STUDENTS' PERSONALITY ORIENTATIONS AND THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARDS STUDENT-CENTERED AND TEACHER-CENTERED INSTRUCTION

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, DULUTH

A PLAN B PAPER SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESEARCH PROBLEMS
PSY. F. 8-050
UNDER THE DIRECTION OF
DR. MOY F. GUM

A REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE
MASTERS OF ARTS (PLAN B)

BY
JOSEPH WILLIAM WOTRUBA
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
DULUTH, MINNESOTA
JUNE, 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

It is difficult to imagine all of the influences of higher education on the student. However, developmentally, the average student enters college with a well-established repertoire of values and attitudes formulated through years of education in kindergarten through high school. However, the first involvement the students have in college is critical to the manner in which they will approach their education (Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; McKeachie, 1969; Sanford, 1962). If the student is willing to be influenced and is open to change, he or she will have little difficulty in adapting to the new sets of values and attitudes encountered in college.

It is quite evident that higher education in our universities and colleges has an impact on the student (Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Sanford, 1962). In our colleges, the students are expected to take more of an active role in determining their education. Typically, however, students throughout their earlier twelve or thirteen years of education in schools have experienced a more teacher directed approach. Introductory college courses typically involve similar methods: lectures,

tests and films as students experienced in their prior thirteen years of education. If students are supposed to take more of an active role in college should the educational methods remain the same? Do we educate to indoctrinate or educate to help establish new ways of expressing personal and intellectual freedoms? What kinds of educational experiences challenge the students' own growth? Are there ways of determining students' orientations and matching them to more effective educational challenges? These were some of the questions that concerned the writer.

Newcomb and Feldman (1969) in their book The Impact of College on Students contend that,

> ....the freshman in college is a novice in an unfamiliar social organization, and is therefore confronted with the values, norms and role structures of a new social system and various new subsystems. Such an experience usually involved desocialization (pressures to unlearn certain past values, attitudes, and behavior patterns) as well as socialization (pressures to learn the new culture and participate in the new social structure). The uncertainties of this learning period often are compounded by the frustrations involved in moving from a system where one is an established member - the former high school and home community - to a system where one is only a novice. (p.89)

This transition may be very shocking to the student. The types of educational experiences demand that the student deal with a variety of expected and unexpected academic, intellectual and social challenges. The

teacher's role is to serve as both a social and intellectual model.

To add to the problem, students desire different qualities and behavior in teachers of different subject matters. Riley, Ryan, and Lifshitz (1950) found that the qualities thought essential for effective instruction vary considerably in the students' eyes, depending on the type of course taught. For example, "in the arts, the three most important qualities were knowledge of the subject, ability to encourage thought, and enthusiasm. For the physical and biological sciences, the important qualities were an ability to explain, organization, and knowledge of the subject. For the social sciences the important qualities were the ability to encourage thought, organization, and tolerance toward student disagreement".

Purpose

It is the purpose of this study to assess the relationships between freshman students' personality orientations and their satisfaction with two educational approaches, the student-centered and the teacher-centered methods.

It is this author's contention that the students' personality orientations have a direct relationship to their perceived satisfaction with student-centered and/or teacher-centered education. The students' person-

alities were assessed as either "task" or "interaction" oriented by use of an inventory. Students have more than these two orientations. However, for the purposes of this study, the task and interaction orientations were the easiest to operationalize within present educational techniques.

In this study, task and interaction orientations were related to student-centered and teacher-centered educational methods in that task-oriented students are seen as individuals who directly approach education as a task, whereas the interaction-oriented students are seen as individuals who seek out more personalized involvements with their education. This task-oriented student is interested strictly in meeting the course goals, accomplishing well outlined tasks and course content. The interaction-oriented student seeks knowledge and increased self-understanding through an involvement with other students and teachers. Task oriented students find that specific goals and content rather than relationships between faculty and student are more rewarding. The interaction-oriented students are interested more in the relationship elements in the educational exchange between faculty and student (Bass, 1962; McKeachie, 1969).

The student-centered approach has typically been non-directive in nature (Asch, 1951; Faw, 1949;

Haigh & Schmidt, 1956). Students interact primarily in self-structured educational groups, share discussions, interface personal values, construct personal awareness for course content through group experiences and establish new patterns of interaction. Usually these groups are facilitated by an instructor who reflects the group members' thoughts and values on the material being discussed. The students' involvements are emotionally tied to the discussion and to the sentiments of other students. The self-disclosure of students challenge their attitudes and values. The students' sentiments are made public for others to reject or accept. The group is also a supportive setting where students can see that their values and attitudes vary and may be similar to others. The effects of this supportive atmosphere opens up to the student higher levels of trust, openness to change, and new ways of relating. Through their participation, students actively select topics to discuss from the course, by which they achieve a self-directedness to their educational experience.

The teacher-centered methods involve rather directive approaches (McKeachie, 1969). The instructor pre-establishes the material without imput from students to be presented and then delivers the content as a lecture speech. If approached enthusiastically,

this format can be very entertaining and informative to the student. The content is usually fed back to the instructor through objective testing. Some instructors may request students to prepare papers or write essay exams on the course content. The students' exchange of personal attitudes and values are constrained to these methods. The teacher centered method of instruction is efficiently delivered and is found in most large introductory classes.

The thesis of this study is that personality orientations of students are influential factors in the satisfaction of students with various educational experiences. If the students' orientation is to fulfill outlined and detailed curriculum objectives they will have a task-oriented personality and find lectures, objective testing and papers very satisfying educational experiences. If the students' orientation is toward interaction processes, then the group discussion format, group projects and alternative educational curriculum designs will be more rewarding. It is to these ends that this study is directed.

Definition of Terms

Personality Orientation: In this study personal orientation will be defined as a score on two personal orientation profiles taken from the administration of Orientation Inventory (Bass, 1962).

Personal Satisfaction: In the context of this study, personal satisfaction will be defined as the students' favorable or unfavorable responses on a Semantic Differential instrument (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957). It will be used to assess the students' attitudes towards specific attributes and characteristics expressed as concepts of the student-centered and teacher-centered methods.

Teacher-Centered Method: In this study this method will be associated with lecture of content by faculty, objective testing and individual paper projects.

Student-Centered Method: In the context of this study this method will be associated with group discussion sessions, group project and the overall design of the General Psychology course.

Statement of Hypothesis

First Hypothesis: Task-oriented students will rate their satisfaction for the teacher-centered methods higher than will interaction-oriented students.

Second Hypothesis: Interaction-oriented students will rate their satisfaction for the student-centered methods higher than will task-oriented students.

Overview

The following chapters contain the literature review in chapter II, the design in chapter III, the results in chapter IV and the conclusion and dis-

cussion in chapter V. The instrumentation used in this study and any relevant informational material to the design of this study are attached as appendices following the Bibliography.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Nevitt Sanford (1962) presented this statement in his book The American College concerning the developmental status of the entering college freshman:

> The freshman develops when he is confronted with challenges that require new kinds of adaptive responses, and when he is freed from the necessity of maintaining unconscious defensive devices; these happenings result in the enlargement and further differentiation of the systems of the personality, and set the stage for integration on higher levels. But this does not distinguish the freshman from other people. Everybody has unconscious motives and mechanisms, and a repertory of coping devices that he hopes will be adequate to the challenges of life, and everybody can develop further when the necessary conditions are present. The point here is that when it comes to planning the freshman's education the characteristics that he has in common with other people may be just as important as those that distinguish him from others; and we can no better afford to neglect general human characteristics in our work with freshman than we can in our dealings with any other group of people. (p.255)

Sanford's statement suggests that educators should not neglect the general human characteristics of the student when planning educational experiences. The more that educators can challenge the students' perceptions, motives, and awarenesses through education, the more rewarding will be the personal development

of the student.

