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Recent studies of teacher effectiveness have centered on classroom management and organization, instructional strategies, presentation of subject matter, and learning climate. Researchers have examined the relationship of specific teacher behaviors to student achievement gains. In the field of bilingual/ESL education for young children, teaching methodologies and techniques have been the subject of investigations. Demographic changes across the community, state, and nation have necessitated changes in the delivery of instruction. Inherent personality traits which make a good teacher in today's environment are difficult to identify. No research exclusively identifying the personality traits of effective bilingual/ESL teachers was found.

The purpose of this study was to identify the personality traits of effective elementary bilingual/ESL teachers, to identify the personality traits of effective traditional
elementary teachers, and to compare the two groups. Effective teachers were identified as those who had reached Career Ladder Level II or Level III in a suburban school district in North Texas. The null hypotheses were that there are no significant differences in the personality traits of the two groups as measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Means were calculated for each of the 16 personality factors for each group of 30 teacher volunteers, and a t test was used to compare the significance of the difference of the means between the two groups on each separate personality factor. The null hypotheses were not rejected for any of the 16 factors at either the .05 or the .01 level of significance. Although there were great variations in individual scores within each group, their means for each factor were quite similar; both groups’ mean scores fell in the average range on each factor. The two groups of volunteers were found to be more experienced, better educated, and more ethnically diverse than the total district teaching population.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, researchers of teacher effectiveness have concerned themselves with classroom management, instructional strategies, motivational techniques, and other related teaching behaviors which can be readily observed. Legislators have demanded more accountability from educators, and researchers have examined the relationship of specific teacher behaviors to student achievement gains. Teachers have received training in various teaching strategies and have learned to use these skills not only to raise their students' levels of achievement, but also to improve their own performance evaluations by their supervisors (Texas Teacher Appraisal, 1986).

The personality traits that make a teacher effective are more difficult to analyze than are teaching strategies. The measurement of these traits or characteristics is subjective and therefore harder to quantify. The relationship a teacher builds with a student plays an integral role in the attitude of the student toward school and learning. Olsen (1988) stated that English as a Second Language (ESL) classes are often a haven for immigrant children, a place to try to use English without the fear of ridicule, a place
where fellow students are sympathetic and may act as a support group, and a place where the teacher tries to make sure that students understand what is happening.

The population of students served in elementary classrooms has changed dramatically in the past 15 to 20 years. The 1974 Lau decision held that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 required schools to provide extra help to students who do not speak English (A Summary, 1990). In 1982, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that Texas has an obligation to educate the children of undocumented immigrants in Plyler v. Doe (Kemerer, 1986). The great wave of immigration during the last 15 years seems to be on a collision course with the school reforms of the 1980s, as an increasingly diverse student population confronts an increasingly rigid school environment (First, 1988). Global conflicts continue to cause large numbers of refugee families to immigrate to the United States from countries torn by economic problems or political strife. Heavy Hispanic and Asian immigration has caused a population shift in 22 southern and western U.S. cities with populations of 100,000 or more in the decade between 1980 and 1990. Students who were previously considered part of an ethnic or racial minority population have now become the majority ("Minority Groups," 1991).
Statement of the Problem

At present there is no generally accepted way to identify the positive personality traits that distinguish an effective bilingual or ESL teacher from an effective traditional elementary classroom teacher; the literature has concerned itself more with teaching techniques and methods of subject matter presentation, which can be more easily learned and evaluated. This investigation attempted to identify the personality traits which differentiate an effective teacher who chooses to work with limited English proficient students from an effective teacher who prefers to work in a traditional classroom.

Significance of the Problem

Teachers and administrators find themselves challenged to develop new teaching approaches, along with finding programs and materials appropriate for the increasingly multilingual, multiethnic, and multinational student population. There is vast diversity among the immigrants themselves, who may come from modern, industrialized nations such as Taiwan, Japan, and Korea or from rural and war-devastated nations such as Laos and Cambodia. Many flee from severely depressed rural areas of Mexico or flee the civil wars in Central America. Immigrant children face barriers of language, culture, health, and mental health that prevent their full participation in this very different
In many school districts, the number of languages and dialects spoken by children and their families is astonishing. In 1992-93, the suburban district where this study was conducted reported 55 languages other than English as the language spoken at home. Across America, language-minority children are not able to learn the academic content of school subjects and are therefore not able to fully participate in the economic, social, and political life of the country. Over the next decade, language-minority children will become the majority in the public schools, seriously straining the schools' ability to educate them.

Classroom discourse and references to increasingly abstract ideas, with which many children are unfamiliar, characterize the classroom environment. Children whose past experience with language is not congruent with the new rules of English will have to learn new ways of making meaning before they can use language to learn in the classroom. When teachers and students come from different cultures and use different languages, the teachers may be unaware of the variations between their own understanding of a context and that of their students. When children and adults do not share common experiences and do not hold common beliefs about the meaning of experiences, the adults are less able to help the children encode their thoughts in language.
Learning mediated by teachers who are personally involved in the lives of young children and who are affectionate, interested, and responsive will be retained longer than learning mediated by an adult who is perceived as impersonal and socially distant (Bowman, 1989).

As the student population changes, schools must adjust and adapt to the needs of this increasingly poorer, more ethnically and linguistically diverse group of students. Minority students now represent a broader socioeconomic range than ever before, making simplistic treatment of their needs even less useful (Hodgkinson, 1985).

Some teachers prefer to teach a certain subject or a certain age of students. These preferences are related to the teacher's personality or personal interest in a particular academic area. It seems to follow that teachers with certain personality characteristics would be more effective in working with certain types of non-traditional students, such as the handicapped, the limited English proficient, or the academically gifted than would be a teacher with different personality traits. Although the instruction of limited English proficient students at the elementary level is a relatively new teaching field, it is growing at a rapid rate and will continue to expand. Teachers who work with such students daily need additional and different preparation during teacher training. Their students will have different
needs, both academically and socially, than the more traditional student.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify those personality traits that set effective elementary bilingual or ESL teachers apart from effective regular elementary classroom teachers. No research exclusively identifying the personality traits of effective elementary bilingual or ESL teachers has been found. It is important to identify the personality characteristics that effective bilingual/ESL teachers possess in common that set them apart from effective regular teachers in more traditional classrooms so those traits can be sought during the teacher selection process. Universities could also use this information in teacher advisement, course planning, and presentation.

For the purposes of this study, bilingual and ESL teachers were grouped together and compared to regular education teachers. The terms bilingual and ESL are frequently used interchangeably in legislation, both at the state and federal levels, and the specific program being referenced may be unclear on the surface. School districts likewise use the terms in a global, general fashion and either term may be used to refer to both programs. In either a bilingual or an ESL program, a student may receive from a minimum of one period per day to the entire school
day of instruction from a bilingual or ESL endorsed teacher. The determination of the amount of time spent with the specially trained teacher is based on a student’s level of English proficiency and the program design of the school district. A transitional bilingual program, which is mandated in Texas, provides instruction in the student’s native language only until the student has acquired sufficient proficiency in English to function effectively in a monolingual English setting.

Bilingual and English as a second language programs are interrelated in that English language proficiency is the common objective of both programs (Leone et al., 1992). In an ESL program, which is often provided where children of diverse language backgrounds attend school together, the home languages of the children are usually not used in class. In a bilingual education program, where children of the same language background are grouped together, the home language is used in class and an English language component is provided as well.

Milk (1990) summarized research suggesting the desirability of an integrated language development approach in the education of language minority children as compared to the previous tendency to conceptualize the fields of bilingual and ESL as essentially independent teacher training activities. In some programs, the bilingual teacher is responsible for all ESL instruction, while in other pro-
grams, English speaking teachers work side by side with bilingual teachers and provide the English portion of the program. It is not necessary for an ESL teacher to know the native language of the students, although the experience of learning a new language and having to rely on it can provide valuable insights into the lives of the students they teach. Despite differing classroom roles, there are similarities in the training needs of bilingual and ESL teachers. A common knowledge base related to the understanding of language and cultural issues underlies effective instructional practices for both. Increased emphasis on the integration of language and content area instruction has made the roles of bilingual and ESL teachers increasingly interrelated and thus provides a tremendous potential for common training experiences in the preparation of ESL and bilingual personnel.

Tikunoff (1983), in his study of effective bilingual programs, included one site where classrooms were multilingual with students representing many home languages. He pointed out that in effective classrooms, English language development occurs simultaneously during the teaching of other basic academic skills. These effective teachers also used knowledge of the students’ native culture to organize instruction based on structures from the native culture, while observing the values and norms of both the native and the new culture.
Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses were that there would be differences in the personality traits of effective teachers of bilingual and English as a second language students and the personality traits of effective teachers of students in regular education classes. The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) was used to measure personality traits.

The 16PF Factor A, a continuum which ranges from cool and reserved to warm and outgoing, listed warm and outgoing as characteristics mentioned in the literature as typical of both second language teachers and regular education teachers (Brown, 1975; Check, 1986; Delamere, 1986; Jones, 1988; Johnson & Prom-Jackson, 1986; Marlin, 1986; Mattsson, 1974; Mills, 1986; Nicholson & McInerney, 1988; Shands & Levary, 1986; Thonis, 1991).

Factor B ranges from concrete-thinking, less intelligent to abstract-thinking, more intelligent. Three researchers cited in this study, Mattsson (1974), Weitman (1986), and Thonis (1991), mentioned intelligence as a factor for teachers in regular education settings. Thonis also mentioned it as important for teachers of language minority children.

Literature reviewed for this study indicates that on the Factor C continuum, which ranges from affected by feelings to emotionally stable, English as a second language teachers scored in the affected by feelings area, showing
limited tolerance for unsatisfactory conditions, while regular education teachers scored in the emotionally stable area (Barnett, 1989; Marlin, 1986; Nicholson & McInerney, 1988).

Factor E, measuring characteristics from submissive to dominant, was mentioned in only one study. Brown (1975) found the submissive trait in regular education teachers.

Several researchers of regular education (Check, 1986; Marlin, 1986; Mills, 1986; Mattsson, 1974) mentioned characteristics at the enthusiastic end of the continuum ranging from sober to enthusiastic found in Factor F.

Factor G ranges from expedient to conscientious. None of the reviewed studies of personality traits of effective teachers mentioned characteristics in this factor.

Brown (1975) found regular education teachers to be bold. Barnett (1989) likewise found the English as a second language teachers to be adventurous and ready to try new things. Factor H classifies characteristics ranging from shy to bold.

Factor I characteristics, which range from tough-minded to tender-minded, were not mentioned by any researchers reviewed in this study.

