AN ATTEMPT TO PREDICT CRITICAL INCIDENT CATEGORIES

FROM THREE PERSONALITY VARIABLES

A THESIS

Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate Division

by

Kathleen I. Carroll

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Psychology

Georgia Institute of Technology

March, 1974

AN ATTEMPT TO PREDICT CRITICAL INCIDENT CATEGORIES

FROM THREE PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Approved:

William W. Ronan, Chairman

Glen D. Baskett

Gerard J. Day

Date Approved By Chairman: 3/5/74

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

SUMMARY

The purpose of the present study was to examine the role of three

personality variables - authoritarianism, locus of control, and need for

approval - in the reported perception of critical incidents by observers.

The hypothesis tested was the following: One or more of three selected

personality variables are predictive of the criterion (the category of the

incident reported). The participants in this study were one hundred and

sixty students enrolled in undergraduate psychology courses at Georgia

Institute of Technology. Seventy-nine subjects reported incidents re-

lated to teachers, while the remaining eighty-one reported course-related

incidents. All participants were administered the three personality

scales - a revised version of the California F Scale, the Internal-External

Locus of Control (IE) Scale, and the Need for Social Approval (SD) Scale.

The reported incidents were categorized and then the data were analyzed

through discriminant analysis and by determining the intercorrelations

between the scores on the three personality variables. The results demon-

strated that the scores on the personality scales were not predictive of

the category of the reported incident. The only significant value yielded

by the results was the correlation coefficient obtained for the scores on

the IE scale and the scores on the SD scale. It was noted that previous

work involving the role of personality variables in the perception of

others has found these variables to be important in the perception of the

traits of others. The present study attempted to determine the role of

personality variables in the perception of the behaviors of the performance

of others. The lack of significant results led to the conclusion that, for the present study, it appeared that the role of personality variables in such perceptions could not be generalized to the evaluation of teacher behaviors and courses.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The critical incident technique (CIT) (Flanagan, 1954) is a method

of performance evaluation used to determine what constitutes effective

and/or ineffective performance on a given job. The CIT obtains informa-

tion from persons who observe performers in a particular job. The role

of the observer is to describe incidents in which he observed effective

and/or ineffective performance. To date, no investigators have examined

the extent to which personality measures of the observer might be related

to the kinds of critical incidents reported. The purpose of the present

study was to investigate the possible importance of three personality

variables as related to the reporting of critical incidents. Evidence

will be cited later to show that the selected personality variables have

been found to be important in the perception of the personality <u>traits</u>

of others. The CIT, however, is involved with the perception of <u>behaviors</u>

of others; specifically, it is concerned with the perceived behaviors of

the <u>performance</u> of a person in a given situation rather than with behaviors .

related to the <u>personality</u> of the individual. The hypothesis tested in

this study was the following: One or more of three selected personality

variables are predictive of the criterion, i.e., the category of the inci-

dent reported. (Exactly how the criterion was obtained will be discussed

more fully in the procedure section of this thesis.)

An indication that personality variables may play a role in the

perception of others is conveyed in the following statement by Gage and

Cronbach (1955), who say that "in the bulk of research to date, social perception as measured is a process dominated far more by what the judge brings to it than by what he takes in during it" (p. 420). So, it appears reasonable to assume that the type of person the observer is, as measured by personality scales, would be important in his perception of a performer in a given job and the kind of incident he subsequently reports. Warr and Knapper (1968) also note that close attention should be paid to the influence of the personality of the perceiver on his judgments about other people.

The three personality variables selected to test the hypothesis were authoritarianism, the internal-external locus of control dimension, and need for approval (or social desirability). Authoritarianism and locus of control have been found to moderate the perception of the traits of others to at least a certain extent, while social desirability or need for approval seems to moderate behaviors under certain conditions. Therefore, it was hypothesized that these variables may also play a role in the perception of the behaviors of others, as measured through the CIT. The reported incident related to either a teacher or a course which the subject had experienced within the past year.

The Critical Incident Technique

The critical incident technique (CIT), as has been previously mentioned, is a way of determining what behaviors are important in effective job performance. Using the CIT, information is obtained from persons who observe performers in a particular job. The observers are asked to describe incidents in which they observed effective and/or ineffective

performance. Incidents are collected which describe the behavior being considered and are then categorized by judges who sort them into groups of similar behaviors. The categories are given a name related to the behaviors described. Although the CIT usually involves describing incidents of human behavior, it has also been used to describe events or occurrences (Fiedler, Mitchell, & Triandis, 1971; Soliman, 1970).

The CIT has been employed in a wide variety of situations. For example, it has been used to examine characteristics of suicidal individuals (Devries, 1966); to discover critical requirements for dentists (Wagner, 1950), salesmen (Bridgman, Spaeth, Driscoll, & Fanning, 1956), and store managers (Anderson & Nilsson, 1964); to study hospital medication errors (Safren & Chapanis, 1960); as a useful approach to psychopathology (Flanagan & Schmid, 1959); and even in constructing a programmed culture training manual to aid members of one culture in adjusting to another culture (Fiedler et al., 1971). The CIT has also been used to determine effective teaching behaviors (Barr, Bechdolt, Coxe, Gage, Orleans, Remmers, & Ryans, 1953) and to compile a checklist of teacher behaviors for teacher evaluations (Ronan, 1971).

Trait Scales

The three individual trait scales that have been chosen for use in the present study, in conjunction with the CIT, are a revised F-Scale to measure authoritarianism (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Byrne, 1974); the Internal-External Scale of Locus of Control (Rotter, 1966); and the Need for Social Approval Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

The Perception of People

Shrauger and Altrocchi (1964) note that, according to Tagiuri (1958), one factor which is important in the perception of other people is the characteristics of the perceiver. They define person perception as the "attribution of psychological characteristics (e.g., traits, intentions, emotions) to other people - either by describing them or by making predictions of their subsequent behavior" (p. 290). They go on to say that this perceptual process can be said to consist of three stages: (1) selecting cues, (2) using these cues to draw inferences about personal characteristics, and (3) translating one's impressions into a verbal response. All three stages of the perceptual process are actually involved in the CIT. That is, the observer must not only select cues and make inferences from these cues in order to arrive at an incident exemplifying effective and/or ineffective performance, but he must also indicate his impressions overtly, either by direct verbalization or through a written report.

The importance of the second step in the perceptual process, drawing inferences, must not be overlooked, especially as it applied to the CIT. Shrauger and Altrocchi (1964) state:

> The most basic form of inference occurs when some cue such as an
> inflection of voice, a gesture, or an eye movement is interpreted
> as signifying some psychological feature of the person being de-
> scribed. The same cue, while equally attended to, may be seen by
> various people as implying very different characteristics or it
> may be seen as reflecting nothing (p. 302).

Authoritarianism

One of the more intensely studied personality correlates of the

perception of others is authoritarianism. Authoritarianism refers to a system of attitudes consisting of several interrelated anti-democratic feelings which include ethnic prejudice, political conservatism, and rejection of the unconventional (Adorno et al., 1950). Scodel and Mussen (1953) identified the following adjectives which have been used to describe authoritarian personalities: "rigid, extraceptive, repressed, conforming, stereotypical in their thinking, and intolerant of ambiguity," while the non-authoritarian person has been described as "flexible, intraceptive, and having a greater capacity for intense personal relationships" (p. 181). Scodel and Mussen also state that the authoritarian individual has a restricted perception of others because he selectively ignores those behaviors which might exclude him from the "ingroup." Another definition of the authoritarian personality has been given by Secord and Backman (1964). An authoritarian individual

> ridigly adheres to conventional middle-class values and has exaggerated concern with such values, is submissive toward moral authorities of his ingroup, condemns and rejects people who violate conventional values, is preoccupied with power and status considerations, tends to identify with powerful figures, and is generally hostile toward members of outgroups (p. 80).

