1983

The Identification of the Operating Personality Construct of Learning Disability Teachers

Patricia A. Atherton
Loyola University Chicago

THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE OPERATING PERSONALITY CONSTRUCT OF LEARNING DISABILITY TEACHERS

by

Patricia A. Atherton

Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

July

1983

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to my director. Dr. John Wellington, and to committee members, Dr. Carol Harding and Dr. Terry Williams. I wish to acknowledge the technical assistance of Dr. Jack Kavanagh and his assistant, Richard Branch, and the emotional support of my children, Leo, Christopher and Jeanette and my husband, Charles D. Atherton, Jr.

LIFE

Patricia A. Atherton, daughter of Jeanette Whisnant McFarland and Otho Kelly McFarland, was born in Blue Island, Illinois. She graduated, with honors as a member of the National Honor Society, from Thornton Township High School in Harvey, Illinois. She received her Bachelor's Degree, along with a Leadership Award from the College of Education, in Educational Psychology from Loyola University in Chicago, Illinois. Her Master's Degree in the field of Learning Disabilities was acquired from Northeastern Illinois University.

Her career began as a teacher for educable mentally handicapped and later with gifted children in the Chicago Public School System. She then was employed as a teacher for behavioral disorders and learning disabilities in Highland Park, Illinois. During that time, she developed a private, therapeutic school for gifted, handicapped children in Winnetka, Illinois. She was then employed as a faculty member in the Department of Special Education at Chicago State University in 1976, and was elected to the position of Chairperson for the department in July, 1980. She also currently holds the position of Coordinator for Faculty Development at Chicago State University and serves as representative to the Board of Governors Systemwide Faculty Development Committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Although experimentation "dominated the field of education in the Thorndike era," (Campbell and Stanley, 1963, p. 3) disproportionately few studies have related to the field of special education. These few studies, however, have reflected the evolution of the field of special education within the context of the total educational system. Social concerns regarding the rights of the elderly, the unborn, the poor, and minorities have had a permanent effect upon society and the schools that serve the needs of society. These issues, which may be generalized as an increased concern for the "little people," have influenced the focus of research from 1920 to 1960 (Gearheart, 1980, p. 12). The handicapped population has been viewed by society as "little people" and consequently has enjoyed the increasing benefits of the benevolent members of society. The research that has focused on this population, however, has concentrated more on production of services rather than on evaluation of services.

Special education research began in 1917 with James Hinselwood, a French physician who first recognized and defined the term word blindness. In 1930, Samuel T. Orton, a neurologist, furthered research through his investigation of the relationship between language processes and hemispheric dominance (Mercer, 1979, p. 14). The plethora of special education research in the 1960's and 1970's focused on: the handicapped

child, anomalies of handicapping conditions, curriculum deemed relevant to the child's needs, and proposed methods of educational therapy for each category of exceptionality.

Research in special education has not kept pace with the rapid growth of special services for the handicapped which has been spurred by recent state and federal legislation (Faas, 1980). Public Law 85-926 provided funds, in the form of direct grants, to institutions of higher learning to encourage the development of training programs for teachers of the retarded. In 1974, Public Law 93-380 was passed to protect the rights of all handicapped children. The most recent revolution in education, however, was brought about by the passage of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, in 1975 (Gearheart, 1980). This Law, again, emphasized the production of services and the accountability of those providing service by mandating the development of an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP), however, the focus remained on curriculum and programming. Neither the legislation nor the changes that emanated from them served to direct attention to the teacher as an active force in the implementation of effective programs.

Research exploring the impact of the special educator's personality on the performance of the handicapped, and on determining which personal qualities contribute to effective remediation has been greatly neglected. Of the few studies dealing with the personal qualities of the special educator, only Cochrane (1975) and Hogue (1978) investigated the personalities of the teacher trained as a learning disability specialist.

The significance of the teacher's role in eliciting acceptable

achievement levels in students has been established as a critical factor (Ysseldyke and Algozzine, 1982; Brammer, 1979; Hamachek, 1978; Valett, 1977; Jersild, 1955). There is, however, a need to precisely define the qualities that enable a special educator of the learning disabled to develop a therapeutic relationship and a therapeutic milieu that promote social/emotional and intellectual growth in students. The need arises as a result of the increased learning disability population and the increased number of general education teachers seeking retraining for job security as special educators of the learning disabled.

The influx of retraining teachers added to the number of new learning disability teachers-in-training calls for a re-evaluation of the criteria for determining acceptable candidates in the field of learning disability remediation. Attempts to develop a screening procedure for candidates in education motivated two Michigan State University studies which investigated the personality traits of potential candidates. Cross (1975) focused on personality traits of candidates for general education, and Johnson (1975) explored the personality traits of candidates pursuing special education programs.

Reflecting on these studies, it seems that the responsibility, at this time, for screening or counseling out prospective teachers rests with the teacher-training institutions.

Historical Background

The significance of the present study can be more clearly understood after a brief narration of the historical evolution of the field of special education, with emphasis on the relatively recent recognition

of learning disabilities as a handicapping condition.

The evolution of the field of special education began in the pre-Christian period when the Spartans were reported to have killed deviant or malformed babies (Kirk and Gallagher, 1979) or left them as victims of wild animals or the elements. From the early years of the Christian era until the 1800's, the development of religious orders effected a change in society's attitudes from those of neglect and mistreatment to those of protection and pity. Hence, the handicapped found havens in convents and monasteries, and occasionally, in the royal domiciles - as court jesters.

Jean-Marc-Gaspard Itard's (1962) discovery and work with the "Wild Boy of Aveyron" in 1799 led to the development of institutional services and programs for the deaf, the blind and the mentally retarded. Itard's work made it possible for the handicapped to be removed from prisons and poorhouses (Faas, 1980).

Edouard Seguin, a protege of Itard, established in Paris the first school exclusively for educating the mentally retarded. Upon his emigration to the United States, Seguin initiated a movement to develop residential facilities for the handicapped which were established in the last half of the nineteenth century.

The American Asylum for the Education and Instruction of the Deaf in Hartford, Connecticut, opened in 1817, and the Perkins Institution for the Blind in Watertown, Massachusetts, which opened in 1829 (Mercer, 1979) were the first American institutions of their kind and purpose. From the latter half of the nineteenth century through 1975, the development of residential institutions was followed by the

establishment of public school classes for the handicapped. The sequence in which the various categories of handicapped conditions were recognized and served began with the blind, and continued on through the deaf, the mentally ill, the mentally retarded, and finally, the learning disabled (Faas, 1980).

The passage of Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, on November 29, 1975, had an impact on the entire educational community. This law, described as the "bill of rights for handicapped children" (Abeson and Zettel, 1977, p. 121), mandated free appropriate education for all handicapped children between the ages of three and twenty-one, with the stipulation that an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) be developed to meet the specific needs of each child.

As a result of this law, individualized education has become a priority throughout the entire educational system. The impetus behind the formulation of P.L. 94-142 and the subsequent movement to demand service for the learning disabled began in 1963 in Evanston, Illinois, with the formation of a parent organization, the Fund for Perceptually Handicapped (Lerner, 1975). This group later became The Association for Children with Learning Disabilities, (with chapters throughout the United States and Europe) an organization with political influence that has not only accomplished the passage of P.L. 94-142 but also the passage of Illinois House Bill 150 in 1979.

Illinois House Bill 150 requires that all teachers-in-training have "some" special education coursework. Illinois House Bill 150 states:

Section 21-21a. Required curriculum for all teachers.

> After September 1, 1981, in addition to all other requirements, the successful completion of coursework which includes instruction on the psychology of the exceptional child, including, but not limited to the learning disabled, and methods of instruction for the exceptional child, including, but not limited to the learning disabled child, shall be a prerequisite to a person receiving any of the following certificates: early childhood, elementary, special and high school.

The fact that the learning disabled is the only category of exceptionality specifically mentioned in House Bill 150 points to the political power of the parents of the learning disabled and their concern for the quantity and quality of programs available to their children. This bill also serves to encourage the general educator to identify and to accommodate the mild learning disability student within the structure of the educational mainstream.

To strengthen H.B. 150, the State Certification Board adopted an amendment specifying three semester hours of special education coursework as a requirement for certification (Staff Report to the State Teacher Certification Board, June 1980).

These two bills, P.L. 94-142 and H.B. 150, have elicited major changes in employment practices of state and local educational agencies and in the programs of teacher-training institutions.

Population Trends

The declining general population and current budget limitations have caused city and suburban schools to reduce teaching positions. The Chicago Board of Education, during the summer of 1981, dismissed many general education teachers and eliminated all full time basis (FTB) substitute positions, except for those in special education.

This has caused an unprecedented number of general education teachers to seek city and state certification for teaching the learning disabled, the largest group within the handicapped population, as a means of maintaining or of acquiring employment.

The State Certification Board of Illinois has attempted to deal with this increase of applicants by employing more stringent certification requirements, such as: pre-student teaching clinical experience (equivalent to one hundred clock hours), and student teaching in the area of specialization. At this time, clinical experience, student teaching and academic performance serve as the only criteria for eligibility and/or certification.

The movement from general education to special education suggests that these general educators are motivated by the desire to achieve job security rather than the desire to help the less fortunate handicapped. The current reduction of teaching positions and transitive employment suggests that there is a need to re-examine the criteria for determining eligibility to teach the handicapped population, and specifically, the learning disabled.

Table 1 shows figures that have been compiled by the Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Specialized Educational Services, in their "Needs Assessment for Special Education Personnel -- Preparation and Personnel Development -- Report for Spring, 1981."

The figures in Table 3 present a projection of personnel needs from 1980 through 1983. These figures reveal a decline in the number of positions open to teachers of the learning disabled, while the learning disability student population continues to increase. This

Table 1

Special Education Personnel Work Assignment Analysis, 1979-1980

Work Assignment	Full Time Employed Classroom	Full Time Employed Resource	Full Time Employed Itinerant	Full Time Employed Other
Learning Disability Teachers	1,321.75	2,564.75	611.25	35.50

"Needs Assessment for Special Education Personnel Preparation for Personnel Development, Illinois State Board of Education," 1981, p. 17.

Table 2

Learning Disability Student Population, 1977-1980
(Combined P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 89-313 Child Count Figures)

	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
Learning Disabed Children	64,134	71,393	78,755

"Needs Assessment for Special Education Personnel Preparation for Personnel Development, Illinois State Board of Education," 1981, p. 3.

Table 3

Projected Numbers of Additional Needed Special Education Personnel
(Collected during the fall of 1980 for FY 1981 P.L. 94-142 Performance Report)

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83
Teachers Needed to Remediate Specific Learning Disabilities	854	697	583

"Needs Assessment for Special Education Personnel Preparation for Personnel Development, Illinois State Board of Education," 1981, p. 3.

trend suggests the possibility of utilizing more discriminate screening procedures as a means of filling the limited number of teaching positions for teachers of the learning disabled with the most qualified candidates.

The employment of a screening procedure, beyond that currently employed, as a means of upgrading the quality of teachers, of special education teachers and, specifically, of learning disability teachers, may be viewed as the charge of the state educational agency, the local educational agency, and the teacher-training institutions. The local educational agencies screen employees through the state certification process and through on-the-job evaluations which are not always consistent, reliable or based on direct observation of teaching performance. The universities, with the responsibility of initial screening, have traditionally focused on the cognitive aspect of academic preparation without addressing the affective development of the teacher or the impact of affect on the teacher-student relationship.

Consideration of the above factors suggests several options which may be explored by concerned teacher-training institutions:

1. Courses incorporating self-awareness, self-exploration and/or the development of interpersonal skills may be included in required professional core curriculum;
2. Interviews may be utilized to determine social/emotional maturity and stability;
3. Formal or informal personality inventories may be included in the admission process;
4. On-going counseling may be introduced as a means of monitoring

the affective development and academic or cognitive development of candidates.

The decline of learning disability teaching positions coincides with a decline of general education teaching positions as a result of the declining general education student population and the limited funding that the current economy has afforded state and local educational agencies. These changes have caused a movement of general educators toward retraining in special education and specifically in the area of learning disabilities, because it is the most "normal" of the handicapped population. The prime motive for this re-training movement appears to be job security.

Another consequence of the budget and employment cuts has been the movement of special educators, certified in other areas of specialization, to pursue additional training in learning disabilities. Many special educators certified in one area of specialization have returned to teacher-training institutions to acquired master's degrees and/or additional certification requirements for teaching learning disabilities as designated by the Illinois State Certification Board. Certification in learning disabilities is sought most often as the result of the large student population (see Table 4). The motive, again, appears to be to maintain or to secure job placement. The threat to job security has accelerated the competitiveness for teaching positions in the area of learning disabilities.

The current transitions described here support the need for research which may serve to further define prerequisite skills needed for effective remediation and suggest a need to explore personal

Table 4

Combined P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 89-313 Child Count Figures by Categories

	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
Mentally Impaired	54,411	43,764	43,961
Physically Handicapped	6,882	3,452	3,920
Speech/Language Impaired	75.952	75,671	71,807
Multiply Handicapped	2,190	4,741	776
Deaf/Blind	133	79	106
Learning Disabled	64,134	71,393	78,755
Behavior Disordered	35,051	27,071	28,921
Visually Impaired	2,696	1,790	1,388
Auditorily Impaired	6,972	4,192	3,301
Other Health Impaired	3,249	2,346	2,269
Total	251,660	234,499	235,047

"Needs Assessment for Special Education Personnel Preparation and Personnel Development" Compiled by Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Specialized Educational Services, Spring, 1981, p. 3.

qualities of potential teachers as a means of addressing the neglected affective component in teacher preparation. The personal qualities which impact on affective development in the classroom may be viewed with importance equal to academic competence.

Purpose of the Study

This study will identify the personality construct of learning disability teachers as perceived by practitioners. The premise of the investigation is that the educational training of learning disability

practitioners and their experience in teaching learning disabled students provide them with insight into the personality construct required to teach learning disabled students. Therefore, the objective of this study is to identify and to describe the personality construct which contributes to effective remediation, wherein, the student's maximum potential for social/emotional development and academic achievement is attained.

A secondary purpose of the study is to determine whether differences exist among subgroups of learning disability practitioners regarding their perception of what personality construct is most important for learning disability teachers to possess.

The goal of this investigation, therefore, is to examine the following hypotheses by conducting a factor analysis and principle component factor analysis to identify the personality construct of learning disability teachers.

Hypothesis 1: There will be no statistically significant differences within the identified personality construct as perceived by learning disability teachers as a function of sex difference.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no statistically significant differences within the identified personality construct as perceived by learning disability teachers as a function of age difference.

Hypothesis 3: There will be no statistically significant differences within the identified personality construct as perceived by learning disability teachers as a function of years of experience teaching learning disability students.

Hypothesis 4: There will be no statistically significant

differences within the identified personality construct as perceived by learning disability teachers as a function of attained academic degrees.

Theoretical Assumptions

The concepts of field theory have been adopted as the most logical theoretical framework for viewing teacher personality traits, because this study pertains to behavior manifested specifically in the educational setting. Kurt Lewin describes field theory as "a method of analyzing causal relationships and of building scientific constructs" (1951, p. 45).

The principle characteristics of his theory are:

1. Behavior is a function of the field which exists at the time the behavior occurs.

2. Analysis begins with the situation as a whole, from which are differentiated the component parts.

3. The concrete person in a concrete situation can be represented mathematically (Hall and Lindzey, 1970, p. 210).

The tenets of Kurt Lewin's field theory when used conjointly with Charles Osgood's semantic differential should provide a statistically defined psychological profile of the teacher of the learning disabled.

Lewin perceives the person (P) not as a perfect unity but as a heterogeneous composite of intercommunicating and interdependent parts. The person is conceptualized spatially as a concentric circle -- within another circle. The inner circle represents the inner-personal sphere (I-P) and is composed of cells which are differentiated as peripheral

cells and central cells. The region of the larger circle is defined as the perceptual motor region (P-M).

The person (P) is surrounded by a psychological environment (E), and the person and the psychological environment constitute the life space (L). Therefore, P + E = L. Behavior is a function of the life space; hence, B = F (L). The life space is represented as an ellipse surrounded by the non-psychological environment or foreign hull. The life space consists of a network of interconnected regions or systems which have permeable boundaries with dimensions of: nearness-remoteness, firmness-weakness and/or fluidity-rigidity (Lewin, 1951).

Lewin utilizes dynamic concepts of energy, tension, need, valence, and force (or vector) to explain human behavior. Energy is viewed as psychic energy released in the processes of regaining equilibrium when the presence of a need or quasi-need arouses tension in the inner-personal sphere.

The need, derived from basic drives, and the quasi-need, a specific intent for satisfying a need, are influenced by properties of the environment, which, in turn, determine the impact of valence or force on locomotion or motoric action.

Lewin conceptualizes valence as the positive or negative value of a region in the psychological environment which has the capacity to attract, to repel, or to vary quantitatively, depending upon the strength of the need. The intensity of the felt need determines the strength, direction and point of application of force on the inner-personal sphere, which results ultimately in psychological or physical locomotion.

Definition of Terms

Special Education - the education of atypical individuals requiring modification of methods, materials and/or instructional strategies due to a physical or psychological handicapping condition. The realm of special education includes the: physically impaired, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, blind or partially sighted, and deaf or hard of hearing. Such individuals are referred to as exceptional or handicapped.

General Education - or regular education refers to the education of individuals who fall within the range of normal psychological, physical and social/emotional development. These individuals, in the context of this paper, are referred to as non-exceptional students.

Personality - as defined by Kurt Lewin is the concept of the person (personality) as a heterogeneous structure of inter-communicating and interdependent parts. The inner-personal sphere and the perceptual-motor region constitute the person and are surrounded by a psychological environment which constitutes the life space. According to Lewin (1938, p. 96), "Every behavior (Be) is a function (F) of the total life space (L) which includes both the person (P) and the environment (E)."

$$Be = F(L) = F(P, E)$$

Characteristics - is a term which refers to "a distinguishing feature or attribute" that identifies or sets apart someone or something (Morris, 1969). Operating personality traits, as described in this study, are those traits which contribute to effective performance of learning disability teachers.

Learning Disability - refers to one of the various categories of exceptionality which fall under the rubric of special education. The definition given in Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act is:

> Specific learning disability means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations.
>
> The term includes such conditions as: perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. The term does not include: children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of: visual, hearing, or motor handicap, of mental retardation, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage (Section 5 (b) (4) of Public Law 94-142).

Methodology

The subjects in this study are 800 learning disability teachers certified by the Illinois State Certification Board and employed in public elementary and high schools within the state of Illinois in May, 1982. Participants are asked to respond to a survey of personality traits arranged on a seven step scale of 50 bi-polar opposites, designed according to the model of the semantic differential proposed by Charles Osgood (Osgood, 1952).

This instrument, referred to hereafter as the Learning Disability Teacher Profile (LDTP), provides for designation of sex, age range, years of teaching experience with learning disabled students and the highest academic degree attained, and requires the participant to allocate the degree of association or importance of each bi-polar opposite for learning disability teachers.

The data collected from this instrument are analyzed using the IBM System 370 SPSS to determine significance at the .05 level for the independent variables. Principle-factor analysis and principle component factor analysis are employed to determine distributional characteristics of the independent variables.

Limitations of the Study

1. The sample of 800 learning disability teachers is drawn from the professional membership of the Illinois Division of Learning Disabilities and of the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities. These memberships may be viewed as representing the most career conscious of the 4,497.75 learning disability teachers in the state of Illinois, rather than the most typical.

2. The generalizability of the results of this study may be limited to the state of Illinois. Since most of the participants have received their academic training and teaching experience within the state of Illinois, then their perceptions may indicate a character unique to the central Midwest, social-cultural milieu.

3. The nature of the data collection, through mailing the Learning Disability Teacher Profile (LDTP), does not permit controlling environmental conditions which may influence the results.

4. The disproportionate number of women employed as teachers may invalidate any comparison of the perceptions of men and women from collected data.

5. Any construct identified through analysis must be viewed as tentative and subject to later confirmation or disconfirmation.

Anything producing correlations between variables "creates" a factor (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 570).

Summary

The basic premise on which this investigation is founded is that teachers, like counselors, fall under the rubric of helping professionals, and as such are concerned with social/emotional as well as intellectual development of students. Hamachek (1978), Sherman and Blackburn (1975), Jersild (1955) and Bousfield (1940) support the notion of the teacher as a "significant" person in the lives of students who have the ability to facilitate or to inhibit student growth. As a result of these and other investigations, several basic concepts are considered:

1. TEACHERS ARE HELPING PROFESSIONALS

If this is true of teachers as a group, it is especially true for the special education teacher whose responsibility rests with ameliorating the damage that fate and society have assigned to the handicapped.

Arthur Combs (1969) initiated studies with colleagues and students at the University of Florida where he examined the belief systems of professors, counselors, teachers, politicians, nurses and priests. These studies indicated agreement in the perceptual organization of those considered "good" or "poor" in their fields.

