This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received 69-2434

CURB, Laura Somervill, 1928-
PERSONALITY TRAITS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO VOTED FOR OR AGAINST SANCTIONS.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1968
Education, psychology

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/2484

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

PERSONALITY TRAITS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO VOTED FOR OR AGAINST SANCTIONS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

LAURA SOMERVILL CURB

Norman, Oklahoma

1968

PERSONALITY TRAITS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

WHO VOTED FOR OR AGAINST SANCTIONS

APPROVED BY

Fred A. Sloan, Jr.

John W. Kenner

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

To Dr. Fred A. Sloan, Jr., dissertation advisor and Chairman of the Doctoral Committee, the writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation for the guidance and help which have made this study possible.

The writer is especially grateful to Dr. Omer J. Rupiper for his generous help and advice. Additionally, the writer is indebted to Dr. John Renner and Dr. Gene Shepherd, the other members of the graduate committee, for their kind assistance.

Special recognition is given the writer's husband, Chapman Reilly Curb, for both his intellectual and his emotional support throughout this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		iii
LIST OF TABLES		v
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	6
	Hypotheses Tested	6
	Need for the Study	7
	Limitations of the Study	7
	Definition of Terms	8
	Treatment of the Data	9
	Organization of the Study	9
II.	REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE	11
III.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY AND PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA	36
	Selection of the Sample	36
	Instrumentation	38
	Treatment of the Data	41
	Presentation of the Data	41
	Interpretation of the Data	48
	Theoretical Interpretations	52
	Summary	54
IV.	SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	56
	Summary	56
	Findings	59
	Conclusions	60
	Recommendations	61
BIBLIOGRAPHY		63

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Means and Standard Deviations of Test Scores on the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values	42
II.	Means and Standard Deviations of Test Scores on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey	43
III.	Means and Standard Deviations of Test Scores on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule	47

PERSONALITY TRAITS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO VOTED FOR OR AGAINST SANCTIONS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Collective action by teachers to secure changes in working conditions underwent a qualitative change in the 1960's. Prior to that time, teachers in groups had used petitions and persuasion to obtain their desired changes in educational policies and fundings. Although they may have threatened to support or withhold support from elected officials, ultimate use of this threatened weapon was not public because of the secrecy of the vote for these elected officials.

In the early 1960's teachers began to use two persuasive techniques which were of a different character from techniques previously used. Both the imposition of sanctions and the strike are active, overt, collective acts. Imposition of sanctions, the most powerful weapon of the National Education Association,

consists of a variety of possible actions ranging from censure to the withholding of services.[1] The American Federation of Teachers, affiliated with the AFL-CIO, uses the teacher strike as its most powerful weapon.

The use by teachers of overt collective action to secure change surprised many people. Letters to the editors of various newspapers, school board members, and state legislators exhorted teachers to maintain their "professional image" by forsaking such actions. In states where unionism was not strong, teachers were promised wrathful action by lawmakers and laymen alike. In spite of this emotional reaction against sanctions and strikes, more than twenty-one states from California to New York and from Utah to Florida experienced collective teacher action during the period 1963-1967.[2]

Sanctions were formally authorized by the National Education Association in 1962.[3] In March, 1965, the Oklahoma Education Association imposed state sanctions on the entire state. In May of that same year, the N.E.A. invoked national sanctions on Oklahoma. After the Okla-

---

[1]Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966), pp. 303-304.

[2]Edward B. Shils and C. Taylor Whittier, Teachers, Administrators, and Collective Bargaining (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968), pp. 21-32.

[3]Lieberman and Moskow, op. cit., p. 231.

homa legislature took action to increase school funds, both the O.E.A. and the N.E.A. lifted sanctions in September, 1965.[4] By late 1967, Oklahoma teachers were asking again for more school funds for both salaries and classroom uses. Through its board of directors, the O.E.A. asked for resignations from Oklahoma teachers to be signed and kept in reserve in the event that the legislature did not approve further school expenditures. Following this action (in February, 1968), Oklahoma teachers held a mass meeting, terming it a "professional day" rather than a one-day strike. In March, 1968, teachers were asked to vote in county unit meetings by secret ballot on the questions of imposing sanctions, maintaining a sanctions alert, or taking no action.

The Oklahoma City unit of the O.E.A. represented the largest group of teachers in the state. Although some teachers in other cities were active in Classroom Teachers Association organizations (C.T.A. is an N.E.A. affiliate from which administrators are excluded), attempts by teachers in Oklahoma City to take action were channeled primarily through the O.E.A. unit. When this unit asked for its members to vote, 1758 teachers voted for sanctions and 918 voted against sanctions.

---

[4]Barbara Carter, "The Teachers Give Oklahoma a Lesson," Readings on Collective Negotiations, eds. Stanley M. Elam, Myron Lieberman, and Michael H. Moskow (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967), p. 381.

The vote to extend the sanctions alert was 1576 for and 888 against.[5]

Pursuant to this teacher voting, the state O.E.A. Board of Directors met to cast votes representing teacher sentiment. The ballot used for teacher voting had included both a vote for or against sanctions and a vote for or against extending sanctions alert. At the meeting of the Board of Directors the vote for sanctions was 101 to 97 and the vote for extending sanctions alert was 154 to 37. Despite the objection of the representatives of the Oklahoma City teachers, this vote was construed by the Board of Directors to be in favor of the continuance of sanctions alert rather than for the imposition of sanctions. This decision caused the Oklahoma City delegation to walk out of the Board of Directors' meeting.[6]

Late in April, 1968, the Governor of Oklahoma vetoed a teacher retirement bill. Once again teachers were asked to express an opinion on the imposition of sanctions. Following this teacher referendum, the Oklahoma Education Association imposed sanctions on the state, effective June 4, 1968.

Shils and Whittier refer to the demands and

---

[5]Letter from John Brothers, Oklahoma City District Chairman of the Oklahoma Department of Elementary School Principals of O.E.A., June 14, 1968.

[6]Ibid.

collective actions of teachers as "teacher militancy."[7] According to these authors, teacher militancy has resulted from exterior causes such as the failure of average teacher salaries to keep pace with the cost-of-living rise, the unsettled conditions caused by federal government programs pushing for speedier racial integration, and "chaotic changes" which threaten teacher dignity and self-respect.[8]

Harmon Zeigler explained teacher involvement in political activity as a result of changes in social class characteristics of teachers caused by the influx of more males into the teaching profession.[9] Iannaccone viewed the rising militancy of organized teacher groups as a "result of the internal closed-system power plays of educational associations and in part as a consequence of improvements made by the profession in teacher training."[10]

Teacher behavior is changing. Among the causes for this change may be personality traits found in

---

[7]Shils and Whittier, op. cit., pp. 2-3.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Harmon Zeigler, The Political Life of American Teachers (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967).

[10]Laurence Iannaccone, Politics in Education (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1967), p. 103.

teachers themselves.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine whether a difference in personality traits in Oklahoma City elementary school teachers accompanied a difference in voting for or against sanctions and to identify these traits. Three statistical hypotheses were formulated.

Hypotheses Tested

Ho_1 There is no statistically significant difference in the mean values of the six individual personality traits on the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values between groups of selected teachers who voted for sanctions and those who voted against sanctions.

Ho_2 There is no statistically significant difference in the mean values of the ten individual personality traits on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey between groups of selected teachers who voted for sanctions and those who voted against sanctions.

Ho_3 There is no statistically significant difference in the mean values of the fifteen individual personality traits on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule between groups of selected teachers who voted for sanctions and those who voted against sanctions.

Need for the Study

Teacher behavior has changed during the history of public schools both in the nation and in Oklahoma. Munn stated that individuals seldom change in their personality traits.[11] Ruch discussed personality traits as intrinsic motivators and stated, "Intrinsic factors are more important than extrinsic ones in determining job satisfaction."[12]

In view of the action of teachers in Oklahoma, that of being the only teacher group in the nation to impose sanctions on the state twice as of the date of this study, it seemed desirable to attempt an assessment of personality traits of these particular teachers at this time. To know more about personality characteristics of teachers with respect to voting behavior could lead to a better understanding of causative factors.

Limitations of the Study

Certain limitations should be kept in mind while interpreting the results of this study. The most serious are those which are inherent in an ex post facto design,

---

[11] Norman L. Munn, Psychology (5th ed. rev.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966), p. 261.

