J. Mountain Res. P-ISSN: 0974-3030, E-ISSN: 2582-5011 DOI: https://doi.org/10.51220/jmr.v19-i2.41
Vol. 19(2), (2024), 397-407

Professionalism and Personality: A Study of Teacher Educators of Uttarakhand

Siddharth Lohani[1] • Ramesh Chandra Singh[1*] • Amar Jeet Singh[1] • Anubhuti Pandey[2]

[1]*Department of Education, HNB Garhwal University, Srinagar Garhwal, Uttarakhand*
[2]*Department of Home Science, HNB Garhwal University, Srinagar Garhwal, Uttarakhand*

Corresponding Author: grameshchandra11@gmail.com

Received: 10.11.2024; Revised: 14.12.2024 ; Accepted: 19.12.2024

Abstract: This study explores the relationship between personality traits and professionalism among teacher educators, aiming to identify how individual characteristics influence key aspects of professional behaviour in educational settings. The research employs a quantitative methodology, with a final sample comprising 952 teacher trainees and 167 teacher educators. For data collection, the *Teacher Educator Professionalism Scale* (TEPS) was developed and standardised to assess teacher educators' professionalism as perceived by students. To measure personality traits, the 16 PF Questionnaire (Form A, developed by R.B. Cattell, with a Hindi version by S.D. Kapoor) was used. Correlation and multiple regression analyses were conducted to assess the predictive power of personality traits on various dimensions of professionalism. The findings reveal that rule-consciousness positively affects teaching performance and inclusivity, while self-reliance and perfectionism are negatively associated with collaborative and student-centred approaches. Imaginative self-discipline is linked to improved teaching performance, whereas traits like emotional sensitivity and suspiciousness hinder equitable behaviour. However, personality traits show limited influence on innovation, suggesting that external factors such as institutional support and professional development play a greater role in fostering creativity in teaching. These insights highlight the need for tailored professional development programmes and institutional strategies to support educators, enhancing both their professional effectiveness and adaptability in diverse educational environments.

Keywords: Professionalism • Personality Traits • Teacher Educators • 16 PF Questionnaire • Teaching Performance • Inclusivity • Innovation.

Introduction

In today's society, the perception of teachers is undergoing a significant shift, as education and the role of educators continue to evolve. Expectations placed on teachers are rising, driven by demands from students, parents, and society at large. Increasing emphasis is being placed on professional competencies and accountability towards stakeholders, viewed through the lens of professionalism. These evolving demands for new skills, knowledge, and pedagogical approaches from various stakeholders call for a reassessment of professionalism within the teaching profession. Consequently, the role and responsibilities of teacher education must be reformed, particularly in areas such as curriculum development, professional standards, and the creation of a forward-thinking teaching and learning environment. India has made notable strides in school education since gaining independence, particularly in terms of access, equity, and quality. Two key developments have shaped the current landscape of teacher education: the political endorsement of Universal Elementary Education through the Right to Education Act of 2009, and the National Curriculum Framework (NCF) of 2005. These initiatives form the bedrock of today's teacher education system. The NCF outlines several concerns, such as the uncritical acceptance of knowledge, insufficient language proficiency among teachers, a lack of reflective opportunities for student teachers, and a disconnect between theoretical knowledge and practical application. Moreover, evaluation systems in teacher education programmes have been criticised for being overly information-focused and lacking in depth and comprehensiveness. In response to the NCF-2005's requirements, the National Council of Teacher Education (NCTE) reviewed teacher education in light of the changing educational landscape, resulting in the National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education (NCFTE) 2009.

This framework underscores the need for a philosophy of teacher education that aligns with current demands while addressing the objectives set out by the Indian Constitution. It advocates for an integrative and eclectic approach to teacher education, empowering teachers to engage with the evolving context. Furthermore, the framework promotes a liberal, humanistic philosophy of teacher education, which is responsive to the needs of inclusive education, fosters social and anthropological understanding through modern pedagogies, and places reflective practice at the heart of teacher training. The role and profile of teacher educators are shaped by various facets of school education, including educational aims and objectives, curricula, pedagogical methods, and the socio-cultural context in which schools function. Teacher educators must possess the competencies and attitudes set out in the NCF-2005, which stresses the need for educators to share the educational philosophy and professional competencies required to foster the desired behaviours in student teachers. In recent years, increased attention has been directed towards teacher educators, highlighting the key characteristics of their professional roles, such as qualifications, recruitment processes, career pathways, teaching and research practices, challenges, and professional development needs (Martinez 2008). The community of teacher educators is diverse, not only in terms of their backgrounds but also in the various settings in which they work.