Combs, Avila and Purkey (1978) state:

> Professional helpers must be thinking, problem-solving people; the primary tool with which they work is themselves. This understanding has been called the 'self as instrument' concept. In the helping professions, effective operation is a question of the use of the helper's self, the peculiar ways in which helpers are able to combine knowledge and understanding with their own unique ways of putting them in operation (p. 7).

2. EFFECTIVE TEACHERS PERFORM WITH THE SELF AS INSTRUMENT CONCEPT

The relationship of knowledge and the effective performance of helping professionals have been discussed by Combs, Avila and Purkey (1978).

> It seems obvious that effective professional helpers must know their subject. Almost everyone, however, has had experience with people who knew their subject but were ineffective in putting it to work. We have seen intelligent medical students who failed as doctors, gifted scholars who couldn't teach, brilliant ministers unable to hold a parish, and clever psychiatrists with obvious problems of their own. Clearly, knowledge alone is no guarantee of successful professional work (p. 5).

3. ACADEMIC THEORY, METHODOLOGY AND SUPERVISED PRACTICUM EXPERIENCE MAY NOT BE SUFFICIENT CRITERIA FOR TEACHER SELECTION

Wilson and Sapir (1982) in discussing the qualities of the learning disabled specialist refer to insight and empathy as essential to the learning process.

> People who greet life experiences as opportunities for personal growth and learning with an attitude of challenge and hope are good role models for children. People 'who know all the answers' are not. Insight and adaptability are at the heart of the clinical teaching approach in which the adult proceeds and modifies in a continuous process based on the child's response (p. 172).

4. EXPERIENCE PROVIDES INSIGHT INTO THE SELF AND INTO OTHERS

Organization of the Study

Chapter I provides an introduction to the study, a statement of the problem, the hypotheses, the significance of the problem, a definition of terms, the assumptions, and the limitations.

Chapter II reviews research focused on the identification of personality traits of: teachers-in-training, teachers-in-training compared with experienced teachers, experienced teachers, superior

teachers, special education teachers, and theorists.

Chapter III presents the methodology, the instrumentation, a description of the subjects, the procedure, the design of the study, and the statistical analysis.

Chapter IV offers the statistical analysis of the data and a discussion of the results.

Chapter V presents a summary, conclusions and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The following review is limited to research regarding personality traits of: teachers-in-training, experienced teachers compared to teachers-in-training, experienced teachers in other disciplines, teachers identified as superior, and special education teachers.

The plethora of research related to personality characteristics mandates limiting the studies discussed to those that focus on identification of specific personality characteristics or traits of teachers, and conducted in or after 1970.

Personality Traits of Teachers-in-Training

Nibondh Thaipanich (1973) initiated a study, at the University of Missouri, which investigates the attitudinal changes, personality traits, and behavior of prospective teachers. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI), Adjective Self-Description, and Behavior Rating Scale is used to measure teaching laboratory behavior. A series of t-tests are employed to determine significant attitudinal changes, and chi-square analysis is utilized to find significance of the laboratory leader's perception of the students' teaching behaviors.

With the students divided into those enrolled for a grade and those enrolled on a pass-fail basis, it is concluded that there is no significant difference in the personality traits of the two groups. However, the students enrolled on a pass-fail basis perceive themselves

as more cooperative, extroverted, and socially oriented.

Those who received a high score on the MTAI are measured as significantly higher in ideology, suggesting that they are more idealistic. The female students are also perceived by the laboratory leaders as superior to the males in effort and general teaching performance, but equal to the males in cooperativeness.

James Calliotte (1971) developed a study, at St. Louis University to explore the effect of basic encounter groups on the personality traits and subsequent teaching behaviors of student teachers. The subjects are 42 secondary school student teachers who are divided into two equal groups, with one group as a control and the other as the experimental group. The encounter groups meet for two hours each week while enrolled in student teaching. The Sixteen Factor Personality Factor Inventory (16PF) is utilized to collect pretest and post test data on the control and the experimental groups.

Calliotte finds no significant difference between the experimental and control groups on the 16PF; however, he does find a significant change on the variable surgency (Factor F) within the experimental group.

The Truax Relationship Questionnaire is administered to one class of each teacher at the end of the student teaching semester. Of the traits that Calliotte identifies as critical in promoting intellectual and emotional growth (accurate empathy, genuineness, non-possessive warmth and concreteness), he finds concreteness to be significantly higher for the control group.

This study also finds a significantly high correlation (beyond

the .001 level) between the students' perception of the teacher's effectiveness and their perceptions of the teacher's positive relationship traits: accurate empathy, genuineness, non-possessive warmth and concreteness.

Edward Walters (1979) conducted a study to determine the effect of age upon the personality traits and attitudes of student teachers enrolled at the University of Mississippi.

One hundred student teachers are divided by age into three groups: 18 to 22 years, 23 to 26 years, and 27 to 42 years. The Interpersonal Orientation Scale (IOS) and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) are administered before and after student teaching. Means and standard deviations are derived for each age group, and an analysis of covariance for differences between means is employed when differences are found at the .05 level of confidence.

Walters finds no significant difference in interpersonal orientation among the three age categories as a result of the student teaching, and no significant differences in personality traits and attitudes of the three groups in 15 of the 16 factors of the 16PF. There is a significant difference at the .05 level in Factor Q which contrasts conservative and experimenting behaviors.

William E. Boyel (1978) developed a study of the relationship between personality characteristics and personal and interpersonal values of education majors at Northern Illinois University. The Shostrom Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) is administered to assess personality characteristics and the Gordon Survey of Interpersonal Values (SIV) is used to define interpersonal values.

The sample consists of 416 education majors at Northern Illinois University, out of which 300 completed the three inventories. The hypothesis tests whether there exists a relationship between personality characteristics of educators and their personal and interpersonal values, and whether this relationship is different for elementary education majors and secondary education majors. Boyle's analysis utilizing the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient t-tests of differences, the multiple regression analyses, and canonical correlation for 41 of the 72 correlations between the POI scales and the subscales and the SIV scales. Significant differences are also found between the elementary and secondary majors on four of the 72 correlations between POI scales and subscales and SPI scales.

Elementary teachers are found higher in: practical mindedness, capacity for intimate contact, decisiveness and synergy, goal orientation, and self-actualizing value. The conclusion of this study is that there are relationships between personality traits and personal and interpersonal values of education majors and that the relationships differ for elementary education majors and secondary education majors.

Personality Traits of Experienced Teachers

Saul M. Amerling (1977) conducted a study of the characteristics of teachers for and against mainstreaming special education students. His study took place at the United States International University. This study is designed to investigate the self-concept, accuracy of perception, and personality traits of regular education teachers who have positive or negative attitudes toward special education students.

The population consists of 83 elementary school teachers in a San Diego county with a total student population of 4,000. These subjects are administered the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) and the Self-Concept Incongruence Scale. Each participant is asked to provide biographical data: age, sex, number of years teaching experience; then, they are provided with a definition of special education students and asked their attitude toward mainstreaming special education students into regular education classrooms.

The data are analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance with significance set at the .05 level.

The findings indicate that all teachers favoring mainstreaming special education students have a higher percentage of accuracy in their perceptions of the special education student than those who do not favor mainstreaming, with the exception of teachers with over 21 years of teaching experience. All teachers with over 21 years of teaching experience also demonstrate significant variance on the neuroticism-stability scale of the Eysenck Personality Inventory.

Personality Traits of Experienced Teachers Compared to Teachers-in-Training

Paul Staiert (1971) initiated a study, at the University of Denver to investigate changes in attitudes, values, needs, and personality traits of 13 participants of the Prospective Teacher of the Disadvantaged Fellowship Program. He uses the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), Study of Values, Acceptance of Self and Others, Tolerance-Prejudice

Attitude Scales, and the Teacher Characteristics Q-Sort to obtain pretest and post test information.

Staiert is concerned with assessment of the attitudes, values, needs and personality traits of teachers prior to participating in this fellowship program and with the extent to which attitudes, values, needs and personality traits changed during and/or after the program. He is also interested in determining any consistency that may be disclosed between the identified characteristics and those projected as desirable by significant writers in the field of education for the disadvantaged.

A survey of the literature produces a list of characteristics suggested as critical for teachers of the disadvantaged. Specific items from each test instrument are then selected to measure any change in relation to the suggested list of characteristics based on the correspondence of item content.

A case study approach is used to report the test information for each of the 13 participants. Pretest information indicates that the prospective participants are a random group. A composite description reveals that they are above average in relation to the 43 items selected as indicative of desirable characteristics for successful teachers of the disadvantaged. Analysis of data indicates a 24.6 percent shift on test instruments from pretesting to post testing toward the position held as desirable by significant writers in the field. The post test data indicates a seven percent change toward the values, attitudes and personality traits deemed as critical by authorities in the field of education for the disadvantaged.

John Zaugra (1974) designed a study, at the University of Montana to compare interests, personality traits, and work values between prospective teachers and experienced teachers in grades one through twelve. Student teachers enrolled at the University of Montana and certified teachers employed in Misoula, Montana, are administered the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, the Work Values Inventory, and a general demographic questionnaire. No significant difference exists in the profile patterns of the two groups in regard to quantitative personality data or work value data. Both groups are interested in helping occupational roles and in self-expressive occupational roles.

This study raises many questions regarding the integrity of the test administration and the statistical analysis in light of significant differences found between prospective teachers and experienced teachers in other similar research.

Lawrence A. Bishop (1975) at the University of California at Berkeley, developed an empirical-descriptive study to analyze the correlation between the personality characteristics of elementary supervising teachers and their student teachers and the extent to which their personalities affect the student teachers' classroom performance.

The subjects are 37 elementary education student teachers enrolled at a private Catholic University in California during 1972-73 and 1973-74, and 37 supervising teachers in whose classrooms the student teachers were enrolled. Trained observers visited the classrooms using the Expert Teacher Action Study (ETAS) to assess the student

teachers' effectiveness. The Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) is utilized to measure personality characteristics for both the student teachers and their supervising teachers.

The data collected on the student teachers and the supervising teachers are analyzed by univariate and multivariate analysis of variance, covariance, regression and canonical correlation coefficients. Analyses are also made of subsamples of student teachers ranked as "above average" and "below average" in teaching effectiveness on the ETAS rating scales. Bishop's findings suggest that the interaction of personalities are significant in affecting the student teachers' classroom performance.

Mona Mary Donnelly (1971) undertook research, at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign aimed at determining differences in the personality traits of experienced and inexperienced teachers in elementary schools, and the influence of grade level taught, of teaching experience, and of the size of the community. She also attempted to determine differences in personality of those with a more positive attitude toward teaching selected content areas. There are 189 subjects: 95 teachers-in-training at the University of Illinois and 89 experienced elementary teachers from three school districts in Illinois.

The measurement instruments include: the Gordon Personal Inventory, the Gordon Personal Profile and a semantic differential.

The conclusions derived are: student teachers show a greater degree of cautiousness, skills in personal relationships, responsibility and emotional stability; whereas, the elementary teachers score higher

in sociability. Teachers with one to three years of experience are less cautious than the more experienced, and those with 14 to 20 years experience measure higher in original thinking than those with 21 to 41 years of experience.

This study defines the personality traits that teachers and teachers-in-training possess. The data are viewed in terms of the years of experience, grade level taught, and the attitudes toward teaching selected content areas. However, exploring the impact of these traits on the process of remediation may be more beneficial in providing generalizations which can be applied to educational systems and training institutions.

Personality Traits of Experienced Teachers in Specific Disciplines

Jack Bullock (1974) developed a study, at the University of Miami to compare the personality traits, job satisfaction, attitudes, training and experience histories of instrumental music teachers in New York state.

The subjects are nominated by instrumental music teachers in Westchester, Rockland, Suffolk, Nassau, Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, and New York City. From 125 junior high school teachers, 27 agreed to participate in the study.

These subjects are administered: the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), the Training and Experience Questionnaire (TEQ) developed by Bullock to examine training and experience histories, and the Personality Interview Questionnaire (PIQ), also developed by Bullock,

to examine personal qualities of training, job satisfaction and experience. The teachers identified as superior through peer evaluation are given a battery of the four tests mentioned above while a control group is administered the 16PF, the MSQ, and the TEQ.

A multivariate analysis of variance was computed for the 16PF and MSQ raw scores.

The factor matrix reveals the superior teachers as shy, sober, humble, reserved, self-sufficient people who are concerned about compensation but not about receiving praise for their work. They are also found to be: creative, realistic, tough-minded, conscientious, persistent, conservative, down-to-earth, and possessing high ego strength.

Forest Parkey (1978) launched a study, at the University of Chicago to describe the stress experienced by teachers in inner city schools and to determine which teacher personality traits are indicative of teaching styles that surface in anxiety-provoking environmental conditions. Parkey views three teacher traits critical in coping with stress: the level of energy, the reality orientation and conceptual understanding, and perception of teaching as a humanistic endeavor or as an easy-entry, high security position.

All subjects are screened and categorized into the following groups:

Group A: those with the greatest amount of job-related stress who tended to have high fight-flight and dogmatism scores, limited conceptual understanding, non-self-actualizing, and maintained high social/empathic distance between themselves and students.

Group B: those with little job-related stress, concerned with eliciting open, warm, human relationships with high pairing-work scores, low fight-flight and dogmatism scores, and concern for self-actualization.

Group C: those with strong job satisfaction, task-oriented, high dependency, and non-self-actualization orientation.

Parkey's analysis of classroom behavior finds considerable differences in the classroom milieu among the three groups when assessed by the Flander's Interaction Analysis Categories which suggests that teaching style and attitudes do play a significant role in the success experienced in an inner city setting.

Franklyn Jackson (1975) initiated a study, at Bowling Green State University to investigate the relationship between students' perceptions and principal's perceptions of the personality traits of sixth grade teachers. He is concerned with defining differences which may exist between teachers considered successful by students and principals, and teachers considered less successful. The sample is drawn from 60 teachers in elementary and middle schools in Ohio and is divided into two groups: the successful teachers and the less successful teachers.

His study does not identify any specific personality traits of the successful or less successful teachers with the Inventory of Personality Traits (IPT) developed by A.S. Barr and A. Combs.

The question may be asked as to whether the IPT is an adequate instrument for this study, or if an additional personality inventory might have increased the validity of his study.

Wexler (1977) at the University of Southern California initiated

a study comparing the personality traits of innovative elementary teachers with a national sample of female elementary teachers. The teachers are classified as innovative based on their scores of 40 or more on the Openness-to-Change Scale of the Dohmann Survey of Teachers' Perceptions Toward Educational Innovations and Change. These subjects are also administered Forms A and B of the Sixteen Personality Factor Inventory (16PF).

Comparisons are made, utilizing the t-tests of significance of the difference of means, between 37 innovative elementary teachers and 43 innovative secondary teachers. Data are then compared with the previously identified national sample of 1,208 female teachers.

Wexler finds that innovative elementary teachers when compared to the national sample, are more intelligent, emotionally stable, assertive, enthusiastic, venturesome, tender-minded, imaginative, self-assured, and controlled emotionally. He also finds that innovative elementary and secondary teachers are similar in their personality profiles and creativity scores. Innovative elementary teachers are more shrewd and conservative than innovative secondary teachers.

Personality Traits of Superior Teachers

Robert J. Cross (1975) initiated a study of the relationship of personality traits with the concept of a good teacher as judged by selected experts at Michigan State University. This research has significance for the present study, because the purpose is to develop a procedure for screening student applicants for university teacher education programs, using an informal, subjective procedure which

could later be developed into a formal, standardized method.

The procedure involves reviewing literature to identify personality traits of good and poor teachers, to organize those traits into a questionnaire, to utilize the questionnaire to collect subjective opinions of principals and student teaching coordinators, and to apply Bayes' Theorem to identify the personality traits which distinguish good from poor teachers.

Comparisons of the responses of sub-groups are made: female principal vs. male principal, female coordinator vs. male coordinator, principal vs. coordinator, female vs. male, and special education vs. general education. The sub-groups agree "almost unanimously" on the most discriminating traits: child-centered, creative, practical, patient, frivolous, motivating and not easily depressed.

A comparison of self-perceptions to perceptions held by others was initiated by James L. Niday (1978) at Bowling Green State University. This study is phase three of a pilot project researching factors of the "Successful Education Environment" by investigating the relationship between self-perceptions of successful and less successful sixth grade teachers regarding competencies and personality traits. The self-perceptions of this selected group of teachers are compared with the perceptions of their students and principals.

The sample for this study, based on sixth grade teachers identified by Arthur White in an earlier dissertation from 160 randomly selected schools throughout the state of Ohio, are ranked and divided into quartiles by Franklyn Jackson in his dissertation. Comparison of competencies are made with 32 successful teachers (Q4) and 33 less

successful teachers (Q1). Personality traits of the successful teachers are also compared with the less successful teachers.

Data for this study are obtained with a self-appraisal questionnaire which includes 11 competency questions, two questions composed by Niday regarding teacher perceptions of their students and principals, and 17 questions from A.S. Barr and A. Combs' Inventory of Personality Traits (IPT). These 30 questions are designed to be answered and evaluated on a five-point scale.

The results of this study suggest no significant difference in competencies and personality traits nor any significant difference between perceptions of teachers by students and by principals in regard to the teachers' self perceptions of personality traits. The successful teachers rated themselves higher than less successful teachers and also have a higher opinion of their students and principals than the less successful teachers do. The students rate teachers higher than the teachers rate themselves on 9 of 11 competencies and 14 of 17 personality traits. There is agreement of students and principals in their perceptions of teachers' competencies and personality traits. Although no personality traits are found to be clustered, there was a cluster of competencies with fairness, knowledge of subject matter, sympathetic understanding and interesting classes, rated in top positions by teachers, students and principals. This study provides insight into the significance and value of self-perceptions of teachers and has implications for teacher evaluation.

Ying-Hau Chen (1975) conducted a study, at the University of Northern Colorado designed to determine significant personality traits

of successful teachers in Taiwan as compared to less successful teachers in the same area. The subjects include 111 teachers identified by school principals as outstanding and 112 teachers rated by principals as ineffective. Both groups are administered the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI).

Chen's study defines 18 personality traits common to the teachers rated as successful by the principals. These are: self-acceptance, sense of well-being, aggressiveness, cooperation, confidence, active, ambition, resourcefulness, versatility, tolerance, organization, persuasiveness, alertness, productivity, observant, spontaneity, perceptiveness, and verbal fluence. The teachers rated as successful are: less flexible, more cautious, methodical, more educated and have more teaching experience than the teachers rated as less successful.

Personality Traits of Special Education Teachers

At Mississippi State University, Edwin B. Headrick (1971) initiated a study to determine whether personality traits differed among the following groups: experienced teachers of educable mentally retarded, experienced teachers of non-retarded children and the prospective teachers. Thirty subjects comprise each group. The students are enrolled at Mississippi State University, and the teachers are selected at random throughout the state of Mississippi.

The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) are administered to all 120 subjects, and the scores are analyzed by using a one-way analysis of

variance. The results show experienced teachers of the educable mentally retarded to be higher in dominance and experimenting qualities than the experienced teachers of non-exceptional children.

The prospective teachers of exceptional children and the prospective teachers of non-exceptional children differ significantly from each other on the same factors which show significant differences between the two experienced groups: dominance and experimenting qualities. There is one exception. The prospective teachers of exceptional children score higher in psychological mindedness than do the prospective teachers of non-exceptional children.

Thelma Claire N. French (1980) at the University of Texas, initiated a study comparing the personality traits of special education and elementary education student teachers.

A group of 32 female special education student teachers are matched with 32 female elementary education student teachers. They are given the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), Brown's Self-Report Inventory (SRI) and Veldman's Adjective Self-Description (ASD).

Data from these instruments are analyzed with F tests and analysis of variance at the .05 level of significance and the .10 level for indicative findings. Three of the 18 categories of the CPI are statistically significant: socialization, communality and psychological-mindedness. Dr. French concludes, however, that the size of the sample limited the validity of statistical differences found between special education and elementary education student teachers as measured by the above instruments.

An investigation of the psychological needs, personal values, and

personality traits of graduate level special education students was made by Pamela Vorigern Cochrane (1975) at the University of Florida. The study is aimed at defining personality traits of special education teachers and determining significant differences between teachers of the mentally retarded, emotionally impaired, learning disabled, blind and partially sighted, and special education administrators.

The subjects are 112 graduate students enrolled full time at two state supported universities in Florida. The instruments utilized are: the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values (SV), and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI).

Analysis of variance is used to determine significant differences at the .05 level between the mean scores of subjects' groups according to the area of specialization, degree level, age, years of experience, and sex. Discriminant function analysis is used to determine the relationship of variables to each other and their contribution to the discrimination between groups.

Dr. Cochrane's study reveals a general profile of special education teachers. They are found to be: poised, spontaneous, aggressive, demanding, and self-confident in personal and social interactions. They have a strong capacity for autonomy and independent thinking and action. They are disbelieving and distrustful in personal and social outlook and intolerant of social beliefs and attitudes of others. No significant difference is found in sub-groups based on area of specialization, except for teachers of the blind and partially sighted, and those in administration.

