deals with the phases of personality and ability.¹³

A scale in which the educational and social qualities are emphasized was placed in the field by Katherine Cranor as a device primarily to aid the supervisor. The main items proposed are: (1) educational preparation, (2) tact, (3) tolerance, (4) poise, (5) appearance, and (6) relationship with the teachers. This contribution is an important one in that the stress is laid upon the vital human element.¹⁴

Relative to rating scales in general R. E. Kent¹⁵ says, "that all the teacher work, including every major factor in it, should be considered in making a self-rating scale, but these factors should be considered only with respect to what they contribute toward educational results in the children under her care." The scale which Kent presented was based upon these groupings: (1) pupil achievement, (2) merit in mechanics, (3) merit as a social worker, and (4) personality. In this device the emphasis is placed upon pupil activity and achievement.

S. G. Rich¹⁶ in his self-rating device, grouped his items upon effective methods of supplying physical needs, power of coöperation with the staff, and maintaining the prestige of the school and profession. In discussing rating devices, Rich advocated that principals be rated by the teachers.

In an analysis of traits that he thought desirable in a supervisor, Joseph S. Taylor¹⁷ evolved a self-rating scheme for teachers. The main divisions of his rating are: (1) scholarship, (2) preparation for work, (3) knowledge of fundamentals of drill, (4) execution of work, and (5) pupil interest.

T. H. Schutte,¹⁸ in 1925, produced a card containing the weighting device in the form of a percentage scale. The percentage idea attached to a scale adds the connotation of relating efficiency to the scale, but supervisors and administrators in general have not favored weighting with the percentage scale in mind because of the tendency to press the field within the scope of the small numerical range.

A self-rating score card for determining efficiency used in Kenosha, Wisconsin,¹⁹ stresses the ideal teacher, under the leadership of the ideal teacher.

12. Bertha Y. Hebb, "Samples of Teacher Self-Rating Cards," in *City School Leaflet No. 18*, February, 1925, U. S. Bureau of Education, pp. 4-5.

13. Franklin B. Dyer, "Questions on Teaching to Help Teachers Make a Self-Examination to Find Ways of Improving," in *Atlantic Educational Journal*, Vol. 11, pp. 343-44 (March, 1916).

14. Katherine T. Cranor, "A Self-Rating Card for Supervisors as an Aid to Efficiency in School Work," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 7, pp. 91-120 (February, 1921).

15. Raymond E. Kent, "What Should Teacher Rating Schemes Seek to Measure," *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 2, pp. 802-07 (1920).

16. S. G. Rich, "Rating of Principals and Superintendents," in *Education*, Vol. 42, pp. 496-500 (April, 1922).

17. Joseph S. Taylor, "Some Desirable Traits of the Supervisor," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 9, pp. 1-8 (January, 1923).

18. T. H. Schutte, *Schutte Scale for Rating Teachers* (Copyright, 1923, by World Book Co., Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York).

19. C. J. Anderson, A. S. Barr, and Maybell G. Bush, *Visiting the Teacher at Work*, D. Appleton & Company, New York, 1925. 382 pages.

There are fifty-two important questions relating to the phases of a teacher's work.

H. T. Johnston,²⁰ writing in *School and Society* in 1917, illustrates a brief scale rating card in which the points are organized with a view of getting at the important features of the worker's efficiency as quickly as possible.

Edwin J. Brown²¹ of the Kansas State Teachers College, in 1929, devised a very searching rating scheme. It is primarily intended for a supervisor's self-rating scale, but it is constructed so that it may be used by teachers. It lends itself to convenient use and ready diagnosis due to depicting graphically the status of qualifications. The scale contains one hundred items.

W. A. Cook²² stated, in a history of the development of rating scales, that the first schemes were those originated by Boyce and Elliott. Cook's criticism of the rating process is that there is uncertainty as to what should be included in a rating scheme, and further, there is little agreement as to the number of points to be used in the scale.

Arthur S. Gist,²³ in a detailed work, analyzed the qualifications and duties of the principal as (1) an administrator, (2) a community leader, (3) publicity man, and (4) his personal relations in the school and community.

In a rating card developed for the field of home economics, Adah H. Hess²⁴ constructed a scale which by its form need not be restricted to this specific area. The card was made with three main divisions: (1) techniques and results of instruction, (2) classroom management, and (3) educational, personal, and social qualifications.

P. R. Spencer²⁵ developed a self-rating scale for principals in which he included these standards: (1) relationship with pupils, (2) vocational guidance, and (3) use of standardized tests for measuring classroom instruction.

Many have been the attempts to determine the factors which are related to teaching success. In 1933, Yaukey and Anderson²⁶ reviewed 106 studies which had been made on this problem. The correlations between various factors—such as intelligence, student teaching, and scholarship and teaching success—varied from—.06 to .77. More often than not such coefficients ranged from .20 to .30. They include seven aims of the good teacher in their rating scale: (1) encourages pupil participation in planning, executing, and evaluating, (2) uses current materials in professional study and in work with pupils, (3) stimulates fair consideration of controversial issues, (4) provides appropriate first-hand experiences for pupils and himself, (5) has an agreeable personal demeanor and appearance, (6) cares for administrative detail with the necessary degree of dispatch, (7) discovers and relates work to the needs of pupils.

20. H. T. Johnston, "Scientific Supervision of Teaching," *School and Society*, Vol. 5, February 17, 1917, pp. 181-88.

21. Edwin J. Brown, *A Self-Rating Scale for Supervisors, Supervisory-Principals, and Helping Teachers*, Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1929.

22. W. A. Cook, "Uniform Standards for Judging Teachers in South Dakota," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 7, pp. 1-11 (January, 1921).

23. Arthur S. Gist, *The Administration of an Elementary School*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1928.

24. Adah H. Hess, "Teacher Rating as a Means of Improving Home Economics Teachers in Service," in *Journal of Home Economics*, pp. 85-90 (February, 1922).

25. P. R. Spencer, "A High School Principal's Self Rating Card," in *School Review*, Vol. 30, pp. 268-71 (April, 1922).

26. James V. Yaukey and Paul L. Anderson, "A Review of the Literature on the Factors Conditioning Teaching Success," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 19, pp. 511-20 (October, 1933).

In 1939, J. W. Giachino²⁷ devised a teacher's self-rating scale containing thirty-six points. He states, "to be judged by others as to one's ability must be taken as a matter of course, but of paramount importance is the success with which an individual is capable, periodically, to take inventory of himself. Self-analysis is important, but only to the extent that an individual will conscientiously recognize his weaknesses and strive to apply the proper remedies for their correction."

