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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to examine the affect prospective teachers recall in their early recollections in relation to their present status among peers. More specifically the research questions were: (1) Do prospective teachers' affective responses to their early recollections vary in relation to peers' evaluation of their interpersonal effectiveness as teachers? (2) Do prospective teachers' affective responses vary among three early recollections? (3) Is there an interaction between high or low peer evaluation and affective responses among three early recollections?

Affective responses were assessed in two ways. First, the Osgood (1969) Semantic Differential measured the Evaluation, Potency, and Activity factors of affective responses to early recollections. An adaptation of McCarter's (1961) Scales of Recalled Affect specified the names and intensity of the feelings experienced.

The Ohlsen-Shultz Sociometric Test (1951) was used to select two criterion groups from upper level secondary education classes. The affective response to early recollections of those subjects who received the highest
assessment by peers were compared to the responses of those who received the lowest assessment on the following dimensions: openness to children's personal concerns, willingness to share the work load, ease in unfamiliar social settings, assertiveness in taking initiative to solve difficult group problems, desirability as colleagues, and sensitivity to the opinions of others. In summary, the study investigated the affective response subjects attributed to their early recollections. Further, it compared affect in early recollection of those subjects who are most highly esteemed as prospective workers to those who are least esteemed.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Memory is not only selective but also active. Adlerian personality theory contends that early recollections reflect the individual's present, characteristic outlook on life. These early recollections are not necessarily accurate descriptions of fact, but instead are constructions the individual devises to define his goals and his feelings about how to approach people and situations. Thus Papanek (1972) says:

Each child selects from his many experiences some which impress him deeply and which he makes the landmarks of his cognitive map. We are not interested in the forgotten, but in what is remembered in this way. It is as if the individual would say to himself, "Because this or that happened to me, I should never again behave in a certain way," or, "This or that brought such desirable results that I will behave again in a similar way and thereby reap the same reward."
The early recollections reflect the person's guidelines for his behavior. An incident may really have happened as it is remembered, or the individual's assumptions and explanations about it may have been added, or it may never have happened. The result is the same. The early recollections will reflect the individual's opinion of the world and himself and the path of behavior he has selected for himself to cope with a complicated world (p. 169-170).

What the individual remembers, according to Adlerian theory, is a significant descriptor of his perception of himself with respect to persons and situations. While all recollections reflect the individual's characteristic outlook, Adler proposed that early recollections are most prototypic in that the import of an experience is clear when recalled even after a long period of time.

A critical factor in assessing the importance of early recollections is the feelings the person remembers having at the time of the recalled experience. Rudolf Dreikurs, in class lectures cited by Verger and Camp, (1970: 513) stressed the importance of asking the individual how he felt at the time of the experience, as these associated feelings are indicative of the person's characteristic outlook on his present life situation. Feelings the person recalls from the past guide his approach to interactions and situations in the present. If the feelings recalled in early recollections do provide affective expectancies for present interactions, they may bear a direct relationship to the response the individual receives from others.
Research concerning early recollections has been conducted in two major areas: personality assessment and vocational development. A number of researchers have examined early recollections in relationship to personality (Purcell, 1952; Berman, 1958; McCarter, 1961; Holmes, 1965; Reimanis, 1966; Lieberman, 1967; Taylor, 1973; Smith, 1974). Basically, these studies are attempts to validate and broaden the use of early recollections as a diagnostic tool. Early recollections are used clinically to help the client recognize the goals of his own behavior. A number of studies are based on the contention that if early recollections reflect basic life goals or characteristic outlook, they should also be predictive of diagnostic categories.

Accordingly, several studies have depended on judges' ratings of manifest content and affective tone of early recollections (Taylor, 1973; Smith, 1974). These studies focus on early recollections as a means of confirming clinical diagnosis.

Purcell (1952), McCarter (1961), Holmes (1965), Holmes and Watson (1965), examined the affect the subjects ascribed to their early recollections. Holmes and Watson found that teachers rated their second and third reported early recollections as more pleasant than unpleasant, whereas nurses demonstrated no clear pattern in affective tone. Purcell (1952) found that high-secure people, as rated on Maslow's Security-Insecurity Test, had
significantly more pleasant memories than low-secure people. Holmes (1965) extended these findings using a continuous scale between pleasant and unpleasant, rather than a dichotomous one, and found that on the first early recollection reported the relationship between security and pleasantness was curvilinear with middle-secure having the most pleasant memories. No differences emerged for second and third early recollections. McCarter (1961) used discriminant analysis to differentiate normal adults from five clinically diagnosed groups on the basis of subject ratings of experienced feelings.

These three studies demonstrate the potential of subject ratings of affect experienced in their early recollections. Thus far, subject affect ratings have been simplistic, and yet they have produced some clear-cut results. More discriminating measures hold a great deal of promise for research in early recollections.

Early recollections have also been examined in relationship to vocational choice (Holmes, 1965; Attarian, 1973; Manaster and Perryman, 1974). These studies attempted to define differences between occupational groups. Attarian (1973) found that clinical judgment of early recollections was more discriminating than the Holland Self-Directed Search in predicted actual choice of college curriculum. Manaster (1973) found significant differences in manifest content of several occupational groups. Holmes (1965) differentiated
teachers from nurses on the basis of early recollections and found that teachers had significantly more pleasant memories according to self- and judges'-ratings. The focus of each of these studies was on the differences between groups and not on the differences within groups. No study assessed the differential meanings of early recollections to subjects who chose one particular profession.

Previous studies have overlooked early recollections as a means of helping subjects become aware of how their characteristic outlook relates to peer support and possibilities for personal development within a career. Instead, the focus has been on prediction of career choice. If early recollections are to be used as a tool for self-assessment rather than as a screening device for adequate choices, diagnosis, or selection--then future research will need to examine differences in early recollections within career groups. Furthermore, since Adler (1927) contended that early recollections are used as warnings against obstacles or situations to avoid, as well as rewards to seek actively, ratings of manifest content may be confounding, unless the early recollections can be clearly categorized as warning recollections or as encouraging recollections.

This study provided two important contributions to research in early recollections: (1) the examination of early recollections in relation to peer esteem within a single career group, namely teachers, and (2) a comprehensive
measurement of the feelings the individual attributes to his early recollections.

ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

For the purposes of this study it was assumed that the recollected experiences a subject chooses to report are influenced by his view of himself in relation to his present life situation. Further, it was assumed that the subject's responses to his early recollections provide a holistic measure of the individual's characteristic outlook, and that items of the Semantic Differential with the highest and purest loadings on each factor (Evaluation, Potency, Activity) and the items from McCarter's (1961) Scales of Recalled Affect validly and adequately surveyed the individual's affective responses to his recollections.

The placement of subjects into criterion groups was determined by a sociometric tool which assigned members to groups on the basis of algebraic scores. It was assumed that those whose scores fell into the top and bottom one quarter of each class were comparable even though differences may have existed in the proportion of positive and negative choices for individuals within either criterion group. That is to say, negative choices for a highly esteemed person were not taken as an indication that the subject was not truly esteemed. Such incidents were taken as indications that some individuals who were highly esteemed were
controversial. The sociometric scoring depended not on simplistic, total consensus, but on overall general assessment of strengths and weaknesses of each member in relationship to the whole group. Finally, it was assumed that the first and fourth quartiles indicated subjects differed significantly in how they were perceived by their peers.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Subjects for the study were drawn from among juniors and seniors in the Secondary Education Curriculum of the School of Education at Indiana State University. All subjects were enrolled in required courses at the junior or senior level. While it was not expected that this population would vary greatly from prospective secondary teachers in other institutions, results of the study should be applied to other populations with caution.

Since the examination of early recollections was limited to assessing subject's affective responses to their written recollections, conclusions must be limited to affective responses and not extended to other aspects of recollections. Results of this study regarding the affective component of early recollections are not necessarily applicable to other aspects of early recollections.

In the present study, recollections were collected in written form in a classroom setting. Conceivably, individuals would recall different recollections in a clinical
setting with a counselor or in a group dealing with career
development or personal concerns. Therefore caution is
necessary in applying the results to other means of elic-
itng recollections.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Early Recollections: The description of a specific
experience that the individual remembers vividly. An early
recollection is specific in that the individual recalls the
particular experience vividly, and in detail. An early
recollection is defined by Mosak (1958) as a construction,
not a reproduction; the recollection need not match actual
fact. No distinction was made between factual accounts of
past experiences, experiences recalled because of having
been told about them, and fabrication. The only criteria
were (1) that the recollection is a specific experience,
and (2) that it is vivid.

High-esteemed Group: The category to which those
subjects are assigned who fall into the top one quarter of
the algebraic scores on the Ohlsen-Shultz Sociometric Test
as a result of peer assessment of interpersonal effective-
ness as teachers.

Low-esteemed Group: The category to which those
subjects are assigned who fall into the bottom quarter of
the algebraic scores on the Ohlsen-Shultz Sociometric Test
as a result of peer assessment of interpersonal effectiveness as teachers.

**Prospective Teachers:** Those students who are enrolled in junior or senior level courses in Secondary Education. The courses chosen were daytime sections of Teaching and Learning in the Secondary School (Secondary Education 305) and Foundations of Education (Secondary Education 449). Both courses are part of the required curriculum for majors in Secondary Education.

**Recalled Affect:** The feelings the individual recalls experiencing at the time of the described event. Recalled affect was further defined as ratings on the four following factors:

- **Pleasantness:** the recalled pleasure of the incident. The factor is identified by the item pleased-displeased.

