

Secondary Pupils and Teacher Qualities: Contrasts in Appraisals

Le Roy D. Travis¹
university of british columbia

Twelve teacher qualities were ranked for relative importance by 266 Canadian and American senior-secondary pupils in anonymous responses to a questionnaire for which they volunteered. Subdivisions of the sample were formed for purposes of comparison on the basis of respondents' sex, nationality, program of studies, and social class (defined by reference to parental occupations). The ratings distributions for these groups were compared (males with females; Canadians with Americans; academic with non-academic pupils; entrepreneurs with professionals, unskilled labourers, and skilled labourers) to explore the extent to which an assumption of homogeneity of orientation and appraisals is warranted. Eleven of 48 (23%) comparisons revealed significant differences. Of these differences, 4 were found in program group comparisons; 3 arose from nationality comparisons; 3 emerged from gender comparisons; and the remaining difference was revealed through social class comparison. At least one significant difference was found in the comparisons for the majority (7 of 12) of the teacher attributes. Finer-grained analyses (i.e., within sex and within nationality) revealed 9 other significant within-group differences in ratings of teacher qualities. The results are discussed relative to issues which arise from simplification by deletion, categorical treatment of diversity or complexity, decomposition strategies in research, and teacher preparation and selection practices.

Douze qualités des enseignants ont été classées par ordre d'importance par 266 élèves canadiens et américains du secondaire qui se sont portés volontaires pour répondre anonymement à un questionnaire sur le sujet. Pour fin de comparaison, des divisions fondées sur le sexe, la nationalité, les programmes d'étude et la classe sociale des répondants (définie en fonction de l'emploi des parents) ont été introduites dans l'échantillonnage. Les cotes attribuées par ces divers groupes ont été comparées (étudiants et étudiantes; Canadiens et Américains; élèves de cours théoriques et élèves de cours pratiques; gens d'affaires, professionnels, ouvriers spécialisés et ouvriers non spécialisés) dans le but d'explorer jusqu'à quel point une hypothèse d'homogénéité d'orientation et d'évaluation pourrait être dégagée. Onze des 48 comparaisons (soit 23 pour cent) ont révélé des différences notables. De ces différences, quatre étaient fondées sur la diversité des programmes d'étude des répondants, trois sur la nationalité, trois sur le sexe, et le reste sur la classe sociale. Au moins une différence importante fut révélée par ces comparaisons pour ce qui est de la majorité (7 sur 12) des qualités attribuées aux professeurs. Des analyses plus minutieuses (par exemple, à l'intérieur des groupes "sexe" et "nationalité") ont révélé neuf autres différences importantes dans la façon d'évaluer les qualités des enseignants. Les résultats du sondage sont étudiés à la lumière des problèmes engendrés par la simplification par suppression, par le traitement catégorique de la diversité ou complexité, par les méthodes de décomposition en recherche, ainsi que par la préparation et le mode de sélection du personnel enseignant.

SECONDARY PUPILS AND TEACHER QUALITIES

Trouble is complication, and frequently complication is troublesome. So too, talk is simple, and often talk simplifies. Complication can sometimes be talked into being less troublesome. Words arrest real or imagined objects, conditions, and events and force them to stand before us. In verbal custody, the objects, conditions, and events seem to conform to the requirements of their captors. They are obedient to the authoritative tone and submissive to categorical imperatives. A tribe or swarm of words, especially an orderly and familiar formation of them, militates against resistance. Tendencies to complication or other troublesome attributes instantly disappear, perhaps to hide in the depths of unconsciousness, at the arrival of these enforcers of meaning and order. For words obliterate the anarchy of ambiguity. Even curiosity and recursive reflection – which tend toward anarchy because they invite ambiguities – are subject to subversion by simple talk.

Accordingly, when we face complication, we feel the urge to name the situation. With the sharpness of a word we want to cut complexity down to digestible proportions. When visited by trouble we are inclined toward talk. We talk to ourselves or seek out others to talk to us. We try to identify and control the species of trouble or complication with words. We talk. We simplify.

Of course simplification is necessary whenever the manifold must be reduced to manageable form and proportion. In science, as in teaching, chaos is dealt with, in part, through ordering representations that simplify through deletion. However, there are various bases for deletion (Anderson & Travis, 1983). Frequently, especially in education and other social-psychological work, the question of what provides the basis for deletion is avoided. For example, it is conventional to avoid such matters because the research requirement for consent of subjects for inclusion has restricted researchers in education and psychology to study of biased samples (Kearney, Hopkins, Mauss, & Weisheit, 1983). Sometimes the question of the basis for deletion can be avoided through mention of the limits of imagination, skills, creativity, or other such signs of incomprehension. Sometimes recourse is had to verbal tricks like the renaming of routines or parts of a decomposed whole (Neisser, 1983). However, occasionally, somebody like Star (1983) will point out that response to constraints (of time, energy, money demands, characteristics of subjects, and so forth) also shapes the way work is done. Accordingly, convenience, categories, choices, side bets, knowledge, social interactions, conclusion pressures, self-marketing, exigencies of production, and the

like urge patterns of commitment and omission or deletion. Perhaps all these and other factors too urge the adoption and habitual use of simple talk or notions which, through deletion, reduce complexity and trouble.

This raises the question of which simple notions are adopted and whence they come. Oddly enough, this question is infrequently and poorly addressed in educational discourse. Accordingly, before we can study the complexity of pupils' orientations to and assessments of various teacher attributes, we must explore this subject.

Trading in Trouble: Cashing-in on Care

The objects of our cares and concerns are the subjects of a genre of discourse that is a commodity the trade in which is a basis for profits, careers, and other advantages. Traffic in this type of simple talk is so common that people may not always recognize that such verbiage can be and is a commodity in trade. Even so, chatter about matters which engage our care is readily distributed and marketed because it is cheaply produced, conveniently packaged, eagerly consumed, and easily assimilated. Concerns about love, knowledge, or work are addressed in authoritative tones by voices which describe the *formula* for love, the *recipe* for knowledge, and the *route* to success. Warm milk, cookies, and directions to the lavatory are familiar, comforting, and reassuring. Moreover, what one suspects is a naturally replenished demand for such conceptual nipples can be enhanced by the standard stunts used in advertising (Ewen, 1977; Martineau, 1971). However, this species of verbal commodity is certainly misleading and deserves description and critical analysis. Its short-term gains are made at the expense of intelligent understanding.

There is an immense market for simple manageable images or fictions that conveniently supply palliatives for fears and vexations and consolation for life's inevitable disappointments. Not surprisingly, also immense is the traffic in these cultural or intellectual equivalents of junk food. As Adelson says, "we seem to need a simple, manageable set of images that will allow us to make sense of what [is] ... complex ... various ... [and] changeable" (1979, p. 33).