Nicholas J. Oganovic,²⁸ in 1937, devised a teacher rating scale based on sustained attention. Sustained attention may be defined as the number of minutes a given pupil pays attention during a given period of time.

In 1941, Harold M. Gray²⁹ constructed a teacher-rating sheet with the three criteria, reliability, validity, and objectivity in mind. He suggests that the supervisor use one of the sheets to rate the teacher, that the teacher be given one to rate himself, and that the principal also be asked to rate the teacher. A study and a comparison of the three ratings would probably give a result which would be better, and much more accurate than that made by only one individual. That it would lack high statistical reliability would also probably be true.

A. W. Dragoo³⁰ developed a rating scale for shop teachers. The traits or characteristics were determined by expert opinion. Arrangement and general form of the scale follows accepted practice in presenting rating-scale technique. The present form has been based on the Purdue rating scale and the Iowa State College rating scale, both of which have had wide use in the field of general education. The field of industry is reflected in the graphic rating form and method here employed. Rating scales by The Scott Company and by Professor Max Freyd use the graphic form. The scale is intended to be used by teachers for self-analysis and contains seventeen points. Any individual teacher may find it of interest to rate himself and locate his score on the quartile table.

27. J. W. Giachino, "Teacher's Self-Rating Scale," in *Industrial Arts and Vocational Education*, Vol. 28, p. 124 (March, 1939).

28. Nicholas J. Oganovic, "Teacher Rating Scale," *Educational Method*, Vol. 16, pp. 343-47 (April, 1937).

29. Harold M. Gray, "Teacher-Rating Scheme," in *Industrial Arts and Vocational Education*, Vol. 30, pp. 289-90 (September, 1941).

30. A. W. Dragoo, "A Rating Scale for Shop Teachers," in *Industrial Arts and Vocational Education*, Vol. 21, pp. 8-9 (January, 1932).

PART TWO

HOW TO USE THE SCALE

In using the self-rating scale which follows, the elementary teacher gives consideration to each of the alphabetized sections as a unit. She should give special attention to each question in its relation to the general head. The teacher should check upon each question by placing an X in the desired column at the right of the page. If the X marks are predominantly to the left of the central space A, the rater should give special attention to the corresponding questions.

If rating is worth doing, it is worth doing right. The items of this self-rating scale are definite, single, and separable and should be easily recorded when judgment is given on a point. The rater must be honest with herself. Self-rating in itself has no significance; it acquires importance only insofar as something is done about it. The principal purpose of this scale is to stimulate the rater to meaningful self-criticism of her own work. Improvement is the object desired. The scale should be used frequently and should be used analytically and critically upon each occasion.

The column symbols are significant in this way: P indicates poor; F, fair; A, average; G, good; and S, superior.

PART THREE
A SELF-RATING SCALE FOR THE ELEMENTARY
TEACHER
THE SCALE

PERSONAL AND SOCIAL QUALITIES OF THE ELEMENTARY TEACHER	P	F	A	G	S
I. To what extent does my professional success depend upon the personal and social factor that:					
A. <i>I am neatly groomed:</i> (Illustrations).....					
1. Do I care for my shoes, polishing or brushing them whenever necessary, and having run-over heels repaired?.....					
2. Do I wear fresh linen each morning?.....					
3. Do I dress as carefully for my work as I do for a social function?.....					
4. Do I vary my costume each day?.....					
5. Are the lines of my clothes becoming to me—that is, they do not accentuate the fact that I am unusually tall or short, etc.?.....					
6. If I wear jewelry, do I wear appropriate jewelry?					
7. Is my dress appropriate for the season?.....					
8. If I wear glasses, are they becoming and always shining?					
B. <i>I am clean in my personal habits:</i> (Illustrations)					
9. Do I have my hair shampooed regularly? ¹ ...					
10. Are my hands and nails clean?.....					
11. Am I free from disagreeable odors?.....					
12. Do I wash my teeth each morning before school?					
C. <i>I cultivate and develop desirable personal traits and characteristics:</i> (Illustrations).....					
13. Do I look at people when talking to them? ²					
14. Is my voice clear and well modulated as opposed to the strident, harsh speaking voice?					
15. Do I convey an air of sincerity?.....					
16. Is my smile friendly and convincing, or does it disappear too rapidly to seem sincere?....					
17. Can I appreciate but not take offense at harmless jokes?					
18. Can I have fun with children and with adults?					
19. Do I meet people easily?.....					
20. Is my enunciation distinct?.....					

1. Although this item is not mentioned frequently, it is highly significant.
2. This item is rarely mentioned, but it is very important.

THE SCALE—Continued

	P	F	A	G	S
D. <i>I am punctual in my daily living: (Illustrations)</i>					
21. Do I keep my appointments?.....					
22. Do I return borrowed articles promptly?....					
23. Do I retire and arise at regular hours?.....					
24. Am I prompt and gracious in acknowledging kindnesses?					
25. Do I get some physical exercise every day?..					
26. Do I give requests immediate attention?...					
E. <i>I have excellent health which permits me to participate in daily activities with enjoyment: Illustrations)</i>					
27. Do I have a physical "check-up" each year?					
28. Do I pay as much attention to my own nutrition as I do to the children's?.....					
29. Is my attitude before pupils one of alertness which reflects my physical vitality?.....					
30. Do I avoid curt replies, satire, and sarcasm in participating in activities?.....					
31. Am I always on the job?.....					
32. Do I work overtime willingly?.....					
33. Do I feel like playing when time permits?...					
34. Am I free from health defects which are remediable?					
F. <i>I have desirable personal habits: (Illustrations)</i>					
35. Do I remember that good posture adds to my appearance and my health?.....					
36. Do I eat wisely in order to control my weight?					
37. Do I have a variety of interests?.....					
38. Am I always impartial in my handling of pupils as well as in my attitude toward others with whom I come in contact?.....					
39. Am I always sincere?.....					
40. Is there evidence of refinement in my manners and conversation?					
G. <i>I have definite training in the development of good mental health: (Illustrations)</i>					
41. Do I keep calm under trying circumstances?					
42. Do I have the ability to endure criticism, slights, and abuse?					
43. Do I put aside unhealthy images and ideas?					
44. Can I smile in the presence of the annoying and irritating things of life?.....					
45. Do I sit, stand, and move in a natural way?					
46. Have I learned to relax?.....					
47. Do I try to do today's work better than yesterday's?					
48. Do I readily discard fears?.....					

