

Marshall University

## Marshall Digital Scholar

---

Theses, Dissertations and Capstones

---

1986

### Compliance patterns and teacher personalities in private and public school organizations in West Virginia

Raymond Augustine Dunleavy

Follow this and additional works at: <https://mds.marshall.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Dunleavy, Raymond Augustine, "Compliance patterns and teacher personalities in private and public school organizations in West Virginia" (1986). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. 1474.  
<https://mds.marshall.edu/etd/1474>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact [zhangj@marshall.edu](mailto:zhangj@marshall.edu), [beachgr@marshall.edu](mailto:beachgr@marshall.edu).

COMPLIANCE PATTERNS AND TEACHER PERSONALITIES IN  
PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONS  
IN WEST VIRGINIA

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty  
of  
West Virginia University  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
The Degree of Doctor of Education

by

Raymond Augustine Dunleavy, M.A.

Morgantown

West Virginia

1986

COPYRIGHT 1986

RAYMOND AUGUSTINE DUNLEAVY

## Acknowledgements

The successful completion of this research was made possible by the helpful contributions of a number of people. In this section I would like to express my gratitude to those individuals most directly involved in the project. First, I would like to acknowledge my dissertation committee of Professors David Acord, John Andes, Patricia O'Reilly, Powell Toth, Ken Young, and Richard Hartnett for their commitment of time and energy and for their valuable input at various phases of the investigation. I am indebted to the many private and public school teachers and principals who gave of their time and effort to participate in the study.

Numerous individuals at both West Virginia University and West Virginia College of Graduate Studies provided invaluable assistance. Richard Hartnett has been a constant source of encouragement and inspiration. He provided continued moral support and exceptional guidance throughout the three year project. Wayne Zirk donated many hours of his time assisting me in applying nonparametric and parametric methods of statistical analysis to the test data. Sue Forrest provided outstanding support in researching the literature on a very exclusive subject and Lois McCarty

helped me in using the computer facilities effectively. I would like to acknowledge the help of Jean Sealey in editing and typing the manuscript. Finally, I am especially grateful to my wife Betty, whose continued patience and understanding enabled me to do the research.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements . . . . .	iii
Table of Contents . . . . .	v
List of Tables . . . . .	vii
Chapter 1. Introduction . . . . .	1
Purpose . . . . .	4
Significance . . . . .	5
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	5
Definition of Terms . . . . .	6
Limitations . . . . .	8
Summary . . . . .	9
Chapter 2. Review of the Literature . . . . .	11
Compliance Theory . . . . .	11
Compliance Orientation of School Organizations . . . . .	16
Compliance-Personality Relationships . . . . .	20
Summary . . . . .	24
Chapter 3. Method . . . . .	25
Subjects . . . . .	26
Procedure . . . . .	27
Instrumentation . . . . .	28
Data Collection . . . . .	34
Data Treatment . . . . .	34
Summary . . . . .	35
Chapter 4. Results and Discussion . . . . .	36
Administrator Compliance Orientations . . . . .	38
PRF-E Normative Data . . . . .	41
PRF-E Teacher Organizational Data . . . . .	47
Administrator Compliance Orientation- Teacher Personality Trait Relationships . . . . .	51
Chapter 5. Conclusions and Recommendations . . . . .	56
Conclusions . . . . .	57
Recommendations . . . . .	61
Future Research . . . . .	62
References . . . . .	64

APPENDICES:

A. Description of PRF-E Personality Traits . .	68
B. Study materials . . . . .	75
C. Principal Evaluation Instruments . . . . .	78
Abstract . . . . .	38

## List of Tables

Table 1 - Typology of Compliance Relations . . . . .	15
Table 2 - Comparison of Characteristics of Private and Public School Organizations . . . . .	37
Table 3 - Administrator Compliance Orientation in Private and Public School Organizations . . . . .	40
Table 4 - Teacher Group and Norm Group PRF-E Scale Scores . . . . .	43
Table 5 - Comparison of Teacher Personality Profiles . . . . .	46
Table 6 - Private and Public School Organizations PRF-E Scale Scores . . . . .	48
Table 7 - Administrator Compliance Orientation and Teacher Personality Trait Relationships . . . . .	52
Table 8 - Personality Trait Relationships . . . . .	54



## CHAPTER 1

### Introduction

The people of West Virginia are becoming increasingly disturbed by widespread reports and personal experiences that indicate a decline in the quality of public school education. Their dissatisfaction is reflected in the growing number of parents in West Virginia who are choosing private schools for the education of their children. Between 1980 and 1985, private school enrollments in kindergarten through the twelfth grade increased nearly 5% while public school enrollments in the same grades decreased almost 6% (Truby, 1980-81 to 1984-85). These are conservative estimates because not all private schools report enrollment figures.

Private education in the United States has become a topic of great interest and controversy. Until recently, children attended private school almost unnoticed, but today these schools are growing so rapidly in numbers and enrollment that they are attracting public attention. If the private sector grows at the present rate, by 1990 it will enroll 15 percent of all elementary and secondary school students (Cooper, 1985). The researcher reported data pertaining to the shifting make-up of the private

educational sector: its size, composition, location, and implications. It seemed clear that the private school sector has been redefined. What was previously a Catholic, ethnic, and immigrant phenomenon, with nine out of ten private school students enrolled in Catholic schools in 1960, has now become diverse, Protestant, Jewish and Catholic. The mix of private schools created a panoply of religious, social, ethnic, and class groups, all finding something of value in the private sector. Roman Catholic enrollments still dominate the private sector with 56 percent or 2.9 million students in 1985.

Private schools are no longer located primarily in the ethnic centers of the East and Great Lakes regions. Surveying private schools by location showed Christian academic to be in small inland towns where no one had even heard of private education 20 years ago. Private schools have become mainstream, southern, far west and Sun Belt. Many families want these schools and are willing to put out effort, time and money to establish and support them.

This new-found diversity means many more families have local options for educating their children, religious, social, and academic, and families will pay for those things if the local public schools cannot

supply them. It will become more difficult for elected officials in Washington, D.C., and the state capitals to ignore the needs of private schools. As private schools gain political clout and go to court, the law may be changed or reinterpreted to accommodate the needs of these schools.

There have been numerous efforts in Congress and at the state level to provide financial assistance to private schools. Proposals for tuition tax benefits have been heard in the U.S. Senate and some state legislatures, and are supported by the current administration. Education voucher plans reappear periodically, often proposed as voter initiatives. Furthermore, aid to private schools is provided in some 30 states already, in the form of assistance for transportation or textbook costs (Catterall, 1985).

The national preoccupation with "excellence in education" is also engendering interest in private education. It has been suggested that the nation's private schools might provide examples of effective schooling to their public counterparts. Recent comparisons of public and private schools are producing vigorous debate and provide impetus for further study (Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore, 1981; Sassenrath, Croce and Pensaloza, 1984).

### Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to explore administrator compliance orientation and teacher personality differences between private and public school organizations in West Virginia. The research premise was that the excessive use of coercive compliance by the school organization resulted in alienation among the teacher participants. The alienation of teachers created a hostile work environment that detrimentally affected the personality that the teachers exhibited toward organizational participants. It was hypothesized that the administrator compliance orientation of private and public school organizations differ, and that this difference was reflected in the personality of teacher organizational participants. An exploration of teacher personalities in school organizations was important for several reasons. (1) It offered clues to the question of why individuals chose teaching as a profession. (2) It provided insights into concepts such as teacher job satisfaction, and morale. (3) It examined the relative congruence between a teacher's internalized needs and the demands of the work situation. The research built on the theoretical personality model of Harry A. Murray (1963:36-141). Murray explained behavior as an outcome

of the relationship between the individual and his or her situational environment, in this study, the private and public school organizational environments. According to Murray, environmental presses were external situational counterparts to internalized personality needs, and behavior in the environment was a function of the congruence between need and press.

### Significance

The trend of increasing private school enrollment posed an obvious threat to the status quo of public school education in West Virginia. A reform in the public school organization to improve the quality of education was necessary if the present-day public school system was to survive. Educational decisionmakers needed data-based information from quality research to improve conditions in West Virginia's public schools. The goal of this research was to help fulfill that need.

### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between the administrator compliance orientation of the school organization and the personality of teacher participants within the organization. The school organizations in this study

were the Catholic private and the public school organizations in West Virginia.

These research questions were addressed:

1. Is there a significant difference (.05 level of significance) between the compliance patterns of private and public school organizations?

2. Is there a significant difference (.05 level of significance) between the personalities of private and public school organization teachers?

3. Is there a relationship (.05 level of significance) between the compliance pattern of the school organization and the personality of teacher organizational participants?

#### Definition of Terms

Compliance. Compliance refers to a relationship consisting of the power employed by superiors to control subordinates and the orientation of the subordinates to this power (Etzioni, 1975:xv).

Administrator Compliance Orientation. The administrator compliance orientation in the school organization refers to the type or combination of types of power employed by the school administrator to control his/her teacher subordinates. Etzioni (1975:5) delineates three basic types of power. Each is

characterized by the means used to obtain compliance: coercive compliance relies on the threat or actual use of physical functions; remunerative compliance flows from control over reward systems such as salaries and wages; and, normative compliance is derived from the capacity to allocate and manipulate reinforcers.

Personality. The term personality has many definitions. No single meaning is accepted universally. Nevertheless, a common theme runs throughout most definitions of personality. Personality usually refers to the distinctive patterns of behavior that characterize an individual's adaptation to his or her total environment. Guilford (1959) tells us that personality is a person's unique pattern of traits. Guilford's definition is the one of choice in this research. Personality traits in this study are personality variables which are based upon the list of manifest needs proposed by H. A. Murray (1963:141-242).