Authoritarianism and the Perception of Others

A series of studies has centered on the role of authoritarianism in the accuracy of interpersonal perceptions. The first such study was that of Scodel and Mussen (1953) who had subjects interact with a partner for a brief period of time and then estimate their partner's authoritarian (F) score. Each pair of subjects consisted of one high authoritarian subject and one low authoritarian subject. When the estimated F scores were classified as either accurate, middle, or inaccurate, 26 of 27 high F

scorers inaccurately estimated low authoritarian subjects, while only 5 lows inaccurately estimated high F scorers. In general, high F scorers did not perceive low authoritarian subjects as having F scores which were significantly different from their own, while low F scorers estimated high F scorers to be significantly higher than their own, but lower than the scores of these high authoritarian subjects really were. Based on these results, Scodel and Mussen concluded that non-authoritarian subjects are more accurate when judging authoritarian others than are authoritarians judging non-authoritarians.

The second sutdy in this series was conducted by Scodel and Freedman (1956) which in essence was a replication of the Scodel and Mussen study just discussed, except for one difference. Instead of pairing authoritarians with non-authoritarians only, they had high and low authoritarian subjects interact with others having similar as well as different F scores. The results of this study were similar to those of the previous one, in that high authoritarian subjects tended to estimate their partners as also being highly authoritarian, whether the partners were high or low. It was also found that the low authoritarian subjects gave estimates which were less uniform than the estimates provided by the high authoritarian subjects, in that the low authoritarian subjects tended to place others in the middle or high range, regardless of whether these others were actually high or low authoritarians.

A third study related to the role of authoritarianism in interpersonal perception accuracy was performed by Crockett and Meidinger (1956), who noted that the results of the two above-cited studies, while finding

differences in the perceptions of authoritarians and non-authoritarians, found no differences in the accuracy of these perceptions. The results of the Crockett and Meidinger (1956) study were congruent with those of the Scodel and Mussen (1953) and the Scodel and Freedman (1956) studies, in that high F scorers tended to estimate their partners' F scores as being high, like their own, while the low authoritarian subjects' estimates contained more variability since these subjects tended to place their partners' F scores sometimes in the high or low range, but most often in the middle range. The design of this study employed three combinations of subjects: authoritarian-authoritarian, nonauthoritarian-nonauthoritarian (as in the Scodel and Freedman [1956] study), and authoritarian-nonauthoritarian (as in the Scodel and Mussen [1953] study).

Another study along these same lines is by Rabinowitz (1956), who instead of having different combinations of high and low authoritarians interact (as in the previous studies) had his subjects first complete the F scale and then fill it out as they thought the typical college student would. His results showed that 20% of the subjects who were low on the F scale assigned significantly higher F scores, compared with their own, to the typical student than did the 20% of the subjects who were high on the F scale.

Secord and Backman (1964) observe that the following generalizations can be made regarding the studies just discussed:

(1) It is usually assmed by the perceiver that the other person is a peer; i.e., the perceiver does not think of him as someone with significant characteristics that might set him apart from others.

(2) The perceiver who is a high authoritarian assumes that the other person possesses values similar to his own and therefore estimates him to be high on most of the authoritarian traits.

(3) The perceiver who is a low authoritarian does not see others to be low authoritarian, but instead usually rates them as average on authoritarian traits.

Secord and Backman believe that these results provide sufficient evidence that the characteristics of the perceiver will affect the way in which he perceives others, in terms of authoritarianism. This is an important statement with reference to the present study, since this is what is being hypothesized - that different types of people, as measured by personality scales, will perceive teachers and courses differently, and that these varying perceptions will be reflected in the kinds of incidents reported in the CIT. Schulberg (1961) found results similar to those mentioned in the series of studies on authoritarianism and person perception discussed earlier. His findings indicated that non-authoritarian judges were better able to perceive that others were not necessarily like themselves, and estimated the largest difference between their own scores and those of their partners.

Christie and Cook (1958), in a review of the series of studies mentioned previously, make the following conclusion: "These studies indicate systematic differences in judgments by high and low scorers on the F scale. It appears in view of the previously cited evidence that this is a function of personality differences on the part of the judges rather than an ability

to make accurate judgments" (p. 181).

Another study dealing with authoritarianism and the perception of others is one by Jones (1953), as cited by Bruner and Tagiuri (1954). Jones presented high and low authoritarian Navy recruits with an interview of a man who might become the leader of their squad. This stimulus person was varied systematically regarding his power and leadership attitudes. The results showed that the low authoritarian subjects were generally more sensitive than the high authoritarian subjects to the diversities in the psychological characteristics of the stimulus person, and more apt to critically judge the leadership figure. These results are what would be expected, since they tend to be in line with that part of the theoretical basis of authoritarianism dealing with the authoritarian's preoccupation with power and status, and his identification with powerful figures or leaders.

Kates (1959) studied authoritarianism and first-impression formation. Subjects (high and low authoritarian males and females) read information on two stimulus persons; one was high in authoritarianism and the other was a low authoritarian. After reading the material, subjects evaluated the stimulus persons by completing the F scale and the Jones Graphic Rating Scale. The results tended to show that high authoritarian subjects perceived the stimulus persons as displaying significantly more authoritarianism, power, leadership, social sensitivity, positive traits, and personal attractiveness than did the low authoritarian subjects. Kates believes that the high and low authoritarian subjects used the same cue to arrive at different perceptions; this cue was that the stimulus persons were

peers. The high authoritarian subjects, according to Kates, used this cue to perceive the stimulus persons as "ingroup" members, with the result that high authoritarian subjects evaluated the stimulus persons as being high in authoritarianism and having favorable personal qualities. Low authoritarian subjects, on the other hand, used this cue to perceive the stimulus persons as being high or middle authoritarian and evaluated them more critically and objectively.

A study by DeSoto, Keuthe, and Wunderlich (1960) lends more insight into the social and self-perceptions of high and low authoritarians. They had high and low authoritarian subjects rate pictures of strangers on personality traits and then rated themselves on the same traits. The results showed that the high authoritarian subjects, as compared with the low authoritarians, displayed general fear, suspicion, and moralistic condemnation of strangers, while emphasizing their own ability and virtue.

Based on the above evidence, it appears possible that low authoritarians may be more objective in their perceptions of others. If this is true, then it is reasonable to assume that high and low authoritarian subjects may give different kinds of incidents when asked to report an incident related to an evaluation of a teacher or a course.

Internal-External Locus of Control

The theoretical basis of the internal-external (IE) dimension states that when a person perceives a reinforcer as following his own action but being not completely dependent upon his action, he usually perceives the reinforcement as a result of luck, fate, chance, as under the control of others in power, or as being unpredictable because of the many complex forces

in his environment. When a person interprets an event in this manner, this is labeled as a belief in external control. On the other hand, if a person perceives that the event is dependent upon his own behavior or his own rather permanent character, this is termed a belief in internal control. This suggests that internal (I) and external (E) individuals will behave differently in certain situations, and previous research has indeed shown this to be true (Rotter, 1966). Therefore, the present study hypothesized that I and E persons are different in still other situations, namely their perception of teachers and courses, and that this difference would be reflected in the kinds of incidents they reported.

Internal-External Locus of Control and the Perception of Others

Not nearly as much work has been done on the role of the internal-external (IE) variable in the perception of others as has been done with authoritarianism. Nevertheless, several pertinent studies can be cited. In Miller's (1970) study, photographs which had been previously rated as either high, medium, or low in physical attractiveness were shown to subjects. The task of these subjects was to fill out Rotter's IE Scale as they thought the person in the photograph would. The results showed that low attractive persons were perceived as being more external than highly or moderately attractive persons, with no difference between these latter two. Another finding was that males perceived females as being significantly more external than males, although this distinction was not made by female subjects. These results were interpreted by Miller as a demonstration of the relevance of the IE variable in interpersonal perception. Therefore, this study is supportive of the notion embodied in the present study; that is, that the IE variable may be important in the observer's

perceptions of critical incidents, which would subsequently be reflected in the ability of the IE variable to predict various categories of critical incidents.