THE SCALE—Continued

	P	F	A	G	S
H. <i>My knowledge of mental hygiene contributes to my spiritual growth and the growth of others:</i> (Illustrations)					
49. Am I a normal integrated personality?.....					
50. Do I know how to guide and train personalities?					
51. Do I have coördinated purposive activity in the doing of worth-while tasks?.....					
52. Do I see the need and value of a significant task for every child in the integration of personality?					
I. <i>I willingly participate in out-of-classroom activities?</i> (Illustrations)					
53. Do I attend the P. T. A. meetings?.....					
54. Do I willingly assist in programs when called upon to help?.....					
55. Can I work hard and be ready to help on committees?					
56. Do I endeavor to interpret the schools to the public?					
57. Do I attend ball games, plays, debates, concerts and other school activities?.....					
58. Do pupils feel free to come to me after school with problems or help of any kind?.....					
J. <i>I am considerate of others:</i> (Illustrations).....					
59. Do I ask for favors, but never command?...					
60. Do I correct in a quiet, friendly way?.....					
61. Do I help other teachers discipline unruly pupils?					
62. Am I hospitable to people who come to school to visit?					
63. Do I refrain from embarrassing a child of inferior ability or one who has physical defects?					
64. Do I exercise care in what I say about the town, school, and pupils?.....					
65. Am I sensitive to social proprieties?.....					
II. To what extent does my personal relationship with other teachers make for success in that:					
A. <i>I am constantly thrown in a social way with the members of the teaching staff:</i> (Illustrations)..					
66. Is my friendship given and received to all and by all without restrictions or inhibitions?					
67. Does the community in which I live approve of my actions?.....					
68. Do I have the respect and approval of the teaching staff?					

THE SCALE—Continued

	P	F	A	G	S
69. Am I, as a teacher, too talkative?.....					
70. Do I welcome an evening at some social function even though I may be in the midst of trying school work?.....					
71. Is my social life varied in its scope and nature?					
III. To what extent is my success due to the fact that in my community relationships I am:					
A. <i>Willing to make acquaintances and take pleasure in doing so:</i> (Illustrations).....					
72. Am I a citizen of the community?.....					
73. Am I interested in the affairs of the town?..					
74. Do I visit school patrons?.....					
75. Do I know the other elementary teachers in the school system?.....					
76. Am I on friendly terms with the other teachers of the community?.....					
77. Am I at all times willing to contribute what I can to civic enterprises?.....					
B. <i>Loyal to the community in a practical, common-sense manner:</i> (Illustrations).....					
78. Am I living according to the social standards of my community?					
79. Do I help to maintain friendly relationships between the school and citizens of the town?					
80. Am I successful in remembering faces and names?					
81. Do I subscribe to and read the local newspaper?					
82. Do I visit "shut-ins"?.....					
83. Do I make most of my purchases in the town in which I teach?					
C. <i>Socially adjusted to the community life of the town in which I live:</i> (Illustrations).....					
84. Do I keep my opinions to myself in matters which are distinctly controversial?.....					
85. Do I enjoy meeting people outside my own profession?					
86. Do I meet people on a level of friendliness?					
87. Do I make others feel comfortable in my presence?					
88. Am I asked to aid in presenting programs in the community?					
89. Am I a gracious hostess?.....					
90. Do I help to improve or stimulate community activities?					

THE SCALE—Continued

	P	F	A	G	S
IV. To what extent am I successful because of my personal relationships with the parents of children in my room in that:					
A. <i>I make personal contacts with the parents:</i> (Illustrations)					
91. Am I invited to visit in the homes of my pupils?					
92. Do I consider the interests of parents when talking to them?.....					
93. Do I understand the parents?.....					
94. Do I enjoy conversation with the pupils' parents?					
95. Do I check with the parents when a pupil is absent?					
B. <i>I understand the problems (financial and emotional) of the patrons of my school:</i> (Illustrations)					
96. Do I make it a habit to listen as well as to talk?					
97. Am I patient with the parents who think that I want to talk about nothing except children and school?					
98. Do I cultivate a wide variety of interests so that I can converse intelligently on many subjects with patrons?					
99. Am I able to put myself in the parents' places and see the problems from their viewpoints?					
100. Do I meet pleasantly the criticism of uninformed parents?					

THE SCALE—Continued

METHODS AND PRINCIPLES	P	F	A	G	S
I. To what extent is my success in pupil relationships due to:					
A. <i>Making time give an educational account of itself?</i> (Illustrations)					
1. Do I begin classwork on time?.....					
2. Are books, supplies, and other equipment conveniently placed to avoid class waste of time?					
3. Do I develop in my pupils time-saving habits?					
4. Is the material selected and the method indicated with a view to adapting it to the needs of the pupils of the class?.....					
5. Do I make use of time by not allowing rapid workers to wait for slower pupils?.....					
B. <i>Making classroom procedures give an educational account of themselves?</i> (Illustrations).....					
6. Is there an orderly routine for the passing and collecting of materials?.....					
7. Do I plan my work so that each pupil may progress at his maximum rate?.....					
8. Do I avoid writing long lists of problems, words, paragraphs, etc., on the blackboard during the recitation period?.....					
9. Am I able to "hold" the entire class or group being taught?					
10. Do I sense waning interest and attention and immediately correct the situation?.....					
11. Do I deliberately make my classroom procedure be an everyday citizenship situation?					
C. <i>Efficient classroom techniques?</i> (Illustrations)..					
12. Do I check absences and tardinesses with a minimum loss of time?.....					
13. Do I relate with definiteness the work of each unit to what has preceded and to what is to follow?					
14. Do I lead the pupils to specific application of new information, abilities, skills, etc.?....					
15. Am I stimulating the pupils to be systematic in selecting useful suggestions and rejecting useless ones?					
16. Am I the directing influence of the class without pupils being unduly conscious of it?					
17. Are the pupils improving habits of study and attention?					