The complicated world of schooling and teaching is filled with this fare. Consider the phenomenon of adolescence. A fairly impressive set of industries has been created out of the exploitation of cares and concerns arising from our involvement as parents, teachers, and others who have regular contact with young people. One of the industrial wastes is a misleading lore about the young (Adelson, 1964, 1979, 1980; Blair & Pendleton, 1971; Pearson, 1984; Springhall, 1983-84; Travis & Violato,

1981, 1985). The mass-mediated or popular commercial culture is, to a very notable extent, a manifestation of this industry and testimony to the popularity of these cares and concerns. Television and radio programs, magazine and newspaper features, and books as well as courses trade in "the established truth about the young" which, says the editor of the *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology* (Adelson, 1980), "consists of fictions designed to serve purposes other than the clear apprehension of reality" (1979, p. 33). Large proportions of the teaching forces apparently accept or believe simple and inaccurate stereotypes and generalizations about this highly variable group of people (Blair & Pendleton, 1971; Pearson, 1984; Springhall, 1983-84; Travis & Violato, 1981, 1985). This low level of conceptual refinement is too common in educational discourses (Barzun, 1946, 1961; Fontana, 1977; Hunt, 1976). For example, instead of acknowledging that teenagers are likely to be as heterogeneous in their preferences, assessments, or views as any other group of people from any given age span of similar breadth, Wragg cheerily assures his readers that he has found a set of enduring characteristics in youngsters which simplifies the world of teaching. Says Wragg:

Such research as has been done into the pupil's eye view of teaching is remarkably consistent. Children prefer teachers who are enthusiastic, know their stuff, can keep order and are fair and friendly without being over-familiar. Above all ... they appreciate key professional skills like the ability to explain things clearly, ... 200 children aged 12 to 16 ... ranked the ability to explain first, closely followed by ... use of pupils' Christian names, help for slow learners, and teachers who were good listeners. (1984, p. 21)

This categorical treatment is clearly misleading and inadequate when one considers the real circumstances wherein such "knowledge" would be, as some like to say, "applied." First, children "from 12 to 16" do not inhabit the same classrooms as a rule. Children and adolescents tend to be sorted into classes by age and age-related performances. Moreover, there are earlier studies which reported that, for example, males and females differ in their assessments of some teacher attributes and that younger pupils differ from older ones in their ratings of teacher qualities (e.g., Morrison & McIntyre, 1973, p. 130; Musgrove & Taylor, 1972, p. 180). On these grounds alone, Wragg's aggregation and his simple generalizations make little sense and have less value. Second, youngsters differ in other important respects which are known to affect outlook and actual groupings for purposes of teaching and learning. Social class is one such factor: This socioeconomic index is known to covary with achievement and, hence, signifies complex influences on group formation for instruction (e.g., Gray, McPherson, & Raffe, 1983). Program groupings

for different purposes, then, reflect sociocultural background as well as abilities, achievement, preferences, aspirations, and other variables (Rutter, Maughan, Mortimer, & Ouston, 1979). Sex or gender might also affect general outlook or more particular assessments due to differential social treatment and constitutional differences (Fontana, 1977, pp. 33–34; Hutt, 1972). Finally, national or ethno-cultural differences might also affect orientation to teachers since educational goals, experiences, histories, and circumstances vary across national boundaries. Accordingly, the categorical treatment of youngsters' appreciation for different teacher attributes is questionable.

Such consideration suggest that comparisons of ratings distributions for pupil groups based on significant social-psychological divisions with educational significance would be more appropriate to gaining understanding of pupils' orientations to and assessments of teacher qualities and teachers. Simple generalizations about youngsters, such as are entailed in the assumption that pupils agree on what teacher qualities are important, run counter to evidence on adolescents' characteristics (Adelson, 1979, 1980). If Hunt (1976) is correct, respect for such differences as exist might be more fruitful than acceptance of the crude simplifications arising from aggregation and categorical generalizations at that level. Accordingly, this study will explore the extent to which significant differences in ratings distributions would emerge from comparisons of rankings of teacher qualities by contrasting sex, program, nationality, and social class groups.

METHOD

Subjects

A nonprobability sample (i.e., volunteers) from the populations of Grades 11 and 12 at four senior secondary schools in metropolitan Seattle (U.S.), metropolitan Toronto (Canada), and metropolitan Vancouver (Canada) responded anonymously to a questionnaire. Of these 266 pupils, 43% ($N = 114$) were males and 57% ($N = 152$) were females; 34% ($N = 90$) were in academic (university preparation) programs and 66% ($N = 176$) were in other (nonacademic) programs; 69% ($N = 184$) were Canadians and 31% ($N = 82$) were Americans. Classified according to parents' occupational status, 10% ($N = 27$) were entrepreneurial and 32% ($N = 85$) were professional, 34% ($N = 90$) were skilled (licenced) labour and 24% ($N = 64$) were unskilled (unlicenced) labour. The sample had a

mean age of 17.37 years (S.D. = 1.28). Ten per cent ($N = 27$) were in the eleventh grade, and 90% ($N = 239$) were in Grade 12.

Procedure

Questionnaires were mailed to co-operating officials at the four high schools (one in the U.S., one in eastern Canada, and two on the Canadian West Coast). They were administered by the officials according to standard procedures described in the questionnaire instructions. Respondents were told that they were participating in a study designed to help teachers become well informed about and hence sensitive to high-school students; they were told not to put their names or any identification on the questionnaire so that anonymity could be assured; and they were informed that only the research staff could examine the questionnaires. Respondents were asked to answer the questions in the booklet while the administrator waited. They were told that the administrators would seal the completed forms in pre-addressed envelopes in the respondents' presence and then mail the packages to the researcher. Completion took approximately 40 minutes.

The Questionnaire

A variety of questions was included in the questionnaire: Some were open ended; others required *yes* or *no* responses; still others were in check-list format; and, finally, some asked respondents to form rank orders. The questions were designed to gain information about the backgrounds, habits, and outlooks of the respondents. The data reported here constitute one subset of this larger data set. The item from the questionnaire which yielded the data on students' assessments of the relative importance of teacher qualities was:

What qualities do you think are most important in teachers? Place 1 beside the most important; 2 beside the next most important; place 3 beside the next and so on.

- Friendly (shows interest in one as a person)
- Knowledgeable (knows the subject well)
- Kind (shows sensitivity and is sympathetically responsive to one's personal difficulties)
- Demanding (expects and requires high-quality work)
- Attractive
- Orderly

- Expressive (lively, exuberant, demonstrative)
- Articulate (skilled in expressing ideas clearly with language)
- Fair (even-handed treatment of everyone)
- Attentive and responsive to one's ideas
- Firm (does not tolerate inappropriate behaviour)
- Confident (has poise, self-confidence, and composure).