Jones and Shrauger (1968) examined the role of the locus of control variable in interpersonal evaluations. Subjects were administered Rotter's IE scale and then took part in a group test with two peers. After the completion of the test the participants evaluated one another's answers. The subjects received evaluations which were "rigged," so that one peer gave them mostly positive evaluations (Positive Evaluator), while from the other they received mostly negative evaluations (Negative Evaluator). The perceived controlling ability of these evaluations was also manipulated, so that half of the subjects were told that the test was an ability measure and the items had right and wrong answers (Ability condition). The other half of the subjects were told that the test was merely a measure of personal opinions and the items had no right and wrong answers (Opinion condition). The results showed that, in relation to the evaluations, external (E) subjects reciprocated more than internal (I) subjects; that is, an E person who received a positive evaluation was more likely to give the Positive Evaluator a favorable criticism, and conversely, if the Negative Evaluator gave an E person an unfavorable evaluation, the E subject was more apt, in turn, to give this person an equally negative judgment. However, this situation did not tend to exist with the I subjects. Also, this difference between I and E subjects' reactions to evaluations tended to be more emphasized in the Opinion condition than in the Ability condition.

The IE variable has also been considered as it relates to inter-personal attraction, as exemplified in a study by Silverman and Shrauger (1971). This study was an examination of how a person's belief in his own I or E locus of control is related to the personality characteristics of others which renders these others attractive to the person. The results demonstrated that E persons were more attracted to people whom they perceived as being competent, independent, and possessing the ability to act for themselves. For I subjects, the only attribute associated with attractiveness was a lack of self-centeredness.

Another study dealing with the locus of control dimension and interpersonal attraction is one by Phares and Wilson (1971). They hypothesized that, in line with Byrne's (1961) often replicated finding that similarity is an important factor in attraction, I persons would have larger interpersonal attraction scores for an I stranger than for an E stranger, while E subjects whould demonstrate more preference for an E stranger. The results confirmed half of the hypothesis, in that I subjects were found to be more attracted to, and displayed greater preference for, an I stranger rather than an E stranger. However, E subjects did not show a greater attraction toward an E stranger.

In summary, it may be said that the above evidence supports the contention that I persons and E persons may have different perceptions regarding the traits of others. If this is true, then it may also be possible that I people and E people have varying perceptions of the behaviors of others, as measured through the CIT.

Relationship of F and IE Scales

Some previous work has been done on the relationship between the F scale and the IE scale. Byrne (1974) notes that authoritarianism may be related to the E dimension of the IE variable, since authoritarianism is associated with a belief in mystical determinants of a person's fate. Baron (1968) determined the correlation between F and IE scores. His correlation was somewhat low and not significant (r = 0.19), and he concluded that the scores on these two instruments were largely independent. Lefcourt (1966) notes that two investigators, Holden (1958) and Simmons (1959), attempted to determine the correlation between F scores and scores on an early version of the IE scale. They found a correlation of 0.51, which was interpreted by them as an indication, in both scales, of the degree to which individuals view the world as containing powerful forces over which they have no control.

Need for Approval (Social Desirability)

The current research on social desirability (SD) is taking basically two directions (Sarason & Smith, 1971). One group of studies is involved with social desirability as a response set and the various factors which affect social desirability ratings. The second emphasis is on social desirability as a personality variable (e.g., need for approval or defensiveness) as related to other behaviors. Strickland and Crowne (1962) list the following characteristics to describe a person with a high need for social approval: "over-compliance in social situations and submission to the beliefs and judgments of others, oversensitiveness to the perceived expectations of others, and a socially desirable response set on personality

inventories" (p. 180).

Some researchers tend to believe that social desirability may actually be a variable in the IE scale; that is, it is possible that subjects may be responding to the social desirability of the item rather than the actual content (Bernhardson, 1968; Hjelle, 1971; Joe, 1972). However, the inconsistent results that have thus far been obtained indicate that the relationship between social desirability and the IE scale is unclear at this time. One reason why the need for approval variable was included in the present study was to determine whether or not a relationship would be found between this variable and the IE variable. Results obtained thus far by other researchers on this issue will be discussed more fully in a later part of this thesis.

Need for Approval (Social Desirability) and the Perception of Others

The role which need for approval plays in the perception of others is another area which has not been investigated to a large extent. The work which has been done thus far appears to be centered on social desirability (SD) as it relates to either attraction, similarity, or conformity. Several such studies are cited below.

Posavac (1971) studied need for approval as a factor in interpersonal attraction by testing the hypothesis that subjects with a high need for approval would evaluate people who agreed with them more favorably, and reject those who disagreed with them; subjects with a low need for approval, on the other hand, would not emphasize attitude agreement quite as much in their evaluation of others. Subjects were administered the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MC-SDS) and an attitude questionnaire. They then were

given attitude scales which had been completed by 30 strangers. The amount of attraction of the subjects toward these strangers was measured by the Interpersonal Judgment Scale. The results supported the hypothesis that the higher a subject's need for approval, the more he tended to prefer strangers who agreed with him. Posavac concluded that, even though attitude similarity was an important factor in interpersonal attraction, the need for approval acted as a moderator in this relationship.

Another study involved with need for approval and interpersonal attraction is one by Ettinger, Nowicki, and Nelson (1970). The main purpose of this study was to examine the role of expectancy and the reinforcement value associated with need for approval in the determination of interpersonal attraction. The hypothesis tested was that the response of an individual toward another is based primarily upon his expectancy regarding gaining the approval of others and the reinforcement value associated with gaining such approval. The degree of attitude similarity between the subjects and the strangers was manipulated by giving the subjects attitude questionnaires which supposedly had been filled out by strangers. In the Similar condition, the subjects got questionnaires of strangers which agreed 100% with their own answers on the survey; in the Dissimilar condition, the subjects got strangers' questionnaires in which the answers disagreed 100% with theirs; and in the Similar-Dissimilar condition and the Dissimilar-Similar conditions, half of the strangers' answers to the questionnaire agreed with those of the subjects and half disagreed. The subjects were also administered the MC-SDS. The results showed that subjects with a high need for approval were more attracted

toward strangers than low scorers.

Closely associated with the notion of interpersonal attraction is the factor of similarity, and some work has been done on perceived similarity as a function of manipulated similarity and subjective social desirability (Kaufmann & Zener, 1967). A study by Byrne (1961) has shown that a person is more attracted to another person if he is perceived as being similar to the perceiver. However, it is possible that if the observer sees his own attributes as "good," then he may be attracted to a similar person either because he too possesses desirable traits, or else simply because he is similar. To examine this issue, a study was conducted in which the subjects' attitude measures were obtained on a 7-point scale among 64 binary choices dealing with various topics. On a second scale, subjects indicated what they thought the socially desirable answer would be to each item. From the 64-item scale, 9 "crucial" items were selected to create two conditions: In the high social favorability condition, subjects' preferences on these 9 items and the subjects' perceptions of the social desirability of these items coincided; in the neutral social favorability condition, the subjects' preferences for the items and their perceptions of the social desirability of the items did not coincide. The other variable manipulated was the similarity between the subjects' answers and those of another person. Subjects were asked to finish filling out the partially completed questionnaire (which contained the 9 crucial items) of their partner. Six of the items were supposedly completed by the subject's partner; the subject's task was to fill in the remaining 3 items as he thought his partner would. There

were two conditions in which similarity was manipulated: In the high similarity condition, 5 of the 6 items already completed by the subject's partner indicated preferences in the same direction as the subject's preferences; in the low similarity condition, 5 of the 6 items were answered in the direction opposite to the subject's preferences. Thus, there were four resulting conditions: High similarity-socially favorable; high similarity-socially neutral; low similarity-socially favorable; and low similarity-socially neutral. The results demonstrated a significant interaction between manipulated similarity and social desirability. When the attitudes involved were perceived as socially desirable, a partner who was supposedly dissimilar was seen as being more dissimilar than when the attitudes were perceived as neutral, and a partner described as similar was perceived as more similar under these same circumstances.

