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ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to ascertain whether there were any significant differences in the personality and behavioral characteristics of teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those teachers who were not nominated. It also attempted to answer these questions: (1) whether certain personal and behavioral factors are important in selecting teachers, (2) how can these factors be assessed, (3) how do teachers perceive themselves and their profession, and (4) what role does ethnicity play in the personal and behavioral characteristics of teachers? Other variables were levels of advanced professional training and years of experience. Data were obtained from the 16 PF and the FIRO-B which were administered to 212 randomly selected teachers in the Honolulu District, and interview sessions with 24 teachers nominated as outstanding. The responses from the inventories were subjected to t-tests for independent samples. One-way analysis of variance was performed on the mean scores of the largest sample ethnic group. The .05 level of confidence was used. Major findings were that nominated teachers were extroverted, satisfied with life, tender-minded, and sensitive to the subtleties of life. They also expressed control and influence over things. Nominated teachers with Bachelor's Plus degrees and with more years of teaching experience needed affection and inclusion. Comparison of mean scores of ethnic groups revealed that nominated Caucasian and Filipino teachers were highly independent. The group that was most satisfied with life were the nominated Chinese teachers. The nominated Hawaiian
Hawaiian teachers expressed more inclusion in their relationships. Japanese nominated teachers' mean scores indicated that they did not exert control over others, and did not want others exerting control over them. Responses from the interviews showed that nominated teachers' perceptions of the most important characteristic of an outstanding teacher was "caring."
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Society's total effort in education must finally reach one focal point, the classroom teacher. The ultimate success of the educational process requires an administration and a faculty who are competent and responsible in their professional areas; who are sensitive to student needs, and are capable of adjusting to changing programs. "The effect of schools on the individual pupil depends to a considerable extent on who the teacher is" (Medley, 1979). A major challenge to the educational administrator is to secure quality instructors.

Teachers can no longer see their role as primarily that of a conveyor of knowledge and skills. They must have an attitude of understanding and permissiveness toward people (Watts, 1982). Furthermore, they must have certain traits of personality such as friendliness, humor, humility, and interest in people that make for effectiveness in teaching children (Knowles, 1971). Effective teachers have been studied for decades to determine what personality characteristics and behaviors are important to their performances. Abilities to effectively communicate, to motivate, and to project genuine understanding are qualities of vital importance to successful teaching. This chapter will describe the context and rationale for research on selected personality and behavioral characteristics of outstanding teachers, and their perceptions of themselves and the teaching profession as a whole.
Context of the Problem

The selection of teachers to be employed by a school system is one of the most important decisions made by educational administrators. Before 1994, 1.3 million new teachers will need to be hired to replace the aging teacher population and accommodate increasing enrollment in U.S. schools (National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, 1989). The State Department of Education figures show Hawaii's school population (now at 169,193) will grow each year until it reaches 185,000 in 1995-96. This will exceed Hawaii's previous high of 182,463 in 1971 (Honolulu Star Bulletin, February 17, 1990).

Perhaps the most sophisticated study which attempted to identify personality constructs related to effective teaching was Ryans' (1960). That research included 6,179 teachers in 1,747 schools. Ryans' most important general finding was that his Teacher Characteristics Schedule could identify teachers according to three factors:

Teacher Characteristic X--warm, understanding, friendly vs. aloof, egocentric, restricted classroom behavior.

Teacher Characteristic Y--responsible, independent, businesslike, systematic vs. evading, unplanned, slipshod classroom behavior.

Teacher Characteristic Z--stimulating, imaginative vs. dull, routine classroom behavior. (Ryans, 1960)

Other researchers during the past two decades such as Ebel (1975), Patrick (1974), Cruickshank (1976), Evertson et al. (1980), Weslander (1981), and Coker (1980) concluded that personality factors such as poise, empathy, enthusiasm, self-confidence, flexibility, tolerance, imagination, self-control, and warmth were related to successful
The presence of such qualities does not guarantee teaching effectiveness, but the absence of them may contribute toward ineffective performance.

The teacher is so crucial to the quality of the educational program that it seems obvious that teachers should be hired with utmost care in terms of their personality traits that affect their teaching behavior in the classroom. Yet, the initial selection of teacher candidates usually is limited to the consideration of achievement test results, course grades, physical health and some attempts at determining speech skills and general character. Because of the recognized weaknesses of traditional selection methods, too many teachers have been employed who have behaviors which contribute towards alienating youths from themselves, other teachers, subjects, and educational institutions (Honolulu Star Bulletin editorial, 6/18/90).

Consequently, in order to reduce the risk of hiring ineffective teachers, there has been a national trend towards measures for teacher selection beyond the typical interview and the use of credentials. Those efforts have generally been in the use of competency tests and/or personality assessment measures. Examples of the latter type of effort are: Predictive Index Organizational Survey Checklist, by Arnold S. Daniels (1988); Emphasizing More Personalized Attitudes Toward Helping Youth (Project Empathy), by the Omaha, Nebraska, Public Schools (Thayer, 1978); and the Teachers Perceiver Interview, by the Lincoln, Nebraska, Public Schools (Muller, 1978). The Predictive Index Checklist is an instrument consisting of a series of words that measure the candidate's perception of what they feel describes their true
selves, and how others expect them to act. The other two instruments pose hypothetical questions or situations to the candidate, with the intent of assessing noncognitive traits and reducing the possible interviewer bias of unstructured interviews.

These methodologies which purportedly discriminate between good and poor teacher applicants have had a considerable impact on their own districts.

The teacher's personality is rarely considered in an objective, systematic way (Miller, 1963). Yet, research studies and socio-psychological theories point toward the strong relationship between the teacher's personality and his or her effectiveness in the classroom.

Theoretical Framework

There is broad agreement among psychological and sociological theorists that a strong relationship exists between teacher personality factors and student educational experience (Barr, 1960).

Arthur Combs' phenomenological approach emphasizes the personal element in teaching and learning. Peter Blau's social exchange theory posits that an individual's social processes has his or her roots in primitive psychological processes. Van Cleve Morris reflects the pragmatist view with his idea of social sensitivity. Heidi Watts, with her developmental stage theory, suggests that the master (outstanding) teacher is one who "... is working smoothly within the context of the classroom and within his or her own personality" (Watts, 1982).

Although each expressed his or her own professional views differently, they do agree that personal and positive kinds of teacher
behavior (enhancement, reinforcement or social reward) have a definite
effect upon the student's total classroom learning experience.

Phenomenological Field Theory

The following quotation from Combs and Snygg illustrates the
emphasis which they place upon the personal element in teaching and
learning:

The translation of knowing into behaving is the
most difficult and pressing task of education.
Gathering and imparting of information can often
be accomplished mechanically, but the business
of helping people discover the personal meaning
of information for them, still requires a human
interrelationship. This is the very heart of
teaching, its reason for being. (Combs, 1965)

This statement offers two things for this study:

1) An understanding of the purpose of teaching, i.e., helping
people to know and to discover the personal meaning of
knowing. This will be the meaning intended by the verb
"teach" when used in this study.

2) The idea that human interrelationships are essential
elements in the teaching function.

A highly effective teacher is "a unique human being who has
learned to use himself effectively and efficiently to carry out his
own and society's purposes in the education of others" (Combs, 1965).

The methods used by such a teacher are of no direct concern to
this study. But, whatever the method, the result should be an
accepting classroom atmosphere as perceived by the student.
Generally, (this atmosphere) is best achieved in situations which treat each person as an individual of dignity and integrity; situations characterized by warmth, friendliness, and acceptance of the student as he is . . . While it is possible for a short time to create an atmosphere strikingly different from the personalities we possess, this is a most difficult deception to maintain for any length of time. To create a situation that is truly warm, understanding, and accepting, we are beginning to understand that it requires a certain kind of person. (Combs, 1965)

The phenomenologists place this emphasis upon the teacher's personality because the student's basic need, self-adequacy (the maintenance and enhancement of the phenomenological self), is highly dependent upon the teacher's positive behaviors which are perceived by the pupil as directed toward himself. The student feels enhanced by the teacher's behavior. The total experience, whether viewed as healthy teacher-student relationships or as discovery of personal meaning, is an "exciting, challenging, enhancing activity well worth whatever effort is expended" (Combs, 1965).

Social Exchange Theory

From the field of sociology the social exchange theory supports the expectation of finding relationships between teacher personality factors and student reactions. Peter Blau posits that men strive to choose alternative social exchanges which will bring the greatest social rewards. "The basic social processes that govern associations among men have their roots in primitive psychological processes, such as those underlying the feelings of attraction between individuals and their desires for various kinds of rewards" (Blau, 1964).
Clearly, then, social exchange theory would predict a significant relationship between the teacher's ability to give rewards, especially those personal rewards which are mediated by the teacher's personality, and the pupil's feeling that the classroom experience has been a rewarding one.

Pragmatism's Social Sensitivity

Van Cleve Morris (1969) theorizes that Pragmatism's goals are not that much different from those of Idealism and Realism except for one important difference. Although pragmatism and the two traditional philosophies all share the goal of developing the intellect and social sensitivity, for pragmatism, the goal of social sensitivity becomes a type of end in itself (Morris, 1969). For the pragmatist, there really is no final end, there is merely growth, a type of social adjustment leading always on to further growth.

Pragmatism answers the question "What is a human being?" with one word . . . experience. Humans are products of their experiences. But this investigator posits that pragmatism recognizes that humans have "innate qualities." Dewey (1966) called them "dispositions." The two main dispositions are intelligence and social sensitivity as stated earlier by Morris. It is apparent that the pragmatist's educational goals, as stated earlier, flow quite naturally from these assumptions. In other words, it seems that they want education to develop both intellect and social sensitivity, and that intellect would serve as a means to accomplish the end, which is social sensitivity.

Morris sums up well the contribution of pragmatism to educational goals when he states:
Inevitably, the "morality of sharing" places a high premium on human intercourse and personal interaction. It is partly for this reason that, under Dewey's thoughts that of the progressives over the last fifty years, socialization of the child has come into equal prominence with the intellectual development of the child as a strategic educational aim. (Morris, 1969)

Developmental Stage Theory

Developmental stage theory has permeated the literature of teaching for many years. Through the eyes of Kohlberg (1975), Piaget (1970) and others, the stages of development have been described and curricular implications drawn. Recently, there has been a shift away from the exclusive emphasis on children to an expansion which includes the entire spectrum of a person's life (Sheehy, 1974 and Levinson, 1978). Building upon this shift, Watts (1982) has posed a developmental stage theory for teachers, one which results in the slow accumulation of learning which causes changes.

To see growth in spurts, stairs, degrees, ladders, may be a Western phenomenon... It may be that the labeling of stages reveals the role of noticeer rather than the moment of change. (Watts, 1982)

Watts suggests three stages of development—the survival, middle, and mastery stages. The survival stage begins sometime during student teaching and usually continues well into the first year of teaching. Some teachers never get beyond this stage while others return to it as a result of such events as reassignment to different grade levels or subject areas. During this stage teachers are struggling with problems of their own competence. Often these problems include
classroom management and anxieties about other's perceptions of their teaching.

Between the survival and mastery stages is the middle stage. Watts (1982, p. 5) describes the middle stage as "... an increasing sense of comfort ... and more attention to child-centered rather than teacher-centered activity ... ." It may also be helpful to think of the middle stage as between two ends of a continuum.

The mastery stage is even more difficult and elusive to define than the others. Easterly, Allen and Williston (1982) state, "While it may be safe to say that we have all known master teachers, each is so very different from the other, and yet each displays somewhat similar personality traits." Watts (1982, p. 7) further defines the master teacher:

- Probably one of the distinguishing marks of a master teacher is an unwillingness to stop growing, examining, and messing around with the job at hand. At this mastery level, the teacher is thoroughly enthusiastic about his or her job and that is the key ingredient of this stage.

**Philosophical Assumption**

The philosophical assumption that can be drawn from these theories can best be reflected through John Dewey's definition of educational philosophy when he states:

- If we are willing to conceive education as the process of forming fundamental dispositions, intellectual and emotional, toward nature and fellow man, philosophy may even be defined as the general theory of education ... . Education is that reconstruction of reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience. (Dewey, 1966)
The metaphysical assumption here is that reality is experience. An individual's value system which includes his or her act of positive regard then becomes a matter of that individual interacting with that experience. Humans are products of their experiences. Dewey identified two innate qualities that humans possess. He referred to them as "dispositions of intelligence and social sensitivity" (Dewey, 1966). Social sensitivity being the end goal with intelligence being the means to accomplishing that end.

One common thread which weaves together these theories is the teacher's personal act of positive regard called "enhancement" by the phenomenologists, "social reward" by the social exchange theorists, Morris's pragmatic goal of "social sensitivity," and Watts' "enthusiastic" master teacher.

The following paradigm is presented as a scaffolding to assist in assessing assumptions about personality traits as being determiners as well as mediators of the teacher's authentic reaction to the student, and as predictors of the teacher's influence over the student's classroom learning experiences.

Paradigm of Theories on Positive Regard

In Phenomenological Field Theory emphasis is placed on the personal element in teaching. Emphasis is placed upon the teacher's personality because of student's basic need, self-adequacy (the maintenance and enhancement of the phenomenological self), is highly dependent upon the teacher's positive behaviors which are perceived by the student as directed toward himself. The student feels enhanced by the teacher's behavior.
**Social Exchange Theory** predicts that a significant relationship between the teacher's ability to give rewards, especially those personal rewards which are mediated by the teacher's personality and the student's feeling that the classroom experience has been a rewarding one. Humans will choose social exchanges which will bring the greatest social rewards.

**Pragmatism's Goal of Social Sensitivity** holds the view that humans are products of their experiences, but also recognizes that humans have innate qualities called "dispositions." Two main ones are intelligence and social sensitivity. Pragmatist sees social sensitivity as leading to a better human community because of each individual's greater sensitivity to the needs of others.

**Developmental Stage Theory** holds the view that teachers grow through three stages of development with the third stage being the master stage where they are characterized by their enthusiasm, and unwillingness to stop growing within the context of their classroom and school.

Philosophical assumptions are the known knowledge supporting a theory of educational leadership and may be centered around such components as the nature of man and society, the nature of leadership, how learning takes place, problem solving, etc.

The paradigm on theories on positive regard may still be too general and perhaps vague to the reader. The following theoretical assumptions are concerned with relating the known knowledge to the particular subject or problem under investigation. It is through the use of theoretical assumptions that we can extend beyond that which
is known. Theoretical assumptions are still too general in nature and cannot be subjected to direct examination. However, the hypotheses which follow are drawn from theoretical assumptions and can be investigated.

Theoretical Assumptions

1. Humans, by the choices they make, are responsible for their lives.
2. Awareness is essential to the making of adequate choices.
3. Values stem from within the individual.
4. The school is the social setting in which the individual learns values through association with others.
5. Both moral and aesthetic values arise out of experience.
6. Experience, with its implied continuing change, is the essence that forms an individual's positive and negative behavior patterns.
7. Teachers have personal acts of positive regard or an optimistic view of human nature.
8. Teachers' personality traits determine the teacher's authentic reaction to students.
9. Certain personality and behavioral characteristics or patterns of characteristics are peculiar to outstanding teachers. These are the same for all ages and sex.
10. Certain personality and behavioral characteristics of outstanding teachers can be objectively measured by means of measuring instruments.
11. Teachers can be objectively identified as outstanding by trained observers of teacher activities and number of interview questions asked.

12. Identification of outstanding teachers' perceptions has considerable validity.

13. The performance of a teacher when participating in a research program is representative of his or her customary or best performance.

14. The influence of such factors as home and community aspirations, previous educational experiences and school climate can be adequately controlled.

15. The philosophies of education and psychology underlying this research study, the measuring instruments used, and the observation and identification of nominated teachers are acceptable and common to those involved.

Statement of the Problem

The educational community needs teachers who are highly effective in their classroom roles. Both research and theory support the expectation of finding significant relationships between teacher effectiveness and teacher personality traits. The selection, education and assignment of teachers are rarely based on any scientific determination of personality traits other than an "accept-reject" type of decision.