Factor L characteristics range from trusting, which includes adaptable, cheerful, and tolerant, to suspicious. Check (1986), Johnson & Prom-Jackson (1986), Marlin (1986), and Nicholson & McInerney (1988) identified the trusting
trait in effective regular education teachers. Fathman (1991) and Thonis (1991) cited adaptability as an important trait for teachers working with students from diverse cultural backgrounds.

Mattsson (1974) found regular education teachers to be practical, at one end of the Factor M continuum, and Brown (1975) found regular education teachers to be imaginative, at the opposite end of the same continuum.

Numerous studies of regular education teachers (Check, 1986; Marlin, 1986; Mills, 1986; Shands & Levary, 1986; and Weitman, 1986) found them at the forthright end of the Factor N continuum, while Brown (1975) found them to be shrewd, at the opposite end. McGroarty (1991) and Fathman (1991) found warmth, at the same end of the continuum as forthright, to be an important characteristic for second language teachers.

The Factor O quality of maturity and self-confidence, as opposed to the opposite of apprehensive, was cited as a characteristic of both ESL teachers (Delamere, 1986) and regular education teachers (Brown, 1975).

The Factor Q1 continuum ranges from conservative to experimenting. Research on the personality traits of both ESL teachers (Lowe, 1987) and regular education teachers (Johnson & Prom-Jackson, 1986; Marlin, 1986; Nicholson &
McInerney, 1988) found them to be experimenting, and tolerant of change.

Factor Q₂ characteristics range from group-oriented to self-sufficient, and were not mentioned as qualities of either ESL or regular education teachers in the studies reviewed.

On the Factor Q₃ continuum, which ranges from undisciplined self-conflict to following self-image, English as a second language teachers scored in the undisciplined self-conflict range, showing little regard for social demands (Barnett, 1989). The characteristics which would have placed regular education teachers anywhere on this continuum were not mentioned in any of the studies cited.

Factor Q₄ characteristics range from relaxed to tense and were not mentioned in any of the studies reviewed.

Basic Assumptions

The basic assumptions in this study were:

- That teachers were honest in answering the questions on the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

- That the teachers' supervisors and the other appraisers were objective in scoring the Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS).

- That teachers who have reached Career Ladder Level II and Level III are the most effective teachers.
• That the **Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire** is an accurate measurement of personality traits.

**Definitions of Terms**

**Bilingual Education** is a full-time program of dual language instruction that provides for learning basic skills in the primary language of the students of limited English proficiency who are enrolled in the program and that provides for carefully structured and sequenced mastery of English language skills. It addresses the affective, linguistic, and cognitive needs of the students and incorporates the cultural aspects of the students' backgrounds (Texas Education Code [TEC], 1991).

**Career Ladder Level II** classification requires a teacher to have a minimum of two years' teaching experience at Level I, a master's degree or 9 postgraduate hours or 135 Advanced Academic Training (AAT) hours and a performance evaluation of "Exceeding Expectations" on the TTAS for the preceding school year (*Employee Handbook*, 1992).

**Career Ladder Level III** classification requires a teacher to have a minimum of three years at Level II, 12 post-graduate hours or 180 AAT hours and a performance evaluation of "Exceeding Expectations" for the preceding school year (*Employee Handbook*, 1992).

**Effective teachers**, for the purposes of this investigation, are teachers who are on Level II or Level III of the Career
Ladder in the suburban district where this study was conducted.

**English as a Second Language (ESL)** is a program of intensive instruction in English by teachers trained in recognizing and dealing with language differences. The program is designed to consider the students' learning experiences and to incorporate the cultural aspects of the students' backgrounds (TEC, 1991).

**Pull out program** is a term used to refer to a teaching arrangement where all students are assigned to a regular home-room class on a grade level. Those who need extra help (e.g., special education, ESL instruction, speech therapy) are taken to another classroom for a period of time to work on the area of special need.

**Regular class** is a term used in this study to refer to a traditional elementary classroom. Students in these classes are normally able to participate in the same learning activities and are at the same instructional level. Typically, this is a self-contained class where the same teacher instructs the same students for the entire day.

**Sixteen Personality Factor** areas are defined as follows (IPAT, Inc., 1991):

**Factor A** is a continuum ranging from cool (reserved, impersonal, detached, formal, aloof) to warm (outgoing, kindly, easygoing, participating, likes people).
Factor B is a continuum ranging from concrete-thinking (less intelligent) to abstract-thinking (more intelligent, bright).

Factor C is a continuum ranging from affected by feelings (emotionally less stable, easily annoyed) to emotionally stable (mature, faces reality, calm).

Factor E is a continuum ranging from submissive (humble, mild, easily led, accommodating) to dominant (assertive, aggressive, stubborn, competitive, bossy).

Factor F is a continuum ranging from sober (restrained, prudent, taciturn, serious) to enthusiastic (spontaneous, heedless, expressive, cheerful).

Factor G is a continuum ranging from expedient (disregards rules, self-indulgent) to conscientious (conforming, moralistic, staid, rule-bound).

Factor H is a continuum ranging from shy (threat-sensitive, timid, hesitant, intimidated) to bold (venturesome, uninhibited, can take stress).

Factor I is a continuum ranging from tough-minded (self-reliant, no-nonsense, rough, realistic) to tender-minded (sensitive, overprotected intuitive, refined).

Factor L is a continuum ranging from trusting (accepting conditions, easy to get on with) to suspicious (hard to fool, distrustful, skeptical).
Factor M is a continuum ranging from practical (concerned with "down to earth" issues, steady) to imaginative (absent-minded, absorbed in thought, impractical).

Factor N is a continuum ranging from forthright (unpretentious, open, genuine, warm, artless) to shrewd (polished, socially aware, diplomatic, calculating).

Factor O is a continuum ranging from self-assured (secure, feels free of guilt, untroubled, self-satisfied) to apprehensive (self-blaming, guilt-prone, insecure, worrying).

Factor O₁ is a continuum ranging from conservative (respecting traditional ideas) to experimenting (liberal, critical, open to change).

Factor O₂ is a continuum ranging from group-oriented (a "joiner" and sound follower, listens to others) to self-sufficient (resourceful, prefers own decisions).

Factor O₃ is a continuum ranging from undisciplined self-conflict (lax, careless of social rules) to following self-image (socially precise, compulsive).

Factor O₄ is a continuum ranging from relaxed (tranquil, composed, has low drive, unfrustrated) to tense (frustrated, overwrought, has high drive).

*Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS) Observation/Evaluation Record* is an evaluation instrument which was developed to implement House Bill 72. A copy is provided in Appendix A.
It is intended to encourage professional growth for teachers and administrators and to improve instruction in the classrooms in Texas. It is based on existing classroom-based research on teaching, and is designed to be usable in all subjects and grades. The appraisals provide information for improvement of instruction, career ladder assignments, and contract renewal decisions. Two appraisers independently observe the teacher and numerically score the instrument. Their scores are weighted and combined for a composite rating in one of five categories: Unsatisfactory, Below Expectations, Meets Expectations, Exceeding Expectations, and Clearly Outstanding (Texas Teacher Appraisal, 1986).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The first step in this study, after selecting a tentative topic, was to review existing literature. This review was necessary to ensure that the specific topic chosen had not been previously investigated. In addition, the literature search provided background material on court decisions that are pertinent to the study.

Pertinent Court Decisions

The need for a means to identify effective bilingual and ESL teachers would not exist to the degree it does today without some of the court decisions of the last 20 years. Two of the more pertinent court cases are discussed below.

Lau v. Nichols

In the late 1960s, several Chinese organizations in San Francisco, California, sued the school district. The suit, filed on behalf of non-English speaking Chinese students, sought relief against unequal educational opportunities which were alleged to violate the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. They lost in the Federal District Court, appealed to the Federal Appeals Court where they lost again, and then appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. In 1974, the
Supreme Court unanimously overturned the lower courts' decisions.

The Supreme Court noted that the California Education Code required that "English shall be the basic language of instruction in all schools" and that all students shall master the English language. The Supreme Court ruled that under these state-imposed standards there was no equality of treatment merely because the non-English speaking students were provided the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum. Further, they stated that: "It seems obvious that the Chinese-speaking minority receives less benefits than the English-speaking majority . . . which denies them a meaningful opportunity to participate in the educational program--all earmarks of the discrimination banned . . . " by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (A Summary, 1990).

The majority opinion stated that teaching English to students of Chinese ancestry who do not speak the language might be one remedy. Another remedy might be to give instruction to the group in Chinese. The court did not rule out other solutions to the problem.

Plyler v. Doe

In May, 1975, the Texas Legislature revised the Texas Education Code (section 21.031) to authorize school districts to deny enrollment in public schools to children who had not been "legally admitted" to the United States. The
code was also revised to withhold state funds from local school districts for the education of these children (commonly termed "illegal aliens"). In the fall of 1977, a class action suit on behalf of school-aged children of Mexican origin was filed against the Tyler Independent School District superintendent, James Plyler, and the Board of Trustees seeking relief from the revised code. The State of Texas intervened as a party-defendant. The U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas ruled that the district and state had to provide a free education to these children.

The decision was appealed, and in June, 1982, the U.S. Supreme Court determined that the illegal aliens were in fact being denied equal protection under the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and that they should receive a free education (Plyler v. Doe, 1982).

Related Studies

The problem of identifying personality traits that are associated with effective teachers is not a new one. Edwards (1988) traced how research on effective education (as related to teacher characteristics) had evolved from 1890 to 1950. Attempts were made to make teacher evaluations less subjective and more objective. Edwards reported that some of the traits used to identify effective teachers in the 1890s included the following: comely and properly placed
head, countenance fair to look upon (without blemish either natural or acquired), body healthy and erect, patient, polite, neat, educated, cultured, knows when to speak and when to keep silent. Edwards also observed that, while the characteristics of the ideal teacher had changed over that 60-year period, the emphasis of research on effective teaching had shifted from the characteristics of the ideal teacher to the study of those teacher behaviors associated with successful teaching.

Numerous other studies related to teachers' personality traits were found and reviewed. Most such studies were dismissed as totally unrelated to this investigation; however, the remainder of this chapter summarizes the more pertinent studies. They have been grouped in the following categories: teacher evaluation in general, teacher selection criteria, special program teacher characteristics, characteristics of effective second language teachers, and studies using the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

**Teacher Evaluation in General**

In a study of the positive traits of effective teachers and negative traits of ineffective teachers, Check (1986) administered a 25-item questionnaire to 747 college students, 104 high school students, and 93 eighth grade students asking open-ended as well as check-off questions in order to evaluate teachers. Check listed traits of effec-
tive teachers as being effective communicators, pleasant, friendly, warm, enthusiastic, excited about teaching, cheerful, sociable, interesting, patient, sensitive to students' needs, possessing a sense of humor, and willing to see students as individuals. Negative characteristics included poor communicator, boring presentator, lacking in knowledge of the subject, disorganized, aloof, and insensitive.

