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This study is an investigation of the personality characteristics of the most and least effective teachers in three church-related universities in a central West Texas city. A student evaluation of instruction form was utilized to allow students in the three universities to rate teacher effectiveness in the classroom.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Isabel Briggs-Myers, The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, 4th ed., Princeton, Educational Testing Service, 1973) was administered to those teachers who were rated both as most effective and least effective by 5,153 students. The use of this instrument, which provides a personality profile that is indicative of dominant personality characteristics (extrovert-introvert; sensing-intuitive; thinking-feeling, judging-perceptive), allows for measurement (by upper and lower quartile scores) of the differences between the personality characteristics of the most and least effective teachers in this sample.
Statistical procedures were employed to ascertain if there were significant differences between the groups of teachers.

The data indicate that there are no significant differences in the personality characteristics of the most and least effective teachers when a rigid statistical design is utilized. Furthermore, the most effective teachers in the sample tend to be equally divided between extroverts and introverts, while the dominant type among the least effective teachers is the introvert. Personality-characteristics profiles are provided for both the most and least effective teachers in the sample, as indicated by data findings. Effective teachers appear to differ from ineffective teachers in both their attitudes toward and expectations of students.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The improvement of college teaching is a contemporary pursuit which has occupied educators and administrators for at least the past two decades. The concept of faculty development appeared on the academic scene during the 1970s with a suddenness which suggested that ultimate and satisfying solutions for all the ills of higher education were finally at hand. The evaluation of teaching, as one means toward the goal of improving college teaching, is now receiving a noticeable surge of attention (5, p. 1). The decade of the 1970s became a period of accountability just as the 1960s was a time of expansion, innovation, and reform in higher education without much concern for accountability (4, p. 25).

The renewal of interest in faculty as teachers and educators, as contrasted to faculty as scholars and researchers, was undertaken nationally by The Project to Improve College Teaching. This project was jointly sponsored by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges (7, p. 26).

Increased professionalism among college teachers, plus consistent pressure by student groups clamoring for
relevance in the classroom, contribute to the needs for evaluation of the presentation of materials and an evaluation of the persons who are responsible for the presentation. While there seems to be widespread agreement that evaluation of teaching and teachers at the college level is necessary and desirable, several questions remain. Who should be evaluated? On what basis should an evaluation be made? Who should make the evaluation—students, fellow teachers, or the instructors themselves? What measurable objectives can be established? To what uses will the evaluations be put?

Student ratings of instruction and instructors seem to be the most widely used procedure of evaluation, but there is no unanimity among persons in the field that student ratings are the most effective type. Additional types of evaluation which may be used are self-evaluation, evaluation by colleagues, and administrative evaluation. A widely stressed admonition is that a variety of evaluations should be used. However, with proper procedures, student ratings can provide an excellent source of first-hand data (5, p. 5).

Statement of the Problem

The problem considered in this study is the relationship of personality characteristics to effective and non-effective teaching in church-related universities. This study seeks to identify personality characteristics of the most effective
and the least effective teachers in three church-related universities by the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. This study also seeks to measure the differences between the personality characteristics of the most effective and the least effective teachers in these universities.

Purposes of the Study

Three primary purposes guide this research.

1. This study identifies personality characteristics of college teachers who are rated as most effective by student raters.

2. This study identifies personality characteristics of college teachers who are rated as least effective by student raters.

3. This study measures the differences between the personality characteristics of college teachers who are rated as most effective and least effective by student raters.

Research Questions

Three research questions are answered in the present study.

1. Is there a cluster of personality characteristics that may be identified with college teachers who are rated as most effective by student raters?
2. Is there a cluster of personality characteristics that may be identified with college teachers who are rated as least effective by student raters?

3. Are there significant differences between the personality characteristics of college teachers who are rated by students as both most effective and least effective?

These questions are answered by data generated by The Student Evaluation of Instruction Form (1), which was developed at Virginia Commonwealth University, and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (8). The Student Rating of Instruction Form contains eight positive questions with a one to five scaled answer option for each question. Only eight items that deal with qualities common to teaching are used; items that deal with teaching styles are not used.

Data generated by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator provides a personality profile indicative of dominant personality characteristics of the most effective and least effective teachers at the three church-related universities. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator profiles are then used to measure the differences between the personality characteristics of the most effective college teachers and the least effective college teachers. The inventory is based on the typological theory of C. G. Jung; generally the typological approach has been directed to the preservation of patterns and the search for homogeneous clusters of personality (3, p. 4).
Typologies are ways of describing more or less enduring features of any individual system of evaluation. Many typological schemes have been advanced that are not based on careful and conscientious research but rather on a priori beliefs or emotionally grounded prejudices. Some schemes have been applied in an attempt at global coverage, which is overly simplified in order to cover every personality configuration possible. Some schemes have been without empirical foundation while others have suffered from statistical naivete (3, p. 5).

Carl Gustav Jung, the Swiss psychiatrist, proposed a sound theoretical interpretation to personality studies. By his discovery of a concept that comprehends different phases of the problem, he has been able to explain not only the basic temperament but also the basic intellectual styles of differences which have been confusing to others. Earlier and later theories offer partial explanations in typology, but no other theory seems to explain the temperamental differences on the basis of the whole attitude of the normal individual (6, p. 561).

The evaluation of teachers has not met with exceptional success in the past. Writers in the field of education have lamented this failure of research to determine the personal characteristics that contribute to effective teaching. One of the contributing causes of this failure seems to be due
to difficulties in defining and measuring personality characteristics. Since this research is not usually conducted within the context of a special personality theory, a theoretical vacuum is created because several different theories are used.

Limitations and Assumptions

This study is limited to three four-year theologically conservative church-related universities in Texas. The faculty members who were rated as either most effective or least effective by student raters were administered a personality inventory in order to determine which personality characteristics are dominant as measured by the personality instrument.

It is assumed that both students and faculty responded honestly to the items on the instruments of measurement. It is further assumed that confidentiality of results were maintained. It is also assumed that, after a period of evaluation and refinement, the results of this study may be generalized in application to other universities of similar philosophy; the personality characteristics which are found to be desirable in faculty members of three church-related universities may be desirable in faculty members who teach in colleges and universities that have a similar purpose. The church-related colleges and those who teach in them have an important heritage to continue and an important role to fill.
Significance of the Study

The now generation of the 1970s may be replaced by the how generation of the 1980s. If this is true, the result may be a new priority on moral education. Education must become more than fragmented knowledge and impersonal facts. Survival may depend upon the capacity to live together in a society that overcomes the moral erosion that has been taking place the past three decades. These great issues must be addressed quickly for the sake of the maintenance of our culture. Cothen says,

The issues on which a society will live or die are moral and ethical, not just scientific and technological. One of the most serious issues confronting the future of our republic is the quality of personhood, not only of individuals who set the pace and call the signals but also the persons who make up the home, the schools, the churches, and the government (2, p. 3).

Colleges and universities may need to evaluate more closely the extent of the influence they exert on the value orientation of youth. Institutions and their faculties may need to accept some responsibility for incorporating such systems into the total educational process.

Secular higher education does not seem equipped to deal with these issues. Legal structures on every side tend to limit higher education to that which is secular. It is imperative, then, that some institutions of higher education be equipped to meet these issues. This study seeks to
identify personality characteristics of persons teaching in those colleges and universities that seek to meet these needs.

Summary

The purpose of this study is to identify personality characteristics of the most effective and least effective teachers in three church-related universities in a central West Texas city. An additional purpose is to measure the differences between the personality characteristics of the most effective and least effective teachers in these three universities.

Three research questions are answered by the present research. A cluster of personality characteristics of the most effective teachers are identified. A cluster of personality characteristics of the least effective teachers are identified. The significant differences between the personality characteristics of the most effective and the least effective teachers are identified.

Organization of the Study

Chapter II contains a review of the literature related to the research questions under investigation. The background and significance of the study are presented, as well as a discussion of directions of evaluation of instruction, the role of Christian higher education, Jungian typology, and the improvement of instruction.
Chapter III contains a discussion of the methods and procedures utilized in collecting and interpreting the data. This chapter includes a description of the sample population of the study and an explanation of the use of the data generated by the evaluation form and the personality instrument.

Chapter IV contains the results of the study with each of the research questions being answered by relevant data. A description of the statistical results are presented in this chapter.

Chapter V contains a summary of the results of the study that includes the major findings, conclusions, and implications. Specific suggestions for further research are also presented.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review significant literature that is related to the problem under investigation. The studies discussed in this chapter apply to the relationship between personality characteristics and effective teaching in church-related universities.

This chapter is divided into five parts. Part one presents the background and significance of the present study in relationship to the relevant literature. Part two explores the present direction of evaluation of instruction. Part three describes the roles of Christian education and educators in higher education. Part four defines Jungian typology and its application to personality assessment, and the possibility of improvement of instruction is examined in part five.

Background and Significance of the Study

The present research contributes to the literature through a better understanding of the personality characteristics of effective and non-effective teachers who are employed in three theologically and politically conservative church-related universities. The present study also
contributes to the literature in the area of personal developmental strategies for improving instruction in the college classroom. This recurring theme continues to be relevant to contemporary research.

One of the outstanding programs for faculty evaluation and development comes from the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, a consortium of small liberal arts colleges, many of which are church-related (50, p. 13). According to the report of this consortium, many universities are sensitive to the need for more effective teaching by faculty, but they seem to approach the problem through instructional strategies rather than through personal developmental strategies. The report also states that approaches to the improvement of instruction have their origin in the behavioral sciences (50, p. 12).

Pine and Boy (56, p. 47) report that college professors prefer to think of themselves as their own best critics in the diagnosis and treatment of their teaching problems. A distinctive feature of the college culture is that faculty members may exercise their autonomy as individuals, making their own decisions about what and how to teach. This academic freedom is also protected by the tradition that the classroom is the unique territory of the teacher and that the art of teaching does not lend itself to objective analysis and review. Some college teachers act as if no one has the
right to make evaluations concerning teacher effectiveness. These teachers have been described as dictators who carve out an empire for themselves in the classroom (56, p. 47). Ericksen (20), however, believes that although many teachers do not try to avoid evaluative judgments, they may want to preserve their distinctly personal style of teaching because they believe it has a unique influence on the students whom they teach. Teachers in various disciplines may possess unusual knowledge about their speciality, but this alone does not automatically equip them to be effective teachers in that field. Additional studies are needed which will provide data that can be utilized by teachers for improvement in teaching skills and interaction with students (20, p. 2).

Ericksen (20, p. 22) emphasizes that three major functions of the teacher are to plan the content and organization of a course of study, to manage classroom time, and to make fair and discriminating judgments about student performance. Not included in these functions are the teacher's involvement away from the classroom (such as preparing a remarkably different syllabus), making special adaptations for particular students, developing new resources for instruction, or providing unusually effective procedures for the evaluation of student work (20, p. 22).
Many university teachers are aware that their research and scholarly productivity are given more recognition and reward by their institutions than their performance as classroom teachers (20, p. 23). In contrast, teaching has been expected, more or less, to take care of itself when teachers are given adequate salaries, classrooms, clinics, instructional laboratories, comfortable teaching loads, and clerical assistance. Information disseminated about teaching is often mimeographed while information released about research is generally much more attractive. It seems that most teacher improvement sessions tend to be directed toward encouraging teachers to become involved in research (20, p. 23).

The comprehensive nature of faculty development should include different roles and responsibilities of the faculty, not just teaching or research, believe Berquist and Phillips (1). They emphasize that faculty development represents a commitment to improving the educational process by concentrating on self-understanding as the first step in the examination of teaching and learning. The teacher's own set of needs, values, and attitudes become the central concern in an adequate program, rather than specific methods of teaching to which each faculty member must conform. Piecemeal efforts to improve college and university teaching have generally proven to be ineffective. Those interested in faculty development must now give serious attention to the impact of change on the faculty member himself (1, p. 177).
There seems to be a symbiotic relationship between a person's self and the work that the person performs. An individual achieves this symbiotic union either by changing one's self concept to fit the work role, by changing the role to fit the self, or a little of both. Through teaching, a person can move beyond what he is at the moment, actualize his potential in the most optimal ways, and realize a creative positive self (56, p. 47). This can be a goal for a teacher who is interested in improvement so that his teaching effectiveness is increased.

Pine and Boy (56, p. 48) insist that everything a teacher does or says has, or could have, a psychological impact on the personal growth and development of the learner. A person's teaching behavior reflects one's essence as a person. The person who is deeply attuned to himself and to the significance of the teaching process harmonizes the self and the teaching process by translating awareness into action.

Knowledge is not enough; technique is not enough; experience is not enough, says Harris (29). There is the same mystery at the heart of the teaching process as at the heart of the healing process. Both are an art more than a science, and the art of being sensitive to the other person is at the base. This ability is not possessed by those who have failed to come to terms with themselves, no
matter what other talents they possess. Teachers who have liberated themselves from what is artificial and unauthentic should be able to communicate, counsel, and teach others more effectively (29, p. 362).

Contemporary Directions of Evaluation of Instruction

The evaluation of instruction is not new, according to Kent (42). The University of Washington has conducted campus-wide evaluations since 1925. The University of Texas and Purdue University were experimenting with evaluations during the same era. Bennington College, Georgia Institute of Technology, and the University of Missouri have conducted similar programs of evaluation since the early 1930s (42, p. 379).

These programs of evaluation are in contrast to some of the contemporary methods of evaluation. Seibert (64) describes Purdue University's "cafeteria" evaluation program that has two major components. The first component is a standardized (mandatory) set of five evaluative statements that constitutes the core; the second component is a collection of 225 statements which describe various aspects of the courses, instructors, and instructional strategies and which constitutes the catalog. Core and catalog are computer scored and a list is published and distributed to the faculty. To use the system, an instructor scans the catalog and selects items most relevant to his teaching
situation. Items are printed on request forms and entered into a computer which prints an individualized rating scale that contains the requested items and the mandatory university core. In the first year of its use, the cafeteria approach was used in 1,000 classrooms, and it continues to enjoy wide acceptance (64, p. 46).

According to Kulik (44), the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan devised a system of instructor-designed questionnaires for faculty members who want to use student reaction as one means to evaluate their teaching. Instructors receive a catalog of 148 items about a particular course. They may collect up to 30 statements about three areas of instruction that include student changes in behavior and attitude; perception of an instructor's style, methods, and abilities; and reactions to specific course elements such as written assignments, readings, laboratory work, textbooks, exams and grading. The teachers indicated that the item pool covered their concerns about teaching, and the results of the ratings would affect their future teaching. In the first year of its use, 90 per cent of the users stated that they would recommend the system to colleagues who were not collecting ratings (44, p. 42).

Ball State University, Bucknell University, Earlham College, and the State University of New York have examined
the impact of institutional reward systems on the enhancement of teaching. Ohio Wesleyan and the University of Michigan have studied their promotion and incentive systems at their respective schools (8, p. 6).

The literature indicates that there is also increased concern about the effectiveness of teaching among groups other than teachers or administrators. College students are asking for opportunities to evaluate their professors, and there are growing pressures from outside the academic community to find out more about the effectiveness of teaching. The issue of accountability affects even the taxpayer, who is asking for evidence of value for his dollars (25, p. 37).