Students' Evaluation of Educators

Student evaluations of teachers are a contentious yet fascinating approach to assessing teacher performance. In recent decades, accountability to key stakeholders has become a pressing issue within the Indian education system. Teacher performance plays a vital role in the teaching-learning process, and Indian authorities have increasingly focused on improving the quality of teaching. However, the question remains: how should the system assess teacher performance and enhance teaching quality? Modern teaching and learning theories stress that learners actively construct knowledge, rather than passively absorb it (Phillips 1995; Prawatt and Floden 1994; Cobb 1995). The 1990s introduced a more nuanced philosophy recognising the importance of individual meaning-making in the learning process (Gredler 1997). Constructivism, as a theory, underscores the current demand for professional, humanistic, and accountable teachers to manage the teaching-learning process. Given these evolving expectations, a critical question arises: what tool should be employed to evaluate teaching performance? Student evaluations of teacher performance have emerged as a significant, though controversial, tool for improving teaching quality. Marsh (1987) and Wachtel (1998) reported that the first "teacher rating scale" was introduced in 1915, with initial studies on students' evaluations of teacher effectiveness emerging in the 1920s. Kulik (2001) identified two primary objectives of student evaluations: assessing teaching quality in faculties and universities, and providing feedback to help faculty members enhance their teaching. Today, student ratings are used in various administrative decisions, course selection, curriculum development, external quality assurance, and research on teaching (Marsh 1987; McKeachie 1997). As primary stakeholders in the teaching-learning process, students' perceptions are invaluable in enhancing teacher performance within institutions. Teaching effectiveness is seen as a two-dimensional construct, involving both "lecturer ability" and "module attributes" (Mittal and Gera 2013). Theall and Franklin (2001) argue that students, who spend an entire term in a course, are well-placed to evaluate their teachers. They can assess lecture clarity, the value of readings and assignments, the instructor's availability and helpfulness, and other aspects of the teaching-learning process.

However, critics question the validity and reliability of student ratings. Kulik (2001) notes that research on these ratings often yields conflicting and inconclusive results. Some argue that students lack the expertise needed to evaluate instructional quality (Gage 1974). Other concerns include the potential for grade inflation (Outcalt

1980; Gross and Small 1979), reduced faculty morale when evaluations are used summatively (Ryan et al 1980), and a tendency for engaging lecturers to receive higher ratings than more effective but less entertaining ones (Rodin and Rodin, 1972). Furthermore, the lack of standardised evaluation instruments (Costin et al 1971) adds further complexity to the issue.

Despite these controversies, student evaluations have been widely used across campuses for many years. In India, the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) has introduced mechanisms to gather student feedback on curriculum, teacher quality, teaching-learning processes, and best practices for achieving excellence in higher education. Marsh (1987) asserts that student evaluations are perhaps the only indicators of teaching effectiveness with thoroughly proven validity. Centra (2003) concludes that extensive research supports student evaluations as reliable, valid, multidimensional, useful for improving teaching, and minimally affected by biases related to course, teacher, or student characteristics.

In conclusion, the literature suggests that student ratings can significantly improve the teaching-learning process and teacher performance in institutions, provided they are valid and reliable. The effectiveness of these ratings also depends on students' maturity and motivation to participate in the evaluation process. Well-designed student ratings can serve as a valuable tool for evaluating certain aspects of faculty teaching performance (Cohen 1981; Marsh 1984; Calderon et al 1994).