[12] Floyd L. Ruch, Psychology and Life (7th ed. rev.; Glenview, Illinois: Scott-Foresman and Company, 1967), p. 413.

namely the inability to manipulate variables and to exercise control over randomization of subjects.

Another limitation has to do with the danger of uncritically generalizing the findings. Although the study dealt with a specific population (Oklahoma City elementary school teachers), no statistical evidence is available to indicate that this population is typical of any larger group of teachers either locally or nationally.

This study was limited to include only personality factors measured by the three selected standardized instruments of a sample of elementary school teachers. Central office personnel, supervisors, counselors, principals, part-time teachers, and high school teachers were excluded from this study. This study was limited to the variables of voting for or against sanctions.

Definition of Terms

Teacher militancy: collective action to secure legislative or school board action on educational issues through the use of sanctions or strikes.

Sanctions:[13] public statements of censure, including statements that conditions in a school district

---

[13]Lieberman and Moskow, op. cit., pp. 303-304.

are unsatisfactory; withdrawal of placement services; requests that teachers not accept employment in a system; and assistance to teachers who seek employment elsewhere.

Personality traits: the six values assessed by the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, the ten traits assessed by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, and the fifteen preferences assessed by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

Elementary school teacher: a teacher in Grades K-6.

Treatment of Data

The critical ratio was used to test the hypotheses in this study. Data on personality traits were obtained from scores on the three tests administered to elementary school teachers and from responses to a questionnaire prepared by the writer and used to determine whether or not each teacher voted for or against sanctions. The mean value of each trait for those teachers in the sanction-favoring group was compared statistically with that same trait for those teachers in the sanctions-opposing group.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is organized into four chapters. Chapter I is a description of the study and includes the introduction, need, statement of the problem, definition

of terms, limitations, and a brief treatment of the data. Chapter II contains a review of research and related literature. Chapter II contains the design of the study, an analysis and presentation of the data, findings, and interpretations. Chapter IV contains the summary and findings of the study, conclusions based on the findings, and recommendations offered in view of the findings and conclusions.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE

In the 1960's many factors were at work to create teacher unrest. Which of these were the most important was difficult to determine. That there was nationwide collective teacher action was well documented by Shils and Whittier,[1] Lieberman and Moskow,[2] and Elam, Lieberman and Moskow.[3]

Shils and Whittier described strikes or imposition of sanctions in more than twenty-one states and scores of communities across the nation from coast to coast, north to south.[4] In the preface to a collection of readings on the subject of collective negotiations,

---

[1]Shils and Whittier, op. cit.

[2]Lieberman and Moskow, op. cit.

[3]Stanley M. Elam, Myron Lieberman, and Michael H. Moskow (eds.), Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967).

[4]Shils and Whittier, op. cit.

Elam, Lieberman and Moskow reported:

> It is a characteristic of twentieth-century United States that occupational groups organize in order to strengthen their position. Teachers have built significant organizations to protect and advance their interests only within the past forty to fifty years, and often these organizations have subordinated salary and welfare to other professional concerns. But this is no longer the case in the Sixties. In this decade teachers have grown militant. They are making themselves felt as a pressure group in an increasingly professionalized and bureaucratized society.[5]

According to Lieberman and Moskow, collective negotiations in American education were being accepted "at an extremely rapid rate."

> Legislation on the subject of collective negotiations was introduced in fifteen legislatures, by incomplete count, and enacted in at least seven in 1965. This is only one indication of the rate at which collective negotiations are becoming a major development in American education. The characteristics of teachers as a group are a crucial factor in this development. These characteristics strongly influence whether collective negotiations will emerge and what their patterns of development will be. Undoubtedly, some teacher characteristics are conducive to collective negotiations and others are not; but both kinds must be taken into account to understand the changes in some districts and the absence of change in others.[6]

What were the characteristics of elementary school teachers as a group in the Sixties? Lieberman and Moskow reported a total of 925,027 elementary classroom teachers in 1960. According to these authors, the

---

[5]Elam, Lieberman, and Moskow, op. cit., p. v.

[6]Lieberman and Moskow, op. cit., pp. 20-21.

typical elementary school teacher was female, married, had a working husband, was 41½ years old, white, and had slightly more than four years of college. She did not hold an extra job either during the school year or the summer of 1961. By virtue of being an elementary school teacher, she belonged to the group whose membership was over half of the total school personnel. Her average salary in the school year 1964-65 was $6035. From a salary standpoint, her relative economic position had improved in the 1960's. She belonged to the National Education Association.[7] These authors further stated, "Most teachers probably believe that strikes are 'unprofessional' except under extreme circumstances."[7]

Portraits of typical teachers based on averages do not always reflect an accurate picture. This is true

---

[7]The description of the typical elementary school teacher, including salary comparison, was drawn from the following description: "In 1963-64 the total instructional staff in public schools was estimated at 1,718,832. . . . A 1961 study showed that in public secondary schools, 56.8 per cent of the teachers were men; in public elementary schools only 12.1 per cent. . . . In 1965 the mean age of all public school teachers was 39.1 years. . . . 25.5 per cent of the elementary teachers were under 30 years of age, 9.5 per cent were 60 years or older, and more than one-third were 50 or more years of age. . . . In 1960, about 10 per cent of the total public school teaching force were nonwhite. In the South, 22 per cent were nonwhite . . . elsewhere in the nation only 4 per cent were nonwhite. Only 27 per cent of the nonwhite teachers were men. . . . In 1960 the proportion of secondary teachers with five years of training was twice that of elementary teachers . . . a study of the preparation of elementary teachers in 35 states showed

of the salary for the elementary teacher described above. Lieberman and Moskow reported that in 1964-65, average instructional salaries were $7800 in New York and $3931 in Mississippi. They further compared teachers' salaries with wage and salary workers in all industries in 1964, showing teachers to be earning a little less than a thousand dollars above the average for such workers.[8]

Shils and Whittier reported a different salary comparison:

> Average salaries for public school classroom teachers increased by 29.5 per cent in the period 1960-65. However, average earnings for accountants, lawyers, chemists, engineers, scientists, and federal employees are still superior to classroom teachers. Since 1951, the consumer price index in the United States (based on the 1957-59 index) rose from 90.5 to 116.5 (July, 1967), a rise of 28.7 per cent. Teachers believe that the index does not keep pace with the realities of rising costs. . . .

84.3 per cent had completed 120 or more semester hours of credit in 1964-65. . . . In 1960, 57 per cent of the women teachers were married . . . about 72 per cent of the spouses of married teachers were employed. . . . Ninety-two per cent of the married women teachers reported their husbands to have jobs. . . . In 1961 . . . 7.6 per cent of all women teachers had other employment during the school year . . . 11.9 per cent of the women were employed during the summer outside of their regular teaching jobs. . . . In 1964-65 the average salary for secondary teachers was $6503. . . for elementary teachers $6035. Instructional salaries since 1958 have continued to increase a little faster than the average for all employed persons. In 1964 the average annual earnings for the instructional staff were $6285 and $5393 for wage and salary workers in all industries. In that same year, 1.8 per cent of all teachers made below $3500, 12.5 per cent - $3500 to $4499, 26.9 per cent - $4500 to $5499, 25.1 per cent - $5500 to $6499, and 33.7 per cent above $6500." Lieberman and Moskow, op. cit., pp. 21-28.

[8] Ibid.

> When teachers' salaries are competitive with the labor market for positions requiring equivalent education and talent, the vacancies in many cities will be filled.[9]

Salaries reported by these authors for educated workers ranged from $7,267 for federal employees to $11,652 for nonsupervisory scientists without doctorates in 1965, with classroom teachers having an average salary of $6,298. Thus the average salary of a teacher was almost a thousand dollars below the lowest average salary for the group of workers described by Shils and Whittier.[10]

Increases in salaries were demanded by teachers in most cases when they did strike or impose sanctions. However, it should be remembered that in the Sixties many states with very low salary scales had no collective action taken by teachers for increases, e.g., Arkansas and Mississippi. In other words, once collective action began, what teachers said they wanted may not always have been the important factor in the initiation of collective action.