College seniors typically are confused concerning their future. In planning the students' educational experiences the educator should keep in mind the developmental character of their students. The student's future success lies in the integration and adjustment to the awarenesses of their educational experiences. McKeachie (1969) pointed out that:

> Students are adults. One of the strongest criticisms that can be leveled against American Higher Education is that it perpetuates adolescence for another four years. It seems clear to me that adult behavior is learned. If no opportunity to practice adult behavior is allowed, such behavior will not be learned. (p. 2)

Students who have been given an opportunity to interact with peers and teachers through their earlier education can more easily make adjustments to these new values experienced in college.

The effectiveness of student-centered and teacher-centered methods has been researched since Dewey (Asch, 1951; Eglash, 1954; Faw, 1949; Guetzkow, Kelly & McKeachie, 1954; Haigh & Schmidt, 1956; Wispe, 1951). Some studies reported the success of student-centered methods over teacher-centered methods (Faw, 1949; Haigh & Schmidt, 1956). These studies showed that there was no difference between the student-centered

and teacher-centered methods in the actual acquisition of knowledge of the content presented. However, the student-centered methods were said to develop interpersonal understanding, self-confidence and other affective traits through the students' interactions.

McKeachie (1969) outlined six skills learned by the students through group discussion. First, students learn to be sensitive to confusion and to ask for clarification. Second, they learn to discuss openly their own thoughts and ideas. Third, they learn to plan efficient use of study, class and discussion time. Some issues may not be covered until the closing of the session; therefore it is important to plan out discussion of certain key issues. A fourth skill is to build on others' ideas so that they may feel encouraged rather than punished. Too often students see discussions as competitive. A fifth ability is that students develop a sensitivity to other group members. Finally, the sixth skill is that students learn to be evaluative and to think about the value of time spent discussing various issues. McKeachie clearly supports the use of group discussion and student-centered methods if higher levels of cognitive abilities are the instructors goals.

There is a considerable amount of information

on the impact of student-centered and teacher-centered methods. Using a class of 102 students, Faw (1949) had students meet two hours per week for lecture and two hours per week for discussion. Faw selected three styles of group structure for the discussions: nondirective therapeutic, alternating nondirective for a few weeks and then directive, and strictly directive. He reported small, but significant differences in favor of the student-centered (non-directive) methods on objective test scores of students. Faw further reported that "the majority of students felt they received greater social and emotional value from the student-centered discussion groups and that greater interest was generated" (1949, p. 105).

Asch (1951) in a similar study used three sections of 30-35 students taught by instructor-centered methods and one section of 23 students taught by student-centered methods. The instructor-centered classes spent two hours a week listening to lectures, doing assigned readings and writing reports. The student-centered (non-directive) class members were free to establish their own goals, select most of their own readings and write weekly reaction reports on their feelings about any experience. The student-centered class members were expected to provide discussion and to grade themselves at the end of the quarter.

The instructor-centered class members were given several subject-matter quizzes and graded accordingly. Asch reported that the instructor-centered class scored significantly higher on the objective and the essay sections of the final. Results from pre and post test of the Social Distance Scale indicated that both groups improved in attitudes of general tolerance. Results from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory tests blind interpretation show that the nondirective group improved to a significantly greater degree in the area of emotional adjustment.

Asch (1951) also pointed out that there seemed to be a certain type of student who benefited most from non-directive teaching. Asch reported that it was obvious that some students were helped more than others" (p.21). Even though Asch did not attempt to classify student personality characteristics that best suited the non-directive or directive methods, he clearly suggested that a further examination of such parameters would be valuable research.

Another study by Haigh & Schmidt (1956) involved 110 students where students could select the teaching methods they preferred. They were given a description of the two methods and a questionnaire designed to help them with the merits of the two methods. One

instructor taught three sections using instructor-centered methods. A second instructor, with two graduate students as assistants, taught another section using student-centered methods. Haigh & Schmidt reported no significant difference between the groups on objective test scores. The pattern of results between the sections indicated no further significant differences in reference to the influence of the two teaching methods on knowledge-gain. Haigh & Schmidt concluded that when students could choose their preference for teaching methods, any advantage of teacher-centered methods as shown in Asch's study seemed nullified. They also attributed the choice of the students' preference as a reflection of personality factors which also influences the capacity of students to respond to these two types of teaching methods.

A more recent study of student-centered and teacher-centered methods was done by Lorimer (1972). Using an alternative educational design in a General Psychology class of 87 students, his purpose was to assess students' need for structure using two teaching methods. Three groups were established for this design. Two groups were selected, one using teacher-centered lecture methods and the other meeting one day per week for lecture. A third group met a separate day for discussion. Besides the discussion group meetings during

regular class hours there were also human relations group meetings in the evenings three nights a week. The student-centered group was given a listing of alternative tasks from which they could accumulate points to improve their final grade. For instance, students were offerred six points to attend human relations group, fifty points to run an experiment and so many points for reading books and articles, writing abstracts and reports. Other listings of point-graded alternatives were listed but are too numerous to list here.

The results of a need-for-structure test indicated a change in the pre-and-post assessments of students' attitudes. Students in the student-centered alternative based group reported more of a change from needing structure to needing less structure by the end of the course. Lorimer attributes this to students' self-reports that they felt they had more alternatives, that they were more self-motivated and accepted more responsibility. They also felt that decisions were up to them and a number of the students reported that they felt more like active learners than passive listeners. Lorimer concluded that the results clearly indicate attitude change and suggest a personality change as well. Lorimer pointed out that students found the student-centered alternative class design more personally sat-

isfying and interesting. Lorimer's results suggest that students learned to need less structure as well as they acquired higher levels of cognitive skills as McKeachie (1969) contends.

Wispe (1951) made an attempt to analyze the interaction of teaching methods and personality factors. He established eight sections of a Social Relations course taught by second year graduate students. The instructors were selected for their strong orientations toward the permissive or directive teaching styles. A TAT-type test, Sentence Completion and a twenty-five item questionnaire were used to assess the value of the teaching styles to the students in each section. A final three-hour examination was given, part essay and multiple choice. The results of the questionnaire and the TAT-type test indicated that the majority of students significantly preferred the directive sections. Furthermore, the correlation between the projective tests and the questionnaire was only about .20: both instruments confirmed that the directive sections were preferred but that permissive sections were more pleasant. Wispe concluded that permissive teaching requires highly skilled and mature teachers, which he felt was beyond the ability of young instructors. The real benefits of permissive teaching can not be realized in a once a week for one semester class. The maximization of the effects

require three one-hour meetings a week for a whole year.

Wispe also reported (1951) that three kinds of students were found. The first desired more direction in sections, seemed personally insecure, dependent and intro-punitive. A second was always satisfied with the teaching and favorable towards teachers and fellow students. A third type of students desired more permissiveness, was more independent, less tense, and extra-punitive. Furthermore Wispe concluded that poorer academically achieving students will benefit more from a directive type of teaching. For maximum learning efficiency student's emotional-intellectual needs should be a consideration in determining the kind of instruction he should receive. Finally "good teaching" is characterized by:

> (1) short expositions on points as they arise in the discussion rather than long lectures;
> (2) an informational type of humor;
> (3) directive-type, specific questions; and
> (4) encouraging, and allowing time for, student participation.
>
> (Wispe, 1951, p.185)

In a study done by Guetzkow, Kelly and McKeachie (1954) they compared three teaching methods in an elementary psychology course. Eight teaching fellows each taught three sections - one by each of the three teaching methods. The entire population of students were given common core lectures, movies and test demonstrations, and text and supplementary reading assignments.