Need. Murray (1963:123-124) defines a need as "a construct (a convenient fictional or hypothetical concept) which stands for a force (the physiochemical nature of which is unknown) in the brain region, a force which organizes perception, apperception, intellection, conation and action in such a way as to transform in a certain direction an existing, unsatisfying situation."

The criterion for the existence of a need is the occurrence of a wish or resolution to do a certain thing (to bring about a certain effect). Murray postulates that need structures are developed in the early years of the life cycle, but the need structure can be changed by society and by the environment. Murray explains differences in personality as differences in need structures and need strengths. According to Murray, the concept of "need" represents the significant determinants of behavior within a person.

Press. Murray (1963:121) defines press as "a property or attribute of an environmental object or person which facilitates or impedes the efforts of the individual to reach a given goal." Press is linked to persons or objects that have direct implementation for the efforts of an individual to satisfy his need strivings. The concept of "press" represents the effective or significant determinant of behavior in the environment.

Catholic Private School. A school which is independent of the local diocese and which operates from a local parish (Chambers, 1985).

### Limitations

There were limitations due to the nature of the



study that affected the <sup>generalizability</sup> generalizability and significance of the research.

1. The small number of administrator subjects in the school organizational groups affected the power to detect compliance orientation-personality trait relationships. This necessitated the use of nonparametric techniques for statistical analyses of the data which negated the application of variable interactions for data interpretation.

2. The compliance orientation of the school principal represented the administrator compliance orientation of the school organization. This limited the compliance orientation statistic to that of first line supervision.

3. The study was restricted to Catholic private and public school organizations in West Virginia.

4. The research was restricted to female elementary school teacher subjects because of the scarcity of male elementary school teachers and of Catholic private secondary schools in the population sample selected for study.

### Summary

In this chapter the need for data-based information to provide for intelligent decisionmaking in improvement

of the quality of education in West Virginia's public schools was stressed. A link was made between Etzioni's conceptualization of compliance and Murray's theoretical model of personality for comparison of private and public school organizations. The research questions were presented and major variables were operationally defined.

## CHAPTER 2

## Review of the Literature

Little research has been performed that directly addressed the relationship between the administrator compliance orientation of the private and public school organizations and the personality of teacher organizational participants. This chapter reviews (1) Etzioni's compliance theory, (2) the compliance orientation of school organizations, and (3) the significant and apparently overlooked research study by Guba, Jackson, and Bidwell (1959) on personality traits of public school teachers.

Compliance Theory

Compliance is universal, existing in all social units. It is a major element of the relationship between those who have power and those over whom they exercise it (Simmel, 1896). Etzioni (1961) chooses compliance as a base for his comparative study of organizations because it is a central element of organizational structure. Characteristics of organizations such as their size complexity, and effectiveness enhance the need for compliance. And in turn, compliance is systematically related to many

central organizational variables.

Etzioni's (1975:3) compliance theory focuses on a relation "in which an actor behaves in accordance with a directive supported by another actor's power, and to the orientation of the subordinate actor to the power applied." Three basic types of power are delineated by the theory, and each is characterized by the means used to obtain compliance. Coercive compliance relies on the threat, or actual use, of physical functions; remunerative compliance flows from control over reward systems, such as salaries and wages; and, normative compliance is derived from the capacity to allocate and manipulate reinforcers (Etzioni, 1975:5).

The exercise of any one type of power influences the orientation that participants have, or will develop, toward the organization. Orientations are described in terms of intensity of involvement in the organization. Etzioni describes three basic patterns of involvement. Alienative involvement reflects an intense negative orientation toward the organization. Calculative involvement is associated with either a weak positive or negative involvement. Moral involvement implies an intensively positive orientation. Etzioni argues that the exercise of coercive power typically leads to alienative involvement; remunerative power to calculative

involvement; and, normative power to moral involvement (Etzioni, 1975:9-10).

Etzioni (1975:12) depicts compliance as the relationship between the power applied by the organization to lower participants, and the involvement in the organization developed by lower participants. There are two parties to a compliance relationship: an actor who exercises power, and an actor, subject to this power, who responds to this subjection with either more or less alienation or more or less commitment. According to Etzioni, the former is considered the higher participant and the latter the lower participant in the organizational structure.

Combining three types of power with three kinds of involvement produces nine types of compliance, as shown in Table 1. The nine types are not equally likely to occur empirically. Three--the diagonal cases, 1, 5, and 9--are formed more frequently than the other six types. This seems to be true because these three types constitute congruent relationships, where the other six do not. Congruent cases are more frequent than noncongruent ones primarily because congruence is more effective, and organization and social units are under external and internal pressure to be effective. The three congruent types of compliance, the coercive

power--alienative involvement, the remunerative power--calculative involvement and the normative power--moral involvement relationships form the basis of Etzioni's compliance theory. The coercive-alienative relationship is referred to as coercive compliance, the remunerative-calculative type as remunerative or utilitarian compliance and the normative-moral type as normative compliance.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

The assumption underlying Etzioni's theory of compliance is that there are three major sources of control, whose allocation and manipulation account to a great extent for the foundations of social order. These control sources are coercion, economic assets, and normative values. Social relationships differ in the relative predominance of this or that kind of control; but none has a priori superiority, nor is there one which, as a rule, is more powerful. Accordingly, three types of compliance serve as a basis for the comparison between organizations: coercive, remunerative, and normative compliances, each representing one type of social order.

Etzioni is concerned primarily with the relationship

Table 1  
Typology of Compliance Relations

<u>Kinds of Power</u>	<u>Kinds of Involvement</u>		
	<u>Alienative</u>	<u>Calculative</u>	<u>Moral</u>
Coercive	1	2	3
Remunerative	4	5	6
Normative	7	8	9

of organizational compliance and other organizational variables which he terms the correlates of compliance. He is only in a limited way concerned with the relationship among the variables. For example, Etzioni explores the relationship between compliance and cohesion, and between compliance and leadership, but not between cohesion and leadership.

Since the original publication of the compliance theory in 1961, more than sixty studies have been undertaken to test one or another part of the compliance theory or to contribute to it by extending its scope. Etzioni (1975), in his revised publication, extensively reviewed all studies. He argued that, when reviewed together, the studies shed fresh light on all the elements of the compliance theory. Although a few of these studies cast doubt on the validity or usefulness of some of the original propositions and although the studies vary considerably in methodological strength and data base, the general picture that emerged is one of substantial and specific support for Etzioni's work. On balance the evidence seemed to strengthen the compliance theory.

#### Compliance Orientation of School Organizations

Compliance theory has generally depicted school



organizations as having dual compliance structures which reflect elements of both normative and coercive compliance, with a much heavier emphasis on normative compliance (Etzioni, 1975:45-49). However, Thomas, Kreps and Cage (1977), in an elaboration of compliance theory, contend that coercive compliance is often more heavily emphasized in the educational organization than is normative compliance. These researchers suggested that the type of compliance school officials might claim to exercise (normative compliance) differed from the type that was actually reflected in their daily activities (coercive compliance).

The researchers contend that schools can be viewed as organizations which actively pursue both control and change goals within a single organization. Therefore, on an operational level, the requirement that social control be maintained over those who are required by law to remain as organizational participants encourages the incorporation of elements of coercive power in school organizations. This can, in turn, stimulate relatively high levels of alienation among students, alienation which fosters negative affect toward school personnel, the goals of the school organization, and personal involvement in the school.

There is a notable lack of research comparing

private and public school organizations especially in the area of the compliance orientation of the school organization. This lack of specific knowledge partly accounts for the impact of the claims that private schools are better run than public schools. In the wake of controversy surrounding such claims, numerous critics have enumerated unique organizational advantages of private schools, and studies across the two sectors have been conducted. In spite of the limited data and range of analysis, it is now possible to identify realistic organizational conditions that distinguish the school sectors (Talbert, 1985).

The selectivity of private school students is cited as the most often noted and perhaps the most important difference between private and public school organizations. Private schools' selective recruitment and retention of students, teachers, and parents enables them to forge value communities and maintain acceptable levels of academic performance. This condition of private school organization facilitates good convergence among the staff, teacher collegiality, high expectations for student success, discipline and order, as well as a sense of community.

Public schools rule of selection by residence yields widely varying mixes of student aptitudes,

values, and educational goals. Further, public schools are more or less open to the proliferation of laws and centrally controlled programs aimed at special student populations. The only administrative layer within the Catholic private school organization at all comparable to the district level in public school organizations is the diocesan structure within the Catholic private school system. The diocesan administrative staff is usually small. For example, in the study cited, seven administrators and two clerical persons administered a system containing 94 schools. Given the size of these systems, it is not surprising that the administrators perform mostly staff functions such as collecting system-wide data on student performance and teacher qualifications and conducting training workshops rather than establishing administrative educational policies for the school system.

Within the public sector, with fragmented authority for education at the national, state, and local levels along with the lack of integration across levels, the resulting educational system is one of considerable disorder. The authority of local education agencies and the influence of local interests have been displaced by centralization. They have been supplemented by the growth of power at the state and national level. The

change has layered authorities over one another, each claiming the prerogative of making some types of educational decisions. The growth of educational authority at the state and federal levels has led to a monolithic concentration of authority at higher levels. It has grown up side by side with the establishment of independent authorities, separate responsibilities, and overlapping jurisdiction. Because of these trends, the environment of public schooling as an institution has become more complex and ambiguous in recent decades.