In a somewhat similar study, Johnson and Prom-Jackson (1986) used evaluations by successful young adults of their most influential elementary and high school faculties' personal characteristics to define general parameters along which teachers' influence and impact are felt. The subjects, who ranged in age from 18 to 34, had been clients of a nonprofit educational organization that identifies talented children from low income backgrounds as possible candidates for college preparatory secondary schools. Social and interpersonal skills, affective characteristics, and temperament stood out as the dominant set of characteristics of influential teachers. Students used the following descriptors: approachable, pleasant, easy to relate to, accepting, tolerant, helpful, concerned, caring, thoughtful, and perceptive of and sensitive to the needs of students. These students recalled their academic growth taking place in a nurturing, interpersonally intensive setting, which also fostered their own personal growth and emerging sense of self. The authors suggested that while this sample was
composed of high-achieving, predominately minority young people, less academically oriented young people might have less internal motivation and thus might be even more responsive to external sources of motivation provided by their teachers. Teachers' affective characteristics influenced their classes as much or more than their cognitive attributes. While academic growth and development was the primary task of the schools, these findings suggest that the teachers who facilitated that academic growth achieved those outcomes through the use of well-developed interpersonal skills and abilities. The authors considered that the identification of individuals who possess the interpersonal abilities to become outstanding facilitators of learning is at least as important as appraising their academic records.

In lieu of using student questionnaires, Weitman (1986) focused on classroom atmosphere in order to measure the quality of preschool programs. This study centered on the characteristics of early childhood teachers as perceived by parents, caregivers, and directors of facilities. Components of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) were used for the determination of quality preschool programs. These components were physical environment, health and safety, nutrition and food service, administration, staff qualifications and development, staff-parent interaction, staff-child interaction, child-child interaction, curriculum, and evaluation. Major indicators
of good programs for young children are identified as the program, parental involvement, and the staff. The greatest impact upon the quality of an early childhood program was determined to be the staff. "Qualities" were defined as those elements unique to an individual as determined by personality, attitudes, experience, and assumptions which are identified with successful effective preschool teachers. Weitman listed qualities of personal attributes, such as maturity, warmth, flexibility, right brainedness, and dependability as well as intellectual, physical, moral, and spiritual qualities. A sample population of 35 directors, 35 parents, and 35 teachers in five Texas cities was asked to rank 50 qualities of effective teachers in their perceived order of importance. Latent factors which enabled these qualities to be observed included possesses interpersonal and educational skills, employs positive guidance techniques for the development of socialization skills in children, prepares an appropriate instructional environment for children, and displays professional attributes. The highest correlation among the rankings supported the notion that nurturing qualities were regarded as more important. The highest two qualities were non-instructional (dependability and encouraging children's expression).

In a study of the procedures and criteria used for conducting teacher performance in Texas public schools, Marlin (1986) categorized items into presage criteria
(teacher characteristics), process criteria (teacher behavior), product criteria (student change or gain), and general job performance requirements (job expectations). Presage criteria are characteristics of the teacher such as personal traits (traits related to the task of teaching and traits related to the teacher as a person), personal characteristics (physical fitness, grooming, voice-speech), and general characteristics-attitudes (positive attitude toward teaching, professional attitude, teacher attitude). The sub-category of personal traits contained four groupings: (a) traits related to membership in the organization—cooperative, adaptable, flexible; (b) traits related to work with students—interested, fair, patient, compassionate, positive, impartial, considerate, tolerant, sympathetic, constructive, democratic, empathetic, humane, courteous; (c) traits related to the task of teaching—enthusiastic, initiatory, resourceful, creative, innovative; and (d) traits related to the teacher as a person—judicious, self-controlled, tactful, sincere, stable, honest, calm, mature, friendly. Marlin's review of the literature identified such additional traits as warmth, understanding, imaginative, sensitive, relaxed, respectful, and enthusiastic.

Finally, Shands and Levary (1986) used the Delphi Method to prioritize the importance of various teacher behaviors in an effort to improve evaluation of teachers’
performance in the classroom. They reported that warm and encouraging teacher behavior is positively associated with learning gains in low socioeconomic status (SES) schools, while it has a negative impact in high SES schools. In elementary schools, supervisors felt strongly that children need to experience success in order to be motivated to learn.

**Teacher Selection Criteria**

Selecting individuals with a high potential for success in teaching continues as a major thrust of the education reform movement. As a result of education reforms, colleges and schools of education have raised their academic standards. Intellectual capabilities have been seen as having prime importance, while the research related to personality factors has been sparse.

Joseph and Green (1986) reviewed the literature regarding reasons for entering the teaching profession. Many who are attracted to teaching desire intrinsic rewards and see the profession as a mission or a calling. They have a desire to share or serve and to lead students toward intellectual growth. Other influencing factors are the opportunity to continue in an educational environment, to be of service to society, or having a preference for a particular subject or interest. Of those turning to teaching as a career change, the desire for fulfillment, stimulation or to
make a contribution to the lives of others were reasons cited. There were also psychological motivations, such as a wish to be in authority, to have children's love, to entertain people, or to be in a field that is not competitive.

In a more objective study, Young (1989) conducted a year-long investigation of a group of ten beginning secondary teachers in order to understand which characteristics can be viewed as important predictors of successful teachers and unsuccessful teachers. At the end of the first year of teaching, data were obtained from the National Teachers Examination, the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory, and a state assessment called the Six Competencies Instrument. Scores on the Six Competencies Instrument categorized the teachers into groups called "High Potential" and "At Risk." The Introvert/Extrovert Scales of the Strong-Campbell were examined because teaching involves a high level of interaction with others. Three teachers were categorized as at risk. They preferred distance between themselves and their students and maintained a passive stance as teachers. The high potential group were neither overtly introverted nor unusually extroverted, although there was a tendency toward extroversion. All three at-risk teachers scored "Investigative" on the Strong-Campbell Test. This is defined as "holds an aversion to persuasive, social, and receptive activities." The author stated that personality and interest factors may be more significant in understanding
successful teachers than commonly thought, and cautioned that personality traits appear well embedded within an individual and thus attempts to change them may have limited impact.

The primary goal in the selection interview is to determine which candidate possesses the experience and competencies that most closely match the critical requirements for the vacant teaching position. These critical requirements are the responsibilities and demands associated with the job. For the teacher of limited English proficient students, these competencies include not only knowledge and skills, but attitudes as well (Pennington & Young, 1989).

Mills (1986) attempted to determine by interview and classroom observation whether the pupil-teacher relationship could be correlated with the results of a pre-employment interview. Teacher performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI) was compared with their classroom instruction as measured by the McDaniel Observer Rating Scale (ORS) to see if the TPI could be used to significantly improve the process used to hire new teachers. The TPI measures such characteristics as innovation, and the capacity of a teacher to stimulate students to think, respond, feel, and learn. It measures a teacher's willingness to search constantly for ideas, materials, and experiences to share with students. Another category is a teacher's capacity to receive satisfaction from the growth of students and not from his or her
own performance. Other areas measured include the ability to see the interests and needs of each student and develop a mutually favorable relationship with each one, accepting their differences and contributing to their self-actualization. Dimensions of the ORS involving teacher personality characteristics include clarity of communication, enthusiasm, and warmth. Mills found that the scores on the TPI could not be used with any real degree of accuracy to predict a teacher's performance in the classroom as measured by the ORS. While the TPI may have value in providing a better understanding of the prospective teacher, it is clearly not an absolute predictor of success. The belief that teachers will perform in the classroom as they say they will may not always be supported by independent observer scores on the ORS.

Nicholson and McInerney (1988) discussed the hiring interview and its use of human judgment in assessing and evaluating information that may be inaccurate, incomplete, or irrelevant. While personal characteristics were considered to be the most difficult to judge, they were considered critical in the success of a candidate over time. Teacher effectiveness dimensions include basic intelligence, academic achievement, appearance, emotional balance, empathy, individualized perception, listening skills, the ability to verbalize teaching decisions and express oneself orally, sensitivity to children's needs, and knowledge of effective
teaching practices. Inference theory states that we infer the characteristics of candidates on the basis of incomplete information because the circumstances, behavior, or sequence of events are similar to those we have experienced in previous situations. Characteristics such as creativity, love for helping others learn, patience, tolerance for ambiguity, adaptability, and willingness to experiment and develop are difficult to determine. An interviewer who begins with a favorable expectancy may give a candidate the benefit of the doubt. Nicholson and McInerney contended that the challenge is to choose candidates on the basis of their values systems, not on how well they mirror the values of the interviewer.

**Special Program Teacher Characteristics**

Dick (1982) stated that the teacher has long been acclaimed and recognized as the most important resource in the classroom, and felt that a major factor contributing to the overall success of any group of students is the manner in which the teacher conducts the class. This caused Dick to question exactly what it was that made one teacher more successful than another. In the review of the literature comparing teachers of handicapped and economically disadvantaged students with traditional teachers, Dick found that despite the diversity of individuals' teaching styles, a common trait among successful teachers of special needs
students was that all of them expressed themselves visually and physically as they taught and worked with students. Successful teachers exhibited the following personality traits: compassionate, intelligent, creative, hardworking, emotionally mature, organized, warm, friendly, responsible, imaginative, enthusiastic, good sense of humor, tact, and cooperation. Administrators polled in this study mentioned the following characteristics as important for teacher success: enthusiastic, professional, imaginative, organized, flexible, and innovative. They described successful teachers' relationships with their students as evidencing a warm interest and concern, where students were valued and accepted as individuals. Dick held that classroom control or climate was the factor differentiating good teachers of special needs students from teachers in traditional classes. The question was then pursued of whether certain personality traits produced the classroom climate that was more advantageous for these students. The California Personality Inventory was administered to teachers identified as successful in both traditional and special needs classes and it was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference in the scores of the two groups.

The results of the exam showed all the scales for both groups falling into the average range, with neither profile possessing extreme fluctuations. Both groups' scores showed them to be confident, forceful, outgoing and quick. Special
needs teachers scored slightly below the norm on the Socialization and Flexibility scales. This indicated that they placed less emphasis on such things as serious, obliging and conforming behaviors than did the traditional teachers. Although both groups scored above the mean on the Flexibility subscale, defined as the "degree of adaptability of a person's thinking and social behaviors," the teachers of special needs students scored higher than the traditional teachers. They therefore tended to be more informal, adventurous, humorous, and rebellious. The traditional teachers obtained a near-average score on the Responsibility subscale, while the special needs teachers were below average. Responsibility was defined as behavior that was conforming and dignified. This was interpreted to mean that the teachers of special needs students were more tolerant of the behaviors exhibited by their students; they placed less emphasis on social conformity. The Responsibility scale measured conformity in the behavioral realm, while the Achievement via Conformity subscale measured conformity in the achievement realm. The special needs teachers placed significantly less emphasis on social and achievement-oriented tasks which relied on conforming behaviors.