Conceptual framework

The factor analytical theory of personality suggests that personality traits have a significant influence on an individual’s behaviour in the workplace. Since the early 1980s, extensive research has been conducted to explore the relationship between personality and work performance. For instance, Schmitt et al (1984) sought to establish the overall validity of a combination of personality variables. In later studies, Barrick and Mount (1991) found that conscientiousness was consistently linked to performance across various job types. Robertson and Callinan (2015) further examined the interaction between job and organisational factors and personality, concluding that personality plays a crucial role in determining overall performance levels, engagement, well-being, leadership, and work attitudes. They also stressed the need for a deeper understanding of how personality traits interact to predict performance outcomes. Another hypothesis posits that each role a person takes on provides additional opportunities to reap benefits such as financial resources, increased self-esteem, the ability to delegate fewer desirable tasks, and opportunities for social interaction and challenges (Barnett and Hyde 2001; Lachance and Brassard 2003). Building on these studies and other literature, the present research seeks to identify the personal and institutional characteristics that define the professional roles and responsibilities of teacher educators. The proposed model will serve as the conceptual framework for the study, drawing on two theoretical concepts related to teacher educators' attributes: professionalism and personality traits.

In this study, professionalism is considered a dependent variable and is defined as the accountability of teacher educators towards novice teachers, represented by six dimensions: teaching performance, professional ethics, a constructive approach to classroom teaching, inclusiveness, equitable behaviour, and the innovative use of ICT and other teaching resources. Personality traits are based on Cattell’s 16 personality factors. This model is designed to analyse the professionalism of teacher educators through the perspective of their personality traits.

Material and Method

A normative survey research design was employed to explore the impact of teacher educators' personalities on their professionalism. In this context, professionalism refers to student feedback on their teacher’s performance within the classroom environment of an educational institution. Personality was conceptualised according to the standard definitions established by Raymond B. Cattell. The target population consisted of all teacher educators and pupil-teacher

trainees in teacher education institutions (B.Ed. and M.Ed.) across Uttarakhand. Three universities oversee pre-service teacher education institutions (B.Ed. and M.Ed.) in Uttarakhand. A multistage stratified sampling procedure was employed to select the sample. Initially, two universities (H.N.B Garhwal University and Kumaun University) were chosen. Subsequently, three strata were developed based on the type of institutional administration (Government, Government Self-Financed, and Self-Financed). From these strata, 14 colleges from Kumaun University and 14 colleges from HNB Garhwal University were randomly selected. In the final stage, all teacher educators in these institutions were included in the sample, with at least 30 pupil teachers selected to evaluate the professionalism of the teacher educators through feedback. The final sample comprised 952 teacher trainees and 167 teacher educators. For data collection, the researcher developed and standardised the 'Teacher Educator Professionalism Scale' (TEPS) to assess the professionalism of teacher educators as perceived by the students. The scale consists of 30 items and covers six factors related to professionalism among in-service teacher educators. The scale was tested for reliability and validity using data from 916 pupil teachers in teacher education institutions (B.Ed. and M.Ed.). Internal consistency was measured using Cronbach's Alpha, with an overall reliability score of 0.93. The reliability of the subscales—teaching performance, professional ethics, constructivist approach, inclusivity, equity, and innovation—were 0.91, 0.90, 0.84, 0.85, 0.84, and 0.72, respectively. Construct validity was established by the researcher. Convergent validity of TEPS was confirmed through exploratory factor analysis, while discriminant validity was determined by examining correlations between the factors. Principal component analysis revealed a six-factor structure, each with an eigenvalue greater than 1, accounting for 67.6% of the variance. Convergent validity was validated through significant factor loadings, ranging from 0.401 to 0.900. Discriminant validity was demonstrated with correlation coefficients between 0.134 and 0.744. To measure personality, the 16 PF Questionnaire (Form A, developed by R.B. Cattell and the Hindi version by S.D. Kapoor) was used. This questionnaire covers 16 functionally independent and psychologically meaningful personality dimensions. The collected data were analysed using correlation and multiple regression analysis.

Results

The correlation matrix provides key insights into the relationships between personality traits and various dimensions of professionalism among teacher educators. Each dimension—Teaching Performance, Professional Ethics, Constructivist Approach, Inclusivity, Equity, and Innovation—is examined in relation to Raymond Cattell's 16 Personality Factors (A, B, C, E, F, G, H, I, L, M, N, O, Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4). The statistically significant findings reveal important relationships, contributing to the understanding of how personality traits influence professional behaviour and effectiveness in educational roles (Table 1).

