Inspired by the Lewinian formula $B = f(P,E)$, much attention has been
given over the past 25 years to the development and use of instruments to assess the qualities of the classroom learning environment from the perspective of both teachers and students (Fraser, 1986, 1994; Fraser & Walberg, 1991). Because a particularly important aspect of classroom environments is the relationship dimension (i.e., the nature and intensity of personal relationships within the environment and the way individuals support and help each other) (Moos, 1979), recent research in The Netherlands, the USA and Australia has focused on perceptions of teacher interpersonal behaviour and communication in the classroom (Wubbels & Levy, 1993).

However, while E (the environment) in Lewin's formula has received close attention in classroom research, P (the person or personality) has been relatively neglected. Reflecting on Lewin's formula, Vroom (1970) observed: "There has, however, been a tendency for investigators in social psychology to concentrate on one or the other of these sets of variables in their explanation of social phenomena.... Few have investigated environmental and personality determinants of behaviour simultaneously" (p. 640). Perhaps surprisingly, given the voluminous literature concerning the characteristics of the good teacher, the research relating teacher personality to teacher interpersonal behaviour in the classroom has been sporadic.

The period up to the 1970s saw intensive interest in the relationship between teacher personality and teacher effectiveness (Barr, 1948; Feldman, 1986). Yet Getzels and Jackson (1963) observed that, despite the critical importance of the problem and a half-century of prodigious research effort, very little beyond the self-evident had been discovered about the nature and measurement of teacher personality. Flaitz (1987) noted that "the rather final-sounding pronouncement of irrelevance found in Getzels and Jackson was to virtually end research into teacher personality traits" (p. 5). He attributed the chaos in the field of teacher personality research at the time to the primitive state of affairs characterising the assessment of relevant teacher personality dimensions. Flaitz declared that "after nearly 25 years of second-class status, the time would seem to be at hand to once again consider the role of non-academic indicators such as cognitive skills and personality..." (p. 13).

Past learning environment studies have shown the importance of interpersonal teacher behaviour in determining student learning outcomes. This study provides a distinctive contribution to learning environment research in that it investigated (1) the relationship between student perceptions of teacher interpersonal behaviour and teacher personality, and (2) teacher self-perception of classroom interactional behaviour and teacher personality. While previous studies in teacher personality were concerned with broad issues of teacher effectiveness and were hampered by lack of appropriate instruments,
this study focused specifically on classroom teacher-student interaction and employs recently-developed measures that are designed specifically for normal populations rather than for clinical use and that are appropriate for use in the classroom setting.

This study used one of the most recently developed and widely used measures of personality in the normal population—the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). Given the extensive literature that consistently reports associations between classroom environments and learning outcomes (Fraser, 1994), and establishes teacher interpersonal behaviour as a key element of classroom environment (Wubbels & Levy, 1993), this study limited its focus specifically to the relationship between teacher personality and teacher interpersonal behaviour as perceived by students. The objectives of the study were to investigate the relationship between teachers' personality and:

(i) teachers' perceptions of their interpersonal behaviour with students in the classroom;
(ii) students' perceptions of the teachers' interpersonal behaviour in the classroom.

This study makes a useful contribution because it is centred on the secondary college sector (Grades 11 and 12) of education, whereas most previous research on learning environments and interpersonal teacher behaviour research in Australia have involved the primary, high school and higher education sectors.

ASSESSMENT OF PERSONALITY

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form G was used as a measure of teacher personality in this study because its non-clinical nature made it an appropriate instrument for investigating normal interpersonal teacher behaviour in normal classroom settings. The MBTI is a measure particularly suited to application in teaching and learning (McCaulley, 1987). Form G has been a frequent choice of researchers in education. The economical Self-Scorable version of Form G contains 94 items. It is divided into two parts, each containing a different response format. Part I contains 49 items composed of items which elicit a self-report of preferences in a variety of personal situations and social settings (e.g., "Are you more careful about: a) people's feelings, or b) their rights."). Part II contains 45 items in the form of word pairs that elicit value judgements and intuitive responses (e.g., "Which word in each pair appeals to you more? a) foundation, b) spire.").