Salary was but one extrinsic factor reported as a cause for teacher action. Shils and Whittier reported the following demands from various striking groups (most of these accompanying a demand for salary increases): more funds for special programs such as the retarded; a longer school year; duty-free lunch periods; less

---

[9]Shils and Whittier, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

[10]Ibid., p. 6.

crowded classes; relief from hall, street, playground, and bookkeeping duties; a voice in planning curriculum and selecting textbooks; more remedial programs; the right to appeal discharges and demotions; the right to seek changes in the methods of rating teacher effectiveness; the setting of what hours varsity athletes go for practice; bans on discrimination; the right to have a legal bargaining agent and a dues check-off; a cessation of board discrimination against married women teachers; clearly stated and professionally acceptable goals; greater health and welfare benefits; full support in enforcing school discipline including police protection when necessary; immediate expulsion of any pupil who attacks a teacher or student; and investigation of any incidents involving intimidation of students or teachers.[11] Teachers are saying in effect that if these various causes of job dissatisfaction are removed, collective action in the form of strikes or imposition of sanctions will not be needed. But were these the factors which caused such actions?

Sergiovanni reported:

> The satisfaction factors identified for teachers tend to focus on the work itself and the dissatisfaction factors tend to focus on the conditions of work. More specifically the elimination

---

[11] Ibid., pp. 47-89.

> of the dissatisfiers (conditions of work factors) does not result in teacher job satisfaction.[12]

According to this finding, a teacher remains dissatisfied until the work itself satisfies, an indication of a different kind of change from an external adjustment of extrinsic factors.

If there were some doubt that salaries and other conditions of work actually sparked organized teacher action, the teaching system itself needed examination.

"In most organizations, collective negotiations become necessary partly because employees lack opportunity to communicate their attitudes to leadership," warned Shils and Whittier under the section title, "Paternalism - A Poor Substitute for Positive Personnel Policies."[13] Paternalism was described by these authors as the administrator knowing best what is best for the classroom teacher.

Corwin included "a centralized decision making process" as part of the description of a "bureaucratic" school system.[14] Kenney, White, and Gentry identified such administrative behavior as belonging to a "closed"

---

[12]Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Investigation of Factors Which Affect Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction of Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc., 1967), p. 1235-A.

[13]Shils and Whittier, op. cit., p. 161.

[14]Ronald G. Corwin, "Militant Professionalism, Initiative and Compliance in Public Education," Sociology of Education, XXXIII (1965), 316.

system.[15] If, as Shils and Whittier maintained, collective teacher negotiations become necessary because of dissatisfaction with a closed system, such a system should be a source of job dissatisfaction as well as a threat to the teacher's sense of power. Yet various studies indicated the opposite to be true. Stout reported:

> A higher percentage of teachers in the "closed" system stress primary loyalty to students and accept responsibility for making policy decisions than in the "open" systems. Also a higher percentage of teachers in the "closed" system stress standardization of work and a centralized decision making process than in the "open" system. This runs counter to the generally accepted idea that as teachers gain more control they also become more professional. Here the group with more control has a greater percentage of low professionally oriented teachers.[16]

Moeller and Charters reported:

> It was hypothesized that a teacher's sense of power would be lower in highly bureaucratic than in less bureaucratic school systems. . . . Contrary to the hypothesis, sense of power was greater in the highly bureaucratic schools. Teachers' feelings of power to influence school policies appear to be affected by variables lying within the teachers themselves as well as in the organizational structure of the school systems. (Emphasis added.)[17]

---

[15] James B. Kenney, William F. White, and Harold W. Gentry, "Personality Characteristics of Teachers and Their Perception of Organizational Climate," Journal of Psychology, LXVI (1967), pp. 167-74.

[16] Ray L. Stout, "Organizational Influence on Teacher Leadership Perception" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968), p. 116.

[17] Gerald H. Moeller and W. W. Charters, "Relation of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers," Administrative Science Quarterly, X (1966), 465.

In a study of individual personality and organizational climate, Collins found that "individual personality was shown to have an impact upon the teacher's perception of climate, and on the satisfaction level he reported with his job."[18] Murphy concluded that "the personality pattern of the perceiver may contribute to his perception of a school's organizational climate."[19]

Another source of motivation for collective action might have been the effect of teachers' organizations on individual teachers, i.e., the ability of the group to arouse a similar sentiment in all its membership. Such identification with a group contributed to national political behavior, according to Sellers, who stated:

> Recent research has shown the importance of party identification in governing individual acts of voting and on the sum of party identifications as representing a prevailing disposition of the electorate that is only marginally affected by the immediate issues and candidates in any election.[20]

---

[18]James A. Collins, "Individual Personality and Organizational Climate," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc., 1967), p. 623-A.

[19]Joseph A. Murphy, Jr., "An Investigation into Certain Personality Factors of Elementary School Teachers and Principals with Reference to the Organizational Climate of the School," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc., 1967), p. 3670-A.

[20]Charles Sellers, "The Equilibrium Cycle in Two-Party Politics," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIX (1965), 37.

Probably the majority feeling of the teacher group played as big a role in determining the use of collective teacher action as party feeling did in determining national voting action. However, what factor determined this majority feeling? Since collective teacher action involves risk-taking to a certain extent, studies of individual and group decisions involving risk were relevant.

Rim cited studies by Stoner (1961), who found groups taking more risky positions than individuals, and Marquis (1962), who found a tendency of groups to shift positions involving risk. Pursuant to these studies, Rim investigated the personality traits related to risk-taking before and after group discussion. He found that the extrovert influences others and is himself prone to take risks prior to group discussion. The average neurotic scorers he found to be those who shifted most readily after the influence of group discussion, in the direction of greater risk-taking. The least prone to shift toward risk-taking were the high neurotic scorers. Using Eysenck's Short Questionnaire for the Measurement of Two Dimensions of Personality, Rim found that group influence originates with the high extrovert scorer who "tends to prefer action to planning for action." He described the extrovert further as follows:

> He is happiest when he gets involved in some project that calls for rapid action, usually takes the initiative in making new friends, says that he is a lively individual, is inclined to be quick and sure in his actions, and would be very unhappy if he were prevented from making social contacts.[21]

Thus far three types of extrinsic factors have been examined in the literature for their possible effects as motivators of initial collective action on the part of teachers in groups. Salary and other work conditions have been found to differ widely across the nation, but teacher groups in states with relatively poor conditions have not always been militant. Closed or bureaucratic school systems have not been found to have a depressing effect on teachers' sense of power, and may be a product of teacher perception according to teacher personality traits. Actions based on group influence appear to be a product of the influence of a particular type of personality.

Harmon Zeigler suggested that teacher militancy was a property of male teachers more than it was of female teachers. After interviews with 803 high school teachers living in Oregon, 60.5 per cent of whom were males, Zeigler addressed two books to the subject of sex as the most important independent variable in

---

[21] Y. Rim, "Personality and Group Discussion Involving Risk," Psychological Record, XIV (1964), 45.

teacher behavior. He stated:

> We have established that income and length of teaching experience are not as important as sex in determining teacher behavior. . . . It was found that some of the consequences of teachers' social mobility can be understood only in terms of sex; this is especially true of matters affecting the political or personal power of the male.[22]

According to Zeigler, the majority of male teachers come from low-status backgrounds, the majority of females from high-status backgrounds. He asserted that the upward-mobile male sees in the teachers' union a more vigorous organization for achieving political goals.

> More than 100 teacher strikes have occurred in the last twenty-five years. The struggle really centers around the professional image of the teacher, with the NEA affiliates and the labor unions offering different teacher images. The revolt against the teachers' associations is primarily an urban phenomenon, led by males.[23]

Zeigler wrote that his decision to concentrate on sex as one explanatory variable arose from a series of inquiries which included the reading of discussions of the role of women in politics.

> Most of these studies reached the same empirical conclusion: women are less active and efficacious in the political process than men. However, two different assumptions about the reasons for these differences emerge. On the one hand, differences are described as the result of social and cultural restraints imposed upon adult males and females. . . . On the other hand, there is

---

[22]Harmon Zeigler, The Political Life of American Teachers (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 49.

[23]Ibid., p. 56.

evidence that differences between the sexes are the result of inherent psychological differences.[24]

Since the proportion of male teachers in elementary schools is quite small (12.1 per cent in 1961), and since these male teachers for the most part are anticipating becoming administrators rather than remaining teachers[25] or expect to leave the teaching profession altogether,[26] the impact of the male teacher on elementary school teacher collective behavior is not comparable to that at the high school level. However, the active and vocal influence of the male teacher in the state organization may very well have been the motivation for that group to exert its influence on all its members for more political involvement than might have occurred had the state organization been made up entirely of female teachers. Since the reaction of the teacher to this group influence has been found to be related to individual personality, and since the majority of education association members were elementary teachers, not all the responsibility for teacher group action rested with the male element of the group.

