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The present chapter purports to examine relationships among teacher effectiveness, teaching styles and personality types of secondary school teachers. The following hypotheses have been tested in the present chapter:

1(a) There will be significant relationship between teacher effectiveness and teaching styles of secondary school teachers.

(b) There will be significant relationship between teacher effectiveness and personality types of secondary school teachers.

(c) There will be significant relationship between teaching styles and personality types of secondary school teachers.

TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

HYPOTHESIS 1(a)

Hypothesis 1 (a) states, “There will be significant relationship between teacher effectiveness and teaching styles of secondary school teachers.” To test this hypothesis, Table 6.1.1 has been prepared.

TABLE 6.1.1

Coefficients of Correlation of Different Components of Teacher Effectiveness with various Teaching Styles (N=400)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>0.364**</td>
<td>0.256**</td>
<td>0.297**</td>
<td>0.308**</td>
<td>0.216**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.256**</td>
<td>0.229**</td>
<td>0.187**</td>
<td>0.216**</td>
<td>0.152**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>0.408**</td>
<td>0.256**</td>
<td>0.311**</td>
<td>0.361**</td>
<td>0.290**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>0.470**</td>
<td>0.275**</td>
<td>0.385**</td>
<td>0.438**</td>
<td>0.316**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>0.328**</td>
<td>0.142**</td>
<td>0.164**</td>
<td>0.272**</td>
<td>0.253**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE (Total)</td>
<td>0.440**</td>
<td>0.277**</td>
<td>0.327**</td>
<td>0.389**</td>
<td>0.293**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level
RESULTS

Relationship of Teacher Effectiveness with Teaching Styles

Table 6.1.1 reveals that the coefficients of correlation of expert (EX) teaching style with various components of teacher effectiveness, namely, preparation and planning for teaching (PP), classroom management (CR), knowledge of subject matter (KS), teacher characteristics (TC), interpersonal relations (IR) and total teacher effectiveness (TE Total) were .364, .256, .408, .470, .328 and .440 respectively. All the coefficients of correlation were statistically significant at .01 level of significance. It indicates that expert teaching style is positively and significantly related to various components of teacher effectiveness i.e. PP, CR, KS, TC, IR and total teacher effectiveness TE (Total).

The coefficients of correlation of formal authority (FA) teaching style with components of teacher effectiveness, namely, preparation and planning for teaching (PP), classroom management (CR), knowledge of subject matter (KS), teacher characteristics (TC), interpersonal relations (IR) and total teacher effectiveness (TE Total) were .256, .229, .256, .275, .142 and .277 respectively. All the coefficients of correlation were statistically significant at .01 level of significance. It indicates that formal authority teaching style bears positive and significant relationship with various components of teacher effectiveness i.e. PP, CR, KS, TC, IR and total teacher effectiveness TE (Total).

Further, the coefficients of correlation of personal model (PM) teaching style with components of teacher effectiveness, namely, preparation and planning for teaching (PP), classroom management (CR), knowledge of subject matter (KS), teacher characteristics (TC), interpersonal relations (IR) and total teacher effectiveness (TE Total) were .297, .187, .311, .385, .164 and .327 respectively. All the coefficients of correlation were statistically significant at .01 level of significance. This shows that personal model teaching style is positively and significantly related to various components of teacher effectiveness i.e. PP, CR, KS, TC, IR and TE (Total).
Table 6.1.1 shows that the coefficients of correlation of facilitator (FC) teaching style with different components of teacher effectiveness, namely, preparation and planning for teaching (PP), classroom management (CR), knowledge of subject matter (KS), teacher characteristics (TC), interpersonal relations (IR) and total teacher effectiveness (TE Total) were .308, .216, .361, .438, .272 and .389 respectively. All the coefficients of correlation were statistically significant at .01 level of significance. It suggests that facilitator teaching style possesses positive and significant relationship with various components of teacher effectiveness i.e. PP, CR, KS, TC, IR and TE (Total).

Further, the coefficients of correlation of delegator (DE) teaching style with various components of teacher effectiveness i.e. preparation and planning for teaching (PP), classroom management (CR), knowledge of subject matter (KS), teacher characteristics (TC), interpersonal relations (IR) and total teacher effectiveness (TE Total) were .216, .152, .290, .316, .253 and .293 respectively. All the coefficients of correlation were statistically significant at .01 level of significance. It shows that delegator teaching style is positively and significantly related to various components of teacher effectiveness i.e. PP, CR, KS, TC, IR and total teacher effectiveness TE (Total).

