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The problem of this study was the identification of selected characteristics of Minnie Stevens Piper Professors. Purposes of the study were: (a) to determine characteristics of Minnie Stevens Piper Professors, and (b) to determine whether these professors possess characteristics which typify outstanding college teachers as described by the Selection Research, Incorporated College Teacher Perceiver interview.

Forty subjects, 20 from community colleges and 20 from senior colleges, were randomly selected from the 1978 through 1988 lists of Piper Professors. Fifteen community college and 11 senior college professors agreed to participate by being interviewed with the College Teacher Perceiver. This interview identified 13 characteristics, or themes, of excellent college teachers.

Major findings were:

1. The average total theme score for all Piper Professors interviewed was below the midpoint score for the total College Teacher Perceiver (CTP) interview. This fell within the conditionally recommended area for hiring criteria. Scores indicated the total group rated highest in Intrapersonal themes, those that typically focus on the teachers' personal philosophy and
feelings about education. The next highest area included themes that focus on the teachers' classroom activities and teaching skills, or Extrapersonal. Lowest, by far, were themes that focus on the teachers' relating skills, Interpersonal.

2. Piper Professors from community colleges had a mean total score which was below the midpoint score of the total CTP. This placed the community college teachers into the conditionally recommended area. Highest individual theme scores were Mission, Achiever and Input Drive (tied for first), with Listening lowest.

3. The senior college group contained the professor with the highest total score. The total mean theme score was below the midpoint score. This indicated a conditionally recommended hiring situation. Highest ranking theme was Achiever, with Listening scoring lowest.

4. Grouping professors into academic disciplines showed that English teachers had the highest total mean theme score. The rank order of professors in the other subject areas was: Occupational; Foreign Language, Education, and Performing Arts (tied); Social Science; Visual Arts; and Science.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Most college students can remember the teachers they considered to be outstanding. Although they may not be able to identify exactly why the teachers were outstanding, they realize that there was something that made some teachers stand out from the crowd. Roueche and Baker (1987) affirm "that there is a core of characteristics which are central to excellent teaching . . . great teachers have certain definable characteristics, a combination of which makes up the 'right stuff'" (p. 145).

The Minnie Stevens Piper Foundation has been identifying excellent teachers at the college level since 1958. This San Antonio based foundation provides a certificate, cash honorarium of $2,500, and a 14 carat gold commemorative pin annually to 10 professors from colleges and universities throughout the State of Texas. These awards are made on the basis of outstanding academic, scientific and scholarly achievement and for dedication to the teaching profession. The institutions making nominations are requested to submit evidence of effectiveness in the classroom, personal contact with students, and an unusual dedication to teaching. Comparisons
are made between the nominee and other faculty members (a) as a teacher, (b) as a scholar, and (c) in contributions made to the achievement of purposes of the institution. Nominations are accepted on the basis of full-time equivalent student body enrollment of (a) 1 to 10,000 students -- one nomination, (b) 10,001 to 20,000 students -- two nominations, and (c) 20,001 and above -- three nominations. The dossiers of local nominees are forwarded to the Piper Foundation where 10 finalists are chosen by a selection committee.

The Minnie Stevens Piper foundation was incorporated in the State of Texas as a non-profit, charitable corporation in 1950. The purpose for which the foundation were formed were (a) to support charitable, scientific or educational undertakings by providing for, or contributing toward the education of financially limited but worthy students; (b) to assist young men and women residents of Texas, attending or wishing to attend colleges and universities throughout the State of Texas, to complete their education and obtain degrees; and (c) to contribute to community chests (now commonly called the United Way), and support other non-profit organizations or activities dedicated to the furtherance of the general welfare within the State of Texas. Randall Gordon Piper and his wife, Minnie Stevens Piper, were the principal donors. (Minnie Stevens Piper Foundation, 1985)

The Piper Foundation is classified as a private foundation through a Letter Ruling under Section 4945 of the Tax Reform Act of
1969. Administration and operation of the foundation programs take approximately two-thirds of each year's distributable income, which in 1986 was $1,110,000. (Minnie Stevens Piper Foundation, 1985)

In addition to the Piper Professors Program, the Minnie Stevens Piper foundation operates a Student Loan Program, Student Aid Library and Bexar County Scholarship Clearing House, Piper Scholars Program, Piper Fellows Program, and other grants within Texas, with special emphasis on projects in the field of higher education. (Minnie Stevens Piper Foundation, 1985)

Increased emphasis is currently being placed on the performance of students from institutions of higher education, both public and private, by funding sources. This increased level of accountability requires that institutions make judicious use of time and other resources in order to identify professorial candidates who have a high probability of success in the classroom. Additionally, staff development can be enhanced by the ability to build on the strengths of incumbents responsible for the intellectual progress of students. An instrument which identifies the probability of success of applicants for professorial positions and aids in the identification of characteristics attributed to outstanding professors could serve as a valuable tool for those responsible for hiring and staff development.

The Selection Research, Incorporated (SRI) College Teacher Perceiver interview was designed to predict the level of an interviewee's success. The development of this instrument began
during the early 1950s on the campus at the University of Nebraska. A group of graduate students and their advisor, Donald O. Clifton, shared a common interest in the study of the thought patterns of successful people. Their interest in positive, development behaviors was in contrast to the traditional approach of psychologists which was to study failure in order to determine how individuals could be helped. “Talent” became a topic of continual discussion and study for this group. (Selection Research, Inc., 1985a)

Over a period of time, the group studied talented counselors who were successful at stimulating student achievement, talented teachers who facilitated positive self-concepts in children, talented nurses who cared for patients so that they recovered sooner, talented student leaders who measurably improved the human environment of a campus or dormitory, and salespeople who built trust and helped persons to develop their potential. Much of the research and development activities of this group during the 1950s and 1960s was based on work done at the Nebraska Human Resources Research Foundation, at the University of Nebraska, which had been founded by William E. Hall and Clifton.

After the group’s selection process improved the retention of Naval ROTC students from 19% to 78%, Clifford M. Hardin, Chancellor of the University of Nebraska, recommended, in 1960, that the investigators turn their attention to the study of success in the insurance industry. This well-established industry afforded a fertile field for the study of success with easy-to-identify
successful agents who sold large amounts of insurance and kept it on the books, and general agents and managers whose records showed how well they developed additional agents. Eight years of research in the insurance industry, which involved intensive research of more than 1,500 salespeople and managers from 200 agencies and companies substantiated what earlier studies had revealed; the success potential of an individual for managing or selling could be predicted with a high degree of accuracy. Thus, the associates began to form a new organizational structure, and in 1968, SRI became a Nebraska-based corporation.

At the core of the SRI approach is the study of the individual. In the early 1950s the structured, minimum-stress interview emerged as the most effective way to "hear" the thought patterns, or themes, of successful persons. The group's interview processes are now being used to identify talent in professional athletes, dentists, religious leaders, Boy Scouts of America leaders, students, and teachers at all academic levels. (Selection Research, Inc., 1985a)

Thus, there exists (a) a group of persons who have been determined to be outstanding college professors, and (b) the means to identify a set of characteristics attributed to outstanding professors. The conditions are present to achieve the objective of a descriptive study as described by Borg and Gall (1979): "to describe subjects or phenomena related to the educational situation" (p. 38).
In educational research there are two conditions which occurring together suggest and justify the descriptive survey: First, that there is an absence of information about a problem of educational significance, and, second, that the situations which could generate that information do exist and are accessible to the researcher. (Fox, 1969, p. 424)

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is the identification of selected characteristics of Minnie Stevens Piper Professors.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to (a) determine characteristics of Minnie Stevens Piper Professors, and (b) determine whether these professors possess characteristics which typify outstanding college teachers as described by the SRI College Teacher Perceiver Interview.

Research Questions

In order to attain the purpose of this study, the following questions were asked regarding characteristics of Minnie Stevens Piper Professors.
1. What themes are possessed by a group of Piper Professors selected from the years from 1978 through 1988?
2. What themes are possessed by subject Piper Professors from two-year colleges?
3. What themes are possessed by subject Piper Professors from senior colleges and universities?
4. What themes are commonly possessed by subject Piper Professors within similar subject disciplines?

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is three-fold. First, if characteristics of outstanding professors are clearly identified, they can serve as guideposts along the path of self-awareness and self-development. Second, these characteristics, and the means of their identification, can be utilized by those responsible for the hiring, retaining, and promoting processes to find individuals who excel in the classroom. Finally, formalized staff development processes can be instituted in order to help experienced college professors attain a higher level of competence in the classroom.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were developed by Selection Research, Incorporated (1984) to indicate the meaning of several key terms and are used frequently throughout this study.
Theme is "a pattern of thoughts, feelings and behavior that is consistent in arrangement and frequently occurs within an individual" (p. 1).

Mission "is what takes some individuals and groups out of society's mainstream in order to assure the quality and purpose of that mainstream. Mission is a deep underlying belief that students can grow and attain self-actualization. A college teacher with mission has a goal to make a significant contribution to other people" (p. 1).

"Achiever--The achiever theme indicates a person's desire to be independent and to receive credit for accomplishments" (p. 1). A college teacher with the achiever theme defines self by performance.

Empathy "is the capacity to sense the feelings and thoughts of another person. Practically, we say we put ourselves into the other person's place. Empathy is the phenomenon that provides the teacher feedback about the individual student" (p. 1).

Rapport drive "is evidenced by the teacher's ability to have an approving and mutually favorable relationship with each student. Such teachers like the students and expect them to reciprocate; rapport is seen by teachers as a favorable and necessary condition of learning" (p. 1).

Individualized Perception "means that a teacher spontaneously thinks about the talents, goals and needs of each student and makes every effort to personalize each student's program" (p. 1).
Listening "is evident when a person spontaneously listens to others with responsiveness and acceptance. Listening is viewed as beneficial to the speaker" (p. 1).

Investment--The investment theme is indicated by a teacher’s capacity to receive a satisfaction from each increment of student growth. This is in contrast to the person who must personally perform to achieve satisfaction" (p. 1).

Input drive "is evidenced by a teacher who is continuously searching for ideas, materials, and experiences to use in helping other people, especially students" (p. 1).

Activation "indicates that a teacher is capable of stimulating students to think, to respond, to feel, to learn" (p. 1).

Innovation "is indicated when a teacher tries new ideas and techniques. A certain amount of determination is observed in this theme because the ideas have to be implemented. At a higher level of innovation is creativity where a teacher has the capacity of putting information and experience together into new configurations" (p. 1).

Gestalt--The gestalt theme indicates the college teacher has a drive toward completeness, sees in patterns--is uneasy until work is finished. When gestalt is high, the teacher tends toward perfectionism" (p. 1).

Objectivity "is indicated when a teacher responds to the total situation, getting facts and understanding first as compared to making an impulsive reaction. Biases are minimized" (p. 1).
Focus "is indicated when a person has models and goals. A person's life is moving in a planned direction. A teacher has clarified goals and selects activities in terms of these goals" (p. 1).

Structured interview is described as a set of questions which are asked in the same way time after time and for which there are responses that are "listened for".

Organization of the Study

The following format is used in presenting this study: Chapter 1 presents the problem, the background, purposes, and significance of the study, and the definition of terms. Chapter 2 provides a review of relevant literature. The procedures followed for the collection of data are detailed in Chapter 3, and an analysis of the results is given in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 offers a summary of the findings, conclusions, and implications and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Possibly no facet of education has been discussed with greater frequency, with as much concern, or by more educators and laymen than teacher effectiveness. Attempts have been made to determine how to define it, to identify it, to observe and measure it, to evaluate it, and to detect and remove obstacles to its achievement. Researchers have analyzed teacher training and experience, traits and characteristics, behaviors, attitudes, values, abilities, interaction patterns, sex, weight, voice quality, and many other aspects. Teacher effectiveness has been evaluated by researchers, students, administrators, parents, master teachers, practice teachers, supervisors, and teachers themselves. (Hatcher, 1975, p.12)

Because of the extensive number of studies concerned with teacher effectiveness, this review of related literature is, by necessity, selective and is limited to teaching effectiveness at the post-secondary level. A review of the literature concerning teacher effectiveness revealed very little available data when judgments are made differentiating good teaching from poor or mediocre
performance. The overwhelming majority of studies on teacher effectiveness demonstrate that no definition of good teaching is acceptable to all, and that researchers and classroom practitioners fail to agree on what teaching effectiveness is. Most of the literature, whether research based or opinion, deals with what should be rather than what is related to effective teaching. Since it is impossible to either prescribe or proscribe that which cannot be described, this study is an attempt to describe, rather than prescribe or proscribe teaching effectiveness. An attempt was made to determine the characteristics, attitudes, and personality traits of outstanding college teachers by looking closely at Piper Professors, who represent perceived teaching excellence, and by identifying which of 13 themes are evident in their lives. This is a direct application of Don Clifton's "canary principle" (i.e., if a canary is being described, it is most helpful to look at canaries) (Selection Research, Inc., 1985a).