Seibert (61) notes that ratings tend to constitute a source of information that can be useful to individual faculty and to academic decision-makers. Although ratings are not infallible indices of good teaching, they are a practical and systematic means of acquiring a set of reliable perspectives and judgments of institutional offerings (65, p. 75). Murray (52, p. 138) states that "Research over the past 20 years indicates that student ratings can provide reliable and valid information on the quality of college teaching." He acknowledges that results are sometimes contradictory, but that the weight of evidence suggests that student ratings of a given instructor are relatively stable
across courses, and time periods; are affected to only a
minor extent by extraneous factors such as class size and
severity of grading, and are consistent with similar
ratings made by alumni, colleagues, and trained classroom
observers. They are also significantly and positively
correlated with more objective measures of teaching
effectiveness such as student exam performance.

Many reasons for evaluating college teaching and teach-
ers have been suggested. The three primary reasons, however,
appear to be those cited by Chronister and Pate:

1. To provide data for administrative decisions
dealing with promotion, tenure, and salary;

2. To provide feedback for faculty self-enrichment;

3. To provide criteria which can be used in research
on teaching and learning (13, p. 269).

Erickson (22) considers the first of these primary
reasons for evaluation of instruction as perhaps the most
controversial. Although student ratings are important,
they do not seem to be adequate within themselves as a
criterion to evaluate changes in pay, promotion, and retention
decisions. If factors such as class size, discipline, and
course content affect course ratings—as they appear to do—
then student ratings reflect more than teacher skills.
Unless such factors can be taken into account, the use of
student ratings for hiring and promotion can be misleading
(22, p. 3).
Administrators can bypass some of this difficulty, Erickson suggests, by comparing an individual teacher's ratings with locally developed norms. Additional rating procedures involving colleagues, administrators, and self-ratings have been found to be more effective in rating teachers for promotions, pay changes, and tenure (22, p. 4).

For administrative purposes, summative evaluation seems to be more appropriate (9). Highly generalized questions seem to be useful since they tend to be equally applicable across a wide range of courses. These generalized statements may not be very helpful to the instructor seeking self-improvement hints, but that is not their major purpose.

The instructor's own statement of teaching objectives, teaching activities, instructional materials, grading methods, and personal attributes will surely influence persons in authority who make administrative decisions. Recognition and promotion on the basis of merit are often strongly defended, but this principle probably lacks credence in many postsecondary institutions. Unless the dimensions of merit have been set forth explicitly, evaluations may be nothing more than window dressing for a seniority system of advancement and recognition. Most of the time, promotion of a tenured rank involves a prediction of the career contributions of the teacher to the aims and goals of the institution (9, p. 1). McCabe reports that older faculty felt more strongly than younger faculty that advancement
decisions should depend on student responses. Younger faculty members tend to consider that quality of publications and success in attracting grants are more important for advancement in rank (47, p. 419).

The following recommendations summarize evaluation of instruction for salary increases, promotion, and tenure as adopted by the National Project III institutions and prepared by the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan (11). These statements reflect the experience of many institutions in the use of student rating questionnaires and other forms of documentation relating to overall competence of teachers. These concepts are applicable primarily to the levels of evaluation that involve salary, promotion, and tenure.

1. Faculty are involved in establishing policies and procedures that are clear, fair, and practical;

2. A variety of sources of information is used, including documentation from the faculty member, students and peers;

3. The performance of both non-tenured and tenured faculty members is reviewed regularly;

4. Normative data compare faculty who teach in reasonably similar situations (11, p. 1).

According to Chronister and Pate (13), the second primary reason for continued evaluation of instruction seems to have received more favorable response in recent years than when self-enrichment emphases were not major issues of concern. Sherman (67, p. 130) encourages teachers to
search for avenues of self-improvement. The institution for which they work has some responsibility to challenge the individual teacher to excellence, but it is the teacher who must ultimately seek improvement. Schwartz (63, p. 68), adds, "Whatever their status, faculty today must be active in their own professional development as a means of self-preservation. There are no other persons who will be as interested as the individual faculty member."

Sherman (67, p. 130) believes that it is also important for teachers to gain practical experience in new modes of teaching. The teacher's problem may be personal and, in this instance, a confidential conversation with a respected colleague might be appropriate. Problems that seem to stem from one's personal style are more difficult to correct than specific and concrete problems such as finding funds for instructional experimentation, seeking technical assistance for a particular procedure, or locating relevant information pertaining to a proposed project on teaching. A teacher who wishes to improve his perceived effectiveness may best look toward personal attributes rather than to course functions to aid self-improvement (67, p. 130).

Even though the evidence concerning changes in teachers through self-improvement is inconclusive, a teacher who wants to know the reaction of students to various features of a course will likely be sensitive to the information received
from them. It may be impossible for the quite science teacher to become a charismatic spellbinder, yet most teachers can try to reduce any dissonance between their teaching habits and how they are perceived by students (9, p. 4).

A college or university faculty is a group of unusually intelligent and capable men and women. Sustaining and strengthening their competence as teachers does not require a massive development program, but it does call for increased access to opportunities and resources relevant to the professional interests of the faculty member (10, p. 5). The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan (10) found that teachers' specific interests may include commitment to the field of study, efforts to improve course quality, analysis of previous quality of student achievement, demonstration of interest in material that relates to recent developments in his field, and a genuine interest in students that would be observed in courtesy, punctuality, and fairness. In many instances, self-generated scholarly renewal is the most appropriate form of professional growth (10, p. 1).

It is the last primary reason for evaluation that seems to hold the potential for the most constructive results. Some evaluation programs may be superficial, and some may have been used by administrators to justify dismissal of a teacher, but the potential for positive application still exists.
Many recent studies relating to teacher effectiveness center on the teaching-research dilemma that faces many university professors (10). There is a new awareness among some teachers to change their primary focus from a specific discipline to the educational enterprise as a whole; one teacher, for instance, may consider himself a teacher of physics rather than a physicist who teaches. The question is how to keep abreast of major activities in individual fields while maintaining competence in the classroom. Conscientious teachers spend considerable time and effort finding ways to link up new developments in their own disciplines and their performance in the classroom (10, p. 1).

Crawford (16) notes that faculty members of undergraduate colleges often are discouraged from doing research by being assigned excessive teaching loads and by being denied financial support. One common excuse for the lack of administrative support is that undergraduate colleges are teaching institutions rather than research institutions. Some administrators imply that research is irrelevant to undergraduate education (16, p. 3). Friedrick and Michalak (26, p. 145) report that even though engaging in scholarly research has long been thought to improve the quality of a faculty member's teaching, empirical studies have generally found little or no positive relationship between the productivity
of a person as a researcher and that person's effectiveness as a teacher.

The policy of discouraging undergraduate research, Crawford points out, seems to be based on the assumption that teaching and research are bipolar opposites and that faculty members may do one or the other but not both. However, since the fundamental process of higher education is to teach people how to solve problems as yet unsolved, it should follow "that teaching and research are educationally congruent as well as philosophically compatible" (16, p. 3).

According to Crawford, systematic research in an institution of higher learning can contribute to the educational process in the following ways if the persons involved are willing to make adjustments:

1. Research can enhance the welfare of mankind through the discovery of relevant data;
2. Research can encourage professional growth of professors who are actively engaged in scientific endeavors which relate to their fields;
3. Research can provide students with new insight as they associate with professors seeking new concepts and relationships;
4. Research can enhance the image of the institution and thereby assist personnel in recruiting better qualified faculty and students (16, p. 3).

Smaller colleges seem to be more concerned about teacher effectiveness while larger universities seem to weigh research more heavily. Friedrick and Michalak
(26, p. 161) found that good researchers seem to be effective organizers, but that small liberal arts colleges and universities do not improve the quality of teaching at their institutions by pressing their faculty to do more research.

According to Ericksen (21, p. 6), research and teaching may be seen as integrated parts of a teacher's role at a graduate university, but they may be competitive functions at two-year or four-year schools. Each teacher seems to view his or her job differently. Some see themselves only as scholars or researchers, while others see themselves as disciplinarians, healers, managers, or molders of the lives of their students.

Taylor (69, p. 149) claims that there should not be a major conflict between teaching and research; the two should become complementary. A teacher who is not engaged in research may be even less inspiring than a dull textbook. At the same time, the researcher may consider his classroom performance as a waste of time. The more logical approach seems to be to encourage the teacher to treat his students as partners in the search for enlightenment through research and other approaches.

The validity of student rating of instruction is strengthened, Taylor says, when the proper evaluation tools are used to perform the proper function. The evaluator needs to decide if he is considering the brilliant lecturer, or
the one who works best in a tutorial setting, or the type who has a talent for leading discussions. The teacher in the college classroom is expected at times to fulfill all of these aspects of instruction in the course of teaching. Many faculty members feel that they can be more effective when students are more highly motivated, and this effect is reflected in student ratings (65, p. 149). Continued research and evaluation are needed as rating procedures become more sophisticated through the use of computer technology. Hoover (36, p. xii) encourages institutions to recognize that educational techniques are becoming increasingly sophisticated as they are designed to deal with the complexities of modern society.

The Role of Christian Education in Higher Education

Christian colleges and universities, as well as public institutions, are viewing the 1980s as if they are higher education's equivalent to the Great Depression. Demographers and economists forecast the decline of high school graduates by almost 20 percent by 1995 (43, p. 38). Consulting firms are now teaching recruiting techniques that approach the hard-sell technique, and college officials are turning to a variety of approaches to put the name of their institutions before high school students who are considering attending college after graduation (68, p. 3).
Undergraduate enrollment almost doubled in the late 1960s as a result of the post World War II population explosion and the demand for college-trained teachers increased. There was also extraordinary expansion in the economy as well as pressures for equality among the minorities that brought an unprecedented number of blacks, women, and disadvantaged students to the campuses. During the 1970s, however, enrollment growth shrank to only 2 to 4 per cent, and much of that increase was attributed to older students (3, p. 16).

According to the Carnegie Council on Education, all higher education institutions will have declines in enrollment in the 1980s (71, p. 8), and the private colleges and universities are predicted to be the hardest hit, particularly church-related colleges and universities. Among the 141 institutions that closed during the 1970s, 57 were four-year colleges, 45 were two-year colleges, and 39 were specialized institutions. Eighty-seven per cent of those that closed had fewer than 500 students, 55 per cent were church-related, and 62 per cent were coeducational. Of the 78 church-related institutions that closed, 34 were seminaries or other special purpose religious schools (71, p. 8).

The private colleges that opened during the 1970s include 34 four-year, 10 two-year, and 32 specialized institutions of higher learning. Forty-seven private institutions
merged with other schools, and two-thirds of the institutions that merged were church-related (71, p. 8).

The Chronicle of Higher Education (54) reports that total college enrollment reached its peak in the fall of 1980 with 11.7 million students, and that it will decrease toward a projected total of 11 million by 1988. Enrollment trends include growing enrollment rates among older students, women, and part-time students. Enrollment in private colleges will drop from 2.3 million in 1981 to 2.1 million in 1988. As many as 200 private colleges could close their doors during the 1980s (54, p. 1). Brocklehurst (3, p. 80) indicates that the comprehensive colleges and universities (particularly the private ones) and other liberal arts colleges will lose significant enrollments in the 1980s.

These are sobering facts for the people who are involved in private Christian colleges today. Christian colleges and universities were established before our nation declared its independence from England. Campolo (5, p. 5) reviews the earliest days of these schools when they trained church leaders for the New World. Schools like Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Brown Universities were begun by Christian groups to train pastors for the settlers and their children. Dartmouth College was founded to train men as missionaries to the American Indians. The Protestant scholars of those early schools believed it was their God-given calling to
expand all fields of knowledge through research and logic. There were ironic consequences to these efforts because their research and findings led them to question the very faith from which their efforts had originated. It is no surprise, therefore, that many of these Christian colleges gradually became secular institutions without church leadership (5, p. 4). Subsequently, many of the most distinguished church colleges cast off their religious ties.

At the turn of the century a new group of Christian colleges emerged, Campolo continues, that sought to provide an education for young people without allowing them to be subverted by secularizing tendencies. These schools were noted for their doctrinal statements in which they clearly delineated a strong commitment to the authority of the scriptures. These schools also advocated a cultural lifestyle that was characterized by prohibitions (5, p. 5).

Christian colleges, which tended to be more radical, grew out of the pre-Civil War revivals, and they became training centers for those who were supposed to change the world. Campolo writes that these colleges were particularly committed to the abolitionist movement, and they believed that if the nation were to be purged from the institution of slavery, it would require an array of intelligent, committed and trained leaders (5, p. 5). Many members of the academic community sought to strengthen each other in the
faith. Faculty members were paid in accordance with their needs, and students paid tuition in accordance with their abilities. Many of these colleges grew, and today their fundamentalist Christianity has become interwoven with conservative American politics. These colleges seek to bring about changes that would move society to structures and lifestyles that belong to an earlier time when America was controlled by White Anglo-Saxon Protestant values. Campolo suggests that each department in such a radical Christian college can contribute to the unique lifestyle of their students, who are encouraged to carry the gospel into the marketplace while bringing the world of the marketplace into the circle of the church (5, p. 15).

It is also true that Christian colleges and universities are as diverse as the culture which nourished them. Reisman (60, p. 14) indicates that these institutions differ very much from one another although they are often stereotyped as "academic backwaters" by students and faculties at cosmopolitan institutions who regard religion as superstition. This diversity is observed in Brigham Young University, governed by the Mormon Church, which has 20,000 students while some of the smallest sects support schools of only a few hundred students. Although adventist colleges are small, they support one of the better medical schools in Southern California. Oral Roberts University flourishes
with a strikingly modern campus while other church-related schools function with limited buildings and facilities. Even Roman Catholic colleges and universities have had to find new sources of income in the 1980s.

Nevertheless, Rainsford (58) says, the need for Christian colleges in our diverse culture continues. In our American system, the private church-related residential liberal arts college was the first and most basic academic institution to be established. Rainsford, the former chairman of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, insists that these colleges represent an important element of diversity in American education that speaks to choice as well as access, quality as well as equality, and values as well as skills (58, p. 9). He says,

Through their rich community, religious life, and concern for developing social responsibility, the Christian colleges speak to the important question of values and human development in the growth of spirit as well as mind and body. The ability of the Christian college to assist students in understanding their place in the universe and still seek answers to their deepest problems in one of their greatest strengths. This kind of college shows a commitment to help explain what others might prefer to explain away or not discuss.

Reisman (60, pp. 14-19) points out that the unifying characteristic in the majority of these schools is that students and faculties tend to subordinate themselves to the academic, moral, and spiritual authority of the institution. He emphasizes that the academic revolution, which
began in the great research universities and the prestigious secular liberal arts universities and spread to other state and private institutions, has not touched the more evangelical colleges. He views these schools as places of partial and temporary escape from freedom which is neither total nor totalitarian.

Tuten (70, p. 8) suggests that Christian colleges and universities may be facing their days of greatest challenge instead of their extinction. A major problem with which public colleges and universities in this country are grappling is centralization and the resultant loss of freedom. The operation of public colleges seems to have moved from the campus to the capitol. Pressures come from governors and legislatures on one hand and from the Federal government and courts on the other. As a result, public colleges are swiftly and surely losing some of their historic freedoms in planning their curricula and developing new programs. This freedom, which is an inherent ingredient of the private colleges, begins to stand out more prominently against the public college trend toward centralization (70, p. 8).

A second major problem for the public colleges and universities, Tuten (70, p. 8) says, is their avowed lack of moral purpose which emphasizes value-free teaching and research. Current influences in society will not permit
or even condone the re-establishment of a moral-religious role within state universities.