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

A look over the Table 6.1.1 shows that expert (EX) teaching style has positive and significant relationship with various components of teacher effectiveness i.e. preparation and planning for teaching (PP), classroom management (CR), knowledge of subject matter (KS), teacher characteristics (TC), interpersonal relations (IR) and total teacher effectiveness (TE Total). Teachers scoring high on expert teaching style also scored high on all the components of teacher effectiveness. This suggests that teachers who prefer to teach through expert teaching style possess higher abilities pertaining to preparation, planning and organizing teaching in accordance with course
objectives, successfully communicate in classroom and are better in interpretation and presentation of the content. Further, they are higher in the ability to seek active participation of pupils, maintaining cordial relations with others and are higher in total teacher effectiveness.

Results entered in Table 6.1.1 depict that formal authority (FA) teaching style has positive and significant relationship with various components of teacher effectiveness i.e. preparation and planning for teaching (PP), classroom management (CR), knowledge of subject matter (KS), teacher characteristics (TC), interpersonal relations (IR) and total teacher effectiveness (TE Total). Teachers scoring high on formal authority teaching style also scored high on all the components of teacher effectiveness. This suggests that teachers teaching through formal authority teaching style possess higher abilities pertaining to preparation, planning and organize teaching as per course objectives, successfully communicate and motivate pupils in the classroom and are better in interpretation and presentation of the subject matter. Further, they are higher in the ability to seek active participation of pupils, maintain cordial interpersonal relations with others and are higher in total teacher effectiveness.

Entries made in Table 6.1.1 show that personal model (PM) teaching style bears positive and significant relationship with various components of teacher effectiveness i.e. preparation and planning for teaching (PP), classroom management (CR), knowledge of subject matter (KS), teacher characteristics (TC), interpersonal relations (IR) and total teacher effectiveness (TE Total). Teachers scoring high on personal model teaching style also scored high on all the components of teacher effectiveness. This suggests that teachers who scored high on personal model teaching style possess higher abilities pertaining to preparation, planning teaching as per course objectives, successfully communicate and motivate pupils in the classroom and are better in interpretation and delivery of subject matter. Further, such teachers possess higher ability in seeking active participation of pupils, adapting to maintain
cordial relations with others through interaction and in total teacher effectiveness.

Table 6.1.1 further depicts that facilitator (FC) teaching style has positive and significant relationship with various components of teacher effectiveness i.e. preparation and planning for teaching (PP), classroom management (CR), knowledge of subject matter (KS), teacher characteristics (TC), interpersonal relations (IR) and total teacher effectiveness (TE Total). Teachers scoring high on facilitator teaching style also scored high on all the components of teacher effectiveness. This suggests that teachers who have an inclination to teach through facilitator teaching style possess higher abilities concerning preparation, planning and organization of teaching as per course objectives, motivate pupils and maintain discipline in the classroom and are better in acquiring, retaining, interpreting and presenting subject matter. Further, they are higher in the ability to arouse perceptions of pupils and seek their active participation, maintain cordial relations with others and are higher in total teacher effectiveness.

A perusal of Table 6.1.1 reveals that delegator (DE) teaching style (FA) has positive and significant relationship with various components of teacher effectiveness i.e. preparation and planning for teaching (PP), classroom management (CR), knowledge of subject matter (KS), teacher characteristics (TC), interpersonal relations (IR) and total teacher effectiveness (TE Total). Teachers scoring high on delegator teaching style also scored high on all the components of teacher effectiveness. This suggests that teachers who prefer to teach through delegator teaching style possess higher abilities related to preparation, planning and organization of teaching according to course objectives, successfully communicate and motivate pupils in the classroom and are better in interpretation and presentation of the subject matter. Further, they are higher in the ability to seek active participation of pupils, maintain cordial relations with others and are higher in total teacher effectiveness.
It can be concluded that different teaching styles, namely, expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator and delegator are significantly and positively related with different components of teacher effectiveness i.e. preparation and planning for teaching, classroom management, knowledge of subject matter, teacher characteristics, interpersonal relations and total teacher effectiveness.

Hence, the Hypothesis 1 (a) namely, “There will be significant relationship between teacher effectiveness and teaching styles of secondary school teachers,” was accepted.

**HYPOTHESIS 1 (b)**

Hypothesis 1 (b) states, “There will be significant relationship between teacher effectiveness and personality types of secondary school teachers.” To test this hypothesis, Table 6.1.2 has been prepared.