The problem to which this study addresses its efforts is the present inability to include teacher personality as a useful factor in the selection, education and assignment of teachers. This study
attempted to answer four basic questions: (1) whether certain personal and behavioral factors are important in selecting teachers, (2) how can these factors be assessed, (3) how do teachers perceive themselves and their profession, and (4) what role does ethnicity play in the personal and behavioral characteristics of teachers?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to ascertain, through systematic research, if there were significant differences in selected personality and behavioral characteristics among public school teachers with the intent of improving selection procedures. It was structured to determine if there was a constellation of personal and behavioral variables which might distinguish teachers who were nominated as outstanding from those who were not nominated.

A secondary purpose of this study was to provide educational administrators an opportunity to examine the perceptions of outstanding contemporary teachers about their profession. To explore with these teachers their values, beliefs, and plans for the future was a venture which, once documented, could be shared with the teaching profession as well as with the community as a whole.

The assumption was that teachers who were nominated as outstanding possess certain personal and behavioral characteristics atypical of the majority of school teachers in the state of Hawaii. If that assumption was correct, educational administrators could develop a personal characteristics profile based on the findings; and subsequently, use this profile to measure teacher applicants.
The Research Questions

The specific research questions are:

1. Whether certain personality and behavioral factors are important in selecting teachers?
2. How can these factors be assessed?
3. How do outstanding teachers perceive themselves, their administrators and their professions as a whole?
4. Do the personal and behavioral characteristics of teachers nominated as outstanding differ if they are from different ethnic backgrounds?

Hypotheses to be Tested

This study is designed to examine a representative sample of public school teachers. Its purpose is to ascertain whether there are any significant differences in the personality characteristics and behaviors of teachers nominated as being outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated as measured by two personality inventory scales: the 16 Personal Factors Questionnaire (16 PF); and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior Questionnaire (FIRO-B).

This study can be more specifically defined by the following operational hypotheses:

1. Do the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF factor QI, Extroversion, differ significantly for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?
2. Do the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF factor QII, Anxiety, differ significantly for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?

3. Do the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF factor QIII, Anxiety, differ significantly for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?

4. Do the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF factor QIV, Independence, differ significantly for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?

5. Do the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor EA, Expressed Affection, differ significantly for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?

6. Do the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor EC, Expressed Control, differ significantly for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?

7. Do the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor EI, Expressed Inclusion, differ significantly for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?

8. Do the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor WA, Wanted Affection, differ significantly for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?
9. Do the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor WC, Wanted Control, differ significantly for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?

10. Do the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor WI, Wanted Inclusion, differ significantly for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?

11. Do the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors differ significantly for those teachers with advanced professional training who were nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?

12. Do the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors differ significantly for those teachers with advanced professional training who were nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?

13. Do the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors differ significantly for those teachers with various years of experience who were nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?

14. Do the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors differ significantly for those teachers with various years of experience who were nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated?
15. Are there similarities in the responses on ten interview questions of nominated teachers when interviewed about their perceptions regarding their profession?

**Ancillary Research Questions**

1. Do the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors differ significantly among the nominated teachers from various ethnic groups?

2. Do the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors differ significantly among the nominated teachers from various ethnic groups?

3. Do the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors differ significantly for teachers of Japanese ancestry who were nominated as outstanding as compared to those teachers of Japanese ancestry who were not nominated?

4. Do the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors differ significantly for teachers of Japanese ancestry who were nominated as outstanding as compared to those teachers of Japanese ancestry who were not nominated?

Due to the large sample of teachers of Japanese ancestry, the investigator decided to include ancillary questions three and four in this study.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study is intended as an initial step in developing a possible methodology of assessing and evaluating personality characteristics
and behaviors of teacher applicants. It merely compares teacher personality profile patterns of 131 teachers who were nominated as outstanding with those who were not nominated.

1. Data generated from the 212 teachers used in this study were from the Honolulu School District's elementary, junior and senior high schools.

2. The identification and nomination of outstanding teachers were based solely on the criteria put forth by a national recognition program.

3. The findings can only be generalized to the teachers in the Honolulu School District.

4. The rating officials may have seen the teacher in light of their own educational philosophy. They may have resorted to subjective judgments concerning classroom discipline, personal attractiveness, or behavior during interview sessions.

Definitions

FIRO-B--(Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior)
A psychological measure of a person's characteristic behavior toward other people in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection.

16 PF--(The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire) An objective test devised to measure sixteen primary functionally independent and psychologically meaningful personality traits.
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16 PF Second-order Traits--The sixteen primary traits have been reduced to four second-order traits by Cattell and summarized with appropriate synonyms.

Personality--The sum of one's qualities of body, mind, and character.

Behavior--Descriptions of behavior provided by such terms as expressed affection, expressed inclusion, expressed control, and wanted affection, wanted inclusion, and wanted control.

Teacher Performance--Refers to what the teacher does on the job rather than to what he/she can do.

Teacher Effectiveness--Refers to the effect that the teacher's performance has on students.

Teachers' Perceptions--Statements expressed during interviews on what teachers thought and felt about themselves, their work, their interactions with others and the profession as a whole.

Nominated As Outstanding Group--Group of teachers selected using a nomination-type scale measuring their philosophy of education and their performance within the classroom and the school. They are a subgroup of the teachers from the Honolulu School District.

Non-nominated Group--Group of teachers randomly selected from the Honolulu School District on the island of Oahu, and the control group for this study.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The question of what makes an effective teacher has eluded researchers for decades. The entire field of teacher evaluation has suffered from a surplus of opinions and a shortage of evidence. Ann Lewis, Executive Editor of Education U.S.A., stated, "Personnel assessors are stumped by the age-old question of what makes an excellent teacher" (Lewis, 1977). James Popham (1969) succinctly pointed out the magnitude of the issue in the following statement:

One of the exclusive targets in the history of the educational research is a valid index of teacher effectiveness. Since the turn of the century, literally hundreds of investigations have probed the question of teacher competency assessment, and most of them produce little, if any significant progress. (Popham, 1969)

There is a commonsense notion of what is a good teacher, but teacher effectiveness, like intelligence, is an often used but difficult to define quality. Brody (1977) stated that a good teacher was harder to define than to find and indicated that researchers have yet to pinpoint the qualities that make one teacher superior to another.

A review of the history of empirical research during the twentieth century by Donald Medley (1979) on teacher effectiveness revealed four general periods. The thrust of the earliest efforts presumed that teacher effectiveness was a result of personality traits or characteristics of the teacher and research was geared to identify those traits.
Those studies tended to emphasize personality attributes that were hypothesized to be related to excellence in teaching. The most frequently mentioned characteristics included cooperation, personal magnetism, appearance, breadth and intensity of interest, consideration, and leadership. Numerous correlational studies were generated as a result of this quest.

Later, effectiveness was not seen so much as the result of certain personality traits possessed by the teacher, but by the methods used in teaching. The results of this research tended to be inconclusive and frequently contradictory.

Following the failure of research on teacher effectiveness as being dependent on teaching methods, researchers sought answers by examining the climate the teacher created and maintained in the classroom. This method of research was to observe behavior in teachers' classrooms on random occasions, looking for behaviors that were stable across observations. This focus was often referred to as "process-product" research. Results of these efforts were disappointing and the quest for defining the basis for teacher effectiveness continued.

More recent research efforts have attempted to identify generic teaching behaviors. Proponents of this thrust view effectiveness as mastery of a repertoire of competencies and the ability to use those professional competencies appropriately.

Review of Other Recent Reviews

In recent years, various researchers and organizations such as Biddle and Ellena (1964), Dunkin and Biddle (1974), Holley (1977),
Gudridge (1980), Rand Corporation (Darling-Hammer et al., 1982), and the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching (Natriello et al., 1977) have reviewed studies on teacher effectiveness. They have concluded that one is unable to precisely define or measure teacher effectiveness, and the bulk of studies on the subject to date have produced negligible or contradictory results. One of the first such efforts was Biddle and Ellena (1964). This summary of research concluded that results have been modest, inconclusive, and often contradictory, and it is not an exaggeration to say we do not today know how to select trained, effective teachers.

According to Dunkin and Biddle (1974), research on teacher effectiveness has been conducted for many years and has generated more than 10,000 published studies. The authors point out that studies have provided few outcomes that a superintendent can use to hire a teacher. They conclude that the significant shortcoming of the earlier studies was that they did not focus on the actual process of the teaching in the classroom, such as the crucial events of teacher-pupil interaction.

A review by the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, prepared by the National Institute of Education, concluded:

The literature on the evaluation of teachers, although bountiful in size and scope, suffers from an accumulation of unresolved issues. Theoretically, the process of evaluating teachers is still plagued with basic questions: Are teachers subject to professional or bureaucratic evaluative processes? What are the critical aspects of a teacher's classroom performance? How are teaching techniques related to learning outcomes? Should teachers be evaluated on performance or outcome? (Natriello et al., 1977)
Freda Holley (1977) reviewed the literature on teacher evaluation and noted the tremendous number of publications about teacher evaluation. She concluded that there was very little true research which would give practical assistance in the design of a more effective evaluation system.

Gudridge (1980) reported research findings from Medley, Coker, Ruth and Robert Soar, and others. She concluded that several studies revealed that the most marked differences between good and bad teachers is the trait of positive expectation. Good teachers believe their students will succeed--and they do. In a study of thirty Maryland schools, for example, both principals and teachers in the better schools expected a lot of the students. Gudridge further stated that what works with one group of students can have the opposite effect on another, depending on such factors as grade level, learning tasks, and socioeconomic status.

A review of the literature of a doctoral dissertation provided an extensive compilation of pertinent research findings. Weslander (1981) reported that from the beginning research findings were mixed and inconclusive. Based upon the literature, experience, academic record, and level of professional activity do not contribute to increased teacher effectiveness. Some personality characteristics, including methods of perceiving, have been found to correlate with improved performance of a teacher. But correlation is not causation, and consistent personality traits of successful teachers still seem to resist clear identification. Stable criteria for judging teacher effectiveness continue to be elusive.
The Rand Corporation (Darling-Hammer et al., 1982) in conducting a teacher evaluation study for the National Institute of Education concluded that linking precise and specific teacher behavior to precise and specific learning of pupils is not possible at this time. Research has produced inconsistent findings.

**Studies Related to the Role of the Teacher's Personal Characteristics to Effective Teaching**

Throughout the four periods of research on teacher effectiveness, the personal qualities and behaviors of teachers have been hypothesized to have contributed toward given effects on students. Ryans (1960), Patrick (1974), Twining (1974), Cruickshank (1976), Tuckman (1979) and Coker (1980) are some of the researchers who have continued to examine this area.

Unfortunately, some researchers would have others believe that these traits and behaviors of successful teachers cannot be identified. Adherence to this negative position results in a line of thinking that states, "It is no use researching this field as past efforts have indicated it will be unproductive." Obviously, additional research is needed. No doubt proper methodological procedures will yield additional knowledge about the personal characteristics and behaviors of successful classroom teachers.

This review of the literature reveals that it is apparent that the traits associated with the effective teacher are large in number. Certainly the numerous and varied lists of teacher characteristics stand as testimony to the fact it is indeed difficult to determine
just what combination of traits defines a good teacher. The lack of easily measured and quantifiable teacher traits has been one of the shortcomings of teacher effectiveness studies.

Probably the largest and most sophisticated study related to teacher effectiveness was that conducted by Ryans (1960). The research included 6,179 teachers in 1,747 schools. The findings revealed that there were three major patterns of teachers' classroom behavior: (1) warm, understanding and friendly behaviors versus aloof, egocentric and restricted teacher classroom behavior, (2) responsible, business-like, and systematic versus evading, unplanned, and slipshod teacher classroom behavior, and (3) stimulating and imaginative versus dull and routine teacher classroom behavior. Vicky Thayer (1978), an expert on this subject, stated, "The Teacher Characteristic Study, directed by Ryans, is the single most extensive study of teachers to date."

Many other researchers such as Gough (1975), Koten (1978), Lewis (1978), Peterson and Karchak (1982), and Rosenshine and Furst (1973), during the past two decades concluded that certain personal qualities are related to effective teaching. Some common personal characteristics and behaviors identified by these researchers are: warmth, flexibility, enthusiasm and dominance, and communication and interpersonal trust.

Flanders (1970) and Amidon and Giametteo (1965) attempted to classify behaviors in terms of the interactive situation between the teacher and the students. They found that the superior teachers talked less, accepted more student ideas, encouraged more pupil-initiated participation, and gave fewer directions than did the average teachers.
Patrick (1974) reported the profile of an effective teacher based on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The writer operationally defined the effective teacher in terms of student preference. The question was asked of college students, "Who was the most effective teacher you have had?" The teachers were then located and administered the Edwards Preference Inventory. The findings revealed that the effective teachers were outgoing and supportive on the one hand, and not autocratic and dogmatic on the other. Among the many traits of an effective teacher which Patrick listed were enthusiasm, creativity, interest in the subject, love of children, love of teaching, being a caring person, competence, understanding, and patience. Patrick concluded that effective teachers scored above the population means on the nurturance, change, affiliation, achievement, introspection, dominance, and exhibition scales of the Edwards. One of her recommendations was that teacher education institutions emphasize people rather than programs. In other words, the personality dimension is more important than the external criteria commonly used to hire teachers.

Manatt and Rice (1977) listed thirty items which they found to discriminate between teachers who were evaluated high and those that were evaluated low. The items were categorized into five rubrics descriptive of teacher behavior: productive teaching techniques, positive interpersonal relations, organized and structured class management, intellectual stimulation, and desirable out-of-class behavior. With each factor, there were six teacher behaviors which discriminated between high and low rated groups. The six items related
to positive interpersonal relations were: the teacher shows respect for pupils; the teacher is tolerant of students with differing ideas; the teacher uses supportive criticism rather than blame, shame, or sarcasm; the teacher is readily available to students; the teacher is fair, impartial, and objective in treatment of pupils, and the teacher provides opportunities for all pupils to attain success.

A Department of Health, Education and Welfare (1970) publication entitled "Do Teachers Make a Difference?" pointed out five categories of traits of an effective teacher. They were: (1) dedication to all children, which included such qualities as patience, humaneness, sensitivity, optimism, and tolerance; (2) ability to communicate, which included poise, sincerity, tact, adaptability, and expressiveness; (3) ability to motivate, which included empathy, enthusiasm, helpfulness, persuasiveness, friendliness, open mindedness, and charm; (4) ability to organize and manage a class, which included confidence, maturity, common sense, responsiveness and equanimity; and (5) the ability to create learning experiences, which included the tendency to experiment, curiosity, imagination, resourcefulness, and artistic ability.

Evertson et al. (1980) examined junior high school mathematics and English classes to determine the relationship between some special classroom teacher behaviors and student achievement. The findings were relatively clear with regard to mathematics classes, but the results for effective English teachers were more complex. For instance, teachers of low-entering-ability teachers used methods quite different from teachers of high ability students in order to be successful.
They were friendlier, more tolerant of personal requests, and encouraged appropriate social contacts with their students. In contrast to math teachers, students wanted English teachers to give them choices—variety in their assignments, and not use class discussion exclusively. While academic rigor in math was valued by students, they were inclined to rate lower those English teachers who used criticism, sustained feedback, or difficult questions. The more effective mathematics teachers were active, well-organized, businesslike, and academically oriented, as well as nurturant, enthusiastic, and affectionate. While these characteristics were associated most clearly with attitude gains, they were related to achievement gains as well. These teachers used appropriate and generous amounts of praise, especially in encouraging and accepting student contribution. This research supports the concept that teacher effectiveness must be viewed differently when looking at differing grade levels or subject areas.

Gudridge (1980) reported findings of the massive six-year Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES), conducted by the California Commission of Teacher Preparation and Licensing under the auspices of the National Institute of Education. The purpose of the study was to identify classroom conditions and teaching activities that foster student learning in elementary schools. The major finding of the study was that the more time students spent engaged in a learning activity, the more they will master the task. Other findings included that academic feedback had the strongest and most consistent positive relationship to achievement; students pay attention more when they
have substantive interaction, and what works with one group of students can have an opposite effect on another, depending on such factors as grade level, learning task, and socioeconomic status.