One other factor which may have contributed to

---

[24]Harmon Zeigler, The Political World of the High School Teacher (Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press, 1966), pp. xiv-xv.

[25]Ibid., p. 3.

[26]Lieberman and Moskow, op. cit., p. 23.

the change in teacher behavior politically was the effect of the passage of time. Gosta Carlson identified the time factor as "a fundamental variable in the process of attitude change" as shown in national voting trends in Sweden, Norway, Great Britain and the United States.[27] As the United States has become more bureaucratized, as various groups through organizational effort have secured various changes for themselves, as the total pattern of American living has changed in the direction of less individual influence and more collective power, it is possible that teachers as a group were acting as a product of these changes.

In many of the studies of teacher behavior discussed so far, personality has emerged as a possible related factor. According to Ruch, personality may be defined as an individual's "particular pattern or organization of measurable traits, both 'inner' and 'outer' ones," a definition which generally implies that "there is a consistency and stability of behavior patterns such that different individuals will respond to the same external situation in a manner determined more by personal characteristics than by the characteristics of the stimulus."[28]

---

[27]Gosta Carlson, "Time and Continuity in Mass Attitude Change: the Case of Voting," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIX (1965), 1-15.

[28]Ruch, op. cit., p. 111.

Personality is formed early in life and remains fairly unchanged in later years. Munn stated:

> In high school, college, and business or professional life, the situations that we meet may have an influence on certain of our personality traits. But personality is altered less at these levels than earlier, because once most habits and attitudes are acquired, they are somewhat resistant to change. Even though many individuals could change their personality in some respects, especially by reacting differently to social situations, they seldom do so.[29]

According to Munn, nobody knows how many really different personality traits there are. These components of personality may be surface traits or they may be unconscious.[30] According to Ruch, traits may be defined as characteristics that can be observed and tested objectively or inferred from observable, measurable behavior.[31]

For the purpose of this study, three objective self-inventories of personality traits were selected. The Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values[32] was selected because it approaches the measurement of personality from the standpoint of motives. Ruch stated:

> The Study of Values is a self-inventory devised to measure the relative importance of six basic

---

[29]Munn, op. cit., p. 261.

[30]Ibid., p. 254.

[31]Ruch, op. cit., p. 112.

[32]G. W. Allport, P. E. Vernon, and G. Lindzey, A Study of Values: A Scale for Measuring the Dominant Interests in Personality (3rd ed.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960).

> motives in an individual's personality: theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious. This classification is based directly upon Eduard Spranger's Types of Men, a brilliant work which presents and defends the view that the personalities of men are best known through a study of their values or philosophy of life.[33]

The questions included in this test identify individuals by types. The manual for the third edition of the Study of Values described these types as follows:

> 1. The Theoretical: The dominant interest of the theoretical man is the discovery of truth. In the pursuit of this goal he characteristically takes a "cognitive" attitude, one that looks for identities and differences; one that divests itself of judgments regarding the beauty or utility of objects, and seeks only to observe and to reason. Since the interests of the theoretical man are empirical, critical, and rational, he is necessarily an intellectualist, frequently a scientist or philosopher. His chief aim in life is to order and systematize his knowledge.
>
> 2. The Economic: The economic man is characteristically interested in what is useful. . . . This type is thoroughly "practical" and conforms well to the prevailing stereotype of the average American businessman. . . . The economic man wants education to be practical and regards unapplied knowledge as waste. . . . In his personal life the economic man is likely to confuse luxury with beauty. In his relations with people he is more likely to be interested in surpassing them in wealth than in dominating them (political attitude) or in serving them (social attitude).
>
> 3. The Aesthetic: The aesthetic man sees his highest value in form and harmony. Each single experience is judged from the standpoint of grace, symmetry, or fitness. . . . He need not be a creative artist, nor need he be effete; he is aesthetic if he but finds his chief interests in the artistic episodes of

---

[33]Ruch, op. cit., p. 145.

> life. . . . Aesthetic people often like the beautiful insignia of pomp and power, but oppose political activity when it makes for the repression of individuality.
>
> 4. The Social: The highest value for this type is love of people. In the Study of Values it is the altruistic or philanthropic aspect of love that is measured. The social man prizes other persons as ends, and is therefore himself kind, sympathetic, and unselfish.
>
> 5. The Political: The political man is interested primarily in power. His activities are not necessarily within the narrow field of politics; but whatever his vocation, he betrays himself as Machtmensch. Leaders in any field generally have high power value.
>
> 6. The Religious: The highest value of the religious man may be called unity. He is mystical, and seeks to comprehend the cosmos as a whole, to relate himself to its embracing totality.[34]

This test has been constructed in such a way that forty is the average for any single value. A high score on one value can be obtained only by reducing correspondingly the score on one or more of the other values. The mean reliability coefficient for the values is given in the manual as .90.

In comparing the scores of students on the Study of Values with their ratings as student teachers two years later, Seagoe found a positive correlation of aesthetic scores with principals' ratings.[35] According

---

[34] Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

[35] May V. Seagoe, "Prediction of In-service Success in Teaching," Journal of Educational Research, XXXIX (1946), 658-63.

to Duncan, significant differences in values exist between teachers in different subject areas.[36]

Duffy concluded that with increased college preparation there is a tendency for scores on the Study of Values to increase in aesthetic, social, and theoretical values, decreasing in the other three. However, she also concluded, "It seems probable that values scores, while not unrelated to average college achievement, are much more closely related to differential achievement in specific fields."[37] Illustrative occupational differences reported in the manual for the Study of Values show that junior and senior high school teachers scored highest on religious values and lowest on aesthetic values.[38] This finding was the same as that of Rupiper in his study of women teachers at the graduate level. The median age for women in Rupiper's study was forty-one years, the same as the national average for elementary school teachers.[39]

---

[36]Lloyd L. Duncan, "Primary Personality Patterns of Good and Superior Teachers in Lower, Middle, and Upper Socio-economic Area Elementary Schools" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1966), p. 13.

[37]Elizabeth Duffy, "A Critical Review of Investigations Employing the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values and Other Tests of Evaluative Attitude," Psychological Bulletin, XXXVII (1940), 597-612.

[38]Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey, op. cit., p. 14.

[39]Omer John Rupiper, "A Psychometric Evaluation of Experienced Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, LV (1962), 368-71.

The second inventory of personality traits selected for this study was the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.[40] According to Ruch, two large groups of normal personality factors have been identified through the use of factor analysis. The hormetic traits depend upon both the physical needs of the body and the kinds of experiences the individual has had. These hormetic factors are needs, attitudes, and interests. The other group, the temperament factors, describe the manner in which the individual characteristically operates in certain areas. The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is a self-inventory device that has grown out of research in which factors of temperament have been studied.[41]

According to Hudson, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey measures separate traits.

> It will produce internal validity or factorial validity of the scores which is fairly well assured by the foundation of factor analysis studies plus the successive item analysis directed toward internal consistency and uniqueness. Each score is probably a fairly clear indicator of one unique trait.[42]

---

[40] J. P. Guilford and W. S. Zimmerman, The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (Beverly Hills, California: Sheridan Supply Company, 1949).

[41] Ruch, op. cit., pp. 146-47.

[42] Marlene Coe Hudson, "Interpersonal Values, Temperament Traits, and Interests Values of Elementary Education Students at the University of Oklahoma" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1966), pp. 7-8.

This survey consists of 300 items that measure ten traits in a bi-polar fashion. These traits are general activity, restraint, ascendance, sociability, emotional stability, objectivity, friendliness, thoughtfulness, personal relations, and masculinity. Cottle and Downie summarize the descriptions of these traits as follows:

> G-General Activity. Energy, vitality, enthusiasm vs. slowness of action and inefficiency.
>
> R-Restraint. Serious-mindedness, persistence, self-control vs. carefree, excitement-loving, impulsive.
>
> A-Ascendance. Self-defense, persuading others, bluffing, leadership vs. submissiveness, hesitation in speaking, and avoiding conspicuousness.
>
> S-Sociability. Many friends and acquaintances, liking social activities and contacts vs. few friends and acquaintances, shyness, dislike of social activities.
>
> E-Emotional Stability. Evenness of moods, interest, and energy, optimism, cheerfulness vs. fluctuation of moods, pessimism, gloominess.
>
> O-Objectivity. Being "thick-skinned" vs. hypersensitiveness, suspiciousness, self-centeredness.
>
> F-Friendliness. Toleration of hostile action, acceptance of dominance, and respect for others vs. belligerence, hostility, resistance to domination, and contempt for others.
>
> T-Thoughtfulness. Reflectiveness,interest in thinking, mental poise, observation of self vs. interest in overt activity, and mental disconcertedness.
>
> P-Personal Relations. Tolerance of people and faith in social institutions vs. faultfinding habits, suspiciousness of others, and self pity.