In a later investigation, McMillan (1987) studied 50 elementary and 50 secondary teachers to determine the relationship of teacher temperament to effectiveness in the classroom, and also sought to determine the relationship of
the teacher’s temperament to the teacher’s sex, to the grade level taught, to the area taught (special education or regular education), and to the subject taught. The Temperament Inventory was used to determine the teachers’ temperaments, and the teachers’ effectiveness was measured by the Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS). The sanguine temperament is defined as a person who is warm, buoyant, lively, receptive by nature, and who enjoys people and has a lovable disposition. The choleric temperament is hot, quick, active, practical, strong-willed, independent, decisive, opinionated and lacking in sympathy and compassion. The melancholy temperament is defined as a person who is analytical, self-sacrificing, sensitive, emotional, introverted, and persistent. A person with this temperament is also a perfectionist, reticent to initiate a new project or in conflict with those who wish to, and finds the greatest meaning in life through personal sacrifice. The phlegmatic temperament is calm, cool, slow, easy-going, avoiding as much involvement as possible, and enjoying people. This type will not assume leadership, but can be a capable leader and is a natural peacemaker. Statistical analyses indicated that teachers with the sanguine or the melancholy temperaments were most effective, while teachers with the phlegmatic temperament were the least effective. Most teachers had the choleric temperament.
There was no relationship between the teachers' temperament and the area taught. The dominant temperaments of the special education teachers were phlegmatic and choleric, as were those of the regular education teachers.

Peyton (1986) studied the characteristics and qualifications perceived to be essential for elementary teachers of the academically gifted to see if they were similar to those perceived to be essential for elementary teachers of students not identified as gifted. Literature on the education of gifted students mentions such personal characteristics as intelligent, flexible, creative, self-confident, a wide variety of interests, sensitive to the needs of gifted and talented children, enjoyment in working with gifted and talented children, favorable attitude toward gifted students, providing a more student-centered approach to teaching, systematic, businesslike in the classroom, stimulating, enthusiastic, imaginative, perceptive, possessing a sense of humor, and exhibiting maturity. In this study, teachers of students identified as gifted, administrators of gifted programs, and gifted students all ranked statements describing desirable characteristics for teachers of students identified as gifted. Teachers of elementary students not identified as gifted, administrators of regular education programs, and students not identified as gifted also ranked the descriptive statements. It was concluded that gifted education teachers should have a favorable attitude toward
students, possess the ability to plan and implement lessons that reflect higher-level thinking skills, and be knowledgeable of learning characteristics of students. Regular education teachers should be able to communicate effectively, inspire and motivate students, effectively discipline, and be positively expectant of student behavior and achievement.

**Characteristics of Effective Second Language Teachers**

In an early study, Hill and Pillsbury (1956) sought to determine what qualities are desirable for teachers of children who are learning a new language and a new way of life. The authors stated that teachers should learn about their students' backgrounds and found that a new language can be learned best and most rapidly through the use of the children's first-hand experiences. Teaching units planned around the children's immediate environment stimulated pupils to develop a desire to communicate. They also found that talking occurred only when the people involved had something in common to discuss.

Barnett (1989) interviewed fellow English as a Foreign Language teachers living abroad in order to learn about the characteristics they shared, and discovered that no teacher was like the composite, but that the composite did explain something about the group as a whole. The characteristics
of these teachers were summarized as "anomie" and "energy." Anomie was defined as the general feeling of restlessness and homelessness, a feeling of not belonging and searching for something else, or a disconnectedness. These teachers did not seem to have chosen teaching, but to have fallen into the profession as a part of a search, an adventure, a way to travel. The profession was a means, not an end. These teachers wanted a change and were willing to abandon the secure and known for adventure, escape, and fantasy. Many were perfectionists and had been or continued to be dissatisfied with themselves or their lives. Energy was defined as the drive, the vigor directed toward the accomplishment of tasks.

Native English speaking English teachers in London described their feelings and observations of effective teacher characteristics in journals during a 12-week study of Mandarin Chinese (Lowe, 1987). The teachers discovered that in the beginning they were anxious and fearful of their own attempts to produce the new language. They described their teacher as encouraging and benevolent, and they felt that their progress was dependent on receiving approval and complimentary feedback from their teacher. Being understood by and understanding another speaker of the new language were additional reinforcements of their efforts. They stated a need for the teacher to use varied approaches to meet the different learning styles of students, as well as
to accommodate the range of learning needs at different stages of acquisition of the new language. Their observations of their own learning emphasized the need for meaning-based presentations that could relate to real life.

In another study of second language teachers, Jones (1988) investigated the attitudes of faculty members who were nominated as effective teachers and advisors by university level international students. Questions were formulated based on the review of the literature, and the 12 faculty members most frequently nominated by 600 international students as being successful teachers and advisors were interviewed. The questions used fell into the following broad areas: What are the cross-cultural experiences of faculty members? What specific faculty attitudes and interpersonal skills are perceived as having an impact on learning? What specific instructional techniques are perceived as enabling faculty members to teach and advise effectively? What suggestions do successful teachers and advisors have for faculty development programming? The following were identified as problems that have an impact on classroom performance: academic needs and related issues, problems connected to cultural background, and conflicts brought on by unmet social needs. It was found that difficulty with the English language created the most conflicts, handicapping foreign students in the classroom, in social settings, and in the community at large. Most of the successful
teachers had worked, studied, and/or lived abroad. Half had had extensive interaction with foreign persons other than students; however, these same 12 professors rarely involved themselves with foreign students in extra-curricular activities and reported a lack of information on the educational systems in the countries their students represented. Foreign students desired changes in faculty behavior that would improve instructional skills, student comprehension, and exam scores. Helpful classroom accommodations included making lecture notes available, use of the blackboard for illustrations, limiting vocabulary (especially idiomatic and slang expressions), explanation of unfamiliar words, and allowing more time on exams.

Jones noted that the professors saw a need to clarify academic expectations at the beginning of the course, and they expected students to adjust to the teachers' expectations. Each teacher respected the student who demonstrated hard work, and each held fast to the academic standards of his or her field. The teachers were flexible in the presentation of their materials, using multiple ways of saying the same thing to transmit concepts and information.

In a description of successful bilingual instruction, Tikunoff (1983) used both qualitative and quantitative procedures to collect data in order to obtain information on teacher characteristics, organization of instruction, allocation of time, language use, students' academic learning
time, and student participation styles. This study was funded by the National Institute of Education in response to a congressional mandate to provide information on which to base a decision about the renewal of support for bilingual education. A consortium of nine educational institutions and agencies collaborated with school districts across the U.S. that served ethnolinguistically diverse student populations in grades kindergarten through six. Studies were conducted in each of the following language groups: Chinese, Cuban Spanish, Puerto Rican Spanish, Navajo, Mexican Spanish, and Vietnamese. In addition, one district was considered multilingual with classrooms where students represented multiple home languages. Active teaching behaviors included clear communication. Teachers mediated effective instruction by the use of the students' home language as well as English, the integration of English language development with basic skills instruction, and the use of information from the students' home culture.

Tikunoff found that the core of effective instruction is a teacher's ability to communicate clearly giving accurate directions, specifying tasks, enabling students to know when they have completed tasks successfully, and presenting new information understandably. This was accomplished by explaining, outlining, summarizing, and reviewing. Information about the students' native culture was used to promote their engagement in learning tasks. It included using
cultural referents, organizing instruction based on structures from the native culture, and observing the values and norms of both cultures.

Delamere (1986) researched the topic of evaluation of ESL instruction and found very little in the professional literature of the field. A list of the characteristics considered essential to effective ESL teaching was developed, as well as a synthesis of the major assumptions and philosophies underlying them. Delamere stated that it is still not known what makes a good teacher or what constitutes good teaching. Various lists of teacher characteristics which were related to courses taught in ESL Teacher Training programs were evaluated and found to be overly concerned with theory. It was noted that the changing nature of ESL teaching methodology and trends that consequently appear will influence teacher evaluation criteria. A list of characteristics considered essential to effective ESL teaching was developed, and these characteristics were divided into the three categories of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Delamere stated that attitudes were poorly represented in the literature, but nevertheless they are an essential consideration. Included in the category of attitudes were the following: interpersonal skills, intercultural awareness and intercultural skills, empathy with students, personal front and style (an individual's pleasantness and self-assurance), ability to student center the
teaching and consider individual learning styles, and concern for students' self-esteem, identification, and lack of self-consciousness. In ESL teaching, the relationship between teacher and student is of utmost importance, as the teacher is often the first real contact the student has with someone outside his or her culture; thus, the student is dependent on the teacher not only for knowledge, but also for emotional support.

Milk (1991) reviewed research on effective bilingual instruction and cited a study of effective schooling for Hispanic students by Garcia, in which several key findings were identified. The intellectual level of the curriculum in the classroom was of the highest order. Students were generally participating in activities and tasks that demanded both creativity and a high degree of cognitive involvement on their parts. Teachers emphasized the importance of substance and content in teaching, and deemphasized mastery of specific skills. Emphasis was on comprehension and on meaning, and students were continuously examining their use of language and their thinking in a conscious manner. There was a diversity of instructional activity, reading and writing were integrated, and assessment took place in the context of actual learning activities. Effective teachers strongly encouraged students to make use of their personal experiences for learning purposes, setting up lessons in a way that led students to draw connections between home or
community experiences and the academic lessons. The teachers worked to obtain autonomy in making curricular decisions within their classrooms and created support networks for implementation of their general approach to instruction.

Milk further cited Brown’s observation that successful teaching requires successful interaction with real learners. He also observed that personal human response that must occur between teacher and learner ultimately relies just as heavily on reflective intuition as it does on careful analysis of classroom processes. Effective teaching is a matter of intuition as well as scientific analysis.

The actual methods a teacher uses have become less obvious, as teacher direction is deemphasized in activities such as computer-assisted instruction, peer tutoring, or cooperative learning. No longer does one methodology dictate the materials or methods that are used in second language classrooms (Fathman, 1991). Successful teachers are more concerned with supplementing the curriculum than implementing it. Teachers now are more likely to take techniques from a number of methodologies, and choose those that best fit their individual teaching styles, particular objectives, and specific students. More recent techniques are those which enhance communication, provide meaningful input, encourage interaction, emphasize meaning conveyed visually or through actions, minimize anxiety, and maximize motivation. Importance is placed on the nature of the learner
activity, the classroom atmosphere, the non-verbal environmental support, and the role of the teacher. No one methodology has emerged as the all-encompassing answer to language teaching. A classroom atmosphere where students are comfortable, confident, and can participate in the learning is an important component in many methodologies. As methods have become more interactive, more serious attention needs to be paid to the people who are interacting. Individual teacher factors, as well as individual and group student factors, need to determine the effective methods for second language teaching. Individual needs and learning styles, as well as the social environment, should be considered. Contextual features such as social setting, learner and teacher background, and culture should influence choices. The personal philosophy and classroom personality of the teacher are important factors. Whereas methods must be theoretically sound, it is ultimately the teacher who translates a method into practice. Different situations call for different techniques and all methodologies can be valuable resources. Teachers are becoming more flexible, more informed, and more discriminating as they choose from the many options available to them in second language teaching.