Table 1: Correlation between Various Dimensions of Professionalism and 16 Personality Traits

Professionalism		A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Teaching Performance	r	.008	-.039	.033	-.080	.072	.079	.106	.001	.076	.297**	.017	-.081	-.119	-.041	.033**	.063
Professional Ethics	r	.002	-.119	-.031	-.101	-.002	.054	.200**	-.068	.051	-.089	-.117	-.069	-.054	-.103	-.057	.119
Constructivist	r	.040	.041	.045	-.055	.025	.122	.171*	.031	.094	.034	.037	-.091	-.095	-.211*	.091	.050
Inclusive	r	.047	-.044	.006	-.117	-.055	.123	.153*	-.014	.017	-.077	-.075	-.095	-.057	-.153*	.004	-.016
Equitable	r	.089	-.058	-.098	-.063	.106	.000	.081	-.169*	.181*	.034	.001	.139	.009	.057	.016	.130
Innovative	r	-.003	.006	-.002	-.001	.024	.061	-.075	-.068	.026	.016	.040	.050	-.056	.062	.052	.053

Teaching Performance is positively and significantly correlated with Factor M (r = .297, p < 0.01), indicating that individuals with higher scores on this trait tend to exhibit better teaching performance. This suggests that attributes such as self-discipline or imaginative tendencies, as defined by Factor M, are crucial in delivering high-quality instruction and managing classroom dynamics effectively. Additionally, slight positive correlations are observed with Factor G (r = .106) and Factor F (r = .079), indicating minor associations between traits such as rule-consciousness (G) and liveliness (F) with teaching effectiveness. These findings imply that being methodical and energetic may positively influence teachers' engagement with students, although these relationships are not strong. A weak negative correlation with Factor O (r = -.119) suggests that traits related to apprehension or insecurity might hinder teaching performance, indicating that educators prone to self-doubt could experience difficulties in classroom management. Regarding Professional Ethics, Factor G (r = .200, p < 0.01) demonstrates a significant positive correlation, suggesting that individuals who are more rule-conscious adhere strongly to ethical standards in their professional conduct. This aligns with the notion that those who value structure and moral codes are more likely to maintain high ethical standards in their interactions with both students and colleagues. Conversely, weak negative correlations with Factor B (r = -.119) and Factor O (r = -.117) indicate that traits related to intelligence (B) and apprehension (O) might slightly detract from ethical conduct. These findings suggest that individuals who are highly introspective or prone to self-doubt may focus less on practical ethical considerations. In terms of the Constructivist Approach, Factor G (r = .171, p < 0.05) and Factor F (r = .122) exhibit positive correlations, implying that educators with higher scores on rule-consciousness and liveliness are more likely to adopt constructivist teaching methods. A constructivist approach emphasises active student engagement and knowledge construction, which may appeal to teachers who prefer structured and energetic learning environments. However, Factor Q2 (r = -.211, p < 0.05) shows a significant negative correlation with the constructivist approach, suggesting that individuals with high self-reliance (Q2) may be less inclined to utilise constructivist methods, potentially favouring more independent and individualistic teaching styles that do not align with the collaborative nature of constructivism. A significant positive correlation with Factor G (r = .153, p < 0.05) indicates that rule-consciousness is positively associated with inclusivity in teaching. Teachers scoring high on this trait may be more inclined to foster structured, inclusive environments that ensure all students feel valued and supported. In contrast, Factor Q2 (r = -.153, p < 0.05) reveals a negative correlation with inclusivity, implying that self-reliant educators may place less emphasis on creating inclusive learning environments. Such teachers might prefer autonomous structures that could unintentionally exclude students who require additional guidance or support. Equity in teaching shows a significant positive correlation with Factor I (r = .181, p < 0.05), suggesting that educators with higher sensitivity or intuitive tendencies (I) are more likely to promote fairness and equality in their teaching practices. These individuals may be more empathetic towards the diverse needs of students, thus ensuring equitable treatment in the classroom. In contrast, a negative correlation with Factor H (r = -.169, p < 0.05) implies that educators with higher levels of boldness (H) may be less inclined towards equitable behaviour, potentially favouring assertiveness or risk-taking approaches that do not always align with fairness and balance. A slight positive correlation with Factor A (r = .089) suggests a potential link between warm-heartedness (A) and equitable teaching, though this association is not statistically significant. The correlations between innovation and the personality factors are predominantly weak and non-significant, indicating that innovation in teaching may not be strongly influenced by individual personality traits. This suggests that factors such as institutional culture, access to resources, and professional development

opportunities may play a more substantial role in promoting innovative teaching practices than inherent personality characteristics.

