

Students' preferences for Lecturers' personalities.

Sarah Tan<sup>1</sup>, Angela Mansi<sup>2</sup> and Adrian Furnham<sup>1,3</sup>

(1) Research Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology,

University College London, 26 Bedford Way, London, WC1H0AP

(2) University of Westminster Business School, 35 Marylebone Road London NW1 5LS

(3) Norwegian Business School (BI), Nydalseveien, Oslo, Norway

Corresponding author: [a.furnham@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:a.furnham@ucl.ac.uk)

**Key Words:** personality, strengths, gender, student, lecturers

**Acknowledgements:** We are grateful to Amy Aaron for helping in the data collection and

## Abstract

The present study set out to examine students' preferences for lecturers' personality as a function of their classroom behaviour, Core Self-Evaluations, and self-rated Character Strengths. Various hypotheses were tested: First, students' Big Five traits would significantly predict corresponding personality preferences for lecturers (the matching hypothesis). Second, students' Core Self-Evaluation scores would significantly predict preferences for Extraverted, Agreeable, and Conscientious lecturers. Third, self-rated Character Strengths would also significantly predict Extraverted, Agreeable, and Conscientious lecturers. We also investigated difference in preferences among two ethnic groups (South East Asian/Chinese vs. Caucasian/British). In all 264 British students completed four questionnaires. Conscientiousness was the most desired trait in lecturers, followed by Agreeableness, Extraversion, Openness, while Neuroticism being least desired respectively. Preference for Agreeable lecturers were best predicted by all individual difference variables. Caucasian students had a stronger dislike for Neurotic lecturers, while Asians had higher preferences for Extraverted, Open, and Agreeable lecturers. There was some evidence of the student/lecturer personality match. Limitations and further research options were discussed.

**Keywords:** Personality, lecturers, students, preferences, strengths, gender

## Introduction

It is apparent in student course evaluations (Marsh, 1987; Olivares, 2001), choice of specific educational institutions (Holland, 1997), selection or avoidance of particular courses (Ackerman & Heggstad, 1997), and teaching styles (Zhang, 2004) that students hold strong views about their lecturers. Indeed, choice of course is often as much determined by the known social behaviour of the lecturer (determined in large part by personality) than by the course content or examination method. Ratings of lectures/professors are widely available and appear to be a strong influence on the choice of a particular course. The central question is what particular behaviours (and values) students seek out and avoid in their teachers. Further it is interesting to understand what other behaviours these preferences are related to.

There is a large literature on the consequences of matching student and lecturer personality preferences and style (Doyle & Rutherford, 1984; Rothman, Basson, & Rothman, 2000). The idea is that if the teaching style of the lecturer matches the learning style of the student the latter will both enjoy more, and do better on, the course than if there is mismatch. However, despite the “common-sensical” nature of this hypothesis there is very little data to support it (Furnham, 2012). There is a large literature on the impact of personality trait similarity in the selection of friends (Selfout et al., 2010), and relationship quality with partners (Barelds & Barelds-Dijkstra, 2007). Again, the idea is that people seek out people who are like themselves (similarity hypothesis) as opposed to being different or opposite them (complementary hypothesis) in personality and associated preferences and social behavior.

Various studies have been done on students’ preferences for the personality profile of their lecturers/professors/teachers (Rushton et al., 1987; Furnham & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2005; Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2008). They tended to find evidence of congruency of personality traits between students’ personality and their preferences for lecturers for four of the Big Five traits (all but Neuroticism) (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Correlations tended to be around  $r = .20$  (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2008). Thus, Extraverted students preferred Extraverted lecturers’ and Open-minded students, Open-minded lecturers.

The present study aims to replicate the hypothesis about the congruency between students’ and lecturers’ Big Five personality characteristics (Costa & McCrae, 1992). It also aims to extend the research in this area by examining the effect of students’ Core Self-

Evaluations (Judge, Locke & Durham, 1997), and Character Strengths (Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Furnham & Lester, 2012) on preferred lecturers' personalities.