Conformity under group pressure as a function of the need for social approval is the area of interest in a study by Strickland and Crowne (1962). This study attempted to test the hypothesis that subjects with a high need for approval would conform more to group pressure by distorting their judgments of objective stimuli than would subjects with a low need for approval. Subjects gave judgments related to an auditory stimulus, after listening to the reports of three accomplices who gave inaccurate judgments. Subjects were also administered the MC-SDS and the Barron Independence of Judgment Scale, which is a measure of conformity. The results demonstrated that subjects with a high need for approval conformed significantly more frequently than did subjects with a low need for social approval.

The findings of Dodge and Muensch (1969) are in contrast to the results obtained in the Strickland and Crowne (1962) study cited above. Using children as subjects, Dodge and Muensch found that no relationship existed between conformity to group pressure and need for approval. They expected, as did Strickland and Crowne, that there would be a direct positive correlation between conformity and need for approval, but their results did not confirm this hypothesis. It is possible that one contributing factor to this discrepancy between the results of these two studies could be the age of the subjects in each. Strickland and Crowne used undergraduate college students as subjects, while Dodge and Muensch had 6th-grade children as subjects. It is possible that the effect of need for social approval is not evidenced until individuals with a high need for approval are old enough to realize how important the approval of others actually is to them.

The evidence cited above indicates that persons with a high need for approval will under some circumstances react differently in a social situation than persons with a lower need for approval. These different responses could be due to varying perceptions of these types of people regarding the traits of others. It this is true, then it is also possible that subjects with a high need for approval will perceive the behaviors of their teachers or incidents related to courses in a manner different from that of a subject with a lower need for approval. Such a difference may be evident in the kinds of incidents reported by these two types of people.

In summary, it appears that the F and IE variables can moderate the perception of traits and characteristics of others to at least some

degree, while the SD variable seems to moderate behaviors under certain conditions. The next question, then, and the one with which this study deals, is whether or not perceptions of reported behaviors are moderated by the personality traits of the perceiver. This is the problem with which this thesis is concerned.

Relationship Between F Scale and SD Scale

To the knowledge of the present writer, no work has been done on the relationship between the F scale and the SD scale. It is anticipated that there will be no relationship between these two scales, since they appear to be tapping such different characteristics.

Relationship Between IE Scale and SD Scale

Some work has been done thus far on the relationship between the IE scale and the SD scale. However, this work has yielded somewhat discrepant results. Studies which have found a correlation between these two scales are the following:

(1) Bernhardson (1968) - found a high and significant correlation between the two scales (r = 0.79, p < .05). He interpreted this to mean that the items of the IE scale which the subject thought to be the most socially desirable tended to be the ones endorsed by the subject.

(2) Altrocchi, Palmer, Hellmann, & Davis (1968) - in two experiments, found a significant correlation between scores on the IE scale and scores on the SD scale, but only for their male subjects (r = -0.29, p < .05).

(3) Lichtman & Julian (1964) as reported by Lefcourt (1966) -

found a significant correlation between scores on the IE and

SD scales ($r = -0.39$, $p < .05$).

Studies which have found no correlation between the IE scale and the SD

scale are the following:

    (1)   Tolor (1967) - using two samples, found two low, nonsignifi-

            cant correlations between the IE and SD scales ($r = 0.26$;

            $r = -0.095$) and hence concluded that Rotter's contention that

            the IE scale is not contaminated by a social desirability

            response set can be assumed.

    (2)   Tolor & Jalowiec (1968) - found a low and insignificant cor-

            relation between the two scales. (They correlated the SD

            scale with the IE scale and two other scales, and the re-

            sulting intercorrelations ranged between 0.00 and 0.08.)

Study Objectives

The purpose of the present study was to examine the role of three

personality variables - authoritarianism, locus of control, and need for

approval - in the perception of critical incidents by observers. Specifi-

cally, the hypothesis tested in this study was the following: One or

more of three selected personality variables are predictive of the cri-

terion, i.e., the category of the incident reported.

Another methodological question concerned the source of the inci-

dent, i.e., does it matter if the participant is asked to report an inci-

dent about the teacher or about the course. It is possible that asking

for a teacher incident would tend to elicit different responses than

asking for a course incident, and this factor might subsequently affect

the results.

Also, since differing results have been obtained regarding the relationships between the three personality scales, another area of interest in the present study was to determine the intercorrelations of these scales.

CHAPTER II

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Subjects

The subjects consisted of 160 students enrolled in undergraduate psychology courses at the Georgia Institute of Technology who volunteered to participate in the experiment. They were given class credit for their participation in the study. Of these subjects, 79 reported teacher incidents, while the remaining 81 reported course incidents. The exact procedure for collecting incidents is described more fully below.

Measures

The instruments used in the present study consisted of three individual trait scales: A version of the California F Scale balanced for acquiescence response set (Byrne, 1974) to measure authoritarianism (Adorno et al., 1950); the Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966); and the Need for Approval Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Flanagan's (1954) critical incident technique was used to collect incidents to describe either the best teacher or the best course.

The reliability for the revised authoritarianism scale was based on the data of the present study. The corrected odd-even reliability coefficient obtained was 0.77. Rotter (1966) stated that the reliability of the Internal-External Locus of Control Scale, using the internal consistency method (Kuder Richardson, split-half, and Spearman-Brown techniques) has been shown to range between 0.65 and 0.79 in ten different

samples. According to Crowne and Marlowe (1960), the internal consistency coefficient (using the Kuder Richardson 20 formula) for the Need for Approval Scale is 0.88.

Procedure

Students in psychology courses who wished to participate in the study were given an opportunity to sign up for a time which was convenient for them. The subjects were run in groups, the size of which varied from 2-10 per group, depending upon the number of subjects who had signed up for one particular time.

One of two different instructions was used at the testing sessions. Seventy-nine subjects were asked about their best teacher, while eighty-one were asked about their best course. When the subjects were assembled, the experimenter gave each of them a sheet of instructions. When each participant had a copy, the experimenter read the instructions aloud while the subjects followed along reading their copy.

The instructions were: "Think of the best college (teacher, course) you have had, during the past year, either here at Tech or at some other school; that is, (the teacher who taught best, the course you thought was best). Then give me an example of why you chose this (teacher, course). In other words, give me one particular incident which you remember as being indicative of the high quality of (this teacher's teaching ability, this course). Try to limit yourself to thinking of a (teacher, course) you have experienced within the past year, but if you can't think of one within the past year, then just think of the best college (teacher, course) you have had."

The experimenter also read an example of a critical incident from the industrial field to the subjects so that they could get a better idea of just how specific the incident should be. The experimenter stressed the fact that the incident should refer to just one particular incident rather than being too general. The experimenter asked if there were any questions, and then requested that the subjects begin writing down the incident on the instruction sheet.

After each subject had written his incident, the papers were collected. Then the experimenter requested that the participants fill out three questionnaires (which were the personality scales). The order of administration of the scales was randomized for each subject. Before the subjects began responding to the questionnaires, the experimenter told them that if they objected to answering any of the items, they were not obliged to do so, although she (the experimenter) hoped that they would answer all of the items. None of the subjects refused to answer the questionnaires. However, one person in the teacher instruction group failed to complete the entire F scale. This subject's F score was deleted from the analysis of the authoritarianism data. After each subject had completed all three questionnaires, the papers were collected and the subjects were given a class credit slip which they were to present to their instructor in order to receive class credit for participating in the experiment. Before the subjects were dismissed, the experimenter thanked them for their participation, explained to them the purpose of the study, and also told them that the results of the study would be in her thesis, a copy of which, upon completion, would be available in the Georgia Institue of Technology library.

One aspect of the CIT involves the actual categorization process in which the incidents reported by the subjects are placed into categories. The categories for the teacher incidents were those developed by Ronan (1971) in his study of the development of an instrument to evaluate college teacher effectiveness, while categories #7, #8, and #9, which relate to course incidents, were developed by the author. In Flanagan's (1954) original article describing the CIT, he makes the following statement: "Once a classification system has been developed for any given type of critical incidents, a fairly satisfactory degree of objectivity can be achieved in placing the incidents in the defined categories" (p. 335). This seems to imply that it is not only acceptable, but it is also preferable to use pre-existing categories, if they are available, as was done in the present study.

