The study resulted from the researcher's personal observation that a number of non-mobile teachers seemed apathetic. The resultant question asked whether there was a relationship between mobility and enthusiasm in the teaching profession. Two major null hypotheses were generated:

H₀₁: There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule sub-scales for mobile and non-mobile teachers.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale for mobile and non-mobile teachers.

The instruments used to test these hypotheses were the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) and the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale (SDES). Development of the SDES became a significant task in the total research.

The teachers, who participated in the study, were randomly selected from rural and small urban schools of the Mid/South-Willamette Valley of Oregon. All teachers had at least eight, but not more than fifteen years of experience.
The One-Way Anova Design (Fixed Arrangement) was used to determine whether any significant differences existed between the means of any of the scales. To validate the SDES, the SDES and the EPPS were correlated. This relationship indicator was established by using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient.

All fifteen sub-hypotheses of $H_01$ were retained. These sub-hypotheses corresponded to the fifteen sub-scales of the EPPS. Four sub-hypotheses comprised $H_02$. The first three of these, dealing with teacher perception of enthusiasm, were retained. The fourth sub-hypothesis, dealing with administrators' perceptions, was rejected.

Therefore, it was concluded that there were no significant differences in personal characteristics between mobile and non-mobile teachers. In addition, the mean scores for teacher personality were similar to the "EPPS General Population Scores." It was also concluded that there were no differences in the levels of enthusiasm of mobile and non-mobile teachers as perceived by the teachers themselves. Administrators, however, perceived mobile teachers to be more enthusiastic than non-mobile teachers.

Correlation of the SDES with the EPPS showed a relationship of "slight to moderate" intensity. This classification range suggests that the SDES be used with caution.

It was recommended that teacher screening practices avoid the criterion of mobility; that evaluation processes include teacher perceptions; that administrators be aware that evaluation of new teachers is not likely to be as accurate as that of the non-mobile
teachers on the same staff; and that behaviors and teaching techniques concerning teacher enthusiasm be taught to prospective teachers as part of their on-going teacher preparation curriculum. It was also recommended that the relationship between teacher mobility and enthusiasm be further investigated, and that the SDES be refined prior to future use.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Many teachers exude vitality and are enthusiastic about their jobs. However, some teachers are not enthusiastic toward students and teaching. Where these people have held the same job for a number of years, it is sometimes assumed that they are stale because of lack of mobility and its attendant change. Some stereotyped thinking exists, i.e., a change is good. The validity of this kind of reasoning needs to be tested. It may be a self-evident truth or it may be a myth.

Whether truth or myth, school administrators have voiced concern regarding the tenured, non-mobile teacher. Some feel that judicious placement of personnel can be instrumental in raising the level of professional vitality among teachers.

It is common practice to periodically move principals and assistant principals. Some district administrators view planned, within-district mobility of teachers in the same manner as that of principals and assistant principals. No research was found either to support or refute the qualitative value of planned, within-district mobility in relation to teachers.

However, inferences might be drawn from a closely related area—-that of teacher turnover. Charters (Charters, 1964, p. 170), in studying teacher turnover and morale found that mobile teachers had lower morale scores. This appears to conflict with extant administrative opinion toward the desirability of planned mobility. These two views may not,
in fact, be diametrically opposed, or for that matter, even be related since Charter's study looked only at teachers who were severing association with their districts. He did not study teachers who retained their tenure and who moved about within the same district.

One specific facet of morale is enthusiasm. Implied or explicitly stated, enthusiasm appears on the majority of teacher evaluation forms. Where implicit, the evaluator makes reference to enthusiasm in the section set aside for general impressions or comments. Failure to make some direct reference to a satisfactory level of enthusiasm almost always places the teacher at a disadvantage. Enthusiasm is a nebulous quality that most administrators are at a loss to define, yet is that desirable, deciding factor that is considered important enough to rate and to seek out.

The review of related literature finds no formal research dealing directly with enthusiasm, per se, either in education or elsewhere. However, there are numerous studies dealing with morale, of which enthusiasm is one of the integral parts.

One study tended to support the administrators' intuition that mobility is valuable. It has been found that teacher self-estimates of morale relate closely to the quality of education as seen by the administrator, i.e., teachers with high morale are good teachers (Redefer, 1975, p. 60). Therefore, it is quite possible that enthusiasm and quality education correlate. Enthusiastic teachers are almost always considered to be good teachers and the best teachers are rated as enthusiastic.

Because enthusiasm permeates the educational system (or perhaps
because it does not) and because little has been done in this area, some attempt should be made to explore the topic.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to determine whether there is a relationship between the horizontal mobility of public school teachers K-12 and their level of professional enthusiasm and personal characteristics. This will provide educational administrators with an information base upon which to make recommendations for the placement or relocation of staff within a district.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

MAJOR PROBLEM: To discover whether mobile teachers have different personal characteristics than do non-mobile public school teachers K-12.

The major problem was found to have three distinct facets. These were, therefore, organized into three sub-problem categories as follows:

Category I: Personal characteristics--sub-problems 1-15,
Category II: Levels of enthusiasm--sub-problems 16-19, and
Category III: Levels of correlation between the sub-problems --sub-problems 20-23.

Category I: Personal Characteristics

Sub-problem 1: To ascertain the level of need for achievement of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 2: To ascertain the level of need for deference of mobile and non-mobile teachers.
Sub-problem 3: To ascertain the level of need for order of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 4: To ascertain the level of need for exhibition of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 5: To ascertain the level of need for autonomy of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 6: To ascertain the level of need for affiliation of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 7: To ascertain the level of need for intraception of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 8: To ascertain the level of need for succorance of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 9: To ascertain the level of need for dominance of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 10: To ascertain the level of need for abasement of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 11: To ascertain the level of need for nurturance of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 12: To ascertain the level of need for change of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 13: To ascertain the level of need for endurance of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 14: To ascertain the level of need for heterosexuality of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Sub-problem 15: To ascertain the level of need for aggression of
mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Category II: Levels of Enthusiasm

Sub-problem 16: To ascertain the level of enthusiasm that mobile and non-mobile teachers believe their co-workers would assign to them.

Sub-problem 17: To ascertain the level of enthusiasm that mobile and non-mobile teachers personally report having in comparison to their co-workers.

Sub-problem 18: To ascertain the level of enthusiasm that mobile and non-mobile teachers believe to be professionally desirable.

Sub-problem 19: To ascertain how administrators rate the enthusiasm level of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Category III: Levels of Correlation

Sub-problem 20: To ascertain the level of correlation between sub-problems 1 to 15 and sub-problem 17.

Sub-problem 21: To ascertain the level of correlation between sub-problems 1 to 15 and sub-problem 19.

Sub-problem 22: To ascertain the level of correlation between sub-problem 17 and sub-problem 19.

Sub-problem 23: To ascertain the level of correlation among problems 16, 17 and 18.

HYPOTHESES

This study generated two major hypotheses which have been designated \( H_0^1 \) and \( H_0^2 \). They are:

\( H_0^1: \) There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule sub-scales for mobile and non-mobile teachers.
H₀²: There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale for mobile and non-mobile teachers.

RATIONALE

It is assumed that the education of pupils will be better in a school characterized by a permanent cadre of career teachers, rather than one staffed by a troupe of itinerants (Bush, 1969). If this is true, then every effort should be made to improve the status of the career teacher and thereby increase the likelihood of attracting and retaining better persons in teaching.

Itinerancy is extreme mobility, the value of which is open to question. While mobility can be expensive to both the educational institution and the teacher, it can also be beneficial. Recruitment costs and personal adjustment costs can be offset by acquisition of the "right" teacher for a position, and the "right" position for the teacher. The mobile teacher brings new ideas, orientations, courses, and vitality to the new job. Consequently, the student is enriched (Taylor, 1968, p. 66, 83.) Other teachers also benefit, since it has been found that the sources for 54 per cent of "new" ideas are other people (Hotvedt, 1973, p. 339). Thus unobtrusive staff development can be promoted by the acquisition of new personnel. The balance desired between too much mobility and too little mobility is difficult to determine (Weins, 1973, p. 15).

It is questionable that the current educational system has within itself sufficient scope for variety to keep teachers enthusiastic and vital. Its routine may devitalize and dull teacher enthusiasm. A
dilemma exists since this same system has the responsibility for injecting variety.

We live in an age of rapid cultural and technological change which creates its own anxieties as well as its own rewards. But long before the rapidity of modern change descended upon us we held to the value of variety and change. Change has been, and still is, associated with spiritual rejuvenation, with rest, and with variety in one's daily living. Mobility may belong to this class of change.

It is presumptuous to assume that change is synonymous with growth and vitality. However, the possibility that change may contribute more to personal growth than non-change should not be overlooked. It would seem that each time a teacher encounters a change of environment, i.e., mobility, he experiences the "thaw" aspect of the "freeze-thaw-refreeze" paradigm (Raia, 1974, p. 154), and therefore, there is potential for growth at that point.

There are many implications surrounding the "mobility, non-mobility, effective teacher" question. If, in fact, mobile teachers are different from non-mobile teachers, decisions regarding the following may be affected:

--tenure
--personal professional development
--inservice training
--planned change within the school
--planned innovation
--district mobility policy (transfers)
--policy regarding sabbatical leave
--policy regarding personnel experience balance within a school
--improvement of teaching
--bonus pay (or penalty) related to mobility or non-mobility
--hiring policy regarding mobile or non-mobile teachers

ASSUMPTIONS
For the purposes of this study, it was assumed:
--that enthusiasm is desirable, is valued in education, and is an integral part of good teaching,
--that morale can be measured, and that enthusiasm, being a facet of morale, can be defined and measured,
--that descriptive antonyms can be established for the synonyms of enthusiasm, and once defined, it is identifiable, by administrators who can perceive differences between teachers,
--that teachers will respond honestly to personality tests, and if given a scale, will accurately report how they believe that others perceive them, and how they view themselves in relation to others,
--that the unidimensional equal-appearing-interval scale is a recognized instrument for identifying perception, and will show relationships (or differences) between items,
--that the semantic differential scale is an established unidimensional equal-appearing-interval scale for identifying perceptions.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions have been offered in order to clarify the meaning of certain terms and their use in this study:

abasement* (aba): to feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doing, to feel better when giving in and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way, to feel the need for confession of errors, to feel depressed by inability to handle situations, to feel timid in the presence of superiors, to feel inferior to others in most respects.

achievement (ach): to do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play.

affiliation (aff): to be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships, to make as many friends as possible, to share things with friends, to do things with friends rather than alone, to form strong attachments, to write letters to friends.

aggression (agg): to attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks about them, to criticize others publicly, to make fun of others, to tell others off when disagreeing with them, to get revenge for insults, to become angry, to blame others when things go wrong, to read newspaper accounts of violence.

autonomy (aut): to be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things, to be independent of others in making decisions, to feel free to do what one wants, to do things that are unconventional, to avoid situations where one is expected to conform, to do things without regard to what others may think, to criticize those in positions of authority, to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

change (chg): to do new and different things, to travel, to meet new people, to experience novelty and change in daily routine, to experiment and try new things, to eat in new and different places.