RESULTS

Four sets of comparisons were made for each of the 12 teacher qualities ranked for relative importance. Rankings were compared for male and female respondents, for academic and non-academic pupils, for Canadian and American students, and for four social class groupings (entrepreneurs, professionals, skilled labour, and unskilled labour). Cross-tabulations of the comparison groups (i.e., two gender, two program, two national, and four class) with their respective ranking distributions were carried out. The 12 ranks for each quality were transformed to triplets (ranks 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10-12) for purposes of analysis. Accordingly, summaries of the three 2×4 and one 4×4 cross-tabulations for each of the 12 teacher attributes are provided in Tables 1 to 6. Since the sample proportions in each contrast category were uneven, Chi square statistics were derived to assess the magnitude of relationships between class, nationality, program, and gender pairings. These are presented first. In all cases, a judgment of significance required that $p < 0.05$.

Relationships Between Sex, Program, Nationality, and Class

The distributions of males and females in the two program categories did not differ ($\chi^2 = 0.00111$; $df = 1$; $p = 0.9734$). In the same way, sex and class were not related in a significant way ($\chi^2 = 2.80414$; $df = 1$; $p = 0.4228$). However, the females-to-males ratio in the Canadian subset was significantly greater than it was in the American portion of the sample ($\chi^2 = 11.97409$; $df = 1$; $p = 0.0005$). Interpretation of such differences as are evident in Canadian-American and male-female comparisons of rankings must take this fact into account.

Except for sex, as just indicated, nationality was not related significantly to any other variable. For class (defined with reference to parental occupations) and nationality, no significant relationship was observed: ($\chi^2 = 6.60720$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0855$). Finally, the relationship of program and nationality was not significant ($\chi^2 = 0.95520$; $df = 1$; $p = 0.3284$).

The remaining relationship of the six currently examined, that of

program and class, was significant (when class was defined with reference to parental occupations). Youngsters from homes of entrepreneurs and those from homes of professionals were over-represented in academic programs and under-represented in non-academic programs, and children from the homes of unlicensed (unskilled) labourers were under-represented in academic programs while they were over-represented in non-academic programs ($\chi^2 = 21.20581$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0001$).

In summary, in the present sample, sex or gender was significantly related to nationality, and program was significantly related to social class. However, the gender and program, gender and class, and program and nationality relationships were not of significant magnitudes. Accordingly, when sex or gender differences are reported in the findings on teacher qualities, the corresponding nationality comparisons are considered (and vice versa). Similarly, when program differences are reported in the findings on teacher qualities, the corresponding social-class comparisons are considered (and vice versa).

We may now turn to the sex, program, nationality, and class comparisons presented for each of the 12 teacher qualities ranked for their importance by the high-school pupils.

Rankings of Teacher Friendliness and Teacher Confidence

Table 1 presents distributions of rankings by proportions of gender, program, nationality, and social class groups for teacher friendliness (Part A) and confidence (Part B). Part A reveals that over half of all groups ranked friendliness in the highest triplet and few placed it in ranks below 6. However, it was not as important to the academic pupils as it was to the non-academic pupils, and Canadians gave it more importance than did Americans. While Canadian males favoured friendliness more than American males ($\chi^2 = 10.31511$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0161$), American and Canadian females did not differ in their ratings of friendliness. The difference between the program groups is the first of four significant differences between them. The Canadian-American difference is the first of three significant differences between these nationality groups. Since no sex or class differences emerged with regard to the ratings of the importance of friendliness, the program and nationality differences are not as complicated as they might have been.

Only one significant difference between comparison groups is seen in Part B. Here, where teacher confidence is ranked, one notices a significant difference between social class groups. The most notable contrast consists of the relatively small proportion of the entrepreneur group which placed teacher confidence in the first three ranks (compared with the skilled

TABLE 1

Teacher Friendliness and Confidence Ranked for Importance by High-School Students: Comparisons of Gender, Program, Nationality, and Socioeconomic Class Groups

		Part A				Part B			
		Attribute (quality): "Friendly (shows interest in one as a person)"				Attribute (quality): "Confident (has poise, self-confidence and composure)"			
Comparisons (by %) of:		Rankings				Rankings			
		1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
Males	(43)	64.5	22.6	9.7	3.2	13.3	36.0	24.0	26.7
Females	(57)	65.0	23.1	9.8	2.1	12.6	34.6	37.0	15.7
Totals		(64.8)	(22.9)	(9.7)	(2.5)	(12.9)	(35.1)	(32.2)	(19.8)
		$\chi^2 = 0.29112$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.9617$				$\chi^2 = 5.36273$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.1471$			
Academic	(34)	52.4	32.9	11.0	3.7	16.9	40.3	24.7	18.2
Non-academic	(66)	72.5	16.3	9.2	2.0	10.5	33.1	35.5	21.0
Totals		(65.5)	(22.1)	(9.8)	(2.6)	(12.9)	(35.8)	(31.3)	(19.9)
		$\chi^2 = 10.71706$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0134^*$				$\chi^2 = 4.14617$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.2461$			
Canadians	(69)	68.2	24.3	6.4	1.2	11.9	34.4	32.5	21.2
Americans	(31)	56.9	18.5	18.5	6.2	15.1	37.7	30.2	17.0
Totals		(65.1)	(22.7)	(9.7)	(2.5)	(12.7)	(35.3)	(31.9)	(20.1)
		$\chi^2 = 13.47144$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0037^*$				$\chi^2 = 0.84011$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.8399$			
Entrepreneur	(10)	56.0	36.0	8.0	0.0	4.5	31.8	54.5	9.1
Professional	(32)	64.8	23.9	8.5	2.8	18.5	41.5	23.1	16.9
Skilled Labour (licenced)	(34)	62.3	23.4	11.7	2.6	12.1	28.8	25.8	33.3
Unskilled Labour	(24)	72.7	12.7	10.9	3.6	11.6	41.9	37.2	9.3
Totals		(64.9)	(22.4)	(10.1)	(2.6)	(13.3)	(36.2)	(30.6)	(19.9)
		$\chi^2 = 6.78573$; $df = 9$; $p = 0.6594$				$\chi^2 = 21.18080$; $df = 9$; $p = 0.0119^*$			

N = 266

* $p < 0.05$

labour group) and the relatively large proportion of the skilled labour group which placed teacher confidence in the last three ranks (compared with the entrepreneurs). Since no program difference was evident here, the observed class difference is relatively unambiguous. This class difference was the only significant difference that emerged in the class comparisons. One last difference of significant magnitude was found when American females were compared with American males: the former gave more importance to confidence more than did the latter ($\chi^2 = 11.11579$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0111$).

Teacher Knowledge and Kindness

Table 2 shows that no class, sex, or any other significant between-group differences emerged from comparisons of group ratings distributions for teacher knowledgeable. Part A of Table 2 indicates that teacher knowledge of subject material is regarded by great majorities of all groups as highly important. This is reassuring. Indeed, no quality is ranked as highly by all groups as is this one. The extent of consensus is indicated by the range between the largest proportion of a group which placed teacher knowledge in the top three ranks (85.5% of the academic pupils) and the lowest (68.0% of the entrepreneur group). The 10% of the non-academic group that ranked this quality below the mid-point rank of 6 was the largest proportion of any group to do so. This teacher quality was one of five on which no significant differences were evident from the comparisons.