Research on Teacher Effectiveness in Higher Education

The literature describing teaching excellence is broadly grouped into two categories. The first category is a very large body of work that develops the philosophical and political underpinnings of teacher evaluation, clinical supervision, classroom observation--or whatever term the author chooses to name the activity--and proceeds to develop numerical scales of one form or another to

The second category describing research on teaching effectiveness is process-outcome, qualitative, or descriptive (Ellner & Barnes, 1983). Process-outcome studies compare the results students attain to the classroom activities of the teacher. Qualitative studies observe all activities within the classroom and attempt to define a process as the outcome of those activities. Descriptive studies gather data about the teaching process by recording behaviors or events as they occur (Roueche & Baker, 1987).

Ellner and Barnes (1983) report that more than two-thirds of male faculty members and four-fifths of female professors identified their primary professional interests as either "leaning toward" or "heavily in" teaching rather than research. Gaff and Wilson (1971) report that during the winter of 1968-69, the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley, CA sent 1,500 questionnaires to six diverse institutions across the country, 70% were returned. The data gathered show that many of the common assertions about college professors are not true of the majority of faculty members. When asked to indicate major sources of satisfaction in their lives, faculty members most frequently checked teaching. Most faculty expressed a desire to be advanced primarily on their teaching effectiveness. It was discovered that most faculty establish and maintain a variety of relationships with
students outside of class, and one out of 10 respondents said that teaching effectiveness should be an important criterion in pay and promotion decisions at their schools (pp. 39-49). Ladd and Lipset (1975) also found that faculty members in the United States, as a group, were more interested in teaching than research and scholarship. They found that for every one professor strongly devoted to research, there are nine equally devoted to teaching. (p. 14)

This appears to be a most unhappy situation because it is widely held that college teachers are trained and socialized in graduate research universities to be scholars and researchers, not teachers. That job is effectively done, so well done that when they find themselves in primarily teaching institutions without time or resources for research and without the prestige of their graduate institution, many wish they were someplace else (Lindquist, 1978, p. 17-18).

Lacey (1983) confesses that he came of teaching age in that older system when college administrators acted as though they believed participation in a graduate program automatically conferred pedagogical competence on researchers. The perception by faculty that academia's most tangible rewards and highest intellectual status were given for doing research helped to discourage a formal study of college teaching. Most college teachers do not have a well-thought-out notion of what
they actually do in a classroom. Most believe that the key to excellent teaching lies somewhere in the elusive nature of personality. Or they assume that good teaching is only a measure of popularity with students; those who can do it have been blessed by the gods and those who cannot should be thinking--after they get tenure--of transferring over to some better-paying administrative position" (p. 72).

Cahn (1978) laments the sad, but indisputable, fact that much of the teaching that goes on in colleges and universities is of very poor quality, and that this crisis results from a failure to recognize the crucial principle that intellectual competence and pedagogic competence are two very different qualities (p. ix). Aleamoni (1980) also supports the view that there is no correlation between scholarly productivity and effective teaching.

Students level many charges against college professors, but the central concern focuses on teaching: faculty neglect teaching in favor of research; they avoid contacts with students; and they resist changing traditional classroom practice. Baird (1973) illustrates conflicts in the teacher's role by examining their reflection in some frequently expressed criticisms of the university culture:

1. College teachers have no training for teaching and are not very much interested in teaching (as compared with research). Their hiring and promotion have little or nothing to do with the quality of their teaching or the opinions of their students.
2. Most courses are dull rather than exciting affairs in which the student, usually in large classes, "takes in and down" what the instructor says and gives it to him on examinations.

3. Interests and curiosities of individual students seem not to be the primary concern of the university, in part reflected in the small amount of contact between student and faculty member.

4. College life is unrelated to "real life" and is an inadequate preparation for it. In addition, universities are unresponsive to the needs of the surrounding community.

5. The university has been amazingly successful in resisting change that might represent a break, small or large, with its traditions and accustomed style of functioning.

6. Universities are hierarchically and elaborately organized within both the faculty and the administration, so that several consequences are frequent: change is slow and diluted, bureaucratic struggle is ever present and exhausting, and the "deviant" proposals and individuals tend to be screened out (p. 90).

Approaching these shortcomings of college teachers from a more positive point of view, Katz (1985) asserts that lack of individuation is the primary difficulty that stands in the way of learning. He believes that teachers are paralyzed into inaction by recognizing the individual differences in thinking style, affect,
motivation, background, and aspiration among students in a class required by individuation. Out-of-class contacts, however, can be helpful in promoting individuality in learning. In fact, Katz believes that establishing a climate of trust in which relationships beneficial to learning can flourish should be an overarching initial objective of any class (p. 14). He develops the prescription that teaching can make most students comfortable and thereby establish conditions that allow them to learn more effectively if teachers can share something about themselves that illuminates their values and styles and cuts through the stereotypes that students sometimes have of professors (p. 17).

Lacey (1983) argues that there are some basic, ingrown, attitudes about teaching that need to be addressed. They are:

Teaching is an innate talent, not something to be learned. It is more like walking, which just comes to us, than it is like reading and writing, which we learn by drill and practice.

Teaching is content-less, so what is taught about teaching is not true subject matter. At worse, it is a lot of gimmicks obscured by pretentious jargon.

Teaching is simply a matter of knowing a field of study well. The more you know about the subject, the better you will teach. Teaching cannot be separated from scholarship because, in essence, it is only your knowledge of an area conveyed to apprentices in the field instead of your peers.
Teaching is personal brilliance, usually in the form of brilliant monologue.

Bad teaching cannot hurt good students.

Teaching is the price we pay for doing our own work--research.

Research is where the deepest stimulation and greatest academic rewards are. (p. 97-98)

A view contrary to Lacey's is outlined by Dressel and Marcus in the forward (p. xii-xv) to their 1982 publication. They are in strong disagreement with those who regard the good teacher as one who knows students well and sees close interaction with them as an opportunity to direct and to enhance their personal development. They believe the only purpose of instruction is to enable students to learn, and the individual who engages in teaching without stimulating others to learn cannot be considered an effective member of the teaching profession. They also do not believe, as many professors argue, that it is essential for an undergraduate college teacher to be involved in frontier research devoted to expanding the discipline.

Dressel and Marcus forthrightly state that college or university teachers should not assume that they are members of an elite group that society is obligated to support in semi-luxury while they do as they wish. Dressel and Marcus feel that teaching is a social service occupation, and that the administrators who manage a social service, whether designated as a service bureau or as a
college or university, have an obligation to account to society for the expenditure of the funds provided.

In their view, the obligations of a professor to a student neither require nor justify intimate and dominating relationships, but anyone who presumes to be a teacher has an obligation to become familiar with the students' backgrounds and with their hopes and aspirations. Every college or university teacher should be concerned with knowing the interrelationships in objectives, methods, concepts, and structures between his or her discipline and other disciplines.

Dressel and Marcus' awareness of human frailty makes it impossible for them to assume that a professor should have complete autonomy in the development of courses, the means and processes by which they are offered, or the grading of students who take them. They also express doubt about recurrent enthusiasm for novel gimmicks or gadgets to promote learning.

Finally, they argue that the provision of a learning environment and a set of principles must be buttressed by a system of rewards so distributed as to make clear to everyone that an institution desires, supports, and rewards good teaching.

Gaff and Wilson (1971) support this argument by reporting that the main conclusion of a study conducted for the Project to Improve College Teaching is that few colleges and universities maintain a climate that faculty view as sufficiently supportive of teaching. If faculty are to devote a considerable portion of their
time to students and derive personal satisfactions from teaching, there must be a visible structure of rewards for such efforts. This means that, for most institutions, a merit advancement procedure must be employed to allow faculty members to get ahead by developing excellence in teaching (p. 43).

To further support the argument that professors need institutional support in order to improve teaching effectiveness, Tuckman (1976) stresses that the knowledge that a skill is favored may be sufficient to induce a change in the behavior of faculty members, even if the actual dollar magnitudes involved are not known. The skills to which he refers are the traditional requirements of the college faculty—research, publishing, teaching, and service. Frequent changes in the reward system may make it difficult for faculty to allocate their time in a rational manner. As a result, they may choose to acquire the skills that bring the most satisfaction irrespective of their monetary rewards, and that skill might not be teaching. As the monetary differential between the skills increases, the incentive to adjust one's allocation of time to obtain a higher salary also increases. At some point, this may induce a change in faculty behavior. Whether this point is reached at a low return or a high one is a matter of empirical verification.

In a speech to the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Bulcock (1984) stated that the summative function of teaching effectiveness calls for an assessment of teaching competence on the basis of which judgments may be made on matters pertaining to
promotion, tenure, merit salary increments, and even dismissal. The formative function, on the other hand, calls for the improvement of teaching through the identification of one's teaching strengths and weaknesses. In this approach, as opposed to the summative approach, care is taken to avoid ranking the teacher or making judgments about the teacher's teaching ability. Bulcock's conclusions are that first, teachers can significantly improve their effectiveness if they are given constructive feedback and the opportunity to develop a teaching style which is congruent with their personality characteristics. Second, formative theory promotes a family of models because different teachers adopt different teaching styles. Third, the formative model is a dynamic rather than a static one. But because of this there are several technical difficulties which have to be coped with if formative theory is to be adequately tested.

The proposition of a dynamic formative model of teaching effectiveness is promoted by Dressel and Marcus's (1982) statement that, "the essence of good teaching is to adapt it to the particular context in which it is provided in such manner as to promote the student's inevitable search for meaning" (p. xvi). Morris (1970) presaged the formative theory when he concluded that teachers and students alike want to locate and make use of the conditions that determine how much and how well subject matter is learned.
Continuing along the same line of thought, Eble (1972) believes a lot is known about effective and ineffective teaching. This knowledge is certainly on the intuitive level as he states: certainly the hundreds of thousands of teachers who appear before students every day have some sense of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of what they are doing. The individual teacher knows, in the pragmatic sense, that this direction is better than another, this approach has worked in the past and may work today, that these acts and attitudes on his part seem to invite the student in and incline him, at the least, toward learning. It is Socratic wisdom that the mark of the knowing teacher is that he knows very little. Of the teaching process itself, he may only know that he must be constantly ready to drop old strategies and adopt new ones. But this knowing is part of the essential wisdom of any man or woman on the way to becoming educated: that few things are certain, that time and events require a continuing effort to recast what is known and to seek new ways of knowing as well as new knowledge itself" (p. 37).

Baird (1973) also believes that teachers vary in their personal characteristics and their approaches to teaching. Individual teachers change their behaviors from subject to subject, class to class, and moment to moment (p. 7).

Two other interesting models appearing in the literature of teaching effectiveness are those of teacher as (a) artist and
(b) craftsman. "Because college professors have been viewed as very independent people, their behavior in the classroom has remained, for the most part, idiosyncratic and has been considered an artistic activity" (Ellner & Barnes, 1983, p. xiii). Kelley and Wilbur (1970) maintain that the best, most inspired teaching at any educational level is an art. Knowledge of subject matter, of media and techniques is not enough. Art uses this knowledge as a means of creative communication, the creativity being the unique addition of the artist. The manner in which the artist uses the variety of materials and techniques affect the behavior of the audience and establish the personal art form or style. Imagination and personality combine with the methods of teaching to determine teaching effectiveness. Kelley and Wilbur (1970) list the following commonly held characteristics of "artistic" teachers who combine quality with popularity in their work:

1. They were keenly and obviously interested in and enthusiastic about their subject matter.

2. They were thoroughly prepared. Most of them worked from notes rather than from manuscript, a practice that indicated their mastery of subject matter.

3. They were organized. Material was presented in segments that moved forward to an integrated whole.

4. They communicated. That is they spoke clearly, forcefully, and logically; listeners could hear and follow the thread of the material.
5. They changed pace. They provided variety in communication to hold attention and to avoid restlessness and boredom.

6. They presented live, vital facts that stimulated and motivated the students.

7. They emphasized instruction rather than persuasion. Students were free to decide for themselves in a controversy.

8. They took a personal interest in each student.

9. They had exciting and interesting personalities.

10. They had character that could be admired by students (pp. 136-137).

Teaching is described by Pullias and Lockhart (1963) as being intimately related to personality. Crucial to all effective teaching is the personality of the teacher, for in the learning-teaching situation, in an important sense, what is to be learned is mediated through the teacher's personality. Pullias and Lockhart state that if one tries to understand the power of the world's greatest teachers, one is steadily led toward the conclusion that life and meaning were given to their teaching by a special quality of the personalities. These personalities are greatly varied, but a common thread seems to run through all examples of powerful teaching: that to be considered or learned, mediated through the teacher, becomes alive and meaningful in a special way and reaches the learner as vital, direct experience. This quality was manifested by Socrates, Hillel, Abelard, Mark Hopkins, William James, William Rainey Harper,
Woodrow Wilson, Frederick Jackson Turner, Louis Agassiz, Anne Sullivan Macy, Alfred North Whitehead, Mahatma Gandhi, Howard Wellington Smith, and a multitude of other less celebrated, but perhaps equally great teachers. The essence of the teaching art lies in the character of the teacher (p. 98).