### **Core Self-Evaluation**

The concept of Core Self-Evaluation (CSE) is theorised as a broad personality trait, consisting of self-esteem, generalised self-efficacy, emotional stability (reverse Neuroticism), and locus of control (Judge et al., 1997). There is evidence indicating overlapping associations between CSE traits and Big Five personality traits, across diverse methodologies and genders (Robins et al., 2001; Farmer et al., 2001). For example, Robins et al. (2001) reported 34% of variance in self-esteem can be explained by the Big Five. The present study hypothesised that CSE scores will be a predictor of lecturer personality preferences, such that it mirrors the preferences of students' Big Five traits, specifically Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Conscientiousness. For example, students' Neuroticism predicted preferences for Agreeable lecturers (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2008), and thus it is predicted that CSE scores would be most strongly linked to a preference for Agreeable lecturers. It also examines whether CSE scores had incremental validity over the Big Five in accounting for lecturer preferences.

### **Character Strengths**

Peterson and Seligman (2004) first conceptualized Character Strengths under the classification of 24 personal strengths with six "higher order" virtues. Furthermore, deployment of character strengths is linked with greater well-being and life satisfaction (Park, Peterson, & Seligman, 2004), academic achievement (Park & Peterson, 2009), vocational satisfaction (Lounsbury et al., 2009), and meaning (Littman-Ovadia & Steger, 2010). Preferences of lecturers' personality may be a reflection of what students' hope to achieve (in terms of Character Strengths) out of their experience in university. That is, they match what they believe to be their strengths with those of the potential lecturer.

Furnham and Lester (2012) developed a shorter measure of the original 240-item questionnaire so that participants can rate themselves on the 24 character strengths to produce the six higher order virtues: Wisdom, Courage, Humanity, Justice, Temperance, and Transcendence. These six virtues were associated with the Big Five traits, such that Extraversion was related to all six factors, Agreeableness was related to Humanity, Conscientiousness was positively related to Courage and Temperance, and negatively

correlated to Transcendence (Furnham & Lester, 2012). We therefore hypothesised that Wisdom, associated with Agreeableness, would be a predictor of preferences for Agreeable lecturers.

### **Ethnicity**

Apart from examining personality traits, the present study aims at exploring cross-cultural differences in preferences for lecturer personality types. In this study we compared students from South East Asia/China and Europe, specifically Great Britain. There has been a current revival of interest in understanding the associations between culture and personality (Cheung, van der Vijver & Leong 2011; Eysenck & Barrett, 2013). For instance, South American and European countries were ranked highest on the Openness dimension, while mostly East Asian countries took the bottom positions (Allik & McCrae, 2004). These findings appear to be consistent with the differences in Extraversion and Openness. Hence, with a probable distinctiveness of culture influencing individual's personality, we hypothesised that there will be a significant difference in preferences of lecturer personality in reflection of the students' personality and culture. Thus British Caucasians might value Extraversion and Openness more than the Asians who would value Conscientiousness and Agreeableness more.

The hypotheses of the study were as follows:

1. Students' personalities would be related to the preference of lecturer personalities, such that similarity in all traits but Neuroticism would predict higher ratings. That is correlations between the students' Big Five scores and the Big Five scores of the most desired lecturers' would be significant and positive. These associations would replicate past findings (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2008).
2. Students' CSE scores would predict preferences for Extraverted, Agreeable and Conscientious lecturers, based on significant strong correlations found between CSE traits and Big Five traits (Robins et al., 2001).
3. Students' character strengths would be significantly associated with their preferences for Extraverted, Agreeable and Conscientious lecturers. Wisdom would be related to Openness and Conscientiousness in Lectures while Humanity and Temperance would be associated with a preference for Agreeableness in lecturers. This would be consistent with the modest degree of overlap between personal strengths and Big Five reported by Lounsbury et al. (2003).

4. There would be significant differences between ethnic groups in preferences for lecturer personality, with distinctions between Caucasians and Asians, the latter wanting more Agreeable and Conscientious lecturers.

## Method

### Participants

A total of 260 undergraduate participants from three London based British Universities taking different courses participated in this study. Most were students in the social sciences. Four participants were excluded from the data as more than 10% of the questionnaires were incomplete. In total, there were 173 females and 82 males (5 missing), age ranged from 18 to 23 years ( $M = 21.05$ ,  $SD = 3.07$ ). There were 111 White British Caucasians and 113 South East Asian Chinese (from China) who were not significantly different in age. The remainder came originally from other regions but were fluent in English and studying at London Universities. These included students from Europe (12 Germany, 5 Greece, 3 Italians), 4 Africans, 10 Chinese Malaysians, 6 Afro-Caribbeans. All participants were fluent in English.