An examination of Part B of Table 2 reveals only one significant difference in the comparisons of ratings for teacher kindness. The non-academic group members rated this quality as more important than did the academic pupils. This finding was not complicated by any significant class differences. Accordingly, we may turn to the ratings for the next pair of teacher qualities.

Demanding and Attractive As Teacher Attributes

Table 3 contains more differences than any other table: two are evident in Part A and three are seen in Part B. Altogether, five of the eight comparisons yielded significant differences in ratings. As seen in Part A of Table 3, males as a group apparently looked upon demanding teachers more favourably than did females. This was also so for academic pupils compared with their non-academic counterparts. Part B of Table 3 shows that significant differences emerge from three of the four sets of comparisons of ratings for teacher attractiveness. Males ranked the

TABLE 2

Teacher Knowledge and Kindness Ranked for Importance by High-School Students: Comparisons of Gender, Program, Nationality, and Socioeconomic Class Groups

		Part A				Part B			
		Attribute (quality): "Knowledgeable (knows the subject well)"				Attribute (quality): "Kind (shows sensitivity and is sympathetically responsive to one's personal difficulties)"			
Comparisons (by %) of:		Rankings				Rankings			
		1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
Males	(43)	81.3	10.4	5.2	3.1	30.2	34.9	24.4	10.5
Females	(57)	76.8	16.7	5.1	1.4	36.1	39.1	18.0	6.8
Totals		(78.6)	(14.1)	(5.1)	(2.1)	(33.8)	(37.4)	(20.5)	(8.2)
		$\chi^2 = 2.45608; df = 3; p = 0.4833$				$\chi^2 = 2.67965; df = 3; p = 0.4437$			
Academic	(34)	85.5	12.0	2.4	0.0	25.9	30.9	27.2	16.0
Nonacademic	(66)	75.3	14.7	6.7	3.3	39.4	40.9	16.1	3.6
Totals		(79.0)	(13.7)	(5.2)	(2.1)	(34.4)	(37.2)	(20.2)	(8.3)
		$\chi^2 = 5.61879; df = 3; p = 0.1317$				$\chi^2 = 16.65334; df = 3; p = 0.0008^*$			
Canadians	(69)	79.7	12.8	5.8	1.7	35.0	38.7	19.0	7.4
Americans	(31)	76.6	17.2	3.1	3.1	31.0	32.8	25.9	10.3
Totals		(78.8)	(14.0)	(5.1)	(2.1)	(33.9)	(37.1)	(20.8)	(8.1)
		$\chi^2 = 1.78437; df = 3; p = 0.6183$				$\chi^2 = 2.02526; df = 3; p = 0.5672$			
Entrepreneur	(10)	68.0	24.0	4.0	4.0	29.2	37.5	29.2	4.2
Professional	(32)	81.9	11.1	6.9	0.0	29.0	31.9	24.6	14.5
Skilled Labour (licenced)	(34)	81.6	10.5	5.3	2.6	37.1	34.3	24.3	4.3
Unskilled Labour	(24)	73.1	21.2	3.8	1.9	38.8	46.9	8.2	6.1
Totals		(78.2)	(14.7)	(5.3)	(1.8)	(34.0)	(36.8)	(21.2)	(8.0)
		$\chi^2 = 8.17510; df = 9; p = 0.5166$				$\chi^2 = 13.98003; df = 9; p = 0.1230$			

N = 266

* $p < 0.05$

TABLE 3

Ranking of Demanding and Attractive as Important Teacher Attributes by High-School Pupils: Gender, Program, Nationality, and Socioeconomic Class Groups Comparisons

Part A		Part B			
Attribute (quality): "Demanding (expects and requires high quality work)"		Attribute (quality): "Attractive"			
Comparisons (by %) of:		Rankings			
		1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
Males	(43)	16.7	28.2	25.6	29.5
Females	(57)	9.8	13.1	23.8	53.3
Totals		(12.5)	(19.0)	(24.5)	(44.0)
		$\chi^2 = 13.66738; df = 3; p = 0.0034^*$			
Academic	(34)	17.5	25.0	31.3	26.3
Non-academic	(66)	10.1	14.3	20.2	55.5
Totals		(13.1)	(18.6)	(24.6)	(43.7)
		$\chi^2 = 16.69121; df = 3; p = 0.0008^*$			
Canadians	(69)	10.8	20.9	24.3	43.9
Americans	(31)	18.5	14.8	24.1	42.6
Totals		(12.9)	(19.3)	(24.3)	(43.6)
		$\chi^2 = 2.61345; df = 3; p = 0.4551$			
Entrepreneur	(10)	8.7	17.4	30.4	43.5
Professional	(32)	14.5	21.0	25.8	38.7
Skilled Labour (licenced)	(34)	13.8	23.1	26.2	36.9
Unskilled Labour	(24)	13.3	11.1	20.0	55.6
Totals		(13.3)	(19.0)	(25.1)	(42.6)
		$\chi^2 = 5.91057; df = 9; p = 0.7488$			
		$\chi^2 = 23.38879; df = 3; p = 0.0000^*$			
		1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
		19.2	15.4	15.4	50.0
		7.6	5.0	5.0	82.4
		(12.2)	(9.1)	(9.1)	(69.5)
		$\chi^2 = 9.76868; df = 3; p = 0.0206^*$			
		4.1	6.8	8.1	81.1
		17.2	10.7	9.8	62.3
		(12.2)	(9.2)	(9.2)	(69.4)
		$\chi^2 = 13.90817; df = 3; p = 0.0030^*$			
		9.0	6.2	8.3	76.6
		20.4	16.7	13.0	50.0
		(12.1)	(9.0)	(9.5)	(69.3)
		$\chi^2 = 12.15526; df = 9; p = 0.2047$			
		0.0	9.1	4.5	86.4
		8.5	13.6	11.9	66.1
		20.0	4.6	10.8	64.6
		11.1	6.7	8.9	73.3
		(12.0)	(8.4)	(9.9)	(69.6)

N = 266

* $p < 0.05$

importance of teacher attractiveness much higher than did females. Similarly, Americans, compared with Canadians, rated more highly the importance of teacher attractiveness. In the same way, academic pupils did not rate this quality as highly as did non-academic pupils.

Since, in this sample, as was described at the beginning of this section, sex and nationality are related to a significant degree, as are program and class, further analyses were carried out to clarify the results at hand. The simplest were disposed of first. Thus, since no class differences were found for these two qualities, the program differences were deemed to be independent of class. The more complicated case of the sex and nationality comparisons required greater scrutiny. Analyses revealed that, while Canadian males rated *demanding* as more important than did Canadian females ($\chi^2 = 15.84694$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0012$), no such differences were observed when the ratings of American males and females were compared. The American groups closely resembled the Canadian males in their ratings of the importance of *demanding* as a teacher quality. Similarly, while Canadian males and females differed with regard to their ratings of teacher attractiveness ($\chi^2 = 17.0471$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0007$, with males giving higher ratings), this was not the case with American males and females. However, in this case, Canadians and Americans, as aggregates, did differ (as described above), even though the Canadian males clearly resembled the American groups in their ratings: The Canadian females differ from both Canadian and American males as well as American females in their assessments. The pattern of observed sex differences reflects the divergence of Canadian females' opinions from those of the other groups and the differences in the sex ratios for the two national groups. The divergence of the Canadian females' ratings from those of their American sisters is also of consequence in the data summarized in Table 4.