*All terms from the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule are assumed to be prefaced with the phrase "Need for."
places, to try new and different jobs, to move about the country and live in different places, to participate in new fads and fashions.

deference (def): to get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and do what is expected, to praise others, to tell others that they have done a good job, to accept the leadership of others, to read about great men, to conform to custom and avoid the unconventional, to let others make decisions.

dominance (dom): to argue for one's point of view, to be a leader in groups to which one belongs, to be regarded by others as a leader, to be elected or appointed chairman of committees, to make group decisions, to settle arguments and disputes between others, to persuade and influence others to do what one wants, to supervise and direct the actions of others, to tell others how to do their job.

endurance (end): to keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved, to work at a single job before taking on others, to stay up late working in order to get a job done, to put in long hours of work without distraction, to stick at a problem even though it may seem as if no progress is being made, to avoid being interrupted while at work.

enthusiasm: (as defined by the panel of judges in this study) active, energetic, alive, eager, spirited, responsive, cheerful, confident, interested, motivated, willing, earnest.

exhibition (exh): to say witty and clever things, to tell amusing jokes and stories, to talk about personal adventures and experiences, to have others notice and comment upon one's appearance, to say things just to see what effect it will have on others, to talk about personal achievements, to be the center of attention, to use words that others do not know the meaning of, to ask questions others cannot answer.

heterosexuality (het): to go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite sex, to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex, to participate in discussions about sex, to read books and plays involving sex, to listen to or to tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited.

horizontal mobility: moving to a new job while remaining at the same level without significant change in pay; obtaining the same kind of job.
intraception (int): to analyze one's motives and feelings, to understand how others feel about problems, to put one's self into another's place, to judge people by why they do things rather than by what they do, to analyze the behavior of others, to analyze the motives of others, to predict how others will act.

mobile teacher: one who moves at least every five years.

mobility: any move; within a district between schools; between districts, between states, et cetera.

need for: manifest need present; reflects the level of that personal characteristic.

non-mobility: working in the same school building for eight years or more.

nurturance (nur): to help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness and sympathy, to forgive others, to do small favors for others, to be generous with others, to sympathize with others who are hurt or sick, to show a great deal of affection toward others, to have others confide in one about personal problems.

order (ord): to have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult task, to have things organized, to keep things neat and orderly, to make advance plans when taking a trip, to organize details or work, to keep letters and files according to some system, to have meals organized and a definite time for eating, to have things arranged so that they run smoothly without change.

personal needs (EPPS): achievement, deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, affiliation, intraception, succorance, dominance, abasement, nurturance, change, endurance, heterosexuality, aggression.

qualitative: pertaining to quality; subjective aspects.

quantitative: pertaining to quantity; identifiable, countable aspects.

social desirability: degree to which something is perceived as being more socially desirable than other things.

succorance (suc): to have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others by sympathetic and understanding about personal problems, to receive a great deal of affection from others, to have others do favors cheerfully, to be helped by others when depressed, to have others feel sorry when one is sick, to have a fuss made over one when hurt.

worth: value, merit, usefulness.
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

Mobility is a complex topic, consisting of many facets. Because of the breadth of existing quantitative research, this literature review discusses only the highlights of the quantitative aspects of mobility. These aspects are not an integral part of the study but must be identified in order to distinguish the "explored" facets of mobility from the "unexplored."

The qualitative facets of mobility come indirectly as a by-product of studies in education, business and industry. Enthusiasm is one such facet. It was usually found to be a peripheral aspect of some other topic, i.e., motivation, work and morale, mood and production output, reading and achievement. No instance of literature linking mobility or non-mobility to enthusiasm was discovered. The two may be unrelated. It appears, however, that this area has not as yet been investigated thoroughly.

While it is recognized that the quantitative and the qualitative aspects of mobility are inseparable, the review of pertinent literature is expedited by separating it into two areas: mobility and enthusiasm. The heading "Mobility" deals primarily with the quantitative analysis of mobility as related to teachers. The heading "Enthusiasm" deals with the subjective quality, enthusiasm, and attempts to show it as a qualitative aspect of mobility.
MOBILITY

Teacher mobility and related quantitative considerations have been extensively explored. It is known how many teachers leave the profession, how long they have taught and their reasons for leaving. It is also known how many teachers move about within the profession, to what age and sex group they belong and their reasons for moving. With this quantitative demographic data it is possible to predict, with fair accuracy, the staffing needs of a locality. However, the relationships between age, experience, mobility, school affiliation, morale, sex, and marital status are far from being clear. All of these factors have impact upon the conduct of this study. They are variables which cannot be controlled.

For the purposes of this study, only horizontal teacher mobility was considered. Horizontal teacher mobility concerns all those teachers who are geographically mobile, whether within districts or between systems or states, but continue to remain in the teaching profession. Although some teachers do move vertically up a promotional ladder, most movements are lateral, from one teaching assignment to another. Less than five per cent of teacher change is vertical (Greenberg, 1973, p. 2).

Even though it is recognized that some teacher mobility is normal because of new professional opportunities, promotions, transfers, retirement, death and other intervening factors, teacher turnover has traditionally been viewed, by administrators, as a problem (Letchworth, 1971, p. 2). Turnover creates recruitment costs and inservice training costs which are a major investment to school districts. The academic
impact of a high rate of turnover usually lessens the efficiency and weakens the cohesiveness of the educational organization. This has implication for achievement of students and the morale of the staff. A survey of Oregon School Districts completed in 1968 found that seven out of ten teachers had left their respective districts within five years (Charters, 1969, abstract). The shortest survival expectancies were found among females between 20 and 24 years of age, then 25 to 29, followed by males age 20 to 24. It is now nationally accepted that younger teachers have a higher turnover rate (Texas Education Agency, 1971). Some educational leaders feel that 85 to 88 per cent of those who began teaching have left the profession by the eighth year (Kowitz, 1970, p. 5). To identify genuine teacher mobility, as opposed to teacher drop-out, requires at least eight years. Because the eighth year appears to be a critical point, this study used only teachers who had proven themselves to be career teachers by virtue of having remained in the profession for at least eight years. This made experience an independent variable, without giving consideration to age.

Age and experience appear to correlate (Kowitz, 1970, p. 16). While there are characteristics differing significantly between widely spaced age groups of teachers (Leggett, 1974, n.p.; Goldman, 1973, p. 340), it is not yet clear whether these are a function of age or of experience (Ryans, 1961, p. 285). A teacher's age is systematically and strongly related to all aspects of mobility, but years of teaching experience do not appear to influence the stability of a teacher's school affiliation (Harnischfeger, 1975, p. 2). The variability within age groups is,
also, such that one should not reach a conclusion concerning individual teachers merely in terms of age or experience alone.

The average length of service for teachers who separate from their school system is substantially shorter, at the time of their departure, than the average length of service for the majority of teachers who remain. Sixty per cent of teachers who leave have been in the system three years or less at the time they depart. Not only are the new teachers the most mobile, they also have the lowest levels of identification with the school system and the lowest morale scores (Charters, 1964, p. 170). While the statistics indicate, on the other hand, that older teachers are more stable (Weins, 1973; Blackburn, 1972, p. 1), mobility, for the experienced teacher, still represents an opportunity for economic advancement. Thus, experienced mobile teachers have significantly higher salaries than their non-mobile counterparts (Kowitz, 1970, p. viii). For mobile teachers, marital status was not found to be a significant factor in mobility or in salary. Marital status is, therefore, not a variable considered in this study.

It appears that morale, as defined and studied by Charters, is in part, determined by the lack of community and school identity, which can only develop over a number of years. There is no indication that these people were unenthusiastic teachers. It might even be inferred that these people were superior teachers since they drew higher salaries.

Kowitz found little relationship between marital status, mobility, and salary. However, Charters feels that the career pattern for women can be understood in terms of the cultural and subcultural norms of society (marriage and children). The career pattern for men is more
affected by conventional economic forces (Charters, 1969, p. 186). There is also disagreement among findings as to whether experienced male teachers or female teachers are the more mobile. Males may be just slightly more mobile, but the difference does not appear to be significant. It is further postulated that men move more often for money (Orlich, 1966, p. 89) and that women move to improve their working conditions (Becker, 1952, p. 57). This lack of consensus regarding the relationship between mobility and sex precluded the use of sex as a variable in this study.

It is apparent that the educational environment (the total system) has considerable impact upon the various components of teacher morale, including enthusiasm, and possibly even teacher personality. Studies have quantified sociometric dissatisfiers, for example, to account for definite patterns of mobility in most school systems. Newly hired teachers are placed in schools with low sociometric status (Greenberg & McCall, 1973, p. vi). Often these teachers want to move out of difficult schools which have discipline problems, where pupils are viewed as having little educational potential, and where the administration is unsupportive. They see little opportunity for professional growth and, where permitted, often move to the senior high school (Castiglione, 1968, p. 31). Most teachers are middle class and prefer middle class schools with a higher sociometric status. Because they have a large investment of specific human capital in their own placement, they will tend to be more satisfied with their assignment and stay on, giving the school a greater experience base (Greenberg & McCall, 1973, p. vi).
Teachers who stay in poor schools adjust and change to fit the situation: they revise their expectations of the children, they integrate into the network of social relations, are accepted by other teachers as equals, establish a reputation of discipline, and establish relationships with the families, thus making their environment predictable and satisfactory (Becker, 1964, p. 381). For a teacher to risk the unknowns in requesting a transfer, ecological and demographic processes must intervene. A change of principals, for example, can initiate movement.

