**The malleable pre-service teacher: Developing and field testing a disposition evaluation instrument**

**Jayne White, Ed.D. and Edward Williamson, Ph.D.**

**Drury University**

Those involved with preparing future teachers for our nation's schools have many responsibilities. One of the least known responsibilities is to produce teachers with the disposition to teach. The amount of growth that a teacher candidate exhibits between their freshman and senior year is staggering. During this time period, teacher educators impact their students in the fields of pedagogy, educational foundations and content knowledge. Teacher educators hope that their efforts will result in classroom teachers who are safe to teach. One area that deserves more prominence is that of disposition to teach. We hope to produce teachers who are malleable, that is, they can be formed into productive and energetic teachers. The purpose of this paper is to give background information on the development of a disposition evaluation instrument at Drury University along with the theoretical foundations for the instrument.

In the field of geology the identification of rocks and minerals is paramount. Some of the properties of rocks and minerals that allow geologists to identify one rock from another are: hardness, luster, cleavage, and streak. For minerals, one property that aids in identity is called tenacity. Tenacity refers to a mineral's physical reaction to stresses such as crushing, bending, breaking, or tearing. Tenacity is composed of several different reactions to various stresses; it is possible for a mineral to have more than one form of tenacity (Friedman, 1999).

Some of the different forms of tenacity are: brittle (if after hammering a mineral the result is a powder or small crumbs); malleable (if a mineral can be flattened by pounding with a hammer); flexible but inelastic (any mineral that can be bent, but remains in the new position after bending); and flexible and elastic (any mineral that can be bent and then spring back to the original position).

While it is obvious that pre-service teachers are not minerals, it seems useful to utilize these terms in order to attempt to identify four different types of teachers each with a unique disposition:

- The Brittle Teacher (falls to pieces when hit)
- The Malleable Teacher (flattened, shaped into something else)
- The Inelastic Teacher (bent into new shape)

- The Elastic Teacher (bent, but returns to original shape)

## Figure 1: Continuum of teacher dispositions



| Brittle | inelastic | malleable | elastic |

Figure 1 provides a beginning point for a new conversation about teacher disposition. In each person's experience they have encountered individuals who possessed one or more of the dispositions listed. This is equally true of those in the teaching profession. As a part of the maturing process inherent to each individual they manifest varying degrees of the dispositions indicated above. Admitting that this is true we proceed to a discussion of teacher disposition.

## Theoretical foundations

Drawing on a rich array of theoretical perspectives the disposition evaluation instrument (DEI) at Drury University reflects those influences that are especially pertinent to the unique environment of a liberal arts university.

Theories emphasized by the authors include the affective domain, especially Bloom's Taxonomy, Krathwohl's Taxonomy for Affective Processes, Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory; emotional intelligence through the findings of Salovey and Goleman; Comer's Developmental Pathways Model; and Brain-Based Learning.

## Affective Domain

To what extent do different kinds of thinking affect teaching performance? Clearly, cognitive skills are important, but cognition does not occur in a vacuum. Many in the field of educational psychology agree there is a relationship between teachers' observable behaviors and unobservable factors that influence teacher behavior. While overt actions and behaviors are quantifiable, emotions, attitudes, interests, and reflective abilities are more intangible and cannot be measured directly; they can only be inferred.

Among the general purposes of education, affective learning, having to do with attitudes, emotions, feelings, values, attitudes, predispositions, and morals is one of the most important but controversial, and perhaps, the most problematic of all school issues.

Virtually all educators agree that teacher attitudes are an important dimension in the teaching process. Affect has a direct effect on teacher behavior impacting how they view themselves and interact with others. A teacher's affective skills, or the lack thereof, permeates both the curricular and instructional processes of the classroom. It is imperative that teachers demonstrate dispositions necessary to help all students learn. They must display attitudes that foster learning and genuine human relationships.

As might be expected, designing a framework for "measuring" affect is difficult. A number of theorists have addressed the importance of affect, attitude, emotion, and disposition in predicting success. Although the language varies among these experts, their thesis is consistent, these qualities do matter.

One might ask, how future teachers can develop children maximally without having the skills necessary to identify and cope with their multiple needs? How can they possibly impact children's attitudes, coping skills, and emotions unless they can also model these skills?