The authority principles recognized by school constituencies appear to define and constrain school organizational patterns within school sectors. The rational-legal model of organization and authority governs public schools, while private schools either embrace the traditional model established in religious organizations or follow a market model, offering alternatives to the dominant norms and hierarchical organizations of established school sectors.

#### Compliance-Personality Relationships

Before the original publication of the compliance theory by Etzioni in 1961, Guba, Jackson and Bidwell (1959) explored the compliance-personality relationship in a public school organization using organizational

administrators and teachers as subjects for the research. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1954) was administered to 366 public school teachers in 22 schools in the suburban areas of Chicago. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) is a paired-comparison type of questionnaire which purported to measure a number of normal personality variables based upon the manifest needs proposed by Murray (1963). Murray's manifest needs measured by the EPPS are described below.

Abasement: to feel timid and inferior to others and accept blame for things that go wrong.

Achievement: to accomplish demanding tasks; to be able to do things better than others.

Affiliation: to form many strong friendships and to share experiences.

Aggression: to show anger and criticize others openly.

Autonomy: to act without regard to the opinion of others.

Change: to seek new experiences and new acquaintances.

Deference: to yield to the leadership and judgment of others.

Dominance: to lead; to make decisions and to

influence others.

Endurance: to work at a task until it is completed.

Exhibition: to talk cleverly for the sake of impressing others; to be the center of attraction.

Heterosexuality: to be interested in members of the opposite sex and in the subject of sex.

Intracception: to observe and analyze the behavior of one's self and of others.

Nurturance: to show sympathy and generosity toward those who are in trouble.

Order: to organize one's work and personal life systematically.

Succorance: to gain encouragement and sympathy from others when one is depressed or hurt.

Statistical analysis of the teacher personality data indicated that the personality traits most characteristic of the public school teacher group were high deference, order, and endurance and low heterosexuality, dominance, and exhibition. Conspicuous by their absence were such needs as achievement, intracception, and nurturance, which might have been expected for the public school teacher group.

Of particular significance was an observed change in the personality traits of the teacher group as a function of teacher work experience. The researchers

suggested a rationale for the phenomenon. They postulated two alternative routes or a combination of the two routes. The differences between new and experienced teachers could result from the progressive elimination of teachers whose personality patterns are unlike those of the experienced group. The apparent decrease in the number of persons who score high on the heterosexuality measure, for example, could be explained if it could be shown that individuals who score high on this measure tend to marry and leave teaching. The second route that the researchers suggested for the change in personality as a function of work experience was the teachers' exposure to the demands of the teaching situation--exposure which in turn led to fundamental personality change. The teacher work environment that Guba and his coworkers envisioned certainly included the compliance orientation of the school organization.

Research data obtained from questionnaires given to the school administrators and teachers indicated that the teachers most like the typical teacher personality pattern were less likely to feel satisfied, effective, and confident in the ability of their administrative officials. The administrators regarded these same teachers as effective. The data reflected a real change

in teacher satisfaction, effectiveness, and confidence as he or she became more aware of the distance between the ideal and everyday teacher practices and school procedures.

### Summary

In this section, the major concepts of the compliance theory were described. Etzioni's review of the literature pertaining to the validation and extension of the compliance theory since its original publication was presented. The compliance orientation of school organizations according to Etzioni and as viewed by more recent researchers were discussed. Organizational characteristics which distinguished between private and public school organizations were discussed. Finally, Guba's research pertaining to compliance-teacher personality relationships in a public school system was reviewed.



## CHAPTER 3

## Method

A study was conducted to address the research questions discussed in Chapter 1. The study attempted to answer the questions "Is there a significant difference between the compliance patterns of private and public school organizations?", "Is there a significant difference between the personalities of private and public school organization teachers?" and "Is there a relationship between the compliance pattern of the school organization and the personality of teacher organizational participants?" A matched two-group experimental design was used in the study. The groups were a Catholic private school organization and a public school organization. The independent variables in the study were the administrator compliance orientations in the school organization. The dependent variables were the individual personality traits of the teacher participants in the private and public school organizations.

The population samples were drawn from a Catholic private and from a public school organization in West Virginia. Student enrollment in the public school organization was 357,324 and in the private school

organization, 14,058. The public school organization was administered through local control by 55 County Boards of Education. The majority of the private school organization was Catholic private which accounted for almost 60 percent of the West Virginia private school students in 1985 (Truby, 1984-85).

### Subjects

The subjects in the study were 10 principals and 78 teachers currently employed by Catholic private and public school organizations located within the Charleston, West Virginia, geographic area during the 1985-86 academic term. The subjects represented a population of diversified, skilled professionals drawn from five Catholic private and five public elementary schools. The Charleston, West Virginia, geographic area was selected for study because the highest concentration and the greatest diversity of Catholic private schools in the state of West Virginia were located there.

The Catholic private school organization principal and teacher participants in the study were drawn from all of the five Catholic private, kindergarten through sixth grade (K-6), elementary school populations within the Charleston, West Virginia, geographic area. The public school organization principals and teachers

participating in the study were drawn from five K-6 public elementary school populations matched as closely as possible to the Catholic private school group on locations within the Charleston, West Virginia, geographic area, student socioeconomic status (SES) and student enrollment.

Student socioeconomic status was described as the percentage of children of the school population who were eligible for free or reduced lunch benefits. Public school organization enrollment included only regular education students. Only regular education classroom teachers were permitted to participate in the study. The experimental design excluded special education students and teachers, as well as physical education teachers, since there were no counterparts in the Catholic private school organization.

### Procedure

The research design allowed personal administration of the evaluation instruments, the Administrator Compliance Orientation Inventory and the Personality Research Form (Form E) to the subjects in a suitable environment. All subjects were told before the evaluation that they were participating in a research project. They were free to withdraw if they had so

desired. All principals and teachers in the study were asked to complete an information sheet to document the necessary demographic data. To ensure anonymity of participants, no names were required on any questionnaire nor were schools or school organizations identified by name. All subjects were told that the information reported about the study would be considered strictly confidential and would not be identified as to subject, school, or school organization.

#### Instrumentation

The Administrators Compliance Orientation Inventory, used to measure the compliance orientation of the school administrator, was a self-constructed, force choice, 10-item questionnaire. The items were written so as to place the subject in an administrative situation. Each situation had three alternative solutions illustrating a coercive compliance, a remunerative compliance, and a normative compliance action. The principals were instructed to choose the one solution that represented his or her typical behavior for each of the 10 situations. The Administrator Compliance Orientation Inventory test scores were reported as the percentage of coercive compliance, remunerative compliance and normative compliance solutions selected from the 10

possible choices. Both principal assessment instruments, the Semi-structured Interview Guide and the Administrator Compliance Orientation Inventory, are presented in Appendix A. All assessment instruments were piloted in several nonresearch schools prior to use in the study to explore their face validity. Participants in the pilot study were asked if they believed that the compliance orientation and the personality assessment instruments described their behavior accurately. Their responses were favorable.

The personality traits of each of the private and public school teachers were measured using the Personality Research Form, Form E (PRF-E). Douglas Jackson (1974) developed the instrument to be used in personality research. The PRF assessed 22 personality traits covering a range of normal social and interpersonal behavior. The scale consisted of 352 true/false items. The time required to administer the test was about 45 minutes. A list of the traits with a definition of each is presented below. A more complete description of each of the 22 PRF-E personality traits is given in Appendix B.

Abasement: the need to comply and accept punishment; self-depreciation.

Achievement: the need to overcome obstacles, to

exercise power, to strive to do something difficult as well and as quickly as possible.

Affiliation: the need to form friendships and associations.

Aggression: the need to assault or injure another; to belittle, harm or maliciously ridicule a person.

Autonomy: the need to resist influence, to strive for independence.

Change: the need to change opinions or values in different circumstances; to dislike routine and avoid it.

Cognitive Structure: the need to make decisions based upon definite knowledge, rather than upon guesses or probabilities.

Defence: the need to defend self against real or imagined harm from other people.

Desirability: the need to present a favorable picture to oneself and to others.

Dominance: the need to influence or control others.

Endurance: the need to be persistent and unrelenting in work habits.

Exhibition: the need for self-dramatization, to excite, amuse, stir, shock, thrill others.

Harm Avoidance: the need to avoid risk of bodily harm and to maximize personal safety.

Impulsivity: the need to act on the spur of the moment and without deliberation.

Infrequency: the need to respond in an implausible or pseudo-random manner.

Nurturance: the need to nourish, aid or protect another.

Order: the need to arrange, organize, put away objects, to be tidy and clean; to be precise.

Play: the need to relax, amuse oneself, seek diversion and entertainment.

Sentience: the need to notice smells, sounds, sights, tastes and the way things feel; to remember these sensations and believe that they are an important part of life.

Social Recognition: the need to excite praise and recommendation; to command respect; to yield eagerly to the influence of an allied other; to conform to custom.

Succorance: the need to seek aid; protection or sympathy; to be dependent.

Understanding: the need to understand many areas of knowledge; to value synthesis of ideas.

Briefly, the test was developed as follows: 20 trait terms were adapted from the list of needs originally formulated by Henry Murray and his coworkers

at Harvard. The traits were further defined and over 100 face-valued items were written for each trait definition. The items were given to over 1,000 college students, and 16 items (8 true, 8 false) for each of the final items were selected according to three criteria-- endorsement frequency between 59 and 95 percent; high correlations with the provisional key for each scale; low correlation with a social desirability scale and further itemmetric refinements. "The resulting scales have high content validity and homogeneity making possible the measurement of personality traits with levels of precision and validity formerly associated only with intellectual abilities and scholastic achievement" (Kelly, 1972).