M-Masculinity. Interest in masculine activities and vocations, hardboiled vs. interest in feminine activities and vocations, easily disgusted, sympathetic, romantic interests, great interest in clothes and styles.[43]

The mean reliability coefficient for the variables as determined from the manual is .81.

Leeds obtained scores on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey from 300 teachers. The highest score was a mean of 19.9 for restraint with both emotional stability and personal relations showing a mean of 19.8. The lowest scores obtained were means of 12.5 for ascendance and 10.3 on masculinity for female teachers.[44]

Cook, in measuring inexperienced or student teachers, obtained a high score of 21.25 as the mean for sociability, with the lowest mean being 15.36 for ascendance.[45] The mean obtained by Rupiper for both men and women was highest for personal relations and lowest for sociability.[46]

---

[43]William C. Cottle and N. M. Downie, Procedures and Preparation for Counseling (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), pp. 265-66.

[44]Carroll H. Leeds, "Teacher Attitudes and Temperament as a Measure of Teacher-Pupil Rapport," Journal of Applied Psychology, XL (1956), 333-37.

[45]Desmond L. Cook, "A Note on the Relationships Between MTAI and GZTS Scores for Three Levels of Teacher Experience," Journal of Educational Research, LV (1962), 363-67.

[46]Rupiper, op. cit., p. 369.

The third inventory selected for this study was the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.[47] This inventory is a forced-choice type designed to measure a number of relatively independent variables obtained from a list of manifest needs which was developed by H. A. Murray et al. (1953). The inventory measures fifteen of these needs: achievement, deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, affiliation, intraception, succorance, dominance, abasement, nurturance, change, endurance, heterosexuality, and aggression. In addition a consistency score is obtained. Cottle and Downie summarize the description of these needs as follows:

> 1. Achievement: to do one's best, to be successful, to do a difficult job well.
>
> 2. Deference: to get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to let others make decisions.
>
> 3. Order: to have work neat, to plan in advance, to keep files neat and orderly.
>
> 4. Exhibition: to say witty things, to tell clever jokes, to be the center of attention.
>
> 5. Autonomy: to be independent of others, to say what one thinks about things, to criticize others, to avoid responsibilities.
>
> 6. Affiliation: to be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to share and to do things with friends.

---

[47] Allen L. Edwards, Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (rev. ed.; New York: Psychological Corporation, 1959).

7. Intraception: to analyze one's motives and feelings, to understand how others feel about things, to predict the behavior of others.

8. Succorance: to receive a great deal of affection from others, to be helped by others, to have a fuss made by others when not feeling well.

9. Dominance: to be a leader, to argue for one's point of view, to settle arguments, to supervise.

10. Abasement: to feel guilty when one does something wrong, to feel timid and inferior, to feel better when giving in.

11. Nurturance: to help friends when they are in trouble, to treat others with kindness and sympathy, to have others confide in one.

12. Change: to do new and different things, to try new jobs, to move about the country.

13. Endurance: to keep at a job until it is finished, to work hard at a task, to avoid being interrupted while working.

14. Heterosexuality: to associate with members of the opposite sex, to be in love with one of the opposite sex, to read books about sex.

15. Aggression: to attack contrary points of view, to make fun of others, to become angry, to blame others when things go wrong.[48]

A consistency score of ten or higher is considered by Edwards to indicate that the subject is not responding to the items on the basis of chance alone.

The manual for the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule reports both college norms and general adult norms for the fifteen variables. According to the manual,

---

[48]Cottle and Downie, op. cit., pp. 273-74.

the mean coefficient of internal consistency (split-half reliability) is .76 and the mean stability coefficient (test-retest) is .87.[49]

Jackson and Guba administered the Personal Preference Schedule to 223 elementary school teachers and 143 high school teachers, comparing the results with the norms reported in the manual. Significant differences were found between the norms for the general population and for teachers in the need measures of deference and heterosexuality. With the exception of the male elementary school teachers, the teachers scored higher than the normative group on order and endurance but lower on exhibition. Jackson and Guba concluded that these five needs appeared to be typical of teachers in general.[50]

Summary

Of the many factors which may initiate collective teacher action, personality traits appeared to be indicated as a major contributing variable. No research has been reported which specifically examines the relation of measurable personality traits to teacher militancy.

---

[49] Edwards, op. cit., p. 19.

[50] P. W. Jackson and E. G. Guba, "The Need Structure of In-service Teachers: An Occupational Analysis," School Review, LXV (1957), 176-92.

The Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values examines personality traits from the standpoint of motivation. The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey measures the manner in which an individual operates in a situation. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule measures personality traits that result from human needs. Together the three measures should provide an adequate assessment of teacher personality traits for the purpose of this study.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY AND PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

This study compared the personality traits of two groups of teachers.

Selection of the Sample

The population studied included all elementary school teachers of the Oklahoma City Public Schools, selected because of the involvement of their unit of the Oklahoma Education Association in securing the imposition of sanctions on the state in 1968. This population worked primarily through the local O.E.A. unit, and the O.E.A. was the sole organization to claim statewide representation of teachers and to invoke sanctions accordingly.

The sample of this population was selected on the basis of percentage representation of all Oklahoma City elementary school teachers according to their locations in lower-, middle-, or upper-class schools. These classifications were provided by the central office of the Oklahoma City Schools. Schools designated as upper-class represent the smallest percentage of the school

population. Only 8 per cent of the elementary school teachers are employed in upper-class schools. Middle-class schools employ 58 per cent, while 34 per cent of the elementary school teachers in Oklahoma City are employed in lower-class schools. For this study schools were selected in order that teachers sampled from those schools represented this distribution within 2 per cent for each classification.

For the sample 200 teachers were chosen. Each was given by the school principal an unmarked envelope containing an information sheet compiled by the writer and the three personality tests with answer sheets. Instructions were given by letter in each packet to return the completed tests unsigned, thus preserving anonymity.

One hundred eighty-two completed test packets were returned, or 91 per cent of those distributed. These packets were then divided into three groups: those returned from teachers who opposed sanctions in both the March and the May teacher referendums, those who favored sanctions on both occasions, and those who favored sanctions on one of these occasions but opposed them on the other. The last group numbered thirty-two teachers and was discarded for the purpose of this study as being neither clearly in favor of nor clearly opposed to sanctions. Of the remaining 150 teachers, 28 were opposed to sanctions on both votes and 122

favored sanctions.

Instrumentation

The tests used for measuring personality traits were the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. As previously described in Chapter II, these tests represented three approaches to the assessment of personality.

The Study of Values, based on the evaluative attitudes of men, consists of a number of questions based upon a variety of familiar situations. The subject designates his preference of responses by numerical rankings of alternatives. Although the test can be scored by the subject, the teachers were instructed to ignore the directions for adding their own scores in order to avoid any simple computation errors. For any single value the corrected mean is forty, based on the scores obtained from the 1960 population used to secure averages for this test.

The manual accompanying the Study of Values cautions investigators that the measures of the six values are not independent of one another, and therefore should have statistical techniques applied to them with care. In this study, comparisons were between group means for each trait rather than between traits themselves

within each group, thus providing for this dependent relationship.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, based on characteristic behavior, consists of 300 items, thirty items for each of ten traits. Each item requires a "Yes," "?," or "No" response. The total score for each trait indicates the degree to which that trait suggests the behavior to be expected from the subject. Since the traits are bi-polar, high scores indicate the positive qualities and low scores indicate the negative qualities.