A series of events in the 1960s prompted a re-evaluation of this valueless emphasis. A long war in Vietnam sapped the nation; Watergate exploded, and a president resigned; scores of political leaders went to jail. Suddenly, the matter of values became an important issue in our country. Some feel that higher education has already washed its hands of any responsibility for morals.

Cothern (15, p. 4) believes that educational excellence involves keeping the classroom aware of the problems of society, while Christian commitment includes genuine Christian lifestyles that extend to all college personnel as they give top priority to the task of relating the goals of higher education to the Christian way of life. The Christian college or university is uniquely equipped to confront the issues and problems of the human family. Christian higher education has the tools to challenge mechanistic pessimism and to offer hope for the regeneration of man and the renewal of society. According to Dilday (17, p. 4), the church-related college has an opportunity to espouse a new and fresh way to describe the dignity and worth of the individual. This kind of college or university can help instill the social sensitivity and the moral courage which good citizenship requires and which this country
and the world need. The small church-related college or university can be the nourishing ground for the development of moral, ethical, and spiritual values. Hoekema (34, p. 973) suggests that it is more accurate to say that students on the college level are taught about religion and ethics rather than that they are taught religion and ethics.

The Christian colleges of our day stand in a position to make one of their greatest contributions of this century. They know their purpose; they do not have to search for it. They need only courage to recommit themselves to their age-old goals (70, p. 9). The Christian colleges should have the intellectual resources to meet the needs of a hurting world of confused men in a disintegrating society. Rainsford (58, p. 10) suggests that intelligence and character are complementary. The ultimate mission of the Christian teacher is to provide for our culture people who are not morally mediocre, but who are morally and intellectually ready to become distinguished in their chosen fields. Hoekema (34, p. 972) reports that many church-related schools have broadened their faculties and student bodies to include people who have a wide variety of religious affiliation and none at all. Rainsford (58, p. 10) contends that the study of values includes not only moral or religious values but also aesthetic, economic, political, social, and academic values. Jaworski (38, p. 1) believes
that many Americans are looking—more so than at any time in recent history—for a type of moral leadership that has a more heightened concern.

Cothen (15, p. 4) says "If our nation and our culture are to have leadership in the moral and ethical issues of our time, it is highly possible that this leadership will come out of the Christian community of scholars." These teachers may not be ultra-religious, but they can be effective teachers in different disciplines so that students can become aware that human values really do make a difference. Chamblee (12, p. 12) suggests that educators should display values that are expressed in the Christian ethic.

Most colleges that survive through the decades of the 1980s and 1990s will make major changes as our educational world changes with the culture. Rewak (59, p. 320) reports that American bishops sent a letter to Roman Catholic colleges and universities in this country urging them to consider a blueprint for the 1980s. This blueprint includes a searching examination of their curricula, a willingness to shed the vestiges of provincialism, a religious adherence to academic standards, and the formulation of communities in which young people may grow in mature commitment and function effectively as the future leaders of America. Jacob (37, p. 10) insists that even the predominately-for-women Roman Catholic college has a chance for survival if the college
meets the needs of those seeking higher education at times and places that fit selected lifestyles. Bucher says,

The church-related college and university needs to incorporate in its life as much intellectual and social pluralism as possible, including various expressions of religious life and thought, and then seek ways to build into this microcosmic reality that process for reflecting on its diverse character and dynamics. . . . Rather than avoiding self-critical perspectives, church related education needs to include in its curriculum the on-going critique of theory (4, p. 10).

Kriegbaum (43, p. 39) emphasizes that those Christian colleges that have a clear vision of their mission to the church and society, and a flexible plan for achieving that mission should emerge stronger than ever. The college-age student should be able to sense that his feelings and ideas have value and that he can view himself as a capable and worthwhile individual. He needs to have positive feelings about his potential for acceptance and achievement (62, p. 19). Effective teachers tend to regard students not as competitors but as assistants in the quest for learning and adjustment. To create a classroom atmosphere in which suspicion, defensiveness, hostility, and anxiety disappear is a worthy goal of those who seek to be effective teachers.

Jungian Typology and Personality Assessment

McCaulley (48, p. 295) reports that Carl Gustav Jung, a Swiss psychiatrist, presented his theory of personality in 1921. Since that time Jung's construct of personality
has been extended in many directions. Although Handel (27) points out that early attempts to demonstrate links with emotional maladjustment seem to have proved futile, in the 1940s and 1950s there was a renewal of interest in Jung's typology. However, the response to the typological approach to the study of personality has been limited because some theorists feel that when traits are distributed on a continuum, it is impossible to separate personality into types (27, p. 1).

Other personality theorists insist that Jung brought a new concept to typologies with his theoretical interpretation. While theories tend to offer partial explanations, no other theory attempts to explain the temperamental differences on the basis of the whole attitude of the individual (27, p. 561).

McCaulley (48, p. 297) implies that Jung emphasized two fundamental human attitudes. The attitude types are designed to show how the human psyche responds to an external object. An extraverted* attitude allows attention to flow to objects and people of the environment. This individual seeks to act upon his environment thereby affirming its importance. An introverted attitude seems to allow strength to flow from the environment back to the individual who consolidates ideas into his own position.

*In all materials published by The Center for the Application of Psychological Research, upon which this study relies heavily, the word extravert is spelled with the a.
According to Handel (27, p. 8), a function type refers to the claim that a particular type acts and orients himself to the objective world by differentiated functions. The four functions in man's psyche are thinking, feeling, sensing, and intuiting. While man uses all four functions, usually one function dominates consciousness. The functions exist as paired opposites. The rational psyche thinking is in opposition to intuiting. When one function dominates the unconscious, the remaining functions seem to remain on the border between the conscious and the unconscious. The two attitudes and four functions are found in each individual's psyche.

Isabel Briggs Myers (53, p. 52) uses the term judging to describe Jung's category of the rational function because it implies an evaluation. The evaluation is based on the dominating function within the individual. It does not imply some ethical or moral evaluation, but rather an intellectual rating. Myers implies that differences in judgment arise from the existence of two distinct and sharply contrasting ways of arriving at conclusions.

These two ways are thinking and feeling. Thinking is the function which brings ideation into conceptual connection while feeling is primarily a process that imparts to the contents of thought a definite value in the sense of acceptance or rejection (52, p. 52).
Handel (27, p. 9) describes the two irrational functions are sensing and intuiting. Intuition is a function that mediates perception in an unconscious way. It is a kind of instinctive apprehension. As an irrational function, its contents have the character of being bestowed on a person in contrast to the derived or produced character of the rational functions. Sensation is the psychological function that mediates the perception of a physical stimulus. It is conscious perception as opposed to intuition which is unconscious perception. It relates to external stimuli as well as to the changes in the internal organic process. Therefore, it is sense perception—perception mediated by the sense organs and body senses (27, p. 9).

Handel (27, p. 51) concludes that although both introvert and extravert approach the world directly, the most important aspect for the extravert is the object while personal experience is the most important aspect for the introvert. The introvert type utilizes his collective unconscious more than the extravert because he does not interact as much with the environment. The extraverted thinker is overly concerned with external relationships and feelings, and must be overly dependent on the approval of others. As a result he has little or no concept of himself except in terms of the love, approval, and appreciation others express toward him (27, p. 51).
Jung felt that each person's behavior is influenced by those around him. Jung says,

What lies within our reach is an opportunity to influence others of like mind in their circle of friends. Sometimes it is an intentional influence on the unconsciousness of others, but its effect lasts only so long as they are not disturbed by conscious intention. Nothing estranges man more from the ground plan of his instincts than his learning capacity, which turns out to be a genuine drive toward transformations of human modes of behavior (41, p. 92).

Jung found that he learned from others as they learned from him. According to Jung,

When the doctor wears his personality like a coat of armor, he has no effect. It often happens that the patient is exactly the right plaster for the doctor's hurt. My patients brought me so close to the reality of human life that I could not help learning essential things from them. Encounters with people of many different psychological levels have been for me more important than conversations with celebrities, and the most significant conversations were anonymous (39, p. 134).

A person-to-person relationship is the primary teaching technique for change, and the effective teacher can be an agent of change through his personality type. Jung suggests that every judgment made by an individual is conditioned by his personality type. Summarizing his philosophy, Jung says,

I am neither spurred on by excessive optimism nor in love with high ideals, but am merely concerned with the fate of the individual human being—that infinitesimal unit on whom a world depends (41, p. 125).
The merit of Jung's theory is that it accounts for many of the differences which other theoretical frameworks leave to random variation. His theory has unusual simplicity, and it is not incompatible with other personality approaches. Much apparently random behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent when viewed as basic differences in mental functions (53, p. 1).

Even though Jung's typology does seem to be unique in the field of typologies, it does not account for the total person. Perhaps there is no personality theory that would be able to account for every aspect of the composition of a teacher's temperament. Jung's theory, however, can be a dynamic and creative approach to understanding the personality characteristics of effective and non-effective teachers in a college or university setting (27, p. 5).

The Improvement of Instruction

Attempts to improve instruction in the college classroom continue. The outcry is as intense as ever with pleas coming from students feeling deprived of stimulating instruction, from external sources demanding accountability of a teacher's work, and from administrators and peers facing difficult academic staffing decisions (67, p. 124).

Sherman and Blackburn (67) speculate that effective teaching depends less on behavior directed toward functional management of a class and more on personality factors which
students perceive to be relevant in the teaching-learning process. The personal qualities which the instructor as an individual brings to the educational setting seem to spell the difference between success and failure as a teacher—at least insofar as student judgments are concerned (67, p. 124). McKeachie (49, p. 90) suggests that college teachers serve as models for students. He emphasizes that personal encouragement from a fellow human being has important effects upon both the motivation to learn and the degree to which students attempt to follow the example of a model.

Candland (6) suggests that teachers of undergraduates may, in their most despairing moments, suspect that collegiate education is merely a device by which society removes troublesome adolescents from its midst by confining them to the care of the college. When sufficient time has passed, the young adult is returned to the society of civilized persons—perhaps none the wiser but at least four years older. The successful college teacher may become somewhat detached from society. Society has a peculiar contract with teachers, urging them to question values and impress upon youth the importance of productive doubt (6, p. 193).

One of the difficulties in improving instruction in the college classroom is the contradiction of goals between education and society. It is almost impossible to establish goals for improvement in instruction without reference to
the goals of our own time and society (6, p. 193). Today's extremely complex society is creating pressures on our educational system not even imagined a decade or so ago, according to Hoover (36), many college instructors have prepared for their teaching tasks under the outmoded belief that knowledge of subject matter automatically establishes one's qualification for teaching. Because of accelerated changes in our society, it is imperative that educational techniques and methods become increasingly sophisticated so that teachers can seek to deal with the complexities in modern society (36, p. xiii).

New analogies are needed when teachers and teaching are discussed. Some faculty analogies, which society has designed, have created misunderstanding in the mind of the general public about how teachers are viewed (33, p. 48). Hill (33) lists what she considers as the most common analogies for the teacher. She views the teacher as preacher, curator, shepherd, actor, salesman, and researcher.

1. The preacher exhorts and cajoles members of his congregation, and his success is measured by the number of souls who enlist in the cause or by the number who reject it;

2. The curator points out the rarities of culture to the uninitiated. His subjects do not understand him so he seeks to be confusing in his presentation;

3. The shepherd gathers and watches over a flock clearly inferior to himself;
4. The actor plays to a passive audience. They witness his academic sleight of hand, and he plays his audience to drown out the lecturer next door;

5. The salesman is a bastardized version of the actor. He takes his product to the people wherever they are, and he tailors his pitch to their pockets;

6. The researcher is different. He disdains the performing arts and is content to mutter an assortment of facts to his students (33, p. 481).

A new analogy, Hill says, may be the teacher as mountaineer. He accepts his leadership role, but he recognizes the need for close cooperation of each member of his group. He has covered the terrain before and he is familiar with the landmarks, but each trip is new as it generates its own anxiety and excitement. He seeks to link climbers together so that they assist one another. He makes a rope by using oral and written contributions of the students, by forging interdisciplinary links where plausible, and he seeks to connect course material with the lives of his students. Hill says, "The teacher is not a pleader, a performer or a huckster, but a confident guide into the most exciting and least understood terrain on earth-man's mind" (33, p. 481).

Almost every college teacher spends some time thinking about his or her teaching effectiveness (31, p. 8). The vast majority of studies on teacher effectiveness illustrate that there is still no totally acceptable definition of good teaching or effective teaching. Much of the literature
seems to deal with what should be rather than what is in regard to effective teaching. Changes in student populations in the 1980s may dictate alterations in teaching styles in order to be more effective. Hatcher compared the characteristics, attitudes, and personality traits of Piper Professor nominees, who are considered to be very effective teachers, with a random sample of college faculty to determine if there were any significant differences between teachers who were perceived to be effective teachers and other college faculty. She found that there were more differences than similarities between the Piper nominees over the random sample in regard to selected personal and professional background and experience variables. The only significant differences between measured personality traits indicates that the Piper nominees were less cautious and more willing to take risks than was the random sample of college faculty (31, p. 8). She suggests that more attention should be given to the affective domain of teaching than to the technical domain. Because of the highly significant differences between the two groups regarding their reasons for teaching, she recommends that effective teaching can be assessed by considering a teacher's feelings, attitudes, his reasons for teaching, and the goals, values, and sources of satisfaction that the teacher holds regarding teaching (31, p. 8).
Langrin (45) suggests that if it is true that personality characteristics affect teacher effectiveness, colleges and universities that wish to improve teaching performance face a very difficult problem. The characteristics of the teachers are more difficult to alter than are the functional behaviors. A teacher who wishes to improve his perceived effectiveness may best begin to work on personal attributes rather than focus his energy on course functions and activities which are more obvious (45, p. 130).

This perspective, however, does not automatically eliminate all other approaches to the improvement of instruction. Continued research will provide opportunities to combine functional tasks and affective qualities so that some significant improvement can be made in the total process of teaching and learning (45, p. 130).

One important function which Overall and Marsh (55, p. 325) suggest for the improvement of instruction is the use of appropriate evaluation techniques. A great deal of research exists to support the use of end-of-term evaluations for assessment purposes. Individual instructors can use such feedback as a periodic check on their classroom effectiveness. The evaluations also provide information for long-range assessments. Maturity, situational consideration, and the emotional distance from instructors and courses do not appear to alter student ratings of the effectiveness of instruction. Cashin and Perrin (7, p. 595) found that student
ratings are not significantly influenced by variables other than the effectiveness of the teacher, or at least that the influences of these variables can be controlled.

A second functional approach, which is designed to aid improvement in instruction, is to use classroom teaching time more effectively. Fitzgerald lists five approaches:

1. Identify parts of course which are essentially lecture-motivational and give these presentations to large groups;

2. Select parts of courses which are interpretative in nature and organize small groups in which the instructor acts as a guide rather than a teacher;

3. Reconstruct parts of courses which are content in nature and let books, periodicals, films, slides, audio tapes, and microfilms inform the students in viewing and listening labs;

4. Employ lesser trained personnel to assist students in learning skills that do not need master skills to communicate;

5. Organize the material to be learned in such a way so that attention can be given to individual differences in students by encouraging students to complete a given area of learning at different rates of time (24, p. 26).