The three teaching methods used were recitation-drill, group-discussion, and tutorial-study. Measures of the outcome of students' experiences were made by course examinations, USAFI examination, Conceptions of Parenthood Tests, and Scientific and Analytic Attitude Toward Human Behavior Test. They found no differences among the three teaching methods from an educational outcome. The few statistical differences favored the recitation-drill method.

Asch (1951) in summarizing his results made these remarks:

> "There is an implicit challenge to educators here as to which is the more important frame of reference - the one designed by the teacher or the one within the student." (p.21)

Non-directive teaching seems to encourage other academic values such as independent judgement, intellectual curiosity and strong positive motivations. Asch further remarks that non-directive teaching of undergraduate courses in General Psychology have as a major objective self-understanding and adjustment. Furthermore that "The future may witness a growing trend in the thinking of educators to the effect that the major objective of all undergraduate education is not information-giving but rather the development of a total personality" (Asch, 1951, p.20).

There seems to be a question of the relationship

between the personality of students and the educational experiences that they find satisfying and most rewarding. This study will assess a minute segment of personality and its relationship with student-centered and teacher-centered methods.

Summary

This review of the literature listed some contributions that related students' attitudes to student-centered and teacher-centered educational methods. It was seen that the variability between research designs, such as with Asch (1951), and Haigh and Schmidt (1956), can greatly influence the results favoring the student-centered or the teacher-centered methods. However, Asch (1951), Haigh & Schmidt (1956), Wispe (1951), and Lorimer (1972) all suggested that the personality of the students had an influence on the perceived teaching methods' effectiveness.

It was also apparent that many studies have found contradictory results as to the overall effectiveness of one method over the other. Lorimer (1972) found that students' attitudes changed when they were tested on a pre-and-post need-for-structure instrument. Students who participated in an alternative educational design where they interacted in groups, reported that they needed less structure. They felt more comfortable with less structure and found their educational exper-

ience highly rewarding. Faw (1949) reported small, but significant differences in favor of student-centered methods on students' scores on objective test results. Asch (1951) reported that instructor-centered methods were significantly more favorable from the results of students' test scores on their final exams. Wispe (1951) concluded that overall students find directive teaching styles more satisfying. Haigh & Schmidt (1956) found no significant difference between methods when students could select their preference for teaching method. However, all of these studies suggest that students' personality and attitudes did have an influence.

This present study is involved with the influence of students' personality orientations and their perceived attitudes towards student-centered and teacher-centered methods.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN

This study is designed to assess the influence of students' personal orientation and their satisfaction with two instructional methods.

Sample

The subjects were selected from a General Psychology class of 150 male and female freshman students registered during winter quarter, 1977 at the University of Minnesota, Duluth. At registration, students were given an information sheet outlining the course (Appendix A). Each student attended lecture on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, with two days of group discussion on Tuesday and Thursday. A sample of 98 students from the entire class population was selected for analysis. The 150 students were divided into eleven discussion groups. During the second week of class students were given the Bass Orientation Inventory. Subjects were selected by computer to be placed in two groups, one group having high scores on task-orientation, the other on interaction-orientation scales. Unequal group samples were established with forty-six Ss in the task-oriented group and fifty-two Ss in the interaction-oriented group for purposes of statistical analysis. Those students not selected as Ss were not included in the statistical tests.

The students not selected had either high scores in the self-oriented scale or had low scores in all three scales. These students took both the Bass Orientation Inventory and the Semantic Differential even though they were not selected for analysis. Those Ss selected for analysis in this study were selected by a program for the Cyberg 74 computer.

Procedure

All students participated in the General Psychology course. During the last weeks of the course they were administered a Semantic Differential. This instrument was used to assess students' attitudes towards the concepts identified as relating to either the student-centered or teacher-centered methods. These scores were then matched to Ss' previous task and interaction orientations and a t-test performed between groups to discover whether or not they were significant differences.

Course Design

The class was scheduled at 8:30 Monday through Friday. Each student was expected to participate in lecture and group discussion sessions as outlined in the course contract (Appendix B). Both the teacher-centered and student-centered methods were established differently in the curriculum.

The teacher-centered sessions involved lectures

by the team of four faculty members, periodic quest lecturers, movies, objective testing and no interaction in which students discussed the sessions with faculty. The course was taught by four faculty members from the Psychology Department. Two of the faculty had expertise in experimental design, physiological psychology and learning, one in social psychology, and the fourth was a graduate student, in counseling. During the quarter, guest lectures were presented by professionals from the community and from within the department. The movies used were those provided through the text publisher.

The student-centered sessions were held on Tuesday and Thursday in eleven discussion groups. Students discussed the content of the General Psychology lectures and other resources the group leaders used to highlight the content. Students typically defined terms, discussed key terms and how they related to their personal lives and society. While in the discussion groups, students were to select a group project topic that they were to present to the entire group during the last weeks of the quarter. Students were required to break up into groups of three to five students and to work outside of class on their group projects which they were to present as a group. An individual project provided an additional opportunity to students to

contract for an "A" grade. The individual project was usually a research paper on some topic that interested the student from the course content. These individual projects were separately negotiated between the student and two members of the faculty team. The discussion group leaders were to see that the content was discussed and that the group projects were set up and completed.

The discussion groups were led by upper-class students in their sophomore, junior, and senior year in Psychology. These teaching assistants (T.A.'s) were participating for academic credit offered through one of two ways. Two courses offered credit for this teaching experience: a projects course in Psychology, and a course in an alternative educational program. A total of thirty-five T.A.s participated as group leaders. The T.A.s structured exercises and led discussions highlighting the content of the course. Teaching assistants were required to participate weekly in an in-service training session led by the faculty team. The purpose of these sessions was to teach group techniques and to allow the T.A.s to discuss the activities of the previous week. The sessions gave an opportunity to exchange group experiences and exercises that worked well or not so well, to explore personal facilitating styles, and to coordinate efforts to meet the

requirements of the course, both for the freshmen and for themselves.

The teaching assistants worked in teams of three or four depending upon their experience with the content. The teaching assistants were required to read from a text by McKeachie; Teaching Tips; A guidebook for the beginning college teacher (1969). With the in-service sessions, the teaching assistants were asked to complete various evaluations and their understanding for various teaching methods. This helped the teaching assistants to understand more fully the purpose of the course's design. These were the requirements of the teaching assistants in addition to leading groups twice a week.

The freshmen had a more complex set of grading criteria. The freshmen had a graduated procedure by which they could select their own grade through completing contracted objectives. In order for all students to receive a minimal credit of "D" they had to complete successfully 50% of the total items on the objective tests and participated in their discussion groups. Students could earn a "C" by completing 60% of total items on objective testing and participate in discussion groups. Those students who participated in their discussion groups, who successfully completed the group project and completed 60% of the objective test

items, were eligible for a "B". Those students who successfully completed an individual paper on a topic of personal interest from the content, as well as all the other previously mentioned requirements were eligible for an "A". Students were given contract copies outlining these criteria on the first day of class, (Appendix B).

There were a total of four 50 point objective tests during the quarter with one 80 point final. An additional incentive for students was that if they completed 90% of the objective test items from the four 50 point section tests, they would not have to take the final. Another opportunity was that they could earn five points towards their final 60% accumulated point total by participating in an experiment run by students from an Experimental Psychology course. These were some additional criteria as well as the basic criteria listed earlier under which freshmen could be graded.

The freshmen also understood that their group teaching assistants would evaluate their group involvement. Student performance in their project groups was evaluated by the other members of their group and the entire discussion group. These assessments were either given orally or by objective evaluations. The teaching assistants then recommended that the student had either successfully or unsuccessfully completed and participated

in the group criteria.