- **Acceptance:** the recalled acceptance of the situation and people involved. The factor is identified by the item accepting-rejecting.

- **Comprehension:** The recalled understanding of the incident. The factor is identified by the item comprehending-puzzled.

- **Aroused:** the recalled involvement in the event. The factor is identified by the item aroused-indifferent.

McCarter (1961) identified these dimensions as the primary factors of recalled affect, and used the above single items to measure each factor. For the purposes of this study,
The items were adapted from McCarter's eighteen point scale to the standard seven point scale Osgood used.

**Affective Meaning:** The meanings the individual ascribes to his recalled affect as defined by ratings on the following factors from Osgood's Semantic Differential (1969):

**Evaluation:** the factor identified by the following items: good-bad, nice-awful, beautiful-ugly, fragrant-foul, sweet-sour, clean-dirty, sacred-profane.

**Potency:** the factor identified by the following items: strong-weak, large-small, heavy-light.

**Activity:** the factor identified by the following items: fast-slow, active-passive, sharp-dull.
Chapter 2

RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE

The research and literature related to early recollections can be divided into three areas: (1) theoretical underpinnings of Adlerian thought, (2) descriptive studies on the relationship between early recollections and various personality measures, and (3) studies dealing with the early recollections of teachers. A fourth section will deal with research and literature related to personal characteristics of teachers.

Adlerian theorists agree on several basic premises about early recollections (Adler, 1927; Mosak, 1958; Papanek, 1972; Ansbacher, 1973; Schrecker, 1973). Early recollections are not thought to reflect "modus operandi," or characteristic behaviors. The individual's basic outlook can remain relatively stable even though behavior may change drastically. For example a person might achieve success by undermining the success of his colleagues or by enhancing cooperation. The crucial aspect of early recollections is not the actual content or behavior described but the function the incident has as a guide for the individual. The individual's affective responses to his recollection is one means of assessing the nature of that guidepost.
Second, early recollections match actual fact to an unknown degree. Rather, they reflect goals and remind clients of obstacles to overcome. They are "voluntary landmarks" in the map the individual follows in his daily decisions (Papanek, 1972). Factual validation of early recollections is, therefore, of no theoretical concern to the Adlerian. The only value in early recollections is identifying the meaning it has for the individual.

Third, the Adlerian conception of early recollections are unique in that they are interpreted holistically. Mosak (1969) differentiated the Adlerian conception from the Freudian conception: Freudian thought fractionates the person into the id-ego-superego structure; whereas individual psychology is based on the indivisibility of the person. From the Adlerian viewpoint, early recollections are a creation of the individual, and not a compromise of antagonistic parts.

Adlerians use early recollections in the following ways:

(a) to help the therapist understand the patient's life style, (b) to help the patient understand his own life style, and thereby (c) to open for the patient the possibility of choosing more healthy behavior and gaining courage to try out new, socially and individually more useful attitudes (Papanek, 1972: 176).

Thus, early recollections are conceived of as symbolic reflections of the individual's whole outlook on life. They are useful to therapists or teachers in understanding the individual and helping the individual to identify and better meet his own goals.
EARLY RECOLLECTIONS AND PERSONALITY

McCarter (1961) differentiated clinically diagnosed and normal subjects on the feelings they recalled experiencing at the time of important life events. Each subject recalled his first recollection in each of five specific situations, and then, without recording the recollection, rated his feelings as more or less pleased or displeased, accepting or rejecting, aroused or indifferent, comprehending or puzzled. Since factors were independent, they could be linearly combined. A multiple discriminant analysis revealed significant differences between recalled affect of normal adult males and all clinically diagnosed groups. Also, paranoid schizophrenics and organically impaired patients were differentiated from each other and from all other groups.

To develop a system for analyzing manifest content, Langs, et al (1960) collected memories from four hundred patients. The derived system was then used to differentiate ten paranoid schizophrenics from ten hysterical character disorders. The scoring system produced a number of significant differences between the two groups. However, caution is necessary in generalizing from such a small sample.

In a follow-up study, Langs (1965a) demonstrated the predictive utility of the scoring system to differentiate clinical groups. Early recollections collected from 48 men were scored on the previously developed scoring
system. These scores were compared to personality vari-
able determined by a battery of psychological tests.
Inter-correlations indicated that traumatic recollections
were positively related to low self-esteem, poor attitudes
towards work, manipulative attitudes, acting out, and pro-
jection as a major defense.

Smith (1974) examined early recollections in rela-
tionship to locus of control. Early recollections of high
school students were rated on an adaptation of the Rotter
locus of control scale. Locus of control was also measured
through the Rotter I-E and through the Dies TAT I-E. No
significant relationships emerged. Concurrent validity of
this method of assessing early recollections was not estab-
lished.

Berman (1958) found thematic differences in the
early recollections of eleven and seventeen year-olds who
were categorized as well adjusted or poorly adjusted on the
basis of a checklist inventory of personality traits. Each
subject gave his first three early recollections and then
twenty-one more recollections were elicited by sets of stim-
ulus words. Judges assessed the thematic content of all the
recollections. No criteria were given for defining the
thematic categories.

In a study by Taylor (1973), behavioral predictions
were made from the content of early recollections of col-
lege students enrolled in a group process class. Video-
taped sessions of the class provided samples of overt
behavior which was categorized on the Combs' Perceptual Characteristics Rating Scale. Judges' predictions of behavior as assessed from early recollections on an adapted form of the Combs' scale, were not accurate reflections of actual behavior.

Anomie, the view of society as normless, was related by Reimanis (1966) to content of early experiences. Both college students and middle-aged adults responded to the Srole scale, as measure of anomie, and to the Childhood Experience Questionnaire. Findings showed that anomie was greatest where childhood experiences did not foster, or actually interfered with, the development of social interest.

Grey (1959) concluded that early recollections were not adequate to screen maladjusted applicants from junior college. College students were designated normal or maladjusted on the basis of the MMPI. Early recollections were collected in written form from each subject and were rated by content and affect. Significant differences emerged only when most and least maladjusted subjects were separated. The most maladjusted were significantly different from normal subjects.

Holmes (1965) replicated an early study by Purcell (1952) and confirmed the finding that subjects' level of security as measured by Maslow's Security-Insecurity Test was directly related to individual and judges' ratings of the pleasantness or unpleasantness of early recollections.
Specifically, low-secure individuals had more unpleasant memories than high-secure individuals. However, Holmes reanalyzed the data on a continuous scale and found a curvilinear relationship where the middle-secure subjects had the most pleasant memories on the first early recollection recorded. Holmes found no differences between groups when he reanalyzed second and third memories.

Rule (1972) compared empathy and genuineness perceived by peers in group counseling and the level of security in early recollections as rated by judges on four bipolar continuums. Since no differences were statistically significant, he suggests that future research focus on the holistic nature of behavior rather than on isolated characteristics.

Lieberman (1967) tested the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between content of early recollections and projective data. The sample was twenty-five females, eleven psychotic and fourteen non-psychotic, from ages fifteen to fifty-one. Lieberman wrote reports on the basis of earliest recollections and recollections related to mother and father. A staff psychologist wrote a report on the usual projective test battery. Both reports were subjected to a descriptive checklist covering perception of the environment and reaction to the environment. The correlation between the two was significant at the .001
level. The author concluded,

While it was found that significantly more information was received from the psychological report than the earliest memories, these memories appear capable of serving as a rapid, valuable sample of the type of data likely to be reflected by the longer time consuming examinations." (Lieberman, 1967: 35).

Of the studies cited only Rule (1972), Taylor (1973), and Smith (1974) reported no significant findings. The other studies reported specific findings which support the value of further research in the area. However, it is apparent that most methods of assessing early recollections either fail to be comprehensive or fail to take into account the affective response of the individual. Thus far, scales designed for S's to rate their early recollections are simplistic and therefore not highly discriminating. Several studies used pleasantness-unpleasantness as a primary dimension for a subject's rating of his early recollections. Such a simple measure fails to take into account the full range of feelings possible for the subject. On the other hand, the comprehensive rating systems devised for judges neglect the meaning of the early recollection to the subject. Such scoring devices seem to be devised for screening and diagnosis rather than for identifying the individual's characteristic outlook on life. The individual is examined in a vacuum without reference to the role he sees himself assuming with the people in his life.
Manaster and Perryman (1974) collected written early recollections from graduate students in teaching, counseling, nursing, biology, and business. Differences in judges' ratings of manifest content emerged between the helping professions (teaching, nursing, and counseling) and biology and business. Those in helping professions used the word "mother" more often and prospective teachers had more neutral affect as rated by judges, than prospective counselors or nurses in training. Results were not dependent on combining the three recollections collected. Manaster and Perryman (1974) concluded that early recollections could be useful in vocational guidance.

Attarian (1973) randomly selected thirty-one males from six different college curriculums. He collected three written early recollections from each and administered the Holland Self-Directed Search (SDS). Three judges read the early recollections and predicted educational preference with better than chance success. Although the SDS is logically predictive of educational preference, it predicted with less than chance success.