The regression results (Table 2) provide insight into the extent to which personality factors predict various dimensions of professionalism among teacher educators. The analysis considers key metrics, including R, R Square (R^2), Adjusted R Square, Standard Error of the Estimate, F-statistic, and Significance (Sig.).

Table 2: Model Summary and Significance of the Model

Model Summary						
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**	**F**	**Sig**
Teaching Performance	.391[a]	.154	.060	2.9665223	1.695	.053
Professional Ethics	.358[a]	.128	.035	2.5815519	1.380	.159
Constructivist	.381[a]	.146	.054	2.4720540	1.590	.078
Inclusive	.321[a]	.103	.007	.8223191	1.073	.385
Equitable	.397[a]	.157	.068	1.2393426	1.752	.043
Innovative	.202[a]	.041	-.062	1.5302471	.398	.981

The model indicates a moderate relationship between personality factors and teaching performance (R = .391). The R^2 value of .154 suggests that personality factors explain 15.4% of the variance in teaching performance, though the adjusted R^2 of .060 shows that after accounting for predictors, the model only explains 6% of the variance. With F = 1.695 and Sig = .053, the model approaches statistical significance but falls just short of the conventional threshold ($p < .05$). This indicates that while personality traits may influence teaching performance, the predictive power of the model is limited. A moderate positive relationship is observed between personality traits and professional ethics (R = .358). The R^2 value of .128 indicates that 12.8% of the variance in professional ethics is explained by personality factors, but the adjusted R^2 of .035 shows that after adjustments, only 3.5% of the variance is accounted for. The model is not statistically significant (F = 1.380, Sig = .159), suggesting that personality traits do not significantly predict professional ethics within this sample. The relationship between personality factors and the adoption of a constructivist teaching approach is moderate (R = .381), with an R^2 of .146, indicating that personality factors explain 14.6% of the variance in this teaching style. The adjusted R^2 of .054 suggests that the model explains 5.4% of the variance after adjustments. The F-statistic (F = 1.590, Sig = .078) is close to significance, indicating that personality traits may have some influence on the constructivist approach, though the relationship is not strong enough to be conclusive. The model shows a weak relationship between personality traits and inclusivity in teaching (R = .321). The R^2 value of .103 suggests that 10.3% of the variance in inclusivity is explained by personality factors, but the adjusted R^2 of .007 indicates that only 0.7% of the variance is explained after adjustments. The model is not statistically significant (F = 1.073, Sig = .385), suggesting that personality traits do not have a significant impact on predicting inclusive teaching practices. A moderate positive relationship is observed between personality factors and equitable behaviour (R = .397). The R^2 value of .157 suggests that personality factors explain 15.7% of the variance in equitable teaching practices, with an adjusted R^2 of .068 showing that 6.8% of the variance remains after adjustments. The model is statistically significant (F = 1.752, Sig = .043), indicating that personality traits significantly predict equitable behaviour among teacher educators. This finding suggests that personality has a meaningful impact on fostering fairness and

equality in teaching practices. The model reveals a weak relationship between personality traits and innovative teaching (R = .202), with an R^2 of .041, meaning that personality traits explain only 4.1% of the variance in innovative teaching practices. The adjusted R^2 of -.062 suggests that the model does not explain any meaningful variance after adjustments. The model is not statistically significant (F = .398, Sig = .981), indicating that personality factors do not significantly influence innovation in teaching, and other factors, such as institutional support or training, may play a more substantial role in promoting innovation.

The coefficients table of regression analysis (Table 3) provide a detailed discussion of the findings for each dimension based on the unstandardised coefficients (B), standardised coefficients (Beta), t-values, and statistical significance (Sig.). In this analysis researchers only took those personality factors and professionalism dimensions which have fit as a model in previous regression analysis.