Significant differences are found between subjects in the master's program and the post master's group. The post master's group tends to be more domineering, aggressive, and achievement oriented than the master's degree students. Significant differences are also found in regard to age, with the older subjects being less timid in the presence of superiors, more achievement oriented and more blunt and direct in thinking and action.

An investigation of attitudes and personality traits of special education and elementary education teachers-in-training was developed by Wilfred A. Johnson (1975) at Michigan State University. The purpose of this study is to facilitate the selection of students most eligible for elementary education and special education - emotional impairment by identifying personality types. The attitudinal and personality characteristics are investigated in terms of: attitudes, interests, needs and the students' perception of their training program.

The sample consists of 98 students who were juniors in the teacher training program for elementary and special education - emotionally impaired at Michigan State University. A battery of self-reporting instruments includes the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI), Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB), and Edwards Preference Schedule (EPPS). A student information form is also administered.

The statistical analysis is subdivided into categorical kinds of information using the Chi-square test of homogeneity to test significant differences between the two groups of teacher training candidates and into quantitative kinds of information using multivariate analysis of variance with each of the three phases (MTAI, SVIB, EPPS) being run

one at a time.

The data obtained on the instruments indicates a significant difference related to the number of formal vocational choices. Those students with more experience exhibit a more positive attitude toward the teacher-training program. The two groups do not differ significantly on the MTAI, EPPS or the SVIB.

Henry W. Hogue (1978) initiated an investigation of personality characteristics and effectiveness of special education teachers at Rutgers University in New Jersey. The goal of this study is to identify personality traits of special education teachers and to determine whether they are unique to this group of teachers, with the purpose of facilitating the selection, training, and employment of special education teachers. The two hypotheses are:

1. Learning disability teachers who are effective will have personality characteristics high in self-control, need for orderliness and warmth with ability to remain detached; and

2. Learning disability teachers will have personality characteristics significantly higher than regular education teachers in self-control, need for orderliness and warmth with ability to remain detached.

The population in this study includes 51 special education teachers and 33 regular teachers employed in Bergen County, New Jersey. These subjects are given the Cattell Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire on a self-administered basis. The special education teachers are rated on the Baxter's Rating Scale of Teacher's Personnel Effectiveness by their Regional Supervisors to determine job effectiveness. Data

from these instruments are statistically treated to produce Pearson Correlations, t-tests of the significance of differences and discriminant analysis using the SPSS Program for IBM OS/370 computers.

The results of the analysis indicate that conscientiousness, self-control and need for orderliness in the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire are not significantly higher in special education teachers when compared with regular education teachers. Special education teachers are found to possess a significantly different constellation of personality traits: greater sensitivity to others, pragmatic, imaginative, shrewder, and experimental/openmindedness. Regular education teachers are found to have higher group dependency needs that special education teachers.

This study suggests that special education teachers as a group have different personality trait constellations than regular education teachers as a group and are primarily more independent and assertive. Further, this study suggests that analysis of personality characteristics is a valid means of screening applicants for teacher-training programs and for school employment.

Personality Traits Identified by Theorists

In addition to the contributions of the above researchers, the following theorists have identified personality traits which are included in the instrument for this investigation: the Learning Disability Teacher Profile (LDTP) (See Appendix A, p. 125). These theorists are selected on the basis of their humanistic posture and their focus on the significance of the qualities of helping professionals in the performance of effective service.

Carkhuff and Pierce (1976) stress the need for teachers to have helping skills that enable them to handle feeling problems which influence learning. The inference here is that learning problems are often feeling problems, and dealing with affect and cognition serves to advance the total development of the child. Attending, responding, personalizing, understanding and initiating are skills they stress as critical in facilitating emotional growth (p. 9).

Brammer (1979) cites six characteristics of the helper: first, awareness of self and values are viewed as a means of preventing the projection of one's values on others while suspending judgement of others; second, the ability to analyze personal feelings and balance the "expertise" attitude with the self-effacing attitude; third, the ability to serve as a model and influence by demonstrating enthusiasm and responsiveness; fourth, an altruistic interest in others; fifth, a strong sense of ethics which serves as a conscious guideline for action; and sixth, responsibility in knowing and respecting personal limitations in the therapeutic process.

Rogers (1957) has contributed an exceptional amount of empirical data regarding the qualities of the counselor. He defines the essential conditions for the interview process: congruence, unconditional positive regard, empathic understanding, warmth and caring, openness, respect, concreteness and specificity.

Rosen (1975) investigated the personal qualities of effective teachers with the development of case studies. In her research, she finds that

> adults who are judged to develop effective relations with children, perceive their childhood selves more positively than do adults who are judged to develop poor relations with children (p. 24).

Those teachers who are considered effective teachers perceive themselves as: independent, resourceful, having feelings of social adequacy, and having the ability to achieve something that was important to them (goal-oriented).

Sapir and Wilson (1978) and Wilson and Sapir (1982) express the need for teacher-training institutions to screen out students unqualified to teach the learning disabled; they speak of "intellectually able students who amass straight 'A' averages but are temperamentally unsuited for work with handicapped children" (p. 222). They specify critical traits as: clarity, insightfulness, organized, structured, perceptive, and courageous, a high level of energy, optimism, resilience and assertiveness. While they see training as a means of enhancing the most desirable qualities in special education teachers, they view optimism, resilience and assertiveness as intrinsic qualities.

DeHirsch (1977) identifies the need for resilience, enthusiasm and flexibility and agrees with Brammer's emphasis on genuineness, warmth and openness.

Summary

This review of literature provides a selected survey of studies that are relevant to the present investigation on the basis of their focus on the identification of personality traits of teachers since 1970. In the first section, Personality Traits of Teachers-in-Training, the investigations use formal, standardized instruments to obtain data.

The results are found to be inconclusive, except in the case of Boyle (1978) whose results reveal significant differences between elementary and high school teachers-in-training. He finds elementary teachers to be: more goal-oriented, practical-minded, decisive, energetic, with self-actualizing values and a greater capacity for intimacy than high school teachers.

In the second section, Personality Traits of Experienced Teachers Compared with Teachers-in-Training, studies are again reviewed for relevance to the present investigation. Each researcher also uses formal, standardized instruments to collect data. The results are inconclusive, except in the case of Donnelly (1971) who finds teachers-in-training: more cautious, emotionally stable, and more adept in personal relationship skills than experienced teachers. She also presents data to support the notion that more experienced teachers score higher in original thinking than less experienced teachers.

In the third section, Personality Traits of Experienced Teachers in Specific Disciplines, a review of relevant studies with bearing on the identification of personality traits reveals that formal, standardized instruments are employed in each study. Data of Wexler (1977) and Amerling (1977) are clear in revealing specific personality traits. Wexler's investigation of innovative teachers finds them to be more intelligent, emotionally stable, assertive, enthusiastic, venturesome, tender-minded, imaginative, self-assured and emotionally controlled than a national sample of female elementary teachers. He also identifies innovative elementary teachers as more shrewd and conservative than innovative high school teachers. Amerling (1977) in his investigation

of the self-perceptions and self-concepts of regular teachers as compared to their perceptions of special education students finds a significant correlation between positive self-attitudes in teachers and their positive attitudes toward special education students.

In the fourth section, Personality Traits of Superior Teachers, studies are reviewed for relevance to the present investigation. Cross (1975) uses questionnaires and Niday (1978) and Ying-Hau Chen (1975) use formal, standardized instruments. Cross (1975) identifies the traits of a good teacher as: child-centered, creative, patient, practical, motivating and not easily depressed. Niday and Ying-Hau Chen both compare teachers categorized as successful with teachers categorized as less successful. Niday (1978) identifies a cluster of successful teacher competencies as: fairness, sympathetic, understanding, and knowledgeable in subject content. Ying-Hau Chen's (1975) data reveals that successful teachers are cooperative, active, confident, ambitious, resourceful, versatile, tolerant, organized, persuasive, alert, productive, observant, spontaneous, perceptive, verbally fluent, and possessing a sense of well-being.

In the fifth section, Personality Traits of Special Education Teachers, a review of relevant studies related to the personality traits of these educators is described. Each investigator employs formal, standardized instruments to collect data and report conclusive results defining personality traits of special education teachers. Hogue (1978), Cochrane (1975) and Headrick (1971) find: independence, dominance, assertiveness, and experimental/openmindedness as common traits of special education teachers. Additionally, Hogue finds that

special education teachers possess: understanding, tolerance, sensitivity to others, imaginative, pragmatic and shrewdness. Cochrane also finds that spontaneity, self-confidence, achievement orientation, demanding and poise are characteristic of special education teachers. In addition to the above traits, Headrick (1971) and French (1980) find "psychological mindedness" as a trait among the special education teachers-in-training and experienced teachers, respectively.

The last section, Personality Traits Identified by Theorists, presents personality traits defined by selected humanistic theorists who are in agreement with the "self as instrument" concepts espoused by Combs, Avila and Purkey (1978). They are: Wilson and Sapir (1981), Brammar (1979), Mosier and Park (1979), Dyer (1978), Hamachek (1978), Combs, Avila and Purkey (1978), Valett (1972), Anderson (1970), and Jersild (1955). The traits identified by these theorists are: responsiveness, understanding, genuineness, self-awareness, nonjudgmental, enthusiastic, ethical, flexible, altruistic, responsible, respectful, congruent, warm, empathic, caring, openness, concreteness, specificity, independence, resourcefulness, clarity, insightfulness, organization, structured, perceptive, courageous, optimistic, resilient and assertive.

The review of the literature has provided evidence that a unique personality construct can be identified for selected populations of experienced and inexperienced teachers-in-training. The literature suggests agreement between the personality constructs of teachers deemed successful in other disciplines, and the personality construct

of experienced special education teachers (Niday, 1978; Ying-Hau Chen, 1975; Hogue, 1978; and Cochrane, 1975). The correlation between the self-perceptions of teachers with the perceptions of students and principals in Niday's study (1978) supports the validity of utilizing perceptions of experienced teachers in the present investigation. Additionally, the humanistic theorists, who support the "self-as-instrument" concept, have specified qualities of helping professionals which are in agreement with those qualities identified by the experimental researchers.

On the basis of the review of the literature, the investigator concludes that:

1. A personality construct of learning disability teachers can be identified.

2. Assessing the perceptions of experienced learning disability teachers to identify a personality profile can be viewed as a valid means of identifying a construct.

3. The identified personality construct of learning disability teachers will agree with the personality construct of special education teachers in previous studies.

4. That variance will be evident in age and number of years in teaching experience (See Appendix A, p. 125).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design of this study by describing: the instrumentation, the sample, the procedure, the experimental design, and the statistical analysis of data. An investigation of the operating personality construct of learning disability teachers is developed by quantifying the perceptions of experienced learning disability teachers. The perceptions of the personality construct are obtained by mailing an instrument to practitioners and requesting them to report the characteristics that they considered most important for learning disability teachers to possess. Data are obtained by assigned value to each of the reported perceptions of characteristics to determine the relative importance of each as perceived by the respondents.

Instrumentation

The instrument constructed for this study, the Learning Disability Teacher Profile (LDTP) (See Appendix A, p. 125) is based upon Charles Osgood's model of the semantic differential, which is a combination of the associational method and the scaling method. The associational method is partly dependent upon the meaning of the stimulus item, and partly upon habit strength factors within the individual making the association. The scaling method is a form of controlled association, wherein, the nature of the association is defined by the scales

(hot-cold); however, the direction and intensity of the association are left to be specified by the subject. The scaling method provides for comparability; whereas, the association method offers the possibility of quantitatively assessing meaningful judgments.

Osgood's theory is founded in the notion that ways in which meanings vary are essentially equivalent and as such can be represented by a single dimension. Allocation of a given concept to an experiential continuum is defined by a pair of polar terms. Each term is postulated as possessing a semantic space; a region of some unknown dimensionality. A semantic scale, defined by polar adjectives, is assumed to represent a straight line function that passes through the origin of the semantic space.

A limited number of continua or scaled steps can be used to define a semantic space within which the meaning of any concept can be specified. A number of samples of such scales then represents a multi-dimensional space (Osgood, 1954, p. 64). The larger or more representative the sample, the better or more precisely defined is the space as a whole. This design is an indirect method of measurement, utilizing metaphor in language, which parallels "alignment of two or more dimensions of experience, defined verbally by pairs of polar opposites, with translation occurring between equivalent portions of the continua" (Osgood, 1952, p. 67).

The exploration of a personality construct unique to learning disability teachers is founded in the notion that learning disability teachers are educational therapists, and are subject to the "self as instrument" concept projected by Combs, Avila and Purkey (1978, p. 6).

Previous research aimed at defining the personality traits of special education teachers uses personality inventories and is based on the assumption that possession of a personality cluster by special education teachers is an indication of the most desirable traits for professionals in the given area of specialization.

The present study differs from previous studies in that the purpose is not to determine traits possessed by learning disability teachers, but rather to determine what traits learning disability teachers with experience perceive as critical in meeting the unique demands of remediating learning disabled students. The assumption here is that teachers, through experience in teaching learning disabled students, have arrived at some insight into the characteristics that have caused failure or contributed to success in teaching. For this purpose, the Learning Disability Teacher Profile (LDTP) was developed, drawing upon personality traits identified in previous research and related literature.

A section requesting demographic information is placed at the top of the LDTP to provide data regarding: age range, sex, acquired academic degrees, number of years teaching learning disabled students, total years of teaching experience, and confirmation of learning disability educator certification (See Appendix C, p. 152).

Fifty pairs of polar opposites are provided on a seven-step semantic scale for which the subjects were required to indicate the degree of association with either of the polar terms. Two examples are given to illustrate the procedure for marking the LDTP, and the subjects are instructed to mark an "X" on the seven-step scale

indicating the degree of association with either of the bipolar opposites judged as an important quality for learning disability teachers to possess.

The instructions read: "Rate the following 50 traits to indicate your perception of the degree of importance for learning disability teachers to possess."

The 50 pairs of descriptive adjectives, as proposed by Osgood (1953) provide a large sample of scales within which the perceptions of the learning disability teachers can be precisely and accurately defined. These are selected on face validity from research and literature regarding the personality characteristics of teachers in special education and regular education.

A critical aspect of the semantic differential lies in selecting the sample of descriptive polar terms. Ideally, the sample should be as representative as possible of all the ways in which meaningful judgments can vary, and yet small enough in size to be efficient in practice. Osgood's model involves using 50 bipolar adjectives with a seven-step scale for each set of objectives.

The determination of which adjectives should logically be included in an instrument designed to define the personality traits of learning disability teachers necessarily emanates from a basic premise on which this study is founded: learning disability teachers and, indeed, all special education teachers function as educational therapists or helping professionals (Wilson and Sapir, 1981; Brammer, 1979; Mosier and Park, 1979; Dyer, 1978; Hamachek, 1978; Combs, Avila and Purkey, 1978; Valett, 1977; Anderson, 1970; Jersild, 1955). As

helping professionals or therapists, their effectiveness is primarily influenced by their personality construct as Combs, Avila and Purkey postulate in the "self-as-instrument" concept.

"Professional helpers must be thinking, problem-solving people; the primary tool with which they work is themselves" (Combs, Avila and Purkey, 1978, p. 6). This understanding has been called the "self as instrument" concept.

> An effective helper is one who has acquired an extensive, accurate, internally consistent personal set of perceptions or beliefs, which serve as guides for the helpers' moment to moment behaviors with students, clients and patients (Combs, Avila and Purkey, 1978, p. 9).

With these concepts in mind, the Learning Disability Teacher Profile was developed using descriptive polar terms drawn from research exploring the personality traits of regular education teachers and special education teachers, and also from literature related to personal qualities of helping professionals recorded in the period from 1970 through 1981. Conclusions regarding the significant qualities of helping professionals are drawn from authorities whose philosophies are consistent with the "self-as-instrument" concept: Carkhuff and Pierce, 1976; Brammer, 1979; Rogers, 1966; Moustakas, 1969; and Combs, Avila and Purkey, 1978.

Sample

The subjects for this study are limited to 200 learning disability teachers, certified by the Illinois State Certification Board, and employed in public elementary and high schools within the state of Illinois in 1982. There are not participants drawn from private

schools, because private educational institutions have no obligation to serve the handicapped population. Furthermore, private institutions often reject students with learning problems rather than hire teachers trained to remediate the learning disabled student. Private schools organized to specifically serve the handicapped are more often devoted to the severely handicapped, such as the: trainable mentally handicapped, educable mentally handicapped, severely emotionally disturbed, blind, deaf, or physically and/or multiply handicapped. The learning disability students are described as the "invisibly handicapped" (Faas, 1980) and, as the largest category within the handicapped population, are predominantly enrolled in public school systems where the potential for integration into regular education programs exists.

The criterion of state certification for the sample guarantees a minimal level of competency and provides a degree of academic equality for all the participants in this study (See Appendix C, p. 152).

"The 1979-80 Education Personnel Work Assignment Analysis," published by the Illinois State Board of Education's Department of Specialized Educational Services in Spring, 1981, reported 1,321.75 learning disability teachers in full time classrooms, 2,564.75 learning disability teachers in resource rooms, and 611.25 learning disability teachers working on an itinerant basis. The city of Chicago has approximately 800 learning disability teachers.

The mailing of 800 LDTP's to the membership of the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities and the Illinois Division for Learning Disabilities serves to provide a selected sample of the 4,497.75 total population of learning disability teachers employed

within the state of Illinois.

Procedure

The names and addresses of subjects from which the sample is derived was acquired from the Illinois Association for Children with Learning Disabilities (IACLD) and the Illinois Division for Learning Disabilities (IDLD). The State of Illinois Certification Board was also contacted for this purpose; however, due to legal restrictions, no addresses could be provided by them for this study.

The Illinois Chapter of the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities is an organization of parents and professionals which has become a powerful political force since its inception in 1963 and has developed an active professional membership of national and international stature. The Illinois Division for Learning Disabilities was chartered in 1968 as an affiliate of the Council for Exceptional Children and is a professional organization of teachers and administrators. IDLD was established for the purpose of sharing current pertinent research (Wallace and McLoughlin, 1979).

The ACLD and IDLD mailing lists may be viewed as beneficial in reaching individuals whose membership in these professional organizations indicates, to a degree, a commitment to the field of learning disabilities and an interest in pursuing professional growth.

The ACLD and IDLD members were divided according to addresses located in the north, west, central and southern regions of the state of Illinois and 200 Learning Disability Teacher Profiles (LDTP) were mailed to members in each region as a means of preventing over

representation in any given part of the state. The regional division was viewed as a means of avoiding any bias resulting from the unique racial, cultural or ethnic character of any given region in the state.

The 800 Learning Disability Teacher Profiles (LDTP) were mailed on May 5, 1982; a response was requested by May 26, 1982. By May 29, 1982, 203 responses were received. The northern region of the state of Illinois yielded 63 returns, the western region yielded 35 returns, the central region yielded 52 returns and the southern region yielded 53 returns. Three of the returns were rejected: one due to the respondent changing all the bipolar terms to other adjectives and two because the respondents indicated certification in areas other than learning disabilities.

The completed LDTP's were checked to ascertain the certification status reported by each respondent. Each step of the seven step scale was sequentially numbered from one to seven with one being the closest step to the positive descriptor and seven being the closest step to the negative descriptor. Each returned LDTP was then numbered from 1 to 200. The value given to the 50 individual items (1 through 7) on each returned LDTP was then recorded with the number (1 through 200) assigned to each instrument to permit later confirmation of record accuracy.

The 50 items on 200 instruments offer the potential for 10,000 correlations between each of the four independent variables: 1) sex, 2) age, 3) years of experience teaching learning disability students, and 4) attained academic degrees.

Design

The design of this investigation is a non-experimental, exploratory survey-based study.

In this design, there are no variables that are manipulated (treatments). Rather, utilizing descriptive and inferential, statistical paradigms, the nature of the relationship between variables, as it exists in the present, is explicated.

This design allows the researcher to better understand, or at least infer, the dynamic relationship of a given set of variables in a data-set.

Statistical Analysis

Two processes of analysis are used with the IBM System 370 SPSS to analyze the data obtained from the Learning Disability Teacher Profile (LDTP): the principal factor analysis method and the principal component factor analysis method. Principal component analysis is "variance orientated" while "factor analysis is covariance or correlation-orientated" (Lawley and Maxwell, 1971, p. 3).

Through principal factor analysis, a varimax rotated factor matrix is employed to determine the highest correlation coefficient for each of the six factors identified. The use of .55 determines the unique specificity or communality of each factor. A multivariate F-test is utilized to determine the significance at the .05 level for independent variables: sex, age, years of experience teaching learning disabilities and attained academic degrees.

Additionally, the data are analyzed using the principal component

factor analysis method. The six factors are rotated to simple structure (orthogonally). Varimax rotation is employed to determine distributional characteristics of the independent variables.