Kelley and Wilbur (1970) also point out the impact of personality and character on the "art" of teaching. They reflect that creative teaching brings together style and imagination in a process not unlike painting or sculpturing. They believe that teaching styles vary widely, from the benevolent to tyrannical, organized to chaotic, dramatic to austere. In an art where knowledge decays and expands, and students provide a constantly changing media, there can be no end point, no complete mastery. It is ever-changing, ever-improving, ever-reflecting the uniqueness of the personality. (p. 137)

Eble (1983), on the other hand, argues that college teaching is a craft. "As a good mechanic is likely to develop by being thrown among a group of garrulous and skilled and experienced mechanics, so might good teachers develop within a group of professors good at and demonstrative about teaching" (p. 63). In an earlier publication (1972), Eble itemizes his observations based on his beliefs that the craft of teaching can be developed and that the academic profession has the fundamental responsibility for the development of the craft:

1. A person can go wrong in all the right directions... All crafts and arts proceed to some degree by testing directions,
pushing on when things work out favorably, and pulling back when they do not . . . Endless possibilities are the chief attractions of teaching. Within those possibilities, good teachers develop their craft. The skilled craftsman, it must be assumed, has a better chance of effecting learning than one who is not.

2. Generosity is surely an essential of good teaching. . . . Individual teachers must have some generosity of spirit or they will not remain satisfyingly attached to their profession. . . . Giving of self—personality and character—as well as of energy, time, skill, and knowledge are required. . . . Generosity of outlook means resisting the tendency to regard knowledge and the institution's packaging and certifying of it as things which must be husbanded away.

3. Energy is often an outstanding characteristic of the effective teacher. . . . Mental energy is as important as physical energy.

4. Variety is another central attribute of effective teaching—timing, pace, moods, subjects and arrangements that define his work.

5. The use of examples and illustrations. . . . Much college teaching suffers by being disconnected from doing.

6. . . . enthusiasm is essential.

7. . . . in almost all student questionnaires clarity and
organization are among the measures of a teacher's performance.

8. . . . honesty appears on evaluation questionnaires prepared by students in such inferential ways as "is well prepared," "presents origin of ideas and concepts," "is fair in grading." . . . Honesty in the teaching profession, like being well prepared, is probably not an absolute requirement. . . . The less concerned we are with self, the less likely we are to be dishonest in furthering our self-interest.

9. Finally, a wise teacher develops his sense of proportion. He knows more, has more to balance, and balances more skillfully. He also does some things very well: writing, acting, designing structures, digging in the earth, or an active doing kind of teaching which gets students to start doing things themselves. Teaching of this kind goes beyond subject matter as thinking goes beyond subject matter and beyond action. (pp. 37-53)

The task of measuring and describing teaching performance is complex, as any educational evaluator knows (Fink, 1982). An overview of descriptors, or characteristics, of effective teachers, however, is not only imperative, but enlightening in the relationship these characteristics have to the College Teacher Perceiver (CTP) interview. Authors andResearchers have not individually identified the totality of the 13 themes of the CTP, but the synthesis of these listings matches with near perfection.
According to Ericksen (1984), learning how to think independently is the most important end product of education and is helped along by the teacher as counselor, mentor, and friend. Does the teacher care?, Is the teacher fair?, Does the teacher know the subject matter?, and How is the course relevant? are, according to Morris (1970), questions most students have foremost in their minds when they start a course. His studies have led Morris to believe that beginning teachers rarely have the opportunity to practice the showmanship developed by a seasoned classroom trouper. Beginning teachers' contact with students is more personal; hence, their showmanship must be of a different sort. They establish rapport with students primarily through their sensitivity to student problems. It is no longer fashionable for college teachers to remain aloof from their students, and beginning teachers must be particularly careful not to seem condescending to students. Regardless of how teachers may feel about the intellectual or personality deficiencies of a group of students, the mark of a good teacher is the ability to conceal these feelings and play the role of an understanding guide who is genuinely interested in the academic welfare of students. Establishing this kind of rapport with students is showmanship in the social and intellectual sense rather than in the sense of dramatic performance. The wise teacher shows that he or she understands both the power of formal instruction and the dynamics of contemporary student life (p. 83).
Eble (1983) purports that presence, appearance, and style, with character being the foundation of style, are significant characteristics of the outstanding professors that most students remember. Then, in an inverse manner, he continues by identifying what he considers to be the seven deadly sins of teaching—arrogance, dullness, rigidity, insensitivity, vanity, self-indulgence, and hypocrisy (pp. 132-137).

Gaff and Wilson's (1971) interpretation of the conclusion of a 1968-69 nationwide study of college professors (done at the height of student unrest on campuses) is that faculty who favored educational change were likely to see development of the student as the purpose of a college education. In their classroom teaching, those who favored educational change were likely to be discursive, analytic, and integrative; to encourage student participation; and to employ loosely-structured evaluation procedures. Proponents of change also had considerable contact with students outside of class. In the same study, Gaff and Wilson found that colleagues significantly influenced the environment of teachers. Fellow faculty members could provide motivation, information, criticism, and reinforcement for efforts and accomplishments. Few colleges were organized to make use of faculty peer groups to improve teaching.

Angers (1963) found eight personal characteristics of effective teachers: (a) enthusiasm, (b) initiative, (c) curiosity, (d) creativity, (e) ability to see rewards in the intangible, (f) high morals, (g) discipline, (h) maturity (p. 115).
Kelley and Wilbur (1970) discovered that teachers who are considered great often lacked what might be considered an essential quality; yet they achieve greatness. Their achievements rest on other qualities which are so outstanding that their shortcomings can be ignored. Teachers whose personality and character elicit admiration and emulation and invite personal contacts beyond the classroom radiate influence of which they may scarcely be aware. People with above-average potential are, to be sure, born; their teaching lives unfold as their latent abilities are developed. However, the majority rarely perceive or achieve their potential in all of the qualities which enhance college teaching.

In a study of new college teachers, Fink (1982) found that new teachers receive high marks on the establishment of good relations with students, their knowledge of the subject, interest in self-evaluation, and the creation of tests that evaluate students for more than memorization. On the other hand, they receive low marks on the stimulation of students to high intellectual effort, flexibility in their teaching approach, involvement of students in class, and leading discussions. His conclusions contain these suggestions to improve teaching ability: (a) Have more and better pre-teaching experience. (b) Allow new teachers to develop their ideas about teaching through seminars on college teaching, discussions with outstanding teachers, viewing videotapes of excellent teachers, and gaining background in the ways to handle different types of students.
(c) Provide more feedback on teaching. Offer specific suggestions through classroom observations or viewing videotapes.

The findings of Vickers' (1979) study indicate that knowledge of subject matter was not the most important concern of the perceivers studied. The study does indicate, however, that while all characteristics on the evaluation instrument are important for the teacher, the qualities original, stimulating, adaptable, student-centered, and systematic may be most discriminating in separating more-effective instructors from less-effective instructors (p. 14).

A panel of developmental studies practitioners at Tri-County Technical College in South Carolina identified these traits as being necessary for developmental educators: caring for students, ability to get along with a wide diversity of people, sincerity, optimism, perseverance, imagination, dedication, assertiveness, self-confidence, patience, firmness, risk-taking (Dickens, 1980).

Hill (1978) wrote that:

the community college cannot rely on great scholars or researchers to help it achieve its goal of service to students with widely different needs and abilities. It can only rely on teachers, teachers who are able and sufficiently interested in students to help them develop their full potential. The success of the community college will not be measured by anything other than the quality of its teachers (p. 141).
Their research led to the conclusion that the acquisition by community colleges of an ideal faculty--innovative, progressive, accepting of the institution's philosophy, student-oriented, and effective teachers--faces many obstacles. To acquire this kind of faculty, leaders would have to hire faculty who are predominantly young, who have had primary school experience and whose academic fields are consistent with progressive-liberal orientations. At the same time, they would have to avoid hiring faculty who have taught either in a four-year college or another community college, and those in the hard sciences. They would also have to discourage faculty involvement in professional organizations since this association produces tendencies inimicable to the community college ideal.

In a similar vein, Schlesinger, (1976) studied and characterized the well-functioning humanities community college faculty member as: older (forty-six to fifty-three), not possessing a doctorate, likely to be employed full-time, and extremely likely to have been employed in secondary schools (p. 9).

The themes of the College Teacher Perceiver were used by Roueche and Baker (1987) to identify excellent professors in their preliminary screening of the Miami-Dade Community College faculty. They then divided the 13 themes, which it should be noted were no longer totally consistent with those used by Selection Research, Incorporated, into the three general categories of characteristics of superior performance identified by Klemp (1977). These divisions
are motivation, interpersonal skills, and intellectual skills. Under the motivation category they listed commitment, goal orientation, integrated perception, positive action, and reward orientation. Objectivity, active listening, rapport, and empathy were subheadings of interpersonal skills, while individualized perception, teaching strategies, knowledge, and innovation were used to identify intellectual skills.

Dressel and Marcus (1982) insist that “the good teacher must want to be a good teacher” (p. xv). The individual must become objective and continually self-critical in seeking feedback from students and peers, as well as evidence in student performance that his or her teaching is indeed effective in stimulating learning. They advance the notion that desirable characteristics of teachers are:

1. interest in and respect for individuals, their aspirations, and their potentials.
2. a pervasive, yet directed curiosity
3. continuing self-appraisal as the motivator and facilitator of learning related to student, self, and course content
4. able communication and demonstration of ideas
5. several affective characteristics that influence the quality and continuing impact of the teaching-learning relationship: (a) a sense of humility, (b) honesty, (c) ethics, (d) self-criticism (p. 204-206).
In a public love letter to a former professor, Guthrie (1987, p. 54) cites Lumsden's reflection on teaching: "The teacher offers a curriculum which prepares the student for life, and life reinforces the curriculum". "Hardness of the head and softness of the heart" is the phrase Braskamp, Brandenburg, and Ory (1984, p. 15) believe comes as close as any to generalizing the list of effective teacher characteristics found in their summarization of the voluminous quantities of research on effective teaching at the collegiate level.

The fact remains, however, that the greatest need in the effort to identify characteristics of effective college teachers is a precise definition of good teaching in each subject and at each level. This study represents an attempt to contribute to the development of such a definition.
CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION

Population

The population for this study was the set of Piper Professors. Eight initial awards were made in 1958, and ten have been made in each of the years since. From the year of its inception through 1988, 308 awards had been made. Of that number, 194, or 63%, were from institutions under state or local control at the time of their nomination, and 114, or 37%, were teaching in private or independent schools. Table 1 lists institutions of origin of all Piper Professors named through 1988 with the following symbols indicating the level of the highest degree offered: 2 = Associate, B = Baccalaureate, M = Master's, D = Doctorate (Torregrosa, 1989). The listings of Piper Professors were provided by the Minnie Stevens Piper Foundation and were compiled on the basis of the years in which the awards were made. Appendix A contains a copy of the letter granting permission to contact the Piper Professors in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public Institutions</th>
<th>Private Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of highest degree granted</td>
<td>Level of highest degree granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1 2 1 4</td>
<td>1 2 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2 4 2 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3 1 2 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4 1 2 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1 2 3 1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2 3 1 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1 2 4 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1 4 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1 2 4 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2 3 2 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2 2 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>4 1 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1 1 3 1 3 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2 1 5 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1 1 4 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1 1 3 4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>3 1 4 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 1--continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public Institutions</th>
<th>Private Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of highest degree granted</td>
<td>Level of highest degree granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 B M D</td>
<td>2 B M D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1 1 5</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1 1 3</td>
<td>2 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>3 2 1 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3 1 4</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1 4 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>2 1 1 4</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1 3 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1 1 3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>3 2 2</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1 1 4</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>2 4 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive survey method was employed to gather information and appropriate data, utilizing the individual interview approach. According to Borg and Gall (1983), the individual interview is one of the two most commonly used instruments for data collection in descriptive survey research. Fox (1969) states
that there are two conditions in educational research, which, occurring together, suggest and justify the descriptive survey: first, that there is an absence of information about a problem of educational significance, and second, that the situations which could generate that information exist and are accessible to the researcher.

Although much information was found concerning the varied viewpoints on the characteristics of excellent teachers, none was found which had been identified using an interview or a structured interview technique. Thus, the SRI structured interview, the College Teacher Perceiver, was used to identify the characteristics of excellent college teachers for this study.

The Interview

The instrument used to collect data for this study was the College Teacher Perceiver (CTP) interview. This device was published in 1984 by Selection Research, Incorporated (SRI). Consisting of 65 open-ended questions, the CTP was designed to assist in the identification of college teachers who possess essential personal thematic characteristics associated with effective instruction. These characteristics are grouped into the following 13 theme areas: Mission, Achiever, Empathy, Rapport Drive, Individualized Perception, Listening, Investment, Input Drive, Activation, Innovation, Gestalt, Objectivity, and Focus. Definitions of these themes are presented in Chapter 1.
The College Teacher Perceiver interview must be administered in a stress-free environment by a trained interviewer. For a person to be certified to score and to analyze the CTP, extensive training is required by SRI. Based on a minimum of 32 interviews, an 85% or greater agreement between the SRI trainer and CTP trainee must be established. The researcher completed this training October 26-30, 1987 with 94% agreement, or interrater reliability.

To score the College Teacher Perceiver, the interviewer listens for key words or phrases in the responses of each professor. A score of one is assigned to those replies which meet the criteria established for a predictor response. Zero is recorded for those responses in which key words or phrases are missing. Thirteen subscores ranging from 0 to 5 and a total CTP score ranging from 0 to 65 were calculated for each interview in this study.