A third functional approach, which has been found to be influential in the improvement of instruction, is an attempt to use some innovative teaching techniques. A good example of innovation at the college level is personalized instruction, where teachers teach as if they had a class of one. This personalized system of instruction is accomplished through the use of self-paced instructional materials and a corps of student helpers called proctors.
An ever-present danger in seeking innovation in the classroom, according to Roche (61), is to go to an extreme that is inappropriate to the total learning process. One college in Vermont lost its accreditation even though it was a pioneer in innovative educational experiments. Roche says, "It seems that dynamic educational experimentalism became simply a mixture of lunacy and larceny" (61, p. 4). Faculties normally know what constitutes an adequate curriculum, and they should take the responsibility for revising an inadequate one. Additional possibilities for innovation in instruction exist through the use of computer technology. Innovative procedures, however, are not adapted easily in every classroom situation. Charting a path to be followed is a matter of behavioral engineering, which is a discipline in its own right. Roche believes that college teachers need to devote considerable effort to the formulation and analysis of goals and purposes which provide the essential foundation for the development of instructional procedures. Fitzgerald (24, p. 6) adds that instructional procedures need to be upgraded so that the classroom is operating at a cognitive level worthy of college instruction. The challenge of the future may be to let more efficient tools present information so as to free the teachers to interpret, analyze, and apply information. Hendrickson (32, p. 34) insists that faculty members will need additional stimulation and renewal if they
are to maintain their interest and teaching effectiveness throughout long careers.

Hohn (35, p. 11) reports on the development of a three-stage model in which eight of the educational goals defined in Bloom's taxonomy serve as a basic guide. This approach employs individualized instruction, small group discussions, and individual projects at appropriate stages of the course. Knowledge and comprehension skills are acquired at the first stage through individualized instruction. Application, analysis, and evaluation abilities are developed through small group discussions, and affective goals are attained through field-related projects.

Feldhusen and Treffinger (23) identify four steps which they suggest will facilitate instructional design. The first step involves identification of the major information, ideas, and principles to be taught. The second step involves identification of the essential attributes of each topic or concept. The third step is to select appropriate exemplars by which the student can detect the sequences involved in achieving the desired educational goal. The fourth and final step is to organize concepts and principles into an appropriate hierarchical arrangement. The task seems to be to decide which subordinate skills or abilities are prerequisite to the learning of higher skills (23, p. 22).
One of the procedures that Feldhusen and Treffinger suggest will aid the teaching enterprise is the writing of behavioral objectives and the sincere attempt to help the student complete them. The behavioral objective should denote or describe an action representing what a student should be able to do when he has completed instructional procedures. The behavioral objective also describes the conditions, settings, or circumstances under which a student will perform whatever he is supposed to learn. A third function of the behavioral objective is to describe a criterion level of performance that the teacher agrees will be acceptable. Some discussion or exchange between student and teacher is needed in order to clarify objectives and the value of attaining them, and to help students formulate additional objectives that are more closely related to their unique needs and interests. When behavioral objectives are described adequately, student achievement is likely to be greater than when no objectives are utilized (23, p. 23).

The use of appropriate evaluation techniques, the more effective use of teaching time, and the utilization of behavioral objectives are three functional approaches to the improvement of instruction which every teacher can use. They apply across disciplines and subject matter.

Because of the lack of data concerning the relationship between teacher personality and effectiveness, additional
studies are needed. Although much of the present data available are confined to elementary and secondary teachers, some of the conclusions seem relevant to the much less researched area of personality factors influencing persons who teach at the college level.

Criticism expressed toward studies of teacher effectiveness and personality patterns continues. Costen and Grush (14) are representative of those critics who insist that personality and teaching effectiveness are not defined precisely enough to permit clear and useful interpretations of the findings. The teacher's personality traits or the traits of the students are usually considered within a given study, but not both within one study (14, p. 36).

Dunn (19, p. 43) believes that as additional studies dealing with teacher effectiveness and personality characteristics are conducted, it will become more evident that colleges and universities need quality teachers that inspire students with their personal characteristics as well as their educational expertise. Teachers will be noted for what they are as well as for what they do.

Fundamental changes in higher education during the next twenty years, Dunn says, will have drastic and far-reaching effects on the delivery of instruction and on what the typical professor does. The very existence of higher education as we know it will be threatened. By the year 2000 Dunn predicts,
25 per cent of the currently existing residential liberal arts colleges will be gone (19, p. 43).

Dunn outlines seven qualities that liberal arts colleges must possess if they are to endure the decade of the 1980s. The following prerequisites fit the patterns that are present in many church-related colleges and universities which have an opportunity to make a distinct contribution to higher education:

1. Colleges that seek to provide a truly excellent education will be able to compete in the 80's;

2. Colleges that provide a learning/living program will have a marketable future. Many students will want to go to college to interact with others, to find a spouse, or simply to learn to live with others;

3. Colleges that have a strong emphasis on religion can utilize this to their advantage. The advertised ideology must permeate all aspects of campus life, and the curriculum must be integrated with the ideology;

4. Colleges must take advantage of the delivery techniques in order to be effective in the future. Utilization of computer-assisted learning will free professors for more interaction with students and for research;

5. Colleges need to provide programs which are tailored for the individual student. The student needs flexibility in a problem-solving curriculum;

6. Colleges must maintain close communication with its supporters and its constituency so that the intents and desires of the college are communicated clearly;

7. Colleges will be forced to change if they survive. Faculties and administrators must be prepared to change teaching methodologies, curricula, organizational structures, and living systems in response
to societal demands. The colleges need to be prepared for rapid decision-making and changes to meet needs of students (19, p. 44).

Ericksen (21) maintains that one of the major keys to change in the university is the quality of the faculty. The quality or the faculty is related to the personal characteristics of faculty members. The teacher is viewed differently by different students, and the interaction between teacher and student becomes a critical issue. Mann reported the results of a study in which teachers were viewed by students as fulfilling different roles. Some teachers are viewed as experts, and their presumed expertise underlies both the right to teach and the students' interest in taking a course. Some teachers are viewed as formal authorities who are seen not only as agents of instruction but also as administrators of control and evaluation. Some teachers are seen as socializing agents who serve as representatives of a particular field epitomizing the values, assumptions, and style of intellectual life that characterize a certain discipline. Other teachers are seen as facilitators who are less absorbed with their own expertise or power than they are with the aspirations of students. Ideally, both the student and teacher feel sufficient trust and freedom to share their ideas and personal reactions not only in relation to the course material, but also in relation to matters that relate to needs outside the classroom (21, p. 2).
Whichever role the college teacher fulfills, he is expected to fulfill it effectively. One of the bases for the teacher's effectiveness lies in his ability to provide leadership that strikes a balance between expertise and authority on the one hand, and alertness to the needs of the students on the other hand. When the affective domain as well as the cognitive domain is considered, the teacher has a better understanding of both who his students are and what he can expect to achieve with them (21, p. 6).

Summary

Chapter II provides a review of the literature that is related to the research questions dealing with personality characteristics of effective and non-effective teachers in church-related colleges and universities. This chapter also provides a survey of the literature of different types of evaluation of instruction, the role of Christian educators in higher education, the application of Jungian typology in personality assessment, and the possibility of improvement of instruction.

Many of the authors agree that it is very difficult to ascertain the relationship between effective teaching and teacher personality. Most of the research in this field is based upon studies of elementary and secondary teachers rather than upon studies of college and university teachers.
There is a noticeable limitation of data that relate to teacher effectiveness and personality characteristics of college teachers.

Several authors forecast a noticeable decline in college enrollment in the 1980s, particularly in the church-related liberal arts colleges and universities. One of the keys to the survival of these schools seems to be the quality of the teaching faculty. If the personal attributes of the individual faculty member are interpreted positively by students and others, one result can be increased effectiveness in the classroom.

Those writers who are interested in improving teacher effectiveness in the classroom emphasize the cultivation and development of both the affective and cognitive domains of the college teacher. College and university administrators may be able to utilize a personality profile in their selection process if it is found that certain characteristics seem to contribute to effective teaching in an isolated and specialized area like the private Christian college or university.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTION AND
TREATMENT OF DATA

Introduction

Previous research in the fields of personality and improvement of instruction has produced results which link personal characteristics and professional methods. Personality characteristics of college teachers may be as important as instructional techniques, and the improvement of instruction in the college classroom may depend on more meaningful interaction between personality and methodology (5, p. 40).

After almost a half century of research, however, continued questions are raised concerning the measurement of personality and teacher effectiveness (4, p. 35). Even though there are difficulties inherent in this type of research, further studies should not be discouraged. Continued research in teacher effectiveness and the evaluation of faculty performance is needed if substantive improvement is to be made in the quality of the educational process (17, p. 130).

Higher education is in an era in which the personal characteristics of the teacher are being examined by students,
fellow faculty members, trustees, and legislators. The personality composition of the teacher is as important as that which is being taught. Some researchers express confidence that personality characteristics of effective and non-effective teachers can be identified (16, p. 9). The central controversy does not concentrate on what one teacher can be observed to do when exposed to different or unusual circumstances but on what the individual teacher does on the average in his or her customary life situation (8, p. 741). The adrogyrous teachers, who are high both in masculinity and femininity, tend to receive the highest ratings of teacher effectiveness (1, p. 247). Present research seems to indicate that students in different disciplines tend to evaluate teachers differently (10, p. 28).

The research technique utilized in the present study consists of student ratings of teachers in a normal classroom setting. Those who were rated as most effective and least effective were asked to complete a self-reporting personality inventory. A personality-type table containing numerical data provides opportunities to evaluate significant differences among the selected teachers.

Even though there are difficulties inherent in this type of research, such a study is needed in church-related universities where special premiums are placed on the quality of teaching personnel. One of the tasks of the Christian
educator is to transmit to the student the wholeness of knowledge, including both the sacred and secular truths within a body of information.

Description of the Research Instruments

The Student Evaluation of Instruction Form (3), which was developed at Virginia Commonwealth University, was employed to determine the most effective and least effective teachers on the basis of student ratings at three church-related universities. The Student Evaluation of Instruction Form contains six items relating to methodology and content of course material, and two items relating to tests administered during the class. It is imperative that instruments used in evaluation at the college and university level be designed for use at that level. Scales that were well received at the secondary level are not appropriate in higher education settings (14, p. 29).

French-Lazovik (6, p. 7) insists that only a small number of items covering the qualities common to good teaching should be used. One teaching style is not judged as being better than another style, but the style with which an individual teacher can be more or less successful depends on a host of variables, including his or her personality, the subject matter being taught, the backgrounds of the students, and the goals of the course (6, p. 7).
Instructors are ranked on eight items of the evaluation form which were used to select the most effective and least effective teachers in three church-related universities. Data indicate that there is no significant difference in student rating of instructors between the small private university and the large public university when the Virginia Commonwealth Form is used (2, p. 14). Students have been found to be competent to evaluate the effectiveness of teacher performance in a reliable manner. Results indicate that the instrument is reliable between instructors in different institutions and that ratings on such instructional scales may be generalized from school to school (3, p. 17). Validity studies utilizing the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form are limited because it is an unpublished instrument.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (12) is used to measure the personality characteristics of those teachers rated as most effective and least effective in three liberal arts church-related universities. The MBTI is one of a growing number of psychological instruments that are concerned primarily with variations in normal attitudes and behavior, rather than with psychopathology (12, p. 294). Widely available only since 1975, the MBTI is used as a counseling tool for self understanding and career planning, as a technique for improving educational practice through an
understanding of type differences in teaching and learning styles, and as a device for working with families and groups to improve communication, teamwork, and leadership (18, p. 295).

The history of the development of the MBTI begins early in this century when Briggs became interested in personality differences and developed her own typology from biographies. When Jung published his book about psychological types in 1921, Briggs realized that Jung's typology was congruent with her own effort but was much more complete. She then studied Jung's system thoroughly and taught it to her daughter, Isabel Briggs Myers. In 1942 Myers began to consider specific questions for use in an instrument that would reliably indicate Jungian typology. Over the next fifteen years she developed a series of scales and tested them on increasingly larger numbers of subjects, leading to the development of the instrument she christened the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. In 1962 the Educational Testing Service published Form F of the MBTI. Myers remained an active researcher until her death in May, 1980 (12, p. 297).

The indicator consists of 166 questions. The first and third parts consist of 125 questions in which subjects are asked to give their own preferences, thoughts, or feelings about various everyday experiences. The second part consists of 41 pairs of words, and subjects are asked
to indicate which word has the greatest personal appeal (16, p. 56).

Jung's theory of psychological types postulates that the four basic mental processes used by everyone are sensing, intuition, thinking, and feeling. Every person uses all four processes, but persons of each type can be distinguished by their relative preferences for each of the four, and by the attitudes in which they use them (11, p. 14).

Sensing (S) is the term used for perception of the observable by way of the senses. Intuition (N) is the term used for perception of meanings, relationships, and possibilities by way of insight. Attitudes developed as a preference for sensing include a reliance on experience rather than theory, a trust of the conventional, a preference for beginning with what is known and real, and moving systematically toward what is characterized as common-sense (11, p. 16). Intuitive types use sensing and intuition but prefer and develop intuition. Attitudes characteristically developed as a result of preference for intuition include a reliance on inspiration more than past experience, an interest in the new and untried, and a preference for learning new materials through an intuitive approach to meanings and relationships (10, p. 15).

Thinking (T) is the term used to define a logical decision-making process aimed at an impersonal finding. Feeling (F) is a term explaining a process of appreciation
as one makes judgments in terms of subjective, personal values. Both of these judgment functions are considered rational processes because they use reasoning to arrive at conclusions or decisions (11, p. 16). Thinking types use both thinking and feeling but prefer to use thinking for making judgments. Expertise in thinking leads to powers of analysis and an ability to weigh facts objectively. Feeling types prefer to reach judgments through feeling. Attitudes typically resulting from a preference for feeling include an understanding of people and a wish to affiliate with them, a desire for harmony, and a capacity for warmth, empathy and compassion (11, p. 16).

Jung postulated that all humans share two fundamentally different attitudes toward the world. In the extraverted attitude, attention flows out to objects and people in the environment. In the introverted attitude, energy seems to flow from the object back to the subject where it is conserved and consolidated within one's own position (11, p. 17).

Extraverts (E) typically create a life with action, social contacts, and a wide circle of acquaintances. Introverts (I) are persons who typically create a life with time for contemplation and socializing with intimates and close friends (11, p. 17).

Jung's theory is concerned with preventing one-sidedness. Therefore, a second preferred function, known as an auxiliary
function, provides balance. A fourth preference—judgment (J) or perception (P)—was developed by Myers to tap the different behavioral indicators. The primary function of this index is to make it possible to identify the dominant and auxiliary functions. Judging (J) types make decisions with a minimum of information-gathering while perceptive (P) types deal with the activities of the world by means of the perceptive process; (J) and (P) refer to the processes used by extraverts as a dominant function and by intraverts as an auxiliary function (11, p. 19).

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is valid in light of the theory on which it is based (13, p. 21). Construct validity studies seem to be most relevant since the indicator was constructed specifically to implement a theory. From a theoretical standpoint, the most important validity coefficients are the types themselves (13, p. 21).

Validity coefficients between the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator continuous scores and other instruments correlate positively. Myers (13, p. 23) reports positive correlations between MBTI preferences and grade-point average, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the Allport-Vernon-Lindsey Study of Values, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the Personality Research Instrument, the Concept Mastery Test, the Brown Holtzman Survey of Study Habits, the David Reading Test, the Science Research Temperament Scale, the Gray-Wheelwright Test, and the Scholastic Aptitude Test.
McCaulley (12, p. 328) reports positive correlations between MBTI Scales and the Sixteen P. F. Questionnaire, the Omnibus Personality Inventory, the Opinion and Interest Survey, and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale.