In a study by Coker et al. (1980), a panel of teachers first compiled a list of teacher competencies believed to be important in teaching. Then trained observers rated one hundred teachers on the competencies. Behaviors related to increased student achievement included: listening to students, involving students in organizing and planning; giving clear, explicit directions; and maintaining self-control. Teacher behaviors related to decreased student achievement included using nonverbal communication skills, using praise or rewards, and giving students a voice in decision making.

Students are very quick to pick up other people's expectations about both their academic competence and their behavior. To an important extent, people tend to live up or down to what is expected of them. This factor was supported in a study by Klemp (1977), an educational psychologist who studied the traits of poor and good teachers as measured by achievement of students, and his conclusions were:

The most marked difference between good and bad teachers is the trait of positive expectation. Good teachers believe their students will succeed . . . and the others have a low opinion of them. The other key trait separating the two is group management skills--the ability to know where the students are, and to be sensitive to their feelings. A certain level of knowledge is needed, but high levels of knowledge do not predict superior performance.
The success of a teacher selection system, Selection Research Interview, was reported by Joe Millard and Richard Brooks (1974). They used Selection Research Interview in the selection of teachers in two school districts in Polk County, Iowa, by analyzing audiotaped interviews with the top three or four candidates for each position, and matching the candidates with previously prepared profiles of the school district. A three-year evaluation study of the Selection Research Interview process was conducted to determine the success of the teachers selected by the process by surveying peers, administrators, and students of the subjects. The survey and appraisal data were compared with the recommendations of the Selection Research Interview psychologists.

Three of the findings of the Millard and Brooks study were:
(1) the Selection Research Interview process of identifying teachers who are likely to be successful in a given school district is reasonably successful; (2) the Selection Research Interview is not equally effective in every district; and (3) the Selection Research Interview service is a useful process for teacher selection if it is used in the manner for which it is designed.

Beatrice Gudridge, an education writer, reviewed a case study in Reno, Nevada, "Helping Good Teachers Become Great." The Reno project, according to Associate Superintendent Roth of the Washoe County School District, Reno, Nevada, attempted to identify the differences between good and great teachers. Roth reported that:

We knew some time ago that some of our teachers were doing a terrific job so we interviewed them to find out what they were doing that was so
effective. We discovered that they were not carbon copies of each other, but that many kinds of strengths could add up to super teaching. (Gudridge, 1980)

By using the teacher perceiver system and expanding upon what was learned, the district has determined many characteristics that distinguish good from great teachers. Some examples are:

Great teachers:
believe that teaching children is more important than teaching subjects
have certain characteristics that develop a learning climate, such as:
    they have empathy
    they listen
    they are objective
    they see people as individuals
have characteristics that activate learning
    they have a drive to build rapport
    they are innovative
have the drive to share their knowledge with students
read and collect things
use specific teaching techniques which they can describe
derive satisfaction from their investment in their work--from seeing children learn

Gudridge reviewed the Teacher Perceiver Interview system and quoted Gale Miller, general manager of SRI Perceiver Academies, Lincoln, Nebraska, who stated that,
The interview requires principals and other administrators to listen for teacher personality traits which have been validated by research as positively related to teaching. The list of traits includes: mission, empathy, rapport,
drive, individualized perception, listening, investment, input drive, activation, innovation, Gestalt, objectivity, and focus. (Gudridge, 1980)

Skipper (1975) conducted a four-year longitudinal study, following educational majors from their freshman year through their senior year, for the purpose of determining whether academic achievement and attitude towards students might be positively associated with effective teaching. Findings of the study revealed academic achievement of these candidates was positively related to personal and professional qualities, along with instructional competency and total effectiveness. Personal qualities were defined as emotional control, poise, and interest in students. Academic achievement is an important and practical factor in predicting teacher effectiveness for secondary candidates.

Thayer (1978) reported on Project Empathy, an Omaha, Nebraska, Public Schools teacher selection methodology, which researched what hundreds of students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community patrons perceived about effective teaching. Eight life-style themes emerged as the focal points around which to describe an outstanding teacher. They were:

1. Relationship: a teacher relates to students by listening, being patient, caring, and building relationships to help students grow and develop.

2. Democratic orientation: a teacher with a democratic orientation works out problems with the students and sees supervision as supportive and understanding; not authoritarian, but is not necessarily permissive.

3. Rapport drive: the teacher likes students and wants them to like him or her; the teacher has a high rapport drive which makes one feel comfortable around them.
4. Empathy: the teacher puts himself or herself in the other person's place and attempts to understand the student's state of mind.

5. Student orientation: the teacher believes students ought to be heard, understood, and dealt with as people first, and such things as curriculum materials and public image take second place.

6. Acceptance: the teacher accepts the person as he is, and helps from that point; accepting teachers often have an openness about them that makes them approachable.

7. Student success: the teacher receives satisfaction from his/her students and sees it as fulfillment of his or her profession.

Follow-up research concerning the effectiveness of this approach in the hiring of teachers has been supportive to this methodology. Administrators from 350 school districts throughout the United States have been trained and are using part or all of the assessment system which stresses the importance of human qualities.

Hicknor (1977) organized a study to determine whether organization of personality variables can be used to predict the attitude of student teachers towards teaching. This followed a literature search which showed little research had been done on the personality characteristics of teachers which influenced their attitudes toward students. Findings supported the study's hypotheses that prospective student teachers with an open conceptual system compared to a more closed or dogmatic system had a more favorable attitude toward students than those with a closed or dogmatic system. The nonauthoritarian individual was found to possess the characteristics of tolerance, achievement, independence, intellectual efficiency, self-acceptance, flexibility, responsibility, and sense of well-being.
A survey which sampled superintendents' ideas concerning their priorities in selecting elementary teachers was reported by Marquardt (1979). The research was designed to develop a profile or a composite description of an ideal candidate. School superintendents from rural districts, suburbs, small cities, and metropolitan communities responded to a survey which requested them to group twelve items under three headings. The group headings specified major consideration, secondary considerations, and minor considerations in teacher selection. The resulting placement of the items in rank order was as follows: major considerations included student teaching record, work with children, emotional stability and personality; secondary considerations included health, majors and minors, grade point average, and work experience. Marquardt suggested that administrators should begin to consider using a screening test for emotional stability and personality before interviewing.

Weslander (1981), in a doctoral dissertation, summarized that the traits, behaviors, and attitudes of effective teachers can be roughly classified into three categories. First, those relating to teaching techniques--those that contribute towards the teacher being organized and aid the teacher to "get down to business." Second, there are characteristics having to do with the personality type or traits of the teacher. As a person, the effective teacher is tolerant, patient, spontaneous, a caring person, friendly, imaginative, governed by an internal frame of reference, concerned with perceptual meaning. Third, the teacher exhibits certain behaviors outside the classroom or before entering the teaching field. The effective teacher has
democratic attitudes, is committed to the goal of assisting pupil
growth, utilizes community resources, is a good team worker, and has
participated in "teacher-like" behaviors before entering teaching.

**Personality Defined**

What is this "personality" that we have been discussing?

Kleinmuntz (1967) defined it by saying:

Generally, psychologists are agreed that the
team personality refers to the unique organization
of factors which characterize an individual and
determines his pattern of interaction with the
environment.

Where does personality come from? Is it some magic innate quality,
is it learned, or can it be changed? These questions would seem to
be an important consideration if we are to make use of what we learn
about teacher characteristics. Three factors were identified by
Heidenreich (1967) in his study of personality:

In any discussion of how personality develops,
it must be kept in mind that personality includes
patterns of reflexes, motivations, attitudes,
values, ideals, habits, goals, beliefs caused
or determined by biological, sociological, and
psychological factors.

Bonner (1961) reached the following conclusion after doing extensive
research on personality characteristics:

... that the structuring of personality, including
its essential components, takes place in a cultural
matrix and cannot be reduced to an inherited
organic structure without falsification and
distortion. As a biological organism, man is
a puny animal; but as a sociological person,
he is truly a constitutive and creative being.
Thus, his psychological nature is vastly more
a function of his place in a social matrix than
a function of his biological inheritance.
For much of this century, most scientists have believed that matters such as personality, attitudes, interests and values were learned, not inherited. But new findings, based upon studies of adult twins and their families, show that the biochemical makeup of people's genes have a significant influence on their personality. James Detjen (1990) reports in an article on personality studies the findings of Dr. Thomas J. Bouchard Jr., chairman of the University of Minnesota's psychology department, and four other researchers. They found that attitudes about religion appear to be strongly influenced by genetics. Their findings, which were reported in the March issue of the Journal of Psychological Science, were based upon psychological tests given to 905 pairs of twins.

The comprehensive series of tests, designed to measure religious attitudes, were given to 53 identical twins who had been reared apart, and to 458 identical and 363 fraternal twin pairs who had been reared together. They found that the religious attitudes of the identical twins reared apart were surprisingly similar, even though they had been brought up by different families with very different attitudes about the truth of the Bible, observing the Sabbath, and other aspects of religion.

The twins had been separated at an average age of three months, and in some cases had not been reunited until the time the tests were given. The researchers found similarities in religious attitudes between identical twins raised apart greater than expected for people brought up in different environments. Bouchard claims that the new findings did not mean environmental factors such as childrearing play
no significant role in the development of personality, values and attitudes. He states:

> I think it is important to recognize that none of our findings imply that human behavior is totally determined by genetic factors. We're far from advocating anything like genetic determinism. But our work does challenge the ... view that has dominated psychology for so long. (Detjen, 1990)

These new findings are expected to revive the long-standing nature vs. nurture debate.

A discussion similar to "which came first, the chicken or the egg" can be developed concerning personality and occupational choice. Cattell and Eber (1973) expressed the idea that even though a man's occupation could be seen in his personality, it could not be determined whether he chose the occupation because of the personality, or if the occupation shaped the personality. They went on to argue:

> ... that personality, apart from special skills, is less correlated with job than with status, for in day-to-day contacts, we cannot so surely place a man's occupation as his class.

Chandler, Powell, and Hazard (1971) related personality formation to intellectual development when they stated:

> Just as innate intellectual potential is subject to the influence of the environment, so most of the traits which combine to form personality can be cultivated within limits for each individual. ... People behave in organized, recognizable ways. That is the basic fact on which the whole psychology of personality is founded. At least two levels of organization, or patterning, can be distinguished: the trait and the personality. As soon as we begin to use adjectives to describe someone's behavior, we are talking a trait language ... Since recurrence is the paramount property of recognizable pattern, a trait is a simple
behavioral pattern, a disposition to behave in a describable way. And a first approximation to a working definition of personality, for the purposes of the assessor, is that it is a pattern of traits.

Bischof (1970) recognized two kinds of traits: source traits and surface traits. Surface traits are clusters of observable behavioral events. They are less important in Cattell's viewpoint. On the other hand, source traits are the underlying influences that help to determine surface traits. Source traits are stable and extremely important; they are the major material which the personality psychologist should be studying.

Siegel (1971) felt that, "personality traits (characteristic modes of reaction) are vocationally significant."

Personality is therefore found to be the organization of factors which characterize an individual and his interaction with the environment. Personality was felt by most authors to be formed by a combination of biological, sociological, and psychological factors. Once formed, a personality tends to remain stable. The trait theory of personality has been well established, and forms the basis for this study. Where personality is expressed in trait terms, personality inventories can be used for assessment.

Personality Characteristics of Teachers

Personality characteristics have come to be accepted as key variables in teaching effectiveness. We well remember the teachers with "good" and "bad" personalities. Those who had a superior or inferior knowledge of the subject or excellent or bad classroom
techniques are remembered less well. Getzels and Jackson (1963) emphasized that:

The personality of the teacher is a significant variable in the classroom. Indeed some would agree it is the most significant variable.

Investigation of personality characteristics and how they relate to teaching effectiveness is not new. For many years, researchers have studied various groups of educators in an attempt to determine what relationships may exist. Pounds and Garretson (1962) listed teacher personality first in a list of things which contribute to effective teaching.

They found that 31.5 percent of all items of teacher evaluation dealt with "personal characteristics." Dawes (1949) in an article on teacher training, wrote: "Nevertheless, his success as a teacher will be determined, in great part, by his own personality and by his conduct as an individual." Peck (1960) felt that personalities of the teachers affected their effectiveness in the classroom.

Cattell (1970) indicated that some researchers are beginning to recognize that individual differences can be assessed by personality measures. He defined personality as "that which permits a prediction of what a person will be in a given situation" (Cattell, 1970).

Intuitively, one feels that the teacher's personality must have potent influences on the climate of the classroom. However, Getzels and Jackson's (1963) studies on teacher personality and Withall and Lewis (1963) in their studies of teacher social interaction in the classroom, concluded that studies relating to these factors were inconclusive, unreplicated, and conflicting.
Tyler (1960) observed that we are not always sure what a given test measures. Different tests may give different results even though they are said to be measuring the same traits. Test scores indicate relative standings, not specific amounts. Barr (1960) stated that in speaking of personality traits, another way of looking at the subject was to consider, not qualities of the person, but characteristics of performance.

Is there an "ideal personality" for the classroom teacher? Lewis (1977) observed probably not. There are probably as many variations in personalities of good teachers as are found among the general population. Generally, however, those persons who are most effective as individuals are most effective as teachers.

Indications are that differences in teaching behavior may be predicted through analysis of personality characteristics. Gillis (1964) felt that personality was a key factor in the change process. Carnie (1967) reported a variety of research studies which he thought substantiated the notion that personality was related to one's resistance to change. His studies found that open-minded groups were faster at solving problems and showed more responsiveness to experimental situations.

Walberg and Welch (1967) discussed the need for analysis of significant interaction as a vital part of personality studies. In describing teacher personalities, such independent variables as education and experience have interaction effects on dependent variables such as test scores and ratings. This is particularly significant in terms of controlled variables such as age and sex.
Many studies using Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire have been conducted with teachers of various disciplines. Watson (1962) examined what kind of people became science teachers and what kind of values they hold. Kleinman (1966) found that science teachers who asked more critical thinking questions than factual questions consistently rated higher on Ryans' scale of twenty-two bipolar adjectives. Handley and Bledsoe (1968) compared the personal characteristics of influential science teachers, regular science teachers and science researchers using Cattell's Questionnaire. The three groups were found to differ significantly in their personality profiles. Walberg and Welch (1967) found in their research that physics teachers appeared to have unique personal qualities. Rothman et al. (1969) showed that a significant relationship existed between teacher attitudes and changes in student attitudes and interests.

**Effective Teacher Personality**

Guba and Getzels (1955) recognized that despite a large number of investigations into personality characteristics and teaching ability, little is known about identifying and predicting teacher effectiveness. Those studies which are available tend to be vague and do not establish a criterion against which teachers in general can be measured for effective classroom behavior. Kerlinger (1958) expressed the view that:

Much research energy has been expended and many words written on the characteristics, behaviors, and effectiveness of teachers. What is an effective teacher like? What does she do? We do not really know.
Dugan (1961) stated that most studies of teacher effectiveness and success were a collection of subjective opinions. She observed that:

The greatest proportion of studies on teacher effectiveness has been concerned with a collection of subjective opinions from experts in teacher education, administrators, teachers, laymen, and pupils, as to the characteristics of good teachers. Little progress has been made to determine, by objective techniques, the importance of these characteristics in teachers who are judged to be doing a good job. Perhaps many of our most cherished opinions as to the pre-requisites for becoming a good teacher will be weakened when subjected to objective measurements.

Perhaps the most extensive study made concerning teacher characteristics was made by Ryans (1960):

But in spite of the recognition and lip service accorded good teaching, relatively little reliable information is available regarding its nature and the teacher characteristics which contribute to it . . . It seems probable that, without losing sight of the important need for developing means of recognizing good teachers, the attention of research must first more properly (and more profitably) be directed toward the identification and estimation of some of the major patterns of teacher characteristics underlying teacher behavior.