In the categorization process, the same categories are utilized by the judges in their categorizations. That is, each judge does not develop his own categories, but rather once the categories have been developed by one judge, the other judge (or judges) uses these same categories and places each incident into what he considers to be the appropriate category. Usually this categorization process is performed independently by more than one individual, in order to check on the reliability of the categorizations. In the present study, the incidents were categorized by the author and by another person very familiar with the CIT. For the teacher incidents, there was 84.7% agreement between the two judges as to the placement of the incidents into the respective categories. For the course incidents, this percentage of agreement was 89.9%. Both of these figures were high enough to warrant the conclusion that the categorizations were

reliable and adequate, since the minimum level of agreement usually associated with the categorization process is 80%. Where there was a discrepancy in the categorizations made by the judges, they re-read the incidents and then, after discussion and mutual agreement, each incident was placed into its appropriate category. In the teacher incident group, two incidents were discarded because they could not be considered incidents, while four of the course incidents had to be discarded for the same reason. For example, one subject in the teacher incident group, when asked for an incident to describe his best teacher, merely responded with, "He explained the material well." Another subject who was asked to give an incident related to his best course merely responded with, "Public speaking - had to stand in front of class and give speeches. I discovered I have stage fright."

The data were analyzed using two methods of statistical analysis:

(1)   Discriminant analysis, in which six discriminant functions were generated - three for the teacher incidents and three for the course incidents.

(2)   Intercorrelations between the scores on the three personality variables.

The subjects were grouped by the incidents they reported, according to the category of their incident, and the scores on the personality scales were analyzed using a discriminant function, which is a regression equation with a dependent variable which represents group membership (Kerlinger, 1973). The purpose of the discriminant function is to maximally discriminate the group members, i.e., it provides information as to which group each member probably belongs. Another way of saying this is that

the discriminant function gives the 'best' prediction, in the least squares sense, of the 'correct' group membership of each member of the sample. The discriminant function, then, can be used to assign subjects to groups on the basis of their scores on two or more measures. From the scores on the two or more measures, the least squares 'best' composite score is calculated (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 650).

Cooley and Lohnes (1962) note that discriminant analysis is a method for estimating an individual's position on a line which best separates classes or groups. This estimated position is obtained as a linear function of the person's $\underline{m}$ test scores (in this case, $\underline{m}$ = 3). Since there may be more than one "best" line which distinguishes among the classes, additional discriminant functions, all mutually orthogonal, may be fitted. This means that the second and third functions account for the remaining variance which has not been accounted for by the first function. Thus, the functions are orthogonal. The maximum number of discriminants which may be fitted is indicated by either the number of groups minus one ($\underline{g}$ - 1), or the number of tests involved ($\underline{m}$), whichever is smaller. In the present study, this maximum number of discriminant functions is three.

The statistical test used in conjunction with the discriminant function is Wilk's lambda. This is a statistical test to determine the extent to which the obtained discrimination of the groups would be probable by chance alone. It also tests for the significance of group separation along each of the discriminant axes. Wilk's lambda was tested with an F-ratio, which indicates the significance of overall group differentiation.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The first two tables identify the categories of the incidents and
show the number of subjects providing a teacher incident (Table 1) and
a course incident (Table 2) for each category. Also included in these
tables are the mean personality scores associated with each category.

Since two sets of instructions were used in this study (one asking
for a teacher incident, the ohter asking for a course incident), the data
were analyzed in line with this methodology, i.e., the teacher incidents
and course incidents were analyzed separately.[1] All the data of this
study were tested at the .05 level of significance. The Wilk's lambda
value obtained for the teacher incidents was 0.841, which was not sig-
nificant ($\underline{F}$ = 0.034, $\underline{df}$ = 12, 183). The Wilk's lambda obtained for the
course incidents was 0.838, which was also not significant ($\underline{F}$ = 0.688,
$\underline{df}$ = 18, 193). Tables 3 and 4 show the discriminant function coefficients
for the teacher incidents and course incidents, respectively. According
to Table 3, it can be seen that the first function (which is actually the
only one worth considering) was determined largely by the F variable and,
to a somewhat lesser extent, by the SD variable. Table 4 shows that the

---

[1]It should be noted that a large overlap occurred in these two con-
ditions among the kinds of incidents reported; that is, a large majority
of the subjects who were asked for a course incident reported a teacher
incident. Therefore, an analysis was performed in which all the incidents
referring to a teacher were analyzed together. The results of this analysis
were similar to those of the separate analyses.

Table 1. Category Identification, Number of Teacher Incidents in Each Category,
and Mean Scores on the Personality Scales for Each Category

Category #	Category Identification	Number in Category	Mean F Score	Mean SD Score	Mean IE Score
1	Personal relationships with students	43	73.85	13.70	11.28
2	Classroom administration	0	---	---	---
3	Student participation	2	75.50	13.50	13.50
4	Classroom presence	6	59.20	11.00	11.00
5	Organization and presentation of material	23	67.62	11.27	10.68
6	Evaluation of student performance	2	68.00	14.50	10.00

Note: The number of incidents in the categories do not add up to 79 because the incidents reported
by 2 subjects had to be discarded since they could not be considered incidents, while the
data from the third subject could not be included in the analysis due to his failure to
complete the F Scale.

Table 2.   Category Identification, Number of Course Incidents in Each Category,
and Mean Scores on the Personality Scales for Each Category

Category #	Category Identification	Number in Category	Mean F Score	Mean SD Score	Mean IE Score
1	Personal relationships with students	27	68.10	12.17	10.62
2	Classroom administration[a]	1	---	---	---
3	Student participation	3	67.80	13.20	12.80
4	Classroom presence	6	65.83	11.83	9.33
5	Organization and presentation of material	20	68.74	14.42	9.63
6	Evaluation of student performance	0	---	---	---
7	Course material	14	67.58	14.42	11.17
8	Manner in which course conducted	3	56.67	14.00	8.00
9	Course as aid in personal life	3	78.67	12.33	6.67

[a]This category, comprised of only one incident, was not included in the analysis since
the program used in the data analysis handles only groups where $n > 1$.

Note: The number of incidents in the categories do not add up to 81 because the
incidents reported by four subjects had to be discarded since they could
not be considered incidents.

Table 3. Discriminant Function Coefficients for the
Teacher Incidents

Variable	Discriminant Function 1	Discriminant Function 2	Discriminant Function 3
F	0.718	0.525	0.457
IE	0.225	-0.702	0.675
SD	0.588	-0.174	-0.790

Table 4. Discriminant Function Coefficients for the
Course Incidents

Variable	Discriminant Function 1	Discriminant Function 2	Discriminant Function 3
F	-0.171	0.742	0.935
IE	0.980	0.200	1.133
SD	0.053	-0.696	0.264

Table 5. Intercorrelation Matrix of Scores on the F,
SD, and IE Scales

	F	SD	IE
F	1.000	-0.043	0.055
SD	-0.043	1.000	-0.162*
IE	0.055	-0.162*	1.000

* $p < .05$

first function was determined largely by the IE variable and to a much lesser degree by the F and SD variables.

The relations among the predictors were examined through inter-correlations between the scores on each of the three personality scales. The intercorrelation matrix thus obtained is shown in Table 6. As can be noted, the only significant value is the correlation between the IE scale and the SD scale ($\underline{r}$ = -0.162, $\underline{p}$ < .05).

At this point, it should be mentioned that the data were also analyzed using six one-way analyses of variance - three for the teacher incidents and three for the course incidents (one analysis for each per-sonality variable under each condition). The results of these analyses confirmed those of the discriminant analysis, in that no significant results were obtained; hence, these analyses were not reported in this thesis.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This study was undertaken in an attempt to discover whether or not the three selected personality variables would be predictive of the criterion, i.e., the category of the critical incident reported. The data obtained indicated that the scores on the three personality variables did not predict the criterion.