The MBTI purports to measure four dimensions of personality using the four bipolar scales of Extraversion-Introversion (EI), Sensation-Intuition (SN), Thinking-Feeling (TF) and Judging-Perceiving
(JP). EI connotes an individual's preference for obtaining information either through orientation toward the outer world of people and things or the inner world of concepts and ideas. The SN index refers to ways of perceiving, either directly through sense-based empirical data (sensation), or indirectly through unconsciously generated information or hunches (intuition). The TF index measures ways of arriving at judgements, either by impersonal, logical, and analytical processes (thinking), or by personal, subjective, and evaluative assessments of information (feeling). The fourth index, JP, refers to preferences in becoming aware or drawing conclusions, either coming to closure by evaluating the day-to-day influx of information (judging), or remaining open by merely gathering and storing data for use (perceiving). The four preferences are assumed to interact in complex nonlinear ways to produce one of 16 psychological types (e.g., INTP).

The MBTI also provides a method of comparing individuals by calculating continuous scores for correlational purposes (Myers & McCaulley, 1985; Wiggins, 1989). Continuous scores are derived by converting the four bipolar scales (eight scale scores) into four continuous scale scores. The eight scales, if used separately, appear to give rise to redundant information due to the degree of item overlap (Thorne & Gough, 1991). The sample of 108 teachers in this study produced the following intrapair correlations of the dichotomous scales: E versus I, -.96; S versus N, -.88; T versus F, -.88, and J versus P, -.94. These values are very similar to the negative intrapair correlation (items in paired scales are scored in opposite directions) of -.95, -.90, -.88, and -.96, respectively, found by Thorne and Gough (1991). They concluded from their figures that, for correlational work, there is nothing to be gained by use of all eight scales. DeVito (1985) suggested that the continuous score is least emphasised in practice because it is a departure from type theory, yet it is this score that is most useful in analysing research findings. In this study, the MBTI was used for multivariate analysis by treating its four scales as continuous measures and correlating them with interpersonal measures.

Reviews reporting sound internal consistency of the MBTI have been conducted by Carlson (1985), Carlyn (1977), Murray (1990), and Stricker and Ross (1963). Lorr (1991), in his review of MBTI reliability studies, cited alpha reliabilities of .82, .83, .84 and .77 for EI, SN, TF, and JP, respectively, commenting that "these findings indicate that the MBTI measures four dimensions and that keyed items measure reliably the scales the items are expected to measure" (p. 1141). DeVito (1985) summarised four test-retest reliability studies of the MBTI. He reported that coefficients from these studies were good, ranging from .48 (14 months) to .87 (7 weeks). Carlson (1985) cited test-retest reliabilities ranging from .79 (TF scale) to .89 (JP scale) for Form G in a reliability study involving a Spanish translation of the MBTI.
Tzeng, Outcalt, Boyer, Ware and Landis (1984) undertook extensive reliability studies at item level. They found positive empirical evidence supporting the MBTI item validity, and concluded that the MBTI can be used with confidence to distinguish separate personality types in terms of four dichotomous dimensions. Sipps and Alexander (1985), in their study of item structure using factor analysis, found six factors, four of which resembled the four scales of the MBTI. More recently, the Tzeng, Ware & Bharadwaj (1991) study provided "strong empirical evidence to support the factorial and construct validities of the MBTI both at item and at preference levels" (p. 689).


For example, Lorentz and Coker (1977) found significant relationships between teachers' scores on the MBTI and the behaviour of their students, concluding that teacher personality influenced the way in which students reacted in class. They found that, while groups of teachers classified by the 16 MBTI personality types did not differ significantly on observational measures of teacher competency, the same groups did differ significantly on the measures of competency as reflected by students. They concluded that while teachers with different MBTI personality types tended to teach in much the same way, they are responded to as individuals quite differently by their students. "While personality may not influence teacher behaviour, it apparently has an effect on student behaviour" (p. 5).