Strong (2002) describes "the teacher as a person" (p. 12). He contends that although numerous studies refer to instructional and classroom management strategies as being key to teacher effectiveness, many interview and survey responses regarding effective teaching emphasize the teacher's affective characteristics more than pedagogical practice.

Peart and Campbell (1999) found that teacher effectiveness was ranked fourth in factors affecting achievement of African American students. Other factors included cultural differences, minority status and poverty. Four areas were identified as important for teachers to address in order to promote student achievement: interpersonal skills, instructional skills, motivational leadership, and racial impartiality.

**Bloom**

Benjamin Bloom, in 1956, created a classification system organizing objectives into a hierarchical framework of behaviors that are more complex or internalized than the previous category. The categories were arranged along a continuum from simple to more complex. The major categories were: knowledge, comprehension, applications, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

**Krathwohl**

Krathwohl, Bloom, Masia (1964) suggested that there were levels or stages of behaviors in the affective domain referred to as degrees of internalization. They referred to internalization as "the process by which the phenomena or value successively and pervasively becomes a part of the individual" (p. 28).

It takes considerable observation to discern whether or not any affective skills have been attained. Krathwohl, Bloom & Masia, (1956, 1964) have been credited with developing a meaningful taxonomy to identify different levels of affective behaviors. The taxonomy was originally developed to organize levels of commitment.

The levels of the Affective Domain were defined as follows:

- Receiving: awareness of particular feelings, attitudes or predispositions; aware and willing to pay attention;
- Responding: reacting and gaining some satisfaction from particular feelings, attitudes, or predispositions;
- Valuing: accepting and/or choosing to make a commitment that involves particular feelings, attitudes, or predispositions;
- Organizing: formulating a personal set of values that involves particular feelings, attitudes, or dispositions. To establish a value system;
- Characterizing: living and being judged by one's consistent set of personal values that involves specific feelings, attitudes, or predispositions; to live one's beliefs;

The Krathwohl Taxonomy for Affective Processes can be used to encourage the development of positive attitudes, interests, and appreciations that should accompany teaching and learning.

**<u>Gardner</u>**

Gardner (1983) proposed that human beings have not one, but seven intelligences or ways of knowing. Gardner's new concept of intelligence expanded earlier thinking about human abilities.

Silver, Strong, & Perini (2000) explain that his method explores ways particular cultures value individuals. Gardner defined intelligence as the ability to: solve problems that one encounters in real life, generate new problems to solve, and make something or offer a service that is valued within one's culture.

Gardner then divided the intelligences into seven categories, later adding an eighth (1993, 1999). He included the two standard types, verbal and mathematical-logical, and added spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical as well as the "personal intelligences": interpersonal and intrapersonal (1993, p. 38), in 1999, he added the naturalist category.

Gardner summarizes the personal intelligences as follows: interpersonal intelligence is the ability to understand other people: what motivates them, how they work, how to work cooperatively with them. Successful salespeople, politicians, teachers, clinicians, and religious leaders are all likely to be individuals with high degrees of interpersonal intelligence. Intrapersonal intelligence is a correlative ability, turned inward. It is a capacity to form an accurate, veridical model of oneself and to be able to use that model to operate effectively in life (1993, p. 9).

Gardner went on to discuss the interplay of emotions and master in managing the personal intelligences (Goleman, 1995). He recognized the importance of these emotional and relational abilities not only on cognition, but on life in general. He states that:

> Many people with IQs of 160 work for people with IQs of 100, if the former have poor intrapersonal intelligence and the latter have a high one. And in the day-to-day world no intelligence is more important than the interpersonal. If you don't have it, you'll make

poor choices about who to marry, what job to take, and so on. We need to train children in the personal intelligences in school. (p. 42)

Again, it stands to reason, that teachers must be capable of: (1) modeling the personal intelligences; and (2) training children in developing skills in those areas.

## Emotional Intelligence

An emotional competence is a learned capability based on emotional intelligence that results in outstanding performance at work. The emotional intelligence capacities are: Independent: Each makes a unique contribution to job performance; interdependent: draws to some extent on others with strong interactions; and hierarchical: the emotional intelligence capacities build upon one another. For example, self-awareness is crucial for self-regulation and empathy; self-regulation and self-awareness contribute to motivation; all the first four are at work in social skills.