Comparison of the two procedures for analysis is provided in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter is organized using the Hypothesis-Analysis-Summary method of presentation. Each focus of the study will be presented separately, followed by an explication of two statistical methods of analyzing data, and finally a brief interpretation of what the data suggest.

The goal of this investigation is to identify the personality construct of a learning disability teacher by employing principal-factor analysis and principal component analysis to analyze the data. The following hypotheses will be examined to determine variance within the identified personality construct as a function of sex, age, years of experience teaching learning disabilities and attained academic degrees. A brief description of the two methods of analysis will facilitate understanding the value of each process.

In principal component factor analysis, a set of variates is transformed linearly and orthogonally into an equal number of new variates which are uncorrelated. The transformation is obtained by determining the latent roots and vectors of either the covariance or the correlation matrix. The latent roots, arranged in hierarchical order, are equal to the variances of the corresponding variates which serves as the unstandardized principal component (Harmon, 1976).

The aim of principal-factor analysis is to account for the

covariance of observed variates in terms of a smaller number of hypothetical variates or factors. The principal-factor method involves essentially the same procedure as the principal component analysis method except that it operates on the reduced correlation matrix wherein estimates of communalities assume a diagonal structure. Principal-factor analysis is correlation-orientated, while principal component factor analysis is variance orientated (Lawley and Maxwell, 1971).

While there is value in utilizing two processes of analysis with semantic differential instrumentation, Kim and Mueller (1978, p. 8) suggest that there is no single solution for most problems and applying different methods to the same data produces results that are generally equivalent. The present study utilizes these two methods of analysis and offers a comparison of the results of each.

The procedure, as explained briefly in Chapter III, involves assigning a graduated value to each step of the seven step scale on the 50 item LDTP with 1 assigned to the most positive descriptor and 7 assigned to the most negative descriptor. All returned LDTP's are then numbered from 1 to 200. The value given to the 50 individual items on each returned LDTP is recorded resulting in 10,000 potential correlations. The sums of each of the 50 descriptors are computed and fed into the IBM System 370 SPSS for analysis. The standard deviations and means of each descriptor or independent variable are displayed in Table 5.

Analysis of the data utilizing the principal-factor method reveals a six factor solution as shown in Table 6. This six factor

Table 5

Standard Deviations and Means of LDTP Scales

Variable Number	A	B	Mean $\bar{X}$	Standard Deviation SD
*1	honest	dishonest	1.4350	0.8302
2	easy	difficult	4.0600	1.2666
3	idealist	realist	4.7250	1.7506
4	relaxed	tense	1.8650	0.9908
*5	organized	disorganized	1.3650	0.7311
*6	insightful	undiscerning	1.4550	0.8785
*7	resourceful	unproficient	1.3100	0.6211
8	sensitive	insensitive	1.4850	0.7828
*9	empathic	indifferent	1.6350	0.8338
*10	active	passive	2.0850	1.0646
*11	structured	unstructured	1.7500	1.0645
*12	flexible	inflexible	1.5550	0.9807
*13	clear	hazy	1.2650	0.6534
*14	direct	indirect	1.7700	1.0061
*15	perceptive	imperceptive	1.3150	0.6618
*16	energetic	lethargic	1.7700	0.9495
*17	hard	soft	3.8700	1.0041
*18	resilient	rigid	2.1700	1.2364
*19	creative	noncreative	1.9350	1.0422
*20	brave	cowardly	2.5350	1.1814
21	young	old	3.9850	0.9430
*22	authoritarian	democratic	4.3850	1.4723
*23	sympathetic	unsympathetic	2.3400	1.1450
*24	altruistic	uncharitable	2.5100	1.0981
25	consistent	inconsistent	1.2200	0.6662
*26	judgmental	nonjudgmental	4.6250	1.6728
27	congruent	incongruent	2.6500	1.2390
*28	responsible	irresponsible	1.2700	0.5821
*29	confident	diffident	1.4650	0.7080
30	respectful	disrespectful	1.5150	0.8623
*31	assertive	compliant	2.2000	1.1163
*32	mature	immature	1.4850	0.8143
*33	genuine	artificial	1.3150	0.6842
*34	calm	agitated	1.4850	0.7297
*35	fair	unfair	1.3000	0.6340
36	open	closed	1.6800	0.9284
*37	independent	dependent	2.1250	1.0794
*38	authentic	deceptive	1.6150	0.9005
*39	strong	weak	1.9250	0.9612
40	accepting	unaccepting	1.6450	0.9662
*41	responsive	unresponsive	1.4050	0.6657

Table 5 (continued)

Variable Number	A	B	Mean $\bar{X}$	Standard Deviation SD
*42	happy	sad	1.9300	0.9642
43	ethical	unethical	1.3850	0.7066
*44	patient	impatient	1.2150	0.5293
*45	spontaneous	constrained	2.3250	1.1817
*46	positive	negative	1.2950	0.6081
*47	kind	cruel	1.4600	0.7624
*48	optimistic	pessimistic	1.6000	0.8624
*49	warm	cool	1.4650	0.7757
50	sharp	dull	2.0500	1.1152

A = positive descriptor
B = negative descriptor
Mean denotes position on scale from 1 to 7
*Descriptors which comprised the identified Personality Construct.

solution is supported by an eigenvalue of .945 which indicates a 4.4 percent of variance and thus the total amount of variability accounts for 84 percent of variability. In determining the number of factors, the most popular criteria is to retain factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 when the correlational matrix is decomposed (Kim and Mueller, 1978; Gorsuch, 1974; Harmon, 1976). However values close to 1 are often retained when there is sufficient rationale for so doing as determined by the judgment of statisticians. The descriptors which are encompassed in each factor are presented to three experts in the field of learning disabilities who possess post graduate degrees and have acquired more than 20 years teaching experience with learning disabilities (See Appendix D, p. 154). Each expert is asked to label the six factors in categorical terms. The concensus of their judgments is utilized in determining appropriate titles for each of the six factors. These six factors represent the underlying personality construct that the subjects, as a group, indicated as relevant and important for the successful learning disability teacher to possess.

A comparison of the results of the principal-factor analysis and the principal component factor analysis is presented in Tables 6 through 12. The same six factors are identified by each method of analysis, however the adaptability and maturity themes exchange positions in their hierarchical status as illustrated in Table 6.

Further comparison of the factors found in each method of analysis will be provided in Tables 7 through 12. While reviewing these tables, the reader will note that the loading values for variates will differ and the number of variates in each factor will vary in the two

Table 6

Titles and Themes of the Six Factor Personality Construct in Hierarchical Order

Principal-Factor Analysis Identification of Factors	Principal Component Factor Analysis Identification of Factors
Factor I Locomotion-Motivational	Factor I Locomotion-Motivational
Factor II Nuturing Need	Factor II Nurturing Need
Factor III Accurate Communication	Factor III Accurate Communication
Factor IV Adaptability	Factor IV Maturity
Factor V Maturity	Factor V Adaptability
Factor VI Order	Factor VI Order

methods of analysis. These minor variations, however, do not change the character of the title and themes of each factor.

For the sake of clarity, the explication of the title-theme descriptions will follow the hierarchical order provided by the principal-factor analysis. Variables included in each factor reflect a factor loading of .40 or more. Factor loadings of less than .40 are not deemed practically significant (Gorsuch, 1974, p. 185). The defining parameters and main theme of each factor will be described in the following sections.

Locomotion-Motivational

The response pattern and theme of Locomotion is presented in Table 7 (p. 64). The locomotion/motivational factor reflects Lewin's concepts of energy, tension, need and valence.

Energy is referred to as psychic energy released to regain equilibrium when tension aroused in an inner-personal region exists. The need to regain equilibrium within the inner-personal sphere is influenced by positive or negative valence and force from the psychological environment. (Force determines the direction, strength, and point of application.) Locomotion results from the influence of force and the strength of valence on the boundaries of the inner-personal system. The dynamic within the teacher's person (inner-personal system plus perceptual motor regions) impacts on the student by eliciting locomotion that intrudes on the student's psychological environment and creates the need and subsequent tension within the inner-personal sphere of the student. The need and tension elicited within the student can then result in dynamic restructuring of the student's psychological environment.

Restructuring the psychological environment can be realized in four ways (Hall and Lindzey, 1970, p. 234).

1. The value of the region may change quantitatively or qualitatively.

2. Vectors may change in strength or direction, or in both respects.

3. Boundaries of regions may become firmer or weaker, appear or disappear.

4. The material properties of a region may be altered, becoming more fluid or rigid.

Restructuring of the psychological environment can also result from changes in tension systems, from locomotion, or as the result

Table 7

Comparison of Principal-Factor Analysis and Principal Component Factor Analysis of Factor I

Factor I					
Principal-Factor Analysis Locomotion-Motivational			Principal Component Factor Analysis Locomotion-Motivational		
Variable No	Variable	Factor Loading	Variable No	Variable	Factor Loading
10	Active	.58	37	Independent	.63
39	Strong	.58	39	Strong	.61
37	Independent	.56	10	Active	.61
19	Creative	.54	19	Creative	.60
20	Brave	.53	20	Brave	.60
16	Energetic	.51	16	Energetic	.54
29	Confident	.49	31	Assertive	.52
24	Altruistic	.45	29	Confident	.50
31	Assertive	.44	24	Altruistic	.49
14	Direct	.40	14	Direct	.43
32	Mature	.40	32	Mature	.40

Loading refers to the degree of correlation between the variable scale and the underlying concept, the learning disability teacher. Loadings < .40 are not practically significant (Gorsuch, 1974, p. 185).

of cognitive processes. Cognitive processing occurs when a person discovers a new way of solving a problem, i.e. an insight, etcetera.

Nurturing Need

The response pattern and theme of Nurturing Need are presented in Table 8 (p. 66).

Nurturing is represented as a basic need that evolves from the central cells or system of the inner-personal sphere. To review the structure of the person as conceptualized by Lewin, the person consists of a concentric circle with a larger circle; the inner circle consists of cells. Those cells around the boundary of the inner-personal circle are peripheral cells, and those in the center are central cells. The area between the concentric circle and the larger circle is the perceptual-motor region. Lewin leaves the perceptual-motor region unstructured, but when the direction of influence is from the psychological environment to the person, the region surrounding the inner-personal sphere represents perceptual processes. When the direction of influence is from the person to the environment, this same region stands for the motor.

When perception in the perceptual-motor region is impacted by a fact in the psychological environment, locomotion and communication to the central systems of the inner-personal sphere take place. Nurturing need assumes a reciprocal response with positive or negative valence, and a variance of force that reflects the strength of the need and the degree of tension emitted from the inner-personal sphere.

Table 8

Comparison of Principal-Factor Analysis and Principal Component Factor Analysis of Factor II

Factor II					
Principal-Factor Analysis Nurturing Need			Principal Component Factor Analysis Nurturing Need		
Variable No	Variable	Factor Loading	Variable No	Variable	Factor Loading
47	Kind	.68	47	Kind	.71
49	Warm	.67	49	Warm	.71
48	Optimistic	.58	9	Empathic	.62
46	Positive	.56	48	Optimistic	.61
9	Empathic	.56	46	Positive	.59
23	Sympathetic	.42	23	Sympathetic	.48
42	Happy	.40	42	Happy	.45
45	Spontaneous	.40	45	Spontaneous	.42

Loading refers to the degree of correlation between the variable scale and the underlying concept, the learning disability teacher. Loadings < .40 are not practically significant (Gorsuch, 1974, p. 185).

Accurate Communication

The response pattern and theme of Accurate Communication are presented in Table 9 (p. 68).

The concepts of locomotion and communication are closely associated due to Lewin's notion of locomotion as being psychological locomotion or physical locomotion which takes place within the psychological environment. The direction or path of locomotion is partly determined by the strength of the boundaries and the fluidity of the regions, and partly by dynamic factors in the life space.

Three principles relate to the conditions of locomotion and communication:

1. The Principle of Relatedness

An event (locomotion and communication) is always the result of an interaction between two or more facts.

2. The Principle of Concreteness

Only a concrete fact, one that actually exists in the life space, can have effects.

3. The Principle of Contemporaneity

Only present facts can influence behavior. Facts of early childhood can have no bearing on the present, unless those facts have managed to remain in some sort of existence throughout the years (Lewin, 1936, p. 235).

Adaptability

The response pattern and theme of Adaptability are presented in Table 10 (p. 70) as identified by the Principal-Factor Analysis and

Table 9

Comparison of Principal-Factor Analysis and Principal Component Factor Analysis of Factor III

Factor III					
Principal-Factor Analysis Accurate Communication			Principal Component Factor Analysis Accurate Communication		
Variable No	Variable	Factor Loading	Variable No	Variable	Factor Loading
13	Clear	.56	13	Clear	.61
*44	Patient	.52	5	Organized	.57
7	Resourceful	.51	7	Resourceful	.54
*46	Positive	.50	*25	Consistent	.46
5	Organized	.49	34	Calm	.45
34	Calm	.42	35	Fair	.43
35	Fair	.42	*50	Sharp	.42

*Variables not common to both statistical definitions of accurate communication.
Loading refers to the degree of correlation between the variable scale and the underlying concept, the learning disability teacher. Loadings < .40 are not practically significant (Gorsuch, 1974, p. 185).

Table 11 (p. 71) as identified by the Principal Component Factor Analysis.

Facts in the psychological environment can also produce changes in the physical world. There is a two-way communication between the two realms: the boundary between life space and the outer world is endowed with the property of permeability; the boundary represents a permeable membrane or screen more than a wall or barrier.

The implication of a permeable boundary between the life-space and the physical world is of far-reaching significance.

Locomotion and communication are influenced by the permeability boundaries: nearness-remoteness, firmness-weakness, and/or fluidity rigidity. The structural composition of the inner-personal sphere is, perhaps, the most critical variable in communication between systems or cells in the inner-personal sphere.

Maturity

The response pattern and theme of Maturity are presented in Table 10 (p. 70) as identified by Principal-Factor Analysis and Table 11 (p. 71) as identified by Principal Component Factor Analysis.

Increased maturity results in a greater differentiation both of the person (inner-personal and perceptual-motor) and of the psychological environment with increased firmness of boundaries, and a complex network of hierarchical and selective relationships among the tension systems. For Lewin, development of behavior is a function of the person and the psychological environment. Analysis of development involves the field concepts of: differentiation, changes in boundary

Table 10

Comparison of Principal-Factor Analysis and Principal Component Factor Analysis of Factor IV

Factor IV					
Principal-Factor Analysis Adaptability			Principal Component Factor Analysis Maturity		
Variable No	Variable	Factor Loading	Variable No	Variable	Factor Loading
18	Resilient	.50	1	Honest	.72
12	Flexible	.49	33	Genuine	.59
41	Responsive	.49	28	Responsible	.54
15	Perceptive	.46	38	Authentic	.47
6	Insightful	.41	*30	Respectful	.45
			*21	Young	.45

*Variables not included in the maturity factor as identified by the principal-factor analysis method as shown in Table 11.
Loading refers to the degree of correlation between the variable scale and the underlying concept, the learning disability teacher. Loadings < .40 are not practically significant (Gorsuch, 1974, p. 185).

Table 11

Comparison of Principal-Factor Analysis and Principal Component Factor Analysis of Factor V

Factor V					
Principal-Factor Analysis Maturity			Principal Component Factor Analysis Adaptability		
Variable No	Variable	Factor Loading	Variable No	Variable	Factor Loading
1	Honest	.61	12	Flexible	.59
33	Genuine	.56	18	Resilient	.58
28	Responsible	.46	41	Responsive	.52
38	Authentic	.45	15	Perceptive	.48
			6	Insightful	.47
			*4	Relaxed	.47

*Variables not included in the adaptability factor as identified by the principal-factor analysis method as shown in Table 9.
Loading refers to the degree of correlation between the variable scale and the underlying concept, learning disability teacher.
Loadings < .40 are not practically significant (Gorsuch, 1974, p. 185).

conditions, organization and integration.

Order

The response pattern and theme of Order are presented in Table 12 (p. 73).

Lewin's concept of integration explains the increase in organization and integration that takes place with maturity, a phenomenon he refers to as organizational dependence. The mutual and reciprocal effect of tension of neighboring systems of the inner-personal sphere does not continue in the matured state of life. In place of the simple interdependence typical in the child's inner-personal system, regions wherein tension is aroused, assume a leader and led relationship with other systems or cells in the inner-personal sphere. "Tension System A leads Tension System B in such a manner as to help a discharge of its tension without necessarily leading to any final equality between the two" (Hall and Lindzey, p. 239).

Organizational interdependence tension does not diffuse from region to region on the basis of proximity alone. Selectivity develops so that remote systems may dominate or lead each other, thus a hierarchy of dominate-subordinate relationships can be established. This explains the ability of an older person to organize and execute complex plans of action. Disorganization and lack of integration would then be viewed as immaturity.

The expectation of this investigation is that the educational training of the subjects and their experience in teaching learning disabled students enhance their insight into the personality construct

Table 12

Comparison of Principal-Factor Analysis and Principal Component Factor Analysis of Factor VI

Factor VI					
Principal-Factor Analysis Order			Principal Component Factor Analysis Order		
Variable No	Variable	Factor Loading	Variable No	Variable	Factor Loading
11	Structured	.62	11	Structured	.67
26	Nonjudgmental	.46	26	Nonjudgmental	.61
5	Organized	.46	22	Authoritarian	.57
22	Authoritarian	.45	17	Hard	.54
17	Hard	.41	5	Organized	.47

Loading is the degree of correlation between variable and the underlying concept, learning disability teacher.
Loadings < .04 are not practically significant (Gorsuch, 1974, p. 185).

which would influence the effectiveness of persons in this professional practice. The six factors presented represent a more specific definition of this personality construct which may potentially contribute to effective remediation, and maximize the potential for the learning disabled to achieve social-emotional development and academic achievement.

Based on the results of the principal-factor analysis wherein a six factor solution is revealed with an eigenvalue of 1, the goal of this investigation, to identify a personality construct of a learning disability teacher, has been achieved (See Appendix E, p. 158).

A further objective of this study is to determine whether statistically significant differences exist among subgroups of practitioners with regard to their perception of a personality construct which is most important for learning disability teachers to possess. Specifically, are the practitioner's perceptions of the personality construct of a learning disability teacher influenced by: sex, age, years of teaching experience, or acquired academic degrees.

These independent variables are tested in the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There will be no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct as perceived by learning disability teachers as a function of sex difference.

To test the differences in perception of each independent variable within the personality construct, the sums of each variable included in each factor are subjected to a multivariate F-test to determine the overall significance. The results of the multivariate F-test are shown in Table 13.

Inspection of Table 13 indicates that the Wilks test, a test of ratio determinants given the F and P value, offers a value of .93. The overall F test for equality of group centroids reveals an F value of 2.50 and a P value of .024 indicating statistical significance at the < .05 level. Based on the results of these data, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no statistically significant differences within the identified personality construct as a function of sex difference is rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Table 13

Analysis of Variance Multivariate Tests of Significance as a Function of Sex

Test Name	Value	Approx F	Hypoth D.F.	Error D.F.	Sig of F
Pillais	.07	2.50	6.00	193.00	.024
Hotellings	.08	2.50	6.00	193.00	.024
Wilks	.93	2.50	6.00	193.00	.024

The univariate F-test is then applied to the data to determine whether the overall F value calls for conditional interpretation to determine the best predictors or discriminators. The results of the univariate F-test are displayed in Table 14. Inspection of Table 14 reveals statistically significant differences for Factor II, Nurturing Need, Factor IV, Adaptability, and Factor VI, Order at the < .05 level of significance.

A purview of the overall F ratio reveals Factor II, Nurturing Need, Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor VI, Order as the best

Table 14

Differences as a Function of Sex Univariate F-Tests With (1,198) D.F.

	Hypoth S.S.	Error S.S.	Hypoth M.S.	Error M.S.	F	Sig of F
F1	13.58	6657.92	13.58	33.63	.40	.526
F2	67.60	2378.99	67.60	12.02	5.63	.019*
F3	8.14	1711.82	8.14	8.65	.94	.333
F4	37.33	1788.67	37.33	9.03	4.13	.043*
F5	11.35	1001.01	11.35	5.06	2.24	.136
F6	124.72	2610.28	124.72	13.18	9.46	.002*

< .05 level of significance.
*Factors with < .05.

discriminators. This conclusion is supported by the significance of the F tests and the relative size of the corresponding means as shown in Table 15 (p. 77). The P value and the F ratio of these three factors appear to suggest that Factor VI, Order is the best discriminator, with Factor II, Nurturing Need and Factor IV, Adaptability ranking next in discriminating power. The results of this particular set of analysis must be viewed with caution due to the limited number of male subjects (N = 13) in comparison to the female subjects (N = 187).

Hypothesis 2: There will be no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct as perceived by learning disability teachers as a function of age difference.