While the MBTI is based on an extensive theory of personality - Jung's typological model (Jung, 1921/1971) - it also can be understood as a measure of cognition. Nelson (1982) suggested that Jung's typology can be regarded as a theory of individual differences in information processing and exchange. She summarised Jung's position as follows: (i) extraversion and introversion tell whether attention is characteristically focused on the objective or the subjective; (ii) the perceptive functions, sensation and intuition, are data-gathering processes, differing in whether data gathered are literal or symbolic; (iii) the judgemental functions, thinking and feeling, are data-evaluation processes, differing in whether the criterion is logical adequacy and coherence or affective value. The MBTI can be understood as a measure of certain cognitive preferences or habitual modes of information processing and therefore as an indicator of cognitive style.
A number of researchers have examined the relationship between MBTI scales and established measures of cognitive style. For example, Jonassen (1981) found a significant relationship between MBTI type, cognitive style as measured by the Educational Cognitive Style Inventory, and teaching style. Ferguson and Fletcher (1987) found significant variations in cognitive style with different preferences on the MBTI. Analysis showed a positive association between Intuition and cognitive integration, and between the T-F scale and cognitive complexity. Taggart, Kroeck and Escoffier (1991) reported results which support the use of the MBTI scales as surrogates for the assessment of brain dominance. They found that Extraversion, Intuition, Feeling, and Perception were associated positively with Right dominance, and Introversion, Sensing, Thinking and Judging were positively associated with Left dominance. Carey, Fleming and Roberts (1989) found that the subscales of the MBTI correlated significantly with field dependence-independence. Perceptual and Intuitive types tend to be more field independent than Judging and Sensing types. Grinder and Stratton (1990) proposed that teachers should have sufficient knowledge of teaching styles and learning styles, as revealed by the MBTI, to enable them the intentionally match or mismatch styles as a pedagogical strategy.

MBTI classroom research provides a common measure of teacher cognitive styles, teacher teaching styles, student learning styles, and student learning outcomes. It seems likely that teacher cognition and teaching style and student learning is moderated by the related intervening variables of teacher communication style and classroom learning environment. This aspect is discussed further in the later section on links between teacher personality and interpersonal behaviour.

ASSESSMENT OF TEACHER-STUDENT INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOUR

Interpersonal teacher behaviour in the classroom was measured using the Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI) (Wubbels, Créton, & Hooymayers, 1985). The QTI is a free-choice high-inference inventory employing five-point numerical Likert rating scales. Based on the circumplex model proposed by Leary (1957), its eight scales are symmetrically arrayed around orthogonal axes representing an Influence dimension (Dominance, D -Submission, S) and a Proximity dimension (Cooperation, C - Opposition, O). Wubbels, Créton and Hooymayers (1985) believed all teacher interactional behaviours can be plotted in this system of coordinates. The quadrants resulting from these axes were subdivided onto equal sized octants. The sectors were labelled DC, CD, etc. according to their position in the coordinate system, the letters coding the relative influence of the axes (see Figure 1).
Figure 1: The model of interpersonal teacher behaviour.

For example, sectors DC and CD are both characterised by Dominance and Cooperation, but in DC Dominance predominates over Cooperation, whereas in CD, Cooperation is more evident. The closer the sectors are to each other, the more closely they resemble each other and the more they represent similar teacher behaviours. Figure 1 describes the typical teacher interpersonal behaviours associated with each sector.