Instrumentation

Orientation Inventory: Subjects were given the Bass Orientation Inventory (1962) in the beginning weeks of the course. Subjects were told that the instrument did not assess deep pathological characteristics and that it would be used as a teaching aid in the section on personality and tests and measurements.

The Orientation Inventory is composed of 27 items. Bass (1962) reported that the instrument lends itself particularly to application in business and industrial settings, with special applications in high school and college settings. Bass suggests that it could be useful to students regarding academic plans or problems and vocational selections. Because of its direct bearing on behavior as a group member, the Orientation Inventory scales appear to have considerable relevance for research in social inter-relationships in both large and small groups.

The Orientation Inventory classifies three personality orientation to social inter-relationships in groups:

(1) Self-Orientation; reflects the extent a person describes himself as expecting direct rewards to himself regardless of the job he is doing or the effects of what he does upon others working with him. For him, a group is "literally" a theatre in which certain generalized

personal needs can be satisfied.

(2) Interaction-Orientation; reflects the extent of concern with maintaining happy, harmonious relationships in a superficial sort of way, often making it difficult to contribute to the task at hand or be of real help to others.

(3) Task-Orientation; reflects the extent to which a person is concerned about completing a job, solving problems, working persistently and doing the best job possible. In groups, despite his concern with the task, the task-oriented member tends to work hard within the group to make it productive. (Bass, 1962, p.3)

Some criticisms have been given to these descriptions that they are biased and emphasize too heavily the Task-Orientation. The instrument itself is equally weighted, even though the descriptions may indicate Bass's personal preferences.

The reliability of the three scales are: self-orientation .73; interaction-orientation .76; and task-orientation .75. These are the results of a test-re-test study based on 84 college students taking two administration a week apart. Bass suggested that the obtained reliabilities are adequate for screening, selection and classification (1962). Fakability was determined when 82 seniors and graduate students were asked to take the inventory twice, the second time with instructions to give the best possible impressions of themselves. The mean scores for self-orientation decreased from 23.7 to 18.0; interaction-orientation

scores increased from 24.0 to 27.4; and task-orientation scores increased from 33.3 to 35.8.

In this study the inventory was used to classify Ss by their scores on the task-orientation and interaction-orientation profile scales. Subjects were selected by their higher scores ranging from 27 to 54 in either the task or interaction-orientation items. The Orientation Inventory is an ipsative test where one profile score is always higher or lower in relation to other profile scores. One profile will always be higher than the other two. Students with scores greater than 27, on either the task or interaction scales, were placed by computer program into two statistical groups. A Cyberg 74 computer was used using a format selected from a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Manual (1975). The samples selected from the entire class population were placed into two unequal statistical groups. The task-orientation group sample had 46 subjects and the interaction-orientation group had 52 subjects. The self-orientation scale was not used because this study was only interested in the task and interaction-orientation associated with the student-centered and teacher-centered methods.

Semantic Differential

The Semantic Differential is used to measure the students' attitudes as a reflection of their satisfact-

ion with the characteristics of the two methods of instruction. The instrument was used because it offers a measure of attitudes, as is pointed out in "semantic space".

> Each semantic scale, defined by a pair of polar (opposite-in-meaning) adjectives, is assumed to represent a straight line function that passes through the origin of this space, and a sample of such scales then represents a multidimensional space. (Osgood, Suci, and Tennenbaum, 1957, p.25)

Five concepts were examined with this instrument in this study. They were : General Psychology (Psychology 1-003, Section 1); Lecture Sessions (Monday, Wednesday, Friday); Discussion Sessions (Tuesday, Thursday); Objective Testing; Group Project; and Individual Project. The instrument used is attached as Appendix D.

The instrument uses seven value scoring scales with values ranging from one for the unfavorable adjective to seven for the favorable adjective. Each scale could be assigned a score of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7. The instrument has fifteen scales to assess the students' evaluative attitude toward the concepts printed at the head of the pages. Of the fifteen scales, eight are evaluative, two are receptive, four are unassigned and one is a potency factor (Osgood, et. al., 1957). Only the evaluative factored scales were used to measure the students' attitudes of satisfaction with the two instructional methods conceptualized through this instrument. The eval-

uative factors selected were; meaningless-meaningful, good-bad, cruel-kind, pleasureable-painful, successful-unsuccessful, unimportant-important, positive-negative and progressive-regressive.

Regarding the reliability of the semantic differential as an instrument, Osgood et.al. (1957) reported, "that the evidence shows that for individual Ss a shift of more than two scale units probably represents a significant change or difference in meaning, and a shift of more than 1.00 to 1.50 scale units in factor score (depending on the particular factor) is probably significant". (p.328) The reliability of the individual scales themselves has been researched and test-retest reliabilities have been exceedingly high. A study of test-retest on scaled items with 100 Ss and 40 items produced an N of 4000 and a resulting coefficient of .85 (Osgood, et. al., 1957, p.127). Another study reported coefficients of .86 to .94 on test-retest reliability. (Hendrickson, 1969, p.140)

Both the Bass Orientation Inventory and the Semantic Differential seemed to offer the reliability necessary to supply the appropriate measurements required for this present study.

Administration of the Instruments

This experimenter administered both instruments to the entire population of the course identified in this

study. After the administration of the Bass Orientation Inventory, Ss were then selected for the two groupings by the procedure previously described. The Orientation Inventory was administered through an oral reading of the instructions, while the students followed along silently. They were given an opportunity to ask procedural questions. They were then instructed that they had twenty minutes to complete the inventory. There were no questions concerning the test and no circumstances developed during the testing.

The Semantic Differential was administered to the entire class population in the eighth week. Students were read the instructions out loud as they followed along silently. Students were given 15 minutes to complete the instrument. There were no questions concerning the test, and no unusual circumstance developed during the testing.

Analysis

An independent sample t-test with unequal Ns was used to determine significance between the task-oriented group and the interaction-oriented group on the Semantic Differential scores with the concepts listed.

Statistical Hypotheses

The following were the null hypotheses tested in this study. All hypotheses pertain to the effect of the different conceptual instructional methods on the students

with task and interaction orientations.

H_0= There will be no significant difference in satisfaction ratings for General Psychology section between Task and Interaction-Oriented groups.

H_0= There will be no significant difference in satisfaction ratings for Lectures between Task and Interaction-Oriented groups.

H_0= There will be no significant difference in satisfaction ratings for Discussion Groups between Task and Interaction-Orientation.

H_0= There will be no significant difference in satisfaction ratings for Objective Tests between Task and Interaction-Oriented groups.

H_0= There will be no significant difference in satisfaction ratings for Group Project between Task and Interaction-Oriented groups.

H_0= There will be no significant difference in satisfaction ratings for Independent Study Project between Task and Interaction-Oriented groups.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter contains the results of the testing of the statistical hypothesis. The independent t-test with unequal Ns between two groups was used to determine significance. All results were considered at the .05 alpha level for a two tailed probability. The t-test results are listed in the tables in this chapter. Each hypothesis is separately listed.

Null Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant difference in satisfaction ratings for the concept of General Psychology between Task and Interaction-Oriented groups.

TABLE I

Results of Students' Satisfaction Ratings of the Concept of General Psychology Course.

General Psychology	N	X	df	S^2	t-value	2-tail Sig.
Task-Oriented Group	46	5.46	96	.758	1.05	.296 NS
Interaction-Orient. Group	52	5.27		.980		

df = n + n - 2
sig. = ≤ .05

The null hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level. No significant difference was found between groups.