Zax (1971) found that the rating accorded a teacher is dependent upon the rater, the criterion, and the environment in which the teacher was being rated. And Inlow (1970) concluded:

The most important single need, in this connection, is for teachers to be emotionally healthy persons . . . The "good" ones, indeed, are substantial people first, then they are teachers. Or, conceivably, they are good teachers because they are substantial people . . . He or she is relatively independent, flexible, consistent, composed before adversity, tolerant before frustration, and not
debilitated by guilt. Nor is he defensive, escapist, or neurotic.

Bernard (1970) described effective teachers in the following terms:

Accent on the positive, competence without dogmatism or arrogance, and respect (not just tolerance) for pupils are among the positive influences.

Dugan (1961) pointed out that although no one personality factor would be found to be predictive of success in teaching, a possible answer would be found in the "... discovery of certain patterns of personality factors coupled with certain professional factors that best suit a teacher for a specific teaching job." He concluded that further research was vital towards the development of patterns of personality profiles.

In addition to the lack of a single, proper criterion, Guba and Getzels (1955) had difficulty in identifying and predicting good teacher characteristics because the then current psychological tools were not that effective. But in 1963, Getzels and Jackson established Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire as an acceptable instrument to study teacher characteristics so long as the studies were not purely evaluative.

Kleinmuntz (1967) found that the psychologist had adopted the measurement point of view in personality studies. It had become necessary to express his observations in terms of quantities rather than descriptive terms because descriptive terms are not adaptable to the use of statistics.
Kelly (1967) defined assessment in psychological terms:

To psychologists, assessment has come to mean any procedure for making meaningful evaluations or differentiations among human beings with respect to any characteristic or attribute.

An increase in the acceptance of the results of personality inventories that use the self-report method is another acceptable practice among psychologists. Cronbach (1960) believed that most self-report inventories offer a fairly comprehensive picture of personality. Scott and Johnson (1972) in writing about personality tests reported:

Thus, the present studies have shown no evidence for the superior validity of any of the indirect measures of personality characteristics over the direct measures against which they were compared. The widespread use of indirect measures is based on the assumption that they are less liable than direct self-reports to distortion by Ss' tendencies towards defensiveness, faking, or responding in a socially desirable fashion. It is quite possible that such deceptive tendencies have been overrated as a source of invalidity when tests are administered with proper attention to encouraging Ss' truthfulness.

Use of personality tests or questionnaires to be completed by the subject is then an acceptable method of gathering data.

After the data have been gathered they must be put into a form that is usable. Stagner (1961) expressed the view that this is possible when he stated:

Thus, it is assumed that sociability, emotional stability, self-sufficiency, manifest anxiety, and other traits are common in the population being studied; one may therefore make numerical comparisons within the population.
In order to make the numerical comparisons, there must be a reference point from which to operate. Kleinmuntz (1967) recognized this when he cautioned:

> Psychological tests have no absolute standards of "pass" or "fail." All meaning for a given score of a person derives from comparing his score with those of other persons. Norms provide such points of comparison, and as its name implies, a norm represents "normal" or average performance.

The nomothetic approach to personality was chosen in lieu of the idiographic, not because of its superiority, but because with it, personality can be described in terms of a particular pattern of traits. The idiographic theorist does not exclude from consideration that the characteristics of an individual are essential if personality is to be understood. Ruch (1960) defined the differences as follows:

> The major difference between the idiographic and nomothetic approaches lies in the way in which the "uniqueness of the individual" is defined. For the idiographic theorists, it consists of genetic, acquired, and environmentally modified dispositions or traits or systems of behavior which are different from those of any other person. . . For the nomothetic theorists, the uniqueness of an individual is defined by his particular patterning of elements which are present in each person in some degree and combination.

### The Use of Tests for Pre-Selection Purposes

Teacher pre-employment testing is emerging rapidly as a new subject across the country (Holley, 1977). Montgomery (1979) reported that this could turn into a bandwagon. Pre-selection tests are generally either instruments which measure cognitive items or personality and interpersonal psychology factors or a combination of the two.
In a survey of the 99 largest school districts in the United States, Holley (1979) found that 25 percent of the districts were using a test for screening purposes. Lewis (1977) reported that "one-third of the big city school systems require a test which is usually nothing more than a test of knowledge." This fad has been fed by accountability, the teacher surplus, student competency testing, and a 1978 United States Supreme Court ruling. This high court decision upheld South Carolina's use of the National Teacher Examination for both certification and for salary purposes. The result is new pressures, laws, and regulations in a number of states to force new teachers to submit to various tests of their competencies. This trend is based partially on the belief that teachers should be able to demonstrate cognitive competencies as a prerequisite to a teaching position.

Northern (1980) reported that ten states have mandated, either by legislative or by Department of Public Instruction action, competency testing for teacher applicants. Fiske (1978) noted that six states use the National Teacher Examination. In Florida, the legislature passed a law requiring a candidate for a teaching job to complete a competency test as well as a one-year internship before being awarded a teaching certificate, beginning in 1980. A new Georgia program requires candidates to pass tests in 18 competencies and 55 indicators. Similar tests have been developed in South Carolina; Houston, Texas; and Montgomery County, Maryland.

In the private sector, personality and psychological testing is not new. Psychological and educational tests are used in the selection of personnel because it is generally accepted that they supply
information which gives additional and valuable assistance in making decisions about people. Many businesses use psychological tests in their employment data collection.

In fact, Koten (1978) reported that Paul Sparks, a psychologist and coordinator of personnel research at Exxon Corporation, stated the following:

There is no major company that isn't at least experimenting with some form of psychological assessment. The trend isn't new. For instance, Sears, Roebuck and Company began its psychological assessment program in the early 1940's. More corporations use psychologists nowadays, partly because testing has become more sophisticated, comprehensive, and objective. "Increasingly, business believe that hiring and promotion decisions are too important to be made solely on the basis of such things as office politics, tenure, and highly-subjective performance evaluations by bosses," says Jon Boentz, Sears' Director of Psychological Research. "Since 1960, more than 1600 firms have created assessment centers. They include General Electric, Union Carbide, International Business Machines, and J. C. Penney," says John Dobbs, Vice President of J. C. Penney Stores.

The testing in the private, as well as in the public sector, has not been done without conflicts. The experience that the Dallas Public Schools had in its research project using the Wesman Personnel Classification Tests is an example of this. Mitchell (1978) reported that the Wesman test was being used as a screening device for new teachers, and caught public fire because the district's validation study revealed low scores for currently-employed teachers.

In addition to possible conflict, administrators have been slow to use such tests for such reasons as cost, lack of trained personnel, and the belief that human behavior is too complex to measure. Although
tests may not be absolute and perfect predictors, they have the capacity to improve batting averages in selection.

Realizing the possibility of conflict, there is substantial support for the personality testing. Two of those proponents were Sergiovanni and Carver (1973), and they pointed out the following:

In most occupations controversy exists over the use of personality tests in estimating personal adequacy; but we believe that the job of teaching, in requiring close contact with children over long periods of time, is an exception and that personality testing in this case is essential.

Support for such testing was voiced by Paul English (1978), an Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, Board of English school board member, when he stated:

Psychological examination should be administered to applicants for teaching positions in the Oklahoma City Public Schools and stricter criteria should be used for selecting teachers--before teachers are hired, whether a prospect has a great interest in kids or if teaching is just a job. Psychological testing and personality inventories could pick out applicants who might display some forms of behavior which will hinder classroom performance.

The attitude of teacher organizations toward the use of tests for licensing, employment, and promotion is unlike more prestigious professions who insist on high standards, partly to restrict admission to special practice.

**Summary**

The review of literature was intended to cite and discuss representative writings in the areas of personality factors that contribute towards the substance or the "gut" of highly effective
teachers. The literature, although large in size and scope, suffered from an accumulation of unresolved issues. Theoretically, evaluating teachers is still plagued with the basic question, "What teacher characteristics and behavior make students learn more?" Since the research of the literature has cited no previous study that has identified a single constellation of personal qualities that fit a person ideally to teach, and a specific philosophy of education, and because of the uniqueness of this study of highly effective teachers, unique because as Thomas Good (1982) stated, "Most research to date has focused on skill achievement in elementary schools, considerably fewer clear cut results are available for secondary and private schools," it is anticipated that this research topic will not only benefit the Hawaii public and private schools, but also districts and universities throughout the nation.

The review of literature also included a look at pre-employment personality and psychological testing in the public schools as well as the private sector. An analysis of that review indicated that the private sector is far more advanced than the public sector in such efforts.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter includes a detailed description of the design, procedures, and methods used in the examination of the proposed hypotheses. The purpose of the study was to determine if teachers who were nominated as outstanding were different in personality and behavioral traits from those who were not nominated.

A secondary purpose was to give educators an opportunity to examine what highly respected teachers think and feel about themselves, their perceptions about their work, their interactions with others, and their profession as a whole.

Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of 2,077 elementary and secondary teachers from 42 schools in the Honolulu School District on the island of Oahu. This district contains diverse student populations which vary across the total socioeconomic continuum. In addition, the communities and the teachers who serve them offer a richness and diversity of ethnic backgrounds. Table 3 in Chapter IV displays the descriptive data of these teachers.

The nominated group consisted of 131 elementary and secondary teachers. The criteria by which they were nominated was a performance evaluation ranking scale used by a national teacher recognition program. It is a national program that takes nominations for excellence in teaching from the public at large, and is open to both private and
public elementary, junior and senior high school teachers in the entire state.

Program administrators, representatives from the community, and peers ranked the teachers on a five point Likert-type summated scale. A ranking of one represented those who appeared to merely do the job with minimum effort and interest. A ranking of five represented the highly motivated teachers whose performance indicated the desired qualities for success in a classroom setting. A rating of two, three, and four represented an evaluation between least outstanding and the most outstanding teachers. The teachers were also observed by the nominating teams in their classrooms and were interviewed on an individual basis as to their perceptions about themselves and their profession as a whole. The investigator privately tallied the results and contacted the teachers selected. Complete privacy was assured each teacher concerning their responses during the interview.

Not all teachers were willing to participate in this study. For example, three teachers were concerned about a potential negative impact on those teachers not chosen. They felt that, if the nominated teachers told anyone else on the staff, then those not nominated might suffer some loss of positive self-esteem. From the responding ninety-eight teachers, twenty-nine were randomly selected for the interview process. Only twenty-four were willing to grant interviews.

The next task was to invite 131 elementary and secondary teachers who were nominated as outstanding and 219 elementary and secondary teachers who were not nominated as outstanding to participate in this study. The control group of 219 was randomly selected from the remaining 1,946 non-nominated teachers in the Honolulu District.
Ninety-eight of the 131 nominated teachers returned their questionnaires for a response rate of 74.81 percent. One hundred and fourteen of the 219 non-nominated teachers returned their questionnaires for a response rate of 52.05 percent. The nominated teachers were designated as Group I and the non-nominated teachers as Group II.

This study was descriptive in nature and was structured as a compared-groups design.

**Measurement of Variables**

**Instrumentation**

The Sixteen Personality Factor questionnaire, the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Form B inventory, and a biographical data questionnaire were administered to both groups. A statement of consent for an interview was distributed only to the nominated group as this was the group whose perceptions were to be analyzed. The following is a brief discussion of these instruments:

1. **The Sixteen Personality Factor** (16PF--Appendix A). The 16PF, an objectively scored test designed by Cattell for basic research in psychology gave the most complete personality assessment possible in a brief time period. The comprehensive coverage of personality rests upon measurement of 16 functionally independent and psychologically meaningful dimensions isolated and replicated in more than 30 years of factor-analytic research on normal groups. In addition to the 16 primary factors, the test can be used as a measure of four secondary dimensions which are broader traits scorable from the component primary factors. Each scale of the
questionnaire has 10 to 13 items. The questions are arranged in a cyclic order determined by a plan to give maximum convenience in scoring by computer and to insure variety and interest for the examinee.

The 16PF can be scored for broad second-order factors as well as for the 16 primaries. At the present time, eight second-order factors have been identified. Only the first four, QI (Introversion vs. Extraversion), QII (Low Anxiety vs. High Anxiety), QIII (Tenderminded vs. Tough-Minded), and QIV (Subduedness vs. Independence) are computed. They are described in detail in Table 1. The second four factors, QV through QVIII were not used because they have not received sufficient study to establish reliability and validity. The means, standard deviations, and the t-ratio relationships for the first four factors will be found in Chapter IV as they are part of the statistical analysis. The second-order factors have been studied by several investigators using widely differing samples. Recently, Krug and Johns (1986) completed a large sample second-order factor analysis using data from the most recent 16PF standardization. Their results were confirmed by comparing them to previous analyses in Cattell's studies.

Reliability. Split-half reliabilities for each of the sixteen factor scales range from .71 to .93, averaging about .84. When Forms A, B, and C of the test were used, reliabilities ranged from .75 to .90 for each of the sixteen factor scales (Cattell et al., 1972).
Table 1
Scales and Description of the Four Second-Order Personality Factors of the 16 Personal Factors Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Low Score Direction</th>
<th>High Score Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>INTROVERSION, shy, self-sufficient, inhibited in interpersonal contacts</td>
<td>EXTROVERSION, socially outgoing, uninhibited, good at making and maintaining interpersonal contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QII</td>
<td>LOW ANXIETY, life is generally satisfying and is able to achieve those things that seem to be important</td>
<td>HIGH ANXIETY, is generally dissatisfied with degree to which is able to meet demands of life and to achieve what is desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIII</td>
<td>TENDERMINDED EMOTIONALLY, sensitive to subtleties of life, likely to be artistic and rather gentle, may be a discouraged and frustrated type</td>
<td>TOUGH POISE, likely to be an enterprising, decisive and resilient personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIV</td>
<td>SUBDUEDNESS, is group-dependent, chastened, passive personality, likely to desire and need support from other persons</td>
<td>INDEPENDENCE, tends to be aggressive, independent, daring, incisive person, likely to exhibit considerable initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cattell et al., 1972, p. 17.
Validity. Validity of the questionnaire is reported as internal validity. Factor analysis showed the items chosen to be good measures of the factors. Internal construct validities range from .73 to .96, averaging approximately .88 (Cattell et al., 1972).

(2) The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Form B (FIRO-B/See Appendix B) This personality inventory is an objectively scored instrument whose primary purposes are to (1) measure how an individual acts in interpersonal situations, and (2) to provide an instrument that will facilitate the prediction of interaction between people. To accomplish the second objective, two aspects of behavior in each dimension are assessed: the behavior an individual expresses towards others (e); and the behavior an individual expresses toward him (w). The scores are additive in nature and can be summed into a single score for the "expressed" and "wanted" behaviors. What's considered a high and a low score?

0-1 are very low scores; the behavior described will be rarely displayed by the person.

2-3 are low scores; the behavior described will not be noticeably characteristic of the person.

4-5 are borderline scores; although not extreme, the person may display a tendency toward the behavior described for the lower (4) or higher (5) score.

6-7 are high scores; the behavior will be noticeably characteristic of the person.
8-9 are very high scores; the behavior will be strongly characteristic of the person.

Dr. Will Schutz (1967) who developed the FIRO-B, observed that much of the behavior we exhibit toward others is motivated by our differing levels of needs for these three interpersonal dimensions. Inclusion is defined as the interpersonal need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people with respect to interaction and association. The interpersonal need for control is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people with respect to control and power. The interpersonal need for affection is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with others with respect to love and affection. The scales and their descriptions are identified in Table 2.

**Reliability.** The FIRO-B scales were developed and normed utilizing approximately one thousand subjects. Split-half reliabilities for each of the FIRO-B scales samples (Schutz, 1978). The coefficient of internal stability refers to the correlation between test and retest scores after a time lapse. For FIRO-B, this is an important measure, since interpersonal orientations are presumably stable traits. The mean coefficient of stability of the six scales is .76 (Schutz, 1978).