### Questionnaires

All participants completed all four questionnaires, either by paper or online. They were completed in this order.

*Lecturer Preference Questionnaire (LPQ)* consists of 30 items, where students were asked to rate the extent to which they like or dislike the personality traits of lecturers. These personality characteristics were derived from the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992) facet sub-scales using the exact label descriptions from the NEO manual. The following were the instructions:

*“This brief questionnaire looks at the sort of characteristics **you** most (and least) want in your lecturers. We want you to think of someone who lectures, gives tutorials or supervises projects. The list below is in fact based on a study that looked at the personality characteristics associated with lecturers. The trait is in italics, the description underneath. Your task is to indicate the extent to which you would like your lectures to have, or not to have, these characteristics.*

*Show your preference by completing the 1- point scale. The more you want that characteristic in your lecturer the higher the positive score (i.e., +4, +5). The less you want those characteristics the higher you circle a negative score (i.e., -4, -5). The middle score (0) means this is not important or relevant to you”*

Short 24-item measure of *Character Strengths* (Furnham & Lester, 2012) based on the traditional VIA-IS (Peterson & Seligman, 2004), was devised to measure six higher order virtues: Wisdom (6 items;  $\alpha = .79$ ), Courage (3 items;  $\alpha = .59$ ), Love (2 items;  $\alpha = .71$ ), Justice (3 items;  $\alpha = .52$ ), Temperance (3 items;  $\alpha = .64$ ) and Transcendence (7 items;  $\alpha = .67$ ).

*Core Self-Evaluation scale* (CSES; Judge et al., 1997) is a 12-item questionnaire developed to operationalise the construct of core self-evaluations. This measure has proved construct and predictive validity in a number of studies. The alpha coefficient for CSES total score for this particular study was .83.

Abbreviated 15-item *Big Five Questionnaire* (McManus & Furnham, 2006) measures the five personality traits. It has proven to be reliable and valid, with at least nine publications utilizing it. The present study's Cronbach's alpha for the five traits, with each subscale consisting of 3 items, were .50, .64, .54, .48 and .67 respectively, indicating adequate internal consistency for looking at population level correlations. These alpha's are typical for this questionnaire which has only 3 items per scale

## **Procedure**

Ethical approval was applied for and granted for the study by the appropriate university committee. Authors of this study engaged purposive sampling to recruit students from various universities and across different disciplines (psychology, economics, business) to take part in this study. Two of the authors were lecturers at different London based universities. Questionnaires were provided via paper or an online survey, with the nature of the research explained before the participants began on the questionnaire. All participants gave their consent to partake in this survey voluntarily.

## **Results**

Students' ratings were then treated to a VARIMAX rotated factor analysis. Five clear factors emerged with nearly all six facets loading on the nominated factor. That is, the facets loaded on the Domains as suggested in the manual. Cronbach's alpha for the factors were Neuroticism .93, Extraversion .63, Openness .76, Agreeableness .80 and Conscientiousness .78.

Table 1 below shows the mean ratings and standard deviation for each of the 30 facets of the NEO-PI-R used by students to rate their preferred personality characteristics of their lecturers. Conscientiousness was rated highest among all other super-traits, especially C1, C2, and C5, while Neuroticism facets received negative evaluations. Two Extraversion (E1 and E6), three Openness facets (O3, O4, and O5), and three Agreeableness facets (A2, A3, and A6) received reasonably positive ratings. Therefore, students appeared to want their lecturers to be highly Conscientious, Agreeable, Extraverted, and Open.

Insert Table 1 here

Table 2 reports the bivariate correlations between predictor variables (students' demographics, personality, character strengths and CSES) and LPQ ratings. Extraverted students were significantly positively correlated with preference for Extraverted lecturers, yet negatively correlated with Agreeable lecturers. Similarly, Open students were significantly positively correlated with Open and Conscientious lecturers, but negatively correlated with preference for Agreeable lecturers. Agreeable students were significantly positively correlated with preferences for Open, Agreeable and Conscientious lecturers, but negatively correlated with preference for Neuroticism. Thus, Agreeable students were more likely to prefer Stable (Non-Neurotic), Open, Agreeable and Conscientious lecturers. Essentially these results support the first hypothesis.