Norms are based on a sample of college students and adults, and the means of total scores center around eighteen. Although intercorrelations of the ten trait scores are generally low, the traits of emotional stability and objectivity have a correlation of .69. According to the manual, the emotional stability score embraces two emotional factors and this may have a bearing on the high correlations. "In either pair," according to the test authors, "each score accounts for less than half the variance of the other, so that there is considerable unique contribution made by each."[1]

Since it is suggested in the manual that more than three "?" responses for any one trait tend to invalidate the score for that trait, no responses

---

[1]Guilford and Zimmerman, op. cit., p. 6.

containing more than this number were used in this study. Total test scores for such individuals were discarded as incomplete.

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, based on needs, consists of 225 items requiring a forced choice response between two alternative descriptions of the subject, most of which begin with "I like" or "I feel." An attempt has been made to minimize the influence of social desirability of responses by pairing two equally acceptable responses on each item representing two different personality traits. Each of the fifteen personality variables is paired twice with each of the other variables. Scores are based on the number of times each statement for a given variable is chosen. The maximum score for any one variable is twenty-eight. The normative sample means for the fifteen traits range from ten to sixteen, roughly. Norms were established by a nationwide sample of adults.

A consistency score is obtained by a comparison of the number of identical choices made in two sets of the same fifteen items. According to the manual, the probability of ten or more identical choices occurring by chance is approximately .15. No clinical significance is attributed to a low consistency score. One explanation for a low score reported in the manual is the reflection of a subject's irritation with the

difficulty of forced choice responses. Therefore, no completed tests were discarded for the purpose of this study, regardless of consistency scores, although the means for each group were computed and were found to be above ten.

Treatment of the Data

The critical ratio for testing the significance of the difference between two independent means according to Garrett was used for each trait comparison between groups in this study.[2] For each of the thirty-one traits measured, a mean was obtained for the group favoring sanctions and for the group opposing sanctions. Significance was accepted only at the .05 level to exclude other influences.

Presentation of the Data

The data for this study were arranged in three tables, each accompanying an hypothesis of the study. Group means and standard deviations for each test variable by teachers favoring and opposing sanctions were presented in each table, together with the critical ratios which were applied to test the significance of the difference between means. At the .05 level differences are significant when the critical ratio is 1.96 or higher.

---

[2]Henry E. Garrett, Elementary Statistics (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1956), pp. 94-100.

Hypothesis 1 was: There is no statistically significant difference in the mean values of the six individual personality traits on the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values between groups of selected teachers who voted for sanctions and those who voted against sanctions. As shown in Table I, no significant difference was found. The highest score for both groups was a mean of 45.0 for the religious value.

TABLE I

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TEST SCORES ON THE ALLPORT-VERNON-LINDZEY STUDY OF VALUES

TRAIT	FOR SANCTIONS (N = 122)		AGAINST SANCTIONS (N = 28)		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	CR[a]
Theoretical	36.9	6.0	36.6	5.9	0.26
Economic	40.6	6.0	42.0	6.8	0.61
Aesthetic	36.8	6.8	39.1	5.7	1.84
Social	37.0	7.7	34.0	7.9	1.62
Political	36.0	6.1	35.4	6.4	0.51
Religious	45.0	8.2	45.0	6.6	0.20

[a]None of the CR's were significant.

Hypothesis 2 was: There is no statistically significant difference in the mean values of the ten individual personality traits on the Guilford-Zimmerman

Temperament Survey between groups of selected teachers who voted for sanctions and those who voted against sanctions. As shown in Table II, there were significant differences found between the two groups in the mean scores for emotional stability, objectivity, and friendliness.

For both groups, the highest mean score was on restraint and the next highest on thoughtfulness. Since the sample was predominately female, low mean scores on masculinity were to be expected. The next lowest score for both groups was on the trait of ascendance.

TABLE II

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TEST SCORES ON THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

TRAIT	FOR SANCTIONS (N = 122)		AGAINST SANCTIONS (N = 28)		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	CR
General activity	16.2	5.5	15.5	5.8	0.60
Restraint	17.6	4.3	17.7	3.8	0.14
Ascendance	11.8	5.5	11.0	4.4	0.75
Sociability	16.7	6.0	15.2	4.5	1.46
Emotional stability	17.0	6.1	14.5	5.5	2.11*
Objectivity	17.0	5.0	14.1	5.9	2.38*
Friendliness	16.4	4.7	14.0	5.2	2.27*
Thoughtfulness	17.5	4.6	17.0	4.2	0.59
Personal relations	16.6	5.3	15.0	5.9	1.36
Masculinity	11.1	4.7	9.7	3.7	1.66

*Significant at .05 level

Normative scores for women for emotional stability and objectivity were reported in the manual as 15.5 and 16.8 respectively. Neither of the mean scores obtained by the two groups of teachers in the sample for this study was extremely high or low. This is also true for the mean score obtained by the sample on the trait of friendliness. The normative mean reported in the manual was 15.7 for this trait.

Guilford and Zimmerman describe the clinical interpretations of scores obtained on emotional stability, objectivity, and friendliness as follows:

> Emotional stability. A high score indicates optimism and cheerfulness, on the one hand, and emotional stability on the other. . . . A very low score is a sign of poor mental health in general; in other words, a neurotic tendency.
>
> Objectivity. High scores mean less egoism; low scores mean touchiness or hypersensitivity. It would appear that a person could be too objective for effective performance as well as too subjective. A too high score might mean that the person is so insensitive himself that he cannot appreciate the other fellow's possible sensitiveness. He may, consequently, hurt the other fellow unwittingly. A high O score should be balanced by a high T score. Although such a person may not feel sympathetic with the other fellow, he can be a sufficiently good observer to know the right thing to do and say in personal relationships. If low on A or G or F as well as on O, the person may suffer in silence.
>
> Friendliness. A high score may mean lack of fighting tendencies to the point of pacifism, or it may mean a healthy, realistic handling of frustrations and injuries. It may also mean an urge to please others; a desire to be liked. A low score means hostility in one form or another. At best, it means a fighting attitude. If kept under good

> control, in many situations this can be a favorable quality. Many of the higher-ranking executives who are regarded as successful may have a below average F score. They may not always be the most pleasant persons to work with, but there are occasions when they can capitalize upon this disposition. It is likely that in positions where a supervisor must "battle" for the welfare of his group, a too strong tendency toward agreeableness would be less suitable than a good fighting spirit. Among the low-scoring individuals on F are those who like to dominate for the satisfaction it gives or for its compensatory value. In positions of authority, these persons are likely to stimulate friction, fear, and low morale in their associates and among their supervisees.[3]

In addition to reporting norms for each trait, Guilford and Zimmerman described the ranges of best and poorest scores in terms of supervisory promise. For each of the traits in which a significant difference was found the group of teachers opposing sanctions had mean C scores of four and the group of teachers favoring sanctions had mean C scores of five. According to the described ranges, C scores of five or better on these three traits indicated personality qualities required for leadership. While C scores of four were not listed as least favorable scores, they were not categorized as favorable. Concerning recommendations for job placement on the basis of these C scores, Guilford and Zimmerman stated:

> In most cases the optimal scores do not extend to the top of the scale, but are at some moderate

---

[3]Guilford and Zimmerman, op. cit., p. 9.

> position between the mean and the top. There is evidence that this is quite general and that with some types of personnel, for example, with those assigned to more isolated, routine types of jobs like stocking-pairing or cigar-wrapping, optimal scores may even range below the means. Such personnel, when contented with their work and performing satisfactorily in it, probably do not have aspirations for promotion to positions where the demands upon personality are greater. They may have gravitated to the places less demanding of "good" personality qualities as an adjustment to their otherwise less favorable qualities.[4]

Hypothesis 3 was: There is no statistically significant difference in the mean values of the fifteen individual personality traits on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule between groups of selected teachers who voted for sanctions and those who voted against sanctions. As shown in Table III, a significant difference was found in the mean scores for the trait of achievement.

For both groups of teachers the highest mean score was obtained on the trait of affiliation. Decidedly the lowest mean score for both groups was that on aggression.