THE SCALE—Continued

	P	F	A	G	S
D. <i>Careful provision on my part for recognition of individual differences? (Illustrations).....</i>					
18. Do I tactfully aid the child who desires assistance yet hesitates to ask for help?.....					
19. Do I have as much concern about the very rapid learner as about the very slow learner?					
20. Are the pupils seated by size so as to make the most advantageous use of the seats available?					
21. Do I plan my work so that I can give individual assistance to those who need it?.....					
22. Do I have different standards of promotion for each youngster?					
23. Do I diagnose pupil abilities and weaknesses, so that my work may be specific?.....					
24. Do I display a kindly and wise attitude toward the underprivileged child?.....					
25. Are my explanations suited to the age, ability, and advancement of the pupils?.....					
26. Do I give challenging material to the rapid learner?					
E. <i>Ability on my part to increase a desire for learning? (Illustrations)</i>					
27. Do my pupils show evidences of growth in ability to form worthy purposes and to achieve them effectively?.....					
28. Do the pupils enter upon their work wholeheartedly, and do they manifest a real and aggressive interest in it?.....					
29. Do I correct faults by encouragement?.....					
F. <i>Ability on my part to increase the learning process itself? (Illustrations)</i>					
30. Do I discover needs of pupils and relate their work to those needs?.....					
31. Do I provide firsthand appropriate experiences for the pupils?.....					
32. Am I using current, everyday, live materials in professional study and in work with pupils?					
33. Is the subject matter adapted to the needs of the pupils?					
34. Am I teaching definitely for the present needs of the child as well as for future needs?					
G. <i>Ability on my part to encourage and improve the personal and social development of the individual child? (Illustrations)</i>					

THE SCALE—Continued

	P	F	A	G	S
35. Are the pupils developing habits of right social relationships as evidenced through such elements as regularity, punctuality, obedience, neatness, accuracy, coöperation?.....					
36. Are the pupils developing proper health habits such as personal cleanliness and correct posture?					
37. Do I encourage pupil participation in planning, executing, and evaluating?.....					
38. Is there evidence of participation in conversation by each child?					
39. Do my pupils respect the opinion of others?					
40. Am I encouraging pupils to bring magazines, newspapers, or other materials to school for the use of other pupils?.....					
41. Do I decide with the pupils upon what materials available money shall be spent?.....					
42. Do my pupils go about their work in a quiet and orderly manner?					
43. Do I maintain a classroom that is neat and clean?					
44. Does a spirit of friendliness permeate the classroom?					
II. To what extent is my success in professional relationships due to:					
A. <i>Keeping abreast of the times by reading professional literature? (Illustrations)</i>					
45. During the last year did I read at least four professional magazines in the average month?					
46. Do I subscribe to at least one professional magazine?					
47. Do I read the most recently published books on educational trends?					
48. Do I enjoy browsing through books for professional items?					
49. Do I read at least four professional books a year?					
50. Do I keep in touch with elementary education by subscribing to and reading <i>The Elementary School Journal</i> and others of a similar nature?					
B. <i>Interest in teaching profession based upon sound training and a program of purposeful improvement? (Illustrations)</i>					
51. Do I continuously extend my training by summer school or extension work?.....					

THE SCALE—Continued

	P	F	A	G	S
52. Did I attend at least one professional convention during the last year?.....					
53. Do I encourage my fellow teachers to belong to professional organizations?					
54. Do I consider travel a measure of professional growth?					
55. Am I member of my local, state, and national education associations?					
56. Do I at least submit professional articles to state and national magazines of a professional nature?					
57. Do I occasionally revise my course of study to keep up with modern trends?.....					
58. Do I attend lectures and meetings of general cultural interest?					
C. <i>Having a definite, clearly stated, philosophy of education? (Illustrations)</i>					
59. Do I know the meaning of education?.....					
60. Am I consistent in my line of reasoning?....					
61. Do I use common sense in meeting everyday situations?					
62. Have I grown with my years of experience?					
63. Do I have a true and unbiased sense of values?					
64. Does my everyday schoolroom activity carry out my own thinking as stated in my philosophy?					
III. To what extent is my success in relationships with teachers due to:					
A. <i>Coöperation with the other teachers? (Illustrations)</i>					
65. Do I willingly aid other teachers when called upon?					
66. Am I sincere in my compliments to other teachers on their successes?.....					
67. Do I offer my services to the new teacher sincerely and in such a manner that she loses no "face" in accepting?					
68. Am I willing to grant the other teachers their viewpoints?					
B. <i>Maintaining a professional and ethical attitude at all times? (Illustrations)</i>					
69. Can I be friendly and gracious but not personal?					
70. Do I refrain from speaking about others, if I cannot commend?					

THE SCALE—Continued

	P	F	A	G	S
71. Do I forget the gossip that I may hear about my fellow teachers?					
72. Do I realize the exact relationship of myself and my position to the profession?.....					
IV. To what extent is my success in relationships with parents due to:					
A. <i>Ability to understand parents?</i> (Illustrations)..					
73. Am I sympathetic and sincere in talking with parents?					
74. Do I visit among parents of my pupils?....					
75. Do I investigate home conditions without any semblance of curiosity or snooping.....					
76. Do I make it a point to get acquainted with the parents of my children?.....					
77. Do I sincerely welcome parents who visit the school?					
B. <i>Coöperation with parents?</i> (Illustrations).....					
78. Do parents apparently coöperate willingly with me in analyzing the difficulties of their children?					
79. Do we have the same goal in mind for the child?					
80. Am I checking with the parents in accomplishment of progress?					
V. To what extent is my success in administrative relationships due to:					
A. <i>Pleasant relationships with the administration?</i> (Illustrations)					
81. Am I loyal to the administration in a sincere, consistent manner, keeping still by word and action when I cannot commend?.....					
82. Do I always speak well, in private and public, of the administration?					
83. Am I alert to do a good turn that will help out the administration?.....					
84. Do I enjoy responsibilities given me by the administration?					
85. Do I coöperate with the janitor in keeping the room, building, and grounds clean?.....					
86. Do I coöperate heartily with the administration in school activities (committee work, Parent Teacher-Association, etc.)?.....					
87. Do I contribute in an active, dynamic way to faculty meetings?.....					
88. Do I make it a habit to listen as well as to talk?					

THE SCALE—Concluded

	P	F	A	G	S
VI. To what extent is my success in community relationships due to:					
A. <i>Ability on my part to adapt socially to community life?</i> (Illustrations).....					
89. Do I make others feel comfortable in my presence?					
90. Do I maintain a social and moral standard worthy of my profession?.....					
91. Do I refrain from discussing school policies among townfolk?					
92. Am I a gracious hostess?.....					
93. Do I practice my knowledge of etiquette and social charm?					
94. Do I keep my opinions to myself in matters of civic controversies?					
B. <i>Loyalty to the community?</i> (Illustrations).....					
95. Do I buy the things which are available in the town in which I teach?.....					
96. Do I participate in community activities?...					
97. Do I boost the community when the opportunity arises?					
C. <i>Interest in community affairs?</i> (Illustrations)...					
98. Am I interested in civic affairs?.....					
99. Do I strive to become better acquainted with the community?					
100. Do I look for ways in which I can help in the growth of the community?.....					