MBTI extraversion-introversion continuous scores typically show correlations from the .50s to the .70s with other measures of this construct (SVIB Occupational Introversion, MMPI Social Introversion, OPI Social Extraversion, and 16 PF Extraversion). MBTI extraversion tends to have low positive correlation with measures of adjustment, and MBTI introversion with measures of maladjustment (12, p. 328).

Reliability data for the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator include measures of internal consistency and test-retest reliabilities of the separate scales and type classifications. Myers hypothesized that adults and other populations likely to have achieved high levels of type development will be clearer about their preferences; therefore, samples from those groups will yield higher internal consistency reliabilities than samples from less developed groups (12, p. 314). Test-retest correlations of continuous scores for ten samples with intervals from five weeks to twenty-one months show a range of reliability coefficients for form F of .73 to .83 for EI, .69 to .87 for SN, .56 to .82 for TF, and .60 to .87 for JP (12, p. 318).

While the consistencies of MBTI individual scales are important for comparing the MBTI to other personality
instruments, the MBTI is primarily concerned with types rather than with the scales themselves. The critical question is how often on retests do individuals come out with the same type—that is, fall on the same side of each of the four dichotomous preferences (12, p. 318). In nine studies for which retest data on type categories are available, a range of from 31 to 61 per cent of the cases fall in the same type on retest after a period ranging from five weeks to six years; from 70 to 88 per cent of the cases in the samples have three or all four preferences in common on retest; from 10 to 22 per cent have two preferences in common, and from 2 to 7 per cent have only one preference that is the same on retest. Only one individual in the composite sample of 1,444 persons changed on all four preferences (12, p. 318).

Additional studies indicate that the E-I, S-N, and T-F scales are independent of each other, but that the J-P scale is moderately related to the S-N and T-F scales (13, p. 20). Split-half reliability studies, which have used the application of the Spearman-Brown correlation formula, produce credible results for an instrument of this sort. With a wide range of age, intellectual ability and socio-economic status included, the only correlation coefficient reported under .75 is the thoughtfulness-feeling category (13, p. 20).
Currently there are two forms of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator in use. Forms E and F are identical except that form F contains unscored items and takes longer to finish. Form F may be given to individuals who are in the eleventh grade or higher, and Form E may be given to individuals who are in the seventh grade through adults (13, p. 84). Form F is used in this study.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is designed to generate sixteen psychological types, and type tables provide the basic information for MBTI research (12, p. 336). Since the preferences are assumed to be dichotomies, and since in each type the preferences are postulated to interact in specific ways, the appropriate method of presenting MBTI data is by the type table (11, p. 36). Such a device arranges the types in logical relation to each other (13, p. 65).

In addition to analyses of individual types, it is also customary to group types for specific predictions. Types are not evenly distributed, as one might hypothesize, but the best estimate of the distribution of types in the population is that extraverts outnumber introverts about three to one, sensing types outnumber intuitive types about three to one, and in female samples, feeling types outnumber thinking types two to one (11, p. 36).

Since the essentials of any type are perception and judgment, this is the starting point in describing the personality type of an individual. The second letter of
the type formula indicates the perception. If it is S, the person is placed in the sensing category; if it is N, the person is placed in the intuitive category. The third letter of the type formula indicates which kind of judgment the individual prefers. If it is T, the person is placed in the thinking category; if it is F, the person is placed in the feeling category (13, p. 15).

The first and last letters of the type formula indicate how a person uses his most skilled mental processes. Does he use them extravertedly or introvertedly? Does he use them judgingly or perceptively (13, p. 68)? There are therefore, sixteen possible combinations within the type table. Any quantitative interpretation of the indicator scores should be made with great caution except where there is clear experimental evidence of some relationship with an external criterion (13, p. 69). It is also true that a conclusion may be true for a pooled category but may yet not be true for all types within that category (11, p. 41).

Perception is understood to involve the process of becoming aware of things, people, occurrences, or ideas. Judgment is understood to include the process of coming to conclusions about what has been perceived. If persons differ in what they perceive and in conclusions at which they arrive, they may show corresponding differences in their reactions, interests, values, needs, and motivations (11, p. 41).
The MBTI scores are understood best as providing an hypothesis concerning the probable typological make-up of the person taking the instrument. When MBTI scores are treated as possibilities to be explored, the best possible use of this valuable tool for the understanding of psychological type is represented (15, p. 11).

Procedures for Data Analysis

The Student Evaluation of Instruction Form (3), which was developed at Virginia Commonwealth University, is utilized to determine the most and least effective teachers at three church-related universities. Teachers whose mean scores on the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form are in the lower quarter will be designated as most effective while those whose mean scores are in the upper quarter will be designated as least effective.

Class size and number of classes taught by each teacher are not distinctions in this research. Previous research (2, p. 20) with the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form suggests the number of classes taught and the size of the classes are not likely to be important variables which influence student ratings; low negative correlations were found between both the size of each class and the quality of instruction and between the ratings and the number of students taught by each teacher (2, p. 20).
In this study, a total of 5,153 responses were recorded from students who rated ninety-two teachers in three church-related universities. Each student who participated in the study marked the eight questions on the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form with a one-to-five response. A one (1) answer is the most positive response, while five (5) is the most negative response. Lower mean scores imply effectiveness, and higher mean scores imply lack of effectiveness. The number of responses and the mean scores of ninety-two respondents are presented in Table I. The mean scores range from 10.00 to 26.00.

The lower quarter scores, which range from 10.00 to 12.64, identify the most effective teachers. The upper quarter scores, which range from 17.29 to 26.00, identify the least effective teachers. Scores from 12.69 to 17.23 represent the inner-quarter ranges; these scores are not included in the present study.

The data generated by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator are used to answer the research questions posed in Chapter I. The data indicate that there are clusters of personality characteristics that can be identified with college teachers who are rated both as most effective and least effective by student raters.

In order to test the differences between the personality characteristics of college teachers rated as most effective
## TABLE I

**MEAN SCORES EARNED BY NINETY-TWO FACULTY MEMBERS ON THE STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>13.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>12.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT NUMBER</td>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES</td>
<td>MEAN SCORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>12.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>19.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>13.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>18.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and least effective by student rates, Hotelling's $T^2$ test is utilized. The question of whether two population mean vectors differ significantly can be answered by the resulting F ratio. If a significant F ratio is found, the extent of the difference can be sought by the use of simultaneous confidence intervals. The .05 level of significance is used as the critical value of significance.

If a significant difference between mean scores of the most effective and least effective teachers on the four sets of variables of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is found, a one-way analysis of variance will be utilized using the .05 level of significance. This will produce data indicating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>14.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>15.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>14.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>14.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the differences between most effective and least effective teachers on each of the four sets of preferences identified with Jungian typology. For purposes of differentiation, the most effective teachers are designated as Group I and the least effective teachers are designated as Group II.

Each answer sheet returned by teachers in both Group I and Group II was hand scored. Preference scores are derived from the points received for each index, so the greater number of points indicates the direction of the preference and the letter part of the score. The points were transformed into preference scores by determining the numerical difference of the two indices and consulting a conversion table. Figure 1 shows how the scores on the MBTI vary in both directions with zero at the center.

Extravert 53 . . . . 0 . . . . 59 Introvert
Sensing 67 . . . . 0 . . . . 51 Intuitive
Thinking 49 . . . . 0 . . . . 51 Feeling
(males)
Thinking 61 . . . . 0 . . . . 49 Feeling
(females)
Judging . . . . 0 . . . . 61 Perception

Fig. 1--Variance of MBTI scores for each index.

This figure indicates that a person's basic preferences can be observed by noting the strength of the indices on either side of zero. These are directions or strengths, rather than scales designed to measure traits. Each index
is intended to reflect a habitual choice between two opposites. The items of each index offer forced choices involving the preference at issue. Responses pointing in opposite directions bear separate weights, which allows for the evidence in each direction to be summed separately. This theory of types attaches no ethical value judgment to one preference as compared to another; each is considered valuable and at times indispensable in its own field (13, p. 3).

Preference scores were transformed into continuous scores so that they could be utilized for statistical purposes. The continuous scores indicate a preference for one trait or the other and the strength of that preference. The continuous scores range from 33 for extravertive, sensing, thinking, and judging preferences along a continuum to 161 for introvertive, intuitive, feeling and perceptive preferences. The continuous scores are interpreted with 100 at the center. A continuous score of less than 100 indicates a preference for E, S, T or J, and a score of over 100 indicates a preference for I, N, F or P. An EI continuous score of 87, for instance, would be interpreted as a preference for extraversion, while a continuous score of 120 would be interpreted as a preference for introversion (13, p. 9).

The letter is considered the most important part of the score. It indicates which personality characteristic an individual uses because it is developed to a higher degree.
The numerical portion of a score shows how strongly the preference is reported so that each person is classified in positive terms by what he likes, not what he lacks (13, p. 9).

If a reference is made to separate personality characteristics, they are called psychological traits. When referring to the sixteen possible combinations of psychological traits, they are called personality types (18, p. 8). Type is that portion of the personality which people create in themselves by their exercise of four preferences.

While man uses four functions, usually one function dominates consciousness. They are paired opposites, and when one function dominates the unconscious, the remaining two functions seem to remain on the border between the conscious and the unconscious (7, p. 75).

Attitude types relate to the different essential interests of the human psyche in relation to external objects. The introverted attitude is one in which the subject is intent on withdrawing energy from an object as though he had to prevent the object from gaining power over him. The extraverted attitude is seen in the way a person relates to objects in the external world. The extravert thinks, feels, acts, and eventually lives in
a way that is directly correlated with objective conditions. His inner life appears to be subordinated to external needs (7, p. 75).

The continuous scores and the direction of the type letters of Group I and Group II are presented in Tables II and III. The strength of the type preference is presented numerically. Table II contains the MBTI scores of teachers who were rated most effective by student raters, while Table III contains the MBTI scores of teachers who were rated as least effective by student raters. Subjects are listed by the numbers assigned to them in the initial phase of the study.

Population of the Study

The sample for this study is drawn from the full-time teaching faculties of three church-related four-year liberal arts institutions in a central West Texas city. Each institution is identified with a different Protestant religious denomination. Abilene Christian University is a part of the Disciples or Church of Christ denomination, Hardin-Simmons University is a Baptist school, and McMurray College is a Methodist institution.

Students at all three colleges rated their faculty members by using the Butler-Peek Evaluation of Instruction Form. A total of 5,153 responses were recorded from students
TABLE II

TYPE PATTERNS AND CONTINUOUS SCORES OF GROUP I RESPONDENTS (12, p. 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>Type Preference*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>E 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>I 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>I 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>E 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>I 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>E 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>I 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>I 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>I 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>E 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>E 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>E 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>I 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>E 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>I 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>I 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>I 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>E 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>E 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>I 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>E 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>E 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>I 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>E 93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E = extravert; I = introvert; S = sensing; N = intuitive; T = thinking; F = feeling; J = judging, P = perception.
TABLE III
TYPE PATTERNS AND CONTINUOUS SCORES OF
GROUP II RESPONDENTS (12, p. 10)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>Type Preference</th>
<th>E-I</th>
<th>S-N</th>
<th>T-F</th>
<th>J-P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>I 115</td>
<td>S 67</td>
<td>F 123</td>
<td>J 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>E 69</td>
<td>S 83</td>
<td>F 149</td>
<td>J 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>I 107</td>
<td>N 123</td>
<td>T 95</td>
<td>J 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>E 75</td>
<td>S 61</td>
<td>T 91</td>
<td>J 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>I 105</td>
<td>N 125</td>
<td>F 129</td>
<td>P 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>I 117</td>
<td>S 39</td>
<td>F 129</td>
<td>J 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>I 137</td>
<td>N 131</td>
<td>F 119</td>
<td>J 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>E 71</td>
<td>N 83</td>
<td>F 113</td>
<td>J 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>I 117</td>
<td>S 47</td>
<td>F 111</td>
<td>J 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>E 55</td>
<td>N 143</td>
<td>F 109</td>
<td>J 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>E 99</td>
<td>S 75</td>
<td>F 119</td>
<td>J 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>I 103</td>
<td>S 49</td>
<td>F 123</td>
<td>P 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>I 123</td>
<td>N 139</td>
<td>F 119</td>
<td>P 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>I 121</td>
<td>N 135</td>
<td>T 83</td>
<td>J 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>I 143</td>
<td>N 117</td>
<td>T 97</td>
<td>J 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>I 139</td>
<td>S 57</td>
<td>F 101</td>
<td>J 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>I 145</td>
<td>S 67</td>
<td>F 113</td>
<td>J 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>E 83</td>
<td>N 127</td>
<td>F 143</td>
<td>P 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>I 137</td>
<td>N 105</td>
<td>F 121</td>
<td>J 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>I 121</td>
<td>S 99</td>
<td>F 131</td>
<td>J 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>I 145</td>
<td>N 117</td>
<td>F 125</td>
<td>J 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>I 117</td>
<td>N 103</td>
<td>F 105</td>
<td>J 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E = extravert; I = introvert; S = sensing; N = intuitive; T = thinking; F = feeling; J = judging, P = perception.
in all three universities. Differences in mean scores on the Student Rating of Instruction Form of the volunteer and non-volunteer groups were tested by the use of Fisher's $t$ test. Since no significant difference was found between the volunteer and non-volunteer groups, they are treated as one sample. Ninety-two teachers from the three universities are included in the study population.

Administration of the Instruments

Approximately two weeks before the administration of the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form in all three institutions, the academic dean of each school sent a memorandum to faculty members to inform them of the study, its purpose, and their involvement. Public announcements concerning the project were made in meetings, and all faculty members were encouraged to participate in the study. Faculty members from Hardin-Simmons University and McMurray College, who participated on a volunteer basis, were sent letters of explanation (Appendices C and D). Faculty members from Abilene Christian University participated on a non-volunteer basis.

A large envelope containing rating forms and an instruction sheet (Appendix E) was prepared for each class taught by a participating teacher. Printed on the outside of the envelopes were the instructor's name, the class
designated, and an assigned number. The envelopes were 
delivered to the instructor's offices. Each teacher took 
the envelope to the classroom, wrote the identifying 
umber on the blackboard, appointed a student to collect 
the completed answer sheets, and left the room. The 
packets were returned to the academic dean's office in 
each university, and they were picked up by the examiner. 
Each student's responses were tabulated on compilation 
sheets designed for this purpose and delivered to the 
computer center where they were scanned and the answers 
punched onto computer cards.

The data generated by the Student Evaluation of 
Instruction Form include mean scores for eight items which 
are scored on a scaled one-to-five response set. Mean scores 
earned by faculty members were ranked numerically and divided 
into upper and lower quarters. The most effective teachers 
were designated as Group I, and the least effective teachers 
were designated as Group II.

A large envelope containing a Myers-Briggs Type 
Indicator test booklet, an answer sheet, and an instruction 
sheet was hand-delivered to each instructor who had been 
rated as most effective or least effective on the basis of 
student ratings. A pre-addressed large envelope was also 
included in each packet. The instructors were asked to 
complete the inventory within a five-day period and return
the completed answer sheet, instruction sheet, and test booklet to the examiner by mail.

Four weeks after the delivery of the personality instrument, a follow-up letter was sent to all individuals who had not responded. Since it was impossible to contact two Group II faculty members, the next two subjects who had mean scores closest to the lowest Group II mean score were included in the sample. Five subjects in Group II and two subjects in Group I were nine weeks or more late in returning their Myers-Briggs Type Indicator booklets and answer sheets. Personal telephone calls were made, and letters were written to the teachers who were more than eight weeks past the deadline. Their answer sheets were eventually received and scored.