Preferences for Agreeable lecturers were significantly negatively correlated with students' CSES, but positively correlated with ethnicity, and character virtues such as Courage, Love, Justice, and Temperance. Preferences for Conscientious lecturers were significantly positively correlated to character strengths, like Wisdom, Courage, Humanity, and Justice. This partly supports hypotheses 2 and 3.

Insert Table 2 here



Table 3 below shows the summarised results of a series of hierarchal multiple regressions. Overall, five series of regressions were conducted on each of the preferred Big Five traits as criterion. The present study examined whether students' age and gender (Block 1), together with students' Big Five personality traits (Block 2), students' Core self-evaluation scores (Block 3), and students' character strengths (Block 4), would significantly predict preferences for Neurotic, Extraverted, Open, Agreeable, and Conscientious lecturers.

The first series of regression showed that both age and gender were not significant predictors for lecturers' LPQ ratings. When students' personalities were added in the second block, they were significant predictors for Extraverted, Open, Agreeable, and Conscientious lecturers, accounting for an increase in 4.6%, 7%, 8%, and 2.8% of variance respectively. Students' gender, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness and Agreeableness were significant predictors of preference for Agreeable lecturers. Extraversion was a significant predictor for Extraverted lecturers, and Openness was a significant predictor for Conscientious lecturers. High Openness and Agreeableness were significant predictors for preference for Open lecturers.

When CSE scores were included into the regressions, students' personality was only significant for predicting preferences of Agreeable and Conscientious lecturers. Thus the model with students' age, gender, personality and CSE scores accounted for 9.4% of the variance in preferences for Agreeable lecturers, with Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and CSE scores as significant predictors. In addition, 5.1% of the variance in preferences for Conscientious lecturers was accounted for in this model, with Neuroticism, Openness, and CSE scores as significant predictors.

When students' character strengths (6 higher order virtues) were included into the regressions, only preference of Agreeable lecturers was significant, accounting for 14% of the variance. The significant predictors were gender, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness Conscientiousness and Love. The Virtues added a small amount of incremental variance.

Insert Table 3 here

Because of numbers, the group was split into two groups: White/Caucasian ( $N = 111$ )

and Asian ( $N = 113$ ). Analysis of variance showed the two groups did not differ in their own personality except Asian students were slightly more Conscientious ( $F(1,222) = 4.23, p < .05$ ). However there were significant preferences of lecturer personalities, with Whites preferring lectures being less Neurotic ( $F(1, 222) = 10.73, p < .001$ ), Extraverted ( $F(1,222) = 23.33, p < .001$ ) Open ( $F(1,222) = 11.08, p < .001$ ) and Agreeable ( $F(1,222) = 11.11, p < .001$ ). A fifth step in the regression was done adding ethnicity but there was little evidence of incremental validity for this step.

## Discussion

In this study we predicted that the Big Five personality traits, other than Neuroticism, would be significant predictors of corresponding preferences for lecturer personality. Results showed that students' Big Five personality traits were indeed significant predictors for all traits except Neuroticism, regardless of age and gender. This was consistent with past findings (Furnham & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2005; Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2008). Neuroticism (Emotional Instability) was unanimously reported to be the least preferred trait in lecturers, and therefore there is no reason to assume less emotionally stable students would prefer lecturers with similar Neuroticism scores. Indeed, Emotional Stability is highly prized by students of their lecturers. They want then to be resilient, able to cope with stress and stable as opposed to being moody. In this sense it was surprising that there was no significant negative correlation and more emotionally unstable students may seek out particularly stable lecturers. However, this may have occurred because overall the students were more emotionally stable than average.