Null Hypothesis II: There will be no significant difference in satisfaction ratings for the concept of Lecture sessions between the Task and Interaction-Oriented groups.

TABLE II

Results of Students' Satisfaction Ratings of The Concept: Lecture Sessions.

Lecture Sessions	N	X	df	S^2	t-value	2-tail Sig.
Task-Oriented Group	46	4.98	96	1.138	1.73	.087 NS
Interaction-Oriented Group	52	4.58		1.166		

df = n + n - 2
sig. = $\leq .05$

The null hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level of significance. No significant difference was found between groups.

Null Hypothesis III: There will be no significant difference of satisfaction ratings for the concept of Group Discussion Sessions between the Task and Interaction-Oriented groups.

TABLE III

Results of Students' Satisfaction Ratings of the Concept: Group Discussion.

Group Discussion	N	X	df	S^2	t-value	2-tail Sig.	
Task-Oriented Group	46	5.59	96	.992	.87	.386	NS
Interaction-Oriented Group	52	5.39		1.18			

df = n + n - 2
sig. = $\leq$ .05

The null hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level. There was no significant difference found between the groups.

Null Hypothesis IV: There will be no significant difference of satisfaction ratings for the concept of Objective Testing between Task and Interaction-Oriented groups.

TABLE IV

Results of Students' Satisfaction Ratings of the Concept: Objective Testing.

Objective Testing	N	X	df	S^2	t-value	2-tail Sig.	
Task-Oriented Group	46	4.48	96	1.227	.11	.914	NS
Interaction-Oriented Group	52	4.45		.974			

df = n + n - 2
sig. = $\leq$ .05

The null hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level. No significant difference was found between the groups.

Null Hypothesis V: There will be no significant difference of satisfaction ratings for the concept of Group Project between Task and Interaction-Oriented groups.

TABLE V

Results of Students' Satisfaction Rating of the Concept: of Group Project.

Group Project	N	X	df	S^2	t-value	2-tail Sig.
Task-Oriented Group	46	5.41	96	1.298	-.32	.748 NS
Interaction-Oriented Group	52	5.49		1.162		

df = n + n - 2
sig. = $\leq$ .05

The null hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level. No significant difference was found between groups.

Null Hypothesis VI: There will be no significant difference of satisfaction ratings for the concept of Individual Project between Task and Interaction-Oriented groups.

TABLE VI

Results of Students' Satisfaction Ratings of the Concept: Individual Project.

Individual Project	N	X	df	S^2	t-value	2-tail Sig.
Task-Oriented Group	46	2.9592	96	2.818	-.31	.761 NS
Interaction-Oriented Group	52	3.1322		2.783		

df = n + n - 2
sig. = $\leq .05$

The null hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level. No significant difference was found between groups.

Summary

None of the hypothesis tested was found to be significant. An independent t-test for unequal Ns was used to determine significance. The alpha level was set at .05 for a two-tailed probability.

The fifth chapter will discuss the results and make concluding statements concerning this study.

Kelly & McKeachie (1954). The studies cited in chapter II indicated that any actual conclusive results were very difficult to identify. Both Faw and Asch reported difficulty in interpreting their results. In the present study, although the results were not significantly in favor of any of the hypotheses, some statements can be made in an attempt to interpret them.

The results of the first hypothesis listed in Table I indicates no significant difference occurred between the task and interaction groups. The null hypotheses could not be rejected. This indicates that the students' ratings of their satisfaction with the General Psychology course could not be discriminated between the two statistical groups. The semantic scale has a possible rating of from 1 to 7 (unfavorable to favorable respectively). The mean ratings on the semantic differential scale for the task-oriented group was 5.46 and for the interaction-oriented group 5.27 towards the concept, General Psychology course. This indicates both types of students had favorable feelings toward the course design. Thus, even though no significant difference between the two groups could be found, the general impression of students was favorable.

Haigh and Schmidt (1956) reported that, although no actual difference could be established on test results between the student-centered and teacher-centered groups,

there was an indication from self-reports that some students benefited more than others from the type of method used. However as this study has attempted to establish, it may be that the task and interaction traits of student personality have no influence on personal satisfaction of students to any great measurable difference. The subjective inclination of this writer is that they do have an influence. However this was not supported by the results. In the second hypotheses, (Table II), the statistical analysis indicates no significant difference between the task and interaction groups in reference to the lecture sessions. The null hypothesis showed a mean of 4.9 for task and 4.5 for interaction groups taken separately. This does indicate both groups favored somewhat the lectures. However these ratings are lower than those in Table I.

Table III lists no significant difference between both groups towards the Discussion Sessions. However the mean semantic differential scaled ratings separately taken are for task group 5.6 and for the interaction group 5.4. This indicates favorable feelings of students toward this type of educational experience.

In table IV no significant difference was found between both groups in reference to students' satisfaction towards the Objective Testing concept. The mean semantic differential scaled ratings for the task group was 4.4

and 4.5 for the interaction group. These separate mean scores show students of both groups had lower satisfaction rating for this type of educational experience though still above average and similar to lecture ratings.

In Table V no significant difference was found between groups in reference to students' satisfaction toward the group project. However the mean semantic differential scaled scores for the task group was 5.4 and for the interaction group 5.4. This indicates a higher general rating of satisfaction towards this educational type experience.

The final Table VI lists the results of the sixth hypotheses. These results showed no significant difference between the groups in reference to their satisfaction toward the individual project concept. The mean semantic differential scale scores for the task group was 2.9 and 3.1 for the interaction group. These were considerably lower ratings and the only ratings below average. Thus some of these students felt that this type of experience wasn't worth the effort.

Experimental Limitations

The experimental design of this study was a quasi-experimental approach to research. No clear experimental or control conditions were established. It would have been more appropriately designed had a clearly established control group and two distinct experimental groups

were separately established for the task and interaction-oriented students under the student-centered and teacher-centered conditions. This would have increased the experimental effectiveness of the design. However these conditions were not possible so a quasi-experimental design was used.

When the design was first constructed no proper control setting could be found. It was not feasible to construct separate settings for students with task or interaction orientations with the two teaching methods. It was thought that the entire class could experience the two instructional methods together, a procedure used by Guetzkow, Kelly, and McKeachie (1954). However, by not separating students into experimental groupings it was felt that they would have more of an awareness of the two instructional conditions. Instead of physically separating students only their scores from the Bass Orientation Inventory indicated their personal orientations.

Another limitation of this study may have been the Orientation Inventory instrument itself. Bass's interpretation of the task profile is biased. Even though the validity of the test itself is supported through research and the instrument can successfully discriminate three personality scales, the face validity of the items and the profile descriptions leaves one with the feeling

that the test favors the task-orientation. It was not always clear to what extent the methods were associated with the task-oriented and interaction-oriented classifications of students.

Other more complex experimental limitations were present as well. The students had the option of selecting other General Psychology sections over the one used in this study. This may have extracted a population of volunteer subjects who were experimentally biased. The class involved a team of four faculty and 35 teaching assistants all with their own personal approach to teaching this type of alternatively based design. The separation of personal styles and skills was not possible. Experimentally it would have been better to have one instructor for separate experimental conditions but instead the course involved these special conditions.

Since the design of the class required that students experience both the traditional educational experience of lectures, testing and papers, and the alternative educational experience of group-discussion and group projects, students may have had some difficulty rating each experience objectively. This experience may have further lessened the ability of students to distill from their experience any clear distinction for each of the educational approaches.