Data Reporting

All statistically significant results are reported and discussed in Chapter IV using both descriptive and tabular representation of results. The level of significance for each item is .05. Data that did not reach the established level of significance are reported without discussion.

Summary

The research design consists of the administration of the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form to each class taught by each instructor who participated in the study.
Faculty members at one university were required by the administration to participate in the study; faculty members at two universities participated on a volunteer basis. After no significant difference was found between the volunteer and non-volunteer groups, they were considered as one sample population for this study.

Those instructors who scored in the lower quarter were designated as the most effective teachers and identified as Group I. Those instructors who scored in the upper quarter were designated as the least effective teachers and identified as Group II. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was administered to these two groups. The answer sheets were hand scored, and the numerical results were tabulated and entered in the type tables that describe sixteen personality types. The percentages of both the most effective teachers and the least effective teachers are identified with each personality type.

The use of the Hotelling $T^2$ test provides a contrast of the personality characteristics of the most effective and the least effective teachers. A one-way analysis of variance provides comparisons on the four sets of variables, which provide comparisons on each of the personality variables between the most effective and the least effective teachers. Chapter IV presents the research findings and interpretations for this study.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the data obtained from responses to the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form, which was administered to students in three church-related universities in a central West Texas city. This chapter also presents the data obtained from responses to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), which was administered to those faculty members who were rated both as most effective and least effective by student raters.

According to the data in Table IV, there is no significant differences at the .05 level between the mean scores of the volunteer and non-volunteer teachers in their responses to the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form. These groups are differentiated according to teachers who did and did not volunteer to take part in this study. Therefore, the volunteer and non-volunteer teachers are treated as one sample.

Teachers whose mean scores on the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form were in the lower quarter are designated as most effective. Teachers whose mean scores on the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form were in the upper quarter are designated as the least effective.
TABLE IV
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VOLUNTEER AND NON-VOLUNTEER TEACHERS: TEST FOR SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DF = 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Teachers</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Volunteer Teachers</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant at the .05 level
The analyses of the data generated by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator are used to answer the research questions posed in Chapter I. These data indicate that there is a cluster of personality characteristics which are identified with college teachers who are rated as most effective by student raters as well as a cluster of personality characteristics which are identified with college teachers who are rated as least effective by student raters. The MBTI is designed to generate profiles of sixteen psychological types, and type tables provide necessary data for MBTI research.

Descriptions of MBTI Traits and Types

**Extravert (E) vs. Introvert (I)**

Jung coined the terms extravert and introvert to explain how a person views his world. Myers (2, p. 1) describes the extravert as one who is oriented primarily to the outer world, and thus he focuses his perception and judgment upon people and things. The introvert is oriented primarily to the inner world, and focuses his perception and judgment upon concepts and ideas. Lawrence (1, p. 13) observes that extraverts are motivated by external events while introverts respond more quickly to internal motivation.

**Sensing (S) vs. Intuitive (N)**

Myers (52, p. 1) suggests the sensing person is made aware of things directly through one of the five senses
while the intuitive person relies more on intuition, which is understood as an indirect perception by way of the unconscious. Lawrence (41, p. 13) views the sensing person as practical and factual, fun loving, and in touch with reality, while the intuitive person is interested in possibilities and subsurface meanings.

**Thinking (T) vs. Feeling (F)**

Myers (2, p. 2) observes the thinking person as one who discriminates impersonally between truth and falsehood, while one who relies on feeling discriminates on the basis of value and non-value. Lawrence (1, p. 13) observes the thinking person as one who is logical, skeptical and impersonal, while he identifies the feeling person as one who is concerned with human values and harmony among people.

**Judging (J) vs. Perceptive (P)**

Myers (2, p. 2) uses the JP index to predict whether a person will rely primarily upon a judging process or upon a perceptive process in his dealing with the outer world.

In terms of Jungian theory, a person may be expected to develop skills with the processes he prefers. If he prefers E he should be more effective in dealing with his environment than with ideas. If he prefers S, he should be more effective in perceiving facts than possibilities. If he prefers T, he should be more effective in thinking judgments
than in feeling judgments. If he prefers J, he probably is more skillful at ordering his environment than in adapting to it.

**Personality Types**

Myers (2, p. 9) describes the combination of the letters from the four scores as 'type.' She identifies the type when all four preference scores have been entered. Myers attempts to describe each type at its best as observed in well adjusted individuals who are functioning effectively in their environment.

**Characteristics of Individuals in the Sixteen Personality Types**

Lawrence presents the following practical set of characteristics of persons in each of the sixteen personality types.

**ENTJ**: Intuitive, innovative, ORGANIZER: aggressive, analytic, systematic; more tuned to new ideas and possibilities than to people's feelings;

**ESTJ**: Fact-minded, practical ORGANIZER: aggressive, analytic, systematic; more interested in getting the job done than in people's feelings;

**INTP**: Inquisitive ANALYZER: reflective, independent, curious; more interested in organizing ideas than situations or people;

**ISTP**: Practical ANALYZER; values exactness; more interested in organizing data than situations or people; reflective, a cool and curious observer of life;

**ESTP**: REALISTIC ADAPTER in the world of material things; good natured, tolerant, easy going; oriented to practical, first hand experience; highly observant of details of things;

**ESFP**: REALISTIC ADAPTER in human relationships; friendly and easy with people, highly observant of their feelings and needs; oriented to practical, first hand experience;
ISTJ: Analytical MANAGER OF FACTS AND DETAILS; dependable, decisive, painstaking and systematic; concerned with systems and organization; stable and conservative;

ISFJ: Sympathic MANAGER OF FACTS AND DETAILS; concerned with people's welfare; dependable, painstaking and systematic; stable and conservative;

ISFP: Observant, loyal HELPER; reflective, realistic, empathic; patient with details, gentle and retiring; shuns disagreements; enjoys the moment;

INFP: Imaginative, independent HELPER; reflective, inquisitive, emphatic, loyal to ideals; more interested in possibilities than in practicalities;

ESFJ: Practical HARMONIZER and worker-with-people; sociable, orderly, opinioned; conscientious, realistic and well tuned to the here and now;

ENFJ: Imaginative HARMONIZER and worker-with-people; sociable, expressive, orderly, opinioned, conscientious; curious about new ideas and possibilities;

INFJ: People-oriented INNOVATOR of ideas; serious, quietly forceful and persevering; concerned with the common good, with helping others develop;

INTJ: Logical, critical, decisive INNOVATOR of ideas; serious, intent, highly independent, concerned with organization, determined and often stubborn;

ENFP: Warmly enthusiastic PLANNER OF CHANGE; imaginative, individualistic; pursues inspiration with impulsive energy; seeks to understand and inspire others;

ENTP: Inventive, analytical PLANNER OF CHANGE; enthusiastic and independent; pursues inspiration with impulsive energy; seeks to understand and inspire others (1, p. 15).

Data Analysis by Research Questions

Research question one asks, "Is there a cluster of personality characteristics that are identified with college teachers who are rated as most effective by"
student raters?" Table V data present the percentages for the most effective teachers in each of the sixteen type categories. One category type is dominant and five other types are reported as significantly higher than the remaining types in the table.

The greatest percentage (20.8%) of the effective teachers are of the ISTJ type; these letters identify the introvertive, sensing, judgmental type with thinking as the auxiliary characteristic. Myers (2, p. A-6) suggests this combination of characteristics makes for a highly dependable teacher who has a complete, realistic, and practical respect for the facts. He absorbs, remembers and uses an immense number of details. He tends to like everything put on a factual basis. His private reactions to events are quite unpredictable, but his response is sound and sensible. It is difficult for one of this type to understand needs that differ widely from his own. He is sympathetic toward others, but he may not accept their logic. His major personality characteristics include analysis, logic and decisiveness (2, p. A-6). Sass (4, p. 82) found that the judging nature of the thinking type allows an individual to deal with ideas and values in a conceptual framework. The thinking type sees conceptual connections and differences between ideas by comparing them logically.

Sixty-six per cent of the most effective teachers are divided among six additional types. Five of these six
### TABLE V

**DISTRIBUTION OF MOST EFFECTIVE TEACHERS BY TYPE**  
**Group I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Judging (N=12)</th>
<th>Perceptive (N=0)</th>
<th>Perceptive (N=3)</th>
<th>Judging (N=9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>ENTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>N=2</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>%8.3</td>
<td>%0.0</td>
<td>%0.0</td>
<td>%12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>N=3</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=3</td>
<td>N=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>%12.5</td>
<td>%0.0</td>
<td>%12.5</td>
<td>%12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>N=2</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types</td>
<td>%8.3</td>
<td>%0.0</td>
<td>%0.0</td>
<td>%8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>ESTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>%20.8</td>
<td>%0.0</td>
<td>%0.0</td>
<td>%4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See pp. 97-98, Chapter IV.*
remaining types are identified as those possessing the auxiliary feeling process. Four of these six remaining types are identified as extravertive in the use of mental processes. Five of these remaining types employ judging as their most skilled mental process.

Research question two asks, "Is there a cluster of personality characteristics that are identified with college teachers who are rated as least effective by student raters?"

Table VI data present the percentages of the least effective teachers in each of the sixteen type categories. The greatest percentage (27.2%) of the least effective teachers are ISFJ type, with two additional types, INFJ and INTJ accounting for 32 per cent of the remaining thirteen types in the table.

Myers (2, p. A-6) has found that the ISFJ teacher is unpredictable in his behavior, but he is difficult to discourage or distract from a pursued goal. This kind of teacher is likely to have personal artistic tastes and judgment. He may be aware of the feelings of others, but he may demand a harmonious classroom in obedience to his personal needs and demands.

Myers (2, p. A-8) observes that the intuitive dominated teacher tends to thrust his own insight into relationships and meanings of things, regardless of established authority
### TABLE VI

**DISTRIBUTION OF LEAST EFFECTIVE TEACHERS BY TYPE**

**Group II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Judging (N=13)</th>
<th>Perceptive (N=3)</th>
<th>Perceptive (N=1)</th>
<th>Judging: (N=5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intuitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>N=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=3</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%=13.6</td>
<td>%=0.0</td>
<td>%=0.0</td>
<td>%=0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intuitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feeling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>N=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=4</td>
<td>N=2</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>N=2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%=18.1</td>
<td>%=9.0</td>
<td>%=4.5</td>
<td>%=9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sensing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>N=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=6</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%=27.2</td>
<td>%=4.5</td>
<td>%=0.0</td>
<td>%=9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sensing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feeling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>N=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%=0.0</td>
<td>%=0.0</td>
<td>%=0.0</td>
<td>%=4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See pp. 97-98, Chapter IV.*
or popularly accepted beliefs. He may be an effective researcher, but he may ignore the feelings of others until he wins them to his way of thinking. He may need encouragement to keep in touch with the needs of his students.

Research question three asks, "Are there significant differences between the personality characteristics of college teachers who are rated as most effective and those teachers rated as least effective by student raters?"

In order to test the differences between the personality characteristics of college teachers who are rated as most effective and least effective by student raters, Hotelling's $T^2$ statistical test was utilized. The question of whether two population mean vectors differ significantly was answered by the resulting F-ratio. The multivariate analysis was utilized because a univariate test seems to be positively biased in the sense that the null hypothesis will be rejected too often. If a multivariate analysis indicates a significant difference between treatment groups, the researcher can be confident that the treatment groups differ with respect to at least one dependent variable. If the calculated value for $T^2$ exceeds the critical value at the .05 level, the null hypothesis can be rejected with assurance (3, p. 179). The univariate $t$ tests tend to yield too many significant differences.
Table VII presents the results when Hotellings $T^2$ is utilized to calculate the overall differences between Group I and Group II on the four sets of variables of the MBTI. A significant result in a multivariate $t$ test of two groups requires further analysis to determine which dependent variable, or variables, contributed to the overall significant difference. Thus, Hotelling's $T^2$ is a preliminary step in the multivariate process. If the calculated value for $T^2$ exceeds the critical value of the .05 level, it is assumed that the mean vectors are not identical.

The present research revealed there are no significant differences between the mean scores of most and least effective teacher on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator scores. The two sets of personality characteristics indentified with most effective and least effective teachers do not seem to be related to differences in teacher effectiveness. If significance had been found at the .05 level, a one way analysis of variance would have revealed which variable contained the significant difference of most and least effective teachers when measured by Hotellings $T^2$. A less stringent univariate statistical design may have pointed to assumptions that are not as rigidly defined as those evaluated by the multivariate design (3, p. 184).
### TABLE VII

**SIGNIFICANCE OF PERSONALITY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUP I AND GROUP II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Number</th>
<th>GROUP I</th>
<th>GROUP II</th>
<th>TOTAL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>104.5000</td>
<td>28.8820</td>
<td>111.0909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>103.0000</td>
<td>22.1143</td>
<td>95.0909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>73.5833</td>
<td>26.7125</td>
<td>73.3636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*T-square = 7.03852; F ratio = 1.63965 (not significant at the .05 level).*
It is true, however, that the largest difference in mean scores was observed on the auxiliary processes of thinking and feeling. If a univariate design were utilized, it is assumed a significant difference may be noted. Evidently, most effective and least effective teachers use these processes differently, even if they do not use them in a significantly different way.

Both sets of teachers are therefore identified as introvertive and judging types. Both groups tend to want to structure their classroom activities through materials they select for students. Both sets of teachers are identified as orderly and having an adherence to structure and schedules. Lawrence (1, p. 81) observes that the classrooms of I, S, and J teachers are likely to be quite and orderly, while the classrooms of E, N, and P teachers tend to experience more movement among active and noisy students.

The dominant process of relating to the environment is difficult to detach from auxiliary processes. While effective teachers are equally divided between extraverts and introverts, the dominant type among ineffective teachers is the introverts. Lawrence (1, p. 79), concludes that extraverted teachers are more likely to be attuned to the changes in student attention and activities, while introverted teachers are more attuned to the ideas they are trying to communicate.
Summary of Data Findings

Based on the findings presented in this chapter, following is a summary of the major findings.

1. There are no significant differences in the personality characteristics of the most and least effective teachers when a rigid statistical design is utilized.

2. The most effective teachers in this sample tend to be equally divided between extraverts and introverts, while the dominant type among the least effective teachers is the introvert.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, PROFILES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study investigates the personality characteristics of the most effective and least effective teachers in three church-related universities in a central West Texas city. The Student Evaluation of Instruction Form was utilized to allow students in the three universities to rate teacher effectiveness in the classroom. Faculty members of one university participated on a non-volunteer basis while faculty members of two universities participated on a volunteer basis. Appropriate statistical procedures were utilized to ascertain that both groups could be viewed as one sample.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was administered to those teachers who were rated both as most effective and least effective by student raters. These degrees of effectiveness were determined through computer selection of the upper and lower quarter mean scores from 5,153 responses. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was chosen for this study because of its self-administering and non-threatening nature. The
psychological type terminology is based on the research and writing of Swiss psychiatrist Carl G. Jung.

A review of related literature revealed that studies on teacher effectiveness and personality have been undertaken frequently at elementary and secondary levels, but that relatively few studies have been attempted at the college and university level. These related studies have an added importance for the church-related college or university because of the structured dependence on faculty members in such schools. The key to the continuing positive contribution of Christian education seems to lie in the quality of faculty in these institutions.