PART FOUR

ESTABLISHING THE SCALE

Analysis of the elementary, or for that matter any, teaching field brings one at once into abrupt contact with questions of objectives, aims, purposes, personality, methods, social factors, administrative influences, classroom procedures, supervisory principles and techniques, faculty relationships, community relationships and an almost innumerable array of other factors which must be considered. Because of this, any scale can be no more than a sampling and a decidedly limited sampling at that. This means, of course, that the validity of the comparatively few selections which are offered must always be open to some question.

In the general construction of this teaching improvement device, the arrangement is such that it predicates an affirmative answer as the optimum response. Could questions have been worded so as to secure a definite "No" or "Yes," greater objectivity would, of course, have been available. Undoubtedly many significant items are not included, and it is unquestionably true that each of the mentioned qualities is not thoroughly and completely analyzed. The only valid excuse for this seeming inadequacy is from the viewpoint of utility. To secure fundamental principles with as much brevity as is consistent with careful work has been the thought kept constantly in mind by the authors.

VALIDITY

A survey of the literature of the elementary teaching field demonstrates a very emphatic trend toward unanimity of opinion in regard to objectives, aims, methods, principles and procedures as they relate to the actual work of the teacher. In the scale which precedes, the main qualities listed are a part of the structure by reason of being possessed of the weight of frequency of occurrence on the part of authorities in the field of elementary education. Published materials only were considered. Points of emphasis by the various authors became main headings of the scale. Each author, upon publishing a work in a recognizedly reputable publication (others were not considered), automatically establishes himself as an authority in the field in which he has written; therefore his opinion tends to be worthy of equal consideration with that of any other writer in the field. This being so, then the greater the agreement found among such writers, the greater the tendency toward validity. This is but using the criterion of "competent judges" with the number of judges much increased.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion it may be said that while rating devices have long been in use by administrators and supervisors, both in business and in the schoolroom, it has been but recently that the teacher has considered rating, or better "checking," herself on the multitudinous items of her daily work.

As was stated previously, the scale should be used frequently and should be used critically and analytically upon each occasion. Knowledge gained from

analysis of other rating schemes, works of educational authorities, both administrative and supervisory, opinions of business experts as expressed in various personnel studies which were evaluated, makes it apparent that the following features concerning the use of scales are worthy of consideration:

1. The capacity for self-evaluation is a phase of judging skill, and being such, it tends to refine itself with practice.
2. Any rating device, not merely a self-rating one, must be used with an extremely objective attitude of mind.
3. Self-rating scales are entirely subjective in their application, hence are extremely difficult to use objectively.
4. If used correctly, humbly, and frequently, a self-rating scale undoubtedly possesses vast capacity for stimulation toward professional growth.

Finally it should be recalled that all school machinery, whether it be animate or inanimate, must give an educational account of itself in terms of the growth and development of boys and girls. All are but means to an end.

PART FIVE

TABLE I

FREQUENCY OF MENTION OF ITEMS IN THE SCALE BY WRITERS

Item number	TABULATION	Fre- quency
	PERSONAL AND SOCIAL	
I-A	*2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 58, 63, 65, 71, 76, 79, 81, 82, 85, 95, 96, 99, 100, 101, 107, 109, 110, 117, 118, 119, 120.	61
I-B	2, 3, 10, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 38, 42, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55, 58, 69, 71, 82, 85, 94, 99, 100, 109, 116, 118.....	27
I-C	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 58, 60, 65, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 76, 78, 79, 82, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 100, 101, 104, 106, 109, 110, 113, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120.....	74
I-D	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 58, 60, 65, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 76, 78, 79, 82, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 100, 101, 104, 106, 109, 110, 113, 115, 116, 117, 119.....	73
I-E	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120.....	93
I-F	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 106, 107, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120.....	87

* Numbers here correspond to the same numbers in the bibliography. In other words, the thought expressed in Item I-A in the scale is voiced by the corresponding author number in the bibliography.

TABLE I—Continued

Item number	TABULATION	Frequency
I-G	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 104, 106, 107, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120.....	84
I-H	2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 72, 74, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 96, 99, 100, 101, 103, 118.....	70
I-I	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 25, 28, 30, 31, 38, 48, 49, 50, 53, 69, 71, 79, 85, 95, 100, 107, 117, 119.....	31
I-J	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 72, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 93, 95, 97, 100, 101, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 113, 117, 119.....	78
II-A	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28, 30, 31, 37, 38, 41, 43, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 58, 59, 60, 69, 70, 71, 76, 80, 82, 83, 86, 93, 94, 95, 100, 107, 108, 109, 119, 120.....	51
III-A	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 31, 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, 46, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 100, 101, 103, 105, 107, 110, 113, 115, 117, 119.....	76
III-B	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 38, 39, 42, 46, 49, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 100, 101, 103, 105, 107, 110, 113, 115, 117, 119.....	67
III-C	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 38, 39, 42, 46, 49, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 100, 101, 103, 105, 107, 110, 113, 115, 117, 119.....	68

TABLE I—Continued

Item number	TABULATION	Fre- quency
IV-A	3, 5, 17, 18, 20, 23, 25, 35, 38, 42, 49, 53, 68, 69, 85, 107, 108, 116, 118, 119, 120.....	21
IV-B	3, 5, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 35, 38, 42, 49, 50, 53, 68, 69, 85, 107, 108, 116, 118, 119, 120.....	23
METHODS AND PRINCIPLES		
I-A	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 30, 34, 35, 38, 39, 42, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55, 62, 70, 71, 76, 78, 82, 83, 85, 89, 93, 95, 100, 108, 109, 110, 119, 120.....	50
I-B	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, 34, 35, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55, 57, 62, 70, 71, 76, 78, 82, 83, 85, 89, 93, 95, 98, 100, 108, 109, 110, 113, 119, 120.....	54
I-C	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 34, 35, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 70, 71, 74, 76, 78, 82, 83, 85, 89, 93, 95, 98, 100, 108, 109, 110, 113, 119, 120.....	62
I-D	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 70, 71, 74, 76, 78, 82, 83, 85, 89, 93, 95, 98, 100, 108, 109, 110, 113, 119, 120.....	68
I-E	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 70, 71, 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 83, 85, 89, 93, 95, 98, 100, 108, 109, 110, 113, 119, 120.....	70
I-F	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 70, 71, 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 83, 85, 89, 92, 93, 95, 98, 100, 103, 108, 109, 110, 113, 119, 120.....	72