PRF-E norms have been systematically gathered. The male and female subject volunteers were drawn randomly so as to be representative of each of the set of 31 U.S. colleges comprising a stratified (by region) random sample of U.S. colleges to which was added a sample drawn from two Canadian universities. The contributions of the estimate of summary statistics of each college was a weighted proportion taking into account the size of the college or university and the number of colleges and universities in the sample. Sampling proceeded in the following manner. A random sample of colleges was drawn



from the list of all colleges provided in a publication of the U.S. Office of Education. From the list, colleges with a religious affiliation or denomination were excluded, as were professional schools and schools offering highly specialized programs. Of the original list of 36 colleges, a total of 5 refused or were unable to participate. The remaining colleges provided lists of students from which were sampled a number proportional to the number of students appearing on the list. The students were contacted, and approximately 50% of those contacted responded positively to the request. A total of 1,350 male students and 1,415 female students were included in the norm subject pool. Separate PRF-E norms were available for male and for female subjects.

The PRF has been consistently received as a highly psychometrically sound assessment device (Anastasi, 1972, 1976; Hogan, 1978; Kelly, 1972; Wiggins, 1972). Reliability and validity considerations were built into the PRF from the first stages of test construction. Indices of reliability and stability reflecting both the homogeneity and stability of the PRF scales were encouragingly high. Odd-even reliabilities for the 22 sixteen-item scales in a college sample range from 0.50 to 0.89, and there was respectable evidence for construct validity (Hogan, 1978; Jackson & Gurthrie, 1967).

### Data Collection

All teachers were administered Form E of the Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1974). Background information requested of teacher subjects included the subject's sex and the number of years the subject has spent in private or in public school teaching. As an inducement for participating in the study, all teachers were offered, on a confidential basis, the results of their individual personality assessment. All school principals, as an inducement for participating in the study, were offered, on a confidential basis, their individual administrator compliance inventory profile. Pertinent demographic information for each of the individual school organizations was gathered by personal interview of the school principal by the researcher. The compliance orientation of each principal was assessed by the Administrator Compliance Orientation Inventory.

### Data Treatment

The teacher personality trait differences between the Catholic private school and the public school organizations were established by an ANOVA procedure (Kerlinger, 1973:216-238). The independent variables were years of teaching experience and school organization

affiliation, i.e., Catholic private or public school organization. The dependent variable was the teacher's PRF-E individual personality trait raw score. Statistically significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) in administrator compliance between the public and the private Catholic school organizations, i.e., coercive compliance, remunerative compliance, and normative compliance, were established by applying the Mann-Whitney U statistical technique to principal numeric responses recorded by the researcher during the interview. Relationships between administrator compliance orientations and teacher personality traits were determined through Spearman correlations of the organizational statistically significantly different independent (compliance) and dependent (personality) variables found in the study.

### Summary

The subjects and the sample populations were described. The procedures to be used in conduct of the research were detailed. The instruments to be used for assessment of administrator compliance orientation and teacher personality traits were described and discussed. Finally, the methods for statistical analysis of the research data were outlined.

## CHAPTER 4

## Results and Discussion

A comparison of the private and public school organizational groups may be seen in Table 2. The data were derived from personal interview of the 10 elementary school principals participating in the study. The characteristics were quantified by calculation of the median, semi-interquartile range (SIQR), and the probability of significant difference between the two groups for each of the values presented:

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

The private school organizational group was matched to the public school organization group on student enrollment, socioeconomic status and geographic location. The assumption was made that these factors might influence the beliefs and values of the administrators and teachers participating in the study.

Table 2 shows that there were no significant differences ( $p < .05$ ), by the Mann-Whitney U test, between the private and the public school organizational groups in student enrollment, socioeconomic status, student CTBS achievement test scores, principal

Table 2  
 Comparison of Characteristics of the  
 Private and the Public School Organizations

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Private School Organization</u>		<u>Public School Organization</u>		<u>P</u>	<u>U</u>
	<u>Median</u>	<u>SIQR†</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>SIQR†</u>		
Student Enrollment	138	102	245	171	.11	6
Student Socioeconomic Status Percent	8	6	13	8	.16	7
Student/Teacher Ratio	17	6	22	8	.04**	4
Student CTBS* Scores						
Below Average	10	2	10	6	.34	10
Average	40	25	69	10	.11	6
Above Average	50	22	25	15	.11	6
Parent Level of Education Percent						
High School	16	5	70	18	.03**	3
College	65	8	25	15	.03**	3
Professional School	20	6	5	3	.11	6
Principal Experience, Years						
Administrative	6	6	8	6	.27	9
Total	17	7	22	4	.27	9
Teacher Experience, Years	9	4	15	4	.03**	3

---

†SIQR = semi-interquartile range.

\*Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, McGraw-Hill, Monterey, CA, 1974.

\*\*p < .05

administrative experience and principal total work experience. There was significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) between the two school organizational groups in student-teacher ratio, teacher experience and parent educational level. The student-teacher ratio was significantly lower in the private school organization than in the public school organization. The teacher experience was significantly higher in the public school organization than in the private school organization and the educational level of student parents was significantly higher in the private school organization than in the public school organization. The findings were consistent with recent research evidence describing feature of school organizations that distinguish the private and public school sectors (Talbert, 1985).

#### Administrator Compliance Orientation

The administrator compliance orientation median test scores and SIQR for the private school and public school organizations are shown in Table 3. These data were calculated from responses obtained from administration of the Administrator Compliance Orientation Inventory to each of the ten principals. The scores, expressed as percent of total compliance, were identified as to the compliance type, coercive

compliance, remunerative compliance, and normative compliance.

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

The results indicated that the median compliance orientation of the private school organizational administrator was 10 percent coercive compliance, 30 percent remunerative compliance and 60 percent normative compliance while the median compliance orientation of the public school organizational administrator was 20 percent coercive compliance, 30 percent remunerative compliance and 50 percent normative compliance.

A nonparametric statistical technique was used to estimate if there was a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) between the administrator compliance orientation of the private and the public school organizational groups. A nonparametric statistical technique was used because the sample size was small and the data were ordinal and not normally distributed (Siegel, 1956). The Mann-Whitney  $\underline{U}$  test was applied to the organizational group administrators' test scores to examine for statistically significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) in coercive compliance, remunerative compliance and normative compliance. A statistically significant difference ( $\underline{U} = 2, p = .016$ )

Table 3

Administrator Compliance Orientation in  
Private and Public School Organizations

<u>Compliance Type</u>	<u>Organization</u>			
	<u>Private School</u>		<u>Public School</u>	
	<u>Median</u>	<u>SIQR†</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>SIQR†</u>
Coercive	10	0	20	0
Remunerative	30	5	30	10
Normative	60	5	50	5

---

†SIQR = semi-interquartile range.



was found between the coercive compliance scores of the two groups which indicated that public school organization administrators emphasized the exercise of coercive compliance when dealing with their subordinates more than did the private school organization administrators. A statistically significant difference ( $\underline{U} = 3, p = .028$ ) was found between the normative compliance scores of the two groups which indicated that private school administrators emphasized the exercise of normative compliance when dealing with their subordinates more than did the public school organization administrators. A significant difference ( $\underline{U} = 11, p = .42$ ) between the two school organizations was not revealed in their administrator remunerative compliance scores.

#### PRF-E Normative Data

Standard score ( $\underline{z}$ ) tests (Dietrich & McClade, 1979) were used to determine if significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) existed between PRF-E mean scores for the teacher participant group and the PRF-E norm group. The teacher group consisted entirely of female teachers. Only one male teacher participated in the study. His protocol was not used to avoid confounding the experimental data. The comparison norm group consisted entirely of

female college students. The teacher group differed significantly from the norm on 13 scales with significant probabilities ranging from less than .001 to less than .05. Table 4 shows that the teacher PRF-E group mean scores were significantly ( $p < .05$ ) higher than the norm mean on the Achievement, Cognitive Structure, Harm Avoidance, Nurturance, Order and Desirability scales. The teacher PRF-E group mean scores were significantly lower than the norm mean scores on Aggression, Autonomy, Change, Exhibition, Impulsivity, Play, and Sentience scales.

---

Insert Table 4 about here

---

An ANOVA statistical analysis of the PRF-E teacher group data, as presented in the next section, indicated that there was a significant effect ( $p < .05$ ) of years of teacher experience on several of the personality trait variables. The data suggested that as the number of years of teaching experience increased, the teachers became less aggressive, less patient and unrelenting in his or her work habits, less prone to act on the spur of the moment decisions without deliberation, less interested in caring for children, less attuned to sensual experiences, and more prone to maximize personal

TABLE 4

## Teacher Group and Norm Group PRF-E Scale Scores

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Teachers Group</u>		<u>Norm Group</u>		<u>z</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Abasement	7.60	2.53	7.66	3.01	-0.20
Achievement	11.15	2.40	10.00	3.41	4.02***
Affiliation	8.81	3.91	8.93	4.03	-0.58
Aggression	5.90	3.20	6.91	3.59	-2.69**
Autonomy	4.79	3.02	7.11	3.23	-6.58***
Change	6.69	3.15	7.87	3.09	-8.69***
Cognitive					
Structure	10.63	2.94	8.71	3.52	5.55***
Defendence	5.85	2.60	6.04	3.48	-0.61
Desirability	12.36	2.36	10.97	2.53	12.41***
Dominance	7.24	3.74	7.60	4.40	-0.82
Endurance	10.40	2.61	10.19	3.33	0.68
Exhibition	5.55	3.70	7.24	4.76	-3.86***
Harm Avoidance	13.18	2.57	9.46	4.43	11.85***
Impulsivity	5.31	3.20	6.53	4.04	-3.23**
Infrequency	0.46	0.60	0.60	0.37	1.27
Nurturance	12.24	2.44	10.90	3.72	4.61***
Order	9.43	4.56	8.15	4.52	2.41*
Play	6.78	3.38	8.95	3.02	-5.56***
Sentience	9.17	2.58	10.76	2.75	-5.28***
Social					
Recognition	8.27	3.42	8.22	3.68	0.12
Succorance	7.95	3.64	8.70	3.70	-1.97
Understanding	8.94	3.60	9.70	3.49	-1.82

---

Teachers Group, N = 78

Norm Group, N = 1,415

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .01$

\*\*\* $p < .001$

safety. (Aggression, Endurance, Impulsivity, Nurturance, Sentience and Harm Avoidance PRF-E scale scores.)