## Salovey

In 1990, Salovey and Mayer broadened the view of intelligence by referring to what it takes to lead a full, complete and successful life: emotional intelligence. Their definition expanded Gardner's personal intelligences into five domains: (1) Knowing one's emotions; (2) managing emotions; (3) motivating oneself; (4) recognizing emotions in others; (5) handling relationships. Mayer, (in Jensen, 1998) suggested that "emotions convey information, just like data or logic" (p. 72). Psychology has been too atomized in the sense that it divided intelligence, motor behavior, and emotions into different areas, rather than considering the inseparable links among them (Marquis 1996, p. B-2).

## Goleman

Goleman (1998) stated:

The rules for work are changing. We're being judged by a new yardstick; not just by how smart we are, or by our training and expertise, but also by how well we handle each other and ourselves. The new rules have little to do with what we were told was important in school; academic abilities are largely irrelevant to this standard. The new measure takes for granted having enough intellectual ability and technical know-how to do our jobs; it focuses instead on personal qualities, such as initiative and empathy, adaptability and persuasiveness. The research distills with unprecedented precision which qualities mark a star performer. And it demonstrates which human abilities make up the

greater part of the ingredients for excellence at work – most especially for leadership. (pp. 3-4)

In 1995, Goleman published new work raising awareness of the role of emotions in learning.  He quantified the characteristics of emotional intelligence allowing for measurement in an area that had not been previously possible. Performance data from business, education, and health related fields resulted in a body of study called emotional intelligence (EQ). This research attempted to explain why, despite equal intellectual capacity, education, or experience, some people excel while others fall behind.

Goleman defined emotional intelligence as the dimension of intelligence responsible for our ability to manage ourselves and our relationships with others.  EQ allows people to recognize and move toward opportunities and to collaborate and communicate with others. He further suggested it is no accident that certain competencies are found repeatedly in high performing individuals including teachers.

Goleman discussed the role of the community in shaping school and classroom culture, suggesting that school should be a place where students feel safe and valued, and are capable of developing relationships with classmates, teachers, and other school personnel. According to this theory, success in the adult world depends on cognitive and emotional competence.  Classroom teachers play a very important role in creating such a positive learning environment.

Goleman contends that emotional competence is central to effective leadership.  He suggests that "interpersonal ineptitude in leaders lowers everyone's performance:  It wastes time, creates acrimony, corrodes motivation and commitment, builds hostility and apathy (p. 32)".

Robert Worden, director of business research at Eastman Kodak, agrees, suggesting that the ability to relate, speak up and be heard and be self-confident are the kinds of abilities that make the critical difference.  He cites other qualities necessary for success: presentation skills,

energetic and enthusiastic, easy to work with, diplomatic, inspirational, and action-oriented.  He

says, "Half the skills you need are technical, but the other half are in the softer domain,

emotional intelligence.  And it's amazing how it's the latter that distinguishes the top performers

(cited in Goleman, 1998, p. 33)."

Worden's observation is borne out by Goleman's research of hundreds of companies. He

conducted a systematic study of the U.S. government, (more than two million employees). He

found that "the higher the level of the job, the less important technical skills and cognitive

abilities were, and the more important competence in emotional intelligence became (p. 33)".

Further analysis of the data revealed "technical superiority played no role in leadership success.

At top executive levels, everyone needs cognitive skills, to a certain extent, but being better at

them does not make a star leader" (Goleman, 1998, p. 33).

Rather, emotional competence made the crucial difference between mediocre leaders and

the best.  Top ranking employees showed significantly greater strengths in a range of emotional

competencies, among them influence, team leadership, political awareness, self-confidence, and

achievement drive.  On average, close to 90% of their success in leadership was attributable to

emotional intelligence. Goleman summarizes saying, "For star performance in all jobs, in every

field, emotional competence is twice as important as purely cognitive abilities…emotional

competence accounts for virtually the entire advantage" (Goleman, 1998, p.33).

To sum up:  For star performance in all jobs, in every field, emotional competence is

twice as important as purely cognitive abilities. For success at the highest levels, in leadership

positions, emotional competence accounts for virtually the entire advantage.

**Developmental pathways model**

Dr. James Comer's model of educational reform is based on the assumption that

meaningful school change results from the process of relationships and community building.

Emphasis is placed on building positive relationships between and among relevant adults and

children.  In Comer's model, the school is a social system.  If this social system is not working

well, children do not develop well along the six developmental pathways: social, cognitive,

physical, psychological, language, and moral/ethical.  Comer believes that positive interpersonal

relationships set the stage for addressing, or even preventing serious and deep-rooted developmental problems. Comer agrees with Goleman in referring to the role of the community in shaping the culture of the school/classroom. He, too, contends that school should be a place where students feel safe and valued, or maximal development will not take place (1996).