Table 3: Significant Predictors of the Model

Coefficients						
Professionalism	**Personality Traits**	**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**
		B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
Teaching Performance	**M**	-.155	.076	-.161	2.035	.044
	Q3	-.149	.052	-.238	2.894	.004
Constructivist	**Q3**	-.117	.043	-.225	2.714	.007
Equitable	**I**	-.057	.029	-.164	2.004	.047
	L	-.057	.028	-.165	2.159	.034

The unstandardised coefficient for trait M is -.155, indicating that a one-unit increase in this trait leads to a decrease of .155 units in teaching performance. The standardised coefficient (Beta = -.161) further suggests a moderate negative influence of this trait on teaching performance. This result is statistically significant (t = 2.035, p = .044), indicating that higher levels of self-discipline or imagination are associated with lower teaching performance. These findings may imply that educators with strong imaginative or self-disciplined tendencies could experience difficulty in delivering practical teaching, potentially due to an overemphasis on abstract thinking or rigid expectations. Trait Q3 also has a negative association with teaching performance, with an unstandardised coefficient of -.149 and a standardised coefficient of -.238, showing a stronger negative effect. This result is highly significant (t = 2.894, p = .004), suggesting that teachers with higher perfectionistic tendencies tend to exhibit lower performance in the classroom. This could be attributed to the rigid and overly high standards that perfectionists set for themselves, potentially limiting their flexibility and adaptability in managing diverse classroom situations.

The unstandardised coefficient for trait Q3 is -.117, and the standardised Beta is -.225, indicating a significant negative relationship between perfectionism and the adoption of a constructivist teaching approach (t = 2.714, p = .007). These findings suggest that perfectionist educators may struggle to embrace the flexible, student-centred teaching methods characteristic of the constructivist approach. The preference for control and structured environments typical of perfectionists may conflict with the collaborative and open-ended nature of constructivist teaching. The unstandardised coefficient for trait I is -.057, with a standardised Beta of -.164, revealing a significant negative association between emotional sensitivity and equitable behaviour (t = 2.004, p = .047). This result suggests that educators who are more emotionally sensitive may face challenges in maintaining fairness and equity in their classrooms. Emotional sensitivity could lead to bias or favouritism, which may compromise their

ability to treat students equally. Similarly, trait L shows a negative influence on equitable behaviour, with an unstandardised coefficient of -.057 and a standardised Beta of -.165. This relationship is statistically significant (t = 2.159, p = .034), indicating that teachers with higher levels of suspiciousness or vigilance may struggle with fostering equity. Such individuals may exhibit mistrust or a heightened sense of caution, which could hinder their ability to maintain fairness and impartiality in classroom interactions.

Discussion

The present analysis explains the complex relationships between personality traits and various dimensions of professionalism among teacher educators. The correlation matrix and regression analysis together highlight several key associations and their implications for professional practice in education. The correlation matrix identifies Factor G (rule-consciousness) as a prominent personality trait significantly associated with multiple facets of professionalism, including teaching performance, professional ethics, the constructivist approach, and inclusivity. This finding suggests that individuals with a high degree of rule-consciousness are likely to excel in maintaining professional standards across these dimensions. Such traits enable educators to foster well-organised classroom environments, adhere to ethical standards, and adopt structured teaching methodologies. These traits may also facilitate a more inclusive teaching environment by adhering to established norms and practices that support all students. Barrick and Mount (1991) identified conscientiousness as a key predictor of job performance across various fields, highlighting its relevance in education, where structured, rule-conscious behaviour is critical for effective teaching. This aligns with the present study's findings that Factor G (rule-consciousness) correlates positively with teaching performance, professional ethics, and inclusivity. Conscientious educators tend to maintain high professional standards, which translates into more organised and ethical teaching practices (Blickle 2000). In contrast, Factor Q2 (self-reliance) shows a negative association with both the constructivist approach and inclusivity. This implies that highly independent educators may find it challenging to engage in collaborative or inclusive teaching practices. This is consistent with the findings of Costa and McCrae (1992), who found that highly self-reliant individuals often prefer solitary work environments, making it challenging for them to engage in collaborative or student-centred approaches. The regression analysis further reinforces this notion by indicating that self-reliant and perfectionist traits, as captured by Q3 (perfectionism), negatively influence teaching performance and the adoption of constructivist methods. Perfectionism, often associated with high personal standards and autonomy, has been found to negatively affect teaching performance due to rigidity and lack of flexibility (Smith, 2002). This aligns with earlier research suggesting that perfectionism can lead to over-planning and decreased adaptability in dynamic teaching environments (Flett and Hewitt 2002). Educators with these traits might struggle with flexible, student-centred pedagogies due to their preference for autonomy and high personal standards. Factor M (imaginative self-discipline) is positively correlated with teaching performance, suggesting that educators who balance creativity with self-discipline are more effective in their teaching roles. This balance allows them to manage classrooms effectively and deliver engaging and impactful lessons, leveraging their imaginative capabilities while maintaining focus on educational objectives. Imaginative educators are often more effective, as they can create engaging, thought-provoking lessons while maintaining the necessary structure for learning (Sternberg and Lubart 1995). This finding is particularly relevant in the context of constructivist pedagogies, which demand both flexibility and discipline from educators (Brooks and Brooks 1993).