For purposes of clarity, the discussion will be limited to the 10 PRF-E scale score differences between the teacher sample and the norm group that were most likely not confounded by effect of teaching experience on the personality variable. These personality traits highlight the dominant characteristic of the teacher sample. The personality pattern that emerged was that the group of teachers described themselves as highly achievement oriented, making decisions based upon definite knowledge rather than upon guesses or probabilities, caring for children, concerned with keeping their personal effects and surroundings neat and organized, and presenting a favorable picture of themselves (high Achievement, Cognitive Structure, Nurturance, Order and Desirability PRF-E scale scores). The teachers further described themselves as possessing low aggressive tendencies, manageable, resistance to change, not exhibitionistic, and orientated to work rather than play (low Aggression, Autonomy, Change, Exhibition, and Play PRF-E scale scores).

The personality profile of the teacher participants in the current study differed from that previously reported by Guba, Jackson and Bidwell (1959) who found

that the personality traits most characteristic of a group of public school teachers were high deference, order, and endurance and low heterosexuality, dominance and exhibition. Conspicuous by their absence were such personality traits as achievement, intraception and nurturance that might have been expected to be included in the personality trait pattern of a teacher group. Guba, Jackson and Bidwell (1959) described the cultural personality stereotype of the experienced teacher as sexually impotent, obsequious, externally patient, painstakingly demanding and socially inept. A comparison of the teacher personality trait profiles developed from each of the studies is shown in Table 5.

---

Insert Table 5 about here

---

It may be seen by examination of Table 5 that although there was no direct disagreement between the values "higher than norm" or "lower than norm" in the personality trait assessment of the teacher subject, the results of the current research clearly depicted the personality profile of the school teacher in a much more favorable and realistic light than that previously reported in the Guba study. The differences between the two might be explained by the fact that the Guba study

TABLE 5

## Comparison of Teacher Personality Profiles

<u>Personality Trait</u>	<u>Research</u>	
	<u>Guba (1959)</u>	<u>Dunleavy (1986)</u>
Abasement	NS	NS
Achievement	NS	+
Affiliation	NS	NS
Aggression	NS	-
Autonomy	NS	-
Change	NS	-
Cognitive Structure	NO	+
Defence	NO	NS
Deference	+	NO
Desirability	NO	+
Dominance	-	NS
Endurance	+	NS
Exhibition	-	-
Harm Avoidance	NO	+
Heterosexuality	-	NO
Impulsivity	NO	-
Intracception	NS	NO
Infrequency	NO	NS
Nurturance	NS	+
Order	+	+
Play	NO	-
Sentience	NO	-
Social Recognition	NO	NS
Succorance	NS	NS
Understanding	NO	NS

---

KEY:    + = higher than norm  
           - = lower than norm  
           NS = not significant ( $p > .05$ )  
           NO = not observed

was conducted over 25 years ago with subjects selected from an urban population while the present research drew from a rural and present-day teacher population for its research evidence.

#### PRF-E Teacher Organizational Data

An ANOVA statistical technique was applied to the private and the public school teacher group PRF-E scale scores to determine if there were statistically significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) in personality traits between the two groups and a statistically significant effect ( $p < .05$ ) of teacher experience on the PRF-E personality traits. The results of the ANOVA statistical analysis are presented in Table 6. The private school and public school teachers group PRF-E scale score means and standard deviations are shown as well as the statistical probability of difference between the private and public school teacher groups and of the effect of teaching experience on the personality trait.

---

Insert Table 6 about here

---

The public school teachers group test scores were significantly ( $p < .05$ ) higher on the PRF-E scale scores of Achievement, Aggression, Defence, and Social

Table 6

## Private and Public School Organizations

## PRF-E Scale Scores

	(N = 41) Private School Group		(N = 37) Public School Group		(a)	(b)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p	p
Abasement	7.88	2.68	7.30	2.24	.32	.58
Achievement	10.58	2.68	11.78	1.89	.02*	.12
Affiliation	9.56	3.41	7.97	4.30	.08	.41
Aggression	5.21	2.88	6.65	3.40	.04*	.004*
Autonomy	4.24	2.72	5.40	3.25	.09	.47
Change	6.61	3.28	6.78	3.06	.81	.45
Cognitive Structure	10.27	3.02	11.02	2.83	.26	.61
Defendence	5.07	2.23	6.70	2.74	.004*	.09
Desirability	12.88	2.12	11.78	2.49	.04*	.95
Dominance	7.28	3.78	7.19	3.73	.90	.44
Endurance	10.24	2.99	10.56	2.13	.57	.02*
Exhibition	5.68	4.09	5.40	3.25	.74	.51
Harm Avoidance	13.21	2.74	13.13	2.39	.87	.002*
Impulsivity	5.14	3.27	5.48	3.17	.64	.04*
Infrequency	0.44	0.59	0.49	0.61	.73	.44
Nurturance	12.36	2.32	12.11	2.59	.63	.006*
Order	8.92	4.54	10.00	4.58	.31	.94
Play	7.15	3.25	6.38	3.51	.32	.29
Sentience	7.29	2.47	9.03	2.72	.64	.03*
Social Recognition	7.41	3.30	9.21	3.35	.02*	.75
Succorance	8.29	3.30	7.57	3.99	.39	.93
Understanding	8.71	3.76	9.19	3.47	.56	.39

(a) Probability of statistically significant difference between two groups as established by ANOVA statistical analysis.

(b) Probability of statistically significant effect of teaching experience on personality trait test score as established by ANOVA statistical analysis.

\*p < .05



Recognition. The private school teachers group PRF-E scale scores were significantly ( $p < .05$ ) higher on the PRF-E scale score of Desirability.

The public school teachers described themselves on the PRF-E relative to the private school teachers as higher achievers, more aggressive, more reluctant to take criticism, more concerned with their reputations and by what other people think, and demonstrate lower self regard. (high Achievement, Aggression, Defence, Social Recognition and low Desirability PRF-E scale scores).

The PRF-E personality trait scale descriptors for achievement, aggression and defence are relatively straight forward and comprehensible. However, an explanation seemed in order for the PRF-E personality traits of Social Recognition and Desirability, which are somewhat more complex. A high score on the PRF-E personality trait scale of Social Recognition does not imply a high degree of social skills for the individual but rather identifies one who excessively strives for social approval from others in the traditional sense. The PRF-E Social Recognition scale can be assessed as a measure of diffuse neurotic tendencies (sample "true" items: "I would not consider myself successful unless other people thought I was," "When I am doing something,

I often worry about what other people think," "I constantly try to make people think highly of me," "Nothing would hurt me more than to have a bad reputation"). The PRF-E Desirability scale can also be assessed as a measure of diffused neurotic tendencies for an individual (sample "true" items: "I have a number of health problems," "I often have the feeling that I am doing something evil," "Many things make me feel uneasy"). That is, according to the PRF-E scale score interpretation, part of what it means to be socially competent or desirable is to be non-neurotic.

The ANOVA statistical analysis of the PRF-E scale scores indicated that there was a significant effect ( $p < .05$ ) of years of teaching experience on several of the personality trait variables. The data suggested that as the number of years of teaching experience increased, the teacher became less aggressive, less patient and unrelenting in his or her work habits, less prone to act on the spur of the moment decisions without deliberation, less interested in caring for children, less attuned to sensual experiences, and more prone to maximize personal safety. (Aggression, Endurance, Impulsivity, Nurturance, Sentience and Harm Avoidance PRF-E scale scores).

Administrator Compliance Orientation-Teacher  
Personality Trait Relationships

Spearman (1949) correlation coefficients were calculated to explore relationships between the five organizational significantly different teacher personality traits and the two organizational significantly different administrator compliance orientations. The relationships between the administrator compliance orientations and the teacher personality traits expressed as Spearman correlation coefficients are shown in Table 7.

---

Insert Table 7 about here

---

A statistically significant ( $\underline{r} = .54, p < .05$ ) relationship was found between the administrator coercive compliance orientation and the teacher personality trait of aggression. A statistically significant ( $\underline{r} = -.56, p < .05$ ) relationship was found between the administrator normative compliance orientation and the teacher personality trait of social recognition. The correlation matrix for the personality trait variables of aggression and social recognition and the other personality trait variables which were not related to the compliance variables are shown in Table 8.