Additionally, a grouping of appropriate theme scores was made to calculate the professors' predicted skill level in the following areas:

1. Intrapersonal--These items tend to typically focus on the professor's philosophy and feelings about education. The inclusion of mission, investment, focus, and achiever themes completes the area.

2. Interpersonal--These items tend to focus on a professor's relating skills. The themes of empathy, rapport drive, listening, and objectivity are included.
3. Extrapersonal--The themes of individualized perception, input drive, activation, innovation, and Gestalt focus on a professor's classroom activities and teaching skill. They reveal how the teacher will operate in the classroom (Selection Research, Inc., 1986).

Validation of the Interview

A large body of research has been produced concerning the validity of SRI's Teacher Perceiver Interview, a predecessor of the College Teacher Perceiver, because of the length of time it has been in existence--nearly 20 years--and the number of school districts in which it has been used throughout the country. The same cannot be said, however, for the College Teacher Perceiver. For many of the reasons noted in Chapter 2 and because of its youth, little has been published concerning the validity of this instrument.

As institutions commit to use the CTP, SRI requests that there be continuing research done to establish its valid use within the organization. The first study completed in the validation process is a 30/30 study in which 30 top-ranked individuals and 30 bottom-ranked individuals are identified. For each of the 60 persons, an SRI Work Rating Scale is completed. This assessment instrument provides a somewhat objective measurement base from which more detailed comparisons can be made. Each of the 60 persons is interviewed using the CTP, analysis and coding is completed, and comparisons made between the top and bottom
groups. This provides evidence to infer the existence of both construct and concurrent validity (Selection Research, Inc., 1985b).

During the 30/30 study, each item and theme on the CTP is reviewed to examine the content of the instrument and its relationship with the responsibilities and tasks of the individuals with which it is being used. In this manner, the degree of content validity of the instrument is determined.

A second, long-term study is used to provide evidence of predictive validity. At the end of a year of its usage, CTP interview summaries are compared to Work Rating Scales completed on each person hired and the current status of each interviewee. This analysis of the relationship of the CTP to the retention and productivity of each employee helps establish the degree of predictive validity within the organization.

In the publication of one of its validation studies, the following statement defines the company's philosophy on validity.

The implication exists that whenever an instrument is adopted to be utilized as part of a selection process, that instrument must be studied periodically with respect to its validity. This is an issue that is concerned with the basic question of whether or not an instrument is measuring what it is intended to measure. By definition, validity is a function of both the time and context under which the instrument is utilized. This implies that validity must be an ongoing continuous process. Furthermore, validity as a concept can
never be completely established, yet its existence can be inferred from evidence collected as the instrument is used (Selection Research, Inc., 1985b, p.1).

In one validation study published by SRI in February of 1985, a sample of 18 college teachers nominated by their institutions as professor of the year were studied. Utilizing the Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient of Correlation to investigate the research question, "Did the SRI College Teacher Perceiver demonstrate acceptable internal consistency when administered to a group of college teachers?" (Selection Research, Incorporated, 1985b, p.2), the conclusion was that the item difficulty appeared to be satisfactory in that there was an absence of items that could be considered to be too easy. It was suggested that the significant negative intercorrelation of the Achiever to Objectivity theme be examined more closely to determine the nature of that relationship. Nine of the 13 themes were significantly intercorrelated with at least one other theme, which was taken to be supportive of the overall instrument.

A top/bottom ranking within the group was established on the basis of total score. Five subjects with total scores greater than 29 comprised the top group, while those with scores less than 22 were placed in the bottom group. Each theme was correlated to group membership. The themes of Mission, Rapport Drive, Activator, Gestalt, Objectivity, and Focus significantly correlated to group, which was viewed as adequate discrimination between a top/bottom
grouping within a homogeneous sample. The SRI researchers felt that these data provided adequate implication for the inference of validity in this particular study (Selection Research, Incorporated, 1985b).

Letters

A letter of introduction (Appendix B) and return card (Appendix C) were mailed to the subjects. The letter explained the nature of the study. The card indicated the subjects' agreement to participate (or not), dates and times preferred for initial contact, and phone numbers. Self-addressed, stamped return envelopes were provided.

Subjects

Subjects for this study were 40 randomly-selected Piper Professors whose awards were received during the years from 1978 to 1988, inclusive.

Procedure

The list of Piper Professors was stratified by removing and numbering the names of those award recipients from community colleges. Using the table, "5000 Random Digits", found on pages 510-511 in Glass and Stanley (1970), 20 subjects were selected. By the same method, 20 subjects were selected from the list of Piper
Professors representing institutions granting the baccalaureate, or higher, degree. Letters were mailed to selected subjects who were asked to return their responses within two weeks. A summary of the responses received is provided in Table 2.

Table 2

Responses from Request to Participate in Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>Senior Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will participate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will not participate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This represents a response rate of 77.5% and 65% participation rate by those selected.

Analysis of Data

As positive responses were received from subjects willing to participate in the study, the subjects were contacted at the times and telephone numbers suggested on their responses. Appointments were made to administer the interviews at their convenience. Some preferred that the interview be administered at first contact. Subject responses were interpreted, scored, and reported in tabular
form for ease of reporting and interpretation. Responses to CTP questions by institution type, individual themes, and grouping of themes into interpersonal, intrapersonal, extrapersonal characteristics, and general discipline areas are shown in tables. Subject groupings were made as follows: (a) English--literature and composition; (b) foreign language--any language other than English; (c) science--biology, chemistry, earth science, and physics; (d) visual arts--painting and sculpture; (e) education--elementary, secondary, and post-secondary; (f) occupational--industrial/technical fields, nursing; (g) social science--history, political science, economics, philosophy; (h) performing arts--music, drama.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

A sample of Minnie Stevens Piper Professors were interviewed for this study with the intent of identifying selected characteristics possessed by them. An effort was made to determine which themes were common to community/junior college professors, which themes were held by professors from senior institutions, and the existence of common themes within similar subject disciplines. Descriptive data were gathered which can be used by persons responsible for the hiring, retention, promotion, and staff development of college professors.

Data for this study were obtained from the administration of the Selection Research, Incorporated College Teacher Perceiver interview to selected Minnie Stevens Piper Professors. The list of Piper Professors from the years 1978 through 1988 was stratified into a group of professors from junior/community colleges and a second group from senior colleges. Numbers were assigned to the names on each list for confidentiality, and 20 numbers were randomly selected from each list by using a random number table. Letters were mailed to the 40 professors selected explaining the
project and requesting their participation. Of the 40 letters distributed, 31 answers were received for a response rate of 77.5%. A total of 26 respondents agreed to be interviewed, thus a participation rate of 65% was established.

The findings presented in this chapter are the results of the collected data. Each research question is presented and discussed, with analysis based on data gathered with the College Teacher Perceiver interview. Data are presented in tabular form to more easily answer the research questions enumerated in Chapter 1.

**Research Question One**

What themes are possessed by a group of Piper Professors selected from the years 1978 through 1988?

The data presented in Table 3 reflect theme scores attained by all subjects, and are listed in the same order in which the interviews were made. An analysis of these results indicates individual theme scores ranging from 0 to 5, and total scores ranging from a low of 16 (two occurrences) to a high of 47 (one occurrence). The mean of total scores is 30.58.
Table 3

Theme Scores of Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subject 1</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
<th>Subject 5</th>
<th>Subject 6</th>
<th>Subject 7</th>
<th>Subject 8</th>
<th>Subject 9</th>
<th>Subject 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiever</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3--continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented in Table 4 represent the mean theme scores of all subjects. Examination of the figures indicates these Piper Professors are high in Achiever, Input Drive, and Mission themes.
with Empathy, Objectivity, and Listening lowest. The average total score was 30.50. This was somewhat below the midpoint score for the total CTP of 32.50. In addition, six themes had an average score greater than a theme midpoint score of 2.50, while six were below. The most difficult theme appeared to be Listening with an average score of 0.96.

Table 4
Mean Theme Scores of Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiever</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Drive</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Perception</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Drive</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intrapersonal themes of Mission, Investment, Focus, and Achiever tend to focus on the teacher's personal philosophy and feelings about education. Interpersonal themes, Empathy, Rapport Drive, Listening, and Objectivity concentrate on the teacher's relating skills. Extrapersonal items target the teacher's classroom activities and teaching skills. Individualized Perception, Input Drive, Activation, Innovation, and Gestalt reveal how the teacher operates in the classroom. Table 5 is an illustration of these theme groupings and how they related to the subjects. It appeared that the weaknesses of the interviewed professors converged in the area of relating to students.
Table 5

**Related Theme Groups of All Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Groups</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Percentage of Theme Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrapersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiever</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>54.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Drive</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>34.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extrapersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiv. Perception</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Drive</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>50.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection Research, Incorporated uses the following guidelines in making hiring recommendations based on College Teacher Perceiver (CTP) interview scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTP Scores</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 and above</td>
<td>Highly recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - 37</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 - 32</td>
<td>Conditionally recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 27</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using these guidelines, data presented in Table 6 illustrates theoretical hiring recommendations that would be made on the Piper Professors interviewed to obtain data for this study. Fully one-half of those interviewed would be conditionally recommended, but over 15% would not make the interviewing cut.

Table 6

**Theoretical Hiring Recommendations for Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTP Scores</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 and above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highly recommended</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - 37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 - 32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Conditionally recommended</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Two

What themes are possessed by subject Piper Professors from two-year colleges?

An analysis of the data presented in Table 7 indicates theme scores attributed to subject Piper Professors from community colleges. An examination of these data reveals individual theme scores ranging from 0 to 5, and total scores with a low of 16 (one occurrence) and a high of 40 (two occurrences). The mean total score was 31.13.
Table 7
Theme Scores of Community College Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiever</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Drive2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data presented in Table 8 indicate the mean theme scores of community college subjects. Three themes, Mission, Achiever, and Input Drive, shared high average scores while Listening was again lowest. Average for total score was 31.13, which once more was slightly below the midpoint score for the total CTP of 32.50. Seven themes had an average score greater than a theme midpoint of 2.50, and six fell below that mark. Listening was the lowest scoring theme with an average score of 1.06.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiever</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Drive</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 8—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input Drive</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theme groupings, shown by data presented in Table 9, were relatively low in the Interpersonal area with the mean theme score total being 36% of the total possible theme scores. The Extrapersonal theme grouping mean theme total score was above the halfway mark (51.76%), as was the Intrapersonal group of themes at 53.95%. 
### Table 9

#### Related Theme Groups of Community College Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Groups</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Percentage of Theme Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrapersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiever</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>53.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Drive</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extrapersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiv. Perception</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Drive</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>51.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the data presented in Table 10 indicates that nearly half (46.7%) of the community college subjects interviewed would receive a recommendation for hiring based on the results of the CTP, with 26.7% highly recommended. Conditional recommendations would be given 40% of this group, that is with some reservation, while 13.3% would not be recommended for hiring.

Table 10

Theoretical Hiring Recommendations for Community College Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTP Scores</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 and above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Highly recommended</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conditionally recommended</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Three

What themes are possessed by subject Piper Professors from senior colleges and universities?

The data presented in Table 11 are the responses of the interviewed senior college Piper Professors. Individual theme
scores ranged from 0 to 5, and total scores with a low of 16 (one occurrence) and high of 47 (one occurrence). The score of 47 was 17.5% higher than the nearest score of 40, which occurred in the community college group. The mean total score was 29.82.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Scores of Senior College Subjects</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>3  1  3  4  2  4  2  2  3  4  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiever</td>
<td>2  5  2  4  4  3  5  2  4  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>2  1  2  0  1  2  1  1  0  2  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Drive</td>
<td>4  3  3  0  3  5  1  1  1  3  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Perception</td>
<td>1  3  2  3  2  5  1  1  2  2  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>1  0  0  1  1  1  1  0  2  1  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>2  2  1  2  2  4  3  0  2  2  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Drive</td>
<td>4  4  2  3  3  2  2  5  3  1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Data presented in Table 12 represent the mean theme scores of senior college subjects. Achiever, Input Drive, and Mission were the three high-scoring themes, while Objectivity, Empathy, and Listening were the three lowest scoring themes. Average for total score was 29.82, which was below the midpoint score for the total CTP of 32.50. Six themes had an average score greater than the theme midpoint of 2.50, and seven were below that mark. In this group, the Listening theme mean score was 35.4% lower than the theme score in position 12, and over 76% (76.2%) less than the top ranked Achiever theme.
Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiever</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Drive</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Drive</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.82</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of the data presented in Table 13 indicates the Intrapersonal theme group ranked highest at 55.90% of the total score for the four individual themes, the Extrapersonal group ranked second at 49.44%, and the Interpersonal group totaled 31.80% of the possible total score.
Table 13

**Related Theme Groups of Senior College Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Groups</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>Percentage of Theme Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrapersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiever</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>55.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Drive</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>31.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extrapersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiv. Perception</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Drive</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>49.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the data presented in Table 14 indicates that only two (18.2%) of the senior college professors would receive a recommendation for hiring, 63.6% would be recommended with reservations, while 18.2% would not be recommended in a hiring situation in which the CTP was used.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTP Scores</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly recommended</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - 37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 - 32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Conditionally recommended</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Four

What themes are commonly possessed by subject Piper Professors within similar subject disciplines?