Prior to the analyses, all subjects are collapsed into four age groups: 21-30 years, 31-45 years, 46-50 years, and 51-60 years. To

Table 15

Tabular Display of Means and Standard Deviations as a Function of Sex

Factors		Male	Female	Pooled Group Est For Entire Sample	F	Sig < .05	Factor Theme
F1	$\bar{X}$	19.54	18.48	18.55	.40	P = .526	Locomotion Motivational
	S_D	5.35	5.83	5.79			
F2	$\bar{X}$	12.00	9.64	9.79	5.63	P = .019	*Nurturing Need
	S_D	4.95	3.35	3.51			
F3	$\bar{X}$	10.00	9.18	9.23	.94	P = .333	Accurate Communication
	S_D	2.80	2.95	2.94			
F4	$\bar{X}$	9.54	7.79	7.90	4.13	P = .043	*Adaptability
	S_D	3.57	2.97	3.03			
F5	$\bar{X}$	6.54	5.57	5.64	2.24	P = .136	Maturity
	S_D	2.81	2.21	2.26			
F6	$\bar{X}$	13.00	16.20	15.99	9.46	P = .002	*Order
	S_D	3.65	3.63	3.71			
	N	13	187				

DF = (1,198)
*Factors with < .05

test for differences in perception of the relative importance of the independent variables within the identified personality construct as a function of age, a multivariate F test is applied to the data to determine the overall significance. The results of the F test are displayed in Table 16.

Table 16

Analysis of Variance Multivariate Tests of Significance as a Function of Age

Test Name	Value	Approx F	Hypoth D.F.	Error D.F.	Sig of F
Pillais	.26	3.03	18.00	579.00	.000
Hotellings	.31	3.24	18.00	569.00	.000
Wilks	.75	3.14	18.00	540.71	.000

The overall F test for equality of group centroids reveals an F value of 3.14 using Wilks test of ratio determinants of .000 indicating statistical significance at the < .05 level. Based on the results of these data, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct as a function of age difference is rejected at the .05 level of significance.

The univariate F-test is then applied to the data to determine the overall F value and to identify any potential discriminators. The results of the univariate F-test are shown in Table 17.

Table 17

Differences as a Function of Age Univariate F-Tests with (3,196) D.F.

	Hypoth S.S.	Error S.S.	Hypoth M.S.	Error M.S.	F	Sig of F
F1	112.86	6558.64	37.62	33.46	1.12	.340
F2	130.16	2316.43	43.39	11.82	3.67	.013*
F3	40.73	1679.23	13.58	8.57	1.58	.194
F4	160.44	1665.56	53.48	8.50	6.29	.000*
F5	33.69	978.67	11.23	4.99	2.25	.084
F6	327.50	2407.49	109.17	12.28	8.89	.000*

< .05 level of significance
*Factors with < .05

Inspection of Table 17 reveals statistically significant differences at < .05 for Factor II, Nurturing Need, Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor VI, Order, with Factor VI being the best discriminator with Factor IV and Factor II ranking next in discriminating power.

This conclusion is supported by the significance of the F-Tests and the relative size of the corresponding means as indicated in Table 18 (p. 80). The P value and the F ratio of Factor II, Nurturing Need, Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor VI, Order further reveal Factor VI as the best discriminator and Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor II, Nurturing Need again ranking next in discrimination strength.

Hypothesis 3: There will be no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct as perceived by learning disability teachers as a function of years of experience teaching

Table 18

Tabular Display of Means and Standard Deviations as a Function of Age

Factor		Group I 21-30	Group II 31-45	Group III 46-50	Group IV 51-60	F	Sig < .05	Factor Theme
F1	$\bar{X}$	17.94	19.47	18.90	17.67	1.12	P = .340	Locomotion Motivational
	S_D	5.20	6.28	6.23	5.26			
F2	$\bar{X}$	10.60	10.39	9.45	8.57	3.67	P = .013	*Nurturing Need
	S_D	3.72	4.19	2.80	2.47			
F3	$\bar{X}$	9.49	9.61	9.29	8.47	1.58	P = .194	Accurate Communication
	S_D	2.69	3.60	2.90	2.10			
F4	$\bar{X}$	8.47	8.87	7.17	6.76	6.29	P = .000	*Adaptability
	S_D	2.32	3.77	2.45	2.51			
F5	$\bar{X}$	6.02	5.61	6.00	4.98	2.25	P = .084	Maturity
	S_D	2.63	2.29	2.37	1.53			
F6	$\bar{X}$	14.43	15.26	16.79	17.76	8.89	P = .000	*Order
	S_D	2.84	3.45	3.83	3.84			
N		47	85	19	49			

DF = (3,196)
*Factors with < .05.

learning disability students.

To test for differences in perception of each independent variable within the identified personality construct, a multivariate F-Test is applied to the data to determine overall significance. The results of the F-test are displayed in Table 19. Inspection of Table 19 indicates that the Wilks Test, a test of ratio determinants given the F and P value, offers a value of .77. The overall F-test for equality of group centroids reveals an F value of 4.45 and a P value of .000 indicating statistical significance at the < .05 level. Based on the results of these data, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no statistically significant differences within the identified personality construct as a function of years of experience teaching learning disability students is rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Table 19

Multivariate Tests of Significance Teaching Experience with LD

Test Name	Value	Approx F	Hypoth D.F.	Error D.F.	Sig of F
Pillais	.24	4.33	12.00	386.00	.000
Hotellings	.29	4.58	12.00	382.00	.000
Wilks	.77	4.45	12.00	384.00	.000

The univariate F-test is then applied to the data to determine whether the overall F value calls for conditional interpretation and to identify the best possible discriminators. The results of the univariate F-test are shown in Table 20. Inspection of Table 20 reveals statistically significant differences for Factor II, Nurturing Need,

Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor VI, Order at the < .05 level of significance

Table 20

Differences as a Function of Teaching Experience with LD Univariate F-Tests with (2,197) D.F.

	Hypoth S.S.	Error S.S.	Hypoth M.S.	Error M.S.	F	Sig of F
F1	120.85	6550.65	60.42	33.25	1.82	.165
F2	156.27	2290.33	78.13	11.63	6.72	.002*
F3	21.13	1698.83	10.56	8.62	1.23	.296
F4	143.50	1682.50	71.75	8.54	8.40	.000*
F5	18.40	993.96	9.20	5.05	1.82	.164
F6	321.77	2413.22	160.89	12.25	13.13	.000*

< .05 level of significance.
*Factors with < .05.

Reviewing the overall F ratio again reveals Factor II, Nurturing Need, Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor VI, Order as the best discriminators. The conclusion is further supported by the significance of the F-tests and the relative size of the corresponding means as shown in Table 21 (p. 83).

The P value and the F ratio of these three factors appear to reveal Factor VI, Order as the best discriminator and Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor II, Nurturing Need ranking next in discriminating power. This rank of discriminating power with regard to the function of teaching experience is consistent with the results of the

Table 21

Tabular Display of Means and Standard Deviations as a Function of Years of Experience Teaching Learning Disabilities

Factor		Group I 0-4	Group II 5-8	Group III 9-23	Pooled Group Est.	F	Sig < .05	Factor Theme
F1	$\bar{X}$	18.10	19.64	17.93	18.55	1.82	P = .165	Locomotion Motivational
	S_D	6.45	5.44	5.36	5.79			
F2	$\bar{X}$	10.70	10.10	8.60	9.79	6.72	P = .002	*Nurturing Need
	S_D	3.95	3.60	2.52	3.51			
F3	$\bar{X}$	9.68	9.12	8.91	9.23	1.23	P = .296	Accurate Communication
	S_D	3.76	2.24	2.61	2.94			
F4	$\bar{X}$	8.82	8.12	6.80	7.90	8.40	P = .000	*Adaptability
	S_D	3.64	2.50	2.50	3.03			
F5	$\bar{X}$	5.90	5.82	5.21	5.64	1.82	P = .164	Maturity
	S_D	2.47	2.37	1.85	2.26			
F6	$\bar{X}$	15.00	15.22	17.80	15.99	13.13	P = .000	*Order
	S_D	3.24	3.50	3.74	3.71			
N		66	67	67				

DF = (2,197)
*Factors with < .05

test of Hypothesis 2 which tests the relative significance with respect to age.

Hypothesis 4: There will be no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct as perceived by learning disability teachers as a function of attained academic degrees.

The subjects are placed into three groups: those with Bachelor's Degree, those with Master's Degree and those with Doctorates. To test for differences in perception of each independent variable within the personality construct, a multivariate F-test is applied to the data to determine overall significance. The results of the F-test are shown in Table 22.

Table 22

Analysis of Variance Multivariate Tests of Significance as a Function of Academic Degrees

Test Name	Value	Approx F	Hypoth D.F.	Error D.F.	Sig of F
Pillais	.07	1.16	12.00	386.00	.312
Hotellings	.07	1.15	12.00	382.00	.315
Wilks	.09	1.16	12.00	384.00	.313

Inspection of Table 22 reveals an F value of 1.16 on the Wilks test of ratio determinants and a P value of .313. The overall F-test for equality of group centroids reveals no statistically significant difference at the .05 level of significance. Based on the results of these data, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no statistically significant difference within the identified personality

construct as a function of attained academic degrees is not rejected at the .05 level of significance.

The univariate F-test is then applied to the data to further determine whether the overall F value calls for conditional interpretation. The results of the univariate F test are displayed in Table 23.

Table 23

Differences as a Function of Academic Degrees Univariate F-Tests with (2,197) D.F.

	Hypoth S.S.	Error S.S.	Hypoth M.S.	Error M.S.	F	Sig of F
F1	70.12	6601.38	35.06	33.51	1.05	.353
F2	40.29	2406.30	20.15	12.21	1.65	.195
F3	19.13	1700.83	9.56	8.63	1.11	.332
F4	21.40	1804.60	10.70	9.16	1.17	.313
F5	29.73	982.62	14.87	4.99	2.98	.053
F6	49.45	2685.54	24.73	13.63	1.81	.166

< .05 level of significance.

Inspection of Table 23 reveals no statistically significant differences for any of the six factors at the < .05 level of significance. This conclusion is further supported by the significance of the F-Tests and the relative size of the corresponding means shown in Table 24. The results of this set of analyses must be viewed with caution due to the limited number of subjects (N = 8) in the Ph.D. category.

Table 24

Tabular Display of Means and Standard Deviations as a Function of Attained Academic Degrees

Factor		B.S.	M.S.	Ph.D.	F	Sig < .05	Factor Themes
F1	$\bar{X}$	17.80	18.65	20.88	1.05	P = .353	Locomotion Motivational
	S_D	5.95	5.69	6.77			
F2	$\bar{X}$	10.18	9.58	11.63	1.65	P = .195	Nurturing Need
	S_D	3.95	3.32	4.0			
F3	$\bar{X}$	9.18	9.17	10.75	1.11	P = .332	Accurate Communication
	S_D	2.72	2.97	3.54			
F4	$\bar{X}$	7.87	7.82	9.50	1.17	P = .313	Adaptability
	S_D	2.49	3.12	4.04			
F5	$\bar{X}$	5.44	5.59	7.50	2.98	P = .053	Maturity
	S_D	2.58	2.02	3.70			
F6	$\bar{X}$	15.33	16.10	17.88	1.81	P = .166	Order
	S_D	3.72	3.65	4.36			
N		45	147	8			

DF = (2,197)

Summary

Chapter IV offers the Hypothesis-Analysis-Summary method of presenting the principal-factor analysis and the principal component factor analysis of data.

The goal of the study, to identify the personality construct of a learning disability teacher, is accomplished utilizing the eigenvalues greater than 1 as the criterion for retaining factors. The six factors identified on this basis using the principal-factor analysis are assigned title-themes of Factor I, Locomotion-Motivational, Factor II, Nurturing Need, Factor III, Accurate Communication, Factor IV, Adaptability, Factor V, Maturity and Factor VI, Order. The six factors identified with the principal component factor analysis were the same however the hierarchical order revealed an exchange of positions for Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor V, Maturity.

The first null hypothesis, no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct will emerge as a function of sex difference is rejected at the .05 level of significance. Multivariate tests of significance and univariate F-tests reveal Factors II, IV and VI (Nurturing Need, Adaptability and Order, respectively) at $< .05$ level of significance.

The second null hypothesis stating that no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct will emerge as a function of age difference is rejected at the .05 level of significance. Multivariate tests of significance and univariate F-tests reveal Factors II, IV and VI (Nurturing Need, Adaptability and Order, respectively) at $< .05$ level of significance.

The third null hypothesis stating that no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct will emerge as a function of years of experience testhing learning disability students is rejected at the .05 level of significance. Multivariate tests of significance and univariate F-tests again show Factors II, IV and VI (Nurturing Need, Adaptability and Order, respectively) as having a < .05 level of significance.

The fourth null hypothesis stating that no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct will emerge as a function of attained academic degrees is not rejected at the .05 level of significance. The multivariate tests of significance and the univariate F-tests reveal all six factors as being more than .05 in F value.

A clear pattern appears in the analysis of data with respect to the first three hypotheses which tested the data on the basis of sex, age and years of experience teaching learning disability students. Analysis of data in all tests of these hypotheses resulted in the identification of Factor II, Nurturing Need, Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor VI, Order as the greatest discriminators.

Further inspection of the greatest discriminators identified as statistically significant as a function of sex, age and experience in teaching learning disability students is provided in Table 24 (p. 89), revealing relative agreement between age and teaching experience. The pattern of these independent variables suggests a possible correlation wherein age could potentially be a confounding variable. The overall F value shows Factor VI, Order as the greatest discriminator, Factor IV,

Table 25

Summation of Hypotheses Rejected at < .05 Inferential Hierarchy of Identified Discriminators as Determined by Univariate F-Tests

Differences as a Function of Sex			Differences as a Function of Age			Differences as a Function of LD Teaching Experience		
Factor Title/Theme	F Value	Sig F	Factor Title/Theme	F Value	Sig F	Factor Title/Theme	F Value	Sig F
Factor 6 Order	9.46	.002	Factor 6 Order	8.89	.000	Factor 6 Order	13.13	.000
Factor 2 Nurturing Need	5.63	.019	Factor 4 Adaptability	6.29	.000	Factor 4 Adaptability	8.40	.000
Factor 4 Adaptability	4.13	.043	Factor 2 Nurturing Need	3.67	.013	Factor 2 Nurturing Need	6.72	.002

Adaptability next in discriminating power and Factor II, Nurturing Need as possessing the least in discriminating power.

The overall F value of the identified discriminators found as a function of sex difference reveals Factor VI, Order as the greatest discriminator, Factor II, Nurturing Need next in discriminating power and Factor IV, Adaptability with the least in discriminating power relative to the three discriminators.

In conclusion, the factors within the personality construct which reflect no statistically significant difference among all subgroups considered for the study (sex, age, years of experience teaching learning disability students and acquired academic degrees) are Factor I, Locomotion-Motivational, Factor III, Accurate Communication and Factor V, Maturity.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

Problem and Research Hypotheses

The role of teacher has been recognized as a critical factor in the development of the social-emotional and the intellectual growth of students, and yet little attention in educational research has been given to the identification of the personality construct of special educators or of teachers of the learning disabled in particular.

The purpose of this study has been to identify the personality construct of learning disability teachers, using the reported perceptions of teachers experienced in teaching learning disabled students. The stated contention of this study is that education preparedness and teaching experience provide practitioners with insights into the operating personality construct which positively impact the process of remediation.

The research goal of this investigation is to identify the personality construct of the learning disability teacher as perceived by experienced practitioners.

Hypothesis 1: No statistically significant difference within the personality construct will emerge as a function of sex differences.

Hypothesis 2: No statistically significant difference within the personality construct will emerge as a function of age differences.

Hypothesis 3: No statistically significant difference within

the personality construct will emerge as a function of years of experience teaching learning disability students.

Hypothesis 4: No statistically significant difference within the personality construct will emerge as a function of attained academic degrees.

Review of Literature

The review of literature is restricted to research studies, conducted since 1970, focusing on the identification of personality traits of teachers-in-training and experienced teachers in general education and in special education.

The major differences between the studies reviewed and the present study are the employment of the semantic differential in lieu of standardized tests, and the contention that the perceptions of experienced practitioners may provide a more accurate cluster of personal qualities which serve to enhance the remediation process. Participants were requested to identify traits which a learning disability teacher should possess rather than to identify traits which they, themselves, possess.

The results of the pertinent studies support the validity of utilizing assessment of perceptions to identify traits (Niday, 1978; Jackson, 1975), support the feasibility of identifying a definitive cluster of personality traits, and further, suggested agreement between personality traits of successful teachers in general education and teachers in special education.

The present investigation utilizes the findings of related research in the formulation of the semantic differential. Traits

identified in previous studies of general and special education practitioners include: psychological mindedness, communality, high socialization (French, 1980); domineering, experimental (Headrick, 1971); poised, spontaneous, aggressive, demanding, self-confident, autonomous, independent, achievement oriented (Cochrane, 1975); sensitive, perceptive, pragmatic, imaginative, shrewd, open-minded (Hogue, 1978); creative, child-centered, patient, motivating, frivolous (Cross, 1975); fair, knowledgeable, sympathetic, understanding (Niday, 1978); self-accepting, cooperative, ambitious, alert, resourceful, versatile, tolerant, flexible, methodical, cautious and verbally fluent (Chen, 1975).

Sample

The subjects for this study are limited to 200 learning disability teachers certified by the Illinois State Certification Board and employed in public elementary and high schools within the state of Illinois. These subjects serve as a selected sample of the 4,534.25 learning disability teachers employed in Illinois as: full time classroom teachers, resource teachers, itinerant teachers, and tutorial teachers -- as determined in the 1979-80 Special Education Personnel Work Assignment Analysis. The subjects for this investigation were acquired from the membership mailing lists of the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities (ACLD) and the Illinois Division for Learning Disabilities (IDLD). The mailing was evenly distributed among addresses in the north, west, central and south regions of the state of Illinois. Returns reflect a relatively even distribution; 63 are from the northern region of Illinois, 34 from the western region,

51 from the central region and 52 from the southern region of the state of Illinois. All subjects share the following commonalities: membership in Association for Children with Learning Disabilities or the Illinois Division for Learning Disabilities, Illinois Certification for Learning Disabilities, and public school employment in the state of Illinois.

Instrumentation

The Learning Disability Teacher Profile (LDTP) was developed, utilizing the personality traits identified in previous research and related literature, in line with Charles Osgood's model for the semantic differential.

Demographic information on the LDTP requests designation of: sex, age, range, total years of experience teaching learning disabled students, acquired academic degrees, and confirmation of learning disability certification.

Fifty, bi-polar adjective opposites are provided on a seven-step semantic scale on which the participants are to indicate the degree of association with either of the polar terms. Each bi-polar adjective is postulated by Osgood as possessing a semantic space, the dimension of which can be determined by a semantic scale. Allocation of a concept to an experiential continuum, defined by a pair of polar terms, permits the determination of the direction and intensity of association with either the positive or the negative term.

Research Design

This investigation is a non-experimental, survey-based study which utilizes descriptive and inferential statistical paradigms, and the nature of the relationship between variables as they exist in the

present. This design permits the investigator to infer the dynamic relationship of a given set of variables in a data-set.

The data are analyzed using the IBM System 370 Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to determine significance at the .05 level.

The principal-factor analysis method and the principal component factor analysis method are employed to determine distributional characteristics of the independent variables. The eigenvalue greater than 1 serves as the statistical criterion for determining the number of factors to be retained. Multivariate and univariate F-tests are applied to the data to identify statistically significant differences within subgroups formed on the basis of sex, age, experience teaching learning disability students and attained academic degrees.

Results and Discussion

Data obtained in the study are factor analyzed using multiple solution to reduce the 50 items of the Learning Disability Teacher Profile (LDTP) to a manageable set of variables. An evaluation of the various solutions through principal-factor analysis and principal component factor analysis led to the selection of a six-factor solution to identify the personality construct that the experienced learning disability teachers perceive as most critical for learning disability teachers to possess. These six factors assume a statistical hierarchical structure which is identified utilizing Kurt Lewin's theoretical concepts of field theory as it relates to personality structure.

The hierarchical order of the six factors, however, differs in each analysis. The principal-factor analysis reveals Factor I,

Locomotion-Motivational, Factor II, Nurturing Need, Factor III, Accurate Communication, Factor IV, Adaptability, Factor V, Maturity, and Factor VI, Order. The principal component factor analysis results in an exchange of positions for Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor V, Maturity; Factor IV becomes Maturity and Factor V becomes Adaptability.

Based on the emergence of six factors reflecting an eigenvalue of greater than 1, the goal of this investigation to identify the personality construct of a learning disability teacher utilizing the reported perceptions of experienced practitioners is recognized as accomplished.

Results in the test of this hypothesis fail to reveal whether the experienced learning disability teachers complied with the request to identify critical personality traits, irrespective of whether they, themselves, possessed the traits, or if they identified traits that they associated with themselves as learning disability teachers.

The agreement, however, between the results of the principal-factor analysis and the principal component factor analysis establishes the existence of a six factor personality construct for the learning disability teacher.