TABLE I—Continued

Item number	TABULATION	Fre- quency
I-G	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, 82, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 94, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 114, 116, 119.....	84
II-A	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 47, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 57, 60, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 71, 76, 79, 82, 83, 85, 87, 92, 93, 95, 100, 107, 119.....	57
II-B	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 62, 70, 71, 73, 80, 82, 83, 89, 93, 95, 99, 100, 106, 109, 110, 113, 114, 116, 117, 120.....	60
II-C	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 62, 66, 70, 71, 72, 80, 82, 83, 85, 87, 89, 90, 93, 95, 99, 100, 106, 109, 110, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121.....	70
III-A	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 60, 62, 65, 70, 71, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 95, 99, 100, 101, 107, 109, 114, 117, 120.....	63
III-B	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 60, 62, 65, 67, 70, 71, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 84, 86, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 107, 109, 114, 117, 120.....	67
IV-A	3, 6, 12, 14, 17, 19, 23, 25, 28, 39, 42, 49, 53, 62, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 75, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 92, 93, 96, 99, 100, 104, 105, 109, 114, 119, 120.....	40
IV-B	3, 6, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 23, 25, 28, 39, 42, 49, 53, 62, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 75, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 92, 93, 96, 99, 100, 104, 105, 107, 109, 114, 119, 120.....	42

TABLE I—Concluded

Item number	TABULATION	Fre- quency
V-A	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 76, 79, 81, 82, 83, 86, 87, 89, 93, 95, 99, 100, 107, 109, 116, 117, 119.....	85
VI-A	1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 59, 62, 63, 66, 70, 71, 85, 100, 110, 117.....	49
VI-B	4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 25, 27, 38, 39, 42, 49, 50, 53, 71, 100, 109, 117, 118.....	26
VI-C	1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 34, 38, 39, 42, 49, 50, 53, 63, 68, 69, 70, 71, 85, 100, 109, 117, 118.....	37

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ALLEN, HOLLIS P., "Earmarks of a Good Teacher," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 96, pp. 25-26 (March, 1938).
2. ALMY, H. C., and SORENSON, HERBERT, "A Teaching-Rating Scale of Determined Reliability and Validity," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 16, pp. 179-86 (March, 1930).
3. ANDERSON, C. J., A. S. BARR, and MAYBELL BUSH, *Visiting the Teacher at Work*, D. Appleton and Co., New York, 1925, 382 pp.
4. ANDERSON, W. N., "The Selection of Teachers," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 3, pp. 83-90 (February, 1917).
5. AVERILL, L. A., *Mental Hygiene for the Classroom Teacher*, Pitman Publishing Corporation, Chicago, 1939, 217 pp.
6. BAIRD, JAMES, and BATES, GUY, "The Basis of Teacher-Rating," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 15, pp. 175-83 (March, 1929).
7. BARR, A. S., *Characteristic Differences in the Teaching Performance of Good and Poor Teachers*, Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, Illinois, 1929. 127 pp.
8. ———, "Some Problems in the Measurement of Teaching Ability," in *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 33, pp. 363-65 (January, 1940).
9. ———, "Systematic Study of Teaching and Teaching Efficiency," in *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 32, pp. 641-48 (May, 1939).
10. BAXTER, BERNICE, "Rating Teachers' Personal Effectiveness," in *Journal of the National Education Association*, Vol. 27, p. 81 (March, 1938).
11. BENT, RUDYARD K., "Various Techniques of Combining Ratings," in *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 28, pp. 65-70 (January, 1937).
12. BLEWETT, BEN, "How to Measure the Efficiency of Teachers," in *National Educational Addresses and Proceedings*, pp. 290-92. 1913.
13. BONE, H. A., "Criteria by Which a Teacher May Measure His Work," in *High School Quarterly*, Vol. 7, pp. 153-55 (April, 1919).
14. BOYCE, ARTHUR C., "Methods of Measuring Teachers' Efficiency," in *Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1915).
15. BRADFORD, MARY C., "Report of the Committee of One Hundred Classroom Teachers' Problems," in *Proceedings of the National Education Association*, Vol. 62, pp. 265-68 (1924).
16. BROWN, EDWIN J., *A Self-Rating Scale for Supervisors, Supervisory Principals, and Helping Teachers*, Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee (1929).
17. ———, *Problems in Classroom Management*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1933. 306 pp.
18. ———, and PHARES, EARL E., *A Self-Rating Scale for High School Principals*, Studies in Education, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas, 1934. 34 pp.
19. BUELLESFIELD, HENRY, "Causes of Failures Among Teachers," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 1, pp. 439-45 (September, 1915).
20. BURNHAM, ESTER STEWART, "What Is Your Score?" in *The Instructor*, p. 54, January, 1943.

21. CAMPBELL, ROALD, "Evaluation and the Rating of Teachers," in *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 41, pp. 671-76 (May, 1941).
22. CARRIGAN, ROSE A., "Rating of Teachers on the Basis of Supervisory Visitation," in *Journal of Educational Method*, Vol. 2, pp. 48-55 (September, 1922).
23. CHARTERS, W. W., WAPLES, DOUGLAS, and CAPEN, SAMUEL P., *The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1929. 666 pp.
24. CLARK, R. C., "A Scale for Measuring Teachers," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 62, pp. 39-40 (February, 1921).
25. COLEGROVE, CHAUNCEY P., *The Teacher and the School*, Charles Scribner's Sons, Boston, 1922. 446 pp.
26. CONNOR, W. L., "A New Method of Rating Teachers," in *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 1, pp. 338-58 (May, 1920).
27. COOK, W. A., "Uniform Standards for Judging Teachers in South Dakota," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 7, pp. 1-11 (January, 1921).
28. COOKE, DENNIS H., *Administering the Teacher Personnel*, Benjamin H. Sanborn and Company, Chicago, 1939. pp. 183-228.
29. COREY, STEPHEN M., "Evaluating Technical Teaching Competence," in *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 41, pp. 577-86 (April, 1941).
30. CRABTREE, J. W., "Rating of Teachers," in *Proceedings of the National Education Association*, Vol. 53, pp. 516-19 (1915).
31. CRANOR, KATHERINE T., "A Self-Rating Card for Supervisors as an Aid to Efficiency in School Work," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 7, pp. 91-120 (February, 1921).
32. CUBBERLEY, ELLWOOD P., *State School Administration*, Chapters 22 and 25, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1927. 773 pp.
33. CURTIS, F. D., "Supervisors' Check List of Criteria of a Skillfully Conducted Class Period," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 20, pp. 678-82 (November, 1941).
34. DAVIDSON, W. N., "How to Measure the Efficiency of Teachers," in *Proceedings of the National Education Association*, Vol. 51, pp. 286-90 (1913).
35. DAWSON, MILDRED A., "Superintendent's Check List for Evaluating Elementary-Grade Teaching," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 93, p. 45 (September, 1936).
36. DENNING, RUTH O., "Weigh Up or Weigh Down," in *School Executive*, Vol. 59, pp. 26-27 (January, 1940).
37. DRAGOO, A. W., "A Rating Scale for Shop Teachers," in *Industrial Arts and Vocational Education*, Vol. 21, pp. 8-9 (January, 1932).
38. DULUTH BOARD OF EDUCATION, "The Duluth System for Rating Teachers," *Board of Education Publication*, June 9, 1922, pp. 2-3, Duluth, Minnesota.
39. DYER, FRANKLIN, "Questions on Teaching to Help Teachers Make a Self-Examination to Find Ways of Improving," in *Atlantic Educational Journal*, Vol. 11, pp. 343-44 (March, 1916).
40. ELLIOT, E. E., "A Tentative Scale for the Measurement of Teachers' Efficiency," in *Teachers' Yearbook of Educational Investigations*, Department of Reference and Research, New York City Schools, 1915.