The typology of C. G. Jung was found to be applicable to evaluate personality characteristics of the most and least effective teachers in church-related universities. His typology is unique in evaluating the total person, but there is no approach that will account for every aspect of the personality make-up of a college teacher. Jung's work relates to the affective domain that may become as important as the cognitive domain which has been researched for many years.

Discussion of Data Findings

The major data findings of this study are as follows.
1. There are no significant differences in the personality characteristics of the most and least effective teachers when a rigid statistical design is utilized.

2. The most effective teachers in this sample tend to be equally divided between extraverts and introverts, while the dominant type among the least effective teachers is the introvert.

The data indicate that there are no significant differences in the personality characteristics of teachers who are rated as most effective and least effective by student raters when a rigid statistical design is utilized. It is true, however, that teachers and researchers who understand type concepts continue to discover evidence which implies that teachers' types do affect how they teach and what they prefer to teach. Teachers seem more likely to understand and get along with students of types similar to their own. Insecure students seem to need teachers of similar type with whom they can relate easily, while more secure students need the challenge of being with teachers unlike them in type so they can strengthen their weaker mental processes.

How a teacher comes to conclusions about students is related to the processes of thinking and feeling. If he uses
feeling, he attempts to bestow a personal, subjective value in interaction. Thinking-type teachers tend to make relatively few comments about student performance, and the comments they do make are likely to be objective statements. Feeling-type teachers praise and criticize, support and correct in both words and body language. Feeling-type teachers have students spend more time in individual work, and they are more likely than thinking-type teachers to move from student to student seeking dialogue. Feeling types can individualize instruction to several at a time, but thinking types seem more comfortable addressing the class as one unit. The most effective teachers tend to utilize the auxiliary process of thinking more than the least effective teachers. Most effective teachers tend to depend more on their evaluation of student needs than on student interpretations of their needs.

Effective college teachers in church-related universities may be extravertive or introvertive in the way they view their environment, while ineffective teachers are introvertive in the way they view their environment. Extraverted teachers are more likely to give students choices about what to study. Extravertive teachers are more likely to structure learning activities for students while introverted teachers are attuned to the ideas they are trying to teach. Both effective and ineffective teachers in church-related universities are
concerned about controlling their classrooms in an orderly fashion. This is indicated by the fact that the judging process is utilized by a majority of both types of teachers.

Profiles of Most Effective and Least Effective Teachers

The following summarizes the characteristics of teachers who are rated as most effective by student raters.

1. The most prevalent type is ISTJ, which identifies effective teachers as being introvertive, with sensing and judging qualities, and with thinking as the auxiliary characteristic. The judging quality is present in 80 per cent of the most effective teachers. This type of teacher is dependable, decisive, painstaking, and systematic. This type of teacher is a linear learner who has a strong need for order, but who prefers to plan alone.

2. This type of effective teacher operates on conscious perception, yet the conceptual ideas and values of others are viewed in a practical framework. Personal autonomy is appreciated by this type of teacher.

3. Since there is an equal number of extraverts and introverts among the effective teachers, this may indicate that many effective teachers turn to the outer world of action, objects, and persons to accumulate ideas which are utilized in the classroom. Thirty per cent of the effective teachers emphasize harmonious group projects for class members.
4. Effective teachers do not seem to function well in a highly structured environment. They tend to feel more comfortable in a setting where they, instead of administrators, make the decisions about their teaching procedures.

The following summarizes the characteristics of those teachers who were rated as least effective by student raters.

1. The most prevalent type is ISFJ, which identifies ineffective teachers as being introverted, with sensing and judging qualities, and with feeling as the auxiliary characteristic. While this type of teacher will listen to the expressions of others, he finds it difficult to accept ideas or concepts that differ from his.

2. Intuition is a noticeable quality in approximately 55 per cent of the least effective teachers. This may indicate that these teachers may be unpredictable if their personal goals and desires are not met. This type of teacher has a tendency to devalue those who disagree with him.

3. Since this type of teacher is primarily theoretical, practical applications may be excluded from his planning. Undergraduates may, therefore, have difficulty grasping non-tangible data and view such a teacher as ineffective.

4. This type of teacher seems to be one who listens but does not empathize with the needs of students. He may be so engrossed in his single-minded pursuit of data that interaction with others may become superficial. The most
efficient contribution of this type teacher may be in laboratory teaching, not the classroom.

Conclusions

Based on the data findings, the following conclusions appear to be warranted about the differences between effective and ineffective teachers.

1. Effective teachers differ from ineffective teachers in their attitudes toward students. Effective teachers tend to present applicable data with which students can identify, while ineffective teachers tend to respond superficially to students. While ineffective teachers may allow discussion and interaction, they do not change their ideas or approaches.

2. Effective teachers differ from ineffective teachers in their expectations of students. Effective teachers tend to be well organized in their objectives for student accomplishment, while ineffective teachers tend to be less well organized.

3. While effective teachers are equally divided among extraverts and introverts, ineffective teachers are predominately introvertive. The effective teacher is oriented to the real world of persons and things. The less effective teacher may have personal goals that he is seeking and may therefore ignore real relationships with students in the process.

4. Effective teachers tend to deal with classes as a group rather than identify with a few isolated individuals. The effective classroom becomes a community of learners since
the teacher benefits from the teaching-learning process as well as the students. The ineffective teacher may be so involved with a few persons in a class that he may not respond to or learn from the whole group.

5. Effective teachers are more likely to use varied test approaches while ineffective teachers seem to be locked in to limited test procedures. Both types of teachers use practical test instruments, but ineffective teachers tend to use objective tests much more frequently that present fewer opportunities for self expression.

6. Both effective and ineffective teachers use the judging process as a method of control. Although both types would like to control their classrooms in an orderly manner, the ineffective teacher may be misinterpreted by the students who view his interest in a few (probably bright) students as a sign that the rest of the class must demand attention.

Recommendations to Church-Related Institutions

Based on the data findings from this study, the following recommendations are offered to church-related institutions in their quest for effective teachers.

1. Church-related colleges and universities may find it advantageous to administer some type of instrument that measures personality characteristics of prospective teachers. The preparation of an individual profile containing self-assessment scores may be beneficial. This procedure could
add to the existing process of interviews, evaluation of transcripts, and review of published materials. Only an institution has identified the personality characteristics of effective teachers, then the applicants who possess those characteristics may be considered more seriously for employment.

2. Church-related colleges and universities may want to published general guidelines about what they expect in a teacher. If an applicant is not willing to abide by the institution's policies, it is wise to ascertain this before employment.

3. Church-related colleges and universities may be able to use student ratings as one aspect of improvement of instruction. Additional evaluation tools, such as self-rating and peer-rating scales, could also be utilized. These rating scales are not designed to be used for pay-rate evaluations or merit raises but for the teachers' self-enrichment and improvement in instruction. It is not likely that a faculty improvement program that has been successful on one campus can be lifted intact and used by another institution, but the same principles could be used.

4. Church-related colleges and universities may be able to respond to student needs for changes in the educational process more rapidly than their state-supported counterparts.
The church-supported school is governed by a board of trustees that is the policy-making body, and their decisions are binding.

5. Church-related colleges and universities may be able to deal with the shift in student population in the 1980s more easily than other types of institutions which have long-term investments in dormitories, athletic programs, and teaching faculties, that are geared exclusively to a younger or different age group. The institutions that recognize this demographic fact will have a better chance to succeed. Faculties in these universities will need instruction and guidance in technologies which may not now be familiar; computer technology, artificial intelligence, and information management systems are becoming more important to the innovative faculty member.

6. Church-related colleges and universities may be able to fill the value void that is almost necessarily present in state-supported institutions. With a renewed emphasis on the humanities, church-related institutions can provide disciplined study, research, and the development of critical thinking within a context of relevance and purpose. These schools can distinguish themselves by the ways in which they respond to the needs of faculty and students alike.
Recommendations for Further Study

The following recommendations for future research appear to be warranted.

1. Further studies should be conducted to evaluate the differences in teacher effectiveness in church-supported colleges and universities and state-supported colleges and universities.

2. Further studies should be conducted in relation to effective teaching in selected fields of instruction; it is possible that effective teachers in one discipline may differ significantly from effective teachers in another discipline.

3. Further effectiveness studies should be conducted as new instruments of evaluation are designed and implemented. Computer technology may provide opportunities for more frequent feedback for teachers and others who are interested in improvement in instruction.

4. Further studies should be conducted that evaluate qualities of the affective domain of the college teacher. Attitudes, value systems, and motivation for teaching may need to be explored. Teaching competency may be related to personality and character as well as technique and skill.

5. Further studies should be conducted to see if differences in effectiveness are noted after workshops, seminars, and training sessions have been conducted to encourage improvement in instruction.
6. Further studies should be conducted in relation to the formulation of assessment instruments that could be used by institutions in the selection of teaching personnel. Criterion other than years of teaching, grade-point average, and number of publications may be needed in order to evaluate those who are applying for teaching jobs. The potentially effective teacher may be discovered this way.

7. Further studies are needed to determine if some alternate instructional strategies could be implemented in college classes that are dominated by students who have certain personality characteristics. Since instruments are available that can identify personality characteristics of teachers and students, different sections of classes could be organized on the basis of personality similarities and differences.

8. Further studies are needed to determine if faculty responsibilities in non-teaching areas have any impact on effectiveness in the classroom. Involvement in research, commitment to service organizations of the university, and advisement tasks may have some influence on effectiveness of teaching.

9. Further studies are needed to determine if small, liberal arts church-related universities can survive the economic, political and educational difficulties of the 1980s.
Effective instruction and the personal qualities of the instructors may become more important in the future.

10. Further studies are needed to evaluate the results of an evident renaissance of studies in the humanities and arts. Curricula and instruction may need to be redesigned to invite, encourage, and support students who seek additional meaning in their lives. Church-related institutions may help meet that need.

11. If further studies of this type are done that use the same instruments, sample size should be increased on additional five-to-ten subjects.
APPENDIX A

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Directions: Be sure to use pencils and mark clearly. Copy the number from the blackboard into the boxes on the answer sheet labeled IDENTIFICATION NUMBER. Start at the top with the first digit, place the next digit in the next lower box. Fill in the corresponding spaces.

Mark your ratings in the appropriately numbered answer positions. Note that succeeding items run across the page. These ratings are an important source of information to your instructor, so be careful in your responses.

Item 1) How would you rate this instructor as a teacher? Is he competent and clear, and does he hold your attention?
1) "A" among the best you have ever had
2) "B" better than average
3) "C" average
4) "D" not as good as most
5) "F" among the worst you have ever had

Item 2) Is this instructor's presentation organized enough to allow you to understand the course materials?
1) "A" 2) "B" 3) "C" 4) "D" 5) "F"

Item 3) Does this instructor present the subject matter in an interesting way, with enough examples, without unnecessarily dwelling on the obvious, to stimulate thinking?
1) "A" 2) "B" 3) "C" 4) "D" 5) "F"

Item 4) Is this instructor sensitive to and respectful of the students, and do they feel free to question and to go to him in times of difficulty with this class?
1) "A" 2) "B" 3) "C" 4) "D" 5) "F"

Item 5) Rate the clarity of this instructor's objectives for this course, and the extent to which he accomplishes them.
1) "A" 2) "B" 3) "C" 4) "D" 5) "F"
Item 6) Compared to other instructors you have had in college, how does this instructor rate overall?
   1) "A"  2) "B"  3) "C"  4) "D"  5) "F"

ANSWER THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS ONLY IF YOU HAVE TAKEN AT LEAST ONE OF THIS INSTRUCTOR'S TESTS:

Item 7) How well do this instructor's tests appear to cover the course material?
   1) "A"  2) "B"  3) "C"  4) "D"  5) "F"

Item 8) How well do his tests help you in learning the subject matter of this course?
   1) "A"  2) "B"  3) "C"  4) "D"  5) "F"
APPENDIX B
APPENDIX B

MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR

Form F

READ THESE DIRECTIONS FIRST:

1. This is a test to show which sides of your personality you have developed the most.

2. The answer you choose to any question is neither “right” nor “wrong.” It simply helps to point out what type of person you are, and therefore where your special strengths lie and what sort of work you will like to do.

3. For each question, choose the answer which comes closest to how you usually feel or act. Mark your choice on the separate answer sheet, as shown here.

Sample Question

167. Are your interests
(A) few and lasting
(B) varied

Sample Answer Sheet

167. A B

If your interests are varied, you would mark answer “B” as it is marked on the sample answer sheet. If they are few and lasting you would mark “A.”

4. If you find a question where you cannot choose, don’t mark both answers. Just skip the question and go on.

NOW TAKE YOUR ANSWER SHEET

5. Fill in all facts called for at the top of the answer sheet.

THEN START WITH QUESTION 1 AND WORK STRAIGHT THROUGH TO THE END OF THE TEST WITHOUT STOPPING
1. Does following a schedule
   (A) appeal to you
   (B) cramp you

2. Do you usually get on better with
   (A) imaginative people
   (B) realistic people

3. If strangers are staring at you in a crowd, do you
   (A) often become aware of it
   (B) seldom notice it

4. Are you more careful about
   (A) people's feelings
   (B) their rights

5. Are you
   (A) inclined to enjoy deciding things
   (B) just as glad to have circumstances decide a matter for you

6. As a guest, do you more enjoy
   (A) joining in the talk of the group
   (B) talking separately with people you know well

7. When you have more knowledge or skill in something than the people around you, is it more satisfying
   (A) to guard your superior knowledge
   (B) to share it with those who want to learn

8. When you have done all you can to remedy a troublesome situation, are you
   (A) able to stop worrying about it
   (B) still more or less haunted by it

9. If you were asked on a Saturday morning what you were going to do that day, would you
   (A) be able to tell pre 'y well
   (B) list twice as many things to do as any day can hold
   (C) have to wait and see

10. Do you think on the whole that
    (A) children have the best of it
    (B) life is more interesting for grown-ups

11. In doing something which many other people do, does it appeal more to you
    (A) to do it in the accepted way
    (B) to invent a way of your own

12. When you were small, did you
    (A) feel sure of your parents' love and devotion to you
    (B) feel that they admired and approved of some other child more than they did of you

13. Do you
    (A) rather prefer to do things at the last minute
    (B) find it hard on the nerves
14. If a breakdown or mix-up halted a job on which you and a lot of others were working, would your impulse be
   (A) to enjoy the breathing spell
   (B) to look for some part of the work where you could still make progress
   (C) to join the "trouble-shooters" who were wrestling with the difficulty

15. Do you
   (A) show your feelings freely as you go along
   (B) keep them to yourself

16. When you have decided upon a course of action, do you
   (A) reconsider it if unforeseen disadvantages are pointed out to you
   (B) usually put it through to a finish, however it may inconvenience yourself and others

17. In reading for pleasure, do you
   (A) enjoy odd or original ways of saying things
   (B) wish writers would say exactly what they mean

18. In any of the ordinary emergencies of life (not matters of life or death), do you prefer
   (A) to take orders and be helpful
   (B) to give orders and be responsible

19. At parties, do you
   (A) sometimes get bored
   (B) always have fun

20. Is it harder for you to adapt to
   (A) routine
   (B) constant change

21. Would you be more willing to take on a heavy load of extra work for the sake of
   (A) additional comforts and luxuries
   (B) the chance of becoming famous through your work

22. Are the things you plan or undertake
   (A) almost always things you can finish
   (B) frequently things that prove too difficult to carry through

23. Are you more attracted
   (A) to a person with a quick and brilliant mind
   (B) to a practical person with a lot of horse sense