**Validity.** Validity of the questionnaire is reported as criterion-related validity. The degree to which a test is effective is predicting or diagnosing individual behavior in specific situations is criterion-related validity (Moore, 1983,
Table 2

Descriptions and Symbols for the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Form B Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Dimensions</th>
<th>Expressed Behavior</th>
<th>Wanted Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCLUSION, need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people with respect to interaction and association</td>
<td>EI I make efforts to include other people in my activities and to get them to include me in theirs. I try to belong, to join social groups, to be with people as much as possible.</td>
<td>WI I want other people to include me in their activities and invite me to belong, even if I do not make an effort to be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL, need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people with respect to control and power.</td>
<td>EC I try to exert control and influence over things. I take charge of things and tell other people what to do.</td>
<td>WC I want others to control and influence me. I want other people to tell me what to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFECTION, need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with others with respect to love and affection.</td>
<td>EA I make efforts to become close to people. I express friendly and affectionate feelings and try to be personal and intimate.</td>
<td>WA I want others to express friendly and affectionate feelings toward me and try to become close to me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p. 212). The validity coefficient of the six scales is 0.40 (Schutz, 1978). This is considered moderately high. Individual responses to the items are at least 90 percent predictable from this scale score. This implies that any sample of items in each dimension would rank respondents in essentially the same way. Therefore, the sampling of the items yields a satisfactory criteria-related predictive validity score.

(3) **Biographical Informational Questionnaire (Appendix C).** This questionnaire was developed by the investigator in order to describe specific characteristics of the groups. Respondents were asked to furnish information on age, ethnicity, educational training and years of experience in teaching.

(4) **Interview Questions.** A pool of questions was drawn from sample interview questions reflecting the professional experiences of graduate students, formal interview processes, and brainstorming sessions. The pool included more than fifty questions. A number of questions were rejected as being too leading, redundant or inappropriate. From the original pool ten questions were eventually selected for use during the interview. They are listed below:

1. Did any person or experience influence your decision to become a teacher?
2. What is the teacher's role in maintaining discipline?
3. How would you describe yourself?
4. How might your students describe you?
5. What kind of person would you like to work for?
6. Do you feel appreciated?
7. If you could establish an ideal school, what would it be like?
8. If you had to do it all over again, would you be a teacher?
9. What are the characteristics of a person whom you feel is an outstanding teacher?
10. What can be done to make teaching a more highly respected profession?

Overview of Design

Data Collection

The two sets of answer sheets, one for the 16PF and the other for FIRO-B, plus the biographical data sheets were lettered. "A" was used to distinguish the nominated group and no letter identified the non-nominated group. Each teacher was assigned a number. The number was checked off as the instruments were returned. The answer sheets, data sheets, 16PF Questionnaires, FIRO-B Questionnaires, self-addressed envelopes, and letters of introduction (Appendix D) with instructions were placed into sealed envelopes and mailed to each teacher. The sample subjects were requested to complete the information and return it to the investigator. This initial request produced 63 responses from the nominated group and 92 from the non-nominated group.

A follow-up letter was mailed four weeks after the original mailing. This follow-up produced 28 responses from the nominated group and 22 responses from the non-nominated group. A second follow-up was mailed two weeks later, which resulted in another 7 responses for the nominated group but none for the non-nominated group. The Hawaii State Teachers Association urged their members to complete the desired data through articles in the association's newsletter (Appendix E). A total return of 98 responses or 74.81 percent of the nominated sample was returned for both the 16PF and the FIRO-B.
One hundred fourteen or 52.0 percent responded from the non-nominated group for the 16PF, and 102 or 46.58 percent responded for the FIRO-B.

Interviews took place in the interviewer's office or a neutral location. In each case, the order of the questions was the same. The interviewer was limited to short encouraging statements as well as clarifying elaborative questions. All interactions were recorded on tape and sessions varied from 30 to 45 minutes in length. Each tape was then transcribed by a secretary and double-checked by a graduate assistant and the interviewer. Completed transcripts were sent to teachers who were asked to edit their own interviews. Teachers responded by adding clarifying statements and deleting certain portions.

**Data Retrieval**

Each item on the 16PF was assigned a zero, one, or two point score. Scoring stencils were used to obtain raw scores. A standardization table in the handbook was used to convert raw scores to standard scores. Sten scores ("standard ten"), which were used in this standardization process, converted the raw scores into a system which places the scores obtained in this study in relation to national norm scores. Sten scores were distributed over ten equal-interval standard score points from one through ten. Stens five and six constituted a solid center of the population. The population mean was fixed at 5.5. Sten scores of five and six were considered average, four or seven slightly deviate, and one or ten extreme. If the "motivational distortion" score exceeded a sten score of seven, it was assumed that the answers were unreliable due to over-motivation.
in providing desirable responses over actual reaction. Allowances, based on national norms, were applied as a distortion correction in responses where this was the case.

The FIRO-B instruments were scored with the use of scoring template. The summary scores were then derived from the six basic scale scores. On the front of the FIRO-B forms, spaces are provided for: sums of columns, sums of rows, and sum of sums. Computation of the summary scores was presented in the FIRO-B Awareness Scale Manual.

Treatment of the Data

The following statistical null hypotheses were tested to accomplish the study's objectives. The 16PF four second-order traits were computed and tested as these were felt to lend the greatest amount of information. All six of the FIRO-B factors were computed and tested.

Hypothesis I: There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second order factor QI, Extroversion, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

Hypothesis II: There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factor QII, Anxiety, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

Hypothesis III: There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factor QIII, Tough Poise, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.
Hypothesis IV: There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factor QIV, Independence, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

Hypothesis V: There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor EA, Expressed Affection, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

Hypothesis VI: There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor EC, Expressed Control, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

Hypothesis VII: There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor EI, Expressed Inclusion, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

Hypothesis VIII: There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor WA, Wanted Affection, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

Hypothesis IX: There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor WC, Wanted Control, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.
Hypothesis X: There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor WI, Wanted Inclusion, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

Hypothesis XI: There are no significant differences between the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors of the teachers with advanced professional training who were nominated as outstanding and those who were not nominated.

Hypothesis XII: There are no significant differences between the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors of the teachers with advanced professional training who were nominated as outstanding and those who were not nominated.

Hypothesis XIII: There are no significant differences between the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors of the teachers with various years of experience who were nominated as outstanding and those who were not nominated.

Hypothesis XIV: There are no significant differences between the mean scores on the scales of the FIRO-B factors of the teachers with various years of experience who were nominated as outstanding and those who were not nominated.

Hypothesis XV: There are no similarities on the ten interview questions in the responses of nominated teachers when interviewed about their perceptions regarding their profession.
Ancillary Research Questions:

1. There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors among the nominated teachers from various ethnic groups.

2. There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors among the nominated teachers from various ethnic groups.

3. There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors of teachers of Japanese ancestry who were nominated as outstanding as compared to those teachers of Japanese ancestry who were not nominated.

4. There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors of teachers of Japanese ancestry who were nominated as outstanding as compared to those teachers of Japanese ancestry who were not nominated.

The five ethnic groups were tested statistically on the 16PF and FIRO-B factors using one-way analysis of variance. The large sample of teachers of Japanese ancestry was so dominant in this study that the investigator considered it almost necessary to test ancillary questions three and four statistically.

The .05 level of significance was used to test all hypotheses. Although individual profiles for each of the subjects were not constructed, personality profiles of the selected findings for each group are found in Chapter IV.
Findings on the perceptions of the nominated teachers about themselves and their profession as determined through the interview process will be presented on a question by question basis in Chapter IV. Responses to the ten interview questions reflect the perceptions of twenty-four nominated teachers from the Honolulu School District.

**Statistical Treatment**

The hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. Responses from each of the subjects on each of the two personality scales were subjected to a priori (two-tailed) t-tests for independent samples. Mean scores were compiled for Group I and Group II and through the use of the SAS statistical package, t-tests were run on the data to determine significant statistical differences at the .05 level.

The two-sample t-test and confidence intervals are based on several assumptions, the most crucial being the independence of the two samples. The second assumption that both populations are normally distributed is less crucial because of the Central Limit Theorem. This theorem states that, "Regardless of the nature of the population distribution--discrete or continuous, symmetric or skewed, unimodal or multimodal--the sampling distributions for T and Y are always normal as long as the sample size is large enough" (Hildebrand and Ott, 1987). If the sample size is sufficiently large, this ensures that the distribution is normally distributed (Cody and Smith, SAS Programming Language, p. 123). How large a sample is sufficiently large?
Hildebrand and Ott (1987) state that one can use the normal approximation anytime \( n \) exceeds 30.

The third assumption is that the variances of the two groups should be approximately equal. This last assumption is checked automatically by the SAS system. Each time a t-test is computed, two variances are shown: separate variance t test and pooled-variance t test. This is a special function to test homogeneity of variances. Huck, Cormier and Bounds (1974) mention this in their text Reading Statistics and Research. Hildebrand and Ott (1987) discuss it as the "separate variance t test."

The SAS t-test output gives two sets of t-values, degrees of freedom, and probabilities. One is valid if the variances are equal and the other is valid if the variances are unequal. The SAS test also lists the probability that the variances are unequal due to chance. If this probability is small (less than .05), then the hypothesis is rejected that the variances are equal. The researcher must then use the t-value and probability labeled UNEQUAL. If the PROB F' value is greater than .05, he then uses the t-value and probability for equal variances. The rule of thumb is to use the t-value, df, and probability labeled UNEQUAL if the probability from the F-test is less than .05.

Hypothesis XV was not tested statistically. Data were categorized from ten questions retrieved from personal interviews. Ancillary questions 1 and 2 were tested using analysis of variance with the five ethnic groups being the independent variables and the characteristics being the dependent variables. A post hoc was done using Duncan's multiple-range test (.05) to find group differences after the null hypothesis was rejected.
Ancillary research questions 3 and 4 were tested statistically through one-way analysis of variance with the personality and behavioral factors being the dependent variables and the nominated and non-nominated Japanese ethnic groups being the independent variables. The F-tests were produced to test significant differences at the .05 level between the main effects and interaction of these selected variables.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine if teachers who were nominated as outstanding were different in personality and behavioral profiles from those who were not nominated. Further analysis was conducted to determine if years of teaching experience and advanced professional training contributed to these differences.

Another purpose of this study was to give educators an opportunity to examine what highly respected teachers think and feel about themselves, and their perceptions about their work, their interactions with others, and their profession as a whole. This was carried out through personal interviews.

To test Hypotheses I through XIV, the two-tailed t test statistic was used and a t score computed for each of the personality factors to determine if there were significant differences between the two groups.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis I

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF factor, Q1, Extroversion, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

The four second-order factors as tested by Cattell are determined by sten scores numbered one through ten. This is a bi-polar concept
Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for All
Nominated and Non-Nominated Teachers (N=212)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominated (N=98)</th>
<th>Non-Nominated (N=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor +15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's +15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience (Years Teaching)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where opposite meanings are on each end of a personality continuum. A plus (+) after the factor indicates a high score on that factor. A minus sign (-) after the factor indicates a low score.

Table 4 reveals that the differences between the mean scores of the two groups on the 16PF second-order factor, Introversion versus Extroversion, are highly significant at the .001 level, thereby rejecting Hypothesis I. The nominated group scored higher, thus making them much more extroverted than the non-nominated group.

**Hypothesis II**

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF factor QII, Anxiety, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

Factor QII, Low Anxiety versus High Anxiety, was highly significant at the higher .001 level. In this instance the nominated group scored lower according to Cattell, thus making them less anxious and more satisfied with life in general, while the non-nominated group was highly anxious and generally dissatisfied with the degree to which they were able to meet life's demands.

**Hypothesis III**

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF factor QIII, Tough-minded, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

Factor QIII, Tender-minded versus Tough-minded, was highly significant at the .0005 level. This indicates that although both
Table 4

16 PF Mean Scores, Standard Deviation, t-Ratio and P Values for Nominated and Non-Nominated Teachers by Second Order Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Nominated (N=98)</th>
<th>Non-Nominated (N=114)</th>
<th>t-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-) Mean SD</td>
<td>(+) Mean SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 QI (Introv vs Extrov)</td>
<td>6.84 1.74</td>
<td>5.80 2.78</td>
<td>3.3075</td>
<td>.0011**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 QII (Low vs High Anx)</td>
<td>2.76 1.48</td>
<td>4.00 2.21</td>
<td>-4.8709</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 QIII (Tender vs Tough)</td>
<td>7.45 1.94</td>
<td>8.40 1.95</td>
<td>-3.5463</td>
<td>.0005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 QIV (Subd vs Indepen)</td>
<td>5.15 2.16</td>
<td>4.35 1.62</td>
<td>3.0816</td>
<td>.0023**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes significant beyond the .05 level
** Denotes significant beyond the .01 level
groups had mean scores in the tough-minded range, the non-nominated group appeared to be more tough, decisive and resilient when compared to the nominated group.

**Hypothesis IV**

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF factor QIV, Independence, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

The nominated group also scored higher on Factor QIV, Subduedness versus Independence, with a $p < 0.0023$ level of significance. They are more independent and aggressive while the non-nominated group is group-dependent and more likely to need support from other people.

**Hypothesis V**

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor EA, Expressed Affection, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

No statistically significant differences were found in the mean scores of this FIRO-B factor EA, Expressed Affection, therefore the null hypothesis is not rejected.

**Hypothesis VI**

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor EC, Expressed Control, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

As reported in Table 5, this factor had a $p < 0.0001$ making it significantly different and rejecting the null hypothesis. This
Table 5
FIRO-B Mean Score, Standard Deviation, t-Ratio and P Values for Nominated and Non-Nominated Teachers by Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Nominated Mean</th>
<th>Nominated SD</th>
<th>Non-Nominated Mean</th>
<th>Non-Nominated SD</th>
<th>t-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H5 EA (Expressed Affection)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.1207</td>
<td>.9040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6 EC (Expressed Control)</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>6.5885</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7 EI (Expressed Inclusion)</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.5555</td>
<td>.1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8 WA (Wanted Affection)</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>4.6975</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9 WC (Wanted Control)</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>4.6672</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10 WI (Wanted Inclusion)</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>5.7072</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes significance beyond the .05 level
** Denotes significance beyond the .01 level
indicates that the sample of nominated teachers expressed more control and influence over their interpersonal relationships with others.

**Hypothesis VII**

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor EI, Expressed Inclusion, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

No statistical significance was found in the mean scores for this factor, therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected.

**Hypothesis VIII**

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor WA, Wanted Affection, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

The mean scores of the nominated group for the factor WA, Wanted Affection, differed significantly \( p < .0001 \) from the mean scores of the non-nominated group. That is to say that the nominated group was markedly more in need of having others express friendly and affectionate feelings toward them.

**Hypothesis IX**

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor WC, Wanted Control, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

Null Hypothesis IX, Wanted Control, was rejected at the .0001 level. The mean scores of this factor for the nominated group were significantly higher than the non-nominated group, indicating that there is a contradiction in terms of this interpersonal "control"
factor. As noted above, the nominated sample needed to express control and influence over things. Yet their mean scores showed a statistically significant difference ($p < .0001$) in wanting others to control and influence their behavior.

**Hypothesis X**

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factor WI, Wanted Inclusion, for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.

The null hypothesis was also rejected for interpersonal factor WI (Wanted Inclusion = $p < .0001$). In this instance the mean scores of the nominated group differed significantly from the non-nominated sample. This indicates that the nominated group needs to belong and needs to have others include them in their activities.

**Hypothesis XI**

There are no significant differences between the mean scores on the 16PF second-order factors of the teachers with advanced professional training who were nominated as outstanding and those who were not nominated.