Does the adjustment to, or the satisfaction with ecological and demographic conditions have anything to do with enthusiasm? It is assumed that satisfied people are non-mobile. It has been established that those who are movers seem to feel that they will find more satisfactory working conditions at institutions other than the one where they are employed. What they actually find is a situation closely resembling the one they left, and once again, they move on (Blackburn, 1972, p. 12). No theory of mobility has emerged, and there is yet no predictor of who will move (Brown, 1967, p. 6). Perhaps some inferences can be drawn from postsecondary institutions where it is felt that a change of landscape may be very good for the individual—he will function better by going to a new institution. A new environment, even if composed of essentially the same ingredients, may be sufficient to recharge a teacher whose energies have been drained off along nonproductive circuits. If so, he gains, as does his school, and mobility becomes a way of keeping faculty regenerated (Blackburn, 1972, p. 12). It is alleged that often the best drop out the most rapidly, leaving a disproportionate number of the less
able to fill the ranks of those who become career teachers. The professional development of these teachers primarily rests with the individual to design a program to improve his own professional knowledge and skills. The completion of additional course work often serves only to allow stubborn staff members to return to their ruts. The requirement is met with as little effort and inconvenience as possible (Miller, 1972, p. 189).

While there are costs to mobility, there are also benefits which accrue. Mobility has benefits for the school, the teacher, and the society. Mobility enables the school to locate specific personnel needed to develop the kind of program desired. Teachers can geographically and educationally situate in places where they are needed. This affords them opportunities to achieve success and career fulfillment. They disperse new ideas, new orientations, new courses and new vitality. This in turn contributes to varied exposure and a broadened perspective for the student (Taylor, 1968, p. 66). One survey (Hotvedt, 1973, p. 339) found that the main source of new ideas for teachers are other teachers, periodicals, and college courses. Fully 54 per cent of teacher sources of new ideas came from friends or those with whom they worked most closely. Therefore, it is logical to assume that professional development is possible by infusing the professional milieu with new people. Just how much mobility is beneficial is not clear. Undoubtedly, the amount of mobility which would maximize the ratio of benefits to costs would vary between educational institutions (Weins, 1973, p. 15).

Mobility is a complex topic. Inherent in, and common to, all the
studies that were cited was some satisfier or dissatisfier of the Herzberg model which will be discussed in the following section. While this investigator has begun to comprehend the relationships between job satisfaction and mobility, the relationship between enthusiasm and mobility is still not clear.

ENTHUSIASM

No literature was found which pertained directly to "enthusiasm." However, research has been done on "morale," which encompasses a number of variables, including enthusiasm. The classic contributions in this area have come from Herzberg (Herzberg, 1959, p. 111), who suggested that those factors associated with job satisfaction (satisfiers) are generally tied directly or indirectly with job activities such as: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibilities, and advancement. The factors associated with job dissatisfaction (dissatisfiers) are usually extrinsic to the work itself and are primarily associated with the job context rather than job activities. When Herzberg's theory is summarized, two factors associated with the job emerge (satisfiers and dissatisfiers) and two factors associated with personality characteristics emerge (motivation seekers, and maintenance seekers) (Sergiovanni, 1967, p. 347). It is the intent of this section of the literature review to see whether mobility can be related to differences in personality characteristics.

Enthusiasm, although a highly important term, when taken out of the Herzberg paradigm, is imprecise and difficult to define. While morale may be considered to be the emotional and mental reaction of a person
to his job, it may be best conceived of as a continuous variable. The level of morale is then determinable by the extent to which an individual's needs are satisfied, and the extent to which the individual perceives satisfaction as stemming from the total job situation. High morale is evident when there is interest in and enthusiasm for the job. What is important in morale is what the person believes and feels, rather than the conditions that may exist as perceived by others (Bentley, 1970, p. 1).

Guba (1958, n.p.), however, considered morale within the framework of organizational theory and the problems of "maintaining the organization." In this approach two components are usually involved: (1) perceived productivity and progress toward the achievement of the tasks of the organization (task-achievement) and (2) perceived job satisfaction of individual needs through the interaction of the participant in his role within the work group and the total organization (needs-satisfaction).

Morale is conceived as an effect related to the successful interaction among individual needs and incentives and organizational goals. These theoretical considerations support the conceptual definition of our teacher morale studies:

Morale refers to the professional interest and enthusiasm that a person displays toward the achievement of individual and group goals in a given job situation (Bentley, 1970, p. 2).

This definition recognizes the satisfaction of both individual and group needs and their effective harmonization as a basis for morale. Given a certain task to be accomplished by the group, "morale pertains to the factors in the individual's life that bring about a hopeful and energetic participation on his part so that his efforts enhance the effectiveness of the group in accomplishing the task at hand" (Child, 1941, p. 393).

The educational system (organization) is frequently quite specific
as to what teachers must do for it (the system), i.e., duties, standards, professionalism. However, beyond meeting teacher financial need with the basic paycheck, it is not clear what responsibility the system deems to have toward teacher needs. It is also not clear that teachers have unique needs.

Using the Morale Tendency Score (MTS) Redefer found that: (1) the morale of teachers is closely related to the quality of education, (2) the morale scores have a significant correlation with ratings by administrators, and (3) that marital status, sex and age do not correlate with morale scores (Redefer, 1975, p. 60). Teachers agree that years of experience are much less important than flexibility and the teacher's relationship with the class (Jenkins, 1973, p. 6). If this is true, it follows that without consideration to marital status, sex or age, we can discover something about quality education by establishing a teacher's level of enthusiasm (a component of morale).

In business and industry, for at least the past fifty years there has been an awareness of a "favorable correlation between self-estimate of mood and output" (Hersey, 1932, p. 355). While educators have been intuitively aware that this was also true for teaching and learning, it has not been until just recently that empirical data have appeared. For example, it has been found that the prime motivators in learning to read are "creative teaching and teacher enthusiasm" (Artley, 1973). Bybee found that "enthusiasm in working with students in science ranked second after adequacy of personal relations" (Bybee, 1972, p. 14). We now suspect that an "educator's personal attitude rather than the methods he employs has the larger impact on the student" (Rigby, 1968, p. 5). It
appears that enthusiasm in education is important.

On the other hand, Young found that enthusiasm, per se, has no real effect upon the achievement of high and low ability students, and teachers can be trained to alter their teaching behavior to exhibit enthusiasm while teaching (Young, 1973). The majority of studies cited allude to the qualitative value of enthusiasm. None of these, however, supplies comprehensive descriptors of, or specified techniques for, the measurement of enthusiasm.

There is controversy as to whether enthusiasm is an attitude or is an inherited or bio-chemical genetic quality. If it is an attitude, then it is learned (Lemon, 1973, p. 16) and is capable of modification by further learning. An attitude is the predisposition to think, feel, perceive, and behave toward a cognitive object. One has an attitude toward something "out there" (Stagner, 1948, p. 202). However, Eysenck has consistently argued that individuals differ from one another in extroversion and their susceptibility to conditioning. He feels that these differences are likely to have a genetic foundation (Eysenck, 1956, n.p.). In addition he argues that certain aspects of attitudes, what he calls the tough-minded tender-minded dimension, do not depend on the learning ability of the individual.

Whether "learned" or "inherited," enthusiasm is a trait. A "trait" is an enduring characteristic of the individual to respond in a certain manner in all situations (Stagner, 1948, p. 202). The use of traits is a common way of measuring one's personality. If one is dominant, one exhibits dominant behavior in most situations. If one is enthusiastic, enthusiastic behavior permeates most of one's activities. While a
trait has subjective reference, an attitude has objective reference. For example, one who has a hostile attitude toward foreigners may be hostile only to foreigners, but one who has the trait "hostility" is hostile toward everyone—at least potentially (Kerlinger, 1964, p. 483).

Enthusiasm has long been one of the more subjective and elusive qualities within morale. Either as a trait or as a personal characteristic, it has traditionally been accepted as a desirable facet of teacher personality. The measurement of enthusiasm holds important implications for the improvement of teaching and learning.

SUMMARY

The qualitative aspects of mobility have been carefully studied and reduced to empirical data. Generalizations can be drawn for any specified group or any specified area. However, qualitative aspects do not seem to have been as extensively explored. A beginning was made by Charters, who, in his studies of mobility concluded that mobile teachers have low morale scores. Redefer found that morale and quality education relate, and that morale and administrators' ratings correlate. Morale scores did not correlate with marital status, sex, or age. No evidence, as yet, supports the contention that mobility and enthusiasm are related.

In industry, Hersey found a favorable correlation between self-estimate of mood and output. In education, Artley established a relationship between learning to read and teacher enthusiasm. Bybee found enthusiasm to be important in working with students in science, and
Rigby noted that the educator's personal attitude, rather than the method he employed, had the larger impact on the student. However, a dissenting study by Young found that enthusiasm had no real effect upon the achievement of high and low ability students and that teachers could be trained to alter their teaching behavior. The distinction between genuine enthusiasm and trained enthusiasm (acting) may be important.

Enthusiasm is both an attitude and a trait. According to Eysenck it is inherited. According to Lemon it is learned. The proportion of learning to inheritance is not known, but may have far reaching implications for teacher training. Whether inherited or learned, social science has developed instruments which measure both the attitude and the trait.

This review of literature found that the quantitative aspects of mobility are well documented, but that little research exists regarding the qualitative aspects of morale and its component, enthusiasm. No studies were found which relate enthusiasm to mobility.
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to provide educational administrators with an information base upon which to make recommendations for the placement or relocation of staff within a district. It makes no attempt to develop a model upon which individual teachers might be assessed, nor does it identify the individual survey participants during the survey or after.

THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

The dependent variable for the study was the teachers' reaction to 225 forced choice items of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, thirty-six items of the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale, and the responses of administrators to twelve items on the Administrators' Form of the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale. The respondents' scores are the rank assigned to the item on a nine-point unidimensional equal-appearing interval Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale. Statistical analysis of the Edwards Personal Preference Scales uses raw scores.

SAMPLING RATIONALE

The characteristics of populations of large metropolitan areas differ from populations of small urban and rural areas.* The factors determining the differences between these populations may be significant. Because this is not definitively known it is, therefore, a study in

itself and not part of this dissertation. Using both metropolitan and rural populations would have necessitated statistical analysis of the differences between the populations, as well as the differences between the mobile and the non-mobile teachers. The intent of this study was to sample from as homogeneous a group as could be identified within a narrow geographic area, thus eliminating environmental differences which might otherwise affect teachers.