Orderliness and Expressivity in Teachers

Table 4 summarizes rating distributions for teacher orderliness (Part A) and expressivity (Part B) and the results of the comparisons. In Part A, we notice the low esteem given a very helpful teacher quality, orderliness, by the vast majority in all groups. The one significant contrast is that found between Canadians and Americans wherein Canadians appear somewhat more favourable towards teacher orderliness than Americans. No significant gender differences, which would complicate these findings, were observed. However, when within-sex-between-country analyses were carried out, Canadian females gave orderliness a higher rating than did American females ($\chi^2 = 9.25606$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0261$). But, they

TABLE 4

Orderliness and Expressivity Ranked as Important Teacher Attributes by High-School Students: Gender, Program, Nationality, and Socioeconomic Class Comparisons

Comparisons (by %) of:	Part A				Part B				
	Attribute (quality): "Orderly"				Attribute (quality): "Expressive (lively, exuberant, demonstrative)"				
	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	
Males	(43)	4.3	20.3	31.9	43.5	22.5	32.4	28.2	16.9
Females	(57)	8.3	15.8	38.3	37.5	24.2	30.5	34.4	10.9
Totals		(6.9)	(17.5)	(36.0)	(39.7)	(23.6)	(31.2)	(32.2)	(13.1)
		$\chi^2 = 2.41104; df = 3; p = 0.4916$				$\chi^2 = 1.89930; df = 3; p = 0.5936$			
Academic	(34)	4.0	20.0	33.3	42.7	21.6	29.7	36.5	12.2
Non-academic	(66)	8.8	15.9	38.1	37.2	24.2	32.3	29.8	13.7
Totals		(6.9)	(17.6)	(36.2)	(39.4)	(23.2)	(31.3)	(32.3)	(13.1)
		$\chi^2 = 2.58268; df = 3; p = 0.4605$				$\chi^2 = 0.94469; df = 3; p = 0.8146$			
Canadians	(69)	9.2	14.9	39.0	36.9	25.0	32.4	33.1	9.5
Americans	(31)	0.0	24.0	26.0	50.0	18.9	28.3	30.2	22.6
Totals		(6.8)	(17.3)	(35.6)	(40.3)	(23.4)	(31.3)	(32.3)	(12.9)
		$\chi^2 = 9.71175; df = 3; p = 0.0212^*$				$\chi^2 = 6.18524; df = 3; p = 0.1029$			
Entrepreneur	(10)	13.0	8.7	17.4	60.9	34.8	30.4	30.4	4.3
Professional	(32)	3.5	15.6	43.9	36.8	24.6	29.5	34.4	11.5
Skilled Labour (licenced)	(34)	8.2	19.7	34.4	37.7	16.1	30.6	32.3	21.0
Unskilled Labour	(24)	4.8	19.0	42.9	33.3	26.1	30.4	32.6	10.9
Totals		(6.6)	(16.9)	(37.2)	(39.3)	(23.4)	(30.2)	(32.8)	(13.5)
		$\chi^2 = 10.90996; df = 9; p = 0.2819$				$\chi^2 = 7.35320; df = 9; p = 0.6004$			

N = 266

* $p < 0.05$

did not differ from Canadian males who, in turn, did not differ from American males and females in rating teacher orderliness.

While no significant differences were evident in the group ratings of expressivity shown in Part B of Table 4, American males appeared more convinced of this quality's importance than Canadian males ($\chi^2 = 10.31511$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0161$) and American females ($\chi^2 = 16.64781$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0118$) when more fine-grained analyses were undertaken.

Ratings of Articulate and Fair as Teacher Qualities

Table 5 includes the distributions of ratings for teacher articulateness (Part A) and fairness (Part B). No significant differences between any of the groups' ratings of *articulate* as a teacher quality are evident in Part A of Table 5. A fairly high degree of consensus prevailed with regard to its importance. The proportions in the top triplet of ranks ranged from a little over one fifth to slightly more than one third, and only slightly smaller proportions define the range in the bottom triplet of ranks. The overall or aggregate consensus ranks articulateness below overall ratings for knowledgeable, friendliness, fairness, and kindness, and it has an importance similar to expressivity.

Part B of Table 5 shows that fairness is highly rated by all groups with proportions in the lower six ranks ranging 7.4% to 29.8%. The only contrast that entailed a significant degree of divergence was that between males and females. The proportions of males at the extremes of their distributions were greater than those of females. Further analyses indicated that Canadian males differ in this way from Canadian females ($\chi^2 = 16.64781$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0008$), but no such contrasts were observed between American males and females. Moreover, American females rated teacher fairness more highly than did Canadian females ($\chi^2 = 9.74529$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.0209$).

Importance of Teacher Attentiveness/Responsiveness and Firmness

The final two teacher qualities rated are attentiveness and responsiveness, and firmness. Part A and Part B of Table 6 reveal no significant differences in the ratings distributions. Even so, the ranges in the proportions of each level are illuminating with regard to the extent of diversity that exists even when the level of consensus is so high that no significant statistical differences are evident. Consider ratings for *attentive and responsive to one's ideas* in Part A of Table 6. The contrasts between the proportions of the entrepreneur group and those of the skilled labour group in the top and bottom triplets are notable. In ranks 1–3, fully

TABLE 5

Ranking of Articulate and Fair as Important Teacher Qualities by High-School Pupils: Gender, Program, Nationality, and Socioeconomic Class Groups Comparisons