McGroarty (1991) notes that research on effective teaching has yet to provide a foolproof method and states that none could or should supersede the teacher’s expert judgment. This is followed with a statement that there is,
however, some basis for identifying teacher behaviors associated with student success in learning a language for different purposes and in different settings. Second language teaching does make a difference and is superior to informal exposure to a language. McGroarty cites a study by Ramirez and Stromquist which used videotapes of nineteen teachers in kindergarten through third grade to identify teacher behaviors associated with second language learning. Teacher behaviors associated with gains in comprehension were modeling or repetition, and the use of visuals, while behaviors associated with improved production of English were asking guided questions, giving commands, and using direct correction of grammar, English synonyms, or translations. The pace of the lesson and the use of a variety of behaviors also contributed to achievement. It became evident that a combination of classroom techniques was superior to reliance on one or two procedures for teaching. Reviewing a number of studies, McGroarty found that both traditional aspects of instruction—the teacher’s method of presentation of verbal material—and the more currently emphasized role of the teacher—creator and manager of group structures—figure in effective second language instruction for elementary students. The summarized studies suggest that teacher values, beliefs, and preferences are apparent in classroom verbal behaviors. Teacher decisions about instruction affect both the nature and the amount of student
exposure to a second language. Students' willingness to take risks in the classroom was found to positively predict class participation and, in turn, higher proficiency in the new language. Thus the teacher's role in creating a comfortable atmosphere is a vital aspect of successful teaching.

Thonis (1991) states that educators agree unanimously that a competent teacher is a critical factor in learning; a good teacher is thought to be the most significant influence in the lives of students. There are, however, many perceptions of who is competent and what is good. Teachers should be persons who enjoy young people and take pleasure in helping them learn. Teachers should be persons who are representative of the society in which the children are living and growing; they should be examples of the values cherished by the community and demonstrate those attitudes and behaviors of importance to society. They should be intelligent, which is defined not only as bright, but also as curious, searching, reflective, and thoughtful. Intelligence may be manifested in sensitivity, compassion, intuition, and empathy. It may be seen in the awareness of how things work and how details are put together. Teachers are sources of knowledge, judges of performance, supporters of egos, objects of affection, leaders of groups, parent surrogates, targets for hostility, friends, and protectors.
Thonis noted that in classrooms where language minority children are enrolled, the teacher should possess the same personal and professional qualifications of any teacher assigned to teach in any classroom. They should have many if not all of these characteristics: a genuine interest in youth, an enthusiasm for learning, an ability to express affectionate regard, a commitment to all students, a respect for parents, a capacity for organization, and an openness to change. In addition, teachers who work with students from diverse language backgrounds should possess these qualities: an awareness of cultural differences, a recognition of language diversity, a knowledge of second language acquisition theory, an understanding of the students' realities, a sensitivity to the values of students' families, a knowledge of the history and heritage of the group, a recognition of the strengths and potential of all students, a willingness to modify and adapt instruction as needed, and a solid grasp of curriculum imperatives for students learning in a second language.

A teacher's personal qualities are especially important in classrooms where minority language students are enrolled, according to Thonis. Among these are the character and temperament traits of good teachers in general and the additional specific requirements of language skills, cultural awareness, and sensitivity to differences. When the personal attributes are clearly present, the professional
expertise may be added. It is difficult, if not impossible, for most of the personal characteristics to be taught or learned. Teachers must know the subject matter they will teach. A teacher teaching English must know its phonology, morphology, syntax, grammar, vocabulary, and semantic systems. They must also know about second language acquisition theory and methods, and about the differences between first language acquisition and second language learning. Knowledge of the social and cultural settings in which the students are living and growing is also important. Teachers should know about the literature, history, art, and music of the students' heritage when possible. They should know about human growth and development. Teachers should also know how to do the following: identify students' language strengths and needs, organize appropriate levels of instruction, maintain an orderly businesslike classroom, provide for a range of language and achievement differences, manage several groups within a single classroom, create interest and enthusiasm for learning, present appropriate lessons and guide practice, monitor students' progress, and vary strategies and pace of instruction. Effective teachers believe in values of courtesy and consideration of others, fairness and justice applied equitably, potential learning abilities of all students, self-confidence and self-esteem, sense of humor and perspective, responsibilities and rights of the group, and safety and security in the classroom.
Thonis divided teachers of English as a second language into three categories: (1) Teachers who speak only English. (2) Teachers who speak English and one or more other languages with some proficiency. Their other language(s) might not be those of the students in the class, but they have first-hand experience in learning another language. (3) Teachers who are competent in the native language of the students and in English. They can organize instruction to minimize language interference and maximize the transfer of the native language skills to English. Competence in the teaching of ESL should include knowledge to deliver instruction in both oral and written dimensions of English. Ideally, ESL teachers should be able to bring together a full language arts curriculum which integrates listening, speaking, reading, handwriting, spelling, literature and creative writing.

In teaching ESL at the elementary and at the secondary levels, Thonis stated that competent teachers should address the personal-social as well as the intellectual needs of their students. Good teachers are those who hold the conviction that language minority students can learn to comprehend, speak, read, and write English well. They know that different materials and methods may be needed for some students, and are not locked into one single approach for everyone. They seek to discover the cultural and linguistic differences among students and view this diversity as a
source of pleasure and enrichment for all students. They are sensitive to the feelings of bewilderment which newcomers to a strange country may experience. They expend every effort to lower the students' anxieties and to create a sense of sanctuary in the class. They have clearly defined expectations and translate those into well-organized, purposeful instruction. They forge a strong bond between the home and the school by recognizing the importance of the parents, their heritage and their language, in the lives of students. They believe that language minority students who are to thrive and learn in an English speaking country must be fluent and literate at a high level. They reach out to the community for available resources to help students and their families adjust to their new realities. They recognize the challenge to prepare students for global citizenship and perceive their multiethnic, multilingual classrooms as microcosms of the larger international world. A competent, caring, knowledgeable teacher is a good teacher.

Studies Using the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire

Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and another questionnaire were used by Brown (1975) to compare the personality characteristics of women physical education teachers to those of teachers in other departments at the same institutions. It was found that women educators were
more outgoing, imaginative, less emotionally stable and more conforming than women physical educators. Both groups scored high in creativity and showed a high tolerance for people.

Mattsson (1974) used Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) to discover the relationship between teacher personality traits and success in the classroom as measured by the Hoyt-Grim Pupil Reaction Inventory (PRI). The subjects were secondary school student teachers representing all content areas. The null hypothesis was that there was no relationship between the scores attained by student teachers on the 16PF and scores attained on the PRI. Mattsson cited other studies correlating the 16PF with the PRI which found successful junior high student teachers to be extraverted, "well-adjusted," warm, friendly, and participating, while successful senior high student teachers were intelligent, enthusiastic, and practical. When Mattsson grouped the subjects by teaching level and content area, the findings were barely sufficient for the rejection of the null hypothesis. The size of the community in which they did their student teaching was more influential in the relationship between successful teaching and the personality traits of the teacher than was the teaching level or subject matter area. In small towns (population less than 2,000), teaching effectiveness correlated significantly with the personality factors of sober, shy, sensitive, trusting, and
introverted. In medium cities (population of 7,500 - 30,000), teaching effectiveness correlated significantly with the factors of outgoing, emotionally mature, trusting, confident, group dependent, relaxed, and low anxiety.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Population

The school district where this study was conducted employed 2,084 teachers during the 1991-92 school year, the latest figure available. The number of their average years of experience was 12.3. Among those teachers, 737, or 35.4%, had attained Level II of the Career Ladder, while 914, or 43.9% had attained Level III. Of the 2,084 teachers in the district, 56.7% had bachelors degrees, 42.5% had masters degrees, and 0.8% had doctorates. The ethnicity of teachers in this district in 1991-92 was as follows: American Indian 0.2%, African-American 2.5%, Asian 0.3%, Hispanic 1.0%, and "Other" (or Anglo) 96%. Of the teachers in the district, 85.4% were female and 14.6% were male (RISD, 1992).

Selection of the Samples

Thirty volunteers were solicited for the study by the investigator from the full-time elementary bilingual and English as a second language (ESL) teachers on Career Ladder Level II and Level III in the district. Thirty volunteer teachers who are on Career Ladder Level II and Level III and who are assigned to a regular self-contained elementary school classroom were also solicited to participate as a
comparison group. Copies of solicitation memoranda may be found in Appendix B. Confidentiality was ensured for the volunteers. They were instructed to omit their names from the answer sheets; however, they were asked to identify whether they are members of the bilingual/ESL teacher group or the regular education comparison group, their ethnicity, level of education, number of years of teaching experience, and gender.

Information about the Career Ladder Level of a teacher was available only to the teacher's supervisor and to the personnel office; however, solicitation memos were sent to teachers in the school district whom the examiner knew and felt had the number of years' experience and additional education which could potentially qualify them for eligibility. While memos were sent to a few regular education teachers who were male, none of them volunteered. There is currently only one male elementary bilingual/ESL teacher, and his years of experience are not sufficient to make him eligible for career ladder. The 60 volunteers who comprised the sample for this study represented the faculties of 25 of the 35 elementary schools in the district.

The average number of years of experience of the bilingual/ESL teacher sample group was 18.0, with a range of 6 to 30 years. Regular education teachers ranged in years of experience from 5 to 34, with a mean of 18.4. This compares
to the district average of 12.3 years of teaching experience.

Of the bilingual/ESL teachers in the sample, 28.6% had bachelors degrees. Of the regular education teachers, 25.0% had bachelors degrees. This compared to 56.7% of the total teaching population in the district. The sample populations had a higher percentage of advanced degrees than the teacher population as a whole. While 42.5% of the total teaching population held masters degrees, 67.9% of the bilingual/ESL sample held masters degrees, and 71.4% of the regular education teachers had received their masters. In both the bilingual/ESL sample and the regular education sample, 3.6% of the teachers had completed their doctorates. This compares to 0.8% of teachers across the district who held doctorates.