41. ELLIOTT, E. C., "How Shall the Merit of Teachers Be Tested and Recorded?" in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 1, pp. 291-99 (May, 1915).
42. ELSBREE, WILLARD S., *The American Teacher*, American Book Company, Chicago, 1939. pp. 449-51.
43. FICHANDLER, ALEXANDER, "Studying Self-Appraisal," in *School and Society*, Vol. 4, pp. 1000-1002 (December, 1916).
44. FORBES, M. G., "Ethics for Teachers," in *Journal of the National Education Association*, Vol. 11, pp. 219-20 (June, 1922).
45. FREEMAN, F. N., "Tests of Personality Traits," in *School Review*, Vol. 33, pp. 95-106 (February, 1926).
46. FREILICH, HELEN, "Problems of Ratings: Do They Improve Teaching?" in *American Teacher*, Vol. 21, pp. 5-6 (January, 1937).
47. FULTON, REED, "Teacher Speaks Up," in *Nation's Schools*, Vol. 25, pp. 49-51 (February, 1940).
48. GIACHINO, J. W., "Teacher's Self-Rating Scale," in *Industrial Arts and Vocational Education*, Vol. 28, p. 124 (March, 1939).
49. GIST, ARTHUR S., *The Administration of an Elementary School*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1928. 308 pp.
50. GRAY, W. S., "Rating-Scales, Self-Analysis, and the Improvement of Teaching," in *School Review*, Vol. 29, pp. 49-57 (January, 1921).
51. GRAY, HAROLD M., "Teacher-Rating Scheme," in *Industrial Arts and Vocational Education*, Vol. 30, pp. 289-90 (September, 1941).
52. HARDESTY, CECIL D., "Can Teaching Success Be Rated," in *Nation's Schools*, Vol. 15, pp. 27-28 (January, 1935).
53. HEBB, BERTHA Y., "Samples of Teachers' Self-Rating Cards," in *City School Leaflet*, No. 18, Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C. (February, 1925).
54. HERVEY, H. P., "The Rating of Teachers," in *Proceedings of the National Education Association*, Vol. 59, pp. 825-29 (1921).
55. HESS, ADAH H., "Teacher Rating as a Means of Improving Home Economics Teachers in Service," in *Journal of Home Economics*, pp. 85-90 (February, 1922).
56. HILDRETH, GERTRUDE H., compiler, *Bibliography of Mental Tests and Rating Scales*, Psychological Corporation, New York, 1939.
57. HINES, HARLAN C., "Merit Systems in Larger Cities," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 68, p. 52 (June, 1924).
58. ———, "The Selection of Teachers for the City of Cincinnati, Ohio," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 59, p. 41 (August, 1924).
59. HUGHES, HARDIN W., "General Principles, and the Results of Rating Characteristics," in *Journal of Educational Method*, Vol. 4, pp. 421-31 (June, 1925).
60. HUGHES, H. F., "This Business of Rating Teachers," in *Educational Method*, Vol. 13, pp. 301-04 (March, 1934).
61. JACOBSON, PAUL B., and REAVIS, WILLIAM C., *Duties of School Principals*, Prentice-Hall, New York, 1941, 812 pp.
62. JOHNSTON, JOSEPH H., "Teacher Rating in Large Cities," in *School Review*, Vol. 24, pp. 641-57 (November, 1916).

63. JONES, EDWARD S., "A Suggestion for Teacher Measurement," in *School and Society*, Vol. 6, pp. 321-22 (September 15, 1917).
64. JONES, OLIVE M., "The Relations of the Principals to the Teacher, and the Standards of Judging the Effectiveness of Teaching," in *School and Society*, Vol. 14, pp. 469-77 (November, 1921).
65. KENT, RAYMOND E., "What Should Teacher Rating Schemes Seek to Measure?" in *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 2, pp. 802-07 (1920).
66. KING, LEROY, "The Present Status of Teacher Rating in United States," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 70, pp. 44-46 (February, 1925).
67. KITTRELL, CHARLES A., "Principles of Developing and Using Teacher-Rating Scales," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 96, p. 51 (June, 1938).
68. KOOS, LEONARD V., *Administering the Secondary School*, American Book Company, New York, 1940. 435 pp.
69. KYTE, GEORGE C., "Appraisal of Teachers' Development," in *Principal at Work*, Ginn and Company, Boston, 1941, pp. 475-77.
70. LANDSITTEL, F. C., "A Score Card Method of Teacher Rating," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 4, pp. 297-309 (June, 1918).
71. LOIN, NELL E., "Teacher Rating," in *Journal of the National Education Association*, Vol. 14, pp. 118-19 (April, 1925).
72. LOWRY, ELLSWORTH, *Supervision and the Self-Rating Card*, State Normal School, Indiana, Pennsylvania. n. d.
73. LOZA, JOHN P., "How Do Your Teachers Grow?" in *School Executive*, Vol. 61, pp. 23-24, 70 (February, 1942).
74. LYNCH, JAMES M., "Teacher Rating Trends Psychologically Examined," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 104, pp. 27-28 (June, 1942).
75. MATHEWS, LEE H., "Item Analysis of Measures of Teaching Ability," in *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 33, pp. 576-80 (April, 1940).
76. McCLURE, WORTH, "The Rating of Elementary School Principals in Service," in *Fourth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals*, National Education Association, pp. 424-46 (1925).
77. MORGAN, CATHERINE, *Manual of Directions for Making Efficiency Card Ratings*, Detroit Public Schools, 1923.
78. National Education Association, Research Division, "Teacher Personnel Procedures: Employment Conditions in Service," *Research Bulletin*, Vol. 20, pp. 83-115 (May, 1942).
79. ORGANOVIC, NICHOLAS J., "Teacher Rating Scale," in *Educational Method*, Vol. 16, pp. 343-47 (April, 1937).
80. OLANDER, HERBERT T., "How to Measure Classroom Teaching," in *School Executive*, Vol. 56, pp. 470-71 (August, 1937).
81. PARROT, AVA L., "Abolishing the Rating of Teachers," in *Proceedings of the National Education Association*, Vol. 53, pp. 1168-73 (1915).
82. PHILLIPS, E. D., "A Self-Rating Scale for Teachers," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 66, pp. 45-46 (September, 1923).
83. PUSEY, EDWARD D., "Testing Teachers for Efficiency," in *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the N. E. A.*, pp. 283-86. 1914.
84. PYGMAN, CLARENCE H., "Don't Rate—Stimulate!" in *School Executive*, Vol. 59, pp. 6-9 (December, 1939).