The alternate approach, of sampling populations of all sizes, large and small, has justification in that it would permit generalizations back to the entire population. This procedure may, however, be hazardous because the intended sample within the scope of the study is small. Error could have been increased by enlarging the disparity from which samples were to be drawn.*

Because the investigator intends to work in rural or small urban school districts in the future, and because little research has been conducted in these environs, the study was limited to teacher populations of districts having the characteristics of rural and small urban school districts.

INSTRUMENTATION AND DESIGN RATIONALE

The review of literature failed to identify any instruments which measured enthusiasm. Therefore, it was necessary to develop the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale. Because only limited testing of this

*Dr. E. Wayne Courtney, Professor, Vocational Education, OSU, and Dr. David Faulkenberry, Associate Professor, Statistics, OSU. Personal communication, March, 1976.
Because it is a robust instrument which gives a reasonably comprehensive profile of personality. It has an established coefficient of reliability ranging from +.60 on the Deference sub-scale to a +.87 on the Heterosexuality sub-scale. A test-retest (stability) score for the instrument indicated an "r" value of +.78 (Edwards, 1959, p. 19). The instrument allows the respondent anonymity if desired. It is easy to administer and easy to score and translates into population percentiles. The forced-choice nature of the questions tends to eliminate respondent inclination to supply socially desirable answers. Respondents without prior knowledge of the test's design, find it virtually impossible to slant responses in any intended direction.

PROCEDURE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE

1. A list of 226 antonyms and synonyms of "enthusiasm" was compiled using Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases (Appendix 4).

2. Two panels were used to validate the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale (SDES). The first panel of 36 people were selected, in Corvallis, to respond to the list of 226 words. Each of these persons met the criterion that at least part of their current position involved a supervisory personnel function.
3. This panel was instructed to select those words which they would use to describe an enthusiastic employee who worked with people (Appendix 5).

4. The twelve most frequently selected words were placed in rank order, with the highest occurrence being placed first.

5. A second panel of 36 people was asked to provide antonyms for the twelve descriptors of enthusiasm (Appendix 6). This panel was comprised of academic personnel representing teachers, counselors, administrators, clerical workers, and graduate students.

6. The antonyms which best clarified the intent of the study were selected by the investigator and critiqued by a linguist.*

7. The antonyms and synonyms were then placed on a semantic differential unidimensional equal-appearing-interval nine-point scale (Appendix 2a, 2b, 2c), with each factor being expanded into three aspects so as to off-set the social desirability inclination of the respondents (EPPS Manual, 1959, p. 5). The aspects are (a) How do you think the people with whom you now work would rate you as a teacher on the following scale? (b) When you think of the people with whom you now work, how would you compare yourself? and (c) What level, on the following scale, do you think is an appropriate level for you, as a professional teacher, to attain or to have attained?

8. Norm scores were obtained by administering the instrument to the entire teaching staff of one elementary, one junior high, and one high school.

*Dr. Robert E. Johnson, Asst. Professor of Anthropology, OSU.
9. Principals administered the instrument during staff meetings, allowing not more than fifteen minutes for its completion, thereby encouraging only first-impression responses.

Because the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale (SDES) was a new instrument, it was decided that correlation with a recognized instrument would serve to establish the worth of the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale. This procedure had been used when the three scales of the Guilford-Martin Personnel Inventory and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale were compared to the EPPS utilizing the product-moment correlation (EPPS Manual, 1959, p. 21). In order to establish reliability for the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale a similar correlation was made with the SDES in this study. The EPPS was selected since it is one of the more widely used tests of personality. The listings in Buros' (1974) Tests in Print show that the EPPS has been used for a variety of purposes which served to establish its reliability and its validity.

Currently, most techniques for measuring attitudinal judgements use scales which are unidimensional. These scales consist of a single continuum of options or attitudes that range between an upper and a lower bound. These boundaries may be defined by a "strongly favor" on one end to a "strongly oppose" on the other. Examples of such one-dimensional techniques are Thurstone scales and paired-comparison scales (Thurstone and Chave, 1929), Likert (1932) scales, successive interval scales (Saffir, 1938), and Guttman (1950) scales. All of these scales are unidimensional and can measure one variable.

Useful procedure in constructing psychophysical (rational) attitude measurement scales were first offered by Thurstone-Chave (1929) in
their equal-appearing-interval scale. In this scale, the universe of attitude items is considered to be an ordered set. However, this scale is cumbersome.

Thurstone's technique requires asking thirty or more judges to sort into eleven categories a large number of statements expressing opinions concerning an attitude object. At one extreme is the most favorable attitude, at the other the least favorable; the neutral position is at the center. The judges are to perceive these categories as separated by equal steps on a continuum of favorability. Hence the method is called the equal-appearing-intervals technique. The median scale value assigned by the judges to each of the statements in the collection is then determined. Only the unambiguous and relevant statements as determined by analysis of the sortings are retained. From these are chosen the statements that represent approximately equal steps along the entire continuum of favorability. The scale is administered by asking subjects to place a check mark after all the statements they endorse as expressing their own sentiment, opinion, or attitude. The subject's score on the scale is the mean or the median scale value of the opinions he has endorsed (Remmers, 1965, p. 314-5).

Likert (1932) demonstrated that the technique of scoring in arbitrary units (1 to 5), when applied to rational scales, could yield results as reliable as the psychophysical scores. This technique, commonly referred to as the Likert scale, is the summated rating scale. The data collection procedure, using the method of summated ratings, begins with the solicitation of responses to a battery of multiple-choice items. For each item, a typical questionnaire has an ordered set of response alternatives ranging between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree"—representing numerical values of -2 to +2 respectively. Respondents select the alternative that best describes their attitude toward the item in question.

The development of the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale used
in this study was patterned in part after the Thurstone procedure and in part after the Likert procedure.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was limited to public school teachers grades K-12 in Linn, Benton, Lane and Marion counties in Oregon. This area is known as the Mid/South-Willamette Valley. Teachers were drawn from rural and small urban school districts having an ADM (average daily membership) of less than 6,500 students as reported in the 1975-76 Oregon School Directory.

The study was designed for at least twenty mobile and twenty non-mobile teachers, but not more than fifty mobile and non-mobile teachers. All teachers had at least eight years of experience, but not more than fifteen years of experience. Teachers classified as mobile had moved at least three times and had not been in their current position for more than two full years prior to the study. Teachers classified as non-mobile had been in their current position eight years or more.

The building administrator (principal) rated each respondent used in the study on the SDES: Administrators' Form.

PROCEDURE

Eighty-four rural and small urban school districts with an average daily student membership below 6,500 in Linn, Benton, Marion, and Lane counties were contacted by telephone or by mail. Fifteen districts expressed interest in participating in the study. They were sent an
abstract of the proposed study and copies of all forms and letters to be used. Eleven districts gave permission to proceed.

The superintendent was the initial contact for each school district in the study. In addition to an oral explanation of the study, the investigator reviewed the abstract with the Superintendent, as well as all forms to be used, and the letters which would be sent to the teachers. Where consent to proceed with the study was obtained, the investigator contacted the individual building principals. The principal was asked to participate in the study and to identify mobile and non-mobile teachers with between eight and fifteen years of experience. When such teachers had already been identified at the district office, the principal was asked to validate the names.

The names of the identified teachers were then put in the appropriate mobile or non-mobile category. The teacher identification process gave no consideration to marital status, sex, or age (Redefer, 1975). Each group of teachers was numbered consecutively, beginning with 01. The mobile group contained fifty names and the non-mobile group contained sixty-nine names. Using the Table of Random Numbers (Downie and Heath, 1974, p. 324) and the prescribed selection procedure (Downie and Heath, 1974, p. 157), forty names were drawn from each group.

Teachers were contacted personally, either individually or in groups (Appendix 7: Oral Presentation to Inform Participants of Study Design and to Obtain Consent). Consenting teachers were given an unmarked envelope containing: (a) a mobility history form (Appendix 8), a cover letter (Appendix 9), Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scales I, II, and III (Appendix 2a, 2b, 2c), and the Edwards Personal Preference
Schedule and answer sheet. Return address labels and postage were provided.

Sixty-one instruments were personally presented to the teachers and administrators at the schools. Nineteen instruments were mailed to persons who had been contacted by telephone or who had consented by responding through the mail. A total of eighty test packets were distributed.

The scored answer sheets for the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule were privately returned to all teachers who requested them along with a letter of explanation (Appendix 10). Information pertaining to individuals participating in the study was available only to the investigator, i.e., test scores, and histories.*

*Public Law 93-348 as implemented by Part 46 of Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations as amended 45CFR46.
MAJOR HYPOTHESES TO BE TESTED

The design of the study tested two major hypotheses. $H_0^1$ consisted of fifteen sub-hypotheses. $H_0^2$ consisted of four sub-hypotheses, each with twelve items (descriptors).

MAJOR HYPOTHESES

$H_0^1$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule sub-scales for mobile and non-mobile teachers.

$H_0^1.1$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

$H_0^1.2$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR DEFERENCE of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

$H_0^1.3$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR ORDER of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

$H_0^1.4$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR EXHIBITION of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

$H_0^1.5$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR AUTONOMY of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

$H_0^1.6$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR AFFILIATION of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

$H_0^1.7$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR INTRACEPTION of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

$H_0^1.8$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR SUCCORANCE of mobile and non-mobile teachers.
H₀₁.₉: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for
NEED FOR DOMINANCE of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

H₀₁.₁₀: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for
NEED FOR ABASEMENT of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

H₀₁.₁₁: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for
NEED FOR NURTURANCE of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

H₀₁.₁₂: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for
NEED FOR CHANGE of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

H₀₁.₁₃: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for
NEED FOR ENDURANCE of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

H₀₁.₁₄: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for
NEED FOR HETEROSEXUALITY of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

H₀₁.₁₅: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for
NEED FOR AGGRESSION of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the
Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale for mobile and non-mobile teachers.

H₀₂.₁: There is no significant difference between the mean score
enthusiasm ratings that mobile and non-mobile teachers expect
their co-workers (peers) to assign to them (Scale I).

H₀₂.₂: There is no significant difference between the mean score
enthusiasm ratings that mobile and non-mobile teachers assign to
themselves (Scale II).

H₀₂.₃: There is no significant difference between the mean score ratings
for enthusiasm thought to be professionally desirable by
mobile and non-mobile teachers (Scale III).
H_{0.2.4}: There is no significant difference between administrators' mean score enthusiasm ratings of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

The One-Way Anova Design (Fixed Arrangement) was used to determine whether any significant differences existed between the means of any of the scales.