An analysis of Table 6 indicated that professional training had statistically significant differences of the mean scores for the nominated and non-nominated teachers with Bachelor's degrees plus training on the 16PF second-order factors. QI (Introversion versus Extroversion), QII (Low Anxiety versus High Anxiety), QIII (Tender-minded versus Tough Poise) mean scores for the nominated group were significantly higher ($p < .001$) than the non-nominated teachers. Only QIV (Subduedness versus Independence) showed no statistical difference.
Table 6

16 PF Mean Score, Standard Deviation, t-Ratio and P Value for Nominated and Non-Nominated Teachers by Advanced Professional Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Bachelor's +</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Master's +</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>7.4509</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QII</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>-3.5010</td>
<td>.0007**</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIII</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>-2.6835</td>
<td>.0084**</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIV</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.5307</td>
<td>.1287</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.6151</td>
<td>.0124*</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QII</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>-0.7531</td>
<td>.4557</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIII</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-1.4591</td>
<td>.1522</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIV</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.7795</td>
<td>.4401</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.8474</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QII</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>-2.7288</td>
<td>.0126*</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIII</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.2098</td>
<td>.2398</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIV</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.8076</td>
<td>.4284</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes significance beyond the .05 level
** Denotes significance beyond the .01 level
Nominated teachers with Master's degrees have mean scores which were significantly different from the non-nominated teacher on factor QI (Introversion versus Extroversion = p < .0001), and QII (Low Anxiety versus High Anxiety = p < .01). Nominated teachers tended to be extremely extroverted (p < .0001) while the non-nominated teachers were highly anxious (p < .01).

Only one factor of the teachers in the Master's Plus category was statistically significant and that was QI (Introversion versus Extroversion). The nominated teachers were significantly more extroverted at p < .01.

The null hypotheses were rejected for factors QI (Introversion versus Extroversion = p < .0001), QII (Low Anxiety versus High Anxiety = p < .0007), and QIII (Tender-minded versus Tough Poise = p < .008) under the Bachelor's Plus category, factors QI (Introversion versus Extroversion = p < .0001) and QII (Low Anxiety versus High Anxiety = p < .01) under the category of Master's degrees, and factor QI (Introversion versus Extroversion = p < .01) under the Master's Plus category.

Hypothesis XII

There are no significant differences between the mean scores on the FIRO-B factors of the teachers with advanced professional training who were nominated as outstanding and those who were not nominated.

Table 7 reveals that there are significant differences between the mean scores of the Bachelor's Plus group with respect to factor EC (Expressed Control = p < .0001), WA (Wanted Affection = p < .001),
Table 7
FIRO-B Mean Score, Standard Deviation, t-Ratio and P-Value for Nominated and Non-Nominated Teachers by Advanced Professional Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor's</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA (Expressed Affection)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.7892</td>
<td>.4318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC (Expressed Control)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>5.242</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI (Expressed Inclusion)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.2138</td>
<td>.2278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA (Wanted Affection)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3.4054</td>
<td>.0013**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC (Wanted Control)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>4.1043</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI (Wanted Inclusion)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>5.0475</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA (Expressed Affection)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>-0.4561</td>
<td>.6507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC (Expressed Control)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>3.2261</td>
<td>.0025**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI (Expressed Inclusion)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-0.4554</td>
<td>.6512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA (Wanted Affection)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.9929</td>
<td>.0047**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC (Wanted Control)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.3911</td>
<td>.6977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI (Wanted Inclusion)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.2255</td>
<td>.8227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's +</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA (Expressed Affection)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>-0.6465</td>
<td>.5277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC (Expressed Control)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>3.7141</td>
<td>.0021**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI (Expressed Inclusion)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.0403</td>
<td>.9684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA (Wanted Affection)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.0041</td>
<td>.3313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC (Wanted Control)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.7316</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI (Wanted Inclusion)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.5476</td>
<td>.0223*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level  **Denotes significance beyond the .01 level
WC (Wanted Control = p < .0001), and WI (Wanted Inclusion = p < .0001). The nominated group expressed more control in their interpersonal relations but wanted support from others in the areas of affection, control and inclusion.

The table also shows that the teachers with Master's degrees differed significantly on factors EC (Expressed Control = p < .003) and WA (Wanted Affection = p < .005). The nominated group expressed more control but also wanted more affection, while the non-nominated group expressed less control and desired less affection. The two groups are similar on factors EA (Expressed Affection) and EI (Expressed Inclusion).

The nominated group under the category Master's plus differed significantly from the non-nominated group on factors EC (Expressed Control = p < .002), WC (Wanted Control = p < .0001), and WI (Wanted Inclusion = p < .02). In this instance, the nominated group rated higher, expressing more control but yet wanting more control and inclusion than their counterparts. The two groups were similar on factors EA (Expressed Affection), EI (Expressed Inclusion), and WA (Wanted Affection).

These findings partially reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis XIII

There are no significant differences between the mean scores on the 16PF second-order factors of the teachers with various years of experience who were nominated as outstanding and those who were not nominated.
An examination of Table 8 revealed that when contrasting the factors of both groups of teachers with less than five years of teaching experience, no statistically significant differences were found. This was also the case when comparing both groups with thirty plus years of teaching experience. In this case, only one factor, QI (Introversion versus Extroversion) differed significantly \( (p < .0046) \). The nominated teachers with thirty years or more teaching experience exhibited very high extroversion traits.

Under the category of teachers with six to ten years of experience, only two factors, QI (Introversion versus Extroversion = \( p < .008 \)) and QIV (Subduedness versus Independence = \( p < .025 \)) showed statistically significant differences. In this instance, the nominated group was extremely extroverted while the non-nominated group showed a tendency to be group-dependent.

Statistically significant data reported under the category of eleven to twenty years of teaching experience indicated that the nominated group differed significantly on factors QI (Introversion versus Extroversion = \( p < .0001 \)), QII (Low Anxiety versus High Anxiety = \( p < .0004 \)) and QIII (Tenderminded versus Tough Poise = \( p < .0167 \)). This indicates that the nominated teachers were highly extroverted, generally satisfied with life and sensitive to the subtleties of life. Whereas the non-nominated group were somewhat introverted, sufficiently meeting the demands of life, and had a resilient personality.

In the twenty-one to thirty year category, only factors QI (Introversion versus Extroversion = \( p < .0001 \)) and QII (Low Anxiety versus High Anxiety = \( p < .0143 \)) showed statistically significant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.1904</td>
<td>.2472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QII</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td>.9935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIII</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-0.5422</td>
<td>.5934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIV</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>-0.9347</td>
<td>.3606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.8295</td>
<td>.0085**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QII</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>-1.7452</td>
<td>.0919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIII</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-1.1653</td>
<td>.2537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIV</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.3631</td>
<td>.0253*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>7.0306</td>
<td>.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QII</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-3.7171</td>
<td>.0004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIII</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-2.4533</td>
<td>.0167**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIV</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.8560</td>
<td>.3959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (Continued) 16 PF Mean Score, Standard Deviation, t-Ratio and P Value for Nominated and Non-Nominated Teachers by Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H13 16PF Years of Experience</th>
<th>Nominated</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Nominated</th>
<th></th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QII</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIII</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIV</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+ Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QII</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIII</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes significance beyond the .05 level
** Denotes significance beyond the .01 level
differences. Again, the nominated teachers were highly extroverted and satisfied with life.

Therefore, the null hypothesis can be partially rejected.

Hypothesis XIV

There are no significant differences between the mean scores on the scales of the FIRO-B behavioral inventory of the teachers with various years of experience who were nominated as outstanding and those who were not nominated.

Table 9 reveals that there are significant differences between the mean scores of the two groups in four of the five categories regarding years of teaching experience. Therefore, the null hypothesis is partially rejected.

In the 0 to 6 year category, the two groups show similarities in all six factors, but in the 6 to 10 year category, there are statistically significant differences in the two groups for factors WA (Wanted Affection = p < .047) and WC (Wanted Control = p < .04). This indicates that the nominated group needed to have other people exert some affection and control over their lives.

Table 9 reveals that teachers in the 11 to 20 years of experience category expressed more control in their interpersonal relations than the non-nominated group.

Under the 21 to 30 years of experience category, factors EC (Expressed Control = p < .0002), WA (Wanted Affection = p < .0006), WC (Wanted Control = p < .0001) and WI (Wanted Inclusion = p < .0003) showed statistically significant differences. Nominated teachers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Nominated</th>
<th>Non-Nominated</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA(Expressed Affection)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC(Expressed Control)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI(Expressed Inclusion)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA(Wanted Affection)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC(Wanted Control)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI(Wanted Inclusion)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA(Expressed Affection)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC(Expressed Control)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI(Expressed Inclusion)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA(Wanted Affection)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC(Wanted Control)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI(Wanted Inclusion)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA(Expressed Affection)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC(Expressed Control)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI(Expressed Inclusion)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA(Wanted Affection)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC(Wanted Control)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI(Wanted Inclusion)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (Continued) Firo-B Mean Score, Standard Deviation, t-Ratio and P-Value of Nominated and Non-Nominated Teachers by Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Nominated</th>
<th>Non-Nominated</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Years of Experience</td>
<td>EA(Expressed Affection)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC(Expressed Control)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI(Expressed Inclusion)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA(Wanted Affection)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC(Wanted Control)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI(Wanted Inclusion)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+ Years of Experience</td>
<td>EA(Expressed Affection)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC(Expressed Control)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI(Expressed Inclusion)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA(Wanted Affection)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC(Wanted Control)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI(Wanted Inclusion)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes significance beyond the .05 level
** Denotes significance beyond the .01 level
tended to take charge of things and yet wanted affection, control and inclusion from other people. The non-nominated group did not seem to "want" these behaviors from others.

Inspection of the mean scores under the 30 plus category reveals again that the nominated group showed statistically significant difference regarding the factor EC (Expressed Control $p < .0026$). These teachers also had extremely high levels of significance for the factors WI (Wanted Inclusion = $p < .0003$) and WA (Wanted Affection = $p < .0119$). They wanted other people to include them in their activities and to express friendly and affectionate feelings toward them.

**Hypothesis XV**

Perceptions of nominated teachers did not show patterns of similarities about their profession when identified through ten personal interview questions.

Ten interview questions were posed to twenty-four nominated teachers dealing with their perceptions about themselves and their profession. Results of the study are presented on a question by question basis.

**Interview Questions**

1. **Did Any Person or Experience Influence Your Decision to Become a Teacher?**

Fourteen of the twenty-four teachers identified a person or persons as influencing their decisions to become teachers. Ten of the responses identified other teachers. Five of the teachers had
mothers who were teachers and had encouraged them, while one teacher was encouraged by her husband who was also a teacher. Two non-teaching mothers also encouraged their daughters to enter the teaching profession. Other influences included two fathers, a grandmother, two cousins, an aunt, a husband, other sisters, in-laws and peers. Four of the teachers cited more than one person as an influence.

Question 2. What is the Teacher's Role in Maintaining Discipline?

Of the twenty-four teachers, sixteen used the authoritarian strategies, whereas the remaining categories (behavior modification, group and socio-emotional) were each chosen by only one teacher as her primary focus. The five remaining teachers split their responses primarily between two groups. Of these five, two of the teachers were evenly distributed between authoritarian and behavior modification strategies. The remaining three are best categorized within the authoritarian and group processes.

Question 3. How Would You Describe Yourself?

Perhaps the most significant pattern of response to this question was not one of similarity of perception among teachers, but the lack of it. The majority of their self-descriptions were totally unique from teacher to teacher. Only five characteristics were mentioned five times each:

1. Caring/Loving
2. Organized
3. Open to listening to other viewpoints
4. Enthusiastic
5. Friendly
Nine self-descriptions were noted two or three times each:

1. Patient
2. Content/Happy
3. Too Busy
4. Energetic
5. Positive
6. Candid/Honest
7. Enjoy what I do
8. A good teacher

Nine of the teachers were critical of themselves and described certain traits about themselves that they would have liked to change. In addition, three of the nine teachers identified areas in their professional lives that were in conflict—a conflict of being organized and being flexible. One teacher worked in the area of special education and she described herself as having to struggle to balance her own expectations for her children in the context of the children's capabilities. Difficulty in balancing the roles of friend and teacher was also discussed by three of the teachers. Additional conflicts were noted in the comments of one teacher who felt torn between the need to listen to the concerns of students and the need to attend to their classroom management matters. Another conflict was having both compassion and being objective in dealings with students.

With the exception of a few consistent characteristics of self-criticism and value conflicts, no patterns emerged.

Question 4. How Might Your Students Describe You?

Thirteen of the teachers indicated that their students would say that they were "comfortable to be with." This was defined in various ways: being friendly, good-natured, easy-going, nice, positive, pleasant, good sense-of-humor and lenient. One teacher believed that
her students would describe her as being "human." Another five felt that their students could come to her with their concerns and problems. Four felt that their students would describe them as requiring "high performance" and being a "tough task master."

Being "fair with high expectations" was cited by five more teachers. Caring was a way in which eight teachers believed they would be described. Three of the teachers believed that their students might say they were "crabby" and "grouchy."

The remaining responses from teachers included:

1. Firm and mean
2. Pretty and young
3. Consistent
4. Takes time to help me
5. Patient
6. Best teacher in the building
7. Sometimes not patient enough
8. Interested in students' welfare
9. Busy
10. Dresses well

Question 5. What Kind of Person Would You Like to Work For?

The most important response cited by teachers dealt with strong leadership. "Strong leadership" was defined in several different ways: One who takes on the authority of the position, one who is goal-oriented, one who is in charge, and one who is confident and has high expectations of his or her teachers. "Instructional leader" was defined as one who gives teachers suggestions, one who identifies school-wide problems, and one who has a definite and consistent plan of managing the school. Almost as important as the area of leadership is the characteristic of "flexibility." It is defined as someone who is open-minded, approachable, and does not get hung up on petty things. The responses are outlined in Table 10.
Table 10
Characteristics of Effective Administrators
As Perceived by Nominated Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Definitions Given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong leadership</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Is in charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Asks for teacher input, not tied up with rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gives suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive of teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Backs up teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gives teachers credit for what they're doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good listener</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusts their effective teachers to teach</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Knows which teachers are doing the job and lets them do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows appreciation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Uses positive reinforcement with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somebody who carries through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of humor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uses humor in positive way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Knows what is going on in the community, the school district and the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlines clear expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Makes clear, reasonable demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Office door open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 6...Do You Feel Appreciated?

Twenty-one of the twenty-four teachers identified specific people who appreciated them or did not appreciate them, while the remaining three gave general kinds of responses. While seventeen teachers cited professional contacts, seven teachers identified personal contacts and four of the teachers mentioned both categories of people. It is important to note that each teacher usually mentioned more than one person. For example, one teacher felt appreciated by other teachers, her students and her past principal, but not her present principal. Nearly half of the teachers appreciated each other or, at the very least, perceived that they were appreciated by other teachers.

Question 7. If You Could Establish an Ideal School, What Would It be Like?

Responses were as follows:

1. Dedicated, cohesive group of teachers 15
2. School-wide goals 18
3. Multi-cultural curriculum 5
4. Strong academic program 8
5. Mentorship by master teachers 6
6. Cultivation of high teacher expectations for their students 6
7. Principal should be instructional leader 20
8. Active parental involvement 18
9. Supportive physical facilities 5
10. Outreach into community 6
11. Adequate number of counselors 10
12. Children who want to learn 19

The remaining responses were only cited once:

1. Smaller class sizes
2. Small neighborhood school
3. Stable student population
4. Higher salaries for teachers
5. Custodians who care about children
6. University students involved with public schools
7. Flex planning time before and after school
8. Support from administrators at top levels
9. Teachers who are organized
10. Teachers who eat lunch with their students
11. Stimulating workshops for teachers
12. Volunteers and aides to work with students
13. Creative school lunch programs
14. Noon outdoors programs

Question 8. If You Had to Do It All Over Again, Would You Be a Teacher?

Of the twenty-four teachers who responded to this question, twenty-three indicated that they would again enter the teaching profession if given the opportunity. This response does not coincide with the literature.

Question 9. What Are the Characteristics of a Person Whom You Feel is an Outstanding Teacher?

The most important characteristic identified by teachers was that of "caring." It was defined as one who is kind, child-oriented, humanistic, cares about the job, puts students first, carries work home if he or she needs to, is dedicated and committed. Table 11 charts the responses for characteristics of an outstanding teacher as perceived by the nominated teachers.

Question 10. What Can be Done to Make Teaching a More Highly Respected Profession?