The goal of this investigation to identify the personality construct of a learning disability has been achieved through the utilization of two processes of factor analysis. The following hypotheses are tested using multivariate tests of significance and univariate F-tests to identify statistically significant differences at the .05 level of significance.

The explication of the six factor personality construct founded

in Kurt Lewin's theory of personality follows.

Factor I, Locomotion-Motivational Valence or Force is judged as a composite of the descriptors: independent, strong, active, creative, brave, energetic, assertive, confident, altruistic, direct and mature (See Table 7, p. 64).

Locomotion-Motivational Valence or Force is consistent with Lewin's concepts of energy, tension, need, valence or force; wherein, psychic energy is released to regain equilibrium in response to intrusion on the psychological environment.

The learning disability teacher's personality (inner-personal system and perceptual-motor region) impacts the inner-personal system and perceptual-motor region of the student by intruding on the student's psychological environment. This intrusion creates a need by eliciting tension within the inner-personal sphere of the student, thus, creating movement or locomotion to regain equilibrium. Locomotion may be of a physical or a psychological nature. Intrusion is viewed as a means of eliciting awareness and response in the student.

Factor II, Nurturing Need is viewed as a composite of the descriptors: kind, warm, empathic, optimistic, positive, sympathetic, happy and spontaneous (See Table 8, p. 66).

Nurturing is viewed as a basic need that evolves from the central cells within the inner-personal sphere. The central cells are surrounded by peripheral cells which make up the inner-personal sphere. The principle facts of the inner-personal region are called needs, and each need occupies a separate cell in the inner-personal sphere.

The source of tension arises in the perceptual-motor region of the student and progresses to the central cells of the inner-personal sphere, thus, creating tension manifested in behavior or in physical or psychological locomotion; thereby, eliciting a reciprocal response in the inner-personal system of the learning disability teacher.

Because the permeability of the membranes of the student's central cells and peripheral cells is more fluid than that of the teacher's more mature personality structure, the dynamics of the communication process - verbal or non-verbal - are more often dependent upon the physical and/or psychological locomotion resulting from the sequence of movement or dynamics of the teacher's inner-personal sphere and perceptual-motor region. This suggests that the teacher's need for nurturing or reinforcement elicits the same need and response in the student, thus, bringing affective satisfaction or dissatisfaction to both.

Factor III, Accurate Communication is judged to be a composite descriptor for: clear, organized, resourceful, consistent, calm, fair and sharp (See Table 9, p. 68).

Lewin conceptualizes communication as the transfer of information from the psychological environment to the inner-personal sphere, from the inner-personal sphere, from the perceptual-motor region to the inner-personal sphere, or from the inner-personal sphere to the perceptual-motor sphere.

Communication and locomotion are viewed as events which result from an interaction of facts. The interaction of facts, represented by subregions in the perceptual-motor region, follow the principles of

relatedness, concreteness and contemporaneity.

The principle of relatedness infers that communication (or locomotion) is always the result of an interaction between two or more facts.

The principle of concreteness suggests that only concrete facts, those that actually exist in life space, can have an effect upon the inner-personal sphere.

The principal of contemporaneity implies that only present facts can produce present behavior; that is, facts that once existed, but no longer exist, cannot influence behavior unless retained at some level of consciousness.

The implication of Lewin's concept of communication is that the dynamics of the learning disability teacher and the dynamics of the student are related, concrete and contemporaneous. Unresolved issues, which may exist as facts, may be permitted to enter into the communication process as a result of the unawareness on the part of either party. This is to say that teachers, being much older than students, are likely to have retained facts of childhood or youth which may limit the accuracy of the verbal or non-verbal communication.

The importance that learning disability teachers attribute to accurate communication is in agreement with the concept of "self-as-instrument" proposed by Combs, Avila and Purkey (1978, p. 6). Their notion of the effective helper is:

> one who has acquired extensive, accurate, internally, consistent personal set of perceptions or beliefs, which serve as guides for the helper's moment to moment behavior with students, clients and patients (1978, p. 9).

Factor IV, Adaptability is viewed as a composite of the descriptors: flexible, resilient, responsive, perceptive, insightful and relaxed. The capacity for adaptability is reflected in Lewin's concept of the permeability of the boundary between life space and the outer world.

Facts, which exist in the region outside and adjacent to the boundary of the life space, can influence the psychological environment; that means non-psychological facts can and do alter the psychological facts. The nature of the facts provide a psychological perspective of determining what is and what is not possible, what might or what might not happen in the life space (Lewin, 1951, Ch. VIII).

The two-way communication between the physical world and the psychological environment, and the degree of permeability of the regions in the psychological environment, as well as the perceptual-motor regions and the peripheral and central cells of the inner-personal sphere, determine the degree of flexibility or adaptability possible within a given personal construct.

Locomotion and communication are influenced by the quality of permeability influencing the parameters of fluidity-rigidity, firmness-weakness, and/or nearness-remoteness of effected regions.

The presence of flexibility and adaptability is identified in the studies of Chen (1975), Headrick (1971), Cochrane (1975), Hogue (1978), and French (1980), all of whom use formal, personality inventories to measure traits of teachers. All these researchers deal with the special educator population except Chen who compares successful teachers with less successful teachers to determine the qualities of

the most successful general education teachers.

Wilson and Sapir (1982), who use the case study approach to determine the qualities of successful learning disability teachers, support the need for resilience and flexibility; however, they view these traits as intrinsic or innate and consider it difficult, if not impossible, to train learning disability teachers to acquire these qualities.

Factor V, Maturity is judged to be a composite of the descriptors: honest, genuine, responsible, authentic, respectful and old (See Table 11, p. 71).

Although Lewin does not consider the use of an age scale for describing development as an adequate means of understanding psychological growth (Hall and Lindzey, 1970, p. 240), he views the number of regions in the inner-personal sphere as increasing with age, with more differentiated tension systems than in the child. The psychological environment becomes more differentiated; the time dimension differentiates into "a remote past, a near past, a present, a near future, and a far future" (Hall and Lindzey, 1970, p. 239).

The adult is also capable of increased discrimination of the reality-unreality dimension. The greater complexity of the inner-personal sphere, perceptual-motor regions and psychological environment along with the decrease in permeability and fluidity of the boundaries of each system suggests that the qualities of honesty, genuineness, responsibility and authenticity are incorporated in the development of the more complex structure of the personality in the maturational process.

The components of Factor V, Maturity are in agreement with the traits identified in the studies of Donnelly (1971), Wexler (1977), Bullock (1974), Calliotte (1971), French (1980), Cochrane (1975) and Chen (1975), indicating the presence and need for maturity in experienced general education teachers as well as for special education teachers in all areas of specialization. The presence of maturity serves a three-fold purpose:

1. to facilitate the development of mature responses in the student;

2. to present a model of appropriate behavior on the affective and cognitive levels; and

3. to enable the teacher to avoid being enticed into manipulative strategies of students who often exhibit inappropriate emotional responses as a result of experienced failure (Jersild, 1952, p. 122).

Factor VI, Order is viewed as a composite of the descriptors: structured, nonjudgmental, democratic, soft and organized (See Table 12, p. 73).

The statistical hierarchical structure of the six personality traits identified places this trait in the position of being viewed as least important relative to the other five.

Lewin refers to the phenomenon of organizational interdependence which is realized with maturity when there is increased organization and integration of the personal system. The reciprocal and mutual effect of tension in neighboring systems of the inner-personal sphere decreases with maturity and is replaced with a leader-led relationship between systems. Selectivity develops with maturity, allowing remote

systems to dominate or lead each other.

The importance of order is in agreement with the findings of Bullock (1974) and Chen (1975), both of whom were investigating personality traits of general educators. Wilson and Sapir (1982) refer to order as "internal organization - of time, space and direction" and suggest that structure, order and coherence are necessary requirements for teaching learning disabled students who often lack the spatial or temporal sense which enables them to determine approaches to tasks, parameters of tasks, or sequential organization of a given task (p. 172).

The elaboration of the six factors identified by factor analyzing the responses to the Learning Disability Teacher Profile (LDTP) clarifies how they relate to Kurt Lewin's theoretical concept of personality structure and demonstrates the relevance to the remediation process.

All six factors are in agreement with one or more of the findings of previous studies. However, this agreement is not isolated to research that investigated special education teachers only. The question is then raised as to whether or not it is possible to define a unique constellation or personality construct for learning disability teachers even though Hogue (1978), Cochrane (1975) and Headrick (1971) have indicated having done so.

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis stating that no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct will emerge as a function of sex differences is tested with multivariate tests of

significance and univariate F-tests. These tests identify Factor VI, Order, Factor II, Nurturing Need and Factor IV, Adaptability as discriminators with statistical significance at the .05 level. Factor V, Order appears to have the greatest discriminating power with a P value of .002 (refer to Table 15, p. 77) and is perceived as relatively more important to female teachers than to male teachers.

Factor II, Nurturing Need with a P value of .019 and Factor IV, Adaptability with a P value of .043 rank next in discriminating power. Both Nurturing Need and Adaptability appear to be relatively more important to male teachers than to female teachers.

An explanation of these findings is proposed here.

Teachers are often viewed by students as significant others and, as such, are called upon to respond to the nurturing need of the students. Responding to this need in students may be perceived as more difficult for male teachers than for female teachers and hence as requiring more effort to respond. Society has imposed the notion of sex learned behavior for males as appropriate with regard to requesting and responding to calls for instrumental support and inappropriate with regard to requesting or responding to calls for emotional support (Brammer, 1979, p. 105). Female teachers, on the other hand, may possibly view themselves as possessing innate nurturing ability and consequently, may not feel a need to consciously develop a system for responding to the nurturing need of students or to the call for emotional support. The challenge of married female

teachers, who are also parents, lies in their ability to balance the roles of mother, wife and teacher and consequently, the need for order, structure or organization may be viewed by them as most critical.

The credibility of any explanation is superceded by the question of whether or not the reported perceptions are:

1. subject to personally felt needs;

2. reported in terms of traits that the learning disability teachers felt themselves; or

3. whether they reported, as requested, those qualities deemed critical for learning disability teachers to possess as an ideal.

The results of these data must be viewed with caution due to the limited number of male respondents (N = 13) as compared with female respondents (N = 187). Consequently, the limited number of male subjects does not permit firm conclusions regarding the differences between male and female teachers.

Based on the results of these data, the null hypothesis that there will be no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct as a function of sex differences is rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis stating that there will be no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct as a function of age differences is tested with multivariate tests of significance and univariate F-tests. The results of these tests identify the same factors as discriminators at the .05 level of

significance: Factor VI, Order, Factor IV, Adaptability, and Factor II, Nurturing Need.

A review of the F value and the P value of each of these discriminators suggests that Factor VI, Order again has the greatest discriminating power with an F value of 8.89 and a P value of .000. Factor IV, Adaptability ranks next in discriminating power with an F value of 6.29 and P value of .000 and Factor II, Nurturing Need reflects the least discriminating power with an F value of 3.67 and a P value of .013.

The subjects are collapsed into four equivalent groups: 21-30, 32-45, 46-51 and 52-60. A review of the means and standard deviations for each factor with respect to each age group reveals the perception of Order as increasing in relative importance with age; the 21 to 30 year group reflects a mean of 14.43, the 32-45 year group reflects a mean of 15.26, the 46-51 year group has a mean of 16.79 and the 52-60 year group has a mean of 17.76. The range of means for all subjects from 21 years of age to 60 years of age is 14.43 to 17.76 for Factor VI, Order.

The pattern of order being perceived as more important with the increase of age may suggest a relationship between the increased complexity of the personal system during maturation, and the increased complexities of the psychological environment and life space for older individuals.

The increased need for order may also reflect the learning disability teacher's image of acquired years bringing mental and physical deterioration and/or the perceived need to structure the remainder of

life to achieve greater personal and/or professional satisfaction.

Based on the results of these data, the null hypothesis that there will be no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct as a function of age differences is rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis stating that there will be no statistically significant difference within the personality construct as a function of years of experience teaching learning disability students is tested with the multivariate tests of significance and univariate F-tests. These tests also identify Factor VI, Order, Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor II, Nurturing Need as discriminators with statistical significance at the .05 level.

As in the F-tests of the second hypothesis which examined the data with respect to age, Factor VI, Order, Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor II, Nurturing Need are identified as the greatest discriminators. The rank of discriminating power again reflects the same pattern. Factor VI, Order reflects an F value of 13.13 and a P value of .000, Factor IV, Adaptability reflects an F value of 8.40 and a P value of .000 and Factor II, Nurturing Need shows an F value of 6.72 and a P value of .002 placing Order as the greatest discriminator, Adaptability next in discriminating power and Nurturing Need as possessing the least discriminating power.

The subjects are collapsed into three categories of teaching experience: the 0-4 years-of-teaching group has an N of 66, the 5-8 years-of-teaching group has an N of 67 and the 9-23 years-of-teaching

group has an N of 67. Review of the means and standard deviations learning disability teachers with four or less years of teaching experience report perceiving Factor IV, Adaptability and Factor II, Nurturing Need as relatively more important than the learning disability teachers with 5-8 years of experience and the teachers with 9-23 years of experience. The discriminating power of Adaptability and Nurturing Need decreases gradually with the advanced years of teaching experience. Factor VI, Order appears to be relatively more important to learning disability teachers with 9-23 years of experience than to teachers with 5-8 years experience, and least important to teachers with four or less years of experience.

The pattern of significant differences reflected in the analysis of years of teaching experience with learning disabled students matches the pattern revealed in the analysis of the perception of the subjects as a function of age. This match suggests a possible correlation between the number of years of learning disability teaching experience and age; wherein, age could potentially be a confounding variable.

The importance attributed to Nurturing Need and Adaptability for the 31-45 age group and 0-4 years of teaching experience group suggests the possibility that the respondents reported their perceptions based on personal needs arising from life experience of child-rearing, and/or issues related to mid-life developments or adjustments. These two personality traits, Nurturing Need and Adaptability, imply emotional adjustments which are most critical at particular stages of adult development.

The learning disability teachers with nine or more years of teaching experience perceive the need for Order as most important, while the 0-4 years of teaching experience group view Order as least important.

This pattern, to a degree, matches the reported perception of Order as a function of age: the 51-60 year old group perceive Order as most important, and each group, progressively, down to the youngest group, 21-30, perceive Order as relatively less important.

Inspection of the results, of reported perceptions of Nurturing Need, Adaptability and Order with respect to the functions of age and years of teaching experience, indicates an inverse relationship between Nurturing Need/Adaptability and Order. The younger (31-45), less experienced (0-4 years) respondents perceive Nurturing Need/ Adaptability as most important, while the older (51-60), more experienced (9-23 years) respondents perceive Nurturing Need/ Adaptability as least important, and Order as most important.

Order may be viewed as a conserving process which is associated with the natural process of individuals becoming more conservative with maturity. Adaptability, like flexibility and resilience, may be viewed as characteristic of the nature of youthful years when the need to cope with marriage, family and career developments is greatest. Order and Adaptability suggest the possibility of being opposing indicators of personal stability; too much of either is viewed as inappropriate for normal adjustment in life.

Nurturing Need when paired with Adaptability is possibly a projection on the part of the 31-45 age group as a reflection of

their personal needs.

Based on the results of these data, the null hypothesis that there will be no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct as a function of years of experience teaching learning disability students is rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis stating that there will be no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct as a function of attained academic degrees is tested with multivariate tests of significance and univariate F-tests. The subjects are placed into three groups: those with the Bachelor's Degree, those with the Master's Degree, and those with a Doctorate. The results revealed no statistically significant difference at the .05 level of significance for any of the six factors at the identified personality construct.

These results must be viewed with caution due to the fact that only eight respondents possess the Doctorate; 147 respondents possess the Master's Degree, and 45 respondents possess the Bachelor's Degree.

Based on the results of these data, the null hypothesis stating that there will be no statistically significant difference within the identified personality construct as a function of attained academic degrees is accepted at the .05 level of significance.

CONCLUSIONS

Six conclusions were reached as a result of the present study.

Conclusion 1

The results of this study have revealed a six factor personality construct:

I. Locomotion-Motivational

II. Nurturing Need

III. Accurate Communication

IV. Adaptability

V. Maturity

VI. Order.

Each of these factors represents a constellation of unique qualities consistent with the findings of Hogue (1978), Cochrane (1975) and French (1980). These studies differ from the present study in that they used formal, standardized, personality inventories to determine traits possessed by special educators, and they did not specifically focus on the personality construct of learning disability teachers. The agreement with previous studies suggests that the personality construct of the learning disability teacher is not unique but is common to special education teachers as well as to the superior teachers characterized in the studies of Cross (1975), Niday (1978) and Chen (1975).

The consistency found between special educators, as a group, and the subgroup of learning disability teachers supports the findings of Cochrane (1975) who found that teachers of the blind and deaf, and administrators in special education did not share the same constellation of personality qualities as teachers in the remaining areas of specialization: educable mentally handicapped, behavior disorders,

and learning disabilities.

Conclusion 2

The results of this study indicate a degree of perceptual agreement of experienced learning disability teachers in regard to the operating personality construct of learning disability teachers. The comparison of reported perceptions as a function of: sex, age, years of experience teaching the learning disabled, and attained academic degrees revealed no statistically significant difference at the .05 level in perceptions of the relative importance of two personality traits: Locomotion-Motivational Valence or Force and Accurate Communication. These two factors appear to relate to the cognitive processes involved in remediation and may be impacted most by teacher preparation programs of universities and colleges.

The four remaining personality traits appear to relate to affective need: Nurturing Need and Adaptability, and factors which facilitate affective development: Maturity and Order.

Conclusion 3

The results of this study suggest that perceptions are potential indicators of the personality constructs identified in previous studies that used formal, standardized, personality inventories. The association between reported perceptions and administered personality inventories is supported by the research of Franklyn Jackson (1975) who compared the results of formal, personality inventories, self-reported perceptions of teachers, and the perceptions of students and supervisors. He found agreement between the personality profiles of the inventories and the reported perceptions of all three groups.

The findings of the present study agree with the results of previous research of Hogue (1978), Cochrane (1975), French (1980), Cross (1975), Niday (1978) and Chen (1975) as stated in the first conclusion. This agreement supports the contention that the present investigation serves to validate the previous studies cited in Chapter II, and that perceptual studies in and of themselves have value in determining the personality construct of teachers.

Conclusion 4

The results of this study reveal a possible relationship between the reported perceptions of Nurturing Need/Adaptability and the life experiences of the respondents. Analyzed data reflect a common pattern in the two subgroups categorized as a function of age and number of years experience teaching the learning disabled, suggesting age to be a potential confounding variable. Nurturing Need and Adaptability are viewed as most important during the period of life which requires adjustment to the challenge of child-rearing and mid-life issues.

Conclusion 5

The results of this study indicate a converse relationship between Nurturing Need/Adaptability and Order in the reported perceptions of subgroups categorized as a function of age and number of years experience teaching the learning disabled. The younger, less experienced teachers view Nurturing Need and Adaptability as most important, and Order as least important, while the older, more experienced teachers perceive Nurturing Need and Adaptability as least important and Order as most important. This conclusion supports the contention that age is a possible confounding variable as proposed

in Conclusion 4.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Replication of this study by expanding the sample to include all learning disability teachers in the state of Illinois and/or nationally would serve to confirm the findings of this investigation. Eliciting the cooperation of all directors and superintendents would be necessary to gain access to all employed learning disability teachers. These administrators would have to be aware of the benefits to be gained from such an investigation in order to appreciate the need to standardize the Learning Disability Teacher Profile (LDTP) for use as a screening instrument.

An investigation employing formal, standardized, personality inventories in addition to self-reported perception (the LDTP) would substantiate a correlational relationship between the two means of assessing personality characteristics of learning disability teachers. If consistency between the two assessments is firmly established, then the LDTP could be viewed as having an advantage by virtue of its simplicity and time efficiency. Cross comparisons of responses on the LDTP and performance on the standardized personality inventories could be initiated between general educators and learning disability teachers. Further comparison could possibly be made among special education teachers in other areas of specialization.

Another potential for future research lies in a comparison of the administered LDTP and Flander's model for assessing classroom observations. This would enable the investigator to determine

consistency between the traits identified by learning disability teachers and the reality of exercising these qualities in the remediation process. The results of this study would indicate whether teachers report traits which they, themselves, possess or whether a cognitive response determined the traits reported by the LDTP.

A further investigation may involve administering the LDTP to incoming candidates to teacher-training institutions. By initiating a follow-up upon the completion of the degree program, insight into any change which may have occurred during the process of teacher-training programs would be evident. Further comparison would be possible by arranging a second follow-up by administering the LDTP after a period of two years of teaching experience. Recording the GPA at the time of entry into the baccalaureate program and again, upon completion of the program would indicate whether or not there exists an interaction effect.