		Part A				Part B			
		Attribute (quality): "Articulate (skilled in expressing ideas clearly with language)"				Attribute (quality): "Fair (even-handed treatment of everyone)"			
Comparisons (by %) of:		Rankings				Rankings			
		1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
Males	(43)	34.6	18.5	25.9	21.0	49.4	24.7	17.6	8.2
Females	(57)	21.5	24.8	31.4	22.3	42.2	42.2	14.8	0.8
Totals		(26.7)	(22.3)	(29.2)	(21.8)	(45.1)	(35.2)	(16.0)	(3.8)
		$\chi^2 = 4.50079; df = 3; p = 0.2122$				$\chi^2 = 12.83283; df = 3; p = 0.0050^*$			
Academic	(34)	29.9	20.8	31.2	18.2	38.2	35.5	19.7	6.6
Non-academic	(66)	23.4	24.2	28.2	24.2	47.8	35.3	14.7	2.2
Totals		(25.9)	(22.9)	(29.4)	(21.9)	(44.3)	(35.4)	(16.5)	(3.8)
		$\chi^2 = 1.93812; df = 3; p = 0.5853$				$\chi^2 = 4.24001; df = 3; p = 0.2367$			
Canadians	(69)	23.0	26.4	29.7	20.9	40.9	38.3	17.5	3.2
Americans	(31)	35.7	12.5	28.6	23.2	54.1	27.9	13.1	4.9
Totals		(26.5)	(22.5)	(29.4)	(21.6)	(44.7)	(35.3)	(16.3)	(3.7)
		$\chi^2 = 6.06390; df = 3; p = 0.1085$				$\chi^2 = 3.90200; df = 3; p = 0.2722$			
Entrepreneur	(10)	21.7	17.4	30.4	30.4	43.5	30.4	17.4	8.7
Professional	(32)	21.7	21.7	38.3	18.3	42.6	33.6	19.1	4.4
Skilled Labour (licenced)	(34)	31.3	23.9	25.4	19.4	48.5	44.1	7.4	0.0
Unskilled Labour	(24)	28.9	20.0	24.4	26.7	40.4	29.8	23.4	6.4
Totals		(26.7)	(21.5)	(29.7)	(22.1)	(44.2)	(35.9)	(16.0)	(3.9)
		$\chi^2 = 5.91315; df = 9; p = 0.7486$				$\chi^2 = 12.55989; df = 9; p = 0.1836$			

N = 266

* $p < 0.05$

Ranking of Attentive and Responsive and Firm as Important Teacher Qualities by High-School Pupils: Gender, Program, Nationality, and Socioeconomic Class Comparisons

Part A		Part B	
Attribute (quality): "Attentive and responsive to one's ideas"		Attribute (quality): "Firm (does not tolerate inappropriate behavior)"	
Comparisons (by %) of:		Rankings	
		1-3	4-6
Males	(43)	16.9	35.2
Females	(57)	16.4	34.4
Totals		(16.6)	(24.7)
		$\chi^2 = 0.31259; df = 3; p = 0.9576$	
Academic	(34)	20.3	39.2
Non-academic	(66)	14.4	31.2
Totals		(16.6)	(34.2)
		$\chi^2 = 3.67564; df = 3; p = 0.2987$	
Canadians	(69)	16.6	32.4
Americans	(31)	16.1	39.3
Totals		(16.4)	(34.3)
		$\chi^2 = 0.89748; df = 3; p = 0.8260$	
Entrepreneur	(10)	33.3	33.3
Professional	(32)	20.0	40.0
Skilled Labour (licenced)	(34)	9.4	32.8
Unskilled Labour	(24)	12.8	34.0
Totals		(16.1)	(35.4)
		$\chi^2 = 11.72950; df = 9; p = 0.2290$	

**p* < 0.05

one-third of the entrepreneur group is found in contrast to the less than one-tenth (9.4%) of the skilled labour group who considered *attentive and responsive* to be of first order importance. At the other end, the skilled labour group had nearly three times the proportion of the entrepreneur group which valued this same attribute least.

Similarly, rankings of *firm* in Table 6, Part B illustrate the magnitude of diversity even without significant statistical difference between the compared distributions. For example, few of the entrepreneur group ranked firmness first while four times as many of the skilled labour group gave it the first level of importance. Again, males at 16% were twice the proportion of females who ranked firmness first.

Finally, explorations of the six tables reveal a number of thematic contrasts that invite further exploration. For example, there is a general and prominent contrast between the ratings of entrepreneurs and those of the skilled labour group although the difference is not significant in the present analyses.

In summary, the comparisons of gender, program, nationality, and social class group ratings of the importance of 12 teacher qualities revealed a notable magnitude of complexity in high-school students' appreciations of teacher qualities. Certainly this complexity resists simple generalizations about youthful preferences or assessments. Significant differences in the distributions of ratings by males and females were observed for one-quarter of the 12 teacher qualities (i.e., for *demanding*, *attractive*, and *fair*). Four such differences were found in the comparisons of program-groups ratings: The academic group regarded *demanding* as a more important teacher attribute while the non-academic group was significantly more inclined to rate friendliness, kindness, and attractiveness as important teacher qualities. Comparison of ratings by Canadians and Americans yielded three significant contrasts: Americans rated attractiveness as important more frequently than did Canadians, while the latter placed more importance on teacher orderliness and friendliness. The final difference yielded by the primary contrasts emerged from comparisons of class group ratings of teacher confidence: The entrepreneurial group valued this teacher quality least while professionals, in contrast, valued it most. In the lowest ranks, skilled labour registered the greatest indifference to teacher confidence. In total, 11 (about 23%) of the 48 basic comparisons produced significant contrasts. In addition, further analyses indicated four within-gender and five within-nationality differences. Canadian males favoured friendliness more than did American males. American males rated expressivity more highly than did Canadian males. Similarly, Canadian females gave orderliness a greater importance than did American females, and

American females rated teacher fairness more highly than did Canadian females. Within the Canadian group, teachers who are demanding or attractive were more highly rated by males than females. The male Canadian ratings distribution for fairness also differed significantly from that of the female Canadians (with the males' distribution being broader and more heavily weighed at both extremes). Finally, within the American group, males rated expressivity as more important than did females, while females ranked teacher confidence more highly than did males. In sum, there is a notable diversity and complexity in pupils' ratings of the importance of these teacher qualities.

DISCUSSION

The foregoing ranking results reveal a complexity of pupil assessments of teacher qualities that is ill served by simple talk about a singular "pupil's eye view." The alleged remarkable consistency of assessments (Wragg, 1984) – even in a group with very low age variance – has been shown to be rather limited. This, together with comparisons of results from the present and other studies, reveals the insubstantial support for an unqualified claim of consistency. Thus, while Musgrove and Taylor reported that "all children agreed on ranking ... appearance as least in importance" (1972, p. 180), results of the present study indicate that only 50% of the males in the sample placed attractiveness in the last three (lowest) ranks of importance while 19.2% rated teacher attractiveness in the top three (highest) ranks. In addition, 15.4% placed this quality in the three other ranks in the upper half. Moreover, in excess of 37% of the American group rated attractiveness in the top six ranks of importance. All other groups lacked anything like unanimity. Similarly, neither the present study nor those of Musgrove and Taylor (1972) confirm Wragg's claim that "above all" and of "first" rank importance in youngsters' reckoning is "the ability to explain things clearly" (1984, p. 21). The proportions of the groups in the present study which placed this quality in the first three ranks of importance ranged from 21.5% (for females) to 35.7% (for Americans). (Males registered 34.6% and Canadians 23% in this category). The findings from Evans' study (Morrison & McIntyre, 1973, p. 130) show similar discrepancies. Moreover, the present study does not support the claim that "above all" youngsters are concerned with "teaching skills" (Wragg, 1984, p. 21). On the contrary, after knowledgeability (which is hardly a skill), the most highly rated teacher qualities for all groups were friendliness and fairness. This and the other discrepancies merely illustrate the diversity and complexity of pupils' appreciation of teacher attributes.