Twenty-three of the respondents believed that teachers must convey a positive public image. This was defined in several ways: educating of parents and community, doing a good job of public relations and working on positive press coverage.
### Table 11

Characteristics of Outstanding Teachers as Perceived by Nominated Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Definitions Given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Take work home if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Integrate new techniques into their teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Able to fit all subjects into their programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel good about themselves</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Share with students about their personal lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like their students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Enjoyed interpersonal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know their material</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Knowledgeable of their subject matter and can get it across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communicators</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Good listeners, simplify ideas so students can understand, explain ideas clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of humor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Joke around with students, fun to be with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual learners</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Read professional materials, attend classes, seminars, conferences, and in-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Huggable, not aloof, expressing affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Makes reasonable demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Enjoy what they are doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Accept new ideas, willing to listen to others' views</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 (Continued) Characteristics of Outstanding Teachers as Perceived by Nominated Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Definitions Given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective classroom management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Allow children independence without losing control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Never give up, willing to go beyond the minimum, to go the extra mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expectations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Challenge students to do their best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People-oriented</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Perceptive to personal problems, concerned about the personality of the child, interested in people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>See the best in each student, look on the positive side of things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain good relationships with students and staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Able to diagnose learning problems and know how to evaluate effective teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide service at the school or district level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide leadership at the school or district level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Involved with program planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closely linked to the issue of public image is the concept of teachers as "professionals." Eighteen teachers felt that this was the foundation stone upon which the whole profession rested. This was "the important good news" which was needed if the overall image of the profession was to be enhanced. The word "professional" was defined in many different ways. Teachers who are professional:

1. Care about their appearance and dress
2. Are accountable for what they are teaching
3. Respect each other's differences
4. Ask for help when they need it
5. Are continual learners
6. Respect their own jobs

Teachers interviewed for this study also identified several ways in which teaching could be a more highly respected profession:

1. Teachers should set higher expectations for their students.
2. Teachers need to be paid higher salaries.
3. Parents and community members need to be involved in the schools.
4. Universities and colleges must do a better job of preparing teachers.
5. More money should be allocated for school materials.
6. Poor administrators should be "weeded out."
7. Central administration should be more involved at the operational level.
8. Creative and innovative ways of teaching should be encouraged and rewarded.
9. The State should require teachers to update their certificates on a continuous basis.

Ancillary Research Questions

Question 1

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors among the nominated teachers from five ethnic groups.
The analysis of variance procedure shown on Table 12 reveals that there are significant differences (.05 level) in the sample mean scores of the five ethnic groups. This indicates that the five group means are far enough apart to permit this researcher to conclude that the changes are less than 5 out of 100 that the five sample means are alike. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected and a significant difference is said to exist among the group means on the four second-order factors.

Duncan's multiple-range test (Cody, 1991) showed that Caucasian and Filipino teachers were significantly higher than the other groups on the extroversion factor, with Chinese, Filipino, and Hawaiian teachers being significantly superior on the low anxiety factor, QII. Caucasian teachers also tested significantly higher on tough-mindedness, factor QIII. Both Caucasian and Filippino teachers showed greater significance on the independence factor, QIV.

Question 2

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors among the nominated teachers from five ethnic groups.

The analysis of variance procedure shown on Table 13 indicates that there are significant differences (.05 level) in the mean scores of nominated Caucasian teachers on the FIRO-B scale for factors "Expressed Control" ($p < .0357$) and "Wanted Control" ($p < .0127$). Duncan's multiple-range test also showed that the Caucasian ethnic group was significantly higher on both expressing control and wanting
Table 12
16 PF Mean Scores of Nominated Teachers by Ethnic Background (N=98)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Caucasian N=14</th>
<th>Chinese N=13</th>
<th>Filipino N=8</th>
<th>Japanese N=53</th>
<th>Hawaiian N=10</th>
<th>Group Norm*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QI (Introv vs Extrov)</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QII (Low vs High Anx)</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIII (Tender vs Tough)</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIV (Subd vs Indepen)</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard mean scores not available for Cattell's second-order factors
Figure 1. 16 PF Mean Scores of Nominated Teachers by Ethnic Background
Table 13
FIRO-B Mean Score of Nominated Teachers by Ethnic Background (N=98)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Caucasian N=14</th>
<th>Chinese N=13</th>
<th>Filipino N=8</th>
<th>Japanese N=53</th>
<th>Hawaiian N=1</th>
<th>Group Norm*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA (Expressed Affection)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC (Expressed Control)</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI (Expressed Inclusion)</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA (Wanted Affection)</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC (Wanted Control)</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI (Wanted Inclusion)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. FİRO-B Mean Scores of Nominated Teachers by Ethnic Background (N=98)
control. There were no significant differences in the other factors, thereby partially rejecting the null hypothesis.

**Question 3**

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors for teachers of Japanese ancestry who were nominated as outstanding as compared to teachers of Japanese ancestry who were not nominated.

The P-values shown in Table 14 reveal that there are significant differences (.05 level) in the 16PF mean scores between nominated teachers of Japanese ancestry and non-nominated teachers of Japanese ancestry on factors QI (Introversion versus Extroversion = p < .0185), QII (Low Anxiety versus High Anxiety = p < .0089), QIII (Tender-minded versus tough-minded = p < .0009), and QIV (Subduedness versus Independence = p < .0369). This indicates that the nominated teachers of Japanese ancestry were more extroverted, more anxious, more tough-minded and more independent than the non-nominated teachers of Japanese ancestry.

**Question 4**

There are no significant differences in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors for teachers of Japanese ancestry who were nominated as outstanding as compared to teachers of Japanese ancestry who were not nominated.

The analysis of variance shown on Table 15 reveals the mean scores of nominated teachers of Japanese ancestry differing significantly (.05 level) from non-nominated teachers of Japanese ancestry on
Table 14
16 PF Second Order Factors for Nominated and Non-Nominated Teachers of Japanese Ancestry by F-Ratio and P-Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.2108</td>
<td>13.2108</td>
<td>5.5843</td>
<td>.0185*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>307.5392</td>
<td>2.3657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>320.7500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.0857</td>
<td>26.0857</td>
<td>7.0276</td>
<td>.0089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>482.5431</td>
<td>3.7169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>508.6288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.3316</td>
<td>46.3316</td>
<td>12.4104</td>
<td>.0009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>485.3275</td>
<td>3.7333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>531.6591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.6955</td>
<td>13.6955</td>
<td>4.3338</td>
<td>.0369*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>410.8196</td>
<td>3.1602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>424.5151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.
## Table 15

FIRO-B Factors for Nominated and Non-Nominated Teachers of Japanese Ancestry by F-Ratio and P-Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA (Expressed Affection)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.4816</td>
<td>5.4816</td>
<td>1.5891</td>
<td>.2070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>448.4275</td>
<td>3.4494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>453.9091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC (Expressed Control)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.7922</td>
<td>20.7922</td>
<td>6.3313</td>
<td>.0126*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>426.9275</td>
<td>3.2841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>447.7197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EI (Expressed Inclusion)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.6471</td>
<td>9.6471</td>
<td>2.3051</td>
<td>.1274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>544.0725</td>
<td>4.1852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>553.7196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WA (Wanted Affection)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.3680</td>
<td>40.3680</td>
<td>8.7329</td>
<td>.0040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>600.9275</td>
<td>4.6225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>641.2955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 (Continued) FIRO-B Factors for Nominated and Non-Nominated Teachers of Japanese Ancestry by F-Ratio and P-Value

### WC (Wanted Control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.9805</td>
<td>10.9805</td>
<td>2.9570</td>
<td>.0840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>482.7392</td>
<td>3.7134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>493.7197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WI (Wanted Inclusion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.8557</td>
<td>10.8557</td>
<td>3.9206</td>
<td>.0469*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>359.9549</td>
<td>2.7689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>370.8106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level
factors EC (Expressed Control = \( p < .0126 \)), WA (Wanted Affection = \( p < .0040 \)), and WI (Wanted Inclusion = \( p < .0469 \)). This indicates that the nominated teachers of Japanese ancestry expressed more control over others, needed more affection, and wanted to be included by others. No significant differences were found for factor WC (Wanted Control) therefore the null is only partially rejected.

Summary

Table 4 revealed that the differences between the mean scores of the two groups on all four of the 16PF second-order factors are highly significant at the .001 level. Therefore, Hypotheses I through IV are rejected. Factor QI, Introversion versus Extroversion, was significant at the \( p < .001 \) level. Nominated teachers scored much higher on this factor indicating their high extroversion characteristic. Factor QII, Low Anxiety versus High Anxiety, was significant at the higher \( p < .0001 \) level. Nominated teachers scored lower on this scale revealing that they were less anxious and more satisfied with life. Factor QIII, Tender-minded versus Tough-minded, was highly significant at the .0005 level. Though both groups had mean scores reflecting tough-mindedness, the non-nominated teachers were significantly more authoritative than the nominated group. The nominated group scored higher on Factor QIV, Subduedness versus Independence, with a .0023 probability level, making them more group-dependent and likely to need other people.

As reported in Table 5, when the FIRO-B interpersonal factors of nominated teachers were compared to factors of the non-nominated
teachers, statistically significant differences were found on four of the six factors.

The testing of Hypothesis V (Expressed Affection) and Hypothesis VII (Expressed Inclusion) found no significant differences, therefore null hypotheses V and VII were not rejected. Null Hypotheses VI (Expressed Control), VIII (Wanted Affection), IX (Wanted Control) and X (Wanted Inclusion) were rejected.

Table 6 shows a similarity on the factor QI, Introversion versus Extroversion, for nominated teachers with advanced professional training. A $p < .0001$ was found for nominated teachers with Bachelor's Plus and Master's degrees and a $p < .01$ for nominated teachers with Master's Plus educational training. The null for Hypothesis XI was partially rejected.

Table 7 shows a pattern of behavioral "wanted" traits on the FIRO-B scale. Teachers with Bachelor's Plus degrees indicated the need or the want of more affection, control and inclusion in their interpersonal relationships. All three categories of Bachelor's Plus, Master's and Master's Plus revealed Expressed Control for nominated teachers showed a significant difference with probabilities of $p < .0001$, $p < .0025$, and $p < .0021$ respectively. The null for Hypothesis XII was partially rejected.

Table 8 revealed a clustering of statistically significant differences in the eleven to twenty years of experience category as well as the twenty-one to thirty years of experience on the scale of the 16PF. No statistically significant findings were found in the
zero to five year category. The null for Hypothesis XIII was partially rejected.

The FIRO-B scale on Table 9 revealed that teachers in the twenty-one to thirty plus years of experience needed and wanted more affection and inclusion from their interpersonal relationships with other people. Again, the zero to five years of experience category showed no statistically significant differences. The null for Hypothesis XIV was partially rejected.

Perceptions of nominated teachers were charted for their responses to the questions concerning what characteristics make an outstanding teacher, and what characteristics make an outstanding administrator. These were identified on Table 10 (Characteristics of Effective Administrators) and Table 11 (Characteristics of Outstanding Teachers). There were some similarities in the responses on nominated teachers' perceptions thereby rejecting the null for Hypothesis XV.

Table 12 shows that Caucasian teachers are highly extroverted and tough-minded while Chinese teachers are less anxious. Both Filipino and Caucasian teachers are more independent than the other ethnic groups. The null was rejected for ancillary question 1.

Table 13 shows the Caucasian group expressing more control over others and yet wanting others to control them. No significant differences were found in the other factors. The null for ancillary question 2 was partially rejected.

The testing by analysis of variance (Table 14) of ancillary question 3 showed that nominated teachers of Japanese ancestry were more extroverted, more anxious, more tender-minded and more independent
than the non-nominated teachers of Japanese ancestry. The null for ancillary question 3 was rejected.

The testing of ancillary question 4 by analysis of variance, Table 15, revealed that nominated teachers of Japanese ancestry expressed more control over others, needed more affection from others, and wanted to be included in their interpersonal relationships with others. No significant differences were found for factor WC (Wanted Control), therefore the null for ancillary question 4 was partially rejected.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the First Three Chapters

This study and its findings provided valuable information for educational administrators and other professional educators concerning personal and behavioral characteristics of teachers. Researchers in the past have isolated very few specific characteristics that correlate with effective teaching. They have struggled for years in attempting to identify those personality traits that contribute to "greatness" in teachers. Little is known about the personality characteristics of successful teachers and particularly those from public schools in the State of Hawaii. Data from this study provide a tentative first step and a statistical baseline to measure the best teacher applicants.

A major contribution of this study was to identify the perceptions of the nominated as outstanding teacher group. It is hoped that their responses might serve as touchstones for all those connected to the field of education--displayed so that those who may have lost touch with the reality of a teacher's world may again be "in touch."

Additional personality differences might have been identified if the comparative groups had included "below standard" performers as well as those rated as nominated outstanding and not nominated as outstanding. That speculation is based on the fact that when comparing the nominated versus the non-nominated teachers, the means of the 16PF and the FIRO-B for the nominated group were greater. In fact,
for the 16PF, the means were greater on all four of the second-order factors, and the FIRO-B, four of the six factors showed statistically significant differences. It is likely that comparison of a wider spread of performance levels would have resulted in an entirely different profile.

The 16PF as well as the FIRO-B were successful in identifying statistically significant differences in personality characteristics between nominated and non-nominated as outstanding teachers. The 16PF was the most discriminating with its central feature being based on the personality sphere concept, a design that insures initial item coverage for all behavior that commonly enters ratings and dictionary descriptions of personality. It has been built up as part of the general structuring research on personality in everyday life and not only on factoring of questionnaire material. For this reason, this investigator might have been more successful at identifying specific personality characteristics had she used the sixteen primary factors instead of the four second-order ones.

The scales of the FIRO-B assessed six important facets of interpersonal psychology. The test endeavored to provide data concerning behavioral characteristics which have a wide and pervasive applicability to human behavior. A limitation of the FIRO-B was that it measured behavior of an individual in a specific given situation and predicted how that individual would interact with other people within that given situation. Therefore, the expectation of "wide and pervasive applicability" is questioned.
The perceptions received from personal interviews with teachers nominated as outstanding resulted in identifying what highly respected teachers think and feel about themselves, their work and their profession as a whole. To explore with teachers their values, beliefs, past experiences and plans for the future is a venture which, once documented, can be shared with the educational administrators and the community at large.

Findings from this study as compared to results of other research efforts vary. The personality characteristic of extroversion identified in this study as being statistically significant for the "nominated" teachers agrees with previous research findings of Weslander (1981), Patrick (1974), Ryans (1960), and Coker (1980). However, some of the personality characteristics that Ryans (1960) found significant to effective teaching were not identified by this study as being important to all teachers. For example, one of Ryans' findings is that effective teachers are warm, understanding and friendly. Information from this study indicated that the nominated teacher group was warm, friendly and tender-minded but the nominated Caucasian and Hawaiian teachers were more tough-minded, as well as the nominated Japanese teachers when compared to the non-nominated group.

The study of the perceptions of the nominated teachers coincide with Thayer's (1978) report on Omaha's public school teachers' perceptions about the teaching profession. Caring and relationship building were key characteristics of outstanding teachers and administrators.
Frederick Herzberg's (1966) theory of job satisfaction lists interpersonal relations as a hygiene factor. Herzberg used the interview technique to study occupational groups to see if motivators were cited more frequently than hygienes. In the female professional group, interpersonal relations (hygiene factor) with peers and subordinates were mentioned more frequently as satisfiers than as dissatisfiers. The FIRO-B factor WA (Wanted Affection) and WI (Wanted Inclusion) were significantly higher for nominated teachers making these two factors hygiene motivators in Herzberg's theory of job satisfaction.

Getzels and Guba's (1954) ideographic dimension of social systems theory reveals the divergent need-dispositions within a person. In situations that evoke two or more equally important but divergent need-dispositions within a person, the individual experiences conflict with respect as to how to behave. The FIRO-B results for the nominated group revealed significantly high scores ($p < .0001$) on EC (Expressed Control) and WC (Wanted Control). This indicates that the nominated teachers exerted more control in their interpersonal relations with others, and yet wanted others to control their lives.