A final consideration of the limitations of this

study's design lies with the research on personality itself. Personality testing is a highly ambiguous endeavor. Personality is multi-faceted and each characteristic or trait demands equally weighted attention. This variability alone may be the most singular limitation of this study and the possible reason for no differences. Freshmen students are experiencing change and the emotional, physical and environmental contingencies serve as influences upon their personal satisfaction. In an educational setting it may be impossible to account for all influences. Therefore personality measurement and attitude assessment in educational research such as that attempted in this study may be too far reaching an endeavor with so much variability.

Conclusion

Although the results of the present study were not significant, the attempt to do research in this area was personally rewarding. This study was an attempt to seek possible answers to the question of whether personality was an influence in students' satisfaction with student-centered and teacher-centered teaching methods. In this study the data revealed no significant differences based on the Semantic Differential. Thus it would seem that the personality of students will continue to be variables of unknown influence to the instructor as it has been for centuries.

It is evident that with such a variable as personality future research in this area should be more finely detailed in experimental procedure and design. A personality instrument, possible such as the Omnibus Personality Inventory (Heist & Yonge, 1968) with good reliability and validity may be helpful. Whatever the instruments used, the design of the study should be more exacting and be constructed with more experimental effect in mind. Quasi-experimental designs are loosely fitted for educational experimentation and should be considered carefully.

The effects of working with undergraduate teaching assistants was also rewarding. The 35 undergraduate teaching assistants found the teaching of psychology a rewarding experience they had never fully appreciated before. Their interfacing with the various personalities of students was a tremendously satisfying and exacting challenge. It may well be that Faw (1949), Sanford (1962) and McKeachie (1969) all were alluding to the benefits of a more affective education rather than the more cognitive. As Asch (1951) so rightly questioned;

> ..."which is the more important frame of reference - the one designed by the teacher or the one within the student?" (p.29)

Summary

One hundred and fifty students registered for a General Psychology class winter quarter 1977 at the University of Minnesota, Duluth. Students were admin-

istered the Bass Orientation Inventory. Their scores were recorded and selected by computer which identified their scores as either task-oriented or interaction-oriented. The entire class was instructed by a team of four faculty and 35 undergraduate teaching assistants. Students were in lecture on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, and on Tuesday and Thursday they participated in eleven discussion groups facilitated by teams of three to four teaching assistants.

In the first week of class students were given contracts outlining the grading criteria (see Appendix B). The grading criteria were in a graduated format and required various options for grading. Participation in group discussion and lecture, a group project and individual project with periodic objective testing were some of the educational methods used.

Students were administered the Semantic Differential during the eighth week of the quarter. The Semantic Differential was designed to rate the students' satisfaction with the concepts of the General Psychology course, Lecture Session, Group Discussion Sessions, Group Project and Independent Project. These semantic differential attitude scores were then matched with the students' Orientation Inventory scores. An independent sample t-test with unequal Ns was statistically run to determine if there were significant differences between the task

and interaction-oriented groups.

The statistical t-test was performed on a Cyberg 74 computer on 98 subjects selected by the Bass Orientation Inventory. The null hypotheses tested were that there would be no significant difference between task and interaction-oriented group scores (taken from the administration of the Orientation Inventory) and the students' Semantic Differential scores for the five concepts tested, (see page 33).

No significant results were found at the .05 alpha level. An interpretation of the results indicated that students ratings of their satisfaction toward the concepts associated with either the student-centered and teacher-centered methods were not significant.

The results of this study may clearly be attributed to the design and the experimental limitations of the study. Any further research in this area would probably be best suited by a more detailed experimental design rather than a quasi-experimental design.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Asch, Norton Jay, Non-Directive Teaching in Psychology, Psychological Nonographs, Vol. 65 (4), 1951.

Bass, Bernard M. The Orientation Inventory; Manual, Consulting Psychologist Press Inc., Palo Alto California, 1962.

Eglash, Albert, A Group Discussion Method of Teaching Psychology. Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 45 (5), pp. 257-267, 1954.

Faw, Volney. A Psychotheraputic Method of Teaching Psychology, American Psychologist. Vol. 4, pp. 104-109, 1949.

Guetzkow, Harold, Kelly, Lowell E. & McKeachie, W. J. An Experimental Comparison of Recitation, Discussion, and Tutorial Methods in College Teaching. Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 45 (4), 1954, pp. 193-207.

Haigh, Gerald & Schmidt, Warren. The Learning of Subject Matter in Teacher-Centered and Group-Centered Classes. Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 47, pp. 295-301, 1956.

Heist, Paul & Yonge, George, Omnibus Personality Inventory - Manual, Psychology Corp. N. Y., 1968.

Hendrickson, A. D. A Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Three Methods of Teaching Mathematics to Prospective Elementary School Teachers. Unpublished Doctoral Disertation, University of Minnesota, 1969.

Lorimer, Steven J. An Experiment in an Alternative-Based Introductory Psychology Class Environment Designed to Decrease the Students' Need for Structure. Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Minnesota, Duluth, 1972.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. Teaching Tips: A guidebook for the beginning college teacher. P. C. Heath & Co., Lexington, Mass., 1969.

Nie, Norman H., Hull, C. Hadlai, Jenkins, Jean G., Steinbrenner, Karin, & Bent, Dale H., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Sec. Ed. McGraw-Hill Co., 1975.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Riley, J. W., Ryan, B. F., and Lifshitz, M. The Students Look at His Teacher: an inquiry into the implications of student ratings at the college level. New Brunswick, N. J., Rutgers University Press, 1950.

Sanford, Nevitt, The American College. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., N. Y., 1962.

Wispe, L. G. Evaluating Section Teaching Methods in the Introductory Course. Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 45, pp. 161-186, 1951.

APPENDIX A

INFORMATION CONCERNING PSY 1003, SECTION L, WINTER 1977

If you take Psy 1003, Section 1, Winter Quarter 1977, you will engage in a somewhat different introductory class. In this course you will experience a number of different learning experiences, not the usual two or three.

In addition to the usual competitive situation in which you read, listen, look and take objective tests you will also take part in cooperative group learning experiences and, for those who elect to do so, an individual project.

The grading system is also different from the typical model. You will be able to earn a "D" or "C" by successfully completing 50 or 60 per cent of the objective test items attempted over the course of the quarter. For 50 per cent of items completed successfully you earn a "D"; for 60 per cent you earn a "C".

To earn one grade higher you need to take part in a successful group project related to psychology. Guidelines or criteria for successful completion of the project will be outlined on the third day of class or before, but, in general, it will require that every member of the small group will share equally in the work, both in quantity and quality.

The final group project will need to be written clearly and will have to reflect "how" the job was completed and include evidence of sound data gathering through library research plus interviews or observations if the latter are necessary for successful completion of the project. In addition, the group will have to "present" its product in an interesting manner which "demonstrates" what has been learned.

For the next higher grade, "B" or "A" respectively, you will be required to do a written independent study project. This will have to be prepared in American Psychological Association style. This report must be clear, show evidence of competent research, and be typewritten in acceptable form. Guidelines and a sample will be prepared for your use.

The faculty for the program will be composed of a team including the following:

RJF/KG/GG/ JW - 12/6/76

Gene Grossman - experimental, learning.
Kamal Gindy - Physiological, experimental.
R. J. Falk - personnel, educational, social.
Joe Wotruba - developmental guidance.

Up to thirty advanced undergraduate teaching assistants will work with Psy 1003 students in Tuesday-Thursday recitation-discussion sections. In these sessions you will engage in discussion of the major topics of psychology working either in a section of 15 students or in sub=groups of about five students each. The TA's will facilitate the learning groups, and will help you improve your skills in group discussion, problem-solving and task-oriented group work. They will also provide guidance to you if you should decide to work on an individual project.

Students registering for this section of General Psychology must be aware that full attendance and participation is required.