According to Comer (1996):

All children are at risk today. More homes are broken, more are led by single mothers, and more have two parents away at work. For children to develop healthily well-functioning adults must be available and attentive to them at all times. In the SDP school, the adults work creatively and enthusiastically with each other and with the children, setting a powerful model for the children's attitudes toward school, society, and the future. (p. 42)

Comer believes it is the teacher's responsibility to create a receptive climate for learning that reflects the developmental needs of children. He further contends that preservice teacher preparation programs too often emphasize only three of the developmental pathways – language, cognitive, and physical. Yet, teachers encounter, on a daily basis children needing support and guidance along the "soft pathways" – social, psychological, & moral/ethical – because of the multitude of societal and familial issues they face (1996).

**Brain-based research**

Institutions of learning no longer need to wonder what factors make an effective teacher. More than 25 years of research in the neurological field, as well as research regarding connections between emotions and intelligence have provided insights for predicting success in the workplace. It is now possible to better understand why, despite equal cognitive abilities, training, and experiences, some people excel while others do not (Lynn, 2002).

The importance of social/emotional development for academic learning has been strengthened by recent insights from the field of neurological sciences, highlighted by Jensen, (1996); Demasio, (1994); Sylwester (1995); and Sousa, (1998).

Sylwester (1995) refers to ways emotions relate to improved academic performance:

We know emotion is very important to the educative process because it drives attention, which drives learning and memory. We've never really understood emotion, however, and so don't know how to regulate it in school – beyond defining too much or too little of it as misbehavior and relegating most of it to the arts, PE, recess, and the extracurricular program… By separating emotion from logic and reason in the classroom, we've simplified school management and evaluation, but we've also then separated two sides of one coin – and lost something important in the process. It's impossible to separate emotion from the other important activities of life. Don't try. (p. 72-75)

If learning is to take place, we must get students emotionally engaged. By the same measure, if preservice teachers become emotionally engaged, if they have the skills, attitudes, and values of competent emotional development, they will be more capable of managing the many needs of children in their classrooms.

Elias suggests that we must attend systematically to making social/emotional education more than a fad in our schools. In order to do this, we must surround our children with knowledgeable, responsible, and caring adults. They ask that "educators rethink the ways schools have addressed or failed to address the development of the whole child, and to do so with an eye toward models that have demonstrated success" (Elias et al., 1997, p. 12).

From the foregoing research summary it becomes clear that disposition is a complex issue and that quantifying disposition will likewise be a complex issue. There is no "one size fits all" approach to measuring student disposition to teach. We can only approximate this intangible feature.

**Efforts to create a disposition evaluation instrument at Drury University**

Drury University, established in 1873 is a private, liberal arts university located in Springfield, MO. Drury University also has an extensive evening college division with locations in St. Robert, Fort Leonard Wood, Rolla, Lebanon, Cabool, Ava, Thayer, and Stockton, all in southern Missouri. Students are able to complete the Bachelor of Science in Education at the main campus in Springfield (through the regular day school, known as Drury College, or the evening division, known as the College of Graduate and Continuing Studies); or at the Mid-Missouri Region located in St. Robert, MO. Education courses are offered at all of the remaining evening college locations.

The School of Education and Child Development at Drury University consists of 11 full-time tenure track faculty, several part-time faculty, and adjuncts. Three of the full-time tenure track faculty are based at the Mid-Missouri Region in St. Robert, MO. The School of Education and Child Development at Drury University certified 119 students to teach in Missouri during the 2002-03 school year.

Drury University is an NCATE accredited institution and subsequently follows the guidelines delineated by that organization. With the increasing emphasis by NCATE on student disposition, Drury University needed to be able to collect data relative to this. In the fall of 2001, the authors began collecting literature on student disposition and how to measure it. During the following year the authors collaborated on a paper that was accepted for presentation at the 2003 AACTE conference in New Orleans, LA (Williamson and White, 2003). In addition, one of the authors attended the 2002 NCATE meeting in Washington, DC.