Since the full details of diversity are rather extensive and further analysis is pointless, the remainder of this paper will consider more pertinent issues. However, before leaving the consistency issue, one should first consider that while a diversity of orientations and rankings in and between groups has been established by the findings of various studies and by the complexity of rankings in this study, the implications of these inconsistencies are not so well established. (I will return to this later.) The second consideration worth noticing is that the full extent of pupil inconsistency in assessing teacher qualities is unknown. There is no reason to suppose that the psychological phenomena represented by the rating indicators are any less subject to situational influences than most other psychological phenomena in most people most of the time (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Feshbach, 1978; Fiske, 1979; Travis & Violato, 1982). For this reason, we can expect a fairly high degree of within-person variability on such indicators. That is, the degree of consistency in a pupil's rankings over several occasions is perhaps rather modest even when the qualities ranked are very abstract. The more specific and less abstract the quality rated, the lower the coefficient of consistency (if these psychological phenomena are like most others) (Mischel 1972, 1973, 1979). Accordingly, in addition to the between-groups inconsistency there is an unknown intra-person inconsistency which mocks talk of the established high consistency in pupils' assessments of teacher qualities (e.g., Wragg, 1984).

The second issue overlooked by enthusiastic but uncritical unsuspecting "trainers" and evaluators arises from the fact that the voice of any one human quality always emanates from a crowd of other human qualities. A chorus always accompanies that voice; the voice may stand out from, blend into, or be camouflaged by the accompaniment. The dynamic interplay of the chorus of characteristics with one other, with the entire ensemble, and with a succession in surround may produce changes of texture, form, and colour in the whole that evoke aesthetic or affective reactions in the observer – reactions which shape or colour perceptions of the given quality's voice. The nature of a particular voice's expression depends upon or is determined by the entire body of qualities. These considerations then raise the question of whether or when we react to persons as we find them, and whether and when we address an isolated quality or characteristic. Can we discern where the dancer stops and where the dance begins? Such considerations raise the second issue. What Neisser (1983) calls the "urge to subdivide," expressed in the "decomposition" research strategy, creates a conceptualization issue: Just what do pupil rankings indicate when qualities are isolated and when their order of reality is decomposed by the abstraction and the isolation

of a quality for rating? Do they merely summarize transitory reactions to their *erstwhile* teachers (as is plausible given overheard exchanges between respondents after ratings were given)? If so, does the bias of convenient sampling units conventionally used (i.e., volunteer pupils in particular classes in particular schools at particular times) inflate homogeneity of ratings from those units? All that can be said is that this is not implausible. Since satisfactory answers to these questions are lacking, some of the implications of the data are also unclear. However, this is not the entire case.

Insofar as pupil reactions and views warrant consideration in research on teachers and teaching, one can confidently assert that an old question formed by Sir Frederick Bartlett deserves renewed attention: "Do you fit the man for the job or the job for the man?" Clearly the two alternatives in Bartlett's question do not exhaust the possibilities. Past and present teacher preparation practices demonstrate that some of both can be done. However, past and current practices of preparation and selection clearly emphasize Bartlett's first option. Moreover, licensing and placement patterns have only recently spoken forcefully for the second option, and attempts at teacher preparation are far more impressive than are selection practices.

Certification requirements for knowledgeability are usually unremarkable and in sometimes appear neglected altogether (e.g., Lyons, 1980). A clear implication of the present results is that a greater emphasis on knowledgeability would probably be well received by the groups represented in this sample. The largest proportions in all groups placed book-side manner above desk-side manner in importance. Moreover, nothing resembling a skill – leave aside a trainable skill – was ranked highly by any groups in this study. The human qualities of friendliness, fairness, and kindness which generally ranked high are *not* skills – trainable or otherwise. Rather, the present results imply that pupils like those sampled here would appreciate an emphasis on these qualities as well as knowledgeability in selection practices. "Training" directed at such objects (save knowledgeability) is futile. As Barzun said well:

Not everything can be made into an 'object' for purposes of teaching It is impossible to teach toleration or democracy. The reason is that these are not subject matters at all but virtues or attitudes Surely, no human quality is a matter for curriculum Would any faculty offer a course called "Wit, Elementary or Advanced"? Or "Firm Principles – Old and New"? ... The only way to install any human virtue is to have parents and teachers and friends who are themselves tolerant and just and who in all reasonable opportunities evince that character. [Similarly] ... like all gifts of nature the ability to think cannot be imparted; it can only be developed. (1946, pp. 28–29)

Selection seems to be the apparent alternative. At the same time, a de-emphasis on methods and other pretensions to technological fact might, through deletion of attention to strategic insincerity, artificial warmth, tactical vagueness, simulated enthusiasm, and gratuitous or condescending praise, simplify the preparation task and reduce trouble created by these dubious and misguided manipulations. Again Barzun saw this 40 years ago:

... there is more to live teaching than a manner: the manner must fit. Teaching is not a process, it is a developing emotional situation. It takes two ... the spur from the class [and] the teacher [who] must have authority as well as be one Nothing gives authority like knowledge This implies that all 'Methods' in the 'educators' sense ... are wholly beside the point. (pp. 37-39)

Although knowledgeability might be expected in virtually all circumstances (and perhaps other qualities might be advantageous to most teaching situations), one feels safe in saying that different kinds of people and different manners, comportments, and orientations to life, learner, task, and situation appeal to or strike different pupils with varying force. In other words, we should expect reactions to different qualities and configurations of qualities in teachers to vary in accordance with variations in the subject, object, task, circumstances, and subjective characteristics (Fontana, 1977, pp. 22) and objective characteristics of whoever is to be taught (Morrison & McIntyre, 1973, p. 47). Variations in age, sex, class background, educational history, expectations, and other factors probably contribute to variation in orientations to, assessments of, and reactions to teachers.

Such considerations should give pause to those who suppose that pupils' judgements have much use, value, or obvious implications for training or evaluation. While their apparent simplicity may be appealing, we need to consider what intelligent, mature judgement looks like. Barzun's description provides a fitting note on which to close:

Judgement ... depends on comparison, but rarely on mechanical, point-for-point comparison. Rather, it requires the bringing together into one view of many elements differing in kind, probability, and importance; and this comprehensive, eagle-eyed assessment ... cannot be done by an inarticulate mind. Only words in their right orders and sense can present to the judgement the manifold reality in which objects, memories, immediate ideas, principles, and future purposes comingle. After this presentment the intuition of the talented and experienced plays its part to produce the decision which the event declares just or true. (1961, p. 245)