Looking at Table 3, the only thing that can be said is that the first discriminant function was determined mostly by the F and SD variables; however, this function did not discriminate among the groups (or categories). Likewise, the only conclusion to be drawn from Table 4 is that the functions failed to discriminate among the groups, or categories of incidents.

The second part of the data analysis involved determining the inter-correlations between the scores on the three personality scales. The resulting intercorrelation matrix is shown in Table 5. There are two things to note regarding the correlation between the scores on the IE scale and the scores on the SD scale:

(1) The correlation coefficient, although small, is statistically significant.

(2) Since the coefficient is small, it accounts for only 2.6% of the variance.

These facts imply that a small overlap does occur between the two scales;

however, this overlap is not very meaningful since it explains only 2.6%
of the variance existing in the two scales.

The finding of a significant correlation between the IE and SD
scales has been substantiated in some previous studies mentioned earlier
(Bernhardson, 1968; Altrocchi et al., 1968; Lichtman & Julian, 1964),
while other researchers found no such relationship (Tolor, 1967; Tolor &
Jalowiec, 1968).

Based on the results of the present study and those of the above
cited studies, it is obvious that more work will have to be done before it
can be discovered exactly what is the relationship between the IE and SD
scales. At present, there appears to be more evidence in favor of the
position that these two scales are indeed related, if only to a small de-
gree. It would be wise for researchers who use Rotter's IE scale to
realize that there is a definite possibility that this scale may be tapping
some of the same characteristics which are measured by the SD scale. De-
pending upon the kind of research involved, this may or may not be an im-
portant consideration to take into account in the utilization of Rotter's
scale.

As indicated in Table 5, the correlation between scores on the SD
scale and scores on the F scale obtained in the present study was both ex-
tremely low and nonsignificant. This implies that there was no relation-
ship between a subject's score on the SD scale and his score on the F
scale. It was not anticipated that such a relationship would exist.

Table 5 also shows that the correlation between the F scale and the
IE scale was only slightly higher than that between the F scale and the SD

scale discussed above. As mentioned earlier, Baron (1968) has done some work with these two scales and concluded that they are, for the most part, independent. On the other hand, Holden (1958) and Simmons (1959) did find a correlation between the F and IE scales. Therefore, the present results tend to be more in agreement with Baron's results than those of Holden and Simmons.

The remainder of this discussion will center on the incidents reported by the subjects and the categorizations of these incidents. Referring to Tables 1 and 2, the interesting fact here is that, of the subjects asked to think of their best course, barely one-fourth of them gave incidents related to the course. The majority of these subjects reported an incident involving a teacher, and subsequently these incidents were put into the categories related to teacher behaviors. This particular finding tended to emphasize the fact that whether the subject was asked for an incident related to a teacher or a course had little effect on the results; that is, since the majority of the subjects asked for a course incident responded with a teacher incident, the instructions requesting a course incident were not very effective in eliciting an incident related to a course _per se_. Therefore, for the majority of the subjects, it did not seem to make any difference whether they were asked to report an incident about a teacher or a course, since most of the participants asked for a course incident responded with a teacher incident.

For both teacher and course incidents, a large number of subjects responded with an incident pertaining to the first category, the teacher's personal relationships with the students. Included in this category are incidents related to the following: "Holds special problem sessions or

allots class time for questions," "gives individual help, in class or office, without hesitation," "encourages questions and explains answers in detail to all questions," and "treats all students fairly and as adults." It therefore appears that to these subjects, an important criterion of what determines teacher effectiveness is the manner in which the teacher interacts with the students.

A larger number of subjects who were asked for a teacher incident gave an incident which fit into the first category than did those subjects asked for a course incident. One possible explanation for this is that the subjects asked to think of their best teacher had a smaller sampling domain from which to choose one particular incident; that is, the subjects asked to think of their best course in actuality sampled from both teacher and course incidents, while the subjects asked about their best teacher sampled only from the domain of teacher behaviors.

The number of subjects responding with an incident related to Category #5 (Organization and presentation of material) was about the same for the two groups of subjects. One reason why this number was this high in the course incident group could be that this particular category is highly related to the course itself; that is, this category deals not with the course material per se (which is Category #7), but with how this material is presented. These categories therefore are rather closely related, as evidenced by the fact that for the course incident group, the next highest number of responses occur in Category #7.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The main conclusion to be drawn from the present study is that the scores of the subjects on the three personality scales failed to predict the criterion, which was the category of the incident reported. It can be said, then, that this study did not demonstrate that these personality variables play a role in the perception of teacher behaviors and courses when the CIT is employed as the method of evaluation.

A second finding of this study is that a low but significant correlation was found between scores on the IE scale and scores on the SD scale. This result tends to provide evidence that an overlap exists in what these two scales are tapping. The correlation obtained was low, indicating that the amount of overlap is rather small, but nevertheless a relationship does exist, and this relationship is significant.

A researcher should be cognizant of the fact that any study which he plans and subsequently carries out may have certain limitations of which others should be aware. This is especially true when the area of study is one in which very little previous work has been done. Such is the case with the present study. Therefore, following is a discussion of several limitations associated with this study.

In the present study, the subjects were asked to report critical incidents relating to their best teacher or best course, and there is a possibility that this procedure might have introduced many other variables which could have affected the results. That is, a large majority of the

subjects may have reported on different teachers or courses. Perhaps another study should be done in which the subjects have all experienced the same teacher or the same course. This would eliminate some of the variability which undoubtedly existed in the present study.

Carrying the above point even further, it is feasible that a more controlled study could be conducted. Since the main purpose of this study was to determine whether or not personality variables play a role in the perception of others using the CIT, and since control of the stimulus situation would allow any effects present to be more pronounced, then another possible method would be to first administer the personality scales to the subjects, then show them a film of a person working at his job, and finally ask these subjects to evaluate the performance of the person in the film. Of course, the actor in the film would have to be engaged in some type of simple task so that all the subjects would be able to give an evaluative judgment of his performance; yet the task should not be so simple that different judgments are not made.

Another limitation of the present study is that only three personality variables were examined. However, there are an extremely large number of different personality variables, and to adequately test all these measures and their combinations seems rather unreasonable, considering all the data such an analysis would generate.

Perhaps at this time it would be well to elaborate a point which has been mentioned previously in connection with the F and IE variables, and it is this: In this study the CIT was used, which resulted in reported behaviors of teachers and reported incidents related to courses.

The studies cited at the beginning of this thesis described how a subject's own personality traits might affect his perception of traits or characteristics in others. None of these studies dealt with the effect of a perceiver's own traits on his perception of the behaviors of the performance of others, which was the main focus of the present study. The results of this study failed to show that such traits played a role in determining the kind of incident reported by the subject. Therefore, it is feasible that the findings mentioned previously on the attribution process do not generalize to the evaluation of teacher behaviors and courses when the CIT is used; at least in this study they did not. In other words, an individual's personality traits may be important when perception of traits of others is involved, while these same personality characteristics are not important when the perception of the behaviors of the performance of others is the area of interest. More work will have to be done on this issue before a more conclusive statement can be made.

It is the opinion of this writer that a good direction for further research in this area would involve a modified version of the present study undertaken in an industrial work situation rather than a school setting, with supervisors or managers as the subjects rather than students. Since supervisors are often required to judge their subordinates, it would be an important contribution to the field of industrial psychology if the role of a rater's personality traits in these evaluations could be determined.

In conclusion, it can be said that even though the present study failed to find any significant results regarding the role of the three personality variables in the prediction of categories of critical incidents,

it is believed that this investigation has made a contribution to a rather neglected area of industrial and social psychology by attempting to discover the importance of selected personality variables in the CIT. This study's lack of significant results should not necessarily deter future work in this area; in fact, it should possibly even instigate more such studies along the lines suggested above. This may be especially true considering the fact that previous work on the role of personality variables in the perception of others has yielded significant and interesting results. Also, the present study did find a significant, although low, correlation between the IE and SD scales, a finding which has also been demonstrated in other studies, and therefore lends even more support to the notion that these two scales may be related, if only to a small degree. For the above reasons, the present author believes that more work should be done on the role of personality variables in performance appraisal situations.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

PERSONALITY SCALES

F Scale

DIRECTIONS: Read each statement carefully. Then, according to the scale below, indicate your degree of agreement with each statement by putting the proper number in the blank to the left of the statement.