However, the first hypothesis was partially supported as detailed analysis of specific personality predictors indicated students' Extraversion as a significant predictor for Extraverted lecturers, Openness for Open lecturers, Agreeableness for Agreeable lecturers, yet Conscientiousness was not a significant predictor for Conscientious lecturers, though students' Openness was related to a preference for Conscientious lecturers. A possible explanation for this may be that because Conscientious students are intrinsically motivated, whereas Open students require more external validation to make them feel motivated, and therefore are more inclined to have competent lecturers who would diligently provide feedback.

Overall, students' Big Five personality accounted for the greatest increase in variance

within the hierarchical regressions, hence suggesting they are better predictors for preferences of lecturer personality than CSE, character strengths, and demographic variables. However, all these variables accounted for a relatively small amount in the variance (15% at most) so the question arises as to what other factors could account for the variance. These might include the way lecturers evaluate courses, whether there are lectures as opposed to seminars and what sort of assignments are required.

It was also predicted that Core Self-Evaluations would predict preferences for lecturer personality, similar to that of Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Conscientiousness, due to the strong correlations found between Core self-evaluation traits and these Big Five traits (Robins et al., 2001). The results demonstrated a partial support for this hypothesis, with CSE scores being a significant predictor for Agreeable and Conscientious lecturers, but not Extraverted. A possible explanation for this finding could be based on Judge and Bono's (2001) postulation that CSE might be a broad, inclusive measurement of Emotional Stability (low Neuroticism), as all four traits share conceptual similarity and strong inter-correlations. This explanation supports the present study's results that CSE is a significant predictor of preferences for Agreeable lecturers, similar to that predicted by students' Neuroticism. Furthermore, core self-beliefs were negatively associated with preference for Agreeableness, thus suggesting that students with low CSE scores tended to rate higher for Agreeable lecturers. This may be due to CSEs' relation to self-esteem, such that students with lower CSE scores represented lower self-esteem, thus they would prefer Agreeable lecturers who are more forgiving and supportive.

Character Strengths, systematically related to the Big Five, were also examined (Lounsbury et al., 2009). However, the regression analysis showed that Character Strengths were only significant for predicting preferences for Agreeable lecturers, specifically by the Humanity factor, which supports our hypothesis. Moreover, the correlational analysis conducted in this study demonstrated conflicting associations with Big Five traits reported previously (Lounsbury et al., 2009). A potential explanation to the inconsistent findings could be due to the relatively new construct of the Character Strengths measure (Furnham & Lester, 2012) used in the present study, as it was reported that the factor analysis of the 24-items did not provide a clear support for the classification into the six higher order virtues as theorised by Peterson and Seligman (2004).

A significant ethnicity main effect was found for preferences for all personality traits except Conscientiousness. The effect of ethnicity was predicted due to known differences in personality across cultures (Allik & McCrae, 2004), and was reinforced in the present study's findings. Results depicted that Caucasian students had a stronger dislike for Neurotic lecturers, while Asians had higher preferences for Extraverted, Open, and Agreeable lecturers.

The present study was subjected to limitations of method invariance, since all questionnaires were self-report measures, social desirability and individual's impression management during the survey, may have distorted both students' self- and lecturers' ratings of personality. A possible solution would be utilising observer's measure of the personality traits, to reduce the biasness in the data collected. We also had a relative small sample of students from two London based universities. It is always desirable to have large representative samples. In this study there was a gender imbalance with many more females than males and students mainly from the social sciences. Whereas both this and other studies have indicated few sex and age differences in lecture preference it is always preferable to have large samples. Third, though we were able to investigate ethnic differences our sample was relatively small and restricted to two different cultures. Given that there are clear differences in the educational values and practices in different countries that must influence student expectations, this area of research deserves further investigation with a bigger and more representative sample from different culture and ethnicity groups.

One suggestion for further studies would be to examine congruency of students' and lecturers' personality, as well as students' academic performances, so as to determine with congruency had positive educational outcomes. Equally it is worth pursuing the idea that lectures' personality predicts such things as their teaching and evaluation style and that this is what influences students most where they have choice of a lecturer.