Anglo teachers comprised 96.0% of the teaching population. The bilingual/ESL sample was 76.7% Anglo, while the regular education sample was 89.7% Anglo. African-American teachers made up 2.5% of the district’s teacher membership. There were no African-American bilingual/ESL teachers; however, 6.9% of the regular education sample was African-American. The total Hispanic teacher population was 1.0%. The bilingual/ESL teacher population was 23.3% Hispanic. There were no Hispanic teachers in the regular education sample. The Asian teacher population in the district was 0.3%. There were no Asian bilingual/ESL teachers who were
eligible to participate, and 3.4% of the regular education sample population was Asian.

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) is an objectively scorable test devised to give the most complete coverage of personality possible in a brief time (IPAT, 1991). Forms A, B, C, and D of the test were designed for use with individuals aged 16 and over, with an educational level of high school or above. Forms C and D have a slightly lower reading level and are shorter than forms A and B. Form A, the most commonly given form, was used in this study. The test was not timed, and was usually completed within 45 - 60 minutes. The 16PF may be scored by hand or by computer. In this study, the number of subjects was small enough to facilitate hand scoring, which was used.

More than 40 years of research on normal and clinical groups provides the background for this comprehensive evaluation of personality, which measures 16 functionally independent dimensions. Any test item contributes to the score on only one factor.

Ten to 13 items are provided for each scale in Form A. The questions are arranged in a rough cycle to insure variety and to maintain interest. Three alternative answers are provided for each of the questions, to avoid the "forced-choice" situation. Items have been chosen to be as "neu-
tral" in value as possible to avoid distortion and faking. Some items which do not obviously refer to a trait, but which are known to measure it, also provide protection against distortion.

A substantial attempt was made in formulating the 16PF standardization sample to obtain a stratified representation of various education levels, geographical areas, ages, and occupations as they occur in the U.S.A. The standardizations of the most recent revisions of the four forms of the test rest upon more than 15,000 individual cases. Samples were drawn across 10 levels of community size ranging from less than 2500 to more than a million, 10 levels of socioeconomic status, geographical location, and race. Data from 36 states are included in the final norm samples for Form A. Samples were selected in such a manner that the racial proportions in the final norm group were congruent with those reported by the U.S. Census Bureau in order to provide for the most general applicability. Age corrections were employed in the generation of the final tables. The final norm group included individuals from 15 to 70 years of age. The norms given for the general adult population are centered upon and corrected to 30 years of age.

Test reliability is an index that measures the degree to which test scores are free from errors of measurement. The average short-interval test-retest reliability for Form A of the 16PF is 0.80. The standard error of measurement
(SEM) defines a theoretical range of scores within which a person's "true" score lies. With Form A short-interval reliability of .80, the SEM equals .89.

Test validation is the process by which evidence is accumulated to support inferences that may be drawn from a test score. Construct validity focuses on the extent to which the test scores correctly measure the traits they were developed to measure. Studies involving many thousands of people sampled across many cultures and demographic parameters show that the basic factorial structure of the test is correct. Criterion-related validity focuses on the extent to which the scores relate to external outcomes such as job success or school performance. This test has been widely used in a variety of research applications. A multidimensional questionnaire should measure its constructs without a great deal of overlap among its scales in order to be efficient. The validity of the primary scales is called concept validity. This is the correlation of the scale scores with the "pure" factors they were designed to measure (IPAT, 1991).

Bloxom (1978) reviewed the 16PF and found the test-retest reliability to be satisfactory with few exceptions. Reliability correlations for Forms A and B ranged from .45 to .93 with a median of .81 in two- to seven-day intervals. In two month test-retest correlations, Forms A and B reliability correlations ranged from .63 to .88 with a median of
58. Bloxom further noted that the criterion of discriminant validity—that the measures of different constructs should not correlate highly with each other—was met in general. It was noted that Factors C, O, and Q4 had correlations exceeding .67 and might therefore be redundant.

Bolton (1978) reviewed the 16 PF and found the norms, reliability, and established criterion relationships to be generally good, but the manual to be inadequate. Bolton stated that the test-retest reliability between Form A and Form B for each scale averaged in the .70s, but noted that this was comparable to other personality inventories. Bolton was critical of Cattell’s use of correlations between scale scores and "pure factors," which are labeled as concept validities, as inappropriate in a manual for general users. Validity coefficients are based on parallel-form correlations and are characterized as being "sufficient for a fair degree of prediction of meaningful criteria." Bolton reported that the 16PF was a product of 25 years of developmental research with a scientific foundation at least as solid as other tests which attempt to measure variations in normal personality and stated that no other instrument has undergone a more thorough examination by critics.

Research Design

This study was designed to determine whether there are personality traits of effective bilingual/ESL teachers that
set them apart from effective teachers who teach more traditional student populations. This information could be used in the teacher recruitment and selection process in order to identify those candidates with greater potential for success in either area. It could also be useful to university teacher training programs for student advisement.

Hypothesis

For the purpose of statistical testing, the null hypothesis was that there is no significant difference in the personality traits of effective elementary bilingual/ESL teachers and the personality traits of effective elementary regular education classroom teachers as measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. The .01 level of significance was used as the rejection point with each set of personality traits.

Data Collection

The 16PF was administered by the investigator after working hours in strict accordance with the directions in the administration manual. Thirty full-time elementary bilingual/ESL teachers who were on Career Ladder Level II or Level III volunteered to participate in the study and 30 full-time regular education teacher volunteers who were on Career Ladder Level II or Level III completed the questionnaire. The answer sheets were hand scored.
Data Analysis

Each answer on the test scores 0, 1, or 2 points. Raw scores were converted to standard scores or "stens" using the norm tables. There are separate tables for high school students, university and college undergraduates, and the general adult population. Within each group there are separate tables for men, for women, and for men and women together. The mean for a sten distribution for the 16PF is fixed at 5.5 and the standard deviation is 2.0 sten scores. As defined in the 16PF administration manual, a sten score of 1, 2, or 3 fell into the lower descriptor of the continuum, a sten score of 4 through 7 was considered average, and a score of 8, 9, or 10 was considered to fall into the higher descriptor of the continuum. The means were calculated for each of the 16 personality factors for each group of teachers and the means for each personality factor were compared. A t test was used to compare the significance of the difference of the means between the two groups on each separate personality factor. A .01 level of significance was used. Wexler (1977) used the 16PF and the Teacher Characteristics and Practices Checklist to identify innovative elementary and secondary teachers and compared their means on each of the 16PF traits using a t test.
The null hypothesis was that there is no significant difference in the personality traits of effective elementary bilingual and English as a second language (ESL) teachers and the personality traits of effective elementary regular education classroom teachers as measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF). To test the hypothesis, a t test was computed to find the significance of the difference between the means of the sten scores of each group of teachers on each of the personality factors. The .01 level of significance was used to compare the means on each of the 16 factors. It was not possible to reject the null hypothesis in any of the 16 factors compared, as shown in Table 1. Even at the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis could not have been rejected. Differences between the means of the two groups were quite small, as shown in Figure 1, while standard deviations (SD) within both groups were large. All of the means for both groups fell within the average range of 4.0 to 7.9. These conditions produced very small t values. Both the bilingual/ESL teacher sample and the regular education teacher sample were more experienced, better educated, and more ethnically diverse than the total teaching population.
Table 1

Results of the 16PF and t Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Factor</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>REG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>5.867</td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>1.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.233</td>
<td>7.633</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>1.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>5.300</td>
<td>2.027</td>
<td>1.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5.433</td>
<td>5.633</td>
<td>2.233</td>
<td>1.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6.233</td>
<td>6.200</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>2.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>6.067</td>
<td>5.833</td>
<td>2.016</td>
<td>1.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>6.600</td>
<td>1.912</td>
<td>2.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6.533</td>
<td>5.767</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>1.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>5.267</td>
<td>2.193</td>
<td>1.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.100</td>
<td>4.967</td>
<td>2.057</td>
<td>1.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5.867</td>
<td>5.633</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>1.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>5.267</td>
<td>4.767</td>
<td>1.818</td>
<td>1.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>5.067</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>2.149</td>
<td>1.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>5.967</td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>1.921</td>
<td>1.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>6.400</td>
<td>6.200</td>
<td>2.044</td>
<td>1.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>6.433</td>
<td>6.067</td>
<td>1.716</td>
<td>1.856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor A

The characteristics in Factor A range from cool, reserved, impersonal, and aloof to warm, easygoing, outgoing, and liking people. The mean score for bilingual/ESL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean Sten Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Less intelligent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>More intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Affected by feelings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Emotionally stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sober</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Expedient</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Venturesome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Toughminded</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenderminded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suspicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Practical</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Forthright</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shrewd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Self-assured</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₁</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Experimenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₂</td>
<td>Group-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₃</td>
<td>Undisciplined self-conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td>Following self-image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₄</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Mean Sten Scores of Bilingual/ESL Teachers and Regular Education Teachers
teachers was 5.677 and the standard deviation was 2.412. The mean score for regular teachers was 5.867 and the standard deviation was 1.570. A t value of -0.381 resulted in a probability (p) of 0.705.

Factor B

The personality traits in Factor B range from concrete-thinking, less intelligent, and dull to abstract-thinking, more intelligent, and bright. This factor was the one in which both groups scored their highest, falling above the mean for the general population. The mean score for the bilingual/ESL teachers was 7.233, and the standard deviation was 1.794. For regular education teachers, the mean was 7.633 and the standard deviation was 1.564. A t value of -0.920 resulted in a probability of 0.361.

Factor C

The characteristics in Factor C range from affected by feelings, emotionally less stable, and easily annoyed to emotionally stable, mature, and calm. Bilingual/ESL teachers scored a mean of 5.600 with a standard deviation of 2.027. The mean for teachers assigned to regular education was 5.300 with a standard deviation of 1.664. The t value was -0.626 with a probability of 0.533.
Factor E

Factor E personality characteristics fall on a continuum ranging from submissive, humble, easily led, and conforming to dominant, assertive, stubborn, and competitive. The mean for bilingual/ESL teachers was 5.433 and the standard deviation was 2.233. Regular education teachers scored a mean of 5.633 with a standard deviation of 1.847. The t value was -0.379 with a probability of 0.706.

Factor F

Factor F ranged from sober, restrained, serious, and introspective to enthusiastic, spontaneous, expressive, carefree and cheerful. On this factor, the scores of the two groups of teachers were nearly the same. The bilingual/ESL teachers had a mean score of 6.233 with a standard deviation of 2.269, while the regular education teachers had a mean score of 6.200 with a standard deviation of 2.310. The t value was -0.056 with a probability of 0.955.