TABLE 7

Administrator Compliance Orientation and  
Teacher Personality Trait Relationships (a)

<u>PRF-E Scale</u>	<u>Compliance</u>	
	<u>Coercive</u>	<u>Normative</u>
	<u>r</u>	<u>r</u>
Achievement	.41	.03
Aggression	.54*	-.33
Defendence	.20	-.09
Desirability	-.09	.23
Social Recognition	.37	-.56*

---

(a) Relationships expressed as Spearman Correlation Coefficient

\* $p < .05$

---

Insert Table 8 about here

---

A significant ( $r = .70$ ,  $p .05$ ) relatively strong relationship was found between the personality trait variables of achievement and social recognition which suggested that the teachers were achievement motivated by excessive concerns for favorable perception by their administrators. No other statistically significant ( $p .05$ ) relationship was found among the personality trait variables.

These research findings support Etzioni's (1975) proposition that the exercise of coercive power typically leads to alienative involvement, an intense negative orientation toward the organization. The Etzioni concept was reflected in the study by the increase in the teacher participant personality trait of aggression as more emphasis was exercised by the administrator in the school organization on the use of coercive compliance to control his or her subordinates. Etzioni argues further that the exercise of normative power typically leads to moral involvement, an intensively positive orientation toward the organization. This concept was reflected in the study by the decrease in the teacher participant

TABLE 8

Personality Trait Relationships

<u>PRF-E Scale</u>	<u>Aggression</u>	<u>Social Recognition</u>
Achievement	.16	.70*
Aggression	1.00	.34
Defendence	.38	.49
Social Recognition	.34	1.00
Desirability	-.44	-.36

---

\* $p < .05$

personality trait of social recognition as more emphasis was exercised by the administrator in the school organization on the use of normative power to control his/her subordinates.

## CHAPTER 5

## Conclusions and Recommendations

This research explored the relationships between the compliance patterns of the school organization and the personality traits of teacher participants within the organizations. The school organizations in this study were the Catholic private school and the public school organizations in West Virginia.

These questions were addressed:

1. Is there a significant difference (.05 level of significance) between the compliance patterns of private and public school organizations?
2. Is there a significant difference (.05 level of significance) between the personalities of private and public school organization teachers?
3. Is there a relationship (.05 level of significance) between the compliance pattern of the school organization and the personality of teacher organizational participants?

A matched, two-group experimental design was used in the study. The independent variables were the administrator compliance orientations of the school organizations. The dependent variables were the personality traits of the teacher organizational



participants. It was anticipated that the findings of the research would indicate that:

1. Statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) differences exist between the compliance patterns of the participating school organizations.

2. Statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) differences in 5 to 10 personality traits would be revealed between the teacher organizational participants.

3. Statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) relationships exist between the compliance orientation of the school organization and the personality traits of the teacher organizational participants.

### Conclusions

These conclusions were drawn from the research evidence:

1. Is there a significant difference (.05 level of significance) between the compliance patterns of private and public school organizations?

There was a statistically significant difference ( $U = 2, p = .016$ ) between the coercive compliance orientations of the private and public school organizational groups. The results indicated that public school organizational administrators emphasized the exercise of coercive compliance when

dealing with their subordinates more than did the private school organizational administrators. A significant difference ( $U = 3, p = .028$ ) was found between the normative compliance orientations of the two groups. The results indicated that private school administrators emphasized the exercise of normative compliance when dealing with their subordinates more than did the private school organizational administrators.

This research evidence suggested that the teacher work environment of the Catholic private school organization in West Virginia was more humanistic in nature and less threatening than the teacher work environment of the public school organization. This difference in teacher work environment was, at least, in part because of the excessive exercise of coercive compliance by the public school organizational administrators. It was postulated, based upon the research evidence, that teacher moral and job satisfaction were higher in the Catholic private school organization than in the public school organization in West Virginia, e.g., the private school teachers organizational group demonstrated lower autonomy and higher affiliation scale scores ( $p < .10$ ) on the PRF-E

than did the public school organizational teachers group.

2. Is there a significant difference (.05 level of significance) between the personalities of private and public school organization teachers?

The public school teachers organizational group was significantly ( $p < .05$ ) higher than the private school teachers group on the personality traits of achievement, aggression, defence and social recognition. The private school teachers organizational group was significantly ( $p < .05$ ) higher than the public teachers group on the personality trait of desirability. The research data indicated that the public school teachers were higher achievers, more aggressive, more reluctant to take criticism, desired more to be held in high esteem by acquaintances and less concerned about presenting a favorable picture of themselves to others than did the private school teachers organizational group.

A further research finding of the present study was that as the number of years of teaching experience increased, teachers, on the average, became less aggressive, less patient and unrelenting in their work habits, less prone to act on the spur of the moment decisions without deliberation, less

interested in caring for children, less attuned to sensual experience, and less prone to maximize their personal safety.

3. Is there a relationship (.05 level of significance) between the compliance pattern of the school organization and the personality of teacher organizational participants?

A statistically significant ( $r = .54, p < .05$ ) direct relationship was found between the coercive compliance orientation of the school organization and the teacher personality trait of aggression. A statistically significant ( $r = -.56, p < .05$ ) indirect relationship was found between the normative compliance orientation of the school organization and the teacher personality trait of desire for social recognition. These research findings supported Etzioni's (1975) theory for congruent compliance relationships.

The research evidence indicated that the predominant normative administrator compliance orientation was optimum for effective supervision of subordinate teacher participants. Excessive coercive and deficient normative compliance orientations were found to promote aggressive tendencies, low self regard, undesirable defendant

and other neurotic behaviors, and an excessive concern for approval and recommendation from significant others. Also, the teacher participants were found to be achievement motivated by excessive, unrealistic concerns for favorable perceptions from their administrators, e.g., the teacher personality trait of achievement was highly correlated with the teacher personality trait of social recognition.

### Recommendations

These recommendations were made.

1. It is recommended that the West Virginia State Board of Education make the results of this study available to the County Boards of Education so that they may evaluate their own policies, procedures and practices from the viewpoint of administrator compliance orientations and the implications thereof.

2. The recruitment and retention of teachers should be an important consideration for efficient and effective operation of the school organization. Therefore, it is recommended that public school systems examine administrator-teacher compliance patterns within their organization to ascertain the compliance pattern and then take appropriate actions to reduce coercive compliance in the organization.

3. School administrators need to be aware of the importance of developing genuine and positive personal relationships with teacher participants in the school organization and then assist them to become integrated into the school community and teaching profession. Seminars for school administrators on interpersonal relationships will strengthen skills in this area. It is recommended that this practice be adopted.

#### Future Research.

These research projects are suggested in order to extend the findings of this study for practical application to educational as well as other organization settings.

1. Investigate administrator compliance orientation and teacher personality differences between secondary private and public school organizations.

2. Expand and modify the Administrator Compliance Orientation Inventory to permit measurement of administrator compliance orientations in organizational settings other than the educational setting.

3. Explore teacher morale and job satisfaction differences between private and public school organizations.

4. Investigate administrator compliance

orientation and student personality differences and relationships between public and private school organizations.

5. Compare the self report and the observational method for measuring compliance.

6. Compare the principal's conception of his or her compliance orientation to the teacher's perception of the principal's compliance orientation.

## References

- Anastasi, A. (1972). Personality Research Form. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The seventh mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park: Gryphon Press.
- Anastasi, A. (1976). Psychological testing. New York: MacMillan.
- Catterall, J. S. (1985). Beyond information and data. In Institute for Research in Educational Finance and Governance Policy Notes, 6(1).
- Chambers, J. G. (1985). Teachers pay--public and private. In Institute for Research in Educational Finance and Governance Policy Notes, 6(1).
- Coleman, J., Hoffer, T., & Kilgore, S. (1981). Public and private schools: A Report to the National Center for Educational Statistics by the National Opinion Research Center. Chicago, University of Chicago.
- Cooper, B.S. (1985). Who operates private schools? In Institute for Research in Educational Finance and Governance Policy Notes, 6(1).
- Dietrich, F. H. & McClade, J. T. (1979). Statistics. San Francisco: Dellen Publishing Company.
- Edwards, A. (1954). Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. New York: Psychological Corporation.



- Etzioni, A. (1961). Complex organizations: A sociological reader. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Etzioni, A. (1975). A comparative analysis of organizations (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Guba, E. G., Jackson, P. W., & Bidwell, C. E. (1959). Occupational choice and the teaching career. Educational Research Bulletin, 38(1), 1-27.
- Guilford, J. P. (1959). Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hogan, R. (1978). Personality Research Form. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The eighth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park: Gryphon Press.
- Jackson, D. N. (1974). Personality Research Form. Port Huron: Research Psychologist Press.
- Jackson, D. N. & Guthrie, G. M. (1967). The convergent and discriminant validation of the Personality Research Form scores. Cited in D. N. Jackson, Personality Research Form manual. New York: Research Psychologists Press.
- Jackson, P. W. & Guba, E. G. (1957). The need structures of in-service teachers: An occupational analysis. School Review, 65, 176-192.
- Kelly, E. (1972). Personality Research Form. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The seventh mental measurements

- yearbook. Highland Park: Gryphon Press.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1974). Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Mann, H. B. & Whitney, D. R. (1947). On a test of whether one of two random variables is stochastically larger than the other. Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 18 50-60.
- Murray, H. A. (1963). Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Olds, E. G. (1949). The 5% significance levels for sum of squares of rank differences and a correction. Annual Mathematical Statistics, 20, 117-118.
- Sassenrath, J., Croce, M., & Penaloza, P. (1984). Private and Public School Students: Longitudinal Achievement Differences? American Education Research Journal, 21, 557-563.
- Simmel, G. (1896). Superiority and subordination as subject matter of sociology. American Journal of Sociology, 2, 167-189, 392-415.
- Talbert, J. E. (1985). Promoting effective schools. Public and private lessons. In Institute for Research in Educational Finance and Governance Policy Notes, 6(1).
- Thomas, C. W., Kreps, G., & Cage, R. (1977). An

application of compliance theory to the study of juvenile delinquency. Sociology and Social Research, 61, 156-175.