24. Do you find people in general
   (A) slow to appreciate and accept ideas not their own
   (B) reasonably open-minded

25. When you have to meet strangers, do you find it
   (A) pleasant, or at least easy
   (B) something that takes a good deal of effort

26. Are you inclined
   (A) to value sentiment above logic
   (B) to value logic above sentiment

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
27. Do you like
   (A) to arrange your dates and parties some distance ahead
   (B) to be free to do whatever looks like fun at the time

28. In making plans which concern other people, do you prefer
   (A) to take them into your confidence
   (B) to keep them in the dark till the last possible moment

29. Which of these two is the higher compliment
   (A) he is a person of real feeling
   (B) he is consistently reasonable

30. When you have to make up your mind about something, do you like to
   (A) do it right away
   (B) postpone the decision as long as you reasonably can

31. When you run into an unexpected difficulty in something you are doing, do you feel it to be
   (A) a piece of bad luck
   (B) a nuisance
   (C) all in the day's work

32. Do you almost always
   (A) enjoy the present moment and make the most of it
   (B) feel that something just ahead is more important

33. Are you
   (A) easy to get to know
   (B) hard to get to know

34. With most of the people you know, do you
   (A) feel that they mean what they say
   (B) feel you must watch for a hidden meaning

35. When you start a big project that is due in a week, do you
   (A) take time to list the separate things to be done and the order of doing them
   (B) plunge in

36. In solving a personal problem, do you
   (A) feel more confident about it if you have asked other people's advice
   (B) feel that nobody else is in as good a position to judge as you are

37. Do you admire more the person who is
   (A) conventional enough never to make himself conspicuous
   (B) too original and individual to care whether he is conspicuous or not

38. Which mistake would be more natural for you
   (A) to drift from one thing to another all your life
   (B) to stay in a rut that didn't suit you

39. When you run across people who are mistaken in their beliefs, do you feel that
   (A) it is your duty to set them right
   (B) it is their privilege to be wrong
40. When an attractive chance for leadership comes to you, do you
(A) accept it if it is something you can really swing
(B) sometimes let it slip because you are too modest about your own abilities
(C) or doesn’t leadership ever attract you

41. In your crowd, are you
(A) one of the last to hear what is going on
(B) full of news about everybody

42. Are you at your best
(A) when dealing with the unexpected
(B) when following a carefully worked-out plan

43. Does the importance of doing well on a test make it generally
(A) easier for you to concentrate and do your best
(B) harder for you to concentrate and do yourself justice

44. In your free hours, do you
(A) very much enjoy stopping somewhere for refreshments
(B) usually want to use the time and money another way

46. Do most of the people you know
(A) take their fair share of praise and blame
(B) grab all the credit they can but shift any blame on to someone else

47. When you are in an embarrassing spot, do you usually
(A) change the subject
(B) turn it into a joke
(C) days later, think of what you should have said

48. Are such emotional “ups and downs” as you may feel
(A) very marked
(B) rather moderate

49. Do you think that having a daily routine is
(A) a comfortable way of getting things done
(B) painful even when necessary

50. Are you naturally
(A) a “good mixer”
(B) rather quiet and reserved in company

51. In your early childhood (at six or eight), did you
(A) feel your parents were very wise people who should be obeyed
(B) find their authority irksome and escape it when possible

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
52. When you have a suggestion that ought to be made at a meeting, do you
   (A) stand up and make it as a matter of course
   (B) hesitate to do so

53. Do you get more annoyed at
   (A) fancy theories
   (B) people who don't like theories

54. When helping in a group undertaking, are you more often struck by
   (A) the inspiring quality of shoulder to shoulder cooperation
   (B) the annoying inefficiency of loosely organized group work
   (C) or don't you get involved in group undertakings

55. When you go somewhere for the day, would you rather
   (A) plan what you will do and when
   (B) just go

56. Are the things you worry about
   (A) often really not worth it
   (B) always more or less serious

57. In making an important decision on a given set of facts, do you
   (A) find you can trust your feeling judgments
   (B) need to set feeling aside and rely on analysis and cold logic

58. In the matter of friends, do you tend to seek
   (A) deep friendship with a very few people
   (B) broad friendship with many different people

59. Do you think your friends
   (A) feel you are open to suggestions
   (B) know better than to try to talk you out of anything you've decided to do

60. Does the idea of making a list of what you should get done over a week-end
   (A) appeal to you
   (B) leave you cold
   (C) positively depress you

61. In traveling, would you rather go
   (A) with a companion who had made the trip before and "knew the ropes"
   (B) alone or with someone greener at it than yourself

62. Which of these two reasons for doing a thing sounds more attractive to you
   (A) this is an opportunity that may lead to bigger things
   (B) this is an experience that you are sure to enjoy

63. In your personal beliefs, do you
   (A) cherish faith in things which cannot be proved
   (B) believe only those things which can be proved
64. Would you rather
   (A) support the established methods of doing good
   (B) analyze what is still wrong and attack unsolved problems

65. Has it been your experience that you
   (A) frequently fall in love with a notion or project which turns out to be a disappointment—so that you “go up like a rocket and come down like the stick”
   (B) use enough judgment on your enthusiasms so that they do not let you down

66. Would you judge yourself to be
   (A) more enthusiastic than the average person
   (B) less excitable than the average person

67. If you divided all the people you know into those you like, those you dislike, and those toward whom you feel indifferent, would there be more of
   (A) those you like
   (B) those you dislike

68. In your daily work, do you (for this item only, if two are true mark both)
   (A) rather enjoy an emergency that makes you work against time
   (B) hate to work under pressure
   (C) usually plan your work so you won’t need to

69. Are you more likely to speak up in
   (A) praise
   (B) blame

70. Is it higher praise to call someone
   (A) a man of vision
   (B) a man of common sense

71. When playing cards, do you enjoy most
   (A) the sociability
   (B) the excitement of winning
   (C) the problem of getting the most out of each hand
   (D) the risk of playing for stakes
   (E) or don’t you enjoy playing cards

GO ON TO PART II
### Sample Question

167. Are your interests
(A) few and lasting
(B) varied

### Sample Answer Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>167.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If your interests are varied, you would mark answer box "B" as it is marked on the sample above. If they are few and lasting you would mark "A."

### WHICH WORD IN EACH PAIR APPEALS TO YOU MORE?

<p>| 72. (A) firm-minded | warm-hearted (B) | 87. (A) reserved | talkative (B) |
| 73. (A) imaginative | matter-of-fact (B) | 88. (A) statement | concept (B) |
| 74. (A) systematic | spontaneous (B) | 89. (A) soft | hard (B) |
| 75. (A) congenial | effective (B) | 90. (A) production | design (B) |
| 76. (A) theory | certainty (B) | 91. (A) forgive | tolerate (B) |
| 77. (A) party | theater (B) | 92. (A) hearty | quiet (B) |
| 78. (A) build | invent (B) | 93. (A) who | what (B) |
| 79. (A) analyze | sympathize (B) | 94. (A) impulse | decision (B) |
| 80. (A) popular | intimate (B) | 95. (A) speak | write (B) |
| 81. (A) benefits | blessings (B) | 96. (A) affection | tenderness (B) |
| 82. (A) casual | correct (B) | 97. (A) punctual | leisurely (B) |
| 83. (A) active | intellectual (B) | 98. (A) sensible | fascinating (B) |
| 84. (A) uncritical | critical (B) | 99. (A) changing | permanent (B) |
| 85. (A) scheduled | unplanned (B) | 100. (A) determined | devoted (B) |
| 86. (A) convincing | touching (B) | 101. (A) system | zest (B) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th></th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th></th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th></th>
<th>(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>facts</td>
<td>ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>quick</td>
<td>careful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>compassion</td>
<td>foresight</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>thinking</td>
<td>feeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>abstract</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>theory</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>justice</td>
<td>mercy</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>sociable</td>
<td>detached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>calm</td>
<td>lively</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>sign</td>
<td>symbol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>create</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>systematic</td>
<td>casual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>wary</td>
<td>trustful</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>literal</td>
<td>figurative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>orderly</td>
<td>easy-going</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>peacemaker</td>
<td>judge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>question</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>accept</td>
<td>alter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>gentle</td>
<td>firm</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>discuss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>foundation</td>
<td>spire</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>executive</td>
<td>scholar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO ON TO PART III
PART III

ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS USING THE DIRECTIONS FOR PART I, ON THE FRONT COVER

124. Do you find the more routine parts of your day
   (A) restful
   (B) boring

125. If you think you are not getting a square deal in a club or team to which you belong, is it better
   (A) to shut up and take it
   (B) to use the threat of resigning if necessary to get your rights

126. Can you
   (A) talk easily to almost anyone for as long as you have to
   (B) find a lot to say only to certain people or under certain conditions

127. When strangers notice you, does it
   (A) make you uncomfortable
   (B) not bother you at all

128. If you were a teacher, would you rather teach
   (A) fact courses
   (B) courses involving theory

129. In your crowd, are you usually
   (A) one of the first to try a new thing
   (B) one of the last to fall into line

130. In solving a difficult personal problem, do you
   (A) tend to do more worrying than is useful in reaching a decision
   (B) feel no more anxiety than the situation requires

131. If people seem to slight you, do you
   (A) tell yourself they didn't mean anything by it
   (B) distrust their good will and stay on guard with them thereafter

132. When there is a special job to be done, do you like
   (A) to organize it carefully before you start
   (B) to find out what is necessary as you go along

133. Do you think it is a worse fault
   (A) to show too much warmth
   (B) not to have warmth enough

134. At a party, do you like
   (A) to help get things going
   (B) to let the others have fun in their own way

135. When a new opportunity comes up, do you
   (A) decide about it fairly quickly
   (B) sometimes miss out through taking too long to make up your mind

136. In managing your life, do you tend
   (A) to undertake too much and get into a tight spot
   (B) to hold yourself down to what you can comfortably swing
137. When you find yourself definitely in the wrong, would you rather
(A) admit you are wrong
(B) not admit it, though everyone knows it
(C) or don't you ever find yourself in the wrong

138. Can the new people you meet tell what you are interested in
(A) right away
(B) only after they really get to know you

139. In your home life, when you come to the end of some undertaking, are you
(A) clear as to what comes next and ready to tackle it
(B) glad to relax until the next inspiration hits you

140. Do you think it more important to be able
(A) to see the possibilities in a situation
(B) to adjust to the facts as they are

141. Would you say that the people you know personally owe their successes more to
(A) ability and hard work
(B) luck
(C) bluff, pull, and shoving themselves ahead of others

142. In getting a job done, do you depend on
(A) starting early, so as to finish with time to spare
(B) the extra speed you develop at the last minute

143. After associating with superstitious people, have you
(A) found yourself slightly affected by their superstitions
(B) remained entirely unaffected

144. When you don't agree with what has just been said, do you usually
(A) let it go
(B) put up an argument

145. Would you rather be considered
(A) a practical person
(B) an ingenious person

146. Out of all the good resolutions you may have made, are there
(A) some you have kept to this day
(B) none that have really lasted

147. Would you rather work under someone who is
(A) always kind
(B) always fair

148. In a large group, do you more often
(A) introduce others
(B) get introduced

149. Would you rather have as a friend someone who
(A) is always coming up with new ideas
(B) has both feet on the ground

150. When you have to do business with strangers, do you feel
(A) confident and at ease
(B) a little fussed or afraid that they won't want to bother with you

151. When it is settled well in advance that you will do a certain thing at a certain time, do you find it
(A) nice to be able to plan accordingly
(B) a little unpleasant to be tied down

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
152. Do you feel that sarcasm
(A) should never be used where it can hurt people's feelings
(B) is too effective a form of speech to be discarded for such a reason

153. When you think of some little thing you should do or buy, do you
(A) often forget it until much later
(B) usually get it down on paper before it escapes you
(C) always carry through on it without reminders

154. Do you more often let
(A) your heart rule your head
(B) your head rule your heart

155. In listening to a new idea, are you more anxious to
(A) find out all about it
(B) judge whether it is right or wrong

156. Are you oppressed by
(A) many different worries
(B) comparatively few

157. When you don't approve of the way a friend is acting, do you
(A) wait and see what happens
(B) do or say something about it

158. Do you think it is a worse fault to be
(A) unsympathetic
(B) unreasonable

159. When a new situation comes up which conflicts with your plans, do you try first
(A) to change your plans
(B) to change the situation

160. Do you think the people close to you know how you feel
(A) about most things
(B) only when you have had some special reason to tell them

161. When you have a serious choice to make, do you
(A) almost always come to a clear-cut decision
(B) sometimes find it so hard to decide that you do not whole-heartedly follow up either choice

162. On most matters, do you
(A) have a pretty definite opinion
(B) like to keep an open mind

163. As you get to know a person better, do you more often find
(A) that he lets you down or disappoints you in some way
(B) that, taken all in all, he improves upon acquaintance

164. When the truth would not be polite, are you more likely to tell
(A) a polite lie
(B) the impolite truth

165. In your scheme of living, do you prefer to be
(A) original
(B) conventional

166. Would you have liked to argue the meaning of
(A) a lot of these questions
(B) only a few

END OF TEST
APPENDIX C
Letter of Explanation

Hardin-Simmons University Faculty

Dear Faculty Member,

I am engaged in a doctoral dissertation project and am asking for your cooperation. The data assimilated will be used for research purposes only and will not be viewed by your administration. It will not be used in evaluation for merit raises, pay increases, or promotions.

The project will include an instructor rating form filled out by students, and each student will rate each instructor only one time. Each faculty member who participates in the study will be asked to fill out a personality inventory at his convenience. The rating form will be administered sometime prior to the time for final exams, and the personality inventory will be administered at the instructor's time of convenience.

The title of the study is "Personality Characteristics of Most Effective and Least Effective College Teachers in Church-Related Universities as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator." The three church-related universities in Abilene will comprise the student raters and faculty personnel.

Thank you for considering this project. Without your cooperation it will not be possible to complete this program. Each person who participates will be given an abstract of the dissertation for his personal files. Please return the enclosed form to the office of Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Montie Campbell
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Howard Payne University
Brownwood, Texas 76801
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APPENDIX D

Letter of Explanation

McMurry College

Dear Faculty Member,

I am engaged in a doctoral dissertation project and am asking for your cooperation. The data assimilated will be used for research purposes only and will not be viewed by your administration. It will not be used in evaluation for merit raises, pay increases, or promotions.

The project will include an instructor rating form filled out by students, and each student will rate each instructor only one time. Each faculty member who participates in the study will be asked to fill out a personality inventory at his convenience. The rating form will be administered sometime prior to the time for final exams, and the personality inventory will be administered at the instructor's time of convenience.

The title of the study is "Personality Characteristics of Most Effective and Least Effective College Teachers in Church-Related Universities as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator." The three church-related universities in Abilene will comprise the student raters and faculty personnel.

Thank you for considering this project. Without your cooperation it will not be possible to complete this program. Each person who participates will be given an abstract of the dissertation for his personal files. Please return the enclosed form to the office of Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Montie Campbell
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Howard Payne University
Brownwood, Texas 76801
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APPENDIX E

Instruction Form

The instructor is asked to write the identification number on the black board. A student should be appointed to collect the finished answered sheets and return them to the academic dean's office.

1. Give evaluation packet to a student in your class.

2. Leave your class until all forms have been filled out.

3. A student should hand out the evaluation sheets and an answer sheet to each student.

4. A student should read the directions to the class

5. Use a pencil only.

6. A student should return the evaluation forms and answer sheets to the academic dean's office.
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