**TABLE 6.1.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sw</th>
<th>En</th>
<th>Bo</th>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.099*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.122*</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE (Total)</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-.105*</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level.
RESULTS

Relationship of Teacher Effectiveness with Personality Types

Table 6.1.2 reveals that the coefficients correlation of preparation and planning for teaching (PP) component of teacher effectiveness with different dimensions of personality types i.e. social warmth (Sw), enthusiasm (En), boldness (Bo), self-sufficiency (Ss), competition (Co) and extraversion-introversion (Total) were -.047, -.099, .000, .032, -.043 and -.059 respectively. None of the correlations were significant at any level of significance except the correlation of enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality types which was negatively but significantly correlated with preparation and planning for teaching (PP) area of teacher effectiveness at .05 level of significance.

Entries made in Table 6.1.2 show that the coefficients of correlations of classroom management (CR) component of teacher effectiveness with different dimensions of personality types, namely, social warmth (Sw), enthusiasm (En), boldness (Bo), self-sufficiency (Ss), competition (Co) and extraversion-introversion (Total) were .021, -.083, .037, .026, -.034 and -.003 respectively. None of the correlations was significant at any statistical level of significance. Thus, component CR of teacher effectiveness has no significant relationship with any of the dimension of personality types.

The coefficients of correlation of knowledge of subject matter (KS) component of teacher effectiveness with dimensions of personality types i.e. social warmth (Sw), enthusiasm (En), boldness (Bo), self-sufficiency (Ss), competition (Co) and extraversion-introversion (Total) were -.067, -.122, -.054, .058, -.055 and -.091 respectively. None of the values of correlations were significant at any level of significance except the coefficient of correlation of knowledge of subject matter (KS) component of teacher effectiveness with enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality types which was negatively and significant at .05 level of significance.
Further, the coefficients of correlations calculated between teacher characteristics (TC), component of teacher effectiveness and various dimensions of personality types i.e. social warmth (Sw), enthusiasm (En), boldness (Bo), self sufficiency (Ss), competition (Co) and extraversion - introversion (Total) were -.053, -.070, .036, .051, -.069 and -.042 respectively which were not significant at any level of significance. Thus, teacher characteristics (TC) area of teacher effectiveness has no significant relationship with any of the dimension of personality types.

Entries made in Table 6.1.2 further reveal that coefficients of correlation between interpersonal relations (IR) component of teacher effectiveness and different dimensions of personality types, namely, social warmth (Sw), enthusiasm (En), boldness (Bo), self sufficiency (Ss), competition (Co) and extraversion - introversion (Total) were -.018, -.078, .073, .066, -.020 and .003 respectively. None of the correlations were significant at any level of significance. Thus, interpersonal relations (IR) component of teacher effectiveness has no significant relationship with any of the dimension of personality types i.e. Sw, En, Bo, Ss, Co and Total.

Table 6.1.2 shows the coefficients of correlation of total teacher effectiveness with different dimensions of personality types. Entries made in Table 6.1.2 show that the correlations of total teacher effectiveness (TE total) with various dimensions of personality types, namely, social warmth (Sw), enthusiasm (En), boldness (Bo), self sufficiency (Ss), competition (Co) and extraversion - introversion (Total) were -.032, -.105, .035, .056, -.053 and -.037 respectively. The coefficient of correlation of teacher effectiveness (total) with enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality types was negative and significant at .05 level of significance, but the coefficients of correlations with rest of dimensions of personality types i.e. Sw, Bo, Ss, Co and extraversion-introversion (total) were not statistically significant at any level of significance. It indicates that teacher effectiveness has significant but negative relationship with enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality types only.
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The results entered in Table 6.1.2 indicate that preparation and planning for teaching (PP) component of teacher effectiveness does not have a significant relationship with social warmth (Sw), boldness (Bo), self-sufficiency (Ss), competition (Co) and extraversion-introversion (Total) dimension of personality types. However, enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality types has significant but negative relationship with preparation and planning for teaching (PP) component of teacher effectiveness. It suggests that teachers scoring high on enthusiasm dimension of personality types being effervescent and carefree are low in their abilities pertaining to preparation, planning and organizing teaching as per course objectives.

The results entered in Table 6.1.2 also reveal that classroom management (CR) component of teacher effectiveness does not have significant relationship with social warmth (Sw), enthusiasm (En), boldness (Bo), self sufficiency (Ss), competition (Co) and extraversion-introversion (Total) dimensions of personality types.