Edwards listed the manifest needs associated with the variable of achievement as follows:

> Achievement. To do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be

---

[4] Ibid., p. 8.

able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play.[5]

The normative score for women on the trait of achievement reported in the manual was 13.58 and the norm for men was 14.79. As Table III shows, the mean score of the teachers voting against sanctions was higher than either the normative score for men or for women, while the mean score obtained by the group favoring sanctions was just about the same as the normative score for women

TABLE III

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TEST SCORES ON THE EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE

TRAIT	FOR SANCTIONS (N = 122)		AGAINST SANCTIONS (N = 28)		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	CR
Achievement	13.9	4.2	15.4	3.4	2.01*
Deference	14.8	3.9	13.6	3.6	1.58
Order	13.4	4.8	14.1	3.5	0.93
Exhibition	12.2	3.4	12.9	4.0	0.79
Autonomy	11.4	4.5	12.1	3.7	0.90
Affiliation	16.5	3.6	15.8	4.0	0.80
Intraception	14.9	4.3	14.3	4.1	0.71
Succorance	12.0	4.0	11.2	3.9	1.03
Dominance	11.2	4.6	11.4	3.8	0.23
Abasement	13.6	4.4	13.6	4.2	0.02
Nurturance	15.9	3.8	15.3	3.8	0.23
Change	15.6	4.2	14.8	4.4	0.89
Endurance	15.2	4.8	15.3	4.4	0.10
Heterosexuality	11.7	6.4	11.9	6.9	0.11
Aggression	10.1	3.9	10.0	3.4	0.06

*Significant at .05 level

[5]Edwards, op. cit., p. 11.

The manual accompanying the Personal Preference Schedule stated that a consistency score of ten indicates a probability of about .15 that identical choices made in two sets of the same fifteen items occurred by chance. The mean consistency score for both groups of teachers in this study was 10.5.

Interpretation of the Data

The problem investigated in this study was to determine whether a difference in personality traits in elementary school teachers accompanied a difference in voting for or against sanctions. If significant differences were found, the traits which were different were to be identified.

As indicated in Tables I through III, a difference existed between the mean scores for four traits. One of these traits, that of achievement on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, was a personality factor derived from a need. The other three factors, measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, were traits based on characteristic behavior.

The need for achievement, which was significantly higher for the group of teachers opposing sanctions, appeared to be stronger in teachers opposing sanctions than it was in either men or women adults in the normative sample. As measured by the Personal Preference

Schedule, this need for achievement encompassed both the desire to accomplish and the desire to be recognized as one who accomplishes. The test items designed to measure need achievement had to do more often with accomplishing a concrete task than they did with being recognized. The need for dominance, on which this group of teachers obtained a mean score of 11.4 (compared to a mean of 11.2 for the group favoring sanctions, with a critical ratio of only 0.23), included several items indicating a need for recognition, e.g., to be regarded by others as a leader, to make group decisions.

Apparently the need for achievement on the part of the teachers opposing sanctions was an expression of a desire to do or to accomplish rather than a desire for recognition only. As mentioned previously, the items on the Personal Preference Schedule began with either "I like" or "I feel." Instructions to the subject emphasized that responses should be in terms of what is liked or felt at the present time. These were not items calling for descriptions of characteristic behavior. A mean score which is higher than average on achievement does not indicate that the subjects have or have not accomplished any task. Rather the score indicates a need to feel a sense of achievement.

The achievement score for the group of teachers

favoring sanctions was 13.9, about the same as the mean score of 13.58 for women belonging to the normative sample. This group of teachers felt a need to achieve which was neither greater nor less than that of women in general. These findings have been interpreted to indicate that there is a significant difference in the need to achieve between the group of elementary teachers favoring sanctions and those opposing sanctions in the sample used in this study.

The traits measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey were based on characteristic behavior. Items were worded in such a way that the subject was called upon to describe himself as he behaved in everyday situations. Scores obtained were bi-polar, enabling low scores to be described as the possession of certain traits rather than the absence of traits.

Significant differences were found in the mean scores for the two groups of teachers on three different traits measured by the Temperament Survey. In all three cases, scores obtained by the group of teachers favoring sanctions were significantly higher than those obtained by the group of teachers opposing sanctions. In addition, all three mean scores obtained by the sanction-favoring group were higher than the normative scores. Those scores obtained by the group of teachers opposed to sanctions were lower than the normative scores

for all three personality traits.

The low scores obtained on the trait of emotional stability indicated a tendency toward instability and depression. Of the thirty items to which the subjects responded which contributed to this trait, seven dealt with fluctuations of moods and seven had to do with pessimism. High scores indicated a tendency toward optimism, cheerfulness, and emotional stability.

The low scores obtained on the trait of objectivity indicated a tendency toward hypersensitiveness and subjectivity. As previously mentioned, persons obtaining low scores on ascendance as well as on objectivity may suffer in silence. The lowest score obtained by all elementary teachers in the sample on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was on the trait of ascendance. However, the group of teachers opposing sanctions scored lower than the normative mean on objectivity, while the group of teachers favoring sanctions scored higher than the norm.

On the trait of friendliness, low scores indicated hostility and belligerence, and high scores indicated friendliness and agreeableness. Other items contributing to a low friendliness score had to do with resentment, the desire to dominate, and resistance to domination.

The data in this study indicated that teachers who voted against sanctions had a tendency to be emo-

tionally unstable, pessimistic, hypersensitive, subjective, resentful, desirous of dominating, and resistant to domination. They had a need to achieve and to accomplish difficult tasks. Teachers who voted for sanctions tended to be emotionally stable, optimistic, objective, and friendly.

Theoretical Interpretations

Much of the research and literature reviewed in Chapter II indicated personality factors to be causes for teacher behavior. Two groups of elementary teachers who behaved oppositely from each other in voting on the question of imposition of sanctions were tested for differences in personality traits in this study. The data in this study indicated differences in personality factors, and these traits have been identified. The findings in this study did not allow an interpretation to be made of the causes of the particular behavior of voting yes or no on sanctions. A synthesis of previous research on the relation of personality traits to behavior, however, and the results obtained in this study appeared to indicate a possibility that the personality factors of emotional instability, subjectivity, pessimism, resentfulness, and resistance to domination, as well as an above average need to achieve, may have contributed to opposition to the majority by these

teachers. If these personality traits have contributed to specific opposition to collective teacher action rather than general negativism toward majority behavior, the imposition of sanctions may have posed an emotional threat to the teachers opposing sanctions. The research done by Rim, reported in Chapter II, indicated that subjects with a high neurotic score tended to avoid taking risks even after the influence of group discussion.[6]

The emotional pattern of the minority group of teachers opposing sanctions was typified by distrust. If this generalized distrust was extended to specific distrust of the state teachers' organization, it may have resulted in distrust of the merits of the recommendations of that organization. As a result of this distrust, a vote against imposing sanctions may have indicated lack of belief in the goals which the organization sought to obtain through the use of sanctions.

The need to achieve is similar to the desire for success. If success within the structure of an individual school system were perceived by a teacher as agreeing with the administration, and if the imposition of sanctions had been perceived as an act opposed by the administration, a vote against sanctions would be expected by teachers desiring to succeed. This possibility might be further increased if other

---

[6]Rim, op. cit.

emotional traits of these teachers caused them to "suffer in silence," the description employed by Guilford and Zimmerman in describing the possible actions of those with low scores on both ascendance and objectivity.

Summary

Hypothesis 1 was: There is no statistically significant difference in the mean values of the six individual personality traits on the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values between groups of selected teachers who voted for sanctions and those who voted against sanctions. On the basis of the data in this study, Hypothesis 1 was accepted.

Hypothesis 2 was: There is no statistically significant difference in the mean values of the ten individual personality traits on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey between groups of selected teachers who voted for sanctions and those who voted against sanctions. This hypothesis was rejected because a significant difference was found between the mean scores of the two groups of teachers on three personality traits, emotional stability, objectivity, and friendliness.

Hypothesis 3 was: There is no statistically significant difference in the mean values of the fifteen individual personality traits on the Edwards

Personal Preference Schedule between groups of selected teachers who voted for sanctions and those who voted against sanctions. This hypothesis was rejected because a significant difference was found between the mean scores of the two groups of teacher on the personality trait of achievement.

Teachers who voted for sanctions obtained a lower mean score on achievement than did teachers who voted against sanctions. Teachers who voted for sanctions obtained higher mean scores on emotional stability, objectivity, and friendliness than did teachers who voted against sanctions.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the early 1960's teachers have become increasingly militant in the use of collective action to secure changes in working conditions and salaries. The imposition of sanctions has been one such collective technique. In Oklahoma, the Oklahoma Education Association has imposed sanctions upon the state twice, the first time in 1965 and the second time in 1968.

Before the second imposition of sanctions the O.E.A. polled its membership twice to find out whether teachers favored the imposition of sanctions. Oklahoma City teachers were found to be in favor of sanctions on both occasions, and the Oklahoma City unit of the O.E.A. was very active in securing this state action.