The data presented in Table 15 indicate mean theme scores attained by subjects and grouped into general academic discipline areas.
Analysis of the data in Table 15 indicate the subject area with the highest total score (38.18) was English, which had mean theme scores ranging from 1.67 (Listening) at the lowest to 4.00 (Rapport Drive) at the high end of the scale. Following, in descending order, were occupational (31.00); foreign language, education, and performing arts (all tied with a total score of 30.00); social science (27.40); visual arts (27.00); and science (24.25). The average total score was 29.72, which was well below the CTP midpoint score of 32.50. Only the group of English teachers surpassed the midpoint score with 17.5%.
Table 15

**Mean Theme Scores of Subjects Grouped by Academic Discipline Areas.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiever</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Drive</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Drive</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.18</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>27.40</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** 1--English (literature, composition); 2--foreign language (any language other than English); 3--science (biology, chemistry, earth science, physics); 4--visual arts (painting, sculpture); 5--education
(elementary, secondary, post-secondary); 6—occupational
(industrial/technical fields, nursing); 7—social science (history,
political science, economics, philosophy); 8—performing arts
(music, drama).

Summary of Findings

The following is a summary of the major findings from this study. Based on the data collected to answer the research questions, Piper Professors interviewed with the College Teacher Perceiver had an average total theme score of 30.58. This was 1.92, or 5.9%, less than the midpoint score for the total CTP of 32.50. Individual theme scores ranged from 0 to 5, with theme score means ranked from high to low as follows: Achiever, Input Drive, Mission, Innovation, Focus and Rapport Drive (tied), Individualized Perception, Activation, Investment, Gestalt, Empathy, Objectivity, Listening. The Achiever theme mean score of 3.15 was 0.65, or 26%, above the theme midpoint score of 2.50, but the lowest scored theme, Listening at 0.96, was 1.54, or 61.6%, below the theme midpoint score. It was also found that the Piper Professors scored highest in the Intrapersonal theme group which included Mission, Investment, Focus, and Achiever, with the four theme scores totaling 10.95, or 54.75% of the possible score of 20. The Extrapersonal theme group which included Individualized Perception, Input Drive, Activation, Innovation, and Gestalt totaled 12.70, or 50.80% of the possible score of 25. Empathy, Rapport Drive, Listening, and Objectivity, the
Interpersonal theme group, scored 6.84, which was 34.25% of the possible score of 20. Hiring recommendations based on results of the CTP interview would be made on 9, or 34.6%, of the subjects with 5 individuals, or 19.2%, highly recommended. Half of the subjects would be conditionally recommended, that is, recommended with reservation, while 4, or 15.4%, would not be recommended.

Data presented on Piper Professors from community colleges indicate that individual theme scores ranged from 0 to 5. The lowest score was 16, with one occurrence, and the highest score, 40, appeared twice. Themes were ranked from high to low in the following order: Mission, Achiever, and Input Drive tied for first; Rapport Drive, Innovation, Focus, Individualized Perception, Activation and Gestalt (tied), Investment, Empathy, Objectivity, and finally Listening. The common Mission, Achiever, and Input Drive theme score of 2.93 was .43, or 17.2%, above the theme midpoint score of 2.50. The score for the lowest ranked theme, Listening, was 1.06. This score was 1.44, or 57.6%, less than the theme midpoint score of 2.50. The mean total theme score of 31.13 was 1.37, or 4.2%, lower than the midpoint score of 32.5. The community college Piper award recipients scored highest in the Intrapersonal theme group, with a total mean score for the Mission, Investment, Focus, and Achiever themes of 10.79. This was 53.95% of the total possible score of 20 for those themes. Next, in order, was the Extrapersonal theme group with a total score of 12.94, or 51.76%, of the total score of 25. Finally, the Interpersonal theme group of
Empathy, Rapport Drive, Listening, and Objectivity total score was 7.20, or 36%, of the total possible score. In a theoretical hiring situation, four, or 26.7%, of the community college Piper Professors would be highly recommended, 20%, or 3 individuals, would be recommended, six, or 40%, would be conditionally recommended, and two, or 13.3%, would not be recommended.

Subjects from senior colleges had individual theme scores ranging from 0 to 5, with a low total score of 16 (one occurrence) and a high total score of 47 (one occurrence) which was the highest score in the entire investigation. Highest mean theme score was for Achiever at 3.45. This figure was .95, or 38%, above the theme midpoint score of 2.50. The theme with the lowest score, Listening, was 1.68, or 67.2%, below the theme midpoint score. The rank ordering of themes from highest to lowest was: Achiever, Input Drive, Mission, Innovation and Focus (tied), Rapport Drive, Activation, Individualized Perception, Investment, Gestalt, Objectivity, Empathy, and Listening. The total of the mean theme scores was 29.82, which was 2.68, or 8.2%, below the midpoint score of 32.50 for the total CTP. Data gathered from theme groupings indicate that senior college professors were rated highest in the Intrapersonal group with total mean theme scores of 11.18, or 55.90% of the possible group score. Next, was the Extrapersonal group with a score of 12.36, or 49.44% of the total score possible. This was followed by the Interpersonal group with total mean theme score of 6.36, or 31.80% of the total possible. Only one of the senior
college subjects would be highly recommended in a theoretical hiring situation, and only one would be recommended. These two individuals accounted for 18.2% of the senior college subjects. Conditional recommendations would be given seven persons, or 63.6%, while two would not be recommended.

Grouping subject professors by academic disciplines revealed that the general subject area of English had the highest total mean theme score of 38.18, followed by Occupational, 31; Foreign Language, Education, and Performing Arts, all 30; Social Science, 27.40; Visual Arts, 27; Science, 24.25. The English teachers surpassed the midpoint score for the total CTP by 5.68 points, or 17.5%. The lowest rated group, science teachers, had a total mean theme score of 8.25 points, or 25.4%, below the midpoint score of 32.5.

Hatcher (1975) compared the characteristics, attitudes, and personality traits of the 1974 Piper Professor nominees with those of 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 significant differences between Piper nominees and the random sample in the following areas:

1. Reason for teaching: nominees valued enjoyment of students, dedication to a discipline, and the academic atmosphere; the random sample valued security, prestige, and the time to pursue their own interests.
2. Highest degree: nominees held the Ph. D. more frequently.
3. Age: nominees were older.
4. Experience: most nominees had 19 years or more.
5. Rank: most nominees were full professors.
6. Tenure: more nominees were tenured.
7. Innovation: more novelty in instructional techniques was shown by nominees.
8. Risks: nominees were generally less cautious.

Comparing Hatcher's (1975) conclusions to those determined by this study, it can be seen that the intervening 15 years have not done much to change the outcomes. The top five themes listed in Table 4, Achiever, Input Drive, Mission, Innovation, Focus tied with Rapport Drive, match the significant personality characteristics found in the earlier study. That is, Rapport Drive coincides with enjoyment of students, Input Drive with dedication to a discipline, and Mission plus Achiever with academic atmosphere. Innovation is congruent in both studies, and Hatcher's risk taking characteristic matches the SRI Achiever theme.

Vickers (1979) also compared the 1978 Piper Professor nominees from 20 community and junior colleges within 200 miles of Austin to a randomly selected group of instructors from the same community and junior colleges. She used a 10-characteristic questionnaire and elicited responses from the teachers, their students, former students, peers, and administrators. Each group of respondents was asked to rank nominees and members of the control
group with respect to the following characteristics/sets of behavior: (a) kindly--harsh, (b) fair--partial, (c) dull--stimulating, (d) probing--cursory, (e) inflexible--adaptable, (f) student-oriented--autocratic, (g) evading--responsible, (h) limited--knowledgeable, (i) original--stereotyped, (j) disorganized--systematic.

Respondents were asked to indicate where, on a Likert-type scale with seven steps, they would rate the subject between a concept pair.

A brief summary of Vickers' (1979) study indicates:

1. Administrators ranked Piper nominees significantly higher than the control group in the categories Original, Stimulating, Knowledgeable, Probing, and Adaptable.

2. In self-evaluations, nominees ranked themselves higher than the control group in all categories except Knowledgeable and Systematic.

3. Peer ratings showed no significant differences between nominees and controls.

4. Students ranked nominees slightly higher in each category.

5. Former students also ranked nominees slightly higher in each category.

Piper nominees were perceived to be slightly, but statistically insignificantly, higher in 44 of 50 instances, with the greatest difference perceived by administrators, the least by peers. Only the originality trait approached significant difference. Again, the
Originality category of Vickers' study coincides with the Innovation theme, one of the top five themes characteristic of Piper award recipients from community colleges in the current study.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Summary

The problem with which this study was concerned was the identification of selected characteristics of Minnie Stevens Piper Professors. The study had two purposes: (a) to determine characteristics of Minnie Stevens Piper Professors, and (b) to determine whether Piper Professors possessed characteristics which typify outstanding college teachers as described by the Selection Research, Inc. College Teacher Perceiver structured interview.

To attain these purposes, four research questions were developed and are listed in Chapter 1. Data were gathered to answer the research questions by administering the College Teacher Perceiver interview to randomly-selected Piper Professors who agreed to participate in the study. The subjects were award recipients during the years from 1978 through 1988. Twenty community college and 20 senior college professors were randomly selected from stratified lists and were asked to participate. A
response rate of 77.5% was attained, and 65% of the subjects actually participated. Data are presented in tabular form in Chapter 4. Analysis and discussion of data are presented in Chapter 4.

Summary of Findings

Based on data from this study, the information which follows is a summary of the major findings.

1. The average total theme score for all Piper Professors interviewed was 30.58, almost 6% below the midpoint score for the total College Teacher Perceiver interview of 32.50. This falls within the conditional recommendation area for hiring purposes. Individual themes were ranked in the following order from high to low: Achiever, Input Drive, Mission, Innovation, Focus and Rapport Drive (tied), Individualized Perception, Activation, Investment, Gestalt, Empathy, Objectivity, Listening. These scores indicate that the total group rated highest in the themes that typically focus on the teacher's personal philosophy and feelings about education, or Intrapersonal. The next highest area was with themes that focus on the teachers' classroom activities and teaching skills, called Extrapersonal. Lowest, by far, were themes that focus on the teachers' relating skills, Interpersonal.

2. Piper Professors from community colleges had a mean total score of 31.13, which was 4.2% below the midpoint score of the total CTP of 32.5. This dropped the community college teachers into the conditionally recommended area, too. Individual theme scores
were rank ordered from Mission, Achiever, and Input Drive (ties for first) to Rapport Drive, Innovation, Focus, Individualized Perception, Activation and Gestalt (tied), Investment, Empathy, Objectivity, Listening. Scores for the theme group areas indicated the ranking to be Intrapersonal, highest; Extrapersonal, second; and Interpersonal, last.

3. The senior college group contained the professor with the highest total score of 47. The total mean theme score was 29.82, or over 8% below the midpoint score of 32.50. This indicated a conditionally recommended situation. Theme ranking was Achiever, Input Drive, Mission, Innovation and Focus (tied), Rapport Drive, Activation, Individualized Perception, Investment, Gestalt, Objectivity, Empathy, Listening. Scores for this group rated the Intrapersonal theme group highest, followed by Extrapersonal, and Interpersonal.

4. Grouping professors into academic disciplines showed that English teachers had the highest total mean theme score of 38.18. This group contained the highest scoring interviewee. The rankings of professors in the other subject areas was: Occupational; Foreign Language, Education, and Performing Arts (tied); Social Science; Visual Arts; and Science.

Discussion of Findings

When related to the data collected an analysis of the review of literature completed for this study reveals that many of the
contradictory characteristics of the total college teaching population apply to the subset of Piper Professors as well.

Participating professors desire to be independent and receive credit for their accomplishments. They tend to define themselves by their performance. On the other hand, they must develop an ability to receive satisfaction from student growth, rather than solely from their own personal performance. The capability of stimulating students to think, to respond, to feel, and to learn is of high priority if these teachers are to attain excellence. This position is supported by Bulcock (1984), Eble (1972), Ericksen (1984), and Gaff and Wilson (1971).

The Piper Professors, to a large extent, are continuously searching for ideas, materials, and experiences to use in helping students. They have an underlying belief that students can grow and attain self-actualization. They want to make a significant contribution to other persons. These findings are consistent with the assertions of Angers (1963), Fink (1982), and Hill (1978).

It was found that subject Piper Professors try new ideas and techniques in their classrooms. They exhibit creativity by combining information and experience into new configurations that are implemented in their teaching. Many of the interviewed Piper Professors had not undertaken the cultivation of the ability to respond to a total situation, which is a characteristic of excellent
college teachers. It is imperative that teachers gather facts and understand rather than make an impulsive reaction, thus minimizing biases.

Gaff and Wilson (1971) report that most faculty establish and maintain a variety of relationships with students outside of class. Rapport with students was seen by the subjects of this study as a favorable and necessary condition of learning. These teachers have the ability to maintain an approving and mutually-favorable relationship with each student. Many of the professors like students and expect them to reciprocate, but the teachers must begin to develop the capacity to sense the feelings and thoughts of other persons. This capacity would provide teachers feedback about individual students. Teachers could learn more about the interests and needs of each student and facilitate efforts to personalize each student's program, when possible.

Piper Professors have models and goals. Their life is moving in a planned direction. These college teachers have clarified goals and selected activities in terms of these goals.