There are implications of this study for teaching practice. First, it demonstrates the personality related behaviors that students' value, which could have implications for lecturer selection and training. Clearly Agreeable and Conscientious behaviors are valued and can be taught and learnt. Second, with many degree courses having "electives" it is worth investigating whether choices are most often made on the topic/area of the course or by the personality and reputation of the lecturer. This could easily lead to an imbalance in

educational experiences in some institutions where various lecturers are assiduously sought out or avoided. Third, the study has implications for how courses are evaluated and how these evaluations are made public such that they influence student choice. It is apparent from table one that some personality related behaviours are more highly valued than others: being straight-forward, warm, orderly and self-disciplined.

## **References**

- Ackerman, P. L., & Heggestad, E. D. (1997). Intelligence, personality, and interests: Evidence for overlapping traits. *Psychological Bulletin*, *121*, 219-245.
- Allik, J., & McCrae, R. R. (2004). Towards a geography of personality traits: Patterns of profiles across 36 cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *35*, 13-28
- Barelds, D.P.H., & Barelds-Dijkstra, P., (2007). Love at first sight or friends first? Ties among partner personality trait similarity, relationship onset, relationship quality, and love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *24*, 476-496.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Furnham, A., Christopher, A.N., Garwood, J., & Martin, G.N. (2008). Birds of a feather: Students' preferences for lecturers' personalities as predicted by their own personality and learning approaches. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *44*, 965-976.
- Cheung, F., van de Vijver, F., & Leong, F. (2011). Toward a new approach to the study of personality in culture. *American Psychologist*, *66*, 593-603.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Doyle, W., & Rutherford, B. (1984). Classroom research on matching learning and teaching styles. *Theory into Practice*, *23*, 20–25.
- Eysenck, S., & Barrett, P. (2013). Re-introduction to cross-cultural studies of the EPQ. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*, 485-489.
- Farmer, R. F., Jarvis, L. L., Berent, M. K., & Corbett, A. (2001). Contributions to global self-esteem: The role of importance attached to self-concepts associated with the Five-Factor Model. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *35*, 483-499.
- Furnham, A. (2012). Intelligence and intellectual styles. In L-F Zhang, R. Sternberg and S. Rayner. (Eds). *Handbook of Intellectual Styles: Preferences in Cognition, Learning and Thinking*. New York: Springer, pp. 173-192
- Furnham, A., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2005). Individual differences in students' preferences for lecturers' personalities. *Journal of Individual Differences*, *26*, 176-184.
- Furnham, A. & Lester, D. (2012). The development of a short measure of character strength. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *28*, 95-101.
- Furnham, A., McManus, I.C., & Scott, D. (2003). Personality, empathy and attitudes to animal welfare. *Anthrozoos*, *16*, 135-146.

- Holland, J. (1997). *Making vocational choices* (3rd Ed.). Berlin Englewood cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 80–92.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19, 151–188.
- Littman-Ovadia, H., & Steger, M. (2010). Character strengths and well-being among volunteers and employees: Toward an integrative model. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 5, 419-430.
- Lounsbury, J. W., Fisher, L. A., Levy, J. J., & Welsh, D. P. (2009). An investigation of character strengths in relation to the academic success of college students. *Individual Differences Research*, 7, 52-69.
- Lounsbury, J. W., Sundstrom, E., Loveland, J. M., & Gibson, L. W. (2003) Intelligence, “Big Five” personality traits, and work drive as predictors of course grade. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 1231-1239.
- Marsh, H. (1987). Students’ evaluations of university teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 11, 253–288.
- McManus, I.C., & Furnham, A. (2006). Aesthetic activities and aesthetic attitudes: Influences of education, background and personality on interest and involvement in the arts. *British Journal of Psychology*, 97, 555-587.
- Olivares, O. (2001). Student interest, grading leniency and teacher ratings. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 26, 382–399.
- Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2009). Strengths of character in schools. In R. Gilman, E. S. Huebner, & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology in Schools* (pp. 65-76). New York: Routledge.
- Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Strengths of character and well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 23, 603–619.
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. New York: Oxford University Press/Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Robins, R. W., Tracy, J. D., Trzesniewski, K., Potter, J., & Gosling, S. D. (2001). Personality correlates of self-esteem. *Journal of Research in Personality, 35*, 463-482.
- Rothman, S., Basson, W., & Rothman, J. (2000). Personality preference of lecturers and students at a pharmacy school. *International Journal of Pharmacy, 8*, 6-9.
- Rushton, J., Murray, H., & Paunonen, S. (1987). Personality characteristics associated with higher research productivity. In D. Jackson & J. Rushton (Eds), *Scientific Excellence* (pp. 129– 148). London: Sage.
- Selfout, M., Burk, W., Branje, S., Denissen, J., van Aken, M., & Meeus, W. (2010). Emerging late adolescent friendship networks and Big Five personality traits: A social network approach. *Journal of Personality, 78*, 509-538.
- Zhang, L.-F. (2004). Do university students' thinking styles matter in their preferred teacher approaches? *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*, 1551–1564.