Following the presentation at AACTE, the authors embarked on a process of refinement. During departmental meetings in the spring of 2003, the disposition evaluation instrument (DEI) was modified. Several of the faculty members field tested the DEI during the spring and summer semesters. Anecdotal evidence of these efforts is included in this paper. While the development of Drury University's DEI is an on-going process, the faculty of the School of Education and Child Development met in the summer of 2003 and gave final approval to the use of the current DEI. Faculty members are encouraged to use the instrument and to continue to report back to the authors with suggestions for modifications. The developers of the DEI maintain that it is a work in progress which will undoubtedly be modified and revised as needed through time. The following section details uses of the Drury University DEI during the 2003-04 academic year.

## Anecdotal evidence

### From the Assistant Director of Teacher Education:

The first day of class I was explaining the expectations of the course by reviewing my syllabus, when one of my students started rolling her eyes.  I let it go, thinking that she would stop...but she did not stop, she became even more obnoxious as the review continued.  This young teacher education student began to whisper while I was speaking, interrupting as I spoke and actually turned her back to me and tried to check her e-mail while I was addressing the class. Needless to say, I asked the young lady to come visit me in my office after class.  I placed the disposition papers in her hand and asked her to rate

herself while I did the same.  Unbelievably, she rated herself at the top on all categories; obviously, I did not.  We continued by examining the discrepancies, specifically, my perceptions.  I followed-up by sharing with her how she could change my perceptions and become an excellent teacher someday. In an astonishing turn of events, this young lady did a MAJOR about face in my class.  Not only did she make an "A", but she never again exhibited behavior (or dispositions) that were unbecoming of a teacher.  In fact, she won an award as one of the top students in the class by the end of the semester. I am SOLD on the value of this document.  Students are made aware of negative dispositions and provided observations by their professors concerning how their behavior is being perceived, then they are given an opportunity to change.  Not only was this extremely valuable to the student and myself, but also to the School of Education...the word was out that "dispositions" are important.

**From an Assistant Professor of Education:**
I can think of one particular situation where having a disposition evaluation would have been extremely beneficial. At one of the off campus locations we had a student who took all of the education courses required for certification, even though most of the instructors realized that this person was not suitable to be in the classroom. We could tell this person exactly what we felt, but without a systematic way to back up our feelings she was allowed to continue taking courses. Finally, the day came when the only course the student had left was student teaching. Because of this student's disposition, our placement coordinator had an extremely hard time placing her in a classroom. Eventually, the student was placed but had a very negative student teaching experience, in fact, she did not complete it. Following this it became even more difficult for the student to be placed, after another unsuccessful try in a private school, this student finally was told she would not be able to complete student teaching. She subsequently began a graduate degree program but dropped this after she was found guilty of plagiarism in her first class and received an "F" for the course. I feel that if Drury University would have had a way to communicate accurately with the student concerning her disposition, none of these negative experiences would have occurred.

**From a Professor of Education:**

I teach one of two courses (Teaching Reading in the Content Field; and Secondary/Elementary School Curriculum) in what we call the "Student Teaching Block" Block classes meet four days each week for four weeks; students then begin their eleven weeks of student teaching. Students enrolled in these courses are required to demonstrate knowledge and competencies expected of classroom teachers involving collaborative planning, teaming, and providing learning experiences appropriate for a range of student needs.  In addition, they must demonstrate ability to work in collaborative groups (in order to make assessment driven curricular decisions).Because of the compacted and intense schedule professors have ample opportunity to observe students in action and to identify discernible patterns of behavior that could impede the learning process.  We use our DEI to help students become aware of both the student and faculty viewpoint. Students are to complete the inventory the first day of class, and again at the culmination of the block.  We (professors) also complete an inventory on all students, and lay them aside.  At the midway point, (or if we begin to observe troubling signs) we go over the student's self-evaluations to see if inconsistencies are evidenced; in which case, we schedule a conference (with the student or students involved), to suggest improvements, and provide developmental support. This past August we began the block as usual.  Less than one week into the semester, we became aware that problems were surfacing in one of the teams.  We agreed to carefully monitor this team. Independently, all professors identified one team member as being "the problem."  We reviewed her earlier completed self-appraisal to find that she rated herself as *Exemplary* (elastic) in all areas (every category).  Interestingly, upon review we had each rated her as being *Unsatisfactory* (brittle). This was especially true in regard to "Relationships with Others" and "Willingness to Collaborate."  Specific areas (our perceptions) in striking contrast with her own self-rating included the following:

- Shows sensitivity to opposing perspectives
- Offers and receives …. feed back
- Respects and relates well to issues of diversity
- Acts based on understanding other people's needs and feelings
- Is aware of strengths and weaknesses in self and others
- Understands diverse world views and is sensitive to group differences

- Manages feelings and emotions constructively
- Is always prepared for lessons
- Handles difficult people & tense situations w/diplomacy & tact
- Mobilizes others to accomplish group goals

Our conference with this student resulted in the following responses:

- "I don't want to work on a team with her – she is different."
- "We voted, and the majority rules"
- "They (other team members) are not willing to bend – they think their theme choice is best"
- "I am the *only* one who seems to know what we are supposed to be doing"
- "I could do better alone or working on a team with my friends"
- "I just want to get this project finished….it really doesn't matter how we do…..When I have a *real class*, I will take it seriously"
- "I don't think we should have to do these lesson plans – I know what I want to do"
- "It is so dumb to have to plan *differentiating activities* – if students don't want to learn, that is their problem – I want to focus on activities/projects for those students who *WANT* to learn"

The gap between this student's perception and ours provided a basis for "further conversation." We met with her to share our perceptions and after three hours of tears, anger, fear, etc., we began to discuss ways to: (1) change or improve her disposition; or (2) change our *perception* and we had only two weeks to go (before she was scheduled to begin student teaching). In private discussion, we (faculty) wondered if it was even possible for her to make the necessary changes in such a short time….. We agreed that we would certainly have been better positioned to impact change in her disposition if some type of systematic plan had been in place four years earlier when this student entered the teacher preparation program. It is important to add that the student in question maintained a very high GPA. In addition, her ACT score is 29. Clearly, she is bright. But the question remains – does she have the disposition to be an effective teacher?

**From an Assistant Professor of Education:**

The Teacher Disposition Survey was given to an undergraduate class of 26 students taking Elementary Curriculum and Instruction. The students rated themselves in all areas. The key findings of these surveys were the following: Five of the students rated themselves in the application level in 95% of the characteristics. Two of the students

rated themselves in the sensitivity level for 3% of the characteristics described relationships with others. Six students rated themselves in the ability level for acting ethically and being above reproach. Twenty-one of the students rated themselves in varied ways throughout the survey. These results show that the students took a pretty broad look at themselves as they answered rated these characteristics.

<div align="center">References</div>

Bloom, B.S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objective: The classification of*
　　educational goals. Handbook of cognitive domain. New York: David McKay

Comer, J. P., Haynes, N.M., Joyner, E.T., & Ben Avie, M, eds. (1996). Rallying the whole
　　village: The Comer process for reforming education. New York, NY: Teachers College
　　Press.

Demasio, A.R. (1994). Descartes'' error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain. New York:
　　Grosset/Putnam.

Elias, M.J., Zins, J.E., Weissberg, R.P., Frey, K.S., Greenberg, M.T., Haynes, N.M., et al.
　　(1997). Promoting social and emotional learning: Guidelines for educators. Alexandria,
　　VA: ASCD.

Friedman, H. (1999). Mineral properties and identification procedures: Tenacity. Retrieved
　　October 25, 2001 from http://www.minerals.net/resource/property/tenacity.htm

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1993). Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice. New York: Basic Books

Gardner, H. (1999). Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century. New
　　York: Basic Books.

Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than EQ. New York;
　　Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.

Jensen, E. (1996). Completing the puzzle: The brain-compatible approach to learning. Del Mar,
　　CA: The Brain Store, Inc.

Jensen, E. (1998). Teaching with the brain in mind. Alexandria, VA.: ASCD.

Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S., & Masia, B. B. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The
　　classification of educational goals. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S., & Masia, B. B. (1964). Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York, N.Y.: David McKay Co.

Lynn, A.B. (2002). The emotional intelligence activity book: 50 activities for promoting EQ at work. New York, NY: American Management Association.

Marquis, J. (1996, October, 17). "A Real Brain Teaser." Los Angeles Times, p. B-2.

Peart, N.A. and Campbell, F.A. (1999). At-risk students' perceptions of teacher effectiveness. Journal for a Just and Caring Education, 5 (3), 269-284.

Salovey, P. & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9, 185-211.