Truby, R. (1980-1982 to 1984-1985). Annual Report, Volume 2, The educational statistical summary. Charleston, WV: West Virginia Department of Education.

Wiggins, J. S. (1972). Personality Research Form. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The seventh mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park: Gryphon Press.

APPENDIX A

Description of PRF Traits

## PERSONALITY RESEARCH FORM SCALES

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Description of High Scorer</u>
Abasement	Shows a high degree of humility; accepts blame and criticism even when not deserved; willing to accept an inferior position; tends to be self-effacing.
Achievement	Aspires to accomplish difficult tasks; maintains high standards and is willing to work toward distant goals; responds positively to competition; willing to put forth effort to attain excellence.
Affiliation	Enjoys being with friends and people in general; accepts people readily; makes efforts to win friendships and maintain associations with people.
Aggression	Enjoys combat and argument; easily annoyed; sometimes willing to hurt people to get own way; may seek to "get even" with people perceived as causing harm.
Autonomy	Tries to break away from restraints, confinements or restriction of any kind; enjoys being unattached, free, not tied to people, places, or obligations; may be rebellious when faced with restraints.
Change	Likes new and different experiences; dislikes routine and avoids it; may readily change opinions or values in different circumstances; adapts readily to changes in environment.
Cognitive Structure	Does not like ambiguity or uncertainty in information; wants all questions answered completely; desires to make decisions based upon definite knowledge, rather than upon guesses or probabilities.
Defendence	Ready to defend self against real or imagined harm from other people; takes offense easily; does not accept criticism readily.

Desirability	Describes self in terms judged as desirable; consciously or unconsciously, accurately or inaccurately, presents favorable picture of self in response to personality statements.
Dominance	Attempts to control environment and to influence or direct other people; expresses opinions forcefully, enjoys the role of leader and may assume it spontaneously.
Endurance	Willing to work long hours; doesn't give up quickly on a problem; persevering, even in the face of great difficulty; patient and unrelenting in work habits.
Exhibition	Wants to be the center of attention; enjoys having an audience; engages in behavior which wins the notice of others; may enjoy being dramatic or witty.
Harm Avoidance	Does not enjoy exciting activities, especially if danger is involved; avoids risk of bodily harm; seeks to maximize personal safety.
Impulsivity	Tends to act on the "spur of the moment" and without deliberation; gives vent readily to feelings and wishes; speaks freely; may be volatile in emotional expression.
Infrequency	Responds in implausible or pseudo-random manner, possibly due to carelessness, poor comprehension, passive non-compliance, confusion, or gross deviation.
Nurturance	Gives sympathy and comfort; assists others whenever possible, interested in caring for children, the disabled, or the infirm; offers a "helping hand" to those in need; readily performs favors for others.
Order	Concerned with keeping personal effects and surroundings neat and organized; dislikes clutter, confusion, lack of

	organization; interested in developing methods for keeping materials methodically organized.
Play	Does many things "just for fun," spends a good deal of time participating in games, sports, social activities, and other amusements; enjoys jokes and funny stories, maintains a light-hearted, easy-going attitude toward life.
Sentience	Notices smells, sounds, sights, tastes, and the way things feel; remembers these sensations and believes that they are an important part of life; is sensitive to many forms of experience; may maintain an essentially hedonistic or aesthetic view of life.
Social Recognition	Desires to be held in high esteem by acquaintances, concerned about reputation and what other people think, works for the approval and recognition of others.
Succorance	Frequently seeks the sympathy, protection, love, advice, and reassurance of other people; may feel insecure or helpless without such support; confides difficulties readily to a receptive person.
Understanding	Wants to understand many areas of knowledge; values synthesis of ideas, verifiable generalization, logical thought, particularly when directed at satisfying intellectual curiosity.

ScaleDefining Trait Adjectives

Abasement	mEEK, self-accusing, self-blaming, obsequious, self-belittling, surrendering, resigned, self-critical, humble, apologizing, subservient, obedient, yielding, deferential, self-subordinating.
Achievement	striving, accomplishing, capable,

	purposeful, attaining, industrious, achieving, aspiring, enterprising, self-improving, productive, driving, ambitious, resourceful, competitive.
Affiliation	neighborly, loyal, warm, amicable, good-natured, friendly, companionable, genial, affable, cooperative, gregarious, hospitable, sociable, affiliative, good-willed.
Aggression	aggressive, quarrelsome, irritable, argumentative, threatening, attacking, antagonistic, pushy, hot-tempered, easily-angered, hostile, revengeful, belligerent, blunt, retaliative.
Autonomy	unmanageable, free, self-reliant, independent, autonomous, rebellious, unconstrained, individualistic, ungovernable, self-determined, non-conforming, uncompliant, undominated, resistant, lone-wolf.
Change	inconsistent, fickle, flexible, unpredictable, wavering, mutable, adaptable, changeable, irregular, variable, capricious, innovative, flighty, vacillating, inconstant.
Cognitive Structure	precise, exacting, definite, seeks certainty, meticulous, perfectionistic, clarifying, explicit, accurate, rigorous, literal, avoids ambiguity, defining, rigid, needs structure.
Defence	self-protective, justifying, denying, defensive, self-condoning, suspicious, secretive, has a "chip on the shoulder," resists inquiries, protesting, wary, self-excusing, rationalizing, guarded, touchy.
Dominance	governing, controlling, commanding, domineering, influential, persuasive, forceful, ascendant, leading, directing, dominant, assertive, authoratative, powerful, supervising.



Endurance	persistent, determined, steadfast, enduring, unfaltering, persevering, unremitting, relentless, tireless, dogged, energetic, has stamina, sturdy, zealous, durable.
Exhibition	colorful, entertaining, unusual, spellbinding, exhibitionistic, conspicuous, noticeable, expressive, ostentatious, immodest, demonstrative, flashy, dramatic, pretentious, showy.
Harm Avoidance	fearful, withdraws from danger, self-protecting, pain-avoidant, careful, cautious, seeks safety, timorous, apprehensive, precautionary, unadventurous, avoids risks, attentive to danger, stays out of harm's way, vigilant.
Impulsivity	hasty, rash, uninhibited, spontaneous, reckless, irrepressible, quick-thinking, mercurial, impatient, incautious, hurried, impulsive, foolhardy, excitable, impetuous.
Nurturance	sympathetic, paternal, helpful, benevolent, encouraging, caring, protective, comforting material, supporting, aiding, ministering, consoling, charitable, assisting.
Order	neat, organized, tidy, systematic, well-ordered, disciplined, prompt, consistent, orderly, clean, methodical, scheduled, planful, unvarying, deliberate.
Play	playful, jovial, jolly, pleasure-seeking, merry, laughter-loving, joking, frivolous, prankish, sportive, mirthful, fun-loving, gleeful, carefree, blithe.
Sentience	aesthetic, enjoys physical sensations, observant, earthy, aware, notices environment, feeling, sensitive, sensuous, open to experience, perceptive, responsive, noticing, discriminating, alive to impressions.

Social Recognition	approval seeking, proper, well-behaved, seeks recognition, courteous, makes good impression, seeks respectability, accommodating, socially proper, seeks admiration, obliging, agreeable, socially sensitive, desirous of credit, behaves appropriate.
Succorance	trusting, ingratiating, dependent, entreating, appealing for help, seeks support, wants advice, helpless, confiding, needs protection, requesting, craves affection, pleading, helpseeking, defenseless.
Understanding	inquiring, curious, analytical, exploring, intellectual, reflective, incisive, investigative, probing, logical, scrutinizing, theoretical, astute, rational, inquisitive.

APPENDIX B  
Study Materials

TO: Prospective Teacher Participants

FROM: Raymond A. Dunleavy, Principal Investigator  
(Telephone: Office/348-6686 or Home/343-3533)

DATE: January 1986

SUBJECT: Research Study

Your school was selected to be in a research study being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at West Virginia University. The purpose of the study is to contribute to an understanding of differences that exist between public school and private school teachers. The following information is provided so that you can decide whether you wish to participate in the study.

Your participation is solicited, but it is strictly voluntary. Participants will be asked to provide a minimum amount of background information and to complete a standardized questionnaire. The questionnaire is a series of true-false statements that a person might use to describe himself or herself. Completion of the questionnaire requires about 30-45 minutes. Questionnaires will be identified only by number, and all information will be confidential in accordance with ethical research practice.

If you decide to participate, please respond to the items on the questionnaire with your first reaction--your immediate feeling. Try to choose the statement that, in general, best describes you, but don't worry or puzzle over any item. You do not have to respond to every statement on the questionnaire; however, an accurate interpretation of scores depends on having a response for all items.

You have received a questionnaire and an answer sheet in an envelope with an identification number. When you have completed the questionnaire, return it with the answer sheet to the envelope. Seal the envelope and return it to the office. Your personality profile will be returned to the office in a sealed envelope with your identification number. Please be assured that all responses and results will remain confidential. Your identification number is \_\_\_\_\_.

Please don't hesitate to call me if you have any questions about the study. If your questions are about your questionnaire results, please refer to your identification number. Thank you for your cooperation.