The regression analysis provides a more subtle view of how personality traits predict different dimensions of professionalism. It reveals that personality traits have a moderate predictive effect

on teaching performance and equitable behaviour, with equitable behaviour being the most significantly influenced dimension. Traits such as I (emotional sensitivity) and L (suspiciousness) negatively impact equitable behaviour, indicating that highly sensitive or vigilant individuals may struggle with maintaining fairness in their teaching practices. This could be due to their heightened emotional responses or tendencies towards mistrust, which might inadvertently affect their ability to treat all students equitably. This echoes findings by Goldstein (1999), who observed that heightened emotional sensitivity can lead to bias in decision-making, particularly in interpersonal settings like classrooms. Educators who are more emotionally reactive may unintentionally favour certain students or struggle to maintain consistency in their treatment of students. For teaching performance, traits such as M (imaginative self-discipline) and Q3 (perfectionism) exhibit a negative impact, suggesting that educators with high levels of perfectionism may face difficulties in practical teaching scenarios. Perfectionism could lead to rigidity and an overemphasis on personal standards, potentially limiting instructional flexibility and effectiveness. Additionally, highly self-disciplined individuals might focus too much on procedures, which could impede their ability to adapt to dynamic teaching environments. Educators with high levels of perfectionism, for instance, may benefit from professional development programs that focus on flexibility and adaptability in the classroom (Hofmann et al 2010). Similarly, self-reliant educators may require support in developing collaborative skills and approaches to inclusive education, as noted by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). The results from the regression analysis and correlation matrix indicate that innovation in teaching does not have a strong relationship with personality traits. This finding suggests that creativity and innovative teaching practices may be more influenced by external factors such as institutional support, professional development, and available resources. The weak correlations observed imply that fostering innovation might require more than inherent personality characteristics; it necessitates a supportive environment that encourages and facilitates creative teaching methods. Previous research has also shown that external factors such as institutional support, training, and professional development are more significant predictors of teaching innovation than personality alone (Fullan 1991). Amabile (1996) argues that while personality traits such as openness to experience can foster creativity, institutional structures and resources play a more pivotal role in enabling innovative practices in education. Moreover, the weak correlation between personality traits and teaching innovation reinforces the need for institutions to foster a supportive environment for creative teaching practices. Research by Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) highlights the role of professional learning communities, resource availability, and a culture of innovation in fostering innovative teaching methods. Therefore, while personality traits such as creativity can contribute to innovation, systemic and institutional support is vital for sustaining and scaling innovative practices.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the study demonstrating the intricate relationships between personality traits and professionalism in education. Traits such as rule-consciousness and imaginative self-discipline are positively associated with effective teaching practices, while self-reliance and perfectionism can hinder collaboration and inclusivity. Additionally, emotional sensitivity and vigilance negatively impact equitable behaviour, aligning with existing research on the challenges these traits present in maintaining fairness. However, the limited influence of personality on innovation underscores the importance of external factors, such as institutional support and professional development, in fostering creativity in teaching. As such, teacher training programs must be designed with these diverse personality influences in mind to enhance professional practice and overall teacher effectiveness.

References

Amabile T M (1996). *Creativity in context: Update to the social psychology of creativity*. Westview Press.

Barnett R C and Hyde J S (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist, 56*(10), 781-796.

Barrick M R and Mount M K (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(1), 1-26.

Blickle G (2000). Do work values predict the use of intraorganizational influence strategies? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*(1), 196-205.