Response Scale

Response	Score
Strongly support	7
Moderately support	6
Slightly support	5
Undecided	4
Slightly oppose	3
Moderately oppose	2
Strongly oppose	1

_____ 1. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.

_____ 2. It is possible that creatures on other planets have founded a better society than ours.

_____ 3. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

_____ 4. It is highly unlikely that astrology will ever be able to explain anything.

_____ 5. There is no reason to punish any crime with the death penalty.

_____ 6. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.

_____ 7. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.

_____ 8. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.

_____ 9. Insults to our honor are not always important enough to bother about.

F Scale (Continued)

_____ 10. When they are little, kids sometimes think about
doing harm to one or both of their parents.

_____ 11. Obedience and respect for authority are the most
important virtues children should learn.

_____ 12. The prisoners in our corrective institutions,
regardless of the nature of their crimes, should
be humanely treated.

_____ 13. Nowadays, when so many different kinds of people
move around and mix together so much, a person has
to protect himself especially carefully against
catching an infection or disease from them.

_____ 14. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think
of hurting a close friend or relative.

_____ 15. The findings of science may some day show that many
of our most cherished beliefs are wrong.

_____ 16. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does
not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for
his parents.

_____ 17. Nowadays more and more people are prying into
matters that should remain personal and private.

_____ 18. Anyone who would interpret the Bible literally just
doesn't know much about geology, biology, or history.

_____ 19. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and
ought to be severely punished.

_____ 20. People ought to pay more attention to new ideas
even if they seem to go against the American
way of life.

_____ 21. It's all right for people to raise questions about
even the most sacred matters.

_____ 22. Some of the greatest atrocities in man's history
have been committed in the name of religion and
morality.

IE Scale

<u>DIRECTIONS</u>: Each of the items below contains two choices, A and B. Please indicate <u>on your answer sheet</u> which of the choices most describes <u>your opinion</u> or <u>the way you feel</u>. In some cases you may find items in which both choices describe your opinions or feelings. In some cases you may find items in which you do not like either choice. In either case, please choose the one which <u>better</u> describes your opinions or feelings. <u>Do not leave any items blank</u>. There are no right or wrong answers as in other tests. Be frank and give your honest appraisal of yourself.

---

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run, people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6. a. Without the right breaks, one cannot be an effective leader.
   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try, some people just don't like you.
   b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
   b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

IE Scale (Continued)

9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
    b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

10. a. In the case of the well-prepared student, there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
    b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
    b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
    b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
    b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
    b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
    b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
    b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
    b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs, the people can control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
    b. There really is no such thing as "luck".

19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
    b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

IE Scale (Continued)

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
    b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run, the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
    b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22. a. With enough effort, we can wipe out political corruption.
    b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
    b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
    b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
    b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

25. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
    b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people; if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
    b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
    b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
    b. In the long run, the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

SD Scale

DIRECTIONS

On the next two pages, you will find a number of statements.
If the statement is true about you, please mark choice "A"
on the IBM answer sheet. If the statement is false about
you, please mark choice "B" on the IBM answer sheet for
that question.

Please do no mark on the questionnaire itself, but use
the IBM sheet.

> TRUE = A
>
> FALSE = B

SD Scale (Continued)
PERSONAL REACTION INVENTORY

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.

2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.

3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.

4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.

5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.

6. I sometimes feel resentful if I don't get my way.

7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.

8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.

9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.

10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.

11. I like to gossip at times.

12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.

13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.

14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.

15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.

16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.

17. I always try to practice what I preach.

18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed, obnoxious people.

19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.

20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.

SD Scale (Continued)

21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.

22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.

23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.

24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.

25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.

26. I have never been irked when people expresses ideas very different from my own.

27. I never make long trips without checking the safety of my car.

28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortunes of others.

29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.

30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.

31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.

32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.

33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

APPENDIX B

EXAMPLES OF INCIDENTS

Incidents from Teacher Instruction Group

Category #1: The best college teacher I have had in the last year was a graduate student who helped teach a chemistry class. One day I was having trouble understanding a particular set of problems. After class I asked him a question and he spent a full hour of his time explaining the material in a manner I understood. I consider this teacher the best I have had because he showed an interest in his students when they sought help.

Category #3: The best college teacher I've had was Mr. _____ . He teaches English 202 and the reason for my opinion is his concern. One day in class we discussed nothing but how to improve the course so it would be more interesting. He was totally sincere in his effort to help the kids in the class and teach an interesting course regardless of the somewhat dull material.

Category #4: Dr._____ (Physics 211, 212). In explaining theories about sound, he played his mandolin in class.

Category #5: The incident which best describes this teacher is when we were dissecting a rat and were having trouble locating some vital parts this teacher came over and helped find them with us. The thing about this that really stands out is that he did not say "look for yourself" nor did he start pulling one part after another out and say what they were. He asked us questions to discover what we did know and then he slowly asked more diffi-cult (concerning the organs we could not locate) questions. He never said this is such and such but rather asked questions like "If this is the kidney then what might this structure be?" If we could not answer a question he would simply back up and ask more questions until we understood completely.

Category #6: Professor in Indus. Engr. One particular incident was prior to the first quiz. The professor told us we would be allowed to have an open book quiz. From that point on it was easier to concern myself with learning what he was teaching rather than cramming it in for a quiz. The professor was very adept in making the learning process easier by his common sense down to earth attitude about it. Too many teachers consider themselves aloof and cannot relate to the student. Bad!

Incidents from Course Instruction Group

Category #1: In the best course I had in the past year, the professor took time out of the regular lecture material to help individually each of the students with the material until everyone was understanding it. He did this at regular intervals so that no one could get behind.

Category #2: My best college course at this place was Mgt. 465, a non-market environment course. The reason for it being the best course was not the subject content, but the professor who went out of his way to make things easier for me. I had 21 hours that quarter and was literally snowed under. I couldn't get all my papers into him on time; I was reading to a blind student several hours a week and I was out sick a week with an ulcer acting up on me. This professor let me get my papers in late several weeks past the due dates. Two of the assignments he let me discuss with him orally instead of writing them down. The high quality of the course was not restricted to the prof just being easy on me; he showed a genuine concern for the welfare of his students which I had found to be a rare phenomenon at Tech. I learned more in that particular course because I had the opportunity to give oral reports which allowed immediate feedback from the professor.

Category #3: The English course at the conclusion of my freshman year stands out as being the best. The course was one in poetry which I can't stand. The teacher adjusted the course more to the class's liking when she decided to study popular lyrics. Due to the switch I became very interested in the course. All the students in the class had to choose a topic to discuss orally in class. I usually dread such course work but in the case of this particular freshman English course I was very happy to get up in front of the class.

Category #4: The best class I have had was in Chemistry 229. When the professor was explaining what state functions were he would walk up the side and over to a spot and then back down to the front of the lecture room by another route. Which showed that all that mattered were the first and last points. It made the lessons easy to remember and the class interesting. He seemed excited by what he was telling us in his tonal qualities and facial expressions.

Category #5: Perhaps the best course I've taken within the last year was Math 315 - probability and statistics. I feel that the course material was of practical value and, moreover, the instructor had an ability to present the subject matter in a sound, challenging manner, and to effectively elucidate points with provocative examples. His availability and desire to discuss problems at any level added greatly to the attractiveness of the course.

Category #7: Mgt. 320 is the best course that I have had so
far. I chose this course in particular because other courses
have built heavily on the material that was taught in this
course. As an example, I am now taking Mgt. 408 and I remembered
a great deal of the basic material from Mgt. 320 which has given
me a good classwork grade in 408. This has also happened in
other courses. For this reason I feel Mgt. 320 is the best course
that I have taken in the past year.