NOTE

- ¹ Joan Brownell, Tom Chang, Margaret Sakon, Barbara Simmins, Claudio Violato and Bill White all made contributions to the project which yielded the data discussed herein. The helpfulness of the service support from the ERSC at UBC and a grant to the author from the British Columbia Department of Labour are also acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- Adelson, J. (1964). The mystique of adolescence. *Psychiatry*, 27, 1-5.
- Adelson, J. (1979). Adolescence and the generalization gap. *Psychology Today*, 12(9), 33-37.
- Adelson, J. (1980). *Handbook of adolescent psychology*. New York: Wiley/Interscience.
- Anderson, Charles C., & Travis, LeRoy D. (1983). *Psychology and the liberal consensus*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Barzun, J. (1946). *We who teach*. London: Victor Gallancz.
- Barzun, J. (1961). *The house of intellect*. New York: Harper.
- Blair, G., & Pendleton, C. (1971). Attitudes of youth toward current issues as perceived by teachers and adolescents. *Adolescence*, 24, 424-428.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ewen, S. (1977). *Captains of consciousness: Advertising and the social roots of consumer culture*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.
- Feshbach, S. (1978). The environment of personality. *American Psychologist*, 33, 447-455.
- Fiske, D. (1979). Two worlds of psychological phenomena. *American Psychologist*, 34, 733-739.
- Fontana, D. (1977). *Personality and education*. London: Open Books.
- Gray, J., McPherson, A., & Raffe, D. (1983). *Reconstructions of secondary education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hunt, David. (1976). Teachers are psychologists too: On the application of psychology to education. *Canadian Psychological Review*, 17(3), 210-218.
- Hutt, C. (1972). *Males and females*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Kearney, K. A., Hopkins, R., Mauss, A., & Weisheit, R. (1983). Sample bias resulting from a requirement for written parental consent. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 47(1), 97-111.
- Lyons, G. (October, 1980). Why teachers can't teach. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62(2), 108-112.
- Martineau, Paul. (1971). *Motivation in advertising*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mischel, W. (1972). Direct versus indirect personality assessment: Evidence and implications. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 38, 319-324.
- Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. *Psychological Review*, 80, 252-283.
- Mischel, W. (1979). On the interface of cognition and personality: Beyond the person-situation debate. *American Psychologist*, 34, 740-754.
- Morrison, A., & McIntyre, D. (1973). *Teachers and teaching* (2nd ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- Musgrove, F., & Taylor, P. (1972). Pupils' expectations of teachers. In A. Morrison & D. McIntyre (Eds.), *The social psychology of teaching* (pp. 171–182). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Neisser, Ulric. (1983). Components of intelligence or steps in routine procedures? *Cognition*, 15, 189–197.
- Pearson, G. (1984, February 24). Ordinary people. *The Times Educational Supplement*, p. 27.
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimer, P., & Ouston, J. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours*. Shepton Mallet, Somerset, UK: Open Books.
- Springhall, J. (1983/1984). The origins of adolescence. *Youth and Policy*, 2, 20–24; 3, 33–35.
- Star, L. (1983). Simplification in scientific work: An example from neuroscience research. *Social Studies of Science*, 13(2), 205–228.
- Travis, Le Roy D., & Violato, C. (1981). Mass media use, credulity and beliefs about youth: A survey of Canadian education students. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 27(1), 16–34.
- Travis, Le Roy D., & Violato, C. (1982). A possible path past some personality study problems. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 28(1), 19–30.
- Travis, Le Roy D., & Violato, C. (1985). Experience, mass media use and beliefs about youth: A comparative study. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 31(2), 99–112.
- Wragg, E.C. (1984, February 24). The classroom in focus. *The Times Educational Supplement*, p. 21.

In freiwilligen anonymen Antworten auf eine Umfrage wurden zwölf Eigenschaften von Lehrern nach dem Gesichtspunkt ihrer relativen Bedeutung von 266 kanadischen und amerikanischen Oberschülern in Abschlußklassen bewertet. Unterteilung der Befragten in Gruppen wurde vorgenommen, um Vergleichsmöglichkeiten, basierend auf Geschlecht, Nationalität, Fachausrichtung und gesellschaftliche Herkunft der Befragten (definiert unter Berücksichtigung elterlicher Berufe), zu schaffen. Die Bewertungsskala bei diesen Gruppen wurde verglichen (männlich/weiblich; Kanadier/Amerikaner; akademische/nicht-akademische Schüler; Unternehmer/Fachkräfte/ungelernte/angelernte Arbeiter), mit dem Ziel, das Ausmaß, in dem eine Annahme von Homogenität der Orientierung und Beurteilung gerechtfertigt ist, zu untersuchen. Elf von 48 (23%) Vergleichen zeigten bedeutende Unterschiede. Von diesen Unterschieden wurden 4 in Fachgruppen-Vergleichen festgestellt; 3 ergaben sich aus Vergleichen der Nationalität; 3 waren in Geschlechts-Vergleichen und der letzte Unterschied war im Vergleich der sozialen Herkunft zu finden. Zumindest ein bedeutender Unterschied wurde in den Vergleichen für die Mehrheit (7 von 12) der Lehrer-Attribute festgestellt. Feinkörnigere Analysen (d.h. innerhalb Geschlecht und innerhalb Nationalität) ergaben neun weitere bedeutende Unterschiede innerhalb der Gruppe in Bezug auf die Bewertung von Lehrerqualitäten. Die Ergebnisse werden diskutiert im Hinblick auf Probleme, die sich aus Vereinfachung durch Auslassen, kategorische Behandlung von Vielfältigkeit oder Komplexität, Aufspaltungsstrategien in der Forschung, wie auch Lehrervorbereitung und Auswahlpraktiken ergeben.

Doce calidades de educadores fueron clasificados por orden de importancia por 266 alumnos canadienses y americanos del ciclo secundario que se ofrecieron como voluntarios para contestar de forma anónima a un cuestionario sobre el tema. A fines de comparar, se introdujeron en las muestras subdivisiones basadas en el sexo, nacionalidad, programas de estudio y la clase social de los encuestados (definida en función de la ocupación de los padres). Se compararon las evaluaciones atribuidas a los diversos grupos (varones contra mujeres; canadienses contra norteamericanos; estudiantes de cursos académicos contra los de cursos técnicos; comerciantes contra profesionales contra obreros especializados contra obreros no especializados) afin de explorar hasta qué punto se podría postular una hipótesis

de homogeneidad de orientación y evaluación. Once de las 48 comparaciones (o sea el 23 por ciento) mostraron diferencias notables. De estas diferencias, cuatro estaban fundadas en la diversidad de los programas de estudio de los encuestados, tres en la nacionalidad, tres en el sexo, y el resto en la clase social. Hubo por lo menos una diferencia importante en estas comparaciones en lo que respecta la mayoría (7 de 12) de las calidades atribuidas a los profesores. Análisis más detallados (por ejemplo dentro de los grupos "sexo" y "nacionalidad") revelaron nueve otras diferencias importantes en la manera en que estos subgrupos evalúan las calidades de los enseñantes. Los resultados de la encuesta se estudian con respecto a problemas que surgen debido a la simplificación por omisión, tratamiento por categoría de la diversidad o complejidad, estrategias de deslindamiento en la investigación, así como por la preparación y modo de selección del personal docente.

Le Roy Travis is an assistant professor in the Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C. v6T 1Z5.