Summary

Authors of literature and research concerning collective action on the part of teachers have hypothesized various causative factors for increased teacher

militancy. Many of them have indicated that personality factors had an important role in the political behavior of teachers, but evidence has not appeared in the literature identifying these personality factors.

This study has been made for the purpose of determining whether a difference existed in the mean scores for various personality traits between teachers who voted for sanctions in Oklahoma City and teachers who voted against sanctions. Elementary school teachers were used for the sample studied since they constitute a majority of the Oklahoma City unit of the Oklahoma Education Association, just as elementary school teachers are a majority of the National Education Association on a nationwide basis.

The three personality measures selected for this study were the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. A questionnaire was used to determine each teacher's vote on the question of sanctions in the two referendums conducted for the O.E.A. Responses to the tests and questionnaire were returned in unmarked envelopes to insure anonymity.

Of the 200 teachers sampled, 182 returned completed tests. Of the total, 122 teachers indicated that they had voted for the imposition of sanctions and 28 teachers indicated that they had voted against sanctions in both

referendums. Thirty-two teachers had voted for sanctions on one occasion and against sanctions on the other, and these returns were not used for the purpose of this study, as they did not appear to indicate a definite position on the subject of sanctions.

Mean scores for each personality trait for the group favoring sanctions and for the group opposing sanctions were then subjected to the critical ratio test for significant differences. Traits which were different were identified and analyzed.

The data gathered were used to support or reject the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no statistically significant difference in the mean values of the six individual personality traits on the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values between groups of selected teachers who voted for sanctions and those who voted against sanctions.

2. There is no statistically significant difference in the mean values of the ten individual personality traits on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey between groups of selected teachers who voted for sanctions and those who voted against sanctions.

3. There is no statistically significant difference in the mean values of the fifteen individual personality traits on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule between groups of selected teachers who voted

for sanctions and those who voted against sanctions.

Findings

1. Mean scores for a total of thirty-one personality traits for each group of teachers, those favoring sanctions and those opposing sanctions, were tested for differences significant at the .05 level of confidence. No significant difference was found in the six values measured by the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values. These data supported the acceptance of the first hypothesis in this study.

2. The second hypothesis was rejected because significant differences were found in the mean values of three individual personality traits on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey between the two groups of teachers. The mean scores on emotional stability, objectivity, and friendliness obtained by the group of teachers voting for sanctions were significantly higher than those for the group of teachers opposing sanctions.

3. The third hypothesis was also rejected because a significant difference was found in the mean values obtained by the two groups of teachers on one trait on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The mean score on achievement for the group of teachers opposing sanctions was significantly higher than the score of the teachers voting in favor of sanctions.

Conclusions

Compared with the normative sample of adults, teachers in Oklahoma City who voted for sanctions were about average in the need for achievement and somewhat above average in the personality traits of emotional stability, objectivity, and friendliness. Typically they were optimistic, not overly sensitive, and agreeable.

On the other hand, teachers who voted against sanctions were far above the normative sample in the need for achievement. This high score did not indicate that these teachers had or had not actually accomplished various tasks, but that they felt a need to accomplish and to be recognized as achievers. In addition to this departure from national norms, these teachers exhibited a tendency to be more emotionally unstable, to fluctuate more in moods, to be more pessimistic, to be more sensitive, to be less agreeable, to have a greater desire to dominate, and to be more resistant to domination than did either the normative sample of adults or the group of teachers who voted for sanctions.

Because these isolated traits, along with a great need to achieve, accompanied an opposition to sanctions, it was concluded that either these teachers were distrustful of the Oklahoma Education Association, cynical about the efficaciousness of imposing sanctions,

or perceived a vote against sanctions as an agreement with the administration and therefore a means of achieving higher status. Possibly all three of these conclusions were factors in the behavior of this group of teachers.

Apparently the O.E.A. represented a majority of its members in the imposition of sanctions on the state, but it did not represent all of its members in this action. A belligerent minority with a need to dominate and a need to achieve was found to be in opposition to this action.

Recommendations

Findings and conclusions of this study support the following recommendations:

1. If the Oklahoma Education Association is to be united in its actions and representative of all its members, its leadership must recognize the differences in personality traits between those teachers who favor its actions and those who oppose them. In order to develop a greater feeling of trust in the organization, procedures should be inaugrated to assist in assuring that the minority members be recognized and represented in decision making.

2. Since this study was limited to Oklahoma City elementary school teachers, it is recommended

that future research be representative of high school teachers and of regional or national groups.

3. Future research should test the relationship of high scores on the need for achievement on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the ambition to become recognized as in agreement with the authority structures of various organizations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Cottle, William C., and Downie, N. M. Procedures and Preparation for Counseling. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

Elam, Stanley M., Lieberman, Myron, and Moskow, Michael H. (eds.). Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education. Chicago: Rand McNally, and Company, 1967.

Garrett, Henry E. Elementary Statistics. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1956.

Iannaccone, Laurence. Politics in Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1967.

Lieberman, Myron, and Moskow, Michael H. Collective Negotiations for Teachers. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.

Munn, Norman L. Psychology. 5th ed. revised. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

Ruch, Floyd L. Psychology and Life. 7th ed. revised. Glenview, Illinois: Scott-Foresman and Company, 1967.

Shils, Edward B., and Whittier, C. Taylor. Teachers, Administrators, and Collective Bargaining. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968.

Zeigler, Harmon. The Political Life of American Teachers. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Zeigler, Harmon. The Political World of the High School Teacher. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press, 1966.

PERIODICALS

Carlson, Gosta. "Time and Continuity in Mass Attitude Change: the Case of Voting," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIX (1965), 1-15.

Collins, James A. "Individual Personality and Organizational Climate," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (1967), 623-A.

Cook, Desmond L. "A Note on the Relationships Between MTAI and GZTS Scores for Three Levels of Teacher Experience," Journal of Educational Research, LV (1962), 363-67.

Corwin, Ronald G. "Militant Professionalism, Initiative and Compliance in Public Education," Sociology of Education, XXXIII (1965), 316.

Duffy, Elizabeth. "A Critical Review of Investigations Employing the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values and Other Tests of Evaluative Attitude," Psychological Bulletin, XXXVII (1940), 597-612.

Jackson, P. W., and Guba, E. G. "The Need Structure of In-service Teachers: An Occupational Analysis," School Review, LXV (1957), 176-92.

Kenney, James B., White, William F., and Gentry, Harold W. "Personality Characteristics of Teachers and Their Perception of Organizational Climate," Journal of Psychology, LXVI (1967), 167-74.

Leeds, Carroll H. "Teacher Attitudes and Temperament as a Measure of Teacher-Pupil Rapport," Journal of Applied Psychology, XL (1956), 333-37.

Moeller, Gerald H., and Charters, W. W. "Relation of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers," Administrative Science Quarterly, X (1966), 465.

Murphy, Joseph A., Jr. "An Investigation into Certain Personality Factors of Elementary School Teachers and Principals with Reference to the Organizational Climate of the School," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (1967), 3670-A.

Rim, Y. "Personality and Group Discussion Involving Risk," Psychological Record, XIV (1964), 45.

Rupiper, Omer John. "A Psychometric Evaluation of Experienced Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, LV (1962), 368-71.

Seagoe, May V. "Prediction of In-service Success in Teaching," Journal of Educational Research, XXXIX (1946), 658-63.

Sellers, Charles. "The Equilibrium Cycle in Two-party Politics," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIX (1965), 37.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "Investigation of Factors Which Affect Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction of Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (1967), 1235-A.

INSTRUMENTS

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., and Lindzey, G. A Study of Values: A Scale for Measuring the Dominant Interests in Personality. 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.

Edwards, Allen L. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Rev. ed. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1959.

Guilford, J. P. and Zimmerman, W. S. The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Beverly Hills, California: Sheridan Supply Company, 1949.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Duncan, Lloyd. "Primary Personality Patterns of Good and Superior Teachers in Lower, Middle, and Upper Socio-economic Area Elementary Schools." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1966.

Hudson, Marlene Coe. "Interpersonal Values, Temperament Traits, and Interests Values of Elementary Education Students at the University of Oklahoma." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1966.

Stout, Ray L. "Organizational Influence on Teacher Leadership Perception." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968.