The ability of the subject professors to spontaneously listen to others with responsiveness and acceptance is inadequate. A view of listening as an ability that is beneficial to the speaker must be developed by persons who desire to be masterful college teachers.

The scope of this study did not encompass an accounting of the many professors who had received excellence awards but did not score high enough to qualify for a hiring recommendation.
Discrepancies in the score levels of professors may be due to differences in criteria for nominations at the local level. This prompts the question that if legitimately selected candidates from a campus score so poorly on an interview that identifies excellent teachers that they would not be recommended for employment, does that hold implications for other faculty members on that campus? Perhaps colleges and universities should evaluate hiring practices in the light of Lindquist's (1978) assertion that college teachers are trained to be scholars and researchers, not teachers.

Conclusions

Based on the data collected and the findings of this study, the following conclusions are warranted:

1. There is little difference between Piper Professors from community colleges and those from senior colleges.
2. Subject Piper Professors have a high level of attainment in intrapersonal abilities.
3. The Piper Professors interviewed have low capability to sustain interpersonal relationships with their students.
4. English teachers score highest on the College Teacher Perceiver.
5. Science teachers score lowest on the College Teacher Perceiver.
6. The College Teacher Perceiver interview is capable of discriminating between and among college teachers of different subject areas.

7. Some Piper Professors do not possess the characteristics of excellent teachers.

8. There is no accounting for the discrepancy between receiving an award for teaching excellence and rating below recommended for hiring.

Recommendations for Further Study

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations for further study regarding teacher effectiveness are made:

1. Further studies should be conducted to examine interpersonal relationships between college teachers and students.

2. Further studies are needed to develop a more precise definition of what is meant by good teaching.

3. Comparative studies to identify the policies, practices, and criteria used in the selection of teachers to receive awards for teaching excellence are recommended.

4. More studies are needed to identify distinguishing characteristics of teachers perceived to be outstandingly effective.

5. Longitudinal studies should be developed to identify characteristics of Piper Professors.
APPENDIX A

PIPER FOUNDATION APPROVAL LETTER
May 26, 1987

Mr. Gary Goodwin, Assistant Dean
Tarrant County Junior College -
Northeast Campus
828 Harwood Road
Hurst, Texas 76053

Dear Dean Goodwin:

Thank you for your good letter of May 21, 1987, regarding the Piper Professor Awards program and your interest therein in connection with your doctoral dissertation.

We are pleased that you wish to use our honorees over the past ten years as your "yardstick," and you have our permission to use the program and its honorees in your study.

You may wish to contact two other persons who have done similar studies here in the State of Texas using the Piper Professor Program in their doctoral dissertations: Margaret A. Hatcher, A COMPARISON OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PIPER PROFESSOR NOMINEES AND OTHER COLLEGE FACULTY, submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Texas Tech University, toward Ed. D. requirements under Dr. Kenneth H. Freeman, 1974; Mozelle Carver Vickers, PERCEPTIONS OF THE PERFORMANCE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY, submitted to Graduate School of The University of Texas at Austin toward Ph. D. requirements under Dr. Kenneth E. McIntyre, 1979; and you may want to also contact Dr. Leonard G. Schulze, Dean, Texas Lutheran College, Seuquin, Texas, who did a study of the program directly for us and at my request.

Dr. Schulze's is the only current address I have. Dr. Hatcher did her dissertation when she was still teaching at Midland College; Dr. Vickers was at Austin Community College; I do not know if they are still there or not.

Attached for your information is a list of honorees since the inception of the program in 1958, the only year in which there were but eight rather than ten awards.

We wish you all possible success in your endeavors. Please give me a call when your time permits; I have some information for you.

Sincerely,

Carlos Otero

Founded in 1950 by RANDALL GORDON PIPER and MINNIE STEVENS PIPER
APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PIPER PROFESSORS
Dear Piper Professor:

As a Minnie Stevens Piper Professor, you belong to a highly select group of people. To become a member of this group, you were identified as an outstanding teacher, and I need your help. A research project is being initiated through which I hope to identify specific characteristics of outstanding professors. This will be accomplished by using the Selection Research, Inc. College Teacher Perceiver interview, a 65 question instrument which is administered individually in complete confidence. The interview usually takes about 30 minutes to complete, but since the questions are open-ended, each response differs and each interview will be a different length. Most will be interviewed by telephone, with some being contacted personally. Each interview will be recorded so responses can be reviewed during the process of interpretation. The results of this research will be reported in a dissertation.

Forty Piper professors from the past ten years have been randomly selected to be in this project, and it is most important that you agree to participate. Your anonymity is guaranteed by the assignment of a number to each participant which will be known only to me. The value of the results of this research is two-fold: first in the future selection of outstanding professors, and second to identify areas of growth for those currently teaching in higher education who wish to become better teachers. You may withdraw from the project at any time without prejudice or penalty.

Please indicate your willingness to be involved by completing the enclosed agreement and returning it in the envelope provided. If you wish written feedback from your interview, enclose a stamped self-addressed envelope.

Your help is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gary Goodwin

This project has been reviewed by the University of North Texas Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (phone 917/565-3840).
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RESPONSE FORM
Yes, I will participate in the Piper Professor research project. Contact me by phone on this date: ________, at this time: ________ to schedule an interview.

PHONE NUMBER: ____/ ____- ______

I do not wish to participate.

Name: ____________________________________________

Signature: _______________________________________

(please return by September 30, 1988)
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PIPER FOUNDATION REQUEST

TO PARTICIPATE
Dr. Herman L. Crow, President
Tarrant County Junior College
Northeast Campus
828 Harwood Road
Hurst, TX 76054

Dear President Crow:

The Minnie Stevens Piper Foundation will again honor ten professors during the current academic year for their dedication to the teaching profession and for their outstanding academic, scientific and scholarly achievement. Honorees will be awarded certificates naming them "Piper Professors of 1990", together with cash honoraria of $2,500.00 each and gold commemorative pins.

The purpose of these awards is to give recognition to the teaching profession rather than to research, publication, administration, or other such related activity, although these criteria will also be considered by the Selection Committee.

Guidelines regarding the number of nominations an institution may make, as well as eligibility based on full-time equivalent student body enrollment were effective with the 1982 Piper Professor Awards and are as follows:

Nominations will be accepted on the basis of full-time equivalent student body enrollment of:

A. 1 to 10,000 students - one nomination
B. 10,001 to 20,000 students - two nominations
C. 20,001 and above - three nominations

Using the above guidelines, the following restrictions will apply toward eligibility to nominate:
Institutions in Group A: If a nominee is selected for an award, the institutions must wait two (2) years before submitting a nomination.

Institutions in Group B: If a nominee is selected for an award, the institution must wait one (1) year before submitting a nomination.

Institutions in Group C: Eligible each year due to their large student enrollment.

Please review these guidelines, and if your institution is eligible to nominate for the 1990 Piper Professor Awards and should you wish to nominate, please advise us by letter so that we may send you new nomination forms. Indicate your full-time equivalent Fall Semester enrollment with your request.

We expect wide faculty participation in the selection of your nominee. If such participation is not manifest in the institution's statement responding to "How was your nominee selected?" (p.2A-Piper Professor Nomination form), it may reflect negatively upon the candidate's consideration by our Selection Committee.

When the ten Piper Professors of 1989 were announced and their dossiers consigned to our permanent records, the selection committee requested that the remainder of files be cleared. This does not preclude your re-nominating any former candidates or you may wish to make new nominations.

Should you not wish to nominate, we should also appreciate receiving such advice from you so that our file on your fine institution might be closed for the remainder of the Piper Professors of 1990 Awards competition.

The deadline for receiving completed forms and related nomination material is November 27, 1989. Candidates chosen by our Selection Committee to receive these awards will be advised approximately April 2, 1990.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
MINNIE STEVENS PIPER FOUNDATION
Assistant Director

CO/ja
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PIPER FOUNDATION ACKNOWLEDGEMENT LETTER
September 13, 1989

Dr. Herman L. Crow, President
Tarrant County Junior College
Northeast Campus
828 Harwood Road
Hurst, TX 76054

Dear Dr. Crow:

Thank you for your letter of September 11, 1989, requesting nomination forms for our Piper Professors Program.

Based on your Fall Semester 1989, full-time equivalent enrollment, your fine institution may nominate one candidate. Candidates for nomination should be full-time instructors. Enclosed you will find necessary blanks for applying.

In addition to the two-part form, up to five letters of recommendation may also be submitted as part of the nomination. These letters may be from members of your administration, the nominee’s colleagues, and/or from current and former students of the nominee. These letters should be attached to the two-part form.

A cordial invitation is extended to you and your staff to nominate, using these forms and returning them by November 28th. Wide faculty participation, as pointed out earlier, is recommended in the selection of candidates. You are advised that the Piper Professor Selection Committee will make note of your procedure, and it will be assessed along with other criteria.

The candidates chosen by our Selection Committee to receive the awards will be advised approximately April 3, 1989, with general announcement of awards to be made shortly thereafter but prior to Commencement.

Thank you for your kind attention, cooperation, and continued interest in the Piper Professors Program.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

MINNIE STEVENS PIPER FOUNDATION
Assistant Director

CO/je
Enclosure
TYPE OF INSTITUTION
AS DEFINED BY
COORDINATING BOARD

( ) Public Senior
( ) Public Community/Jr.
( ) Public Technical Inst.
( ) Independent Senior
( ) Independent Junior

1990
PIPER PROFESSOR NOMINATION

Name of College/University/Institute

Address of Institution Zip

Name of Piper Professor Nominee Highest Degree Held
(Abbreviated Form)

Rank/Title of Nominee and Department

Years of Teaching at College Level At Present Institution

Current Teaching Load: Lecture Hours/Week ; Lab Hours ; Other *
Approximate No. Students: Undergraduate ; Graduate ; Other *

Last Year's Teaching Load: Lecture Hours/Week ; Lab Hours ; Other *
Summer Teaching:

* Other - Conference courses; Theses/Dissertations Directed; Misc. (Describe in next section)

Please describe current additional or administrative duties, i.e., Chairman of Department, Graduate Advisor, Thesis/Dissertation Director, etc., giving numbers of Professors/Students involved and approximate number of hours devoted thereto.

Student Organizations or Scholastic Fraternities Sponsored: (during past three years).

Membership in Honor Societies; Professional Societies; Listing in Who's Who or Other; Special Educational Projects Undertaken (TV series, etc.), Special Awards/Grants Received:
Service to off-campus community: (committee work, church work, fund drives, Scouts, etc.)

Since the Piper Foundation is primarily interested in identifying and honoring effective and dedicated teachers, the Selection Committee would appreciate any information you care to submit about the nominee's teaching. Is there evidence that the nominee is particularly effective in the classroom and in personal contact with students? Has the nominee demonstrated an unusual dedication to the profession of teaching? Does the nominee inspire respect and admiration in his colleagues? In comparison with other members of the faculty, how do you rate the nominee (1) as a teacher, (2) as a scholar, and (3) in the contribution made to the achievement of the purposes of the institution?

How was your nominee selected? Please be specific and indicate if he/she has been nominated before.

Fall Semester Full-time Equivalent Student Body Enrollment of your Institution:

Date

Signature of Administrator

Rank/Title/Administrative Position
1990
PIPER PROFESSOR NOMINATION

PERSONAL INFORMATION
Name ( ) Dr.; ( ) Mr.; ( ) Mrs.; ( ) Miss

Last First Middle

Home Address

Number and Street

City Zip Telephone

College/University

Address

Name of Institution

Building and Office Telephone and Extension

Date of Birth ___________ ; Place of Birth ___________; Soc. Sec. # _____________.

Marital Status: ___________; Number of Children ___________; Ages _____________.

Military Service Record: Branch ___________; Dates ___________; Rank _____________.

EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE: Schools and Colleges Attended, beginning with High School

Name of Institution Dates of Attendance Degree/Diploma Received

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Additional Training (Summer Institutes, Seminars, etc.)

Institution Dates of Attendance Type of Training

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Inclusive Dates</th>
<th>Title/Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLICATIONS: Although the Selection Committee is not primarily concerned with "Research / Publish or Perish," please summarize any research projects completed, and list any books/articles published and/or in use, exclusive of your Master's Thesis and/or Doctoral Dissertation. (Continue on reverse side if necessary)

|                                      |
|                                      |
|                                      |
|                                      |
|                                      |
|                                      |
|                                      |

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE: Why are you teaching?

|                                      |
|                                      |
|                                      |
|                                      |
|                                      |
|                                      |
|                                      |
CURRICULUM VITAE: Other than what has heretofore been enumerated, please indicate the highlights of your teaching career.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH: Short personal history.

