The problem of 'teaching success' has been and is being studied by several educationists and psychologists. Attempts were made in the past to define scientifically the qualities and behavioural characteristics of a successful teacher. The problem has been studied in different forms and from different angles. The objective underlying such research is mainly to define and measure success in teaching, the competence of teaching personnel.

The Research Section of the New York State Education Department has undertook an extensive study of this problem which is still in progress. This research Section concentrated its attention on studying this problem related to teacher effectiveness under the guidance of Mr. W. W. Coxe and D. G. Rayons and others at U.C.L.A.
K. M. Evans (1951) who has critically surveyed the methods of assessing teaching abilities says that there is one group of people who see most of the teachers' work in a way in which other cannot and that is pupils. The pupils who have studied under teachers regularly over a period of time will know more about what goes on during lessons than any one else can do. But he further ppines that students are not sufficiently familiar with other work of teachers to rate them accurately.

H. Stewert (1956) has studied the problem under the title 'A Study of Critical Training Requirements for Teaching Success'.

He used the items in questionnaire as: (1) think of a person you consider most effective as a teacher among those teachers you have observed during the past six months. The person you were thinking about, probably did many things that convinced you he was well trained. I would like you to tell 'the last thing he did' that made you consider him especially well trained. (2) You probably observed a person within last six months, who was very ineffective as a teacher because of poor training. Please tell me the last thing he did that made you consider him particularly ineffective as a teacher, because of poor training. Item number 3 and 4 were the same as 1 and 2 respectively, with the time limit of 'last one month' instead of 'last six months'.
The purpose of this study was to identify some critical training requirements for success in teaching, i.e. the types of training which makes the difference between effective and ineffective teaching.

His findings were classified under five heads as:
(1) Planning and organization. (a) Pre-planning: A well trained teacher has pertinent materials well organized and readily available before the class period begins. (b) Cooperative planning: A well trained teacher knows how to plan with the students and how to incorporate their ideas into the lesson plan. (c) Flexible Planning: A well trained teacher is sensitive to the interests and needs of students and is able to modify the lesson plan, according to them. (d) Integrating planning: A well trained teacher is able to make the subject matter more meaningful by effective use of available resources.

(2) Interpersonal relationship: A well trained teacher knows how to maintain (a) a teacher-pupil relationship, (b) teacher-staff relationship, and (c) home-school relationship (i.e. effective working relationship with parents.)

(3) Subject matter: (a) A well trained teachers has knowledge of the subject matter, (b) use of related materials, (c) clarity of presentation.

(4) A well trained teacher is able to use instructional techniques properly.
J. C. Gowan (1956) studied the problem 'The Use of Adjective Check-list in Screening Teaching Candidates'. He gave a check-list consisting of 300 items.

The rater was asked to put a circle mark around the number of adjective which describes the teacher to be rated. The adjectives were classified as (1) high criterion group, and (2) low criterion group. Some high criterion adjectives were: Active, Ambitious, Attractive, Capable, Charming, Cheerful, Clear thinking, Cooperative, Reliable, Self-confident, etc.; some adjectives of low criterion group were: Conservative, Conventional, Dependent, Dull, Shy, Easy-going, etc.

Several ratings were secured for each student (of semester course in education taught by the investigator) at the end of each semester.

Each member of the class was asked to indicate the potentially good teachers in the class by asking the question 'which of your classmates would you most like to have as teachers for your children'? Fifteen choices were allowed, and the number of times chosen constituted the score on teaching potential which was used as criterion.

Within the limits of the data presented, it has been shown that (1) certain adjectives in the check-list distinguish significantly between potentially good and poor teachers as
rated by their classmates. (2) Low criterion potential teachers tend to be less realistic and objective about themselves than high criterion candidates.

Jarecke, Walter H. (1951) have discussed the problem of 'Evaluating Teaching Success Through the Use of the Teaching Judgement Test'. The method employed in the development of this test was to create situation typical in the daily lives of teachers based on: classroom association with students, faculty and administrators, method of teaching, professional knowledge and attitudes, community relations and sense of humour.