Additional research could be initiated using high school learning disability students who have received long standing remedial services. This approach would provide a comparison of the students' perceptions of operating personality traits of learning disability teachers with the perceptions of experienced learning disability teachers. The LDTP may require a degree of modification to accommodate the students' level of conceptualization.

The validation of the Learning Disability Teacher Profile (LDTP) as a screening instrument for incoming candidates for training in learning disability programs may be further enhanced by a study comparing the perceptions the faculty of teacher training institutions

with the perceptions of practitioners. This would facilitate determining whether the perceptions of faculty and the curriculum that they implement are consistent with the perceptions of the practitioners who must meet the challenge of realities in the field. The question to be answered is: do teacher-training institutions adequately prepare the trainees to be cognizant of the personality construct that is required for effective teaching.

The underlying inference in each of these recommendations for further research as related to the present investigation is the need to establish standardization of the LDTP by determining the validity and reliability. Standardization of the LDTP would present the possibility of utilizing it in counseling prospective students during the admission process for teacher training institutions or for assisting school administrators in screening candidates for teaching positions. Further research is required to serve the initial inspiration for this investigation; that is, to develop a screening instrument which will contribute to determining the most eligible candidates for teacher training programs and ultimately, enhance the quality of education for learning disability students.

REFERENCES

Allport, F.H. (1955). Theories of perception and the concept of structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Anderson, R.P. (1970). The child with learning disabilities and guidance. Series V: Guidance and Exceptional Students - Monograph Series. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company.

Amerling, S.M. (1977). A study of the characteristics of teachers for and against mainstreaming of special education students. Unpublished manuscript, San Diego, California: United States International University.

Amidon, E., & Flanders, N. ((1961). The effects of direct and indirect teacher influence on dependent-prone students learning geometry. Journal of Educational Psychology, 52, 289-291.

Barrett-Lennard, G.T. (19). Dimensions of therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs (76, No. 562).

Beeker, B.A. (1977). Selected personality traits of students preferring episodic or distributive nursing. Unpublished manuscript, New York: Columbia University Teachers College.

Biber, L.A. (1958). Teacher education in mental health from the point of view of the educator. In M. Krugman (Ed.), Orthopsychiatry and the School. New York: American Orthopsychiatric Association.

Bishop, L.A. (1975). Student teaching effectiveness as a function of the personalities of supervising teachers and student teachers. Unpublished manuscript, Berkeley, California: University of California.

Bousfield, W.A. (1940). Student's ratings on qualities considered desirable in college professors. School and Society, 253-256.

Boyle, W.E. (1978). An investigation of the relationship between personality characteristics and personal and interpersonal values of education majors. Unpublished manuscript, DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University.

Brammer, L.M. (1979). The helping relationship: Process and skills (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.,

Bullock, J. (1974). An investigation of personality traits, job satisfaction attitudes, training and experience histories of superior teachers of junior high school instrumental music in New York State. Unpublished manuscript, Miami: University of Miami.

Burt, C. (1940). The factors of the mind, an introduction to factor-analysis in psychology. Warwick Lane, London: University of London Press, Ltd.

Calliotte, J.A. (1971). The effect of basic encounter groups on student teacher's personality traits and subsequent teaching behaviors. Unpublished manuscript, St. Louis: St. Louis University.

Campbell, D.T., & Stanley, J. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company.

Chen, Y. (1975). A study of attitude, personal characteristics and personality traits of outstanding teachers in Taiwan, The Republic of China. Unpublished manuscript, Colorado: University of Northern Colorado.

Cochrane, P. (1975). Psychological needs, personal values, and personality traits of graduate level special education students. Unpublished manuscript, Florida: University of Florida.

Combs, A.W. (1975). The personal approach to good teaching. In D.A. Read and S.B. Simon (Eds.), Humanistic Education Sourcebook. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Combs, A.W. (1961). A perceptual view of the nature of 'helpers' in personality theory and counseling practice. Papers of First Annual Conference on Personality Theory and Counseling Practice. Gainsville, Florida: University of Florida.

Combs, A.W., Avila, D., & Purkey, W. (1978). Helping relationships (2nd ed.) Basic concepts for the helping professions. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Combs, A.W., Sapir, D.W., Gooding, C.T., Benton, J.A., Dickman, J.F., & Usher, R.H. (1969). Florida studies in the helping professions. Gainsville, Florida: University of Florida Social Science Monographs.

Combs, A.W., & Sapir, D.W. (1963). The perceptual organization of effective counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 10, 222-226.

Cross, R.J. (1975). A study of the association of personality traits with the concept of a good teacher in the judgements of selected groups of experts. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan: Michigan State University.

Cumbie, A.Y. (1977). A study of the relationships between and within - personal characteristics and behaviors, both expected and perceived, of the situational effectiveness system (SES). Unpublished manuscript, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1977.

Cunningham, C.H. (1975). Factors influencing elementary school student teachers' self concerns. Unpublished manuscript, Houston, Texas: University of Houston.

Davis, J.A. (1964). Great expectations. London: Aldine Publishing Company.

DeHirsch, K. (1977). Interactions between education therapist and child. Bulletin of the Orton Society, 275, 88-101.

Donnelly, M.M. (1971). A study of elementary teacher's personality traits and attitudes toward teaching selected content areas in the elementary school. Unpublished manuscript, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois.

Dyer, W.G. (1978). Implications of the helping relationship between learning disabled students and their teachers. Learning Disability Quarterly - Journal of the Division for Children with Learning Disabilities, 1, 55-61.

Ellena, W.J., Stevenson, M., & Webb, H.V. (1961). Who's a good teacher? Washington, D.C.: American Association for School Administrators.

Ekstein, R., & Motto, R. (1969). From learning for love to love of learning. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Emmerling, F.C. (1961). A study of the relationship between personality characteristics of classroom teachers and pupil perceptions. Unpublished manuscript, Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University.

Faas, L.A. (1980). Children with learning problems - a handbook for teachers. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company.

Flanders, A.A. (1960). Teacher influence, pupil attitudes and achievement: Studies in interaction analysis. Final Report - Cooperative Research Project 397 - U.S. Office of Education.

French, T.C.N. (1980). A study of personality differences between student teachers in the fields of special education and elementary education. Unpublished manuscript, Austin, Texas: University of Texas at Austin.

Gearheart, B. (1980). Special education for the '80's. St. Louis: The C.V. Mosby Company.

Gibb, J.R. (1978). Trust: A new view of personal and organizational development. Los Angeles: Child Tutors Press.

Gorsuch, R.L. (1974). Factor analysis. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Company.

Hall, C.S., & Lindzey, G. (1970). Theories of personality (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Hamachek, D.E. (1978). Encounters with the self. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Harman, H.H. (1976). Modern factor analysis (3rd ed.). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Harvey, O.J. (1966). Experience, structure and adaptability. New York: Springer.

Headrick, E.B. (1971). A comparison of personality traits of experienced and prospective teachers of the educable mentally retarded and non-retarded in Mississippi. Unpublished manuscript, Mississippi: Mississippi State University.

Hogue, H.W. (1979). Personality characteristics and effectiveness of special education teachers. Unpublished manuscript, Rutgers University.

Horst, P. (1965). Factor analysis of data matrices. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Jackson, F.A. (1975). The identification and comparison of selected personality traits of selected 6th grade teachers through principal-student feedback. Unpublished manuscript, Kentucky: Bowling Green State University.

Jersild, A.T. (1955). When teachers face themselves. New York: Teachers College Press.

Johnson, D.W. (1978). The social psychology of education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Johnson, W.A. (1975). A study of the attitudinal and personality traits of students accepted into the elementary education and special education-emotional impairment training program at Michigan State University during spring term, 1974. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan: Michigan State University.

Karworski, T.F., Gramlich, F.W., & Arnott, P. (1944). Psychological studies in semantics: I - Free association to words, drawings and objects. Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 233-247.

Kim, J., & Mueller, C.W. (1978). Factor analysis, statistical methods and practical issues. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lawley, D.N., & Maxwell, A.E. (1971). Factor analysis as a statistical method. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company, Inc.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers. New York: Harper and Row.

Lewin, K. (1935). A dynamic theory of personality. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mercer, C.D. (1979). Children and adolescents with learning disabilities. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Morris, W. (Ed.). (1969). The American heritage dictionary of the English language. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company.

Mosier, D.B., & Park, R.B. (1979), Teacher - therapist. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.

Moustakas, C. (1969). Personal growth. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Howard A. Doyle Publishing Company.

Niday, J.L. (1978). Comparison of self-perceptions held by others of selected teachers. Unpublished manuscript, Kentucky: Bowling Green State University.

Odbert, H.S. (1948). An approach to language behavior through a test of word meanings. American Psychology, 3, 274-275.

Odbert, H.S., Karowski, T.F., & Eckerson, A.B. (1942). Studies in synesthetic thinking: I musical and verbal association of color and mood. Journal of General Psychology, 26, 153-173.

Osgood, C.E. (1957). A behavioristic analysis of perception and meaning as cognitive phenomena. In J. Bruner (ed.), Contemporary Approaches to Cognition. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Osgood, C.E. (1953). Method and theory in experimental psychology. New York: Oxford University Press.

Osgood, C.E. (1953). The nature and measurement of meaning. Psychology Bulletin, 49, 197-237.

Osgood, C.E., & Grooms, R.R. (1962). On semantic differential resistance to response bias based on stimuli word positions. Psychological Reports, 10, 634.

Osgood, C.E., Saporta, S., & Nunnally, J.C. (1956). Evaluative assertive analysis. Urbana, Illinois: Institute of Communication Research, University of Illinois (mimeo).

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G., & Tannenbaum, P. (1957). The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Urbana Press.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G., & Tannenbaum, P. (1955). Factor analysis of meaning. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 50, 325-338.

Parkay, F. (1978). Inner-city high school teachers: The relationship of personality traits and teaching style to environmental stress. Unpublished manuscript, Chicago: University of Chicago.

Rider, R.H. (1973). The influence of basketball coaches on their players' personalities. Unpublished manuscript, Utah: University of Utah.

Rogers, C.R. (1975). The interpersonal relationship in the facilitation of learning. In D.A. Read and S.B. Simon (Eds.), Humanistic Education Sourcebook. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Rogers, C.R. (1966). The facilitation of learning. In L. Siegel (Ed.), Contemporary Theories of Learning. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Rosen, J.L. (1975). Perceptions of the childhood self and teacher-child relations. Final Report, National Institute of Education.

Rosenblith, J., & Allinsworth, W. (Eds.). (1969). The causes of behavior - readings in child development and educational psychology (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969.

Rosenthal, R. (1966). Teacher exploration and pupil learning. In Overly (Ed.), The Unstudied Curriculum, 53-64.

Rosenthal, R., & Jackson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ross, A.O. (1977). Learning disability: The unrealized potential. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Sapir, S.G., & Wilson, B. (1978). The professional's guide to working with the learning disabled child. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Sherman, B.R., & Blackburn, R.T. (1975). Personal characteristics of teaching effectiveness of college faculty. Journal of Educational Psychology, 47, 124-131.

Sprinthall, R.C., & Sprinthall, N.A. (1974). Educational Psychology: A developmental approach. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Staiert, P. (1971). Changes of selected attitudes, values, needs and personality traits of participants in a fellowship program for prospective teachers of the disadvantaged. Unpublished manuscript, Denver: University of Denver.

Tan-Hei, D. (1974). Personality traits and characteristics of vocational-technical teachers of selected instructional areas in the area vocational-technical institutes of Minnesota. Unpublished manuscript, Minnesota: University of Minnesota.

Taylor, C.E. (1981). The relationship of personality traits of elementary school principals to efficiency on selected administrative functions as perceived by elementary classroom teachers. Unpublished manuscript, Kentucky: Bowling Green State University.

Thaipanich, N. (1973). A study of attitudinal changes, personality traits, and behavior of prospective teachers during the professional laboratory experience. Unpublished manuscript, Missouri: University of Missouri-Columbia.

Thelen, H. (1954). Dynamics of groups at work. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Valett, R. (1977). Humanistic education. St. Louis: Mosby Company.

Wallace, G., & McLoughlin, J. (1979). Learning disabilities, concepts and characteristics (2nd ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Walters, E. (1979). A study to determine the effects of age upon the personality traits and attitudes of student teachers. Unpublished manuscript, Mississippi: University of Southern Mississippi.

Weaver, H.M. (1978). An assessment of the effects of methods courses with and without field experience on the achievement and attitudes of pre-service elementary teachers with varied personality traits. Unpublished manuscript, North Carolina: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Wexler, G.J. (1977). Personality characteristics of innovative elementary teachers as measured by the Cattel Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Unpublished manuscript, California: University of Southern California.

Wilty, P. (1947). An analysis of the personal traits of the effective teacher. Journal of Educational Research, 40, 662-671.

Yonay, S. (1979). Teacher's personality traits and preference for managerial styles of principals. Unpublished manuscript, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.

Ysseldyke, J.E., & Algozzine, B. (1982). Critical issues in special and remedial education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company.

Zaugra, J.F. (1974). A study of selected relationships among interests, personality traits, and values between student teachers and experienced teachers. Unpublished manuscript, Montana: University of Montana.

APPENDIX A

LEARNING DISABILITY TEACHER PROFILE

Please mark X: Female:_____Male:_____LD Certification: Yes_____No_____
Age: 21-25_____,26-30_____,31-35_____,36-40_____,41-45_____,46-50_____,
51-60_____
LD Teaching Experience_____years; Total Teaching Experience_____years.
Current Position: Resource_____, Self-Contained_____, Itinerant_____,
Tutorial_____; High School, Jr. High_____, Elementary School_____
Degrees Acquired: Bachelors_____, Masters_____, Doctorate_____.

Rate the following fifty traits to indicate your perception of the degree of importance for learning disability teachers to possess.

For very closely associated, mark: deep ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___shallow
For closely associated, mark loud ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___soft

---

1. HONEST	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	DISHONEST
2. EASY	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	DIFFICULT
3. IDEALIST	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	REALIST
4. RELAXED	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	TENSE
5. ORGANIZED	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	DISORGANIZED
6. INSIGHTFUL	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	UNDISCERNING
7. RESOURCEFUL	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	UNPROFICIENT
8. SENSITIVE	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	INSENSITIVE
9. EMPATHIC	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	INDIFFERENT
10. ACTIVE	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	PASSIVE
11. STRUCTURED	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	UNSTRUCTURED
12. FLEXIBLE	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	INFLEXIBLE
13. CLEAR	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	HAZY
14. DIRECT	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	INDIRECT
15. PERCEPTIVE	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	IMPERCEPTIVE
16. ENERGETIC	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	LETHARGIC
17. HARD	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	SOFT
18. RESILIENT	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	RIGID

19. CREATIVE	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	NONCREATIVE
20. BRAVE	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	COWARDLY
21. YOUNG	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	OLD
22. AUTHORITARIAN	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	DEMOCRATIC
23. SYMPATHETIC	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	UNSYMPATHETIC
24. ALTRUISTIC	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	UNCHARITABLE
25. CONSISTENT	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	INCONSISTENT
26. JUDGEMENTAL	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	NONJUDGEMENTAL
27. CONGRUENT	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	INCONGRUENT
28. RESPONSIBLE	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	IRRESPONSIBLE
29. CONFIDENT	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	DIFFIDENT
30. RESPECTFUL	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	DISRESPECTFUL
31. ASSERTIVE	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	COMPLIANT
32. MATURE	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	IMMATURE
33. GENUINE	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	ARTIFICIAL
34. CALM	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	AGITATED
35. FAIR	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	UNFAIR
36. OPEN	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	CLOSED
37. INDEPENDENT	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	DEPENDENT
38. AUTHENTIC	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	DECEPTIVE
39. STRONG	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	WEAK
40. ACCEPTING	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	UNACCEPTING
41. RESPONSIVE	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	UNRESPONSIVE
42. HAPPY	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	SAD
43. ETHICAL	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	UNETHICAL
44. PATIENT	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	IMPATIENT

45. SPONTANEOUS _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ CONSTRAINED

46. POSITIVE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ NEGATIVE

47. KIND _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ CRUEL

48. OPTIMISTIC _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ PESSIMISTIC

49. WARM _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ COOL

50. SHARP _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DULL

Thank You!

May 5, 1982

Dear Colleague:

I am in the process of completing a doctorate in counseling psychology at Loyola University of Chicago.

I would like to request your help by asking you to complete the enclosed Learning Disability Teacher Profile. This is not an evaluation of you as a teacher, but an attempt to determine what personality traits you perceive as critical in teaching learning disability children and youth based on your educational background and your experience as a learning disability teacher.

Please do not put your name or other identifying information on the Learning Disability Teacher Profile. This is to insure privacy of participants.

Completing this fifty item profile will take ten minutes.

When you have completed the profile, return it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope by May 26, 1982.

If you have any questions regarding this study or wish to receive an abstract of the results, please call me at 312-835-3845 or write to my return address.

Your time and cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Pat Atherton
756 Glencoe Drive
Glencoe, Illinois 60022

APPENDIX B

Investigator: Nibondh Thaipanich

Year: 1973

Subjects: Teachers-in-Training

Focus: Attitudes, Traits, Behaviors

Instruments: Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory

Adjective Self-Description

Behavior Rating Scale

Results: No difference in traits

Pass-Fail students saw themselves as:

Traits: Cooperative

Extroverted

Socially-oriented

Investigator: James Calliotte

Year: 1971

Subjects: Teachers-in-Training

Focus: Impact of Basic Encounter Groups

Instruments: Sixteen Personality Factor

Truax Relationship Questionnaire

Results: No difference in traits between groups

Found change in pre- and post- tests

Traits: Genuineness

Accurate Empathy

Non-possessive Warmth

Concreteness

Investigator: Edward Walters

Year: 1979

Subjects: Teachers-in-Training

Focus: Impact of Age on Traits or Attitudes

Instruments: Interpersonal Orientation Scale

Sixteen Personality Factor

Results: No difference in age groups

No difference in traits or attitudes

Traits: None

Investigator: William Boyle

Year: 1978

Subjects: Teachers-in-Training

Focus: Traits versus Personal and Interpersonal Values

Instruments: Shostrom Personal Orientation Inventory

Gordon Survey of Personal Values

Traits: Goal Orientation

Practical Mindedness

Capacity for Intimacy

Decisiveness

Synergy

Self-Actualing Value

Investigator: Paul Staiert

Year: 1971

Subjects: Experienced Education Teachers versus Teachers-in-Training

Focus: Changes in Attitudes, Values, Traits of Fellowship Students

Instruments: Sixteen Personality Factor

Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

Study of Values

Acceptance of Self and Others

Tolerance-Prejudice Attitude Scales

Teacher Characteristics Q-Sort

Results: Change found in attitudes after program experience

Traits: None

Investigator: John Zaugra

Year: 1974

Subjects: Experienced Teachers versus Teachers-in-Training

Focus: Comparison of Interests, Traits and Work Values

Instruments: Strong Vocational Interest Blank

Sixteen Personality Factor

Work Values Inventory

Results: No difference in interests, traits or work values

Traits: Interest in Helping Occupation (both groups)

Interest in Self-Expressive Occupation (both groups)

Investigator: Lawrence Bishop

Year: 1975

Subjects: Experienced Teachers versus Teachers-in-Training

Focus: Comparison of Supervising Teachers and Student Teachers

Instruments: Expert Teacher Action Study

Omnibus Personality Inventory

Results: No difference of significance

Traits: None

Investigator: Mona Mary Donnelly

Year: 1971

Subjects: Experienced Teachers versus Teachers-in-Training

Focus: Comparison of Experienced Teachers and Inexperienced Teachers

Instruments: Gordon Personality Inventory

Semantic Differential

Goardon Personal Profile

Results: Differences found

Traits: Student Teachers: More Cautious
Personal Relationship Skills
Responsibility
Emotional Stability

Elementary Teachers: More Social

Experienced Teachers: Original Thinking

Investigator: Jack Bullock*

Year: 1974

Subjects: Experienced Teachers in Specific Disciplines

Focus: Traits, Training, Experience, Job Satisfaction Comparison

Instruments: Sixteen Personality Factor

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Training and Experience Questionnaire*

Personality Interview Questionnaire*

Results: Differences found

Traits: Superior teachers were:

Shy	Realistic
Humble	Persistent
Sober	Conservative
Reserved	Conscientious
Creative	Tough-Minded
Self-Sufficient	Down to Earth
	High Ego Strength

Investigator: Forest Parkay

Year: 1978

Subjects: Experienced Teachers in Specific Disciplines

Focus: Describe Stress on Experienced Teachers

Instruments: Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories

Results: Attitude did make difference in classroom

Traits: None

Investigator: Franklyn Jackson

Year: 1975

Subjects: Experienced Teachers in Specific Disciplines

Focus: Perceptions of Students and Principals of Teacher Traits

Instruments: Inventory of Personality Traits

Results: No differences

Traits: None

Investigator: Gary Wexler

Year: 1977

Subjects: Experienced Teachers in Specific Disciplines

Focus: Traits of Innovative Teachers - National Sampling

Instruments: Dohmann Survey of Teacher's Perceptions Toward Educational Innovation and Change