Silver, H., Strong, R., and Perini, M. (2000). So each may learn: Integrating learning styles and multiple intelligences. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Sousa, D.A. (1998). How the brain learns. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Strong, J.H. (2002). Qualities of effective teachers. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Sylwester, R. (1995). A celebration of neurons: An educator's guide to the human brain. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Williamson, E. & White, J. (2003). Disposition of teachers: A new discussion for the 21st Century. Paper presented at AACTE 55th Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA January 24-27, 2003.

# DRURY UNIVERSITY
# SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT
# DISPOSITION EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

| Area 1 Relationships with Others | Sensitivity | Inclination | Ability | Application |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Candidate possesses a sense of humor | | | | |
| Candidate is willing to voice unpopular views | | | | |
| Candidate cultivates and maintains extensive informal networks | | | | |
| Candidate thinks clearly and stays focused under pressure | | | | |
| Candidate acts ethically and is above reproach | | | | |
| Candidate admits mistakes and confronts unethical actions in others | | | | |
| Candidate seeks out relationships that are mutually beneficial | | | | |
| Candidate takes tough, principled stands | | | | |
| Candidate is attentive to emotional cues | | | | |
| Candidate shows sensitivity and understands perspective of others | | | | |
| Candidate builds rapport and keeps others in the loop | | | | |
| Candidate offers and receives useful feedback and identifies the need for further growth | | | | |
| Candidate mentors, coaches, challenges, and fosters skills in others | | | | |
| Candidate increases satisfaction and loyalty | | | | |
| Candidate makes and maintains personal friendships among associates | | | | |
| Candidate offers appropriate assistance | | | | |
| Candidate is effective in give and take, registers emotional cues, and attunes message | | | | |
| Candidate spots potential conflict bringing disagreements into the open and de-escalates the conflict | | | | |
| Candidate encourages debate and open discussion | | | | |
| Candidate orchestrates win-win situations | | | | |
| Candidate demonstrates an understanding of effective verbal and non-verbal communication by choosing language and delivery techniques appropriate to the audience | | | | |
| Candidate models effective communication strategies in asking questions, listening, giving directions, probing for understanding and helping others to express their ideas | | | | |

| Area 2 Reliability | Sensitivity | Inclination | Ability | Application |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Candidate frequently creates his/her own opportunities in the classroom | | | | |
| Candidate builds trust through reliability and authenticity | | | | |
| Candidate meets commitments and keeps promises | | | | |
| Candidate is on-time | | | | |

| Area 3 Willingness to Collaborate | Sensitivity | Inclination | Ability | Application |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Candidate seeks out fresh ideas | | | | |
| Candidate actively seeks out opportunities to fulfill the group's mission | | | | |
| Candidate mobilizes others | | | | |
| Candidate helps out based on understanding other people's needs and feelings | | | | |

| Area 4 Reflective Practice (including self-assessment) | Sensitivity | Inclination | Ability | Application |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Candidate knows emotions | | | | |
| Candidate realizes links between feelings | | | | |
| Candidate recognizes that feelings affect performance | | | | |
| Candidate has a guiding awareness of values and goals | | | | |
| Candidate is aware of strengths and weaknesses | | | | |
| Candidate holds self accountable | | | | |
| Candidate adapts responses and tactics | | | | |
| Candidate is results-oriented | | | | |
| Candidate learns how to improve performance | | | | |
| Candidate finds a sense of purpose in the larger mission | | | | |
| Candidate operates from hope of success rather than feeling of failure | | | | |
| Candidate sees setbacks as result of manageable circumstances not personal flaw | | | | |
| Candidate is reflective and learns from experience | | | | |
| Candidate uses the group's core values in choices and decisions | | | | |
| Candidate understands diverse world views and is sensitive to group differences | | | | |

| Area 5 Personal Appearance | Sensitivity | Inclination | Ability | Application |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Candidate possesses self-assurance | | | | |
| Candidate manages feelings and emotions | | | | |
| Candidate is always well-groomed; appropriate dress | | | | |
| Candidate is composed, positive, and unflappable | | | | |

| Area 6 Teaching (including differentiation) | Sensitivity | Inclination | Ability | Application |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Candidate respects and relates well to people of diverse backgrounds | | | | |
| Candidate understands needs and matches needs to services or products | | | | |
| Candidate challenges bias and intolerance | | | | |
| Candidate is always prepared for lessons | | | | |
| Candidate challenges authority | | | | |
| Candidate continually seeks to improve professional skills and knowledge | | | | |