Holmes (1965) compared early recollections of first year teacher trainees and nurse trainees. Each subject wrote her first three early recollections, two educational early recollections, and two medical early recollections.
Then the subjects rated each early recollection on a pleasantness-unpleasantness scale. Early recollections were also rated on the basis of manifest content. Teacher trainees cited more educational early recollections on the first three early recollections combined than did the nurses. However, the difference was not significant when only the first early recollection was used. When all three freely associated early recollections were taken into account, teachers reported significantly more pleasant early recollections than did nurses. The difference was significant at the .05 level. Once again, the first early recollection alone did not differentiate teachers from nurses.

These three studies focus on differences between professional groups. Early recollections demonstrate some promise as a tool for predicting vocational choice. However, predictive ability of a tool does not support the adequacy of the tool as a way of assessing possibilities for satisfaction. Presumably, those who are esteemed receive the satisfaction of support and acknowledgment. Research that related early recollections to colleague perceptions would be useful in exploring the possibilities for using recollections as a resource for career development.

TEACHERS' PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

This section will review literature concerning teachers' personal characteristics. The central thesis of
the study is that individuals with different approaches to life are perceived differently by others. Examination of personal characteristics as they relate to measures of teaching effectiveness will be made. Teacher characteristics will then be examined in specific relation to colleague evaluation.

In 1960, Ryans published a monumental study of the characteristics of teachers. The work was carried out in 450 school systems beginning in 1948. Those who were generally assessed by observer teams as good teachers could be characterized as generous in appraisal of behavior and motives of others, interested in literature and art, active in social groups, involved in pupil relationships, non-directive in preference of classroom procedures, intelligent and emotionally well adjusted. As opposed to teachers rated favorably, teachers rated unfavorably (at least one standard deviation below the mean) were characterized as being more critical of others, less involved with others personally, younger, not as bright, and not as well-adjusted emotionally (Ryans, 1960, pp. 397-398).

The study also indicated that those who were judged as warm, understanding, and stimulating possessed more favorable attitudes towards pupils. However, assessment of the pupils' behavior did not bear any relationship to teachers attitudes (Ryans, 1960, p. 385).
Stanton (1973) suggested that good teaching is based on the teacher's personality, or more specifically, his effective use of his unique self. Proposing that teacher behavior is a function of his personality, the author concluded that teacher education must be concerned with personal growth. Qualities like congruence, acceptance, and empathetic understanding are characteristics that are reflective of Ryans' (1960) descriptions of the most effective teachers. Development of these characteristics, according to Stanton, must be a central part of teacher education curricula.

Dandes (1966) set out the proposition that valuable teacher characteristics were warmth, non-authoritarianism, openness of belief system and liberalism in educational ideals. Teachers were sent the Personal Orientation Inventory as a measure of self-actualization, the Dogmatism Scale, the California F Scale as a measure of authoritarianism, and the Inventory of Opinions on Educational Issues. The 118 responses were correlated and results indicated that the psychologically healthy teacher did indeed manifest characteristics associated with good teaching.

While teachers' personal characteristics and potential for growth can be assessed through clinical and diagnostic means, students' perceptions are also critical in assessing teachers' interpersonal effectiveness.
Influence of teacher personality on students' perceptions was investigated by Murray (1972). Teachers' self-actualization was measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory and student perception of teacher concern was measured by the Student Estimate of Teacher Concern. Five teachers selected as self-actualizing and five as non-self-actualizing were rated by 382 students. Differences between the two groups were significant at the .0001 level showing that self-actualizing teachers were perceived as more concerned than non-self-actualizing teachers.

Emmerling (1961) compared students' perceptions of teachers to the teachers' Q-sort evaluation of problems they experienced as teachers. Teachers who were most open in their descriptions were characterized as empathic and congruent, according to the Relationship Inventory, and as pupil-centered on the Schuman Student Centeredness Scale. The author concluded that teacher openness was directly related to positive perceptions of teachers' interpersonal characteristics.

Finally, three studies specifically related personal characteristics of teachers to evaluation by colleagues.

Issacson, McKeachie and Milholland (1963) correlated college students' perceptions of their psychology instructors, colleagues' perceptions of each other and the instructor's personality. The instruments were the Descriptive Adjective Scale, a measure of students' perceptions
of teacher effectiveness, the Peer Group Nomination, and a test developed by Catell's Institute for Personality and Ability Testing. The overall score for student rating of effectiveness correlated most clearly with peer characterization of the teachers as cultured, that is, artistic, imaginative, and effectively intellectual. Specific student ratings of teachers' rapport correlated positively with peers' assessment of teachers' enthusiasm, and students' high ratings on skillfulness correlated positively with emotional stability as measured by the personality test. Students' high ratings on skillfulness correlated positively with emotional stability, as measured by the personality test. Unexpectedly, colleague perception of warmth did not appear to be a factor relating to students' high evaluation of teachers. The findings exemplify the complexity involved in assessing teacher characteristics in relationship to impact on students and peers.

Zahn (1965) concluded that open student teachers, as measured by the Dogmatism Scale, were perceived by their cooperating teachers as more harmonious in their relationships to students than closed student teachers. Furthermore, the quality of the student teacher's performance was related to his openness as measured by the Dogmatism Scale. Those who are not limited by a strong belief system, that is, those who are most open, improved most in their teaching
attitudes when supervised through Interaction Analysis as opposed to traditional supervisory techniques.

Webb's (1971) study supported the hypothesis that students have more positive attitudes towards sensitive teachers. Colleagues chose the most and least sensitive teachers of junior high students in one community. Students who were classified as insecure or as problem students had more negative attitudes towards classes where teachers were rated as low in sensitivity than where teachers were rated as high in sensitivity.

SUMMARY OF LITERATURE

The review of recent literature on teachers' traits indicates a relationship between a number of personal characteristics and the perceptions of students, colleagues, and supervisors. Congruence, acceptance, and empathy have been linked to positive perceptions of students (Emmerling, 1961; Stanton, 1973). Cooperating teachers judged open student teachers as more effective in their interpersonal relationships with students than closed student teachers (Zahn, 1965). Webb (1971) related sensitivity of teachers to educational attitudes of students and found that problem students were most debilitated in their attitudes by insensitive teachers. These findings support Ryans' (1960) original findings that teachers rated most highly by observers were warm and understanding, organized and stimulating.
Thus far, research has focused on global measures of teachers' personality such as openness or self-actualization as correlates of colleague and student perceptions. Further research might focus on the nature of teachers' affective responses to their own life experiences.

The review of the present research on early recollections did not consistently support the use of early recollections as a diagnostic or selection device but did demonstrate enough promise to encourage further, more refined research. Berman (1958), McCarter (1961), Reimanis (1966), and Lieberman (1967) demonstrated the utility of early recollections as a part of diagnosis. Lieberman (1967) concluded that, although the usual psychological assessment yields more information, the findings would be in essential agreement with interpretation of early recollections, a quick and inexpensive device.

In relation to vocational choices, early recollections yield relevant data, as indicated by judges' ability to predict vocational choice on the basis of three early recollections (Attarian, 1973). Holmes (1965) was able to differentiate the recollections of teachers and nurses and Manaster and Perryman (1974) distinguished persons according to a variety of college curriculums. These writers substantiate clinical support for the validity and usefulness of early recollections. (Adler, 1927; Mozak, 1969; Verger, 1970; Papanek, 1972; Ansbacher, 1973; Schrecker, 1973).
However, present research has not dealt with all of the salient features of early recollections described by Adlerian theory. For research to yield clearer, more consistent results, measures of early recollections must fit the theoretical conceptions of early recollections as: holistic, or reflective of a person's total life outlook; constructed rather than faithfully reproduced; and understandable only in relation to the individual's unique experiencing of the event.

One specific need for further research was to assess comprehensively the feelings the individual attributes to his early recollections. Previous research has demonstrated that more discriminating measures of affect were necessary. A second need was to continue vocationally related early recollection research. In particular, it seemed fruitful to examine differences in early recollections within career groups.

Chapter Three presents a design for a study that incorporated these two basic suggestions.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is a presentation of the general plan and procedures. It is divided into the following three sections: (1) Major hypotheses investigated, (2) Implementation of the study, and (3) Analysis of the data.

MAJOR HYPOTHESES INVESTIGATED

The major hypotheses investigated in this study are stated below in the null form. Each of the three hypotheses was tested separately for each of seven factors. The hypotheses were stated as follows:

The hypothesis for testing the differences between groups: There are no statistically significant differences between the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups in scores totaled for all three recollections for the Evaluation, Potency, and Activity factors (Osgood, 1969) and for the Acceptance, Pleasantness, Arousal and Comprehension factors (McCarter, 1961).

The hypothesis for testing the within group comparison was stated: There are no statistically significant differences among the scores for the three recollections
within the high-esteem group and within the low-esteem group for the Evaluation, Potency, Activity factors (Osgood, 1969) and for the Acceptance, Pleasantness, Arousal and Comprehension factors (McCarter, 1961).

The interaction hypothesis was stated: There is no statistically significant interaction between the high-esteem or low-esteem group membership and the scores among three recollections for the Evaluation, Potency, and Activity factors (Osgood, 1969) and for the Acceptance, Pleasantness, Arousal and Comprehension factors (McCarter, 1961).