Entries made in Table 6.1.2 regarding the relationship of knowledge of subject matter (KS) component of teacher effectiveness with various dimensions of personality types, namely, social warmth (Sw), boldness (Bo), self sufficiency (Ss), competition (Co) and extraversion-introversion (Total) reveal that no significant relationship could be worked out of these variables. Knowledge of subject matter (KS) dimension of teacher effectiveness is not related significantly with dimensions of personality types like SW, Bo, Ss, Co and Total, except with enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality types which bears negative but significant relationship with knowledge of subject matter component of teacher effectiveness. This suggests that teachers, who are high in their enthusiasm level, score less on the knowledge of subject matter component of teacher effectiveness and possess low level of abilities pertaining to acquiring, retaining, interpreting and presentation of course contents within the classroom situations.
The results entered in Table 6.1.2 further indicate that teacher characteristics (TC) and interpersonal (IR) components of teacher effectiveness do not possess significant relationship with dimensions of personality types, namely, social warmth (Sw), enthusiasm (En), boldness (Bo), self sufficiency (Ss), competition (Co) and introversion – extraversion (Total).

The coefficients of correlations entered in Table 6.1.2 concerning the relationship of teacher effectiveness (Total) with the different dimensions of personality types reflect that teacher effectiveness (total) is not significantly related to personality type dimensions, namely, social warmth (Sw), boldness (Bo), self sufficiency (Ss), competition (Co) and extraversion - introversion (Total) except with the enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality types which has a significant but negative relationship with teacher effectiveness (total). This indicates that teachers who score high on enthusiasm dimension of personality types are low in their teacher effectiveness. Teachers possessing high level of enthusiasm are less able on the aspects of teacher’s roles and functions including preparation, planning and organizing teaching as per course objectives, classroom management, delivery and presentation of subject matter, level of acceptability in teaching profession and adapting to in maintaining cordial relations with others.

To sum up, teacher effectiveness and its various components i.e. preparation and planning for teaching (PP), classroom management (CR), knowledge of subject matter(KS), teacher characteristics (TC) and interpersonal relations (IR) do not have significant relationship with any of the dimensions of personality types, namely, social warmth (Sw), boldness (Bo), self sufficiency (Ss), competition (Co) and extraversion - introversion (Total), except the enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality types which bears a negative and significant relationship with preparation and planning for
teaching (PP), knowledge of subject matter (KS) dimensions of teacher effectiveness and teacher effectiveness (Total).

Hence, hypothesis 1(b) namely, “There will be significant relationship between teacher effectiveness and personality types of secondary school teachers,” was partially accepted. The results are partially consistent with More (1988) and Srivastava and Dubey (1991) who have reported that personality factors have significant relationship with teacher effectiveness.

**HYPOTHESIS 1 (c)**

Hypothesis 1(c) states, “There will be significant relationship between teaching styles and personality types of secondary school teachers.” To test this hypothesis, Table 6.1.3 has been prepared.

**TABLE 6.1.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>-0.185**</td>
<td>-122*</td>
<td>-0.183**</td>
<td>-0.170**</td>
<td>-149**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En</td>
<td>-0.133**</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-139**</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-0.132**</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-0.134**</td>
<td>-133**</td>
<td>-.071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level
RESULTS

Relationship of Personality Types with Teaching Styles

Entries made in Table 6.1.3 reveal that the coefficients of correlation of the social warmth (Sw) dimension of personality types with various teaching styles, namely, expert (EX), formal authority (FA), personal model (PM), facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE) were -.185, -.122, -.183, -.170 and -.149 respectively. The correlations of SW dimension with various teaching styles namely EX, FA, PM, FC and DE were negative and significant at .01 level. However, the correlation of Sw component with FA teaching style was negative and significant at .05 level.

The coefficients of correlation of enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality types with various teaching styles i.e., expert (EX), formal authority (FA), personal model (PM), facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE) were -.133, -.025, -.045, -.139 and -.087 respectively. All the values of correlations were negative. The correlation of enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality type with EX and FC teaching styles were negative and significant at .01 level, whereas, the coefficients of correlation of enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality types with FA, PM and DE teaching styles were not significant at any statistical level of significance.

The coefficients of correlation worked out and entered in Table 6.1.3 for the boldness (Bo) dimension of personality types with various teaching styles, namely, expert (EX), formal authority (FA), personal model (PM), facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE) teaching styles were .019, .023, -.065, -.019 and .068 respectively. None of these correlations were statistically significant at any level of significance.

The coefficients of correlation regarding the self-sufficiency (Ss) dimension of personality types with different teaching styles, namely, expert (EX), formal authority (FA), personal model (PM), facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE) teaching styles were worked out as .017, -.022, .040, .055 and -.005 respectively. None of the correlations were significant at any level of
significance showing that self-sufficiency (Ss) dimension of personality type is not significantly related to any of the teaching styles.