Category #8: The best course I have taken in college was Sociology
176 with Mrs. _____. The particular incidents that contributed the
most to my picking this course were the weekly meetings we had in
class in which the class was divided up into groups for discussion
among ourselves of certain parts of our study material. The re-
laxed atmosphere and the fact that we were all students and
therefore had much in common made this type of course very enjoyable
as well as very beneficial.

Category #9: I think that the best course I have had in the past
year was Sociology 176, specifically because we studied leadership
in the small group. One point I learned was that often a leader
was needed who could smooth over social problems in the group. I
work with a Boy Scout troop and last Monday night a problem such as
this developed and I was able to use what I had learned to keep one
of the young boys from becoming very upset when the other boys were
making fun of him about his clothes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

Altrocchi, J., Palmer, J., Hellmann, R., & Davis, H. The Marlowe-Crowne, Repressor-Sensitizer, and Internal-External Scales and attribution of unconscious hostile intent. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 1229-1230.

Anderson, B. & Nilsson, S. Studies in the reliability and validity of the critical incident technique. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1964, 48, 398-403.

Baron, R. A. Authoritarianism, locus of control, and risk-taking. Journal of Psychology, 1968, 68, 141-143.

Barr, A. S., Bechdolt, B. V., Coxe, W. W., Gage, N. C., Orleans, J. S., Remmers, H. H., & Ryans, D. C. Report of the committee on the criteria of teaching effectiveness. Review of Educational Research, 1953, 22, 238-263.

Bernhardson, C. S. Relationship between individual social desirability ratings and Hand Acquisition and IE scores. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22, 773-776.

Bridgman, C. S., Spaethe, M., Driscoll, P., & Fanning, J. Salesmen helped by bringing out jobs' "critical incidents." Personnel Journal, 1958, 36, 411-414.

Bruner, J. S. & Tagiuri, R. The perception of people. Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. II. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954.

Byrne, D. Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 713-715.

Byrne, D. An introduction to personality. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1974.

Christie, R. & Cook, P. A guide to published literature relating to the authoritarian personality through 1956. Journal of Psychology, 1958, 45, 171-199.

Cooley, W. W. & Lohnes, P. R. Multivariate procedures for the behavioral sciences. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

Crockett, W. H. & Meidinger, T. Authoritarianism and interpersonal perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 378-380.

Crowne, D. P. & Marlowe, D. A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 349-354.

DeSoto, C., Kuethe, J. L., & Wunderlich, R. Social perception and self-perception of high and low authoritarians. Journal of Social Psychology, 1960, 52, 149-155.

Devries, A. G. A potential suicide personality inventory. Psychological Reports, 1966, 18, 731-738.

Dodge, N. & Muensch, G. A. Relationship of conformity and the need for approval in children. Developmental Psychology, 1961, 1, 67-68.

Ettinger, R. F., Nowicki, S., & Nelson, D. A. Interpersonal attraction and the approval motive. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1970, 4, 95-99.

Fiedler, F. E., Mitchell, T., & Triandis, H. C. The culture assimilator: An approach to cross-cultural training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 95-102.

Flanagan, J. C. The critical incident technique. Psychological Bulletin, 1954, 51, 327-358.

Flanagan, J. C. & Schmid, F. W. The critical incident approach to the study of psychopathology. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1959, 15, 136-139.

Gage, N. L. & Cronbach, L. J. Conceptual and methodological problems in interpersonal perception. Psychological Review, 1955, 62, 411-422.

Holden, K. B. Attitude toward external versus internal control of reinforcement and learning of reinforcement sequences. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1958. Cited by H. M. Lefcourt, Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65, P. 210.

Hjelle, L. A. Social desirability as a variable in the locus of control scale. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 807-816.

Joe, V. C. Social desirability and the IE scale. Psychological Reports, 1972, 30, 44-46.

Jones, E. E. The role of authoritarianism in the perception and evalua-
    tion of a prospective leader. Unpublished doctoral dissertation,
    Harvard University, 1953. Cited by J. S. Bruner & R. Tagiuri, The
    perception of people. Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. II.
    Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954. P. 648.

Jones, S. C. & Shrauger, J. S. Locus of control and interpersonal
    evaluations. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968,
    32, 664-668.

Kates, S. L. First-impression formation and authoritarianism. Human
    Relations, 1959, 12, 277-285.

Kaufmann, H. & Zener, L. Perceived similarity and liking as functions
    of manipulated similarity and subjective social favorability.
    Psychonomic Science, 1967, 9, 75-76.

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. (2nd ed.) New
    York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1973.

Lefcourt, H. M. Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A
    review. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65, 206-220.

Lichtman, C. M. & Julian, J. W. Internal versus external control of
    reinforcement as a determinant of preferred strategy on a behavioral
    task. Paper presented at Midwestern Psychological Association, St.
    Louis, 1964. Cited by H. M. Lefcourt, Internal versus external control
    of reinforcement: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65. P. 216.

Miller, A. G. Social perception of internal-external control. Perceptual
    and Motor Skills, 1970, 30, 103-109.

Phares, E. J. & Wilson, K. G. Internal-external control, interpersonal
    attraction, and empathy. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 543-549.

Posavac, E. J. Need for approval as a moderator of interpersonal attrac-
    tion based on attitude similarity. Journal of Social Psychology, 1971,
    85, 141-142.

Rabinowitz, W. A note on the social perceptions of authoritarians and
    nonauthoritarians. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956,
    53, 384-386.

Ronan, W. W. Development of an instrument to evaluate college classroom
    teaching effectiveness. Dept. of HEW Grant No. 1-2-045. Atlanta:
    Georgia Institute of Technology, 1971.

Rotter, J. R. Generalized expectancies for internal vs. external control
    of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80.

Safren, M. & Chapanis, A. A critical incident study of hospital medica-
tion errors. Hospitals, 1960, 34, 32-34; 57-66.

Sarason, I. G. & Smith, R. E. Personality. Annual Review of Psychology,
1971, 27, 393-446.

Schulberg, H. C. Authoritarianism, tendency to agree, and interpersonal
perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 101-
108.

Scodel, A. & Freedman, M. L. Additional observations on the social
perceptions of authoritarians and nonauthoritarians. Journal of
Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 92-95.

Scodel, A. & Mussen, P. Social perceptions of authoritarians and non-
authoritarians. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953,
48, 181-184.

Secord, P. F. & Backman, C. W. Social psychology. New York: McGraw-
Hill Book Co., 1964.

Shrauger, S. & Altrocchi, J. The personality of the perceiver as a factor
in person perception. Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 62, 289-308.

Silverman, R. E. & Shrauger, J. S. Locus of control and correlates of
attraction toward others. Journal of Social Psychology, 1971, 84, 207-
213.

Simmons, W. Personality correlates of the James-Phares scale. Unpublished
master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1959. Cited by H. M. Lefcourt,
Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A review. Psycho-
logical Bulletin, 1966, 65. P. 210.

Soliman, H. M. Motivation-hygiene theory of job attitudes: An empirical
investigation and an attempt to reconcile both the one- and the two-
factor theories of job attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970,
54, 452-461.

Strickland, B. R. & Crowne, D. P. Conformity under conditions of simulated
group pressure as a function of the need for social approval. Journal
of Social Psychology, 1962, 58, 171-181.

Tagiuri, R. Introduction. In R. Tagiuri & L. Petrullo (Eds.), Person
perception and interpersonal behavior. Stanford: Stanford University
Press, 1958. Cited by S. Shrauger & J. Altrocchi, The personality
of the perceiver as a factor in person perception. Psychological
Bulletin, 1964, 62. P. 290.

Tolor, A. An evaluation of the Maryland Parent Attitude Survey. Journal
of Psychology, 1967, 67, 69-74.

Tolor, A. & Jalowiec, J. E. Body boundary, parental attitudes, and internal-external expectancy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 206-209.

Wagner, R. F. Critical requirements for dentists. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1950, 34, 190-192.

Warr, P. B. & Knapper, C. The perception of people and events. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1968.