DESCRIPTION AND SELECTION
OF THE SUBJECTS

The sample was drawn from juniors and seniors enrolled in Secondary Education 305, Teaching and Learning in Secondary Schools, and, in Secondary Education 449, Foundations of Education, during the spring semester of 1975 at Indiana State University. Data was collected from approximately 200 students in Secondary Education 305 and approximately 90 students enrolled in Secondary Education 449. Choice of specific class sections used was dependent on cooperation of the specific faculty members. Only those subjects who fell into the top or bottom one quarter of the sociometric scale were included as subjects for the study. The sample included fifty-six subjects in each of the two criterion groups.
COLLECTION OF THE DATA

The investigator collected all the data during one regular class period of each section. First, subjects were asked to arrange their seats so that they could see one another. Each person then received booklets containing both the materials for their early recollections and the Ohlsen-Shultz Sociometric Test. Subjects were asked to recall and then briefly write their earliest recollections. They were asked to recall the feelings they remembered and on the next page of the booklet, respond to those feelings. Each person repeated the process for the two next earliest recollections.

Each person had received his booklet in a folder with a code name on it. With the folder in front of him, like an open book so that all other class members could see the code names, each person filled out the Ohlsen-Shultz Sociometric Test, using the code name for identifying peers.

The process of data collection took approximately thirty minutes of class time. None of the data were directly related to specific class members. Complete anonymity was maintained. Once the data were gathered, the purposes of the study were shared with all classes.

The investigator collected the data during the last week of April, 1975 and the first week of May, 1975. The use of a single investigator and standard instructions decreased variation in style of instrument administration.
OSGOOD'S SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

The Semantic Differential was selected because it provides a measure of the subject's affective responses to a stimulus. The review of the literature substantiates the Semantic Differential as a tool which elicits metaphorical responses from the individual rather than literal interpretations. These associational responses are dependent on the individual's subjective experiences. Thus, the Semantic Differential is particularly appropriate for measurement of psychological stimuli.

Furthermore, the literature indicates a dominance of the primary factors identified by Osgood as Evaluation, Potency, and Activity. Although these factors do not always emerge independently, they do, either jointly or independently, measure the dominant aspects of affective meaning a person attributes to stimuli.

The review of the literature is divided into: (1) a description of the instrument and its development, (2) the use of the Semantic Differential in personality study, (3) the use of the Semantic Differential in the study of emotions, (4) and the use of the Semantic Differential in the study of values and attitudes, and (5) summary of the research.

The Semantic Differential is a combination of associational and scaling procedures for the measurement of meaning. It is composed of sets of bipolar adjectives on
which individuals can rate the connotative meanings of concepts, experiences, or persons. Each scale is divided into seven equal sections for the individual to indicate the strength and direction of his response to the stimulus.

Osgood (1969) based the Semantic Differential on two separate factorial analyses. In the first analysis, one hundred subjects rated twenty concepts on fifty scales. The results revealed three clear factors which he named Evaluation, Potency, and Activity. Evaluation accounted for nearly half of the variance. Potency and Activity each accounted for roughly half as much as Evaluation. Several other factors were not defined clearly enough to be drawn out as separate factors. Osgood does not claim that the three factors measure the whole affective semantic space (Osgood, 1974). However, Evaluation, Potency and Activity have emerged as independent factors in over twenty language-cultural communities (Osgood, 1964). A standard list of stimuli was given to subjects from each culture, and qualifiers were elicited. The predominant qualifiers were then used to elicit their opposites. Finally, the selected pairs of opposites were used as rating scales for one hundred concepts. Each subset of ten concepts was judged on all the scales by twenty subjects. In each language group Evaluation, Potency, and Activity emerged as the primary factors. Clearly, the Semantic Differential consistently reveals the three factors: Evaluation, Potency, and Activity.
To date, the Semantic Differential has been used in over 500 studies. The research began with studies of synesthesia, the description of one sensory experience, in terms of another of the five senses. For example, music can be described in terms of color. These studies demonstrated that meanings of an experience can be located on a continuum between pairs of polar opposites (Karwoski and Odbert, 1938; Karwoski, Odbert, and Osgood, 1942). Furthermore, these studies indicated the metaphoric nature of the scales. Osgood (1974) prefers to call these metaphoric responses "affective" because the subject is required to make an experiential link between the stimulus and the scales.

**Semantic Differential and the Study of Personality**

The Semantic Differential is particularly useful in the area of psychology as a measure of self and others (Endler, 1961; Feshbach and Beigel, 1968; Taylor, 1971; Clancy, 1972). Endler found that female patients' assessment of self on the Semantic Differential changed during the course of psychotherapy and that these changes correlated significantly with clinical assessment of success in therapy.

Taylor (1971) used the Semantic Differential to assess the relationship between the individual's attitude toward an issue and the way he perceived another individual's attitude toward the same issue. The subject used the Semantic Differential to respond to a controversial issue. Also,
from a role-playing situation Taylor surmised and rated the role player's attitude towards the same issue. Subjects' opinions correlated significantly with perceptions of the role players.

Rentz, Fears, and White (1968) used the Semantic Differential as a sociometric device by having each student rate his peers on the Differential. The authors found that the peer choices were highly related to personality factors as identified by the Junior-Senior High School Personality Questionnaire. They concluded that, "the groups perceived the independent, persevering, somewhat bright individual, who was sensitive to group needs as desirable and worthwhile (p. 66)." Individuals with positive traits were affirmed by their peers.

Everett (1973) attempted personality assessment through comparing similarity of meaning space between the concept "myself" and other concepts. College students were divided into low and high achievers in order to compare ratings of "myself" and several "achievement" concepts. No significant similarities emerged; nor did comparison of "myself" to the Allport-Vernon Scale of Values yield significant similarities. Finally, students both ranked and semantically rated the values in the Allport-Vernon Scales and again no significant relation emerged.

Everett concluded that the Semantic Differential was not accurate enough to measure the relation between
semantic space and the preference and similarity space derived by independent means. However, students were not asked to respond to the "achievement" concepts with personal reference to themselves. Certainly the concept "myself" was personalized, but the other terms could have been rated with personal reference or with an abstract, general reference. The former would have been appropriate for this particular study.

Semantic Differential and the Study of Emotions

Block (1957) asked the question: What are the factors behind emotions for men and women and across cultures? He first asked American men and women to rate fifteen emotions, such as Love and Anger on a twenty item form of the Semantic Differential. The sums for the adjective pairs for each emotion were rank-ordered. The rank-order correlations between men and women ranged from .84 to .98 except for Grief, yielding three clear factors: pleasantness-unpleasantness, level of activation, and interrelatedness. Block found similar results when he conducted the study with a Norwegian sample. However, where differences were found, it was hypothesized that judges who were familiar with both cultures could predict cultural leanings. Judges' consensus was accurate beyond the .01 level of significance. The author concluded that there is a strong congruence in the affective meaning of emotions
across these two cultures, and where differences exist they are predictable and reflective of the culture.

McCarter (1961) used an adaptation of the Semantic Differential. College students recalled past experiences in which they experienced opposite feelings. For example, an individual may have recalled his happiest and his saddest experiences. He would then rate the similarity between eighty emotions and the feelings he recalled in the two events.

Factor analysis revealed four factors which McCarter named: pleased-displeased, indifferent-aroused, accepting-rejecting, puzzled-comprehending. The first factor accounted for 44.2% of the variance while the last three factors combined accounted for 14.7% of the remaining variance. McCarter used these factor names as single Semantic Differential items to measure the recalled affect in early recollections of normal and clinical groups. Discriminant analysis clearly separated normal and clinical groups.

Semantic Differential and the Study of Values and Attitudes

In order to examine the meaning of college students' preferences for particular ways of life, Osgood, Ware and Morris (1961) assessed male college students' Semantic Differential responses to descriptions of thirteen ways of life. Students also ranked the descriptions in order of
preference. Results indicated that for this population preferred modes of life are good, potent, active and venturesome as opposed to bad, weak, passive, and dull. These usually independent factors fused into one single predominant factor. Two other factors were clearly defined: predictability and kindness.

This study demonstrated that the Semantic Differential can be used to rate complex stimuli. Unlike most studies in which the subjects respond to one word concepts, these subjects reacted to whole paragraphs of one hundred words or more.

Furthermore, this study indicated that the factors of Evaluation, Potency and Activity do not cover the entire affective meaning space and that these three independent factors can be fused under certain circumstances with certain subjects.

Homant (1969) compared Semantic Differential ratings of each of the values listed in Rokeach's Values to rankings of those values. Evaluation, Potency, and Activity scores were correlated with the rank value. Homant found a .68 and .62 correlation between the Evaluative factor and the rankings, indicating that high ranked values tended to be evaluated positively on the Semantic Differential. There was correlation between Potency and Activity and the rankings. Priorities in values could be assessed through Evaluation items of the Semantic Differential.
In assessing non-cognitive outcomes of teacher training Stiggans (1972) employed the Semantic Differential. The sample of 252 undergraduate education majors rated concepts related to the interpersonal demands of teaching and concepts not related to teaching. The interpersonal terms were systematically presented in class. Ratings at the beginning and end of the term were first factor analyzed, yielding a four factor solution: Evaluative, Personally Evaluative, Leniency, and a combination of Activity and Potency. Then, multivariate analysis of these factor scores revealed significant changes in meaning of the interpersonal terms, but not in the unrelated concepts. The author suggested that assessment of personal meanings of concepts relating to teaching would be a valuable addition to teacher education.

Clancy (1972) asked school counselors to respond to twenty occupations on the Semantic Differential. Half of the counselors responded simply to job titles; whereas the other half responded to paragraphs which described the job and work conditions; the subjects also completed a demographic questionnaire and the Dogmatism Scale.