Table 6.1.3 further reveals that the coefficients of correlation of competition (Co) dimension of personality with different teaching style i.e. expert (EX), formal authority (FA), personal model (PM), facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE) were .013, -.054, -.055, -.028 and .065 respectively which were not significant at any level of significance.

Entries made in Table 6.1.3 also show that the coefficients of correlations calculated between introversion-extraversion (Total) personality type and different teaching styles, namely, expert (EX), formal authority (FA), personal model (PM), facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE) were -.132, -.091, -.134, -.133 and -.071 respectively. The correlations between introversion-extraversion (Total) and EX, PM and FC teaching styles were negative but significant at .01 level whereas correlations between introversion-extraversion (Total) and FA and DE teaching style were not significant at any level of significance.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The coefficients of correlation entered in Table 6.1.3 have conclusively established that social warmth (Sw) dimension of personality types has negative but significant relationship with various teaching styles, namely, expert (EX), formal authority (FA), personal model (PM), facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE). Significant but negative correlation indicates that more ability of social warmth in a teacher helps in developing less inclination towards various teaching styles, namely EX, FA, PM, FC and DE. This suggests that teachers scoring low on social warmth dimension of personality types possess more knowledge and expertise needed by students and maintain status as an expert, focuses more on clear expectation and acceptable ways of doing things and believes more in teaching by personal example, facilitates teacher-student
interaction through encouragement and were more concerned with developing students' capacity to work independently.

The entries made in Table 6.1.3 with regard to the relationship of enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality type with various teaching styles, namely, expert (EX), facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE) reveal that enthusiasm (En) dimension of personality type has a negative and significant relationship with EX and FC teaching styles. It suggests that enthusiastic teachers being active, expressive, effervescent and carefree have a less tendency to teach through EX and FC teaching styles. Further, teachers scoring low on enthusiasm dimension of personality types strive more to maintain status as experts among students by displaying detailed knowledge and also develop in students the capacity for independent action, initiative and responsibility.

The results entered in Table 6.1.3 indicate that boldness (Bo) dimension of personality types is not significantly correlated with any of the teaching styles, namely, expert (EX), formal authority (FA), personal model (PM), facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE). This means that there is no significant relationship of boldness (Bo) dimension of personality types with any of the teaching styles, namely, expert (EX), formal authority (FA), personal model (PM) facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE).

The results entered in Table 6.1.3 regarding the relationship of self-sufficiency (Ss) dimension of personality type with various teaching styles like EX, FA, PM, FC and DE show that self-sufficiency (Ss) dimension of personality type has not a significant relationship with any of the teaching styles, namely, expert (EX), formal authority (FA), personal model (PM), facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE).
Entries made in Table 6.1.3 regarding the relationship of competition (Co) dimension of personality types with different teaching styles like expert (EX), formal authority (FA), personal model (PM), facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE) show that competition (Co) dimension is not significantly related to any of the teaching styles, namely, expert (EX), formal authority (FA), personal model (PM), facilitator (FC) and delegator (DE).

The results entered in Table 6.1.3 have conclusively established that introversion-extraversion dimension (Total) has significant but negative relationship with expert (EX), personal model (PM) and facilitator (FC) teaching styles. But the coefficients of correlation with formal authority (FA) and delegator (DE) teaching styles were not significant at any statistical level of significance. The negative but significant correlations of introversion-extraversion personality types with EX, PM, and FC teaching styles further indicate that introvert teachers score high on teaching styles, namely, expert (EX), personal model (PM) and facilitator (FC) teaching styles as compared to extrovert teachers. This suggests that teachers scoring low on introversion-extraversion dimension of personality types strive more to maintain status as experts among students by displaying detailed knowledge, more concerned in establishing a prototype for how to think and behave and provide more personal flexibility while teaching with focus on students’ needs, goals and willingness to explore options.

It can be concluded that social warmth (Sw) dimension of personality types has a significant but negative relationship with EX, FA, PM, FC and DE teaching styles of school teachers teaching secondary classes. Enthusiasm dimension of personality type has significant but negative relationship with expert and facilitator teaching styles and introversion-extraversion bears negative and significant relationship with expert, personal model and facilitator teaching styles. However, boldness (Bo), self sufficiency (Ss) and competition
(Co) dimensions of personality types do not have any significant relationship with any of the teaching styles of secondary school teachers.

Hence, hypothesis 1(c), namely, “There will be a significant relationship between teaching styles and personality types of secondary school teachers,” was partially accepted. The results support the findings reported by Parkay (1980) who has reported that personality factors are indicative of teaching styles of school teachers.