Brooks J G and Brooks M G (1993). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Calderon T G, Gabbin A L and Green B P (1994). Faculty performance evaluation: A study of student feedback and self-assessment. *Journal of Accounting Education, 12*(4), 339-356.

Centra J A (2003). Will teachers receive higher student evaluations by giving higher grades and less course work? *Research in Higher Education, 44*(5), 495-518.

Cobb P (1995). Where is the mind? A coordination of sociocultural and cognitive constructivist perspectives. *Educational Researcher, 24*(7), 4-7.

Cohen P A (1981). Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: A meta-analysis of multisection validity studies. *Review of Educational Research, 51*(3), 281-309.

Costa P T and McCrae R R (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Psychological Assessment Resources.

Costin F, Greenough W T and Menges R J (1971). Student ratings of college teaching: Reliability, validity, and usefulness. *Review of Educational Research, 41*(5), 511-535.

Flett G L and Hewitt P L (2002). *Perfectionism: Theory, research, and treatment*. American Psychological Association.

Fullan M (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. Teachers College Press.

Gage N L (1974). *The scientific basis of the art of teaching*. Teachers College Press.

Goldstein L S (1999). The relational zone: The role of caring relationships in the co-construction of mind. *American Educational Research Journal, 36*(3), 647-673.

Gredler M E (1997). *Learning and instruction: Theory into practice* (3rd ed.). Prentice-Hall.

Gross L A and Small D (1979). The student evaluation of faculty: A new dimension. *Educational Research Quarterly, 4*(1), 2-7.

Hargreaves A and Fullan M (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. Teachers College Press.

Hofmann S G, Sawyer A T, Fang A and Asnaani A (2010). Emotion dysregulation model of mood and anxiety disorders. *Depression and Anxiety, 27*(3), 183-192.

Kulik J A (2001). Student ratings: Validity, utility, and controversy. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2001*(109), 9-25.

Lachance L and Brassard A (2003). Women, work, and family in Canada: A discussion of contemporary issues. *Canadian Psychology, 44*(4), 278-291.

Marsh H W (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(5), 707-754.

Marsh H W (1987). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Research findings, methodological issues, and directions for future research. *International Journal of Educational Research, 11*(3), 253-388.

Martinez M E (2008). Teacher educators' competence: A review of their characteristics and methods. *Teacher Development, 12*(2), 155-169.

Mc Keachie W J (1997). Student ratings: The validity of use. *American Psychologist, 52*(11), 1218-1225.

Mittal S and Gera N (2013). Exploring determinants of students' perception of teachers: A two-dimensional study. *International Journal of Business and Management, 8*(15), 48-56.

National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE). (2009). *National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education: Towards Preparing Professional and Humane Teacher*. New Delhi: NCTE.

National Curriculum Framework (NCF). (2005). *National Curriculum Framework for School Education*. National Council of Educational Research and Training.

Outcalt C L (1980). Student evaluation of teaching: Potential effects of grading leniency. *Research in Higher Education, 12*(4), 319-331. Phillips D C (1995). The good, the bad, and the ugly: The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Researcher, 24*(7), 5-12.

Prawatt R S and Floden R E (1994). Philosophical perspectives on constructivist views of learning. *Educational Psychologist, 29*(1), 37-48. Robertson I and Callinan M (2015). *Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in work performance*. Routledge.

Rodin M and Rodin B (1972). Student evaluations of teachers: Attitudes toward general and specific classroom techniques. *American Educational Research Journal, 9*(3), 285-291. Ryan T A, Anderson R C, and Birchler A (1980). Evaluating faculty: Use of student ratings in faculty evaluation. *Research in Higher Education, 12*(2), 161-170.

Schmitt N, Gooding R Z, Noe R A and Kirsch M (1984). Meta-analyses of validity studies published between 1964 and 1982 and the investigation of study characteristics. *Personnel Psychology, 37*(3), 407-422. Sternberg R J, and Lubart T I (1995). *Defying the crowd: Cultivating creativity in a culture of conformity*. Free Press.

Theall M, and Franklin J (2001). Looking for bias in all the wrong places: A search for truth or a witch hunt in student ratings of instruction? *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2001*(109), 45-56

Tschannen-Moran M and Hoy A W (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805. Wachtel H K (1998). Student evaluation of college teaching effectiveness: A brief review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 23*(2), 191-211.