Factor G

Factor G qualities range on a continuum from expedient, disregarding rules, and self-indulgent to conscientious, conforming, and rule-bound. The mean score for bilingual/ESL teachers was 6.067 with a standard deviation of 2.016, while regular education teachers had a mean score of 6.833 with a standard deviation of 1.724. The t value was -0.482 with a probability of 0.632.
Factor H

Personality characteristics in Factor H range on a continuum from shy, intimidated, and cautious to bold, venturesome, and uninhibited. The mean score for bilingual/ESL teachers was 6.000, with a standard deviation of 1.912. The mean for regular education teachers was 6.600 with a standard deviation of 2.143. The t value was calculated at -1.144, with a probability of 0.257.

Factor I

The characteristics in Factor I range from tough-minded, self-reliant, independent, and realistic to tender-minded, sensitive, over-protected, and not realistic. This factor was the one with the greatest difference in the means of the two groups of teachers. The mean score for bilingual/ESL teachers was 6.533 with a standard deviation of 1.383. For regular education teachers, the mean was 5.767 and the standard deviation was 1.775. The t value of -1.866 resulted in a probability of 0.067.

Factor L

The personality traits in Factor L range from trusting, adaptable, cheerful, and tolerant to suspicious, skeptical, distrustful, and doubtful. The mean score for the bilingual/ESL teachers was 5.500, with a standard deviation of 2.193. For regular education teachers, the mean was 5.267.
with a standard deviation of 1.741. The t value was -0.456, with a probability of 0.650.

Factor M

The characteristics in Factor M range from practical, down to earth, and steady to imaginative, absent-minded, and impractical. Bilingual/ESL teachers scored a mean of 5.100 with a standard deviation of 2.027. The mean for teachers assigned to regular education was 4.967 with a standard deviation of 1.586. The t value was -0.281 with a probability of 0.780.

Factor N

Factor N personality characteristics fall on a continuum ranging from forthright, open, unpretentious, and warm to shrewd, polished, efficient, and calculating. The mean for bilingual/ESL teachers was 5.876 with a standard deviation of 2.417. Regular education teachers scored a mean of 5.633 with a standard deviation of 1.712. The t value was -0.431 with a probability of 0.668.

Factor O

Factor O ranged from self-assured, secure, and self-satisfied to apprehensive, insecure, and worrying. The bilingual/ESL teachers had a mean score of 5.267 and a standard deviation of 1.818, while the regular education teach-
ers had a mean score of 4.767 and a standard deviation of 1.431. The t value was -1.184 with a probability of 0.241.

Factor Q₁

The personality traits in Factor Q₁ range from conservative and respecting traditional ideas to experimenting, liberal, and open to change. This factor had the lowest mean score for both groups. The mean score for the bilingual/ESL teachers in this factor was 5.067 with a standard deviation of 2.149. For regular education teachers, the mean was 4.533 and the standard deviation was 1.907. The t value was -1.017 with a probability of 0.313.

Factor Q₂

The characteristics in Factor Q₂ range from group-oriented, preferring to work and make decisions with others, and depending on social approval at one end of the continuum to self-sufficient, resourceful, independent, and not needing the support of others to act. Bilingual/ESL teachers scored a mean of 5.967 with a standard deviation of 1.921, while the mean for teachers assigned to regular education was 5.400 with a standard deviation of 1.673. The t value was -1.218 with a probability of 0.228.

Factor Q₃

Factor Q₃ personality characteristics fall on a continuum ranging from undisciplined self-conflict, lax, and
careless of social rules to following self-image, socially precise, and compulsive. The mean for bilingual/ESL teachers was 6.400 with a standard deviation of 2.044. Regular education teachers scored a mean of 6.200 with a standard deviation of 1.827. The t value was -0.400 with a probability of 0.691.

Factor Q

Factor Q ranged from relaxed, composed, satisfied, and having little drive to tense, frustrated, impatient, and hard driving. The bilingual/ESL teachers had a mean score of 6.433 with a standard deviation of 1.716, while the regular education teachers had a mean score of 6.067 with a standard deviation of 1.856. The t value was -0.795 with a probability of 0.430.

Comparison of Teacher Groups

The mean scores for the bilingual/ESL teachers showed little variation. Except for the mean of 7.233 on Factor B (intelligence), their means ranged from 5.0 to 6.5. The mean scores for the regular education teachers were only slightly more varied. Except for their mean of 7.633 on Factor B (intelligence), their means ranged from 4.5 to 6.6. There are noticeable differences among the individual sten scores of the teachers within the bilingual/ESL teacher group, as shown in Table 2, and within the regular education
teacher group, as shown in Table 3. However, these two
groups of effective teachers, when compared to each other,
were more alike than they were different. They were also
more like each other in experience and education than they
were like the total teaching population.
Table 2

Individual Stem Scores for Bilingual/ESL Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Q₁</th>
<th>Q₂</th>
<th>Q₃</th>
<th>Q₄</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Q_1</th>
<th>Q_2</th>
<th>Q_3</th>
<th>Q_4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the entire study, a discussion of the findings, some conclusions which were reached as a result of the findings, and concludes with recommendations for further related research studies.

Summary

In recent years, researchers have examined the relationship of specific teacher behaviors to student achievement gains. These studies of teacher effectiveness have concerned themselves with classroom management and organization, instructional strategies, presentation of subject matter, and learning climate. In the field of second language learning for young children, teaching methodologies and techniques have been the subject of research. The inherent personality traits which make a good teacher in today's environment are more difficult to determine. Demographic changes across the community, state, and nation have necessitated changes in the delivery of instruction. Official programs for second language learning at the elementary level have a brief history in the United States, and no published research exclusively identifying the personality
traits of effective elementary bilingual/English as a second language (ESL) teachers could be found.

The purpose of this study was to identify the personality traits of effective elementary teachers of bilingual/ESL students and of effective elementary teachers of more traditional students, and to compare the personality traits of the two groups. The personality traits of each group were identified by scoring their responses on the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF). The statistical null hypothesis was that there was no significant difference in the personality traits of the two groups of teachers as measured by the 16PF. Means were calculated for each of the 16 personality factors for each group of teachers and a t test was used to compare the significance of the difference of the means between the two groups on each separate personality factor.

Findings

The statistical null hypothesis was tested using a t test of the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the regular teachers in each of the 16 factors of the 16PF and the mean scores of the bilingual/ESL teachers in each of the 16 factors of the 16PF. The null hypothesis was not rejected for any of the 16 factors at either the .05 or the .01 level of significance. However, there are some generalizations which can be made about the two groups of
teachers based upon their mean scores on the 16PF. The factors discussed below are those where the difference between the means of the two groups was 0.4 or greater.

Factor B measures intelligence, ranging from concrete-thinking, less intelligent to abstract-thinking, more-intelligent, and bright. The person who scores high on Factor B tends to be quick to grasp ideas, a fast learner, and alert. This was the factor in which both groups of teachers scored the highest. The regular education teachers scored above one standard deviation from the mean for the female adult population norms. The bilingual/ESL teachers' score was only slightly lower. While the scores of both groups of teachers fell within the average range, this was the area where they deviated most from the female adult population norms. This is not surprising for a group whose educational level was higher than that of the average adult female population.

Factor H is a continuum ranging from shy, timid, hesitant, and intimidated to bold, venturesome, uninhibited, and able to handle stress. This was a factor where, although both groups scored in the average range, the means of the two groups showed a noticeable variation. The mean for regular education teachers was nearer the bold and venturesome end of average, indicating that they are more sociable, ready to try new things, and able to deal with people and emotional situations without fatigue. They may also consume
much time talking. The bilingual/ESL teachers' mean score was also above the adult female mean; however, it was closer to the mean than the regular teachers' score.

The characteristics where the two groups showed the largest variation was Factor I, which ranges from tough-minded, self-reliant, no-nonsense, realistic, independent, and responsible to tender-minded, sensitive, fanciful, demanding of help, impatient, dependent and unrealistic. The mean of the teachers in the regular education group fell barely above the mean on the tender-minded side of the continuum for the female adult population, while the mean of the bilingual/ESL teachers fell farther above the mean on the same side of the continuum. This factor was the only one which approached a statistically significant difference.

Factor 0 measures characteristics ranging from self-assured, secure, free of guilt, self-satisfied to apprehensive, self-blaming, guilt-prone, insecure, and worrying. The regular education teachers' mean, while within the average range, was closer to the self-assured side of the continuum. The bilingual/ESL teachers' mean was closer to the mean of the adult female population, although it still fell on the self-assured side of the continuum.

Factor Q1 measures personality characteristics ranging from conservative and respecting traditional ideas to experimenting, liberal, and open to change. While both groups of
teachers' means fell in the average range, the regular teachers' score showed them to be closer to the conservative side of the continuum. They would be more confident in what they accept as "tried and true," even though something else might be better. They would be more cautious about accepting new ideas, and tend to oppose and postpone change. They would be more likely to go along with tradition and be more conservative in religion and politics. The bilingual/ESL teachers' score also fell on the conservative side, but was much closer to the mean for the adult female population.

When the two sets of scores were graphed, the $Q_2$ factor ranging from group-oriented, a joiner, a follower to self-sufficient, resourceful, preferring to make own decisions was an area where some noticeable differences appeared. The regular education teachers' mean was practically on the mean for the adult female population. The bilingual/ESL teachers' mean score was slightly closer to the self-sufficient side of average.

The two groups of teachers' mean scores were remarkably similar in the other factor areas. The sample populations were more experienced, better educated, and more ethnically diverse than the total school district teaching population. In comparing their scores on each factor of the 16PF, both groups consistently fell into the average range on the continuum of each factor.
Conclusions

There is no statistically significant difference in the personality traits of effective elementary teachers of bilingual/ESL students and effective elementary teachers of regular education students in this study as measured by the 16PF Questionnaire. In spite of large variations in sten scores within each factor for either group, the mean differences between the two groups proved to be small. These two groups of teachers were more alike than they were different.

Both groups of teachers were more experienced than the total teacher population average in this district. The bilingual/ESL teachers' years of experience ranged from 6 to 30, with a mean of 18.0. The regular education teachers' years of experience ranged from 5 to 34, with a mean of 18.4. This compares to an average of 12.3 years of experience for the total district teaching population. Years of experience is one of the criteria for advancement on the Career Ladder, so it is not surprising that the sample groups, who were all on Level II or Level III of the Career Ladder, were more experienced than the total population of teachers.