The Australian version of the QTI (Wubbels, 1993) has 48 items, six for every sector of the model of interpersonal teacher behaviour in Figure 1. The items are assigned to the eight scales of Leadership (DC), Helping/Friendly (CD), Understanding (CS), Student Responsibility and Freedom (SC), Uncertain (SO), Dissatisfaction (OS), Admonishing (OD), and Strict (DO) behaviour. The instrument can be used as either a teacher self-report measure or as a measure of student perceptions (using the class as a unit of analysis) of teacher interpersonal behaviour. Each item in the QTI is scored on a 5-point Likert scale. Examples of items are "This teacher acts confidently" (DC) and "This teacher thinks we cheat" (OS). Aggregated class data is used to produce eight scale scores which together form a profile for the teacher. For ease of comprehension and comparison, the results can be represented visually in a characteristic "cob-web-like" figure where sectors are shaded according to the scale scores.

Validation information for the QTI is available in Wubbels & Levy (1989), who concluded that the QTI can be used safely to give teachers feedback about their interpersonal classroom behaviour based on class means. Furthermore, the QTI has been shown to be a valid and reliable measure of perceptions of classroom interaction in Dutch, American and Australian studies (Wubbels, Créton, Levy & Hooymayers, 1993).

The QTI has been used to develop a typology of teacher interpersonal or communication styles (Wubbels, Brekelmans, Créton, & Hooymayers, 1990). Eight distinct types were derived through a cluster analysis. These eight types were labelled Directive, Authoritarian, Tolerant and Authoritative, Tolerant, Uncertain/Tolerant, Uncertain/Aggressive, Repressive, and Drudging. Wubbels, Brekelmans & Hooymayers (1990) established a relationship between the eight teacher types and both cognitive and affective student learning outcomes.

LINKS BETWEEN TEACHER PERSONALITY AND INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOUR

Parkay (1980) found that personality was indicative of teaching style in three groupings of teachers. Group 1 teachers emphasised
teacher-determined rules and revealed conflict between teacher and students. They expressed traditional and limited understandings of the educative process, and preferred to maintain high social and empathetic distance between themselves and students. Group 2 was characterised by warm and supportive teacher-student interactions. These teachers expressed accepting and caring attitudes toward students and a concern for their intellectual and emotional development. Group 3 emphasised productivity and achievement, stressing the importance of mastery of predetermined course materials. They expressed the view that well-prepared, hard-working teachers would succeed. It can be speculated that Group 1 probably contained a large proportion of ST teacher types, Group 2 probably consisted mainly of NFs, and Group 3 consisted mainly of SJs. The similarity of Group 1's interpersonal style to the QTI Admonishing (OD) sector, Group 2's similarity to the Helping-Friendly sector, and Group 3's similarity to the Leadership (DO) sector is apparent. The findings of this study provide support for the notion of the interdependence of personality type and interpersonal teacher behaviour.

Tonelson (1981) was in no doubt about the interconnectedness of teacher personality and interactional behaviour as he endeavoured to determine why there is a significant relationship among the variables of teacher personality and student outcomes. He proposed a mechanism whereby teacher personality, especially a self-concept in accord with reality, can affect student learning outcomes through the psychological environment of the classroom. He believed that this environment was essentially the product of the kinds of interactions teachers have with students. He declared that "the teacher sets the psychological environment of the classroom, ... This atmosphere provides the stage for learning" (p. 96).

The research on MBTI type and QTI interpersonal style can be linked conceptually in three ways. First, the relationship of teacher personality to observed interpersonal behaviour can be understood using the social systems model of the classroom proposed by Getzels and Thelen (1960/1972). This theoretical model proposes that personality dispositions in tension with role-expectations, and in the context of classroom climate, give rise to a transactional style. Second, social cognition theory suggests that the schema and scripts which give rise to the cognitive style of the teacher (measured by the MBTI) influence teacher self-perceptions of classroom interactional behaviour. Teacher cognitive style influences teacher perceptions of and cognitions about students and classroom psychosocial environment. These perceptions and cognitions tend to give rise to characteristic interpersonal behaviours (measured by the QTI) with consequences for student learning outcomes. Third, Mehrabian (1971) described social style in terms of a dominant-submissive, and affiliative behaviour. He proposed two eight-sector (apparent circumplex) models - one of general
interpersonal behaviour, and the other of personality type (Figure 2). The model drew direct links between particular personality types and specific (1971) interpersonal behaviours and cognitions. Mehrabian's diagram of type was based on Jung's typology. The diagram of interpersonal dimensions is essentially similar to Wubbels' model of teacher classroom interpersonal behaviour. Mehrabian's diagrams promise a useful model for analysis by predicting systematic and coherent links between teacher personality and teacher classroom communication style. However, he did not develop his ideas beyond a speculative stage. This study sought empirical support for Mehrabian's intuitions.