[Signature]

Date

Signature of Nominee
APPENDIX G

PIPER PROFESSORS

1958 - 1988
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1958

Sister Mary Agnesine Hanick, M.M.
Associate Professor of Music Education
Incarnate Word College

James W. Amyx, M.E.
Associate Professor of Petroleum Engineering
Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas

Stephen E. Clabaugh, Ph. D.
Professor of Geology
The University of Texas

Sister Mary Elaine Gentemann, M.M.
Associate Professor of College Theory
Our Lady of the Lake College

Brother William J. Hamm, S.M., Ph. D.
Professor of Physics
St. Mary's University

R. W. Lee, M.S.
Chairman of Division of Natural Sciences
St. Philip's College

E. Cooper Smith, Ph. D.
Professor of Chemistry
Trinity University

Henry B. Webb, M.A.
Professor of History
San Antonio College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1959

Sarah Frances Anders, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Sociology
Mary Hardin-Baylor College

Joe E. Brown, Ph. D.
Professor of Economics
Texas College of Arts and Industries

M. D. Bryant, Ph. D.
Professor of Biology
Austin College

Alfred Thomas DeGroot, B.D., Ph. D.
Distinguished Professor of Church History
Texas Christian University

Lewis E. Fraser, Ph. D.
Director of Modern Languages
San Angelo College

Earl M. Lewis, Ph. D.
Chairman of the Department of Political Science
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College

Pauline Berry Mack, Ph. D., Sc. D.
Professor of Household Arts and Sciences
Texas Woman's University

Eduardo G. Scheel, M.A.
Chairman of Foreign Language Department
Sacred Heart Dominican College

R. S. Underwood, Ph. D.
Professor of Mathematics
Texas Technological College

George S. Wolfskill, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Social Science
Arlington State College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1960

Clifford B. Casey, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Sul Ross State College

Christine B. Cash Ph. D.
Professor of Education
Jarvis Christian College

Joseph I. Davies, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Biology
Rice University

George H. Dubay, M.A.
Chairman of the Department of Mathematics
University of St. Thomas

Katharine Evans, M.A.
Associate Professor of English
Del Mar College

Gladys Fox, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Stephen F. Austin State College

Inez Grant, M.E.
Chairman of the Department of English
South Plains College

Arthur M. Pullen, Ph. D.
Chairman of the Department of Biology
East Texas State College

Charles G. Smith, Ph. D., Litt. D.
Professor of English
Baylor University

Bertie Warren, S.M.
Chairman of the Department of Science
Amarillo College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1961

Jean Autrel, Ph. D.
Chairman of the Department of Foreign Languages
Midwestern University

Selma L. Bishop, Ph. D.
Professor of English
McMurry College

Henry A. Bullock, Ph. D.
Professor of Sociology
Texas Southern University

Cecil C. Crawford, Ph. D.
Professor of Philosophy
Texas Western College

Hazel Floyd, Ph. D.
Professor of Education
Sam Houston State Teachers College

Brother James F. Gray, S.M., Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Mathematics
St. Mary's University

Marjorie Morris, M.A.
Instructor of English
Odessa College

Margaret Pannill, M.A.
Instructor of English
Navarro Junior College

Adolph C. Streng, M.A.
Professor of Christianity and Philosophy
Texas Lutheran College

Marjorie T. Walthall, Ed. D.
Professor of Music and Education
San Antonio College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1962

Cecil Irvy Ayers, M.S.
Professor of Agronomy
Texas Technological College

Charles Kenneth Collings, D.D.S.
Professor of Periodontology
Baylor University College of Dentistry

Louise S. Cowan, Ph. D.
Professor of English
University of Dallas

Emmie Craddock, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Southwest Texas State College

Herbert Pickens Gambrell, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Southern Methodist University

Sister Mary Generosa Callahan, C.D.P., Ph. D.
Professor of English
Our Lady of the Lake College

Oscar Aaron Grant, Ph. D.
Professor of Social Sciences
Tarleton State College

Charles LaMotte, Ph. D.
Professor of Biology
Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas

Roger Paul McFerran, M.S.
Professor of Physics
The Texarkana College

Marcel Patterson, M. D.
Associate Professor of Internal Medicine
The University of Texas--Medical Branch
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1963

Mozella Arnold, M.A.
Instructor of English
Temple Junior College

Norris G. Davis, Ph. D.
Professor of Journalism
The University of Texas

Luther Guy Hagard, Jr., Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Government
Arlington State College

Clyde L. Hall, Ph. D.
Professor of Economics
Austin College

George C. Hester, LL. D.
Professor, the Lucy King Brown Chair of History
Southwestern University

John Keith Justice, Ph. D.
Professor of Agriculture
Abilene Christian College

William Crews McGavock, Ph. D., F.A.I.C.
Professor of Chemistry
Trinity University

Rupert Norval Richardson, Ph. D., Litt. D.
Professor of History
Hardin-Simmons University

B. E. Schulze, M.S., F.T.A.S.
Associate Professor of Physics
Del Mar College

Autrey Nell Wiley, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Texas Woman's University
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1964

Sister Joseph Marie Armer, C.C.V.I., Ph. D.
Professor of Biology
Incarnate Word College

John T. Biggers, D. Ed.
Professor of Art
Texas Southern University

Anne L. Campbell, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College

S. L. Canterbury, Ph. D.
Professor of Engineering
Kilgore College

Mabel Major, M.A.
Visiting Professor of English
Baylor University

Lucille Norton, Ph. D.
Professor of Health and Physical Education
Stephen F. Austin State college

Rev. John D. Sheehy, C.S.B., M.A.
Professor of History and Political Science
University of St. Thomas

Irwin Spear, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Botany
The University of Texas

Ralph A. Wooster, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Lamar State College of Technology

L. A. Youngman, M.S.
Professor of Physics
Pan American College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1965

Arthur Chesley Bowman, Ph. D.
Professor of Economics
San Antonio College

Sister Mary Arthur Carrow, C.D.P., Ph. D.
Professor of Speech
Our Lady of the Lake College

Bill G. Crane, Ph. D.
Professor of Government
St. Mary's University

Michel A. Dassonville, D. es L.
Professor of Romance Languages
The University of Texas

Helen Hewitt, Ph. D.
Professor of Music
North Texas State University

Harold Alfred Jeskey, Ph. D.
Professor of Chemistry
Southern Methodist University

Mina W. Lamb, Ph. D.
Professor of food and Nutrition
Texas Technological College

Louis H. Mackey, Ph. D.
Professor of Philosophy
Rice University

Lorraine Sherley, M.A.
Professor of English
Texas Christian University

Orville J. Stone M. D.
Assistant Professor of Dermatology
The University of Texas--Medical Branch
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1966

William Arrowsmith, Ph. D.
Professor of Classics and University
Professor in Arts and Letters
The University of Texas

Anton H. Berkman, Ph. D.
Professor of Biological Sciences
Texas Western College

Thomas Morgan Hammond, M.A.
Professor of Physics
Schreiner Institute

Lowell H. Harrison, Ph. D.
Professor of History
West Texas State University

Frances Kellam Hendricks, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Trinity University

William H. Matthews, III, M.A.
Professor of Geology
Lamar State College of Technology

Cothburn Madison O'Neal, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Arlington State College

Cecil B. Ryan, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Poultry Science
Texas A&M University

Cornelia M. Smith, Ph. D.
Professor of Biology
Baylor University

P. Eugene Smith, Ph. D.
Professor of Chemistry
Del Mar College
Lloyd B. Cherry, M.A.
Professor of Electrical Engineering
Lamar State College of Technology

Exalton A. Delco, Jr., Ph. D.
Professor of Biology
Huston-Tillotson College

Sister Claude Marie Faust, C.C.V.I., Ph. D.
Professor of Mathematics
Incarnate Word College

Beula Hamm, Ph. D.
Assistant Professor of Business Administration and Economics
Stephen F. Austin State College

Billy Mac Jones, Ph. D.
Professor of Social Sciences
Angelo State College

Lena Beatrice Morton, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Texas College

John J. W. Rogers, Ph. D.
Professor of Geology
Rice University

Joseph Satin, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Midwestern University

Hal T. Weathersby, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Anatomy
The University of Texas Southwestern Medical School

Paul C. Witt, Ph. D.
Professor of Chemistry
Abilene Christian College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1968

Robert A. Galvan, Ph. D.
Professor of Modern Languages
Southwest Texas State College

William A. Goetzmann, LL. D.
Stiles Professor of American Studies
and Professor of History
The university of Texas at Austin

Jack R. Harvey, M.A.
Professor of English
Weatherford College

Robert E. Hoffman, M.M.
Professor of Music
Amarillo College

George Glenn Killinger, Ph. D.
Professor of Sociology
Sam Houston State College

Nelda R. Lawrence, Ed. D.
Professor of Business Education and Office Administration
University of Houston

Brother Simon Scribner, C.S.C., Ph. D.
Professor of English
St. Edward's University

Cedric Taylor Stubblefield, Ph. D.
Professor of Physical Chemistry
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College

John George Hatch Thompson, Ph. D.
Professor of Mechanical Engineering
Texas A&M University

Helen Irene Weiss, Ed. M.
Associate Professor of Education
Texas Lutheran College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1969

Frederick H. Ginascol, Ph. D.
Professor of Philosophy and Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Willis Gilliland Hewatt, Ph. D.
Professor of Biology
Texas Christian University

W. Norton Jones, Jr., Ph. D.
Professor of Chemistry
McMurry College

Sister Mary Clodovia Lockett, S.S.N.D., Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Biology
University of Dallas

Eby Nell McElrath, Ph. D.
Professor of Chemistry
University of Houston

Clovis C. Morrisson, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Government
North Texas State University

Sydney C. Reagan, Ph. D.
Professor of Real Estate and Economics
Southern Methodist University

Daniel A. Sternberg, A. Mus. D.
Professor of Music
Baylor University

Ernest Wallace, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Texas Technological College

Trenton W. Wann, Ph. D.
Professor of Psychology
Rice University
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1970

Norman L. Biggs, Ph. D.
Professor of Gross Anatomy
Baylor University College of Dentistry

Thomas L. Brasher, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Southwest Texas State University

Donald E. Everett, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Trinity University

Calvin Huckabay, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Houston Baptist College

Clyde R. Nichols, M.S.
Professor of Electrical Engineering
The University of Texas at El Paso

Clarence W. Norris, Ph. D.
Professor of Sociology
St. Philip's College

Melvyn Hirsch Schreiber, M. D.
Professor of Radiology
The University of Texas Medical Branch

Anton Marinus Sorensen, Jr., Ph. D.
Professor of Animal Science
Texas A&M University

Kenneth W. Street, Ph. D.
Professor of Government
Austin College

Barbara Taylor Warburton, M.S.
Instructor in Biology
Texas Southmost College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1971

Lucille M. Boyd, M.A.
Instructor in Foreign Languages
Navarro Junior College

Richard B. Byrne, Ph. D.
Professor of Radio-Television-Film and Drama
The University of Texas at Austin

Charles Kincheloe chamberlain, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Stephen F. Austin State University

Aileen Creighton, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Del Mar College

Verna Mae Crutchfield, Ed. D.
Professor of Education
Angelo State University

James Leslie McCary, Ph. D.
Professor of Psychology
University of Houston

Josiah C. Russell, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Texas A&I University

Brother Louis A. Schuster, S.M., Ph. D.
Professor of English
St. Mary's University

Charles Leland Sonnichsen, Ph. D.
Benedict Professor of English
The University of Texas at El Paso

Louis Tomaino, M. Ed., M.S.W
Assistant Professor of Social work
Our Lady of the Lake College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1972

Roy Hamilton Biser, Jr., M.S.
Professor of Physics
Lamar University

Glenn R. Capp, Sr., J.D., Litt. D.
Professor of Oral Communication
Baylor University

Robert A. Divine, Ph. D.
Professor of History
The University of Texas at Austin

Thomas P. Dooley, Ph. D.
Professor of Biology
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College

Joyce Wang fan, Ph. D.
Professor of Chemistry
Houston Baptist College

Edward Norbeck, Ph. D.
Professor of Anthropology
Rice University

Bernard Christopher O’Halloran, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Incarnate Word College

Carlos Pestana, M. D., Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Surgery
The University of Texas Medical School at San Antonio

Robert Osborne Reid, M.S.
Professor of Civil Engineering and Oceanography
Texas A&M University

Joe F. Taylor, Ph. D.
Professor of Government
Amarillo College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1973

Ruth I. Anderson, Ed. D.
Professor of Business Administration
North Texas State University

R. Douglas Brackenridge, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Religion
Trinity University

Hoyt J. Burnette, M.S.
Instructor in Biology
McLennan Community College

Bruce D. Fallis, M. D.
Professor of Pathology
The University of Texas
Health Science Center at Dallas

Bro. Anthony P. Frederick, S.M., M.A.
Professor of English
St. Mary’s University

Zelma Ruth Odle, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Abilene Christian College

Ben Procter, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Texas Christian University

Ralph R. Robbins, Jr., Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Astronomy
The University of Texas at Austin

Sister Frances Jerome Woods, C.D.P., Ph. D.
Professor of Sociology
Our Lady of the Lake College

George Ruble Woolfolk, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1974

George Francis Carter, Ph. D.
Distinguished Professor of Geography
Texas A&M University

Frances Pauline Dushek, M.A.
Professor of Mathematics
Del Mar College

Gladys Jeannette Fashena, M. D.
Professor of Pediatrics
The University of Texas Southwestern Medical School at Dallas

John Hugh Hill, Ph. D.
Professor of History
University of Houston

John N. Igo, Jr., M.A.
Professor of English
San Antonio College

Duane Chad Morrison, B.D.
Instructor of Drafting
Grayson County College

DeWitt Carter Reddick, Ph. D.
Jesse H. Jones Professor of Journalism
The University of Texas at Austin