Both groups of teachers had a higher percentage of advanced degrees than the total district teacher population. In the total population, 56.7% of the teachers held bachelors degrees, 42.5% held masters degrees, and 0.8% had received doctorates. The bilingual/ESL teacher sample
showed 28.6% with bachelors degrees, 67.9% with masters degrees, and 3.6% with doctorates. The regular teacher group was composed of 25.0% with bachelors degrees, 71.4% with masters degrees, and 3.6% with doctorates. It could be predicted that the educational level of the sample groups might be higher than the educational level of the district teachers in general, as they are composed of teachers on Career Ladder Level II or III. One requirement for Career Ladder advancement is additional hours of college study. The sample groups are more likely comprised of teachers who intend to make teaching a career and would feel that the time and energy invested in advanced studies would be advantageous. The higher-than-average level of education of the sample populations may also have influenced their willingness to participate in the study, as they would be more aware of the importance of research in the field of education.

The sample was more ethnically diverse than the district teaching population. Anglo teachers comprised 96.0% of the total teaching population, but the bilingual/ESL sample was 76.7% Anglo and the regular education sample was 89.7% Anglo. African-American teachers comprised 2.5% of the district’s teacher membership, but provided 6.9% of the regular education sample. The district had a Hispanic teacher population of 1.0%, but the bilingual/ESL sample was 23.3%. As bilingual teachers must be fluent in Spanish, it
is not surprising that many of them would be Hispanic. The Asian teacher population in the district was 0.3%, but 3.4% of the regular education sample was Asian.

The use of volunteers may have resulted in samples which do not accurately represent the total populations. It is possible that the volunteers from both groups who were willing to give up some personal time after a day of work to assist in a research project were in fact those teachers who represent similar personality characteristics regardless of their teaching assignment. They may be the ones in the classroom who are more willing to give some extra time and energy to help an individual student who is having difficulty grasping a concept in an unfamiliar language, or to help a regular student who needs a second or alternative explanation of a new process to clarify it.

These conclusions regarding volunteers are supported by Borg and Gall (1983), who state that individuals who serve as volunteers for research studies tend to be better educated, have higher social-class status, be more intelligent, higher in need for social approval, and more sociable than nonvolunteers.

Recommendations for Further Research

Research should continue on the personality traits of effective teachers. It is important for colleges and universities to advise prospective teachers as to which teach-
ing fields they might enter to be successful. It is also important for districts to hire and assign teachers to positions where they will be most effective. Whereas teaching techniques may be learned, personality traits are inherent and less likely to change.

Future studies of this topic should be undertaken using different instruments, questionnaires, or personality tests to compare the two groups of teachers. Whereas the 16PF has been used in research in a variety of educational settings, it was developed for use with the general public.

Future studies in the area of personality traits of regular teachers and teachers of second language learners should include different geographical regions of the country in order to include more varied language populations and different teaching arrangements.

Future studies should compare the personality traits of bilingual/ESL teachers with the personality traits of regular teachers in small communities, suburban districts, and metropolitan districts. It is important to see if the personality traits of teachers are related more to the size of the community in which they live and work than they are to their teaching assignment.
APPENDIX A
TEXAS TEACHER APPRAISAL SYSTEM
OBSERVATION/EVALUATION RECORD
## Texas Teacher Appraisal System

### Observation/Evaluation Record

**School Year 19**

**Teacher:**

`Assignment/Grade`  

**Teacher's Supervisor:**

**Appraiser:**

**Other Appraiser:**

**Subject Area Observed:**

**Beginning Time**  

**Ending Time**  

**Observation Date**  

**Appraisal Period 1 or 2 (circle)**

---

### TEACHER'S SUPERVISOR:

1. After each formal observation, an **OBSERVATION RECORD** must be completed for Domains I-V. Record the date on which the OR is completed in the upper right hand corner of this form.

2. For each indicator observed and/or credited, circle the numeral 1. Evidence concerning indicators for which credit is denied must be documented in the space provided.

3. For each criterion in which Exceptional Quality is awarded, circle the numeral 3. Evidence concerning the basis for awarding EQ credit must be documented in the space provided.

4. At the end of each appraisal period and/or prior to the summative conference, an **EVALUATION RECORD** must be developed. Review the completed OBSEVATION RECORD(S) and any cumulative data collected up to the end of the appraisal period to determine whether changes need to be made regarding SE and EQ credit. Record the date the EVALUATION RECORD is developed in the space provided in the upper right hand corner of this form. If after reviewing the data there are no changes to be made, complete items 5 and 6 below. If previously awarded SE or EQ credit is to be denied, strike through the circled numeral. If credit which was previously denied is to be awarded, circle the appropriate numeral. Initial and date each change and record documentation to substantiate the change(s) in the space provided.

5. For Domain V, credit is automatically awarded unless documentation justifies denial.

6. For each domain, record the total credits earned in the space provided.

---

### OTHER APPRAISER(S):

1. After each formal observation, an **EVALUATION RECORD** must be completed for Domains I-V. Record the date on which the ER is completed in the upper right hand corner of this form.

2. For each indicator observed and/or credited, circle the numeral 1. Evidence concerning the basis on which credit for an indicator has been denied must be documented in the space provided.

3. For each criterion for which Exceptional Credit is awarded, circle the numeral 3. Evidence concerning the basis for awarding EQ credit must be documented in the space provided.

4. For each domain, record the total credits earned in the space provided.

5. If the teacher's supervisor has scored the teacher's performance in Domain V less than satisfactory, review documentation and score Domain V.

---

### I. Instructional Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exceptional Quality</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. varies activities appropriately</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. interacts with group(s) appropriately</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. solicits student participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. extends responses/contributions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. provides time for response/consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. implements appropriate level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exceptional Quality</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. communicates learning expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. monitors student performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. solicits responses/demonstrations for assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. reinforces correct responses/performances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. provides corrective feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. instruction needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FOR EVALUATION RECORD**  

**DOMAIN CREDIT TOTAL**  

(epoch = 60)
II. Classroom Management and Organization

3. Organizes materials and students.
   a. secures student attention
   b. uses procedures/routines
   c. gives clear administrative directions
   d. maintains appropriate seating/grouping
   e. has materials/aids/facilities ready
   Exceptional Quality 3

4. Maximizes amount of time available for instruction.
   a. begins promptly/avoids waste at end
   b. implements appropriate sequence of activities
   c. maintains appropriate pace
   d. maintains focus
   e. keeps students engaged
   Exceptional Quality 3

5. Manages student behavior.
   a. specifies expectations for behavior
   b. prevents off-task behavior
   c. redirects/stops inappropriate/disruptive behavior
   d. applies rules consistently and fairly
   e. reinforces desired behavior when appropriate
   Exceptional Quality 3

III. Presentation of Subject Matter

6. Teaches for cognitive, affective, and/or psychomotor learning.
   a. begins with appropriate introduction
   b. presents information in appropriate sequence
   c. relates content to prior/future learning
   d. defines/describes concepts: skills, attitudes, interests
   e. elaborates critical attributes
   f. stresses generalization/principle/rule
   g. provides for application
   h. closes instruction appropriately
   Exceptional Quality 3
Observation/Evaluation Record

III. Presentation of Subject Matter (continued)

7. Uses effective communication skills.
   a. makes no significant errors
   b. explains content/assumptions clearly
   c. stresses important points/dimensions
   d. uses correct grammar
   e. uses accurate language
   f. demonstrates written skills

   Exceptional Quality 3

IV. Learning Environment

8. Uses strategies to motivate students for learning.
   a. relates content to interests/experiences
   b. emphasizes value/importance of activity/lesson
   c. reinforces/praises efforts
   d. challenges students

   Exceptional Quality 3

9. Maintains supportive environment.
   a. avoids sarcasm/negative criticism
   b. establishes climate of courtesy
   c. encourages slow/reluctant students
   d. establishes and maintains positive rapport

   Exceptional Quality 3

V. Professional Growth and Responsibilities

10. Plans for and engages in professional development.
   a. progresses in growth requirements or none needed
   b. stays current in content taught
   c. stays current in instructional methodology

   For Evaluation Record
   Domain Credit Total
   (SE + EQ)

Form #316252
Original to Teacher Supervisor
Copy 2 to Teacher
Copy 3 to Other Appraiser (as appropriate)
V. Professional Growth and Responsibilities (continued)

11. Interacts and communicates with parents.
   a. initiates communications with parents as appropriate  
   b. conducts conferences with parents in accordance with local policy  
   c. reports student progress to parents  
   d. maintains confidentiality

12. Complies with policies, operating procedures, and requirements.
   a. follows TEA requirements  
   b. follows district/campus policies/procedures  
   c. performs assigned duties  
   d. follows promotion procedures

13. Promotes and evaluates student growth.
   a. participates in goal-setting  
   b. plans instruction  
   c. documents progress  
   d. maintains records  
   e. reports progress

Comments:

FOR EVALUATION RECORD
DOMAIN CREDIT TOTAL

The signature of the teacher indicates that he/she has reviewed and received a copy of this record.

Form #316253

Original to Teacher Supervisor Copy 2 to Teacher Copy 3 to Other Appraiser

(as appropriate)
APPENDIX B

SOLITATION MEMORANDA
I am seeking elementary teacher volunteers to assist in gathering data for my doctoral dissertation. I plan to compare the personality traits of effective elementary teachers in regular education classrooms with the personality traits of effective elementary teachers in bilingual or ESL assignments. Effective teachers are defined as those who have reached Career Ladder Level II or Level III. The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire will be administered to both groups of teachers on Wednesday, January 13 at 4:15 p.m. in the large group room at the district instruction building. It should take 45-60 minutes.

Your name will not be used. You will be asked to indicate by abbreviation on the answer sheet if you are a teacher in a regular education class or if you are a teacher of limited English speakers, the number of years teaching experience you have, your gender, your ethnicity, and your level of education. I plan to use the information gathered from this study to assist in teacher recruitment and selection in the future. I will also share it with area universities for their use in teacher advisement.

Please call me at 238-6520 by January 8 if you are willing to participate in this study or if you have questions. If you are unable to come on the 13th, but are willing to participate, please phone me so that we can make other arrangements.
I am seeking elementary bilingual and ESL teacher volunteers to assist in gathering data for my doctoral dissertation. I plan to compare the personality traits of effective elementary teachers in regular education classrooms with the personality traits of effective elementary teachers in bilingual or ESL assignments. Effective teachers are defined as those who have reached Career Ladder Level II or Level III. The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire will be administered to both groups of teachers on Wednesday, January 13 at 4:15 p.m. in the large group room at the district instruction building. It should take 45-60 minutes.

Your name will not be used. You will be asked to indicate by abbreviation on the answer sheet whether you are a teacher in a regular classroom or a teacher of limited English speakers, the number of years teaching experience you have, your gender, your ethnicity, and your level of education. I plan to use the information gathered from this study to assist in teacher recruitment and selection in the future. I will also share it with area universities for their use in teacher advisement.

Please call me at 238-6520 by January 8 if you are willing to participate in this study or if you have questions. If you are unable to come on the 13th, but are willing to participate, please phone me so that we can make other arrangements.
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