85. REAVIS, WILLIAM C., and CHARLES H. JUDD, and EDWARD H. STULLKEN, *The Elementary School*, Revised Edition, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1938. 571 pp.
86. REEDER, WARD G., *The Fundamentals of Public School Administration*, Macmillan Company, New York, 1941, Chapter 9, pp. 230-50.
87. RICH, STEPHEN G., "Rating of Principals and Superintendents," in *Education*, Vol. 42, pp. 496-500.
88. RIDDLE, ANNA "Teacher Rating, Report of the Committee of One Hundred on Classroom Teachers' Problems," in *Proceedings of the N. E. A.*, Vol. 65, pp. 202-15 (1925).
89. RITTER, ELMER J., "Ratings of Teachers in Indiana," in *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 18, pp. 740-56 (June, 1918).
90. ROBERTS, MILDRED M., "Supervisor as a Reviver," in *School Executive*, Vol. 57, pp. 248-50 (February, 1938).
91. ROSTKER, LEON E., "Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Ability," in *School and Society*, Vol. 51, pp. 30-32 (January, 1940).
92. ———, "Method for Determining Criteria of Teaching Ability in Terms of Measurable Pupil Changes," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 28, pp. 1-19 (January, 1942).
93. RUEDIGER, W. C., "Rating Teachers," in *School and Society*, Vol. 20, pp. 263-68 (August, 1924).
94. RUEDIGER, WILLIAM C., and STRAYER, G. D., "The Quality of Merit in Teachers," in *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 1, pp. 272-78 (May, 1910).
95. RUGG, HAROLD O., "Self-Improvement of Teachers Through Self-Rating," in *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 20, pp. 670-84 (May, 1920).
96. ———, "Is the Rating of Human Character Practicable?" in *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 12, pp. 425-38; 485-501 (December, 1921); Vol. 13, pp. 30-42 (January, 1922); pp. 81-93 (February, 1922).
97. SAMUELSON, EMIL E., "Evaluation of Teachers and Teaching," in *School Executive*, Vol. 60, pp. 15-16 (May, 1941).
98. SANTEE, JOSEPH F., "Supervision of Smaller School Systems," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 93, pp. 23-24 (November, 1936).
99. SCHUTTE, F. H., *Schutte Rating Scale for Teachers*, World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, 1923.
100. SEARS, JESSE B., *Classroom Organization and Control*, Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1928. 400 pp.
101. ———, "The Measurement of Teacher Efficiency," in *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 4, pp. 81-94 (September, 1921).
102. SENGER, HARRY L., "Status Teacher-Rating in 1936," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 93, p. 56 (September, 1936).
103. SHANNON, JOHN R., "Comparison of Three Means for Measuring Efficiency in Teaching," in *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 29, pp. 501-08 (March, 1936).
104. ———, "Elements of Excellence in Teaching," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 27, pp. 168-74 (March, 1941).
105. SHUSTER, LILLIAN, "Rating Teachers While in Service," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 98, p. 45 (April, 1939).

106. SIMPSON, RAY H., "Teacher, Here Is Your Final," in *Clearing House*, Vol. 16, pp. 47-48 (September, 1941).
107. SHOWALTER, B. R., "A Score Card for Rural Teachers," in *School and Society*, Vol. 12, p. 200 (September, 1920).
108. SKILES, C., "Superior Teacher," in *Educational Method*, Vol. 14, pp. 236-39 (February, 1935).
109. SMITH, THOMAS B., "Description of Elementary Teachers Given by Junior High School Pupils," George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville. n. d.
110. STOUT, E. J., "Ethics of Teacher Selection," in *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 70, pp. 132, 134 (January, 1925).
111. TAYLOR, JOSEPH S., "Some Desirable Traits of the Supervisor," in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 9, pp. 1-8 (January, 1923).
112. THOMPSON, ANNA M., "Report of the Committee on Teacher Rating," in *N. E. A. Addresses and Proceedings*, Vol. 63, pp. 375-77 (1925).
113. TROW, W. C., "How Shall Teaching Be Evaluated?" in *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 20, p. 269 (April, 1934).
114. TWISS, GEORGE R., "A Plan for Rating the Teachers in a School System," in *School and Society*, Vol. 9, pp. 748-56 (June 21, 1919).
115. WAGNER, C. A., "The Construction of a Teacher Rating Scale," in *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 21, pp. 361-66 (January, 1921).
116. WALKER, H. M., *Measurement of Teaching Efficiency*, Macmillan Company, New York, 1935. 237 pp.
117. WEBER, SAMUEL E., *Coöperative Administration and Supervision of the Teaching Personnel*, Chapter 9, Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York, 1937.
118. WINSLOW, C. E. A., *The School Health Program*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1938. 120 pp.
119. WITHAM, E. C., "School and Teacher Measurement," in *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 5, pp. 267-78 (May, 1914).
120. YOUNG, FRANK, "Some Factors Affecting Teaching Efficiency," in *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 32, pp. 649-52 (May, 1939).
121. YOUNG, L. P., *Administration of Merit-Type Teachers' Salary Schedules*, "Contributions to Education," No. 552, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1933. 104 pp.