Analysis of variance was employed to test differences between the Semantic Differential scores for the two levels of information and the high or low dogmatism of the counselors. Differences in the Semantic Differential scores were significant at the .01 level of significance,
indicating that highly dogmatic counselors tended to be undiscriminatingly positive toward all the occupations listed. Furthermore, greater information yielded less favorable ratings of occupations. This study indicates the plausibility of using the Semantic Differential to measure the meaning of described activities; the Semantic Differential is not limited to measuring responses to single word concepts.

Do people who have a positive attitude toward a concept have different meaning space for the concept than those who have negative attitudes toward it? To answer the question, Szalay, Windle, and Lysne (1970) asked subjects to rate controversial words on the Semantic Differential and to respond to those same words on an attitude questionnaire. High intercorrelations indicated that subjects who disagreed on an issue as determined by the attitude questionnaire also differed in the affective meaning they attributed to controversial words related to that issue. The Semantic Differential appeared to be a valuable tool in understanding values.

**Summary of Research**

In the study of personality the Semantic Differential has proven to be a unique tool, enabling assessment of the individual's affective responses to personally significant concepts, experiences, activities and persons.
Endler (1961) effectively used the Semantic Differential as a measure of growth in psychotherapy. Taylor (1971) found a clear relation between ratings of one's own perceptions and ratings of other's perceptions. Rentz, Fears, and White (1968) demonstrated that the Semantic Differential used as a sociometric device clearly taps desirable personality characteristics.

Quite differently, Everett (1973) concluded that the Semantic Differential is not effective in matching semantic spaces that he contended should be similar. His study of values was similar to one by Osgood, Ware, and Morris (1961) where Semantic Differential ratings of thirteen ways of life demonstrated consistent student preferences. Perhaps the differences in results of these two studies could be explained by instructions which personalized the concepts for the latter subjects but not for the former. Szalay, Windle and Lysne (1970) and Homant (1969) also provided good support for the use of the Semantic Differential in the study of values.

related to early experiences. Neither of these studies relied on Osgood's Evaluation, Potency, Activity configuration. Osgood (1969) contended that these factors were consistent, primary dimensions of affective meaning. Although he contended that under some circumstances these factors may merge and others may be measurable, he stolidly upheld Evaluation, Potency, and Activity as primary factors. The instances where they merge, Evaluation tended to be the dominant dimension.

Based on the vast support for the use of the Semantic Differential as a measure of the individual's affective responses to ideas, experiences, and persons, the Semantic Differential was accepted as appropriate for this study. It was used to assess the feelings subjects experienced in their earliest recollections. The items that Osgood (1969) has identified as the purest measures for each of the three primary factors were utilized. (See Appendix B.)

In addition, the four items from McCarter's (1961) study were adapted from an eighteen point scale to the standard seven point scale used by Osgood. These items were analyzed separately as no data existed to demonstrate their relationship to Osgood's factors. All the items were listed in random sequence and varied as to whether the negative or positive adjective was first.
The Ohlsen-Shultz Sociometric Test was designed from a description that students and supervisors deemed to be important characteristics of prospective teachers. The test was developed over a period of five years from 1949 to 1954. The final version consisted of twelve items which require each member to name those prospective teachers (the top and bottom fifteen percent) who are perceived as desirable or undesirable colleagues and teachers. The scale demonstrated test-retest coefficients ranged from .72 and .92.

The Ohlsen-Shultz Sociometric Test was first used to examine peer assessment in relationship to college class, age, cumulative grade point average, performance on the American Council on Education Psychological Examination, stated personal values of life, and the student's reasons for choosing teaching as a career. Most items differentiated the extremes (the items which did not were deleted from further use). Ohlsen and Dennis (1951) concluded that on retest the proportion of persons named was increased and those who were most esteemed were recognized early. In addition, those who were most esteemed tended to get better grades, take a less self-centered attitude toward life than the other groups, and were inclined to have improved their status in the group over the term. Those who were not highly esteemed were likely to be mediocre students, were
inclined to put self first, and had chosen teaching for purposes of employment security.

Ohlsen and Shultz (1954) conducted a second study at the University of Illinois and found that those students who were identified by a conference of judges as the best student teachers were also better accepted by peers. Likewise, those chosen as poorest student teachers were least accepted by peers. Chance could not account for the differences in algebraic scores on the sociometric test between best and poorest student teachers. These differences were significant at the .01 level of significance based on analysis of variance.

Shultz (1954) conducted a follow-up on the best and poorest student teachers and found that approximately an equal number of both groups taught during the year following graduation. Shultz measured the success of these first year teachers on a behavioral assessment instrument he developed and administered to the building principal, a class of pupils taught by the teacher, and to the teacher himself. Both best and poorest former student teachers saw themselves as performing differently than did their pupils and administrators. Administrators rated the best student teachers more favorably than the poorest student teachers, but these findings only reached the .07 level of significance. Responses of the pupils taught by the two groups were significantly different at the .01 level for three of
the six items, at the .10 level for two items and at the .05 level for one item. These findings provided further validation for the accuracy and consistency of student teachers perceptions of their peers' impact on colleagues, teachers, and administrators.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The analysis of the data was divided into two parts. First, the algebraic scores of the Ohlsen-Shultz Sociometric Test for each class section were computed to identify those who fell into the top and bottom quarters of each class section. Those who fell into the top quarter were the high-esteemed group and those who fell into the bottom quarter were the low-esteemed group.

Second, the affective responses to early recollections were scored by adding the scores for items representing Osgood's factors. Each recollection had one score for each of three factors as well as single scores for the McCarter (1961) items. Scores for each item ranged from a one, representing the positive end of the scale, to seven, representing the negative end.

Analysis of variance over repeated measures with equal cell frequency (Dayton, 1970: 246-256) was used to test the hypotheses for each factor concerning: (1) differences between groups on all three recollections for a particular affective factor, (2) differences in the factor's
scores among the three recollections within each group, (3) the interaction between the group membership and factor scores among the three recollections. A separate analysis of variance was conducted for each factor of the Semantic Differential and for the factors identified by McCarter (1961). A significant difference between groups was taken to indicate a relationship between affective responses to recollections and peer perceptions. A significant difference among recollections within a group was taken to indicate the presence of a group specific pattern in affective meaning of the three reported recollections. Finally, significant interaction was taken to indicate that high-esteemed and low-esteemed groups differed in the patterns of affective meaning of their three reported recollections.

In the statistical treatment outlined above, a computed F-value at or below the .05 level of significance was considered acceptable for rejection of the null hypothesis.
Chapter 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents restatements of the null hypotheses and statistical findings. Secondary education students, who were differentiated on the basis of peer perceptions of interpersonal effectiveness as teachers, were compared to assess differences in the feelings they attached to their early recollections. Seven affective measures were employed. Three measures were derived from Osgood's (1969) Semantic Differential primary factors: Evaluation, Potency, and Activity. Four were derived from McCarter's (1961) Scales of Recalled Affect: Comprehension, Acceptance, Arousal, and Pleasantness. Each measure was repeated for the first, second, and third earliest recollections reported by each subject for both the Semantic Differential and the McCarter scales. Subjects employed the entire range of scores to indicate their affective responses. The statistical test employed was analysis of variance over repeated measures with equal cell frequency. The t-test comparisons of the high-esteemed prospective teachers to the low-esteemed prospective teachers were made on each variable for each of the three recollections.

The hypotheses for each analysis of variance are stated and the findings for between group comparison, within
group comparison, and interaction are discussed together.
Separate t-test comparisons would have been computed to
determine the specific source of differences if an analysis
of variance had revealed statistically significant results.

AFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO EARLY RECOLLECTIONS
BASED ON THE EVALUATION FACTOR
OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Analysis of variance over repeated measures was
used in testing the following three hypotheses concerning
the relationship between Evaluation Factor of affect
attributed to early recollections and peer assessment of
high or low professional potential.

The between group comparison was tested by the
hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differ-
ences between the high-esteemed and low-esteemed groups
in Evaluation scores totaled for all three recollections.

The within group comparison was tested by the
hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differ-
ences among the Evaluation scores for the three early
recollections combining the high-esteemed and the low-
esteemed groups.

The interaction was tested by the hypothesis:
There is no statistically significant interaction between
high-esteemed or low-esteemed group membership and the
Evaluation scores among the three early recollections.
Table 1 presents the summary statistics for the analysis of variance over repeated measures as it was applied to the Evaluation Factor of the Semantic Differential.

Findings

The analysis of variance over repeated measures indicated:

(1) There were no significant differences between the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups in their Evaluation scores totaled for three early recollections. The obtained F-value of 0.607 did not surpass the required F=3.93 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

(2) There were no significant within group differences in Evaluation scores totaled for the three early recollections. The computed F-value of 0.796 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

(3) There was no significant interaction between high-esteemed or low-esteemed group membership and Evaluation scores among the three early recollections. The computed F-value of 0.324 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

In all three cases, therefore, the null hypotheses for the analysis of variance were retained as tenable hypotheses. It was concluded that the high-esteemed and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>13890.238</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>76.190</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76.190</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.437706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Within Groups</td>
<td>13814.048</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error Between)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>27853.333</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>199.500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.750</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.452470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem X Evaluation</td>
<td>81.238</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.619</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.723525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation X Subjects</td>
<td>27572.595</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error Within)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
low-esteemed prospective teachers did not differ significantly in their Evaluation scores related to the affective component of three early recollections.

**AFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO EARLY RECOLLECTIONS**
**BASED ON THE POTENCY FACTOR OF**
**THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL**

Analysis of variance over repeated measures was used in testing the following three hypotheses concerning the Potency Factor of affect related to early recollections as assessed by prospective secondary teachers perceived by peers as having either high or low professional potential.

The between group comparison was tested by the hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differences between the high-esteemed and low-esteemed groups in Potency scores totaled for all three recollections.

The within group comparison was tested by the hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differences among the Potency scores for the three early recollections combining the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups.

The interaction was tested by the hypothesis: There is no statistically significant interaction between high-esteemed and low-esteemed group membership and Potency scores among the three early recollections.
Table 2 presents the summary statistics for the analysis of variance over repeated measures as it is applied to the Potency Factor of the Semantic Differential.

Findings

The analysis of variance over repeated measures indicated:

(1) There were no significant differences between the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups in their Potency scores totaled for three early recollections. The obtained F-value of 1.743 did not surpass the required F=3.93 for a p=0.05 level of statistical significance.

(2) There were no significant group differences in Potency scores totaled for three early recollections. The computed F-value of 1.690 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=0.05 level of statistical significance.

(3) There was no significant interaction between high-esteemed or low-esteemed group membership and Potency scores among the three early recollections. The computed F-value of 0.032 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=0.05 level of statistical significance.

In all three cases, therefore, the null hypotheses for the analysis of variance were retained as tenable hypotheses. It was concluded that the high-esteemed and low-esteemed prospective teachers did not differ significantly in their Potency scores related to the affective component of three early recollections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>1721.997</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1721.997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>26.860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.860</td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td>0.189501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Within Groups (Error Between)</td>
<td>1695.137</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>15.410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>1885.333</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potency</td>
<td>28.518</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.259</td>
<td>1.690</td>
<td>0.186920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem X Potency</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.968416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem X Subjects Within Groups (Error Within)</td>
<td>1856.274</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>8.438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO EARLY RECOLLECTIONS
BASED ON THE ACTIVITY FACTOR OF
THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Analysis of variance over repeated measures was
used in testing the following three hypotheses concerning
the Activity Factor of affect related to early recollections as assessed by prospective secondary teachers perceived by peers as having either high or low professional potential.

The between group comparison was tested by the hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differences between the high-esteemed and low-esteemed groups in Activity scores totaled for all three recollections.

The within group comparison was tested by the hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differences among the Activity scores for the three early recollections combining high-esteemed and low-esteemed groups.

The interaction was tested by the hypothesis: There is no statistically significant interaction between high-esteemed and low-esteemed group membership and Activity scores among the three early recollections.

Table 3 presents the summary statistics for the analysis of variance over repeated measures as it was applied to the Activity Factor of the Semantic Differential.
Table 3

Analysis of Variance of Peer Esteem and Activity of Affect in Early Recollections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>2455.307</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>38.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.003</td>
<td>1.729</td>
<td>0.191231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Within Groups (Error Between)</td>
<td>2417.304</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>21.975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>2912.667</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>13.714</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.857</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.588526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem Activity</td>
<td>60.167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.083</td>
<td>2.331</td>
<td>0.099556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity X Subjects Within Groups (Error Within)</td>
<td>2838.786</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>12.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

The analysis of variance over repeated measures indicated:

(1) There were no significant differences between the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups in their Activity scores totaled for three early recollections. The obtained F-value of 1.729 did not surpass the required F=3.93 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

(2) There were no significant within group differences in Activity scores totaled for three early recollections. The computed F-value of 0.531 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

(3) There was no significant interaction between high-esteemed or low-esteemed group membership and Activity scores among the three early recollections. The computed F-value of 2.331 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

In all three cases, therefore, the null hypotheses for the analysis of variance were retained as tenable hypotheses. It was concluded that the high-esteemed and low-esteemed prospective teachers did not differ significantly in their Activity scores related to the affective component of three early recollections.
AFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO EARLY RECOLLECTIONS
BASED ON THE COMPREHENSION FACTOR OF THE
McCARTER SCALES OF RECALLED AFFECT

Analysis of variance over repeated measures was
used in testing the following three hypotheses concerning
the Comprehension Factor related to early recollections as
assessed by prospective secondary teachers perceived by
peers as having either high or low professional potential.

The between group comparison was tested by the
hypothesis: There are no statistically significant dif-
ferences between the high-esteemed and low-esteemed groups
in Comprehension scores totaled for all three recollections.

The within group comparison was tested by the
hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differ-
ences among the Comprehension scores for the three early
recollections combining the high-esteemed and the low-
esteemed groups.

The interaction was tested by the hypothesis:
There is no statistically significant interaction between
high-esteemed and low-esteemed group membership and Compre-
hension scores among the three early recollections.

Table 4 presents the summary statistics for the
analysis of variance over repeated measures as it was
applied to the Comprehension Factor of the McCarter Scales
of Recalled Affect.
Table 4

Analysis of Variance of Peer Esteem and Feelings of Comprehension in Early Recollections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>520.369</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>6.298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.298</td>
<td>1.348</td>
<td>0.248220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Within Groups (Error Between)</td>
<td>514.071</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4.673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>996.667</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.036</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.635748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem X Comprehension</td>
<td>5.881</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.940</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.520134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension X Subjects</td>
<td>986.714</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4.485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups (Error Within)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

The analysis of variance over repeated measures indicated:

(1) There were no significant differences between the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups in their Comprehension scores totaled for three early recollections. The obtained F-value of 1.348 did not surpass the required F=3.93 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

(2) There were no significant within group differences in Comprehension scores totaled for three early recollections. The computed F-value of 0.454 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

(3) There was no significant interaction between high-esteemed or low-esteemed group membership and Comprehension scores among the three early recollections. The computed F-value of 0.656 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

In all three cases, therefore, the null hypotheses for the analysis of variance were retained as tenable. It was concluded that the high-esteemed and low-esteemed prospective teachers did not differ significantly in their Comprehension scores related to the affective component of three early recollections.
AFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO EARLY RECOLLECTIONS
BASED ON THE ACCEPTANCE FACTOR OF THE
McCARTER SCALES OF RECALLED AFFECT

Analysis of variance over repeated measures was used in testing the following three hypotheses concerning the Acceptance Factor related to early recollections as assessed by prospective secondary teachers perceived by peers as having either high or low professional potential.

The between group comparison was tested by the hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differences between the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups in Acceptance scores totaled for all three recollections.

The within group comparison was tested by the hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differences among the Acceptance scores for the three early recollections combining the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups.

The interaction was tested by the hypothesis: There is no statistically significant interaction between high-esteemed and low-esteemed group membership and Acceptance scores among the three early recollections.

Table 5 presents the summary statistics for the analysis of variance over repeated measures as it was applied to the Acceptance Factor of the McCarter Scales of Recalled Affect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>593.321</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.679</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>590.643</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.369</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>0.149261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Within Groups (Error Between)</td>
<td>988.667</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>4.432</td>
<td>2.491</td>
<td>0.056140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>16.863</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.432</td>
<td>4.982</td>
<td>0.0395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>966.821</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4.395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Within Groups (Error Within)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Analysis of Variance of Peer Esteem and Feelings of Acceptance in Early Recollections
Findings

The analysis of variance over repeated measures indicated:

(1) There were no significant differences between the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups in their Acceptance scores totaled for three early recollections. The obtained F-value of 0.499 did not surpass the required F=3.93 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

(2) There were no significant within group differences in Acceptance scores totaled for three early recollections. The computed F-value of 1.919 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

(3) There was no significant interaction between high-esteemed or low-esteemed group membership and Acceptance scores among the three early recollections. The computed F-value of 0.567 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

In all three cases, therefore, the null hypotheses for the analysis of variance were retained as tenable hypotheses. It was concluded that the high-esteemed and low-esteemed prospective teachers did not differ significantly in their Acceptance scores related to the affective component of three early recollections.
AFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO EARLY RECOLLECTIONS
BASED ON THE PLEASANTNESS FACTOR OF THE
McCARTER SCALES OF RECALLED AFFECT

Analysis of variance over measures was used in testing the following three hypotheses concerning the Pleasantness Factor related to early recollections as assessed by prospective secondary teachers perceived by peers as having either high or low professional potential.

The between group comparison was tested by the hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differences between the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups in Pleasantness scores totaled for all three recollections.

The within group comparison was tested by the hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differences among the Pleasantness scores for the three early recollections combining the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups.

The interaction was tested by the hypothesis: There is no statistically significant interaction between high-esteemed and low-esteemed group membership and Pleasantness scores among the three early recollections.

Table 6 presents the summary statistics for the analysis of variance over repeated measures as it was applied to the Pleasantness Factor of the McCarter Scales of Recalled Affect.
Table 6

Analysis of Variance of Peer Esteem and Feelings of Pleasantness in Early Recollections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>729.702</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.767287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects with Groups (Error Between)</td>
<td>729.119</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6.628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>1427.333</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantness</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.965976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem X Pleasantness</td>
<td>8.506</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.253</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.518045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantness X Subjects Within Groups</td>
<td>1418.381</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>6.447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error Within)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

The analysis of variance over repeated measures indicated:

(1) There were no significant differences between the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups in their Pleasantness scores totaled for three early recollections. The obtained F-value of 0.088 did not surpass the required F=3.93 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

(2) There were no significant within group differences in Pleasantness scores totaled for three early recollections. The computed F-value of 0.035 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

(3) There was no significant interaction between high-esteemed or low-esteemed group membership and Pleasantness scores among the three early recollections. The computed F-value of 0.660 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

In all three cases, therefore, the null hypotheses for the analysis of variance were retained as tenable hypotheses. It was concluded that the high-esteemed and low-esteemed prospective teachers did not differ significantly in their Pleasantness scores related to the affective component of three early recollections.
AFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO EARLY RECOLLECTIONS
BASED ON THE AROUSAL FACTOR OF THE
McCARTER SCALES OF RECALLED AFFECT

Analysis of variance over repeated measures was used in testing the following three hypotheses concerning the Arousal Factor related to early recollections as assessed by prospective secondary teachers perceived by peers as having either high or low professional potential.