Velma Bennett Reiff, M. A.
Assistant Professor of English
Hardin-Simmons University

Emmet George Smith, M.M.
Professor of Organ
Texas Christian University

Charles Edward Tatum, Ph. D.
Professor of Economics and Geography
Prairie View A&M University
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1975

William James Boswell, J. D.
Professor of Law
Baylor University School of Law

Franz Richard Brotzen, Ph. D.
Professor of Materials Science
William Marsh Rice University

Wilma Alene Brown, Ph. D.
Professor of Nutrition and Food Science
Texas Woman’s University

Mary Lynn Crow, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Education
The University of Texas at Arlington

Fred Emil Ekfelt, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Stephen F. Austin State University

Daniel Edward Farlow, M.A.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
Southwest Texas State University

James a Hankerson, M.A.
Instructor, Social Science Division
El Centro College

Harley Dean Oberhelman, Ph. D.
Professor of Romance Languages
Texas Tech University

Alfred Charles Scherer, Ph. D.
Professor of German
Trinity University

June Popham Wood, M.A.
Professor of Mathematics
University of Houston--Downtown College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1976

Samuel Warren Cochran, Ph. D.
Professor of Psychology
East Texas State University

N. Catherine Cominsky, Ph. D.
Professor of Biology
University of Houston

Theron Wilford Kirk, M.M.
Professor of Music
San Antonio College

Jenny Lind Porter, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Huston-Tillotson College

Jack Reynolds, M. C., F.A.C.R.
Professor of Radiology
The University of Texas Health Science Center
at Dallas--Southwestern Medical School

Jose Rivas, D.R.E.
Professor of Religion
Howard Payne University

Clarence Carven Schultz, Ph. D.
Professor of Sociology-Anthropology
Southwest Texas State University

Marilyn McAdams Sibley, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Houston Baptist University

Shelton Lee Williams, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Political Science
Austin College

Michael Max Winesanker, Ph. D.
Professor of Musicology
Texas Christian University
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1977

David Virgil Aldrich, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Marine Sciences
Texas A&M University
Moody College of Marine Sciences and Maritime Resources

Annie Lou Winton Ballard, M.A.
Director, Division of Communications
Kilgore College

Fred McKee Garland, Ph. D.
Professor of Chemistry
Texas A&I University

James M. Palmer, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Sociology
East Texas Baptist College

Floyd Elsworth Peterson, Ph. D.
Margaret Root Brown Professor of Fine Arts (Music)
Southwestern University

David Lloyd Petrash, D.M.A.
Instructor of Fine Arts (Music)
Grayson County college

Allan A. Saxe, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Political Science
The University of Texas at Arlington

Gary Alan Smith, M.S.
Associate Professor of Biology
Tarrant County Junior College, Northwest Campus

Zell R. SoRelle, Ph. D.
Professor of Speech
West Texas State University

Evelyn Fiedler Streng, M.A.
Associate Professor of Science
Texas Lutheran College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1978

Mary Katherine Bell, M.A.
Associate Professor of Mathematics
Lamar University

Jesse Herndon Burr, Ph. D.
Professor of Biology
Stephen f. Austin State University

Geraldine Johnston, M.S.
Instructor of English
Navarro College

Gretchen Mleszkowski, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Literature
University of Houston at Clear Lake City

Carolyn Oliver Perry, M.A.
Instructor of English
San Jacinto College

John William Preece, C.D.S., M.S.D.
Associate Professor, Department of
Diagnosis and Roentgenology
The University of Texas Health Science
Center at San Antonio--Dental School

Robert Lynn Reid, M.A.
Professor of History
Baylor University

Helen Starr Roberts, M.A.
Associate Professor of Speech and Drama, Fine Arts
South Plains College

Frances Richter Swinny, M.A.
Professor of Speech and Drama
Trinity University

Donald Lewis Zelman, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Social Sciences
Tarleton State University
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1979

Henrietta H. Avent, D.P.E.
Professor, Department of Health & Physical Education
Southwest Texas State University

Sister Alice Ann Coles, M.J./M.A.
Associate Professor of English
Our Lady of the Lake University

Brother Charles J. Cummiskey, S.M., Ph. D.
Professor & Chairman, Department of Chemistry
St. Mary's University

Duane Orrin Eberhardt, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Economics
Department of Business Administration
Angelo State University

Russell John Long, Ph. D.
Regents' Professor of Biology
Lamar University at Beaumont

Edward Williford Martin, Ph. D.
Professor and Head, Department of Biology and
chairman, Division of Natural Sciences
Prairie View A&M University

Sister M. Geralda Schaefer, Ph. D.
Associate Professor, Mathematics Department
Pan American University at Edinburg

A. Elizabeth Taylor, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Texas Woman's University

Dolores C. Villarreal, M.A.
Associate Professor/Chairman, Medical Clerical Programs
St. Philip's College

Mary Cecilia Wyllie, M.A.
Instructor of English
Alvin Community College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1980

Anshel Brusilow, Ph. D.
Professor of Music
North Texas State University

Robert J. Connelly, Ph. D.
Professor of Philosophy
Incarnate Word College

Harley Davis, Ed. D.
Instructor, Industry and Technology
Paris Junior College

Frank J. Doe, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Biology
University of Dallas

Robert W. Huff, M. D.
Associate Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
The University of Texas
Health Science Center at San Antonio

Billy V. Koen, Sc. D.
Associate Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering
The University of Texas at Austin

Lois E. Martin, Ed. D.
Professor of Education
Hardin-Simmons University

Eugene Paul Martinez, Ph. D.
Professor, Mechanical engineering
Lamar University at Beaumont

Allen J. Matusow, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Rice University

Joan Phelan Quarm, M.A.
Associate Professor of English
The University of Texas at El Paso
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1981

Harry Matthew Brown, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Midwestern State University

Ronald Darby, Ph. D.
Professor of Chemical Engineering
Texas A&M University

Betty Jo Graber, M.Ed.
Instructor and Coach, Director of the Physical Education Division
Weatherford College

Joseph J. Lagowski, Ph. D.
Professor of Chemistry
The University of Texas at Austin

Jerry Bryan Lincecum, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Austin College

Kittye Dale Mooring, Ed. D.
Professor--School of Business
Texas Southern University

Mary Frances Park, Ed. D.
Professor of Education
Sam Houston State University

Sammy M. Ray, Ph. D.
Professor--Department of Marine Biology
Texas A&M University at Galveston

Dorothy Nell Short Rogers, M.A.
Assistant Professor of Speech communication and Drama
East Texas Baptist College

Anne Dean Turk, M. A.
Instructor of Piano and Theory--Music Department
Kilgore College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1982

Barbara B. Aldave, J. D.
Professor, School of Law
The University of Texas at Austin

William J. Bell, Ph. D.
Professor and Head, Department of Journalism and Graphic Arts
East Texas State University

Young C. Chen, Ph. D.
Assistant Professor of Microbiology and Virology, Department of Biological Sciences
North Texas State University

Melvin L. Daniels, Ed. D.
Professor of Music
Abilene Christian University

Milo E. Kearney, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of History
Department of Arts and Sciences
Pan American University at Brownsville

Edward Mangum, M.A.
Professor of Theatre Arts, Humanities
St. Edward's University

Marian L. Martinello, Ed. D.
Associate Professor, Division of Education
The University of Texas at San Antonio

William Samelson, Ph. D.
Professor, Chairman, Department of Foreign Languages
San Antonio College

Robert W. Walts, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Southwest Texas State University

Marion R. Webb, Ph. D.
Associate Professor in Spanish
Houston Baptist University
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1983

Anthony C. Anderson, M.A.
Associate Professor of Art/Film
Department of Art
The University of Texas at Arlington

Jewel Edward Berry, Ph. D.
Professor and Head, Department of Biology
Prairie View A&M University

William Bristow, M.F.A.
Professor, Department of Art
Trinity University

Alta Lewis Dollar, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Business Administration
School of Business
Texas Wesleyan College

Homer D. Fetzer, Ph. D.
Professor and Chairman, Department of Physics
St. Mary's University

David Thomas Gibson, Ph. D.
Director and Professor
Center for Applied Microbiology
The University of Texas at Austin

Larry G. Hufford, Ph. D.
Professor of Politics and Human Relations
Incarnate Word college

Alleene Simpson Lockhart, Ph. D.
Professor of Dance and Physical Education
Chairman Department of Dance
Texas Woman's University

Raymond Joseph Sousa, Ph. D.
Assistant Professor of English
Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio

Rosemary Valladolid, M.S.N.
Instructor of Nursing
El Paso Community College--Rio Grande Campus
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1984

David J. Clinkscale, M.A.
Associate Professor of Government
Coordinator of History and Government
Tarrant County Junior college--Northwest Campus

Ralph D. Feigin, M. D.
Professor and Chairman
Department of Pediatrics
Baylor College of Medicine

Timothy L. Flinn, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Mathematics
Tarleton State University

Gary T. Garner, D. M. A.
Professor of Music and Director of Bands and Orchestras, Department of Music
West Texas State University

Barbara T. Jones, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Chemistry
Southwestern Adventist College

U. Lynn Jones, Ph. D.
Associate Professor, Political Science
McMurry College

Costas Katsigris, M.S.
Instructor, Fine and Applied Arts Department
El Centro College

Michael P. Starbird, Ph. D.
Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics
The University of Texas at Austin

Fisher A. Tull, Ph. D.
Professor, Department of Music
Sam Houston State University

Ronald J. Williams, Ph. D.
Professor of Engineering Technology
Del Mar College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1985

Ruth A. Bagnall, Ph. d.
Associate Professor of Biology
University of St. Thomas

Ruth E. Bulger, Ph. D.
Professor, Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences
The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston

M. Duane Gage, M.A.
Associate Professor of History
Department of History, Philosophy & Religion
Tarrant County Junior college--Northeast Campus

Joseph J. Granata, Ph. D.
Instructor of Biology and Geology, Science Department
San Jacinto College--South Campus

Terry M. Mikiten, Ph. D.
Associate Professor--Department of Physiology
Associate Dean--Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences
The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio

David D. Neher, Ph. D.
Professor and Acting dean
College of Agriculture and Home Economics
Texas A&I University

Alan K. Pierce, M. D.
Professor of Internal Medicine
The University of Texas Health Science Center at Dallas

Katherine E. Staples, Ph. D.
Department head of Technical Communications and
Instructor of English
Austin Community College

Fred A. Tarpley, Ph. D.
Professor of Literature and Languages
East Texas State University

Robert W. Wylie, M.A.
Professor and Chairman, Department of English
Amarillo College
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1986

Robert Vernon Blystone, Ph. D.
Professor of Biology
Trinity University

Mary Greet Crawford, M.A.
Professor of Office Administration
Wiley College

H. McAfee Daniel, M.A.
Professor of English
Navarro College

Bro. William H. Dunn, C.S.C., Ph. D.
Professor of History
St. Edwards University

Charles Albert Endress, Ph. D.
Professor of History
Angelo State University

Lewis M. Fox, M.A.
Professor of Economics
San Antonio College

M. Neal Guentzel, Ph. D.
Professor of Life Sciences
The University of Texas at San Antonio

William V. Rice, Jr., Ph. D.
Professor of Economics and Management
University of Houston--Clear Lake

Ray Kenneth Robbins, M.L.S.
Professor of Criminal Justice
Western Texas College

Wayne Joseph Sheehan, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of History
Sul Ross State University
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1987

Arthur F. Beyer, Ph. D.
Professor of Biology
Midwestern State University

Mary Joyce Burnett, Ed. D.
Professor of Business Administration
School of Business
Texas Wesleyan College

Ann Cartwright, Ph. D.
Professor of Chemistry
San Jacinto College--Central Campus

S. Donald Greenberg, M. D.
Professor of Pathology, Otolaryngology and Medicine
Baylor College of Medicine

Robert P. Hallman, M.Ed.
Professor of English
Schreiner College

William L. Jenkins, B.V.Sc., M.Med.Vet., Ph. D.
Professor, Department of Veterinary Physiology & Pharmacology
Texas A&M University

Ross Mario Lence, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Political Science
University of Houston

Dennis McFadden, Ph. D.
Professor of Experimental Psychology
Department of Psychology
The University of Texas at Austin

Ralph William Pease III, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Sam Houston State University

Richard J. Smith, Ph. D.
Professor of History
William Marsh Rice University
PIPER PROFESSORS OF 1988

Beverly Ann Chiodo, Ph. d.
Associate Professor
Department of Computer Information Systems and
Administrative Sciences
Southwest Texas State University

Donna Lynn Clevinger, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Drama
University of North Texas

Bill Freeman, Ed. D.
Professor of Education
Austin College

Albert J. Griffith, Ph. D.
Professor of English
Our Lady of the Lake University

Rosanna Taylor Herndon, Ph. D.
Professor of Communication
Hardin-Simmons University

Diane Martin Jordan, Ph. D.
Instructor of English and Developmental Writing
Eastfield College

Calvin A. Kent, Ph. D.
Professor of Private Enterprise
Baylor University

John G. Rechtien, S.M., Ph. D.
Professor of English
St. Mary’s University

Vicente D. Villa, Ph. D.
Professor of Biology
Southwestern University

Kathryn M. Yandell, Ph. D.
Professor of Physical Education
Texas Lutheran College
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