RAD/s



TO: Teacher Participants

FROM: Raymond A. Dunleavy, Principal Investigator  
Telephone: 348-6686 (office/343-3533 (home))

DATE: January 1986

SUBJECT: Research Study

Thank you for participating in the research study.  
Enclosed is the personality profile developed from your  
answers to the questionnaire.

The profile is reported in a standard T-score  
distribution. A T-score of 40 to 60 is considered  
average, above 60, higher than average and below 40,  
lower than average. I have included a description of  
each personality trait so that you can better interpret  
your test profile.

I appreciate your time and effort in completing the  
questionnaire. If you need further information on the  
research study or on your scores, please contact me.

/js

encls

APPENDIX C

Principal Evaluation Instruments

Identification Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Note: This assessment of principal compliance orientation requires that a structured interview be given by the researcher. During the interview, the interviewer and the respondent both read the directions given, and the interviewer assists the respondent if any questions concerning the assessment become evident.

## SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

What is the total number of students enrolled in your school? \_\_\_\_\_

Approximately what percentile of the students in your school come from low income families? \_\_\_\_\_%

How is this number determined? \_\_\_\_\_

What is the approximate education level of the parents of students in your school? Please tell me the approximate percentage in these categories:

\_\_\_\_\_ % Graduate degree (medical, legal, other professional graduate degree)

\_\_\_\_\_ % College graduate

\_\_\_\_\_ % High school graduate

What approximate percentage of the students in your school fall into these categories on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills?

Below Average (Stanines 1, 2, 3) \_\_\_\_\_%

Average (Stanines 4, 5, 6) \_\_\_\_\_%

Above Average (Stanines 7, 8, 9) \_\_\_\_\_%

What categories of exceptional students are served by your school? Approximately how many students are there in each of these exceptionalities?

\_\_\_\_\_ Gifted                      \_\_\_\_\_ EMI                      \_\_\_\_\_ TMI

\_\_\_\_\_ SLD                              \_\_\_\_\_ BD                              \_\_\_\_\_ VI

\_\_\_\_\_ HI                              \_\_\_\_\_ Physically Handicapped

\_\_\_\_\_ Other



How many staff members are employed in your school in each of these positions?

	<u>Full Time</u>	<u>Part Time</u>
Administrator	_____	_____
Classroom teacher	_____	_____
Special education teacher	_____	_____
Teacher aide	_____	_____
Counselor	_____	_____
Subject are specialist (e.g., reading)	_____	_____
IMC person	_____	_____
Food service person	_____	_____
Clerical	_____	_____
Custodian	_____	_____

How many years work experience in education do you have? \_\_\_\_\_

How many years have you been a principal? \_\_\_\_\_

## ADMINISTRATOR COMPLIANCE ORIENTATION INVENTORY

Assume that you are involved in each of the following ten situations. Each situation has three alternative actions you might initiate. Think about what you would do in each circumstance. Then circle the letters of the alternative action choice which you think would most closely describe your behavior in the situation presented. PLEASE CIRCLE ONLY ONCE CHOICE

#1

SITUATION: You have just received the CTBS scores for the students in your school. The scores are lower than expected. Your teachers are concerned and have asked you how best to motivate student learning.

## ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

- A. Suggest keeping students after school and during recess, limiting participation in extracurricular activities, and stopping out-of-class activities such as assemblies and field trips if expected learning is not demonstrated.
- B. Make funds available for teachers to purchase small gift items (special pencils, books, pencil boxes, etc.) to reward students if expected learning is demonstrated.
- C. Recommend establishing a school-wide recognition program including an honor roll, names in school newsletter, verbal praise to reward demonstrated learning.

#2

SITUATION: A new teacher in your school is performing below your standards. After explaining your performance expectations, you observe no marked improvement.

## ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

- A. Establish a teacher-of-the-month program and specifically encourage this teacher to work for the award.
- B. Establish a program for improvement which provides specific training and supervision

related to areas of need.

- C. Make sure the teacher is aware that improvements in performance will be accompanied by recommendations for merit pay.

#3

SITUATION: You observe that certain members of your staff are either tardy or leave early from school. Excessive sick leave is also evident.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

- A. Establish specific rewards for improved attendance, e.g., extra supplies for classroom.
- B. Call staff meeting to explain the effects of loss of class time. Request teachers' ideas for improvements in the situation. Offer award for perfect attendance.
- C. Write directive to teachers about the undesirable situation. mandate specific consequences for tardiness and unauthorized absences, e.g., infractions will be documented and noted in personnel files.

#4

SITUATION: Your staff is experiencing difficulties in classroom management. The teachers ask you for the best practices to use so that students will obey the established rules. You answer their question.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

- A. Ignore undesirable behavior and praise good behavior.
- B. Give corporal punishment, time out, suspension and expulsion for undesired behavior.
- C. Give well-behaved students privileges and rewards, e.g., extra credit points, excuse from assignments or tests, etc.

#5

SITUATION: You are asked by your director to accept a teacher for your staff on transfer who is not really qualified for the job.

## ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

- A. Accept the teacher for your staff and encourage and support the teacher as much as possible.
- B. Accept the teacher for your staff but request to send teacher for training.
- C. Accept the teacher but request that your school be publicly recognized for its efforts in employer/employee relations.

#6

SITUATION: You are aware that the teacher turnover in West Virginia each year ranges from 8 to 12 percent. A Board of Education member asks you for your recommendation on what major change in educational practices would tend most to reduce this statistic. You answer the Board member's question.

## ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

- A. Arrange school conditions and methods of operation in such a way that teacher efforts are facilitated and supported.
- B. Set up a tighter administrative structure in the school system.
- C. Increase the teacher salary levels.

#7

SITUATION: You have added several new classroom teachers to your school staff. How best would you supervise their classroom instruction?

## ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

- A. Provide detailed and specific guidance. Base their evaluation on how well the teachers follow clear, definite, documented rules pertaining to classroom instruction.
- B. Give teachers latitude to use their own judgment. Favor an informal case-by-case approach for supervising classroom instruction. Give teachers certificates for outstanding performance.
- C. Your style is a mixture of both the above.

Teachers receive material reward for outstanding performance, e.g., an appreciation dinner.

#8

SITUATION: Since you can't give teachers more pay, in what way can you assure desirable teacher behavior:

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

- A. Take disciplinary action, e.g., transfer teacher to less desirable classroom, document specific occasions when teachers break the rules.
- B. Offer incentives, e.g., new textbooks for their students.
- C. Reinforce desired teacher behavior, e.g., recognition, praise, privileges.

#9

SITUATION: you are asked to interview a person for your staff. The person is qualified for two available positions but prefers position A. You prefer to hire him/her for position B. You want to convince the person to take position B.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

- A. Tell the person that you will give him/her a quiet, air-conditioned classroom for taking position B.
- B. Tell the person that you will provide extra classroom supplies if he/she takes position B.
- C. Tell the person that only the one position is available.

#10

SITUATION: You have difficulty in staffing a certain teacher expertise in your school. There is a scarcity of these people in your district and some of those who fill these positions are resigning.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

- A. Hold people who are working in these positions. Pursue legal action if teacher contract is broken.

- B. Raise pay scale specifically for the teacher expertise.
- C. Raise position prestige specifically for the teacher expertise, e.g., give it a special title.

Directions for scoring: Circle the letter that has been chosen for each situation. After you have circled the alternative action, total the number of circles for each sub-column and enter the total in the space provided.

Situations	Alternative Actions		
#1	A	B	C
#2	B	C	A
#3	C	A	B
#4	B	C	A
#5	A	B	C
#6	B	C	A
#7	A	C	B
#8	A	B	C
#9	C	B	A
#10	A	B	C
TOTALS			

Compliance Patterns and Teacher Personalities In  
Private and Public School Organizations  
in West Virginia

Raymond Augustine Dunleavy

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore administrator compliance orientation and teacher personality relationships and differences between Catholic private and public school organizations in West Virginia. The Personality Research Form, Form E (Jackson, 1974) was administered to 41 teachers of a Catholic private school organization and to 38 teachers of a public school organization. Statistical analysis of the Personality Research Form, Form E (PRF-E) data using an ANOVA method revealed significant differences between the school organizational groups for 5 of the 22 personality traits measured. The results indicated that public school teachers were higher achievers, more aggressive, more concerned with their reputation and what other people think, did not accept criticism as readily, and demonstrated lower self regard than did the private school teachers. The teacher personality traits



of achievement and social recognition were highly correlated which suggested that the teachers were achievement motivated by excessive concern for favorable perception by significant others.

The Administrator Compliance Orientation Inventory, a self-constructed, 10-item, forced choice questionnaire based on Etzioni's (1975) compliance theory, was administered to the five private and the five public school principal organizational participants. The Mann-Whitney U test was applied to the compliance orientation test scores to examine for statistically significant differences in test scores between the Catholic private and public school organizational groups. Significant differences were found in the administrator coercive compliance and normative compliance scores. A significant difference was not revealed between the two school organizations in the administrator remunerative compliance scores. The results indicated that the public school organization placed more emphasis on the exercise of coercive compliance and less emphasis on the exercise of normative compliance to control teacher subordinates than did the private school organization. Spearman (1949) correlation coefficients were used to examine the relationships between the administrator compliance

orientation and the teacher personality traits. Statistically significant relationships were found between the administrator coercive compliance orientation and the teacher personality trait of aggression and between the administrator normative compliance orientation and the teacher personality trait of social recognition. These research findings supported Etzioni's (1975) theory for congruent compliance relationships. Further research is recommended for better understanding application of this study to educational settings.