The between group comparison was tested by the hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differences between the high-esteemed and low-esteemed groups in Arousal scores totaled for all three recollections.

The within group comparison was tested by the hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differences among the Arousal scores for the three early recollections combining the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups.

The interaction was tested by the hypothesis: There is no statistically significant interaction between high-esteemed and low-esteemed group membership and Arousal scores among the three early recollections.

Table 7 presents the summary statistics for the analysis of variance over repeated measures as it was applied to the Arousal Factor of the McCarter Scales of Recalled Affect.
Table 7
Analysis of Variance of Peer Esteem and Feelings of Arousal in Early Recollections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>381.000</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>12.964</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.964</td>
<td>3.875</td>
<td>0.051532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Within Groups (Error Between)</td>
<td>368.036</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3.346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>356.667</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td>0.225952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem Arousal</td>
<td>9.214</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.607</td>
<td>2.957</td>
<td>0.054051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal X Subjects Within Groups (Error Within)</td>
<td>342.786</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

The analysis of variance over repeated measures indicated:

(1) There were no significant differences between the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups in their Arousal scores totaled for three early recollections. The obtained F-value of 3.875 did not surpass the required F=3.93 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

(2) There were no significant within group differences in Arousal scores totaled for three early recollections. The computed F-value of 1.498 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

(3) There was no significant interaction between high-esteemed or low-esteemed group membership and Arousal scores among the three early recollections. The computed F-value of 2.957 did not surpass the required F=3.04 for a p=.05 level of statistical significance.

In all three cases, therefore, the null hypotheses for the analysis of variance were retained as tenable hypotheses. It was concluded that the high-esteemed and low-esteemed prospective teachers did not differ significantly in their Arousal scores related to the affective component of three early recollections.
DISCUSSION AND FURTHER OBSERVATIONS

The findings revealed no relation between affective responses to recollections and peer esteem as defined in this study. At the outset of the study, it was contended that affect in early recollections was reflected in peer perceptions. Adlerian theory suggested that the affect in early recollections provided a clear reflection of the individual's present outlook on life. It was reasoned that, as a major guiding force for the individual, characteristic outlook would influence others' perceptions of the individual. The findings of this study did not support this line of thinking.

The following observations were discussed in relation to the study:

1. Characteristic outlook was not reflected in actual behavior, as assessed by peers. Mosak (1958) clearly stated that early recollections reflect characteristic outlook rather than characteristic behavior. It could be that the individual's affective responses to his recollections were so complex and so unique to the individual that they remained relatively undiscernible in his behavior. Peers may have based their perceptions on the individual's actual interpersonal behavior. The present findings suggested a distinction between the individual's outlook and his actual behavior.
2. Subject selection was determined by the sociometric test used. The range of sociometric test scores from the highest-esteemed member to the lowest varied from class to class. The range was affected by the size of the class, but it was also possible that some class sections chose their highest and lowest esteemed group members with more agreement than did other class sections. It is not known how these differences may have affected the results.

3. Affective responses to early recollections provided a measure of individuals' perceptions of their early recollections. The subjects did utilize the full array of affective responses available on each of the seven point scales ranging from one descriptor to its opposite. The subjects clearly differed in the kind and intensity of affective responses they made to their recollections. Some subjects responded at the extremes of the dimensions ranging from acceptance to rejection, comprehension to puzzlement, arousal to indifference, and pleasantness to unpleasantness. They also showed great variation in the extent to which they considered their feelings as positive or negative, potent or impotent, and active or passive.

These clearly differentiated feelings do not necessarily bear a one to one relationship to opposed outlooks on life. An individual's affective responses may need to be considered in relation to his cognitive conclusions about the recollections in order to have a clear picture
of his outlook on life. One person could respond nega-
tively to a recollection and conclude that while not always
pleasant, life is an inviting challenge. Another person
with negative responses to his recollections could conclude
that it is best to withdraw from life's challenges.

4. Sex factors contributed to the understanding
of the findings. An ex post facto analysis was conducted
to determine whether sex functioned as an intervening vari-
able in the sociometric test. It was found that the men
were proportionately over represented in the low-esteemed
group. Of the forty-two men in the study, twenty-seven
were in the low-esteemed group while fifteen were in the
high-esteemed group. Of the seventy women, twenty-nine were
in the low-esteemed group and forty-one were in the high-
esteemed group. It would be expected that more women would
be selected for both groups because of the preponderance of
women in teacher education at Indiana State University.
Sex was apparently an intervening variable in the measure of
esteem. The large number of men in the low-esteemed group
suggests that: (1) the men enrolled in secondary education
are less effective interpersonally than are women; or (2)
the characteristics measured by the Ohlson-Shultz Socio-
metric Test are more valued in women than in men.

Sex was also considered with respect to affective
responses subjects made to their recollections. A three-way
analysis of variance was computed for the combined effects
of sex, esteem, and each of the seven factors. Results indicated that sex was a significant variable for two of the factors, Acceptance and Arousal. For the variable, Acceptance, an interaction was found between factor scores and sex among the three recollections. Summary statistics for the three-way analysis of variance are presented in Table 8. The obtained F-value for the interaction between sex and esteem of 3.175 was statistically significant at p=.04. Male subjects' progressively higher Acceptance mean scores for the first, second, and third recollections, respectively, indicate that males felt relatively accepting of their first recollections, less accepting of their second, and least accepting of their third. Female subjects, on the other hand, maintained relatively high Acceptance mean scores for all three recollections, indicating no such tendency to reject later recollections.

For the Arousal factor, the results indicated significantly different factor scores for males and females. The mean score for males was 2.75 and for females was 2.22. Summary statistics for the three-way analysis of variance are presented in Table 9. The obtained F-value for variance between subjects with sex as a variable was 4.243, and was statistically significant at p=.04. This result indicated that women felt a significantly higher degree of arousal for all three recollections taken together than did men.
Table 8
Analysis of Variance of Peer Esteem, Sex, and Feelings of Acceptance in Early Recollections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>7.326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.326</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>0.244876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.882384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Esteem</td>
<td>5.970</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.970</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>0.293553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Within Groups</td>
<td>578.764</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5.359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error Between)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>18.438</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.219</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>0.121876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Acceptance</td>
<td>27.544</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.772</td>
<td>3.175</td>
<td>0.043746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem X Acceptance</td>
<td>5.264</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.632</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.546028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Esteem X Acceptance</td>
<td>2.720</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.731160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance X Subjects</td>
<td>936.889</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>4.337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error Within)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 9

### Analysis of Variance of Peer Esteem, Sex, and Feelings of Arousal in Early Recollections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>13.661</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.661</td>
<td>4.243</td>
<td>0.041826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>9.673</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.673</td>
<td>3.004</td>
<td>0.085907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Esteem</td>
<td>4.445</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.445</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>0.242630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Within Groups (Error Between)</td>
<td>347.764</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td>5.540</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>1.765</td>
<td>0.173561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Arousal</td>
<td>3.635</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.817</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>0.315953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem X Arousal</td>
<td>6.383</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.192</td>
<td>2.034</td>
<td>0.133284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Esteem X Arousal</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.973686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal X Subjects Within Groups (Error Within)</td>
<td>338.899</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1.569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For both the Arousal and Acceptance factors, sex was a discriminating variable. However, it was not clear whether men and women differed in the content of their recollections or if they only differed in the responses they made to their recollections. Men and women may be socialized to value and therefore recall different experiences. They, also, may be taught that certain feelings are acceptable for women while others are acceptable for men. If so, men and women may selectively recall sex-appropriate feelings.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY

According to Adlerian theory, early recollections are reflective of one's characteristic outlook on life. Recollections are constructed by the individual to function as guideposts for interaction with the world and the people within it. Recollections are holistic reflections of outlook in that they indicate the individual's basic approach to life situations rather than revealing specific unresolved conflicts. From this holistic viewpoint it becomes clear than the affective meaning the individual attaches to his recollections is critical to assessing the relation of his early recollections to his present involvement in life situations.

The questions this study sought to answer were: (1) Do prospective teachers' affective responses to their early recollections vary in relation to peers' assessment of their interpersonal effectiveness as teachers? (2) Do prospective teachers' affective responses vary among three early recollections? (3) Is there an interaction between high or low peer evaluation and variation in affective responses among three early recollections?
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A comparison was made between prospective secondary teachers who were esteemed by their peers for their interpersonal effectiveness salient to teaching and those who were not esteemed. The subjects for these two criterion groups were selected from upper level Secondary Education classes at Indiana State University on the basis of the classes' response to the Ohlsen-Shultz Sociometric Test (1951). The number of negative choices a person received was subtracted from his positive choices to establish a final score. Those scoring in the highest quartile of each class were designated the high-esteemed group while those in the lowest quartile were designated the low-esteemed group. The entire sample of subjects recorded their three earliest recollections which were then rated on a version of the Semantic Differential which included the purest items measuring the dimensions Osgood (1969) called Evaluation, Potency, and Activity. Early recollections were also evaluated on a modified version of McCarter's (1961) Scale of Recalled Affect including the factors: Acceptance-Rejection, Comprehension-Puzzlement, Arousal-Indifference, and Pleasantness-Unpleasantness.