CORRELATION BETWEEN INSTRUMENTS

A relationship indicator was established utilizing the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. The variables correlated include the scores of the:

1. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (all sub-scales), with
2. Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale II (Teacher Self-Comparison to Peers), and

The correlations were described in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Value</th>
<th>Approximate Descriptive Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than .20</td>
<td>slight, almost negligible relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.20 - .40</td>
<td>low correlation; definite but small relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40 - .70</td>
<td>moderate correlation; substantial relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70 - .90</td>
<td>high correlation; marked relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.90 - 1.00</td>
<td>very high correlation; very dependable relationship (Guilford, 1965, p. 145).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL RATIONALE

One-Way Analysis of Variance may be used when two or more levels of
a single factor are to be considered at a time. Basically, the assumptions for using the F statistic are that (1) the data have been derived from normally distributed populations, (2) the variances are common or equal or ratioed proportionally, and (3) the samples have been randomly drawn (Courtney, 1974, #38, p. 2).

When used, the F statistic calculates the variances of the means. The F statistic compares the variance of the mean to the overall variance of the sample observations. Statistical decisions are made on the basis of these comparisons.

Formula for the F test:

\[ F = \frac{MS^*}{MS} \]

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) is a statistical technique which is appropriately used for determining the degree of linear relationship which exists between two measures. Such measures must necessarily approximate a normal distribution. The Pearson "r" calculates the proportion of linearity existing for two sets of data (Courtney, 1975, #21, p. 2). It is a common and widely used statistical technique in behavioral research as well as in the other sciences. It is used to show how sets of data vary, or do not vary, together, and is an excellent descriptive measure. If the sets of scores which are described vary together, they are said to covary and there will exist a high directional relationship (Courtney, 1974, #22, p. 2).

*MS = Mean Square
The investigator used a fixed statistical arrangement. Management of the statistical procedure was accomplished through the use of a One-Way Analysis of Variance technique. The basic experimental design incorporated fifteen separate measures of personal needs and forty-eight items from the enthusiasm scales (Administrators' Form—twelve items and Teachers' Scales I, II, and III—twelve items each). These were the dependent variables. They were compared to two independent variables of mobility and non-mobility.

The arrangement of the statistical design provided in Table 1 and Table 2 list the tests of significance for the null hypotheses. The critical F ratio that was utilized in each case for the purposes of rejection was the tabulated F where degrees of freedom approximate 1 and alpha = .01.
### Table 1

**ONE-WAY ANOVA DESIGN (FIXED ARRANGEMENT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Personal Needs Scores on EPPS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A/1</td>
<td>MS groups/MS error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within (error)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B/43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

**SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL OF ENTHUSIASM**

**FOR EACH ITEM**

**FOR EACH SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A/1</td>
<td>MSgrps/MSerror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within (error)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B/43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

The analysis of the data will be presented in two parts. The first will deal with the hypotheses and analysis of variance. The second part will deal with correlation of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale.

The statistical data obtained from teachers and administrators will be presented and analyzed utilizing the format set out in the design for the major hypotheses. The detailed procedure, as well as the statistical technique for testing the hypotheses and analyzing the data, is cited in Chapter III.


The major problem was to discover whether mobile teachers have different personal characteristics than do non-mobile teachers. Scores were obtained from respondents' rankings on the nine-point Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale and from the fifteen scales in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scales are shown in Appendices 1, 2a, 2b, and 2c.
RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

The design of the study used the analysis of variance technique which permits the comparison of means between two groups. The results of the one-way analysis of variance used to test for significant differences are shown first in tabular form and then in a graph, i.e., Table 3 and Graph 1, Table 4 and Graph 2, Table 5 and Graph 3, et cetera (see pages 45 to 56). The .01 level of significance was chosen as the critical region for tests of significance included in this study to assure rigor. A one-tailed test of significance was used.

Based on the results of the analysis, the main hypotheses were retained at the specified level of significance as shown in Tables 3-7. While no major hypotheses were rejected, one sub-hypothesis was rejected because items within it did show significant difference at the .01 level of significance.

RESULTS OF TEST FOR MAJOR HYPOTHESIS (H01)

There was no significant difference between the mean scores of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule sub-scales for mobile and non-mobile teachers. The critical F-value at the .01 level of significance with degrees of freedom (df) = 1, 42 was 7.27. The computed values for the test sub-scales (sub-hypotheses) were outside the critical region; hence, the null hypothesis was retained for these sub-scales (sub-hypotheses) (see Table 3, Graph 1; Table 4, Graph 2, pages 45 to 56).

H01.1: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT* of mobile and non-mobile teachers.

RETAINE
H₀1.2: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR DEFERENCE of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

H₀1.3: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR ORDER of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

H₀1.4: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR EXHIBITION of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

H₀1.5: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR AUTONOMY of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

H₀1.6: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR AFFILIATION of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

H₀1.7: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR INTRACEPTION of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

H₀1.8: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR SUCCORANCE of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

H₀1.9: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR DOMINANCE of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

H₀1.10: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR ABASEMENT of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

H₀1.11: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR NURTURANCE of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

H₀1.12: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR CHANGE of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

H₀1.13: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR ENDURANCE of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.
H₀1.14: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR HETEROSEXUALITY of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

H₀1.15: There is no significant difference between the mean scores for NEED FOR AGGRESSION of mobile and non-mobile teachers. RETAINED.

RESULTS OF TEST OF MAJOR HYPOTHESIS 2 (H₀2)

Major hypothesis two (H₀²) stated that there was no significant difference between the mean scores on the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scales for mobile and non-mobile teachers. The critical F-value at the .01 level of significance with degrees of freedom (df) = 1, 42 is 7.27. The Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scales are:

Scale I: Teacher estimate of how peers would rate them,

Scale II: Teacher self-comparison to those with whom they work (peers),

Scale III: Professional level of enthusiasm thought desirable by teachers, and

(Scale IV): Administrators' Form: Administrator's rating of the teacher.

The items within the four scales are the twelve descriptors or synonyms of enthusiasm that were selected by the panel of judges for the development of the scale. The items are arranged according to strength with the strongest item or descriptor appearing first. The twelve descriptors, in order of selection by the panel at the time the instrument was developed were: active, energetic, alive, eager,
spirited, responsive, cheerful, confident, interested, motivated, willing, and earnest (Appendix 2a, 2b, 2c).

The computed values for the test sub-scales (sub-hypotheses) for teachers (SDES I, II, and III) were outside the critical region; hence, the null hypothesis was retained for these items (see Table 5, Graph 3; Table 6, Graph 4; Table 7, Graph 5).

H₀².1: Scale I: Teacher Estimate of Peer Rating. RETAINED (Table 5).

H₀².2: Scale II: Teacher Self-Comparison to Peers. RETAINED (Table 6).

H₀².3: Scale III: Professional Level Desired by Teachers. RETAINED. (Table 7).

H₀².4: (Scale IV): Administrators' Form: Administrators' rating of teachers. REJECTED. (Table 8).

The computed values for the test sub-scale (sub-hypothesis H₀².4) for the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale: Administrators' Form (administrators' rating of the teachers) (Appendix 1) had several items (descriptors) which were within the critical region and therefore rejected. The five descriptors of enthusiasm contained within the rejected sub-hypothesis were: active, energetic, alive, spirited, and cheerful (Table 8, Graph 6). The seven descriptors that were retained in the same sub-hypothesis included: eager, responsive, confident, interested, motivated, willing, and earnest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SAMPLE 1</th>
<th>GROUP 2*</th>
<th>COMPUTED F VALUE</th>
<th>DECISION**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achievement</td>
<td>14.500</td>
<td>15.090</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deference</td>
<td>13.136</td>
<td>14.272</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>order</td>
<td>11.045</td>
<td>11.954</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exhibition</td>
<td>13.954</td>
<td>14.419</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomy</td>
<td>11.818</td>
<td>12.636</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affiliation</td>
<td>17.363</td>
<td>15.409</td>
<td>1.938</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intraception</td>
<td>15.954</td>
<td>13.818</td>
<td>3.763</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>succorance</td>
<td>11.727</td>
<td>13.272</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominance</td>
<td>13.772</td>
<td>16.500</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abasement</td>
<td>14.863</td>
<td>11.272</td>
<td>7.152</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurturance</td>
<td>15.863</td>
<td>15.772</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td>16.136</td>
<td>14.227</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endurance</td>
<td>14.863</td>
<td>15.727</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heterosexuality</td>
<td>13.909</td>
<td>16.045</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggression</td>
<td>10.500</td>
<td>9.727</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistency score</td>
<td>7.727</td>
<td>8.090</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Group 1 = Mobile Teachers  Group 2 = Non-mobile Teachers  
**Critical F = 7.27  Alpha = .01  df = 1 and 42  
n = 22 for each group
EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE
MEAN SCORES
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TABLE 4
EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE
MEAN SCORES AND PERCENTILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>MEAN 1**</th>
<th>%TILE* 1</th>
<th>MEAN 2</th>
<th>%TILE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achievement</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deference</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>order</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exhibition</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomy</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affiliation</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intraception</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>succorance</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominance</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abasement</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurturance</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endurance</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heterosexuality</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggression</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistency score</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentiles are the median of the Percentile Tables for men and the Percentile Tables for women.