Table 1

*Students' mean preference ratings and standard deviation for lecturer personality super- and primary-traits*

Big Five traits	Mean	SD
Neuroticism:	-22.14	10.01
N1: Anxiety	-3.57	2.10
N2: Angry Hostility	-3.87	1.92
N3: Depressive	-3.92	1.78
N4: Self-conscious	-3.34	2.00
N5: Impulsive	-3.48	2.07
N6: Vulnerable	-3.84	1.83
Extraversion:	13.82	6.57
E1: Warmth	3.60	1.19
E2: Gregarious	2.23	1.91
E3: Assertiveness	1.76	2.07
E4: Activity oriented	0.84	2.32
E5: Excitement-seeking	1.90	2.01
E6: Positive emotions	3.48	1.24
Openness:	8.77	8.31
O1: Fantasy life	0.69	2.37
O2: Interested in aesthetics	1.24	2.19
O3: Interested in feelings	2.13	1.82
O4: Action oriented	2.32	1.61
O5: Ideas oriented	2.59	1.59
O6: Values oriented	-0.29	2.59
Agreeableness:	14.13	10.36
A1: Trusting	1.98	1.90
A2: Straightforward	2.28	2.20
A3: Altruistic	2.60	1.81
A4: Compliant	1.15	2.54
A5: Modest	1.29	2.47
A6: Tender-Minded	2.26	1.71
Conscientiousness:	18.93	6.60
C1: Competence	3.83	1.13
C2: Orderly	3.78	1.33
C3: Dutiful	2.72	1.89
C4: Achievement-striving	2.94	1.56
C5: Self-disciplined	3.40	1.40
C6: Deliberate	2.23	2.02

Table 2

*Correlations of Lecturers' personality with Students' demographics, personality, CSES, and character strengths*

		Lecturers'				
Factors		N	E	O	A	C
Students'	N	.04	-.11	-.00	.10	.07
	E	-.05	.21**	.11	-.17**	.03
	O	.11	.10	.26**	-.13*	.14*
	A	-.19**	-.02	.13*	.16*	.13*
	C	-.08	-.05	-.02	.05	.12*
	CSES	-.08	.07	-.02	-.13*	.11
	Wisdom	-.04	.06	.12*	-.04	.14*
	Courage	-.00	-.01	.08	.14*	.21**
	Humanity	-.10	-.06	.05	.22**	.14*
	Justice	-.09	.08	.04	.14*	.17**
	Temperance	-.04	-.10	.06	.15*	.12*
	Transcendence	.02	.13*	.15*	.02	.07
	Age	-.07	-.07	-.02	.04	.02
	Gender	-.11	-.09	-.01	-.06	.10
	Ethnicity	.22**	.32**	.22**	.22**	.09

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Note the *N* for ethnicity was 222, with Caucasian/White = 1 and Asian/Chinese = 2

Table 3

*Hierarchical regressions of students' age & gender, big five personality super-traits, personal strengths, and CSES as predictors of LPQ ratings*