RJF/KG/GG/ JW - 12/6/76

APPENDIX B

Psychology 1003, Section 1, Winter 1977 - LEARNING CONTRACT

I, _____, agree to the following "contract." I understand that the following will determine my final grade in this class:

To pass the course I realize that I must attend all classes, recitation-discussion sessions, and whatever outside-of-class small-group meetings as are necessary to complete a successful small-group project.

To receive a "D" I will need to pass 50% of the objective items attempted.

To receive a "C" I will need to complete 60% of the objective items attempted.

To receive a next higher grade, "C" or "B" respectively, I will take part in a quality small-group project. Whether or not I receive the grade will be dependent upon self-evaluation, evaluation by others in my small group, and by the teaching assistants.

To receive a next higher grade of "B" or "A" respectively, I will complete a high-quality independent study project. This will be a paper written in acceptable form (American Psychological Association). In addition to form, the paper will have to be clear and will need to give evidence of sound research - using such sources as the library, interviews and/or observation.

I understand that guidelines or criteria for all work will be available to me during the first week of the quarter, amended in minor ways if needed, and that I may confer with faculty at any time if I feel it necessary for clarification of such guidelines.

I understand that I have the opportunity to appeal any decisions made concerning my grade to the next level of decision-making, beginning with my group peers, undergraduate teaching assistants, and faculty.

Signed: _____

RJF/KG/GG JW - 12/6/76

Learning contract p. 2.

Turn in one copy; keep the other identical copy for your reference.

.....

PLEASE PRINT

Name _____ Phone _____

Class: ___ Fr ___ Soph ___ Jr ___ Sr ___ Other _____

Major (s) _____ Minor(s)_____

Have you taken Psy 1501 or SSP 1101? ___yes ___no

RJF/KG/GG/ JW - 12/6/76

APPENDIX C

THE ORIENTATION INVENTORY

Bernard M. Bass, Ph. D.

DESCRIPTION, ADMINISTRATION, AND SCORING

DESCRIPTION

How a person reacts to the challenge of a job and to those working with him depends upon the kinds of satisfactions and rewards he seeks and the dissatisfactions most disturbing to him. Often mutually exclusive are three kinds of satisfaction: getting the job done, having a happy time with others, or gaining some self-satisfying ends. This three-fold classification is drawn from a theory of interpersonal behavior in organizations (1, Ch.8). The theory resulted in several years of research to develop, refine and evaluate the Orientation Inventory (1,8).

Three scores are obtained from this inventory:

s - Self-orientation: reflects the extent a person describes himself as expecting direct rewards to himself regardless of the job he is doing or the effects of what he does upon others working with him. For him, a group is "literally a theatre in which certain generalized needs can be satisfied. The other members are both the remainder of the cast as well as an audience for which the self-oriented member can air his personal difficulties, gain esteem or status, aggress or dominate" (1, pp. 149-150). A person with a high score in self-orientation is more likely to be rejected by others, to be introspective, to be dominating and to be unresponsive to the needs of others around him. He is concerned mainly himself, not co-workers' needs or the job to be done.

i - Interaction-orientation: reflects the extent of concern with maintaining happy, harmonious relationships in a superficial sort of way, often making it difficult to contribute to the task at hand or to be of real help to others. Interest in group activities is high but not ordinarily conductive to the progress of the group in completing tasks.

t - task-orientation: reflects the extent to which a person is concerned about completing a job, solving problems, working persistently and doing the best job possible. In groups, despite his concern with the task, the task-oriented member tends to work hard within the group to make it productive as possible. If he is interested in what the group is doing, he will fight hard for what he regards as right.

Reference: Bass, A. M. Comparisons of the behavior in groups of self-oriented, interaction-oriented and task-oriented members. Tech. Rep. 25 Contract N79NR 35609, Louisiana State University, Baron Rouge, 1961.

THE ORIENTATION INVENTORY

By

Bernard M. Bass, Ph. D.

Directions. This test consists of 27 statements of opinions and attitudes. For each statement please indicate in the answer space which of the three alternatives (A, B, or C) is most true, or most preferred, or most important to you by printing A, B, or C in the MOST column on the separate answer sheet.

Then choose the least true or least preferred of the three alternatives and write its letter in the LEAST column.

For every statement, be sure you mark one alternative in each column. If A is entered under MOST, then either B or C should be marked under LEAST, and so on. Do not debate too long over any one statement; your first reaction is desired.

BEGIN HERE

1. One of the greatest satisfactions in life is:
   A. Recognition for your efforts.
   B. The feeling of a job well done.
   C. The fun of being with friends.

2. If I played football, I would like to be:
   A. The coach whose planning pays off in victory.
   B. The star quarterback.
   C. Elected captain of the team.

3. The best instructors are those who:
   A. Give you individual help and seem interested in you.
   B. Make a field of study interesting, so you will want to know more about it.
   C. Make the class a friendly group where you feel free to express an opinion.

4. Students downgrade instructors who:
   A. Are sarcastic and seem to take a dislike to certain people.
   B. Make everyone compete with each other.
   C. Simply can't get an idea across and don't seem interested in their subject.

5. I like my friends to:
   A. Want to help others whenever possible.
   B. Be loyal at all times.
   C. Be intelligent and interested in a number of things.

6. My best friends:
   A. Are easy to get along with.
   B. Know more than I do.
   C. Are loyal to me.

7. I would like to be known as:
   A. A successful person.
   B. An efficient person.
   C. A friendly person.

8. If I had my choice, I would like to be:
   A. A research scientist.
   B. A good salesman.
   C. A test pilot.

9. As a youngster I enjoyed:
   A. Just being with the gang.
   B. The feeling of accomplishment I had after I did something well.
   C. Being praised for some achievement.

10. Schools could do a better job if they:
   A. Taught children to follow through on a job.
   B. Encouraged independence and ability in children.
   C. Put less emphasis on competition and more on getting along with others.

11. The trouble with organizations like the Army or Navy is:
   A. The rank system is undemocratic.
   B. The individual gets lost in the organization.
   C. You can never get anything done with all the red tape.

12. If I had more time, I would like to:
   A. Make more friends.
   B. Work at my hobby or learn something new and interesting.
   C. Just take it easy, without any pressure.

13. I think I do my best when:
   A. I work with a group of people who are congenial.
   B. I have a job that is in my line.
   C. My efforts are rewarded.

14. I like:
    A. Being appreciated by others.
    B. Being satisfied personally with my performance.
    C. Being with friends with whom I can have a good time.

15. I would like to see a story about myself in the newspaper:
    A. Describing a project I had completed.
    B. Citing the value of my actions.
    C. Announcing my election to a fraternal organization.

16. I learn best when my instructors:
    A. Provide me with individual attention.
    B. Stimulate me into working harder by arousing my curiosity.
    C. Make it easy to discuss matters with them and others.

17. Nothing is worse than:
    A. Having your self-esteem damaged.
    B. Failure on an important task.
    C. Losing your friends.

18. I like:
    A. Personal praise.
    B. Cooperative effort.
    C. Wisdom.

19. I am considerably disturbed by:
    A. Hostile arguments.
    B. Rigidity and refusal to see the value of new ways.
    C. Persons who degrade themselves.

20. I would like to:
    A. Be accepted as a friend by others.
    B. Help others complete a mutual task.
    C. Be admired by others.

21. I like a leader who:
    A. Gets the job done.
    B. Makes himself respected by his followers.
    C. Makes himself easy to talk to.

22. I would like to:
    A. Have a committee meeting to decide what the problem is.
    B. Work out by myself the correct solution to the problem.
    C. Be valued by my boss.

23. Which type of book would you like to read?
    A. A book on getting along with people.
    B. A historical romance.
    C. A how-to-do-it book.