**Mean 1 = Mobile Teachers    Mean 2 = Non-mobile Teachers
**Edwards Personal Preference Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Non-mobile Teachers</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>NORMS USED</th>
<th>Median of General Adult Men and Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>14.5 13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mobile</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Raw score)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mobile</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Percentile)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE I
(Teacher Estimate of Peer Rating)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SAMPLE GROUP MEANS</th>
<th>COMPUTED F VALUE</th>
<th>DECISION**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>7.409</td>
<td>6.909</td>
<td>2.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>7.363</td>
<td>6.818</td>
<td>1.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alive</td>
<td>7.590</td>
<td>7.181</td>
<td>1.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eager</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>7.136</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirited</td>
<td>6.954</td>
<td>6.590</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>6.454</td>
<td>6.318</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>7.318</td>
<td>7.136</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>7.227</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>0.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested</td>
<td>7.454</td>
<td>7.318</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated</td>
<td>6.909</td>
<td>7.090</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing</td>
<td>7.636</td>
<td>7.090</td>
<td>2.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earnest</td>
<td>7.818</td>
<td>7.318</td>
<td>2.219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Group 1 = Mobile Teachers  Group 2 = Non-mobile Teachers

**Critical F = 7.27    Alpha = .01    df = 1 and 42

n = 22 for each group
Graph 3

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE I
MEAN SCORES
(Teacher Estimate of Peer Rating)
### TABLE 6

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

**SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE II**

*(Teacher Self-Comparison to Peers)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SAMPLE GROUP MEANS</th>
<th>COMPUTED F VALUE</th>
<th>DECISION**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>7.136</td>
<td>7.136</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>7.181</td>
<td>7.090</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alive</td>
<td>6.954</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eager</td>
<td>6.636</td>
<td>7.318</td>
<td>5.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirited</td>
<td>6.863</td>
<td>7.109</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>6.818</td>
<td>6.727</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>7.227</td>
<td>7.181</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>7.136</td>
<td>7.136</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested</td>
<td>7.181</td>
<td>7.154</td>
<td>1.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated</td>
<td>6.954</td>
<td>7.227</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing</td>
<td>7.681</td>
<td>7.454</td>
<td>0.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earnest</td>
<td>7.863</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>1.603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Group 1 = Mobile Teachers

Group 2 = Non-mobile Teachers

**Critical F = 7.27**

Alpha = .01

df = 1 and 42
Graph 4

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE II
MEAN SCORES
(Teacher Self-Comparison to Peers)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SAMPLE GROUP MEANS</th>
<th>COMPUTED F VALUE</th>
<th>DECISION **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>7.772</td>
<td>7.409</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>7.818</td>
<td>7.454</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alive</td>
<td>7.909</td>
<td>7.545</td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eager</td>
<td>7.681</td>
<td>7.545</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirited</td>
<td>7.227</td>
<td>7.227</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>7.136</td>
<td>7.272</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>7.545</td>
<td>7.818</td>
<td>0.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>7.681</td>
<td>7.772</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested</td>
<td>7.681</td>
<td>7.863</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated</td>
<td>7.727</td>
<td>7.818</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing</td>
<td>7.090</td>
<td>7.500</td>
<td>0.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earnest</td>
<td>7.954</td>
<td>7.636</td>
<td>0.425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Group 1 = Mobile Teachers  Group 2 = Non-mobile Teachers

**Critical F = 7.27    Alpha = .01    df = 1 and 42
n = 22 for each group
Graph 5

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE III
MEAN SCORES
(Professional Level Desired by Teachers)

Mobile Teachers ——— Non-mobile Teachers ————
### TABLE 8

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

**SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE: ADMINISTRATORS' FORM**

*(Administrators' Rating of Teachers)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SAMPLE 1</th>
<th>GROUP 2*</th>
<th>COMPUTED F VALUE</th>
<th>DECISION**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>7.681</td>
<td>6.454</td>
<td>20.330</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>7.454</td>
<td>6.545</td>
<td>10.344</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alive</td>
<td>7.727</td>
<td>6.954</td>
<td>9.409</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eager</td>
<td>7.227</td>
<td>6.954</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirited</td>
<td>7.409</td>
<td>6.591</td>
<td>10.800</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>6.954</td>
<td>7.409</td>
<td>1.398</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>7.954</td>
<td>7.272</td>
<td>7.272</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>7.409</td>
<td>7.090</td>
<td>1.605</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested</td>
<td>7.772</td>
<td>7.318</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated</td>
<td>7.591</td>
<td>7.272</td>
<td>1.689</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing</td>
<td>8.090</td>
<td>7.409</td>
<td>5.783</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earnest</td>
<td>7.863</td>
<td>7.727</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Group 1 = Mobile Teachers  
Group 2 = Non-mobile Teachers

**Critical F = 7.27  
Alpha = .01  
df = 1 and 42

n = 22 for each group
Graph 6

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE: ADMINISTRATORS' RATING OF TEACHERS
MEAN SCORES

Mobile Teachers ——— Non-mobile Teachers ————
SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESES

The original, null hypotheses, that there were no significant differences between the means of the two groups, were retained for 58 of the 63 items (EPPS--fifteen, SDES--four scales, twelve items per scale). Five items were rejected. All of the five rejected items were located in $H_{02.4}$ (Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale: Administrators' Form). They were: active, energetic, alive, spirited, and cheerful.

RESULTS OF THE PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION

The design of the study used the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient to establish a relationship between the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and Semantic Differential Scale II (Teacher Self-Comparison to Peers) and the Administrators' Form of the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale.

The results of the statistical correlations of the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale II (Teacher Estimate of Peer Rating) with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule are reported in Table 10. Graph 7 shows that deference, exhibition, affiliation, and change correlated most frequently but with slight strength. Achievement, autonomy, dominance, abasement, endurance, and heterosexuality correlated in the low range. Autonomy, dominance and aggression show correlations which were classified as substantial.

Graphing the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule with Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale II (Graph 8) showed a uniform number of slight correlations. Low and moderate correlations were also evenly
### CORRELATION OF SEMITIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE II WITH ALL THE SCALES OF THE EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHLENE

**Teacher Self-Comparison with Peers Correlated with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILLING</th>
<th>EARNEST</th>
<th>MOTIVATED</th>
<th>CONFIIDENT</th>
<th>INTERESTED</th>
<th>MOTIVATED</th>
<th>WILLING</th>
<th>EARNEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CORRELATION OF SEMITIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE II WITH ALL SCALES OF THE EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHLENE

**Groups 1 and 2 Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>ENERGETIC</th>
<th>ALIVE</th>
<th>EAGER</th>
<th>SPIRITED</th>
<th>RESPONSIVE</th>
<th>CHEERFUL</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>INTERESTED</th>
<th>MOTIVATED</th>
<th>WILLING</th>
<th>EARNEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1* Mobile Teachers  
*2* Non-mobile teachers

### Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>ENERGETIC</th>
<th>ALIVE</th>
<th>EAGER</th>
<th>SPIRITED</th>
<th>RESPONSIVE</th>
<th>CHEERFUL</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>INTERESTED</th>
<th>MOTIVATED</th>
<th>WILLING</th>
<th>EARNEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1* Mobile Teachers  
*2* Non-mobile teachers

### Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>ENERGETIC</th>
<th>ALIVE</th>
<th>EAGER</th>
<th>SPIRITED</th>
<th>RESPONSIVE</th>
<th>CHEERFUL</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>INTERESTED</th>
<th>MOTIVATED</th>
<th>WILLING</th>
<th>EARNEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1* Mobile Teachers  
*2* Non-mobile teachers
Graph 7

CORRELATION OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE II WITH THE EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE

Vertical space = 4 correlations within each strength range. $\rho \geq 0.01, 0.01 < \rho < 0.1, 0.1 \leq \rho < 0.2$

Positive correlations appear above the base line
Negative correlations appear below the base line
CORRELATION OF THE EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE WITH SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE II

Graph 8

1 vertical space = 1 correlations within each strength range,
  e.g., 3-2, 50-40, 60-60
   Positive correlations appear above the base line
   Negative correlations appear below the base line
distributed with the exception of confident which had a larger low negative correlation. Energetic, alive, eager, cheerful, and motivated had a few substantial correlations.

Table 12 shows that the correlations varied between +.38 for eager and dominance, to -.46 for willing and autonomy. All the correlations for autonomy (-.14 to -.46) and aggression (-.00 to -.34) were negative. Dominance and heterosexuality showed definite and substantial, positive relationships with the enthusiasm scale. Change, exhibition, affiliation, nurturance, and succorance showed slight positive and negative correlation with the enthusiasm scale. Table 11 shows that deference was negatively correlated only for mobile teachers.

The results of the statistical correlations of the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale: Administrators' Form with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule are reported in Tables 11 and 12 and on Graph 9. The correlations were well distributed with deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, nurturance and aggression correlating most frequently with slight strength. Affiliation, intraception and heterosexuality showed low correlations but much less frequently. Intraception, dominance, change, and endurance show moderate correlation. Affiliation showed only positive correlations. Deference, order, autonomy, dominance, and endurance showed the most frequent negative correlations.

When Groups 1 and 2 were combined (Table 12), intraception had the strongest positive correlation. Endurance had only negative correlations. Change correlated with cheerful to produce the strongest correlation (+.43). Succorance correlated with spirited for the strongest negative correlation (-40).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>DEFEERENCE</th>
<th>ENDURANCE</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>AUTONOMY</th>
<th>EXHIBITION</th>
<th>AGGRESSION</th>
<th>HETEROSEDIALITY</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>SEMANTIC</th>
<th>ENTITIES</th>
<th>SCALE: ADMINISTRATORS' FORM WITH THE EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11**

**Table 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>DEFEERENCE</th>
<th>ENDURANCE</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>AUTONOMY</th>
<th>EXHIBITION</th>
<th>AGGRESSION</th>
<th>HETEROSEDIALITY</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>SEMANTIC</th>
<th>ENTITIES</th>
<th>SCALE: ADMINISTRATORS' FORM WITH THE EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 - Mobile Teachers  2 - Non-mobile Teachers

**Groups 1 and 2 Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>DEFEERENCE</th>
<th>ENDURANCE</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>AUTONOMY</th>
<th>EXHIBITION</th>
<th>AGGRESSION</th>
<th>HETEROSEDIALITY</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>SEMANTIC</th>
<th>ENTITIES</th>
<th>SCALE: ADMINISTRATORS' FORM WITH THE EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group 1 - Mobile Teachers**  **Group 2 - Non-mobile Teachers**
CORRELATION OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE

ADMINISTRATORS' DIRECTIONS WITH THE EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Value</th>
<th>Approximate Descriptive Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; .20</td>
<td>slight, almost negligible relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.20 - .40</td>
<td>low correlation; definite but small relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40 - .70</td>
<td>moderate correlation; substantial relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70 - .90</td>
<td>high correlation; marked relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; .90</td>
<td>very high correlation; very dependable relationship (Guilford, 1965, p. 145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Correlations at +.30+</td>
<td>Negative Correlations at -30+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intraception - alive</td>
<td>achievement - alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- spirited</td>
<td>succorance - spirited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- cheerful</td>
<td>order - motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- interested</td>
<td>endurance - motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- motivated</td>
<td>dominance - willing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td>cheerful - interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interested - interested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graphing the correlations of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule with the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale: Administrators' Form (Graph 10) showed correlations both positively and negatively distributed throughout the entire scale.
Graph 10

CORRELATION OF THE EVAWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE WITH THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE: ADMINISTRATORS' FORM

1 vertical space = 4 correlations within each strength range.
E.g. 0-10, 10-20, 20-60
Positive correlations appear above the base line
Negative correlations appear below the base line.
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

Introduction of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to provide educational administrators with an informational base upon which to make recommendations for the placement or relocation of staff within a district. This purpose was facilitated by determining whether there was a relationship between the horizontal mobility of public school teachers K-12 and their level of professional enthusiasm and personal characteristics.