Sixteen Personality Factor

Results: Differences found

Traits: Innovative Teachers: More Intelligent, Emotionally Stable, Assertive, Enthusiastic, Venturesome, Tender-Minded, Imaginative, Self-Assured, Emotionally Controlled

Innovative Elementary Teachers: More Shrewd and More Conservative than Innovative High School Teachers

Investigator: Saul Amerling

Year: 1977

Subjects: Experienced Teachers in Specific Disciplines

Focus: Self-Concept and Perceptions of Regular Teachers Toward Special Education Students

Instruments: Self-Concept Incongruence Scale

Eysenck Personality Inventory

Results: Differences found

Traits: More accurate perception of students correlated with positive attitudes toward special education students

Teachers with 21 years of experience had significantly positive rank on Neuroticism-Stability Scale of the Eysenck Personality Inventory

Investigator: Robert Cross

Year: 1978

Subjects: Superior Teachers

Focus: Traits of Superior Teachers

Instruments: Questionnaire

Results: Defined Traits

Traits: Good teachers were:
- Child-Centered
- Creative
- Practical
- Patient
- Frivolous
- Motivating
- Not Easily Depressed

Investigator: James Niday

Year: 1978

Subjects: Superior Teachers

Focus: Self-Perceptions of Successful versus Less Successful Teachers

Instruments: R.C. Bryan's Student Opinion Questionnaire

Barr & Comb's Inventory of Personality Traits

Results: No difference

Traits: Found cluster of competencies: Fairness, Knowledge of Subject Matter, Sympathetic, Understanding, Interesting Classes

Successful Teachers rated themselves higher

Investigator: Ying-Hau Chen

Year: 1975

Subjects: Superior Teachers

Focus: Comparison of Successful Teachers and Less Successful Teachers

Instruments: Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory

California Psychological Inventory

Results: Found difference

Traits: Good teachers possessed: self-accepting, sense of well-being, aggressive, cooperative, active, confident, ambitious, resourceful, versatile, tolerant, organized, persuasive, alert, productive, observant, spontaneous, perceptive, verbally fluent -- also less flexible, more cautious, methodical, more educated, more experienced

Investigator: Edwin Headrick

Year: 1971

Subjects: Special Education Teachers

Focus: Comparison of Special Education Teachers with Non-Special Education Teachers AND Teachers-in-Training of Special Education and Regular Education

Instruments: California Psychological Inventory

Sixteen Personality Factor

Results: Difference found

Traits: Experienced Special Education Teachers: more dominant (than Experienced Regular Education Teachers) and higher in experimenting qualities

Teachers-in-Training: Same except higher in psychological mindedness than peers

Investigator: Thelma Clair French

Year: 1980

Subjects: Special Education Teachers

Focus: Comparison of Special Education Teachers and Regular Education Teachers

Instruments: California Psychological Inventory
Brown's Self-Report Inventory
Veldman's Adjective Self-Description

Results: Found difference

Traits: Special Education Teachers: Socialization
Communality
Psychological Mindedness

Investigator: Pamela Cochrane

Year: 1975

Subjects: Special Education Teachers

Focus: Defining Traits of Special Education Teachers AND Differences among LD, EMH, BD, blind, partially sighted and administrators

Instruments: Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values

California Psychological Inventory

Results: Defined traits

Traits: Special Education Teachers: poised, spontaneous, aggressive, demanding, self-confident, capacity for autonomy, independent thinking, intolerant of social beliefs and attitudes of others, distrustful in personal and social outlook

Post-Master's Group: more domineering, aggressive, achievement-oriented

Investigator: Wilfred Johnson

Year: 1975

Subjects: Special Education Teachers

Focus: Identification of Personality Types of Teachers-in-Training for BD

Instruments: Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory
Strong Vocational Interest Blank
Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

Results: Difference found

Traits: Those with more formal experience with special education children had a more positively attitude toward the program

Investigator: Henry Hogue

Year: 1978

Subjects: Special Education Teachers

Focus: Identification of Traits of Special Education Teachers

Instruments: Sixteen Personality Factor

Baxter's Rating Scale of Teacher's Personal Effectiveness

(Done by Regional Supervisors)

Results: Difference found

Traits: Special Education Teachers: understanding and tolerance for others on higher level

possessed unique constellation of personality traits: sensitivity to others, pragmatic, imaginative, shrewder, experimental/openmindedness

Regular Education Teachers: higher group dependency needs

APPENDIX C

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SPECIAL EDUCATION CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES (p. 2, Section B, October, 1981)

1. 32 semester hours including at least one (1) course in each of the following areas:
   a. Survey of Exceptional Children
   b. Characteristics course for children with learning disabilities.
   c. Two (2) semester hours methods course for children with learning disabilities.
   d. Psychological diagnosis of all types of exceptional children.
   e. Student teaching for children with learning disabilities (K-12).
   f. Pre-student teaching clinical experience at the elementary and second levels equivalent to 100 clock hours in the area of specialization.
      (1) Applicants with the required credit in student teaching and evidence of successful teaching experience need not complete additional student teaching.
      (2) Applicants with successful teaching experience in the field of specialization need not complete pre-student teaching experience.
2. The remainder of the required 32 semester hours may be completed by taking additional courses in the above areas and other coursework in special education.

APPENDIX D

VITA

Dr. Angel M. Diaz
1548 Timberwood Court
Sycamore, Illinois 60178

Chicago State University
Department of Special Education
95th at King Drive
Chicago, IL 60623

Home Phone: (815) 895-6667

Office Phone: (312) 995-2076

PERSONAL:

Age:	40	Birthplace:	Mexico
Sex:	Male	Citizenship:	U.S. (Naturalized)
Birthdate:	10/21/31	Marital Status:	Married
Health:	Excellent	Wife:	Mary Katherine (B.A., Math Teacher)
		Children:	Marc, 6, and Michael, 9

EDUCATION:

High School: Holding Institute (Private Methodist School), Laredo, Texas

College: NAME	MAJOR	DATES	DATE & DEGREE
Laredo Junior College		50/51&54/55	
University of Texas (Austin)	Psychology	1955-1960	B.A. 8/57
University of Houston	Special Ed.	1961-1970	M.Ed. 1/68
University of Houston	Special Ed.	1961-1970	Ed.D. 8/70

EXPERIENCE:

1951-1954 - U.S. Air Force - Honorable Discharge
1957-1960 - Counselor (part-time) Brown Schools for Exceptional Children (Austin, TX)
1960-1967 - Special Teacher of the Minimally Brain-Injured, Galena Park School District (Galena Park, TX)
1967-1970 - Graduate student at the University of Houston
1970-1975 - Assistant Professor of Special Education and Director of Educational Diagnostic and Remedial Services in the Department of Special Education (including the Reading Laboratory and the Clinical Teaching Center) at Illinois State University. Received Associate Professor rank on August 21, 1974.
1975-1976 - Associate Professor of Special Education and Director for the Special Education Department's Prescriptive Education Laboratory at Northern Illinois University.
1976- - Associate Professor of Special Education at Chicago State University

HONORS, SPECIAL RECOGNITION, OTHER SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

High School: President of student body, President of Junior class, President of English Club, Honor Society

VITA

MAURINE PATTEN, Ed.D.
540 Fairway Lane
Sycamore, IL 60178
815/895-6492

Married: 1961
Children: 2

Education

1977 Ed.D. Northern Illinois University, Administration and Services/ Ed. Psychology

1977 M.S. Chicago State University, Special Education/Psychology

1961 B.S. Bradley University, Elementary Education

Teaching Certificates: 03-Ed, K-9
10-LD, EMH, Soc/Emotionally Disturbed (K-12)
12-General Administration/Sp. Ed., K-12

Certified Instruction for Effectiveness Training Associates (Parent Effectiveness Training and Teacher Effectiveness Training)
Certified in Reality Therapy
Family Therapy (38 hours), The Family Institute of Chicago

Current Position

September, 1980 to present - Assistant Professor, Chicago State University

Related Professional Experience

1978-80 Assistant Director of Elementary Programs, DeKalb County Special Education Association

1976-78 Special Education resource teacher, Sycamore School District

1974-76 Special Education teacher, DeKalb County Special Education Association

1970-74 Director/teacher, Southwest Cooperative Preschool, Chicago, Illinois

1965-70 Private tutoring

1961-63 Regular education teacher

Responsibilities

Assistant Director, DCSEA

Organized and conducted principal meetings and inservice events (especially in the areas of PL 94-142 and mainstreaming)

James A. Wolter, Ed.D.
130 Woodland Avenue
Winnetka, IL 60093

Position Desired
Associate Professor
Permanent Appointment
Chicago State University

Education:

Product of the Chicago Public School System.

1/53-1/57, Steinmetz High School, Chicago, Diploma
Activities: Baseball, Football, Acting, Senior Class Vice President

2/57-8/57, Wright Junior College, Chicago
Activities: Baseball

9/57-6/60, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, B.S.
Major: Biology; Minor: Earth Science
Activities: Baseball and Football

9/60-1/61, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb,
Major: Education - Student Teaching

6/67-8/70, Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, M.A.
Major: Special Education (Teaching the Emotionally Disturbed)

9/70-6/72, Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago
Assorted Counseling and Supervision courses.

6/72-6/78, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, C.A.S.
Major: Education - Supervision and Administration

6/78-8/80, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Ed.D.
Major: Leadership and Educational Policy Studies
Dissertation Title: The Relationship Between Administrative Characteristics and Self-Actualization Among High School Administrators.

APPENDIX E

Principal-Factor Analysis Eigenvalue and Variability

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variability	Cumulative Percent
1	10.67215	49.3	49.3
2	2.26333	10.5	59.8
3	1.79067	8.3	68.1
4	1.56842	7.2	75.3
5	0.98099	4.5	79.8
6	0.94529	4.4	84.2
7	0.87045	4.0	88.2
8	0.79556	3.7	91.9
9	0.71840	3.3	95.2
10	0.65592	3.1	98.3
11	0.63676	2.9	101.2
12	0.59655	2.8	104.0
13	0.53533	2.5	106.5
14	0.49321	2.3	108.8
15	0.40002	1.8	110.6
16	0.36819	1.7	112.3
17	0.35583	1.6	113.9
18	0.33702	1.6	115.5
19	0.26875	1.2	116.7
20	0.23854	1.1	117.8
21	0.23782	1.1	118.9
22	0.16712	0.8	119.7
23	0.16585	0.8	120.5
24	0.13692	0.6	121.1
25	0.10084	0.5	121.6
26	0.04433	0.2	121.8
27	0.03482	0.2	121.9
28	0.01091	0.1	122.0
29	-0.01001	-0.0	122.0
30	-0.01647	-0.1	121.9
31	-0.04035	-0.2	121.7
32	-0.07610	-0.4	121.3
33	-0.09535	-0.4	120.9
34	-0.11649	-0.5	120.4
35	-0.13881	-0.6	119.7
36	-0.17293	-0.8	118.9
37	-0.17548	-0.8	118.1
38	-0.19774	-0.9	117.2
39	-0.21901	-1.0	116.2
40	-0.23229	-1.1	115.1
41	-0.26352	-1.2	113.9
42	-0.26561	-1.3	112.6
43	-0.28232	-1.3	111.3
44	-0.28752	-1.3	110.0
45	-0.31782	-1.5	108.5
46	-0.33240	-1.5	107.0
47	-0.34174	-1.6	105.4

48	-0.36142	-1.7	103.7
49	-0.39950	-1.8	101.9
50	-0.40644	-1.9	100.0

The eigenvalue of greater than 1 determines the factors to be retained. The six factor solution indicates 4.4 percent of variability with a cumulative percent of 84.2. This supports the six factor solution in the present investigation.

APPENDIX F

Principal-Factor Matrix Correlation Solutions

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
V1	0.40354	0.20087	-0.25671	-0.18177	0.07717	0.49600
V2	-0.01659	-0.43845	0.02837	0.04762	0.01611	-0.05494
V3	-0.04211	-0.47616	0.04613	0.00031	0.05955	0.07609
V4	0.21383	-0.16159	0.01479	-0.16060	0.30479	-0.25749
V5	0.33303	0.40190	-0.08026	0.52481	0.19671	0.01651
V6	0.38339	-0.06938	-0.26118	0.04393	0.26094	-0.14095
V7	0.51141	0.22896	-0.37055	0.04595	-0.05480	-0.26001
V8	0.47472	-0.10243	0.00296	0.03394	0.29123	0.24724
V9	0.50671	-0.44617	0.07337	0.05481	-0.01114	0.07367
V10	0.46306	0.18265	0.31995	-0.21208	-0.14185	-0.02219
V11	0.20292	0.33923	0.31389	0.41186	0.30256	0.08691
V12	0.43354	-0.13169	-0.14942	-0.02434	0.40398	-0.14831
V13	0.52580	0.09201	-0.17695	0.28884	-0.07310	-0.26707
V14	0.39571	0.34809	0.15663	0.09414	-0.08945	-0.18075
V15	0.69330	-0.01900	-0.12023	0.00445	0.17632	-0.14412
V16	0.52831	0.29970	0.14277	-0.19516	-0.11712	0.18924
V17	-0.00342	0.32777	0.30769	0.16308	0.18803	0.24720
V18	0.40459	-0.29330	-0.21784	-0.14728	0.27144	-0.20339
V19	0.52589	0.00876	0.26284	-0.26118	-0.07274	-0.20530
V20	0.44746	0.24325	0.11654	-0.33480	-0.07543	-0.11483
V21	-0.03334	-0.-7897	0.36086	0.27876	-0.25864	-0.20972
V22	-0.15375	0.32548	0.32117	0.18109	0.37845	-0.09918
V23	0.32746	-0.36194	0.12997	-0.18622	0.10531	0.26379
V24	0.46245	-0.17592	0.41340	-0.23128	-0.01959	-0.00412
V25	0.26695	0.30329	-0.31759	0.23320	-0.10881	0.10240
V26	-0.14208	0.23793	0.45283	0.12930	0.31492	0.19438
V27	0.38810	-0.04051	0.07094	-0.30623	0.04122	0.02497
V28	0.58746	0.12181	-0.30356	0.01293	-0.07527	0.21558
V29	0.70221	0.17602	-0.03050	-0.09086	-0.06410	-0.01811
V30	0.52778	0.06512	-0.09984	0.12096	-0.08284	0.33381
V31	0.34243	0.42453	0.11944	-0.19296	-0.03937	-0.07602
V32	0.62000	0.08986	-0.10199	-0.14651	-0.05759	0.03500
V33	0.60208	0.17838	-0.28563	-0.16248	-0.00322	0.20162
V34	0.58350	-0.05243	0.02636	0.21838	-0.06711	-0.18926
V35	0.56796	0.06516	-0.31998	0.07077	0.03841	-0.07615
V36	0.61967	-0.09654	0.09881	-0.11235	0.18951	-0.02838
V37	0.49823	0.13741	0.29783	-0.28757	0.03811	-0.15828
V38	0.59667	0.13184	-0.27231	-0.26326	-0.04384	0.03641
V39	0.54685	0.22489	0.21653	-0.15347	-0.10721	-0.14551
V40	0.49227	-0.12908	-0.08378	0.13590	0.06805	-0.12683
V41	0.64378	-0.12271	0.01324	0.05620	0.26389	-0.16080
V42	0.47666	-0.10267	0.35710	0.12905	0.01383	-0.04059
V43	0.50338	-0.01156	0.06952	0.09732	0.08943	0.16933
V44	0.45270	-0.15662	-0.04240	0.45425	-0.14673	-0.11091
V45	0.46592	-0.19774	0.20700	-0.06069	0.04633	0.00025
V46	0.64714	-0.21001	0.01470	0.36101	-0.15736	0.03065
V47	0.62452	-0.38415	0.06202	0.18071	-0.12030	0.18104
V48	0.57819	-0.15080	0.20230	0.12655	-0.10219	0.28834
V49	0.56785	-0.39393	0.17997	0.14539	-0.19705	0.12974
V50	0.40918	-0.15435	0.12581	0.13466	0.46052	0.10494

APPENDIX G

Principal Component Matrix Correlation Solutions

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
V1	-.04575	.02244	-.10840	.33645	-0.6757	.04595
V2	-.05942	.09442	-.02444	-.07863	.05604	-.05815
V3	-.07770	.12563	-.08320	-.01995	.04431	-.03403
V4	.02617	-.05297	-.05743	-.09154	.24597	.01161
V5	-.10516	-.03677	.18941	.03391	.03265	.22234
V6	-.06618	-.05202	.04309	.01110	.20355	.01039
V7	.02409	-.13266	.17654	-.00703	.07624	-.09364
V8	-.08009	.08411	-.08849	.13228	.09022	.13131
V9	-.04484	.15937	-.03289	-.01684	.02031	-.03768
V10	.18194	.00738	-.04511	-.03389	-.07925	.00337
V11	-.04578	.02376	.05282	-.01090	.03250	.32277
V12	-.05461	-.03998	-.02216	-.00419	.27357	.05975
V13	-.01326	-.04430	.21661	-.09154	.04577	-.03366
V14	.11279	-.06143	.11325	-.08435	-.03330	.04878
V15	.00409	-.02750	.04356	-.00752	.15879	.01096
V16	.12709	.00679	-.05180	.11353	-.11810	.02923
V17	-.00577	.03228	-.04806	.07328	-.05301	.25561
V18	-.03204	-.03173	-.03236	-.02735	.25612	-.06020
V19	.18169	-.01192	-.03915	-.10973	.03109	-.05116
V20	.18638	-.07764	-.04051	-.00912	.00079	-.04612
V21	.05726	.07344	.11927	-.22795	-.11337	-.00334
V22	.01095	-.06436	-.00754	-.08031	.12496	.27396
V23	-.01970	.14673	-.17733	.09234	.02014	.01101
V24	.13527	.09475	-.12603	-.07108	-.00225	.00745
V25	-.06246	-.04335	.15491	.12185	-.08293	.00458
V26	.00028	.04156	-.10430	.01679	.01258	.30175
V27	.09093	.00355	-.10786	.03869	.04311	-.03337
V28	-.03744	.01206	.04729	.18741	-.05730	-.03566
V29	.08606	-.02199	.03595	.04330	-.00872	-.02137
V30	-.05399	.09243	.01943	.17763	-.11861	.03621
V31	.15999	-.10020	.00245	.01005	-.02339	.03038
V32	.06175	-.01152	.00397	.07785	-.00401	-.05101
V33	.00859	-.02690	-.01346	.20631	-0.1365	-.03430
V34	.01201	.02990	.13536	-.10498	.02657	-.01282
V35	-.03420	-.04746	.10559	.05450	.07896	-.04290
V36	.03921	.03051	-.06238	.00051	.12377	.04530
V37	.18677	-.03799	-.07063	-.07401	.05576	.01800
V38	.06104	-.06147	-.00783	.13170	.02295	-.09889
V39	.17234	-.03755	.01635	-.06419	-.02368	-.00772
V40	-.03243	.02128	.07613	-.04578	.09369	-.00813
V41	-.01037	.00876	.01666	-.05518	.19519	.06116
V42	.04801	.10214	.00433	-.10286	-.00261	.08419
V43	-.02791	.07955	-.01473	.07238	-.00145	.09005
V44	-.07908	.08940	.20001	-.09900	-.03705	-.01342
V45	.04229	.08580	-.05843	-.03983	.03831	.01691
V46	-.06408	.14119	.13552	-.03744	-.06919	-.00968
V47	-.06452	.19701	.01438	.02362	-.07027	-.02662
V48	-.01590	.17943	-.02769	.07021	-.12464	.05362
V49	-.01180	.20374	.00857	-.02932	-.10241	-.04464
V50	.11719	.02806	.15748	-.09029	-.20931	-.10081

APPENDIX H

Demographic Data

	Variable	Categories	Absolute Frequency	Cumulative Frequency %
I	Sex	Male	13	6.5
		Female	187	100.0
II	Age	21 - 30 Yrs.	47	23.5
		31 - 45 Yrs.	85	54.5
		46 - 50 Yrs.	19	75.5
		51 - 60 Yrs.	49	100.0
		Mean falls in 31 - 45 age range. Mode falls within 51 - 60 age range.		
III	Learning Disability Teaching Experience	0 - 4 Yrs.	66	33.0
		5 - 8 Yrs.	67	66.5
		9 - 23 Yrs.	67	100.0
		Mean falls within 5 - 8 Yrs. experience group. Mode falls within 5 - 8 Yrs. experience group.		
IV	Highest Attained Degree	Bachelors	45	22.5
		Masters	147	96.0
		Dotorate	8	100.0

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Patricia A. Atherton has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. John A. Wellington, Director
Professor, Counseling Psychology and Higher Education, Loyola

Dr. Terry Williams
Assistant Professor, Counseling Psychology and Higher Education, Loyola

Dr. Carol Harding
Assistant Professor, Foundations of Education, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

October 5, 1983
Date

John A. Wellington
Director's Signature