		Lecturers'									
		N		E		O		A		C	
		$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t
Students'											
Step 1	Age	-.070	1.13	-.077	1.24	-.017	.270	.034	.553	.019	.313
	Sex	-.106	1.71	-.094	1.51	-.010	.167	-.055	-.890	.103	1.66
<i>F</i>		$F(2,257) =$		$F(2,257) =$		$F(2,257) =$		$F(2,257) =$		$F(2,257) =$	
		2.02		1.83		.049		.571		1.40	
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>		.015		.014		.000		.004		.011	
Adj <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>		.008		.006		-.007		-.003		.003	
Step 2	Age	-.067	1.07	-.034	.549	.003	.056	-.025	.405	.003	.043
	Sex	-.064	.979	-.054	.836	-.001	-.015	-.148	2.34*	.069	1.06
	N	.051	.818	-.094	1.52	.005	.085	.133	2.17*	.066	1.05
	E	-.044	.685*	.233	3.64*	.100	1.58	-.207	3.29*	-.017	.262
	O	.094	1.52	.067	1.09	.254	4.18*	-.119	1.97*	.160	2.58*
	A	-.160	2.49	.003	.044	.140	2.24*	.186	2.98*	.098	1.54
	C	.001	.012	-.103	1.54	-.063	.950	.095	1.46	.106	1.58
<i>F</i>		$F(5,252) =$		$F(5,252) =$		$F(5,252) =$		$F(5,252) =$		$F(5,252) =$	
		2.10		3.45**		5.27**		5.71**		2.54*	
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>		.055		.077		.095		.106		.058	
Adj <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>		.029		.052		.070		.081		.032	
Step 3	Age	-.069	1.09	-.034	.542	.003	.046	-.028	.468	.007	.111
	Sex	-.077	1.16	-.051	.773	-.006	.087	-.176	2.74	.100	1.53
	N	.013	.177	-.085	1.17	-.009	.119	.052	.729	.159	2.18*
	E	-.041	.631	.232	3.62	.101	1.59	-.200	3.20*	-.025	.394
	O	.093	1.50	.067	1.09	.253	4.16	-.121	2.02*	.162	2.65*
	A	-.157	2.46	.002	.037	.141	2.25	.190	3.07*	.093	1.47
	C	.025	.345	-.108	1.53	-.054	.771	.146	2.11*	.048	.683
	CSES	-.078	.999	.018	.231	-.028	.367	-.165	2.18*	.189	2.45*
<i>F</i>		$F(1,251) =$		$F(1,251) =$		$F(1,251) =$		$F(1,251) =$		$F(1,251) =$	
		.998		.053		.135		4.77*		6.00*	
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>		.059		.077		.096		.122		.080	
Adj <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>		.029		.048		.067		.094		.051	
Step 4	Age	-.065	.989	-.026	.404	-.013	.195	-.058	.951	-.025	.396
	Sex	-.079	1.15	-.062	.929	.008	.127	-.171	2.68*	.120	1.82
	N	.001	.019	-.081	1.10	-.015	.198	.014	.199	.147	2.01*
	E	-.046	.647	.207	2.97	.116	1.67	-.183	2.75*	-.002	.022
	O	.083	1.22	.044	.662	.232	3.47	-.089	1.38*	.182	2.74*
	A	-.156	2.35	.020	.314	.140	2.15	.141	2.27*	.077	1.19
	C	.036	.481	-.093	1.27	-.083	1.14	.069	.989*	.001	.014

	CSES	-.088	1.07	.021	.259	-.056	.697	-.188	2.46*	.164	2.07*
	Wis	-.041	.491	.005	.056	-.005	.062	-.143	1.83	-.023	.284
	Cour	.072	.861	-.016	.200	0.03	.339	.104	1.33	.123	1.53
	Hum	-.027	.358	-.087	1.17	-.009	.126	.190	2.66*	.034	0.46
	Just	-.078	1.16	.114	1.72	.033	.492	.081	1.28	.140	2.13*
	Temp	-.033	.447	-.084	1.16	.069	.951	.070	1.00	.035	0.49
	Trans	.040	.572	.117	1.71	.064	.932	.026	.391	-.064	.950
<i>F</i>		<i>F</i> (6,245) =		<i>F</i> (6,245) =		<i>F</i> (6,245) =		<i>F</i> (6,245) =		<i>F</i> (6,245) =	
		.436		1.39		.592		3.20**		2.08	
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>		.068		.108		.108		.186		.125	
Adj <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>		.015		.057		.059		.140		.075	

Note: \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ , N = Neuroticism, E = Extraversion, O = Openness, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, CSES = Core self-evaluation scores, Wis = Wisdom, Cour = Courage, Hum = Humanity Just = Justice, Temp = Temperance, Trans = Transcendence; Gender coded 0 = Male, 1 = Female.