Procedures

The instruments used for the study were: the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. These instruments were given to a sample of teachers and administrators representing rural and small urban communities of the Mid/South-Willamette Valley. The study employed a one-way analysis of variance design (fixed model), with the F-statistic used for analysis. The instruments were correlated using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. Several superintendents assigned a secretary or personnel clerk to assist in the identification of teachers. Others personally identified the teachers. Building administrators were then contacted for permission to solicit their teachers as participants for the study. Teachers were recruited at the school in group meetings, by telephone, or by mail.

Follow-up telephone calls were made until the specified minimum number of forty respondents had returned their forms. Forty-four completed test packets and six uncompleted test packets were returned.
Hypotheses Findings

In consideration of the limitations of this study, the following hypotheses were tested and are offered with appropriate findings:

1. There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule sub-scales for mobile and non-mobile teachers.

   Based on the absence of significant differences between the mean scores of the two groups, this hypothesis was retained (Chapter IV, Table 3).

2. There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scales for mobile and non-mobile teachers.

   Based on the absence of significant differences between the mean scores of the two groups, sub-hypothesis 2.1 (Teachers' Estimate of Peer Rating), sub-hypothesis 2.2 (Teacher Self-Comparison to Peers), and sub-hypothesis 2.3 (Professional Level Desired by Teachers) were retained (Chapter IV, Tables 3, 4, and 5).

   Based on the significant differences between the mean scores of the two groups (for five descriptors within the scale) sub-hypothesis 2.4 (Administrators' Rating of Teachers) was rejected.

Instrument Correlation Findings

In consideration of the limitations of this study, the following instrumentation relationships were tested and are offered with appropriate findings:

A relationship indicator was established utilizing the Pearson
Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. The variables correlated include the scores of the:

1. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (all scales), with
2. Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale II (Teacher Self-Comparison to Peers), and

Based on the correlation of all the scales of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule with Semantic Differential Scale II (Teacher Self-Comparison to Peers) the relationships were found to be consistently small or moderate. The scores were uniformly distributed for each of the scales.

Based on the correlation of all the scales of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule with the Administrators' Form of the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale, the relationships were found to be small but exhibiting some variation.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions: Hypotheses Tested

In consideration of the limitations of this study, the following hypotheses were tested and are offered with appropriate conclusions:

1. There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule sub-scales for mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Mobile and non-mobile teachers possessed the same needs for achievement, deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, affiliation, intraception,
succorance, dominance, abasement, nurturance, change, endurance, heterosexuality, and aggression as defined by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Comparison of teacher scores to the "EPPS General Population Scores" showed that teachers, as a group, possess norms which exhibit no unique group characteristics.

2. There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scales for mobile and non-mobile teachers.

Mobile and non-mobile teachers possessed the same perceptions of teacher peer ratings, self-comparison to peers, and level of personal professional enthusiasm which they felt to be desirable.

Administrators perceived significant differences between mobile and non-mobile teachers. The differences they perceived existed for active, energetic, alive, spirited, and cheerful. Administrators perceived no differences for teachers on eager, responsive, confident, interested, motivated, willing, and earnest.

Conclusions: Instruments Correlated

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule with Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale II and Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale: Administrators' Form established that the instruments correlated within the range classified as "slight to moderate." This classification suggests that the SDES should be used with caution.

Within the limitations of the instruments and for the teachers tested, it was concluded that, where a high degree of enthusiasm
was present, dominance and heterosexuality were, to a high degree, also present. However, where enthusiasm was low, aggression, autonomy, and deference were present. Enthusiasm and change were only slightly related.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for Action

The following recommendations for action originate from the findings and conclusions of the hypotheses tested:

1. Criteria for teacher selection, other than mobility history should continue to be used by school administrations for purposes of hiring new certified personnel.

2. Teacher training institutions need to focus upon providing models of desired teaching behaviors for students of teaching. Both Young and Lemon support the theory that behaviors and attitudes are learned. Since teachers will learn more from their peers than anywhere else—54% of their new ideas (Hotvedt, 1973), these models should be provided in realistic teaching situations (field experiences). Little effort should be directed toward personality analysis and screening.

3. The teacher evaluation process needs to include the teacher, at least one peer, and the administrator. The perceptions of each are different. Therefore, articulation needs to be stressed between all parties for accuracy of evaluation.

4. Evaluation of teachers with less than three years of service needs to be handled with extra care since perceptions of these teachers tend to be less accurate than for teachers with considerably more experience. This study found that administrative perception of teachers
tend to be less accurate than for teachers with considerably more experience. This study found that administrative perception of teachers and teacher self-perception of themselves was more congruent for those teachers with over eight years of service in the same school, than for teachers with less than three years experience in the same school (Table 5, p. 49; Graph 3, p. 50) (Table 8, p. 55; Graph 6, p. 56).

**Recommendations for Further Research**

1. Replicate this study in small urban and rural school districts early in a school term when follow-up can be facilitated.

2. Replicate this study in a large metropolitan area.

3. A study needs to be made to determine whether it is age or experience which determines teacher characteristics.

4. A study needs to be conducted to determine whether planned teacher mobility within a district is desirable.

5. A study needs to be conducted to determine whether good teaching and enthusiasm are related.

6. A study needs to be conducted to determine the reasons for discrepancies between teacher self-perception of a level of enthusiasm and administrative perception of the teacher's level of enthusiasm.

7. A study needs to be conducted to determine whether students perceive a difference between "trained" enthusiasm and "inherent" enthusiasm.

8. The low correlations between the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale could be construed to mean that the instruments are incompatible, that the
Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale is not a valid instrument, or that enthusiasm is not a function of any of the personality variables. A study needs to be conducted to further revise and test the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale.
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APPENDICES
Appendix 1

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE
ADMINISTRATORS' FORM

Please rate teacher A ____________________________
and/or teacher B ____________________________
by placing a check mark between the dots at the appropriate place on each of the following scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>A: ____________________________</th>
<th>B: ____________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LETHARGIC</td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUID</td>
<td>ENERGETIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISTLESS</td>
<td>ALIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACKADAISICAL</td>
<td>EAGER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECHANICAL</td>
<td>SPIRITED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVED</td>
<td>RESPONSIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SULLEN</td>
<td>CHEERFUL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESITANT</td>
<td>CONFIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APATHETIC</td>
<td>INTERESTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIFFERENT</td>
<td>MOTIVATED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELUCTANT</td>
<td>WILLING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIVOLOUS</td>
<td>EARNEST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2a

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE I
FOR THE PROFESSIONAL TEACHER

How do you think the people with whom you now work would rate you as a teacher on the following scale?

DIRECTIONS: Place a check mark between the dots at the appropriate place on each scale. Remember that you are responding to what your peers think of you.

LETHARGIC :________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: ACTIVE
LANGUID :________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: ENERGETIC
LISTLESS :________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: ALIVE
LACKADAISICAL :________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: EAGER
MECHANICAL :________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: SPIRITED
RESERVED :________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: RESPONSIVE
SULLEN :________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: CHEERFUL
HESITANT :________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: CONFIDENT
APATHETIC :________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: INTERESTED
INDIFFERENT :________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: MOTIVATED
RELUCTANT :________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: WILLING
FRIVOLOUS :________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: EARNEST
Appendix 2b

**SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE II**
**FOR THE PROFESSIONAL TEACHER**

When you think of the people with whom you **now** work, how would you compare yourself?

**DIRECTIONS:** Place a check mark between the dots at the appropriate place on each scale. Remember, you are comparing yourself to the average of peers in your building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANGUID</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>ENERGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISTLESS</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>ALIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACKADAISICAL</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>EAGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECHANICAL</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>SPIRITED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVED</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>RESPONSIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SULLEN</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>CHEERFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESITANT</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APATHETIC</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>INTERESTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIFFERENT</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>MOTIVATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELUCTANT</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>WILLING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIVOLOUS</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>EARNEST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ENTHUSIASM SCALE III
FOR THE PROFESSIONAL TEACHER

What level, on the following scale, do you think is an appropriate level for you, as a professional teacher, to attain or to have attained?

DIRECTIONS: Place a check mark between the dots, at the appropriate place on each scale.

|---------------|--------------------------------------------|

Title: HORIZONTAL MOBILITY, PROFESSIONAL ENTHUSIASM, AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS K-12 IN RURAL AND SMALL URBAN SCHOOLS OF THE MID/SOUTH-WILLAMETTE VALLEY.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to determine whether there is a relationship between the horizontal mobility of public school teachers K-12 and their level of professional enthusiasm and personal characteristics. This will provide educational administrators with an information base upon which to make recommendations for the placement or relocation of staff within a district.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

To discover whether mobile teachers have different personal characteristics than do non-mobile public school teachers K-12.

MAJOR HYPOTHESES

$H_01$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule sub-scales for mobile and non-mobile teachers.

$H_02$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the
Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale for mobile and non-mobile teachers.

INSTRUMENTATION

A Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale was developed by using panels of randomly selected judges. Because the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule corresponded most closely with those factors examined by the Enthusiasm Scale, it was chosen to establish the worth of the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale, and to expand upon aspects of teacher personality.

PROCEDURE

District administrators will be approached for permission to identify teachers on the basis of experience and mobility history. Each teacher will be asked to complete a mobility history form, an Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and a Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale. Principals will be asked to rate the teacher using the Administrators' Form of the Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The investigator will use a fixed statistical arrangement for data analysis. Management of the statistical procedure will be accomplished through the use of a one-way analysis of variance technique. The basic experimental design will incorporate 63 separate measures of personality and attitude (the dependent variables). These will be compared with the two independent variables of mobility and non-mobility.
Think of employees, who work with people, whom you consider to be enthusiastic.