Figure 2: Mehrabian's model of the qualities of social behaviour and corresponding qualities of personality (from Mehrabian, 1971, p.64)

METHODOLOGY

The same teachers completed the MBTI and teacher QTI, and one of the classes of each teacher completed the student QTI. Using the scales of the MBTI as independent variables, associations with the scales of the QTI were computed. Both simple and multiple correlations were employed, and analyses were performed for both the individual student and the class mean as a unit of analysis.

The sample in this study was comprised of 108 teachers and their 108 classes containing 1,883 students drawn from all eight of the Tasmanian senior secondary colleges. The sample was representative of college teachers in terms of gender, years of experience, and teaching area, and of Grade 11/12 College students in regard to gender and age.

RESULTS

Analysis of responses to the QTI revealed that each QTI scale had acceptable internal consistency reliability (Table 1), with alpha coefficients ranging from .66 to .83 using the individual student as the unit of analysis, and from .83 to .93 using the class as a unit of analysis. The ability of the QTI to differentiate between the perceptions of students in different classrooms was examined by performing a one-way ANOVA for each scale with class membership as the main effect. It was found that each QTI scale differentiated significantly (p<.001) between classrooms and that the eta2 statistic ranged from .26 to .33. Also included in Table 1 are the reliability figures published by Wubbels and Levy (1989) for a sample of 1,606 students and 66 teachers in the USA who used the original long form of the QTI. A comparison of the two sets of results indicates that the results are quite similar.

Table 1: Internal consistency (Cronbach alpha coefficient) and ability to differentiate between classrooms for total sample for the QTI.
* p<0.001

The eta2 statistic (which is the ratio of 'between' to 'total' sums of squares) represents the proportion of variance explained by class membership.

1 Cross-validation Long Form alpha coefficients from USA sample of 1606 students and 66 teachers (Wubbels & Levy, 1989).

Figure 3 graphically illustrates the relative proportions of the 16 types in the sample. The largest representation of types in the sample is by ENTJ and INTJ teachers (each 13.9% of sample), with Thinking-Judging types accounting for 47.5% of the sample. This suggests that the predominant personality types in Year 11/12 colleges value high academic standards, subject-centred teaching, orderliness, and hard work. These values therefore can be expected to hold a strong place in the staff cultures of these colleges.

McCutcheon, Schmidt and Bolden (1991) found the largest subgroup of types represented in their sample of elementary teachers was the ESFJ type (42%), and the largest subgroup represented in their sample of secondary teachers was the ISTJ type (14.3%). Hoffman and Betkouski (1981) reviewed numerous MBTI studies which examined the relationship between teacher personality, teaching style and teacher effectiveness. They concluded that the personalities of teachers as a group are different from the general population. A particular set of type preferences (Extraversion, Sensating, Feeling, and Judging) predominate among teachers. The Sensating-Judging (SJ) and Intuiting-Feeling (NF) combinations of type are frequently associated with teachers and together comprise about 90% of teacher ranks. The Sensating, Feeling, and Judging types were associated with elementary grades, and the Introversion and Intuiting combination for higher grades, especially college level. Ratings of teacher effectiveness consistently favour the ENFJ teacher. The sample distribution supports the prediction of the predominance of Intuitive teachers for higher grades but necessarily Introversion.

Figure 3