Scores for all three recollections on each of the seven factors were compared with two-way analysis of variance over repeated measures with equal cell frequency. Each of the seven analyses yielded: (1) a between group comparison for each set of factor scores totaled over the
three recollections, (2) a within group comparison of factor scores among the three recollections, and (3) an assessment of the level of interaction between group membership and factor scores among the three recollections.

The hypothesis for testing the difference between groups was stated: There are no statistically significant differences between the high-esteemed and the low-esteemed groups in scores totaled for all three recollections for the Evaluation, Potency, and Activity factors (Osgood, 1969) and for the Acceptance, Pleasantness, Arousal, and Comprehension factors (McCarter, 1961).

The hypothesis for testing the within group comparison was stated: There are no statistically significant differences among the scores for the three recollections combining the high-esteemed and low-esteemed groups for the Evaluation, Potency, and Activity factors (Osgood, 1969) and for the Acceptance, Pleasantness, Arousal and Comprehension factors (McCarter, 1961).

The interaction hypothesis was stated: There is no statistically significant interaction between the high-esteemed or low-esteemed group membership and the scores among three recollections for the Evaluation, Potency, and Activity factors (Osgood, 1969) and for the Acceptance, Pleasantness, Arousal and Comprehension factors (McCarter, 1961).

The statistical analysis of the data revealed the following results:
Affect in early recollections, as measured by the Evaluation, Potency, and Activity factors of the Semantic Differential did not differentiate the high-esteemed group from the low-esteemed group. Evaluation, Potency, and Activity did not vary significantly among the three recollections within the groups. There was no significant interaction between esteem for interpersonal effectiveness as teachers and the Evaluation, Potency, or Activity factors among the three recollections.

Likewise, affect in early recollections, as measured by the factors derived from the Scales of Recalled Affect called Acceptance, Comprehension, Arousal, and Pleasantness did not differentiate the high-esteemed group from the low-esteemed group. These factors did not vary significantly among the three recollections within groups. Finally, there was no significant interaction between esteem for interpersonal effectiveness as teachers and the factors, Acceptance, Comprehension, Arousal, and Pleasantness among the three recollections.

Additional findings indicated a preponderance of men in the low-esteemed group. Three-way analysis of variance indicated that sex was a contributing variable in the measure of Arousal and Acceptance. Concerning the Arousal factor, men expressed less Arousal than women when scores for all three recollections were combined. Regarding the Acceptance factor, men felt decreasingly accepting of their
experiences from first to third recollections, whereas women did indicate a significant change, remaining relatively accepting of all recollections. A further finding was that subjects utilized the full range of affective responses available on the seven point scale used in the study. Finally, subjects selected for the high-esteemed group and the low-esteemed group were differentiated by the Ohlsen-Shultz Sociometric Test.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were offered:

1. The feelings prospective teachers recognized and attributed to their early recollections were not so basic to their typical interactions as to be reflected in peers' perceptions of interpersonal effectiveness. The individual's affective description of his early experiences was not directly related to peer perception of sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs of students and colleagues. Recalled feelings did not clearly characterize a person in the eyes of peers.

2. Characteristic outlook was not a simple counterpart of peer perception. The lack of relationship in peer perceptions and the individual's affective responses to his early recollections demonstrated the complexities involved in objectively assessing the individual's basic approach to
life. If characteristic outlook did influence the perceptions of others, that influence was complex and, perhaps, indirect. Peer perceptions of interpersonal effectiveness related to teaching probably did not provide an adequate means of comparing the characteristic outlooks of prospective teachers.

3. Affective responses to early recollections did provide a basis for comparison of prospective teachers. Subjects used the full range of scores on each item of the affective measures, indicating variation in kind and intensity of affective responses. This variation suggested that prospective teachers responded to their early experiences based on their own system of individual perceptions and private conclusions. Individual perceptions varied not only in relation to differences in life experiences but also in relation to individual interpretation of the experiences. Feelings attributed to early recollections may have been influenced by the individual's characteristic outlook on life experiences.

4. It was concluded that men and women differ in their affective responses to early recollections. It was not clear whether men's affective responses differed from women's because the experiences were different or because men and women tended to recall different kinds of feelings. If men and women recalled different experiences, their affective responses were shaped by the nature of the
experiences. If they differed in their affective responses to similar experiences, then their perceptions of experiences were shaped by the feelings they were willing to recall. In either case, men and women conceived of their early recollections differently.

5. Sex also made a difference in how individuals were perceived by their peers as being interpersonally effective. The preponderance of men chosen for the low-esteemed group suggested biased perceptions. Men may be perceived as less effective in their relationships to students and colleagues, or the characteristics admired in men's relationships may differ from those assessed in this study. The source of the bias was not determined but it was concluded that men and women prospective teachers were not perceived alike in their ability to relate to others effectively.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The following recommendations can be made for further research:

1. A factor analysis of all the items used to measure Evaluation, Potency, and Activity should be conducted to clarify the nature of prospective secondary teachers' affective responses to their early recollections. The four items derived from McCarter's (1961) study could be analyzed with the original pool of items used by Osgood (1969). Thus, the relationship between Potency, Activity,
and Evaluation, on one hand, and Acceptance, Comprehension, Arousal, and Pleasantness on the other, would be clarified. A factor analysis would provide an assessment tool tailored to measuring affect related to early recollections. It could also be useful in assessing early recollections as a tool for developing self-awareness as a part of the career development of prospective teachers.

2. Affective responses to early recollections should be studied in conjunction with other means of assessing early recollections. Affective responses should be considered in relation to the content of recollections. The Semantic Differential could be used to categorize those who clearly differ in affective responses. Content analysis could determine consistencies among individuals who make similar affective responses. Differences in content between groups could also be assessed.

3. The individual's characteristic outlook should be assessed more directly in future studies. The relationship between affective responses to recollections and peer perceptions of characteristic affect could be established through the Semantic Differential. The Semantic Differential could measure both affective responses to recollections and peers' assessment of the individual's affective responses to a stimulus experience which would approximate a typical life experience. In this way, peers' ability to assess characteristic affect could be measured directly.
4. Sex should be considered as an independent variable in further studies of early recollections. Sex could be related to content of recollections and to affective responses to recollections. Likewise, sex should be considered as an independent variable in measurement of peer perceptions.
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APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A
There is a place for your code name in the upper right-hand corner of the paper. Write your code name in that space now. The code name ensures complete confidentiality of all the information you give.

Each of you have the same set of 12 questions. Read each question very carefully and note the code name of the individual in this class who first occurs to you after having read the question (for classes of fifteen or more, name two persons). It may be difficult or uncomfortable to answer some items, but it is important that you answer all the questions.

1. Which member of this class is the kind of person whom you would like most to be a member of the school staff in which you teach?

2. Which member of this class shows greatest willingness to do more than his share of the work?

3. Which member of this class is the kind of person to whom a pupil would be most likely to turn if he had a personal problem?

4. Which member of this class would be most at ease in an unfamiliar social setting?

5. Which member of this group would be most apt to take the initiative in solving a difficult group problem?

6. Which member of this class is the kind of person to whom a pupil would be least likely to turn if he had a personal problem?
7. Which member of this group would be most sensitive to the opinions of others in the group and actually value these opinions?

8. Which member of this class shows least willingness to do his share of the work?

9. Which member of this class would be least at ease in an unfamiliar social setting?

10. Which member of this class is the kind of person who you would like least to be a member of the school staff in which you teach?

11. Which member of this group would be least apt to take the initiative in solving a difficult group problem?

12. Which member of this group would be least sensitive to the opinions of others in the group and actually not value these opinions?
EARLY RECOLLECTIONS INSTRUMENT

You will be asked to write the three earliest childhood experiences you can remember before the age of 8 and to rate them on 17 scales. The ratings should show how you felt during each experience. Between each pair of contrasting words is a scale divided into 7 equal-sized sections. Mark the section of the scale that reflects the degree of similarity between one of the words and the feeling you recall experiencing at the time of the event. If your feelings were very closely associated with one end of the scale, you might place your check mark as follows:

up : : : : : X down

If your feelings were quite closely related to one side of the scale, you might check as follows:


If your feelings seemed only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other, you might check as follows:


Only if you considered the scale completely irrelevant, or both sides equally associated, would you check the middle space on the scale:


Now think back as far as you can to the first incident you can remember vividly. Do not be concerned if you think you remember because you have been told about the incident. Do not worry about accuracy of fact. The only limitations are that: (1) the event is a specific incident and not a common occurrence like, "We always went to the beach," (2) you can remember the event vividly or with some detail, and (3) the event took place before you were 8. It is sometimes difficult to start thinking about the past. If you have trouble, just sit back and reminisce about how things were when you were young until a specific event comes to mind. Then write the recollection below. Only one or at most two sentences are necessary.
Recall your feelings and respond to the following scales:
(Rate every one.)

sweet : : : : : : sour

Now think back again. What is the next experience you recall before the age of 8. Describe the incident in a sentence or two below.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________