There is an example that: A foot-ball game is over at 8-00 A.M. and a class is to start at 9-00 A.M. Administrators desire strongly to conduct the class as usual, and students require holiday.

What a teacher should do? The instruction was given that: rate from best to poor on a five-point scale as (1) He should not attempt to conduct the class because it would be a waste of effort to teach it. (2) He should joke about it and enter into the fun of situation, but hold class. (3) He should comment on it but hold the class to the assignment. (4) He should dismiss students causing disturbances and adhere strictly to assignment. (5) He should use the period to counsel the students in using the most advisable methods in obtaining their demands.
Significant relationship was found between scholastic ability and teaching success, as shown by master's examination and teaching success as measured by teaching judgement test. Teaching experience seems to have a bearing on teaching success. A relative short test, viz. teaching judgement test seems to have some predictive ability for teaching success. A situational test of forced-choice rating or ranking type is useful in measurement of teaching potential. The work attitude of teacher as a whole person effects teaching performance. The conclusions of this study are limited to secondary school teachers only.

Ruja Harry (1953) made an attempt to measure the success of teachers by using 'A Student Centred Instructor Rating Scale'. This scale consisted ninety statement items, describing teachers duties in the classroom and outside the classroom.

The student raters were asked to designate the qualities of the instructor to whom they were rating on the five point scale from highly characteristic to decidedly not characteristic. The values of the items were +2, +1, 0, -1 and -2 to highly favourable, favourable, uncertain, unfavourable, and highly unfavourable items respectively.

The scale was highly reliable, as indicated by a split half coefficient of reliability of 0.969, and each item was consistent with the scale as a whole. The scale was valid
to a high degree as indicated by a biserial r, correlating score per paper with expressed like or dislike of 0.903.

It is claimed in this study that students can rate their instructors fully. Though the students who are studying under the instructor can know the instructors better than any body else, but it is beyond their ability for scientific and impartial rating of their instructors. Students may not be considered as matured raters to rate their instructors on a five point scale.

Orleans, Jacob S. and others (1952) have discussed the problem in 'Some Preliminary Thoughts on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness'. They describe the work of A. S. Barr who summarized 150 studies (completed upto 1948) on teacher effectiveness.

The basic pattern for most of the studies has been the correlation of measures of various teacher competency or with average measures of limited areas of pupils growth.

They further state that, one cannot help but conclude that either wrong questions have been asked, or the approaches to the problem have been faulty or some of the right things have not been measured or the measures employed have been inadequate. Barr has made a statement that 'It is apparent that the identification and definition of teacher competency is yet by no means satisfactory.'
Morsh, Joseph E. and others (1956) have studied the problem 'Student Achievement as a Measure of Instructor Effectiveness'.

In planning this study, a course was required in which an adequate sample of instructors could be compared on the basis of their students' achievement. From the available course in Air Force Technical Schools, the Aircraft mechanic course at Sheppard Air force Base was selected, and from this course the hydraulic phase, taught by 121 instructors was chosen as best fitting the requirements of the study. This phase was taught in a single building in which two rows of class rooms were arranged on either side of the central corridor. On each side the first class room had training equipment for the first day training, the second classroom had equipment for the second day training and so on for the seven days of training in the phase. Every week day six new classes of about fourteen students each entered the first day of training. Each class was assigned an instructor.

The correlation between the gains of the instructors' first class and of their second class (taught approximately a month later) was used in determining the reliability of this measure of instructor effectiveness.

Just before taking the instructors' final phase examination, students made an overall rating of their instructors.
They rated as: outstanding, very good, good, poor and unsatisfactory on (1) knowledge of subject matter, (2) teaching methods, (3) understanding of students, and (4) as personal friend.

This study showed that (1) under certain conditions students' gain can be reliably measured. (2) The students appeared to know when they are well taught.

In this study students are the raters, who cannot be said to be the matured raters to rate their instructors judiciously on five point scale.

So, an attempt is made in this study to find out the effect of training on job success of teachers. Principals and supervisors, who are in close contact with the teacher, and who are supervising the teachers' work are selected as raters. They are matured enough to rate on five point scale.