Fessler, Burke and Christensen (1983) have characterized outstanding teachers as being enthusiastic and growing. This study reveals that the nominated teachers were significantly more extroverted thereby validating their theory. Watts' (1982) mastery stage of development characterizes an "increasing sense of comfort" and "working smoothly within the context of the school and his or her own personality" also coincides with the findings of low anxiety in the nominated group of outstanding teachers in this study.
Discussion of Conclusions from Data in Chapter IV

The selection of teachers to be employed in a school district is a serious responsibility of administrators. Criteria used to measure the applicants typically include personality variables such as enthusiasm, poise, flexibility, warmth, interpersonal skills, etc. However, there remains considerable doubt as to what personality characteristics are associated with good teaching and how those factors can be assessed.

To help solve that riddle for school administrators, the major purpose of this study was to ascertain whether there were any significant differences in the personality and behavioral characteristics of teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those teachers who were not nominated. Other variables were levels of advanced professional training and years of experience. A secondary purpose was to provide educational administrators an opportunity to examine the perceptions of outstanding teachers about their profession.

Data were obtained from two personality inventories, the 16PF and the FIRO-B, and personal interview sessions with twenty-four teachers nominated as outstanding. The two inventories were administered to 212 teachers in the Honolulu District on the island of Oahu.

Responses from the 212 subjects on each of the two personality inventories were subjected to t-tests for independent samples using the SAS statistical package. One-way analysis of variance was performed on the mean scores of the largest sample ethnic group using
the SAS statistical package. The .05 level of confidence was used as the basic criterion for rejecting the null hypothesis.

Specific findings of this study identified a number of significant differences as a result of the statistical analysis. A summary of these results is reported in Table 16. One major finding ($p < .001$) was that teachers who were nominated as outstanding were more extroverted as measured by the 16 PF than those who were not nominated. Cattell (12) described behavior of the more extroverted as more socially outgoing, less inhibited, and good at making and maintaining interpersonal contacts. A second major finding ($p < .0001$) was that nominated teachers were generally satisfied with life and were able to achieve those things that seemed to be important to them. The third finding ($p < .0005$) found the nominated teachers being more tender-minded and sensitive to the subtleties of life. And the last statistical difference ($p < .002$) was identified in the personality factor of subduedness versus independence. The nominated group was found to be more independent, aggressive and daring than the non-nominated group.

An analysis of the data from the FIRO-B also identified statistically different interpersonal behavior between the nominated and non-nominated teachers. One of those differences ($p < .0001$) was on the interpersonal factor EC (Expressed Control). As measured by the FIRO-B, the nominated teachers expressed more control and influence over things as compared to the non-nominated teachers. Interestingly, the nominated group also wanted more control, affection and inclusion from others around them. This validates Getzels and Guba's (1954)
Table 16

Summary of Findings of Personality Factors, Advanced Educational Training, Years of Experience, Perception of Nominated Teachers, Ethnicity by Tests, Factors, Direction and Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Factors</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personality Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 PF Introversion vs Extroversion</td>
<td>Nominated teachers are more extroverted</td>
<td>Hypotheses I-IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________________________________</td>
<td>_______________________________</td>
<td>________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Anxiety vs High Anxiety</td>
<td>Nominated teachers less anxious</td>
<td>There are no significant differences (NSD) in the mean scores on the scale of the 16 PF second-order factors for those teachers nominated as outstanding compared to those who were not nominated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderminded vs Tough-minded</td>
<td>Nominated teachers more tender-minded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subduedness vs Independence</td>
<td>Nominated teachers more independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (Continued) Summary of Findings of Personality Factors, Advanced Educational Training, Years of Experience, Perception of Nominated Teachers; Ethnicity by Tests, Factors, Direction and Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRO-B</td>
<td>Expressed</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td>Hypotheses V-X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are NSD in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressed</td>
<td>Nominated teachers expressed more control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypotheses V-X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressed</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are NSD in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypotheses V-X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are NSD in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypotheses V-X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are NSD in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors for those teachers nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (Continued) Summary of Findings of Personality Factors, Advanced Educational Training, Years of Experience, Perception of Nominated Teachers, Ethnicity by Tests, Factors, Direction and Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 PF</td>
<td>Introversion vs Extroversion (QI)</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with Bachelor's Plus/Master's and Master's Five more extroverted</td>
<td>Hypothesis XII: There are NSD in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors of the teachers with advanced professional training who were nominated as outstanding and those who were not nominated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 PF</td>
<td>Low Anxiety vs High Anxiety (QII)</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with Bachelor's Plus and Master's less anxious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 PF</td>
<td>Tender-minded vs Tough-minded (QIII)</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with Bachelor's Plus more tender-minded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 PF</td>
<td>Subduedness vs Independence (QIV)</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (Continued) Summary of Findings of Personality Factors, Advanced Educational Training, Years of Experience, Perception of Nominated Teachers, Ethnicity by Tests, Factors, Direction and Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRO-B</td>
<td>Expressed Affection</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td>Hypothesis XIV: There are NSD in the man scores on the scale of FIRO-B factors of teachers with advanced professional training who were nominated as outstanding and those who were not nominated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressed Control</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with Bachelor's Plus/Master's and Master's Plus expressed more control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressed Inclusion</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted Affection</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with Bachelor's Plus and Master's Plus wanted more affection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted Control</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with Bachelor's Plus and Master's Plus wanted more control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted Inclusion</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with Bachelor's Plus and Master's Plus wanted more inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (Continued) Summary of Findings of Personality Factors, Advanced Educational Training, Years of Experience, Perception of Nominated Teachers, Ethnicity by Tests, Factors, Direction and Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 PF</td>
<td>Introversion vs Extroversion (QI)</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with 6 to 30 plus years of experience more extroverted</td>
<td>Hypothesis XIII: There are NSD in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors of teachers with various years of experience who were nominated as outstanding and those who were not nominated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Anxiety vs High Anxiety (QII)</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with 11 to 30 years experience less anxious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tender-minded vs Tough-minded (QIII)</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with 11 to 20 years experience more independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subduedness vs Independence (QIV)</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with 6 to 10 years experience more independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (Continued) Summary of Findings of Personality Factors, Advanced Educational Training, Years of Experience, Perception of Nominated Teachers, Ethnicity by Tests, Factors, Direction and Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressed</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with 11 to 20 years experience expressed more affection</td>
<td>Hypothesis XIV: There are NSD in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors of teachers with various years of experience who were nominated as outstanding and those who were not nominated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with 11 to 30 plus years experience expressed more control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Inclusion</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted</td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with 6 to 10 years and 21 to 30 plus years experience wanted more affection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with 6 to 10 years and 31 to 30 years experience wanted more control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Nominated teachers with 21 to 30 plus years of experience wanted more inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (Continued) Summary of Personality Factors, Advanced Educational Training, Years of Experience, Perception of Nominated Teachers, Ethnicity by Tests, Factors, Direction and Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Perceptions of Nominated Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothesis XV: Perceptions of nominated teachers did not show patterns of similarities about their profession when identified through ten personal interview questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding teachers did show similarities on the ten question topics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. influence on the decision to become a teacher;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. teacher's role in maintaining discipline;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. personal assessment of strengths and weaknesses;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. perception of students' opinion on self (teacher being interviewed);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. sense of being appreciated by others;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. desirable traits in school administrators;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. characteristics of the ideal school;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. validity of career choice;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. characteristics of outstanding teachers;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. how to make teaching a more highly respected profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (Continued) Summary of Personality Factors, Advanced Educational Training, Years of Experience, Perception of Nominated Teachers, Ethnicity by Tests, Factors, Direction and Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 PF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introversion vs Extroversion (QI)</td>
<td>Nominated Caucasian and Filipino teachers more extroverted</td>
<td>Ancillary Question 1: There are NSD in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors among the nominated teachers from the five ethnic groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Anxiety vs High Anxiety (QII)</td>
<td>Nominated Caucasian teachers highly anxious; Nominated Chinese and Hawaiian teachers less anxious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tender-minded vs Tough-minded (QIII)</td>
<td>Nominated Caucasian teachers more tough-minded; Nominated Japanese teachers more tender-minded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subduedness vs Independence (QIV)</td>
<td>Nominated Caucasian and Filipino teachers more independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (Continued) Summary of Personality Factors, Advanced Educational Training, Years of Experience, Perception of Nominated Teachers, Ethnicity by Tests, Factors, Direction and Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIRO-B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressed</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td>Ancillary Question 2: There are NSD in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors among the nominated teachers from five ethnic groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressed</td>
<td>Nominated Caucasian teachers expressed more control from others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressed</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted</td>
<td>Nominated Caucasian teachers wanted more control from others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (Continued) Summary of Personality Factors, Advanced Educational Training, Years of Experience, Perception of Nominated Teachers, Ethnicity by Tests, Factors, Direction and Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 PF</td>
<td>Introversion vs Extroversion (QI)</td>
<td>Nominated Japanese teachers more extroverted</td>
<td>Ancillary Question 3: There are NSD in the mean scores on the scale of the 16PF second-order factors of teachers of Japanese ancestry who were nominated as outstanding as compared to those who were not nominated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Anxiety vs High Anxiety (QII)</td>
<td>Nominated Japanese teachers highly anxious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tender-minded vs Tough-minded</td>
<td>Nominated Japanese teachers more tough-minded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subduedness vs Independence (QIV)</td>
<td>Nominated Japanese teachers more independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRO-B</td>
<td>Expressed Affection</td>
<td>No significant differences</td>
<td>Ancillary Question 4: There are NSD in the mean scores on the scale of the FIRO-B factors of teachers of Japanese ancestry who were nominated as compared to those who were not nominated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
idiographic role conflict of contrasting need-disposition as mentioned earlier in this section. There were no significant differences noted between the two groups on EA (Expressed Affection) and EI (Expressed Inclusion).

The expectancy feature of Victor Vroom's (1964) motivational theory is illustrated in the FIRO-B factors of "expressed" and "wanted." The motivation to perform or express the act is a combination of an individual's expectations that the action will have a particular outcome. The nominated teachers' high EC (Expressed Control) mean scores, indicating that they express more control over others, might be the act that would bring them WC (Wanted Control) or more guidance by their school administrators.

No significant differences were found on both the 16PF and the FIRO-B scales in the zero to five year categories of years of experience. Both inventories did reveal that teachers in the twenty-one to thirty plus years of experience category needed and wanted more affection and inclusion from their interpersonal relationships with others. Teachers with Bachelor's Plus degrees indicated the need of more affection, control and inclusion in their interpersonal relationships.

The comparison of means of ethnic groups revealed that the nominated Caucasian and Filipino teachers were highly independent. The nominated Caucasian teachers' extremely high mean scores on tough-mindedness did not coincide with Ryans' findings of effective teachers being more tender-minded. The group that was the least anxious and most satisfied with life was the nominated Chinese
teachers. The nominated Hawaiian teachers expressed more inclusion of others in their interpersonal relationships. This seems to be part of their culture and lifestyle. The nominated Japanese teachers' mean scores indicated that they did not exert control over others, and did not want others exerting control over them.

A summary of the findings from Chapter IV is reported in Table 16.

Limitations

It must be noted that certain limitations were imposed due to the nature of the design of this study. They include:

1) Data generated from the 212 teachers used in this study were from one school district, the Honolulu School District; therefore the inferences drawn can only be generalizable to this defined population.

2) The national teacher recognition program instrument used to nominate outstanding teachers was the sole criterion used to differentiate the nominated teachers from the non-nominated ones.

3) Some of the differences in the mean scores of the subjects on the 16PF and the FIRO-B could be associated with sex response differences rather than to the other independent variables.

4) Perhaps the most important limitation of this study was the absence of any teachers in the sample who were rated as
ineffective. Because of legal and political considerations, none in this category were tested.

**Recommendations**

This study's results could be useful to colleges of education in counseling and working with pre-service teachers. University students as well as colleges of education need to know as early as possible when students are not well suited for teaching careers. The 16PF could be administered to all education majors and their results compared to the profile of successful teachers in this research sample. The results of this investigation, with sufficient replication for validation, may have a predictive value before students complete their teacher training. It is recommended that personnel officers use the 16PF as a routine screening device, but not the FIRO-B because of narrow measurability.

The following are recommendations for future study:

1) It is recommended that the present study be replicated with the exception that the subjects for the sample should come from the most effective teachers and the least effective teachers, instead of the nominated and non-nominated groups of teachers.

2) It is further recommended that a sizable number of teachers of different teaching areas be tested.

3) It is recommended that the study be replicated using a sizable number of junior and senior high teachers for the purpose of developing baseline data for the best junior and senior high teachers.
4) Another consideration would be to use the 16PF to test pre-service subjects and then a subsequent testing after the same subjects have had a year of active teaching for the purpose of assessing if going on the job affects the personality characteristics of teachers.

5) An area of possible research would be replicating the study, but instead of using subjects from one urban district, select subjects from a cross section of urban as well as rural districts.

6) Another area of possible research would be to replicate the study between males and females and majority and minority subjects.

7) It is further suggested that the study be replicated in all the school districts in the State of Hawaii. This study could only be generalized to the Honolulu School District's teacher population.

8) Another avenue for research would be to examine other personality traits. The present investigation was limited to the study of the 16PF second-order factors. A regression analysis could be done on all of Cattell's 16 primary traits to determine which traits could predict an effective teacher.
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APPENDIX C

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA SHEET

Background Information

Please check one (1):

I. Age Range

25-30
31-35
36-40
41-45

46-50
51-55
56-60
60+

II. Sex

Male Female

III. Years of Experience

0-5
6-10
11-20
21-30
30+

IV. Educational Background

Bachelor's
Bachelor's + 15
Master's
Master's + 15

Doctorate
Specialist

V. Grade Level

Elementary Jr. High Sr. High

VI. Ethnicity

Caucasian
Chinese
Filipino
Japanese
Korean

Hawaiian
Pacific Islander
Other
APPENDIX D
LETTER TO SAMPLE PARTICIPANTS

November 12, 1990

Name:
Address:

Dear _______________________

I would first like to congratulate you on being selected as a participant in this research study titled "Personality Profiles of Outstanding Teachers in Hawaii's Public Schools."

Because the sample of teachers in this study is small, I must have your cooperation in order to complete it. Names of individuals and schools will not be identified in this study.

Would you please take about 15 minutes to complete the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, the FIRO-B and the background sheet and return them to me by December 7, 1990? Simply place the test materials and the background sheet into the self-addressed envelope and drop it in the mail.

Your returning this information would greatly help to facilitate a more accurate profile of outstanding teachers in Hawaii's public school system, and help me complete my doctoral requirements.

I am aware of the busy schedules that are imposed upon you as school teachers. Therefore, I am enclosing a $5.00 book of stamps for the time spent in helping me.

With kindest regards,

Leinaala A. Isa

Attachments (3): 16 PF, FIRO-B, Background Sheet
APPENDIX E
HAWAII STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

Tom Husted is new executive director

At its November 17 meeting, the HSTA Board of Directors chose Tom Husted as executive director. Husted is currently the assistant executive director for Government Relations, Professional Development and Communications for the Arkansas Education Association. Husted joined HSTA on January 1, 1991.

A former teacher, Husted has worked for various state education associations, including New York, Utah, North Carolina and Arkansas. Husted received his Master's degree in Economics from Kent State University and his Bachelor's degree in Education and Social Science Education from Mansfield State University.

Said Husted, "My contribution as HSTA executive director will be a relentless insistence upon innovation, anticipating and planning for the needs of members and attention to measurable results."

Husted will fill the executive spot, vacant since February 1990, which was temporarily held during the interim by Joan Lee Husted (no relation). During this time, Joan was covering two jobs, acting executive director and her own position as director of Programs. Joan will return to director of Programs when Tom starts in January.

Welcome aboard, Tom Husted.

Doctoral candidate doing teacher survey

Some teachers will receive a letter from Leinaala Isa, asking them to complete and return a survey about personality traits of outstanding teachers.

As the letter states, the information will be used by the College of Education, and for partial completion of doctoral credits for Isa. HSTA has discussed the project with Isa.

The survey is completely anonymous and takes 15 minutes to complete.
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