24. Which would you prefer?
    A. Teach pupils how to play the violin.
    B. Play violin solos in concerts.
    C. Write violin concertos.

25. Which leisure-time activity is satisfying to you?
    A. Watching westerns on TV.
    B. Chatting with acquaintances.
    C. Keeping busy with interesting hobbies.

26. Which would you prefer, assuming the same amount of money was involved?
    A. Plan a successful contest.
    B. Win a contest.
    C. Advertise the contest and get others to participate.

27. Which is important to you?
    A. To know what you want to do.
    B. To know how to do what you want.
    C. To know how to help others to do what they want.

THE ORIENTATION INVENTORY Answer sheet

Name_____(Print) I. D. Number_____
(Last) (First)

Please answer below following instructions given on first page of inventory.

	MOST	LEAST		MOST	LEAST
1.	____	____	17.	____	____
2.	____	____	18.	____	____
3.	____	____	19.	____	____
4.	____	____	20.	____	____
5.	____	____	21.	____	____
6.	____	____	22.	____	____
7.	____	____	23.	____	____
8.	____	____	24.	____	____
9.	____	____	25.	____	____
10.	____	____	26.	____	____
11.	____	____	27.	____	____
12.	____	____			
13.	____	____			
14.	____	____			
15.	____	____			
16.	____	____			

THE ORIENTATION INVENTORY

(Bass, 1962)

Norms for 908 College Students
(South, Midwest, and Far West)

	Males (N = 523) Raw Scores				Females (N = 385) Raw Scores			
T Score	s	i	t	Centile Score	s	i	t	T Score
80	44	44	52	99.8	42	45	50	80
75	41	40	49	99.3	39	42	47	75
70	37	37	46	97.7	36	39	43	70
65	34	34	42	93.3	33	36	40	65
60	31	31	39	84.2	30	33	37	60
55	28	27	36	69.2	27	30	34	55
50	25	24	32	50.0	24	27	30	50
45	22	21	29	30.8	21	24	27	45
40	18	18	26	15.8	18	20	24	40
35	15	15	22	6.7	15	17	20	35
30	12	11	19	2.3	12	14	17	30
25	9	8	16	.6	9	11	14	25
20	6	5	12	.1	6	8	10	20
Means	24.7	24.3	32.3		24.1	26.7	30.2	
Standard Deviations	6.33	6.42	6.68		5.89	6.15	6.56	

APPENDIX D

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Name: _____ Discussion Section #: ____
(Print- Last Name First)

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this instrument is to measire the meanings of certain concepts to various people by having them judge them against a series of descriptive scales. On each page of this booklet you will find a different concept to be judged and beneath it a set of scales. You are to rate the concept on each of these scales in order. Here is how you are to use the scales:

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

rough __X__:____:____:____:____:____:____ smooth

or

rough ____:____:____:____:____:____:__X__ smooth

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely) you should place your check mark as follows:

rough ____:__X__:____:____:____:____:____ smooth

or

rough ____:____:____:____:____:__X__:____ smooth

If the concept is slightly related to one side as opposed to the other (but is not really neutral) then you should check as follows:

rough ____:____:__X__:____:____:____:____ smooth

or

rough ____:____:____:____:__X__:____:____ smooth

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the concept you are judging.

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated

to the concept, then you should place your check mark in the middle space as follows:

rough ____:____:____: X :____:____:____ smooth

IMPORTANT!!!

1. Place your check marks in the middle of spaces; not on the boundaries (:).

2. Be sure you check every scale for every concept; DO NOT OMIT ANY.

3. Never put more than one check mark on a single scale.

Do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier. Make each item a separate and independent judgement. Work at a fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless because we want your true impressions.

INITIAL EACH PAGE

GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY
(PSY. 1003, Section 1)

meaningless	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	meaningful (E)
interesting	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	boring (R)
good	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	bad (E)
insensitive	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	sensitive (R)
pleasant	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	unpleasant (UA)
cruel	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	kind (E)
pleasurable	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	painful (E)
tense	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	relaxed (UA)
successful	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	unsuccessful (E)
unimportant	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	important (E)
competitive	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	cooperative (UA)
positive	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	negative (E)
dark	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	bright (UA)
progressive	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	regressive (E)
constrained	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	free (P)

Total Scale Items = 15 Scales (Factors)
8 Evaluative (E)
2 Receptivity (R)
4 Unassigned (UA)
1 Patericy (P)

56 is the possible point total score loaded in the Evaluative factor

INITIALS _____

LECTURE SESSIONS
(MONDAY, WEDNESDAY, FRIDAY)

meaningless	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	meaningful
interesting	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	boring
good	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	bad
insensitive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	sensitive
pleasant	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	unpleasant
cruel	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	kind
pleasurable	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	painful
tense	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	relaxed
successful	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	unsuccessful
unimportant	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	important
competitive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	cooperative
positive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	negative
dark	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	bright
progressive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	regressive
constrained	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	free

INITIALS _____

DISCUSSION SESSIONS
(TUESDAY, THURSDAY)

meaningless	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	meaningful
interesting	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	boring
good	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	bad
insensitive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	sensitive
pleasant	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	unpleasant
cruel	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	kind
pleasurable	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	painful
tense	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	relaxed
successful	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	unsuccessful
unimportant	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	important
competitive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	cooperative
positive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	negative
dark	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	bright
progressive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	regressive
constrained	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	free

INITIALS _____

OBJECTIVE TESTING

meaningless ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ meaningful

interesting ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ boring

good ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ bad

insensitive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ sensitive

pleasant ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ unpleasant

cruel ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ kind

pleasurable ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ painful

tense ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ relaxed

successful ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ unsuccessful

unimportant ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ important

competitive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ cooperative

positive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ negative

dark ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ bright

progressive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ regressive

constrained ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ free

INITIALS _____

GROUP PROJECT

meaningless ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ meaningful

interesting ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ boring

good ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ bad

insensitive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ sensitive

pleasant ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ unpleasant

cruel ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ kind

pleasurable ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ painful

tense ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ relaxed

successful ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ unsuccessful

unimportant ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ important

competitive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ cooperative

positive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ negative

dark ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ bright

progressive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ regressive

constrained ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ free

INITIALS _____

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT
(if you choose to do one then respond below,
if not disregard this page)

meaningless	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	meaningful
interesting	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	boring
good	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	bad
insensitive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	sensitive
pleasant	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	unpleasant
cruel	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	kind
pleasurable	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	painful
tense	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	relaxed
successful	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	unsuccessful
unimportant	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	important
competitive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	cooperative
positive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	negative
dark	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	bright
progressive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	regressive
constrained	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	free

INITIALS _____

APPENDIX E

Summary Table

Population-150
Sample - 98
df = n+n-2=96
.05 Alpha Level

PERSONAL ORIENTATION
(Bass Orientation Inventory 1962)

STUDENT SATISFACTION

(Semantic Differential)

	Interaction-O Group n = 52	t-value	Task-O Group n = 46	2-tail Value
General Psychology	5.27	1.05	5.46	.296
Lecture Sessions	4.58	1.73	4.98	.087
Group Discussion	5.39	.87	5.59	.386
Objective Testing	4.45	.11	4.48	.914
Group Project	5.49	-.32	5.41	.748
Individual Project	3.1322	-.31	2.9592	.761

* p .05

Instruments Used:

Bass Orientation Inventory - (1962)
Bass, Bernard M. The Orientation Inventory; Manual, Consulting Psychologist Press Inc., Palo Alto, California, 1962.

Semantic Differential - (1957)
Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, Illinois; University of Illinois Press, 1957.