ACTIVE		ADMIRABLE		ADMIRATION		AGITATED
ALACRITY		ALIVE		AMBITION		ANIMATED
ANIMUS		ANTICIPATING		ANTITHESIS		APPRECIATIVE
APTITUDE		ARBITRARY		ARDENT		ARDUOUS
ARTICULATE		ASSENTING		ATTACHED		ATTITUDE
ATTRACTIVE		BEHAVIOR		BENT		BOISTEROUS
BOLD		BORING		BUOYANT		BRIGHT
BROAD MINDED		CAPTIVATING		CHARMING		CHEERFUL
CHEERING		COMMON		COMMUNICATIVE		CONFIDENT
CONSERVATIVE		CORDIAL		CREATIVE		DEDICATED
DEMONSTRATIVE		DECEITFUL		DESIRABLE		DEVISIVE
DEVOTED		DISHONEST		DISORDERLY		DOGOMATIC
DRAMATIC		DREAMER		DULL		EAGER
EARNEST		ECCENTRIC		EFFECTIVE		ELATED
ELECTRIC		EMPATHETIC		EMPRESSEMENT		ENCOURAGING
ENDURANCE		ENERGETIC		EXCITING		EXPECTING
EXPERIENCED		EXPRESSIVE		EXULTANT		FAITH
FAITHFUL		FAIR		FANATIC		FASTIDIOUS
FEELING		EXCITED		FERVOUR		FIDGETY
FIRE		FIRED		FLEXIBLE		FLURRYING
FLUSHED		FLUSTERED		FLUTTERING		FONDNESS
FOOLISH
FRAME OF MIND
GENIAL
GUSHING
HONEST
HYSTERICAL
IMPETUOUS
INDIFFERENT
INHERITED
INSPIRING
INTRACTABLE
INVENTIVE
LEANING
LOVELY
MOODY
NICE
ORDERLY
PARTIAL
PERSEVERENT
PIQUANT
PUNCH
REASSURING
RESTLESS
SANGUINE

FORGIVING
FRANK
GLOWING
GUSTO
HOPEFUL
IDEALISTIC
IMPROVISOR
INEFFECTIVE
INNOVATIVE
INTERESTED
INTRIGUED
LAZY
LEARNING
LOVING
MOROSE
NUISANCE
ORIGINAL
PASSION
PERSUASIVE
POINTED
RACY
RELIABLE
RIGID
SECURE

FORCEFUL
FRIENDLY
GRATUITOUS
HAPPY
HUMOROUS
IMAGINATIVE
IMPULSIVE
INFATUATED
INSENSITIVE
INTERESTING
IRRATIONAL
LEADER
LIVELY
MOBILE
MONOMANIAC
MOTIVATED
OPTIMISTIC
ORIGINALITY
PASSIONATE
PERVERSE
POWERFUL
RATIONAL
RELIABLE
RESOLUTE
ROMANTICIST
SELF-RELIANT

FORWARD
GARRILIOUS
GRAVITY
HEARTY
HEARTY
HURRIED
IMPATIENT
INCLINED
INFATUATED
INSPIRED
INTOLERANT
IRRITABLE
LEADING
LOQUACIOUS
MONOMANIAC
NARROW MINDED
OBSTINATE
ORIGINATOR
PASSIVE
PESSIMISTIC
PROGRESSIVE
READY
RESPONSIVE
SAD
SENSIBLE
SENSITIVE   SENTIMENTAL   SINCERE   SPARKLING
SPIRITED    STICKLER     STRONG    SUCCESSFUL
SUFFERANCE  SULKEY       SULLEN    SUPPORTIVE
SYMPATHETIC TENACIOUS   TENDER    TOLERANT
TOUGH       TRAIT        TURBULENT UNAPPRECIATIVE
UNCONTROLLED UNCTUOUS    UNFAIR    UNSUCCESSFUL
UNUSUAL     USUAL        VALUABLE VEHEMENT
VEIN        VERBOSE     VERVE     VIGOROUS
VISIONARY   VIVACIOUS   VOLUNTARINESS WARM
WARM HEARTED WEAK       WILLING   WINNING
WISE        WISTFUL     WORTHLESS WORTH WHILE
ZEALOUS
Dear Participant:

No standardized tests or scales appear to exist, which adequately measure enthusiasm. In an attempt to devise such an instrument, it is first necessary to determine what words are generally considered to be descriptors of enthusiasm. Your opinion would be of great help in defining what we recognize as enthusiasm, but find so difficult to put into words.

The purpose of this survey is to arrive at a list of words which describe employees who work primarily with people rather than things. There is no intention to test or to rate you as a person. This is a public opinion survey.

Attached is a list of words which might define enthusiasm. Which of the words would you use to describe an enthusiastic employee? Check those words which you would use; cross out those which you would not use; and disregard all others (leave unmarked). Please feel free to add words and write in comments or suggestions that might make the definition of enthusiasm more complete for you.

Sincerely,

Esther Neuman
Appendix 6

The following words describe enthusiastic teachers. Please write in the antonym (opposite meaning). The antonym should describe an unenthusiastic teacher, e.g., the opposite of "alive" may literally be "dead" but not in this set, since unenthusiastic teachers are physically "living."

| ACTIVE     | \_
| ENERGETIC | \_
| ALIVE      | \_
| EAGER      | \_
| SPIRITED   | \_
| RESPONSIVE | \_
| CHEERFUL   | \_
| CONFIDENT  | \_
| INTERESTED | \_
| MOTIVATED  | \_
| WILLING    | \_
| EARNEST    | \_ |
Appendix 7

ORAL PRESENTATION TO INFORM PARTICIPANTS OF STUDY DESIGN
AND TO OBTAIN CONSENT*

1. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY is to see if any differences exist between teachers who have had a mobile teaching career and those who have stayed in specific teaching positions over a long period of time. This information will be used to make recommendations to educational administrators regarding teacher hiring, placement, or transfer.

2. AUTHORIZATION: Your superintendent of schools and your principal have identified you as a person who meets all the requirements of participating in this study. Those requirements are:
   a) at least eight years of teaching experience, but not more than fifteen years of teaching experience,
   b) a definite pattern of career mobility, or a definite pattern of non-mobility.

3. PROCEDURE: You will be given an unmarked test packet containing:
   a) a cover letter
   b) mobility history form
   c) Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and answer sheet
   d) Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale
   e) return postage and mailing label (display samples here).
   You need not put your name on any of the answer sheets. The entire set will take between 45 minutes and 90 minutes for you to complete depending upon how quickly you read. You may take these home if you wish. These may also be left with the school secretary if you wish me to pick them up personally.

4. CONSENT AND IDENTIFICATION: You are free to consent to participate or you are free to refuse to participate. If you decide to participate, your test scores will not be shown to anyone, nor will they be discussed with anyone.

5. You may REQUEST your Edwards Personal Preference Schedule results if you wish (see cover letter).

6. QUESTIONS:

*Public Law 93-348 as implemented by Part 46 of Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations as amended 45CFR46.
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TEACHER MOBILITY HISTORY

A. Total number of different schools in which you have worked for four or more months

B. Total years of teaching experience __________ Age __________

Male ______ Female ______ Married ______ Other ______

1. How long have you taught at this school? __________

2. At what school were you employed before coming here? __________

   How long did you work there? __________

   Reason for moving
   (e.g., changed grade level, spouse moved, moved for better pay, better working conditions, better administration, better geographic area, wanted a change, dissolved a personal relationship, et cetera.)

   Repeat #2 format as often as necessary.

3. __________

4. __________

5. __________

6. __________

7. __________

If necessary, use reverse side of this page.

PLEASE RETURN THE EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE TEST BOOKLET WITH THE OTHER ANSWER SHEETS. Thank you.
Appendix 9

Dear Teacher:

The attached Mobility History questionnaire seeks approximate information about your teaching career, rather than exact information. It is not necessary that you specify the exact names of the schools in which you have worked, unless doing so helps you to recall the sequence of jobs that you have had in the past.

It is also quite acceptable to "round off" teaching experience in an approximate manner, i.e.,

1 - 3 months = 0 year
4 - 6 months = ½ year
7 - 8 months = 1 year

If you have had a number of years of experience and have been highly mobile as well, you might find it helpful to complete questions #1, #2, #3, et cetera, before answering questions A and B. Please start by listing your current job and then working backwards.

Complete the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule as rapidly as is comfortably possible. You probably could spend hours analyzing answers for the questions. This is not the intent. Put down your first reaction and don't worry about how the scores are going to come out. Go ahead and enjoy the test. It is a "fun frustration" test to take.

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule scores are recorded on a Profile Sheet when your test is marked. The profile is quite meaningless to persons not trained in its use and interpretation, and therefore, has to be taken to a psychologist or counselor for interpretation. If you want a copy of your profile so that you may discuss it with a counselor, please sign here and attach this page.

______________________________ (signed)

The Semantic Differential Enthusiasm Scale is much easier to understand but may require more thought. The responses that you give are only valid if they are honest ones. Try to record how things really "are" rather than how you would like them to be.

YOUR TEST SCORES AND YOUR PERSONAL HISTORY WILL NOT BE SEEN BY ANYONE BUT THE RESEARCHER.

Thank you for your help. Without it, this study would not be possible. Your "input" may ultimately make possible the development of new and better personnel staffing policies.

Sincerely,
(signed) Esther Neuman
DO NOT PEEK AT YOUR TEST SCORES UNTIL YOU HAVE READ THIS LETTER!!!!

Dear Participant:

Thank you so much for participating in the mobility study. Your interest and your expenditure of time are very much appreciated.

Before you look at your test scores, try to guess how you might score in terms of percentiles. Do you think that on each of the following items that you score the same as most people, or higher, or lower than most people? Percentile 50 means that you are right in the middle, percentile 20 means that 80% of the people score higher than you do, and percentile 80 means that 20% of people score higher than you do.

These estimates will give you an opportunity to see whether you "see yourself" as the test "sees" you. Keep your estimates so that you can take them with you when you talk with a counselor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>SUCORANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEFERENCE</td>
<td>DOMINANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORDER</td>
<td>ABASEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXHIBITION</td>
<td>NURTURANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTONOMY</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>ENDURANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRACEPTION</td>
<td>HETEROSEXUALITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will notice that the Edwards Personal Preference test has been scored, but that the numbers do not seem to have any meaning or relation to each other. You are correct in your observation. A score of 15 on one scale may be equivalent to 20 on another scale.

Because it is likely that you have not been trained in the interpretation of this test, your raw scores have not been converted to percentile scores, nor has your profile been completed. This has been done to encourage you to visit with a counselor for the interpretation of the test, and to provide you with an opportunity to question someone as to the insights that you might gain about yourself.

Thank you again for your participation. I hope that your conversation with a trained counselor will be profitable and interesting for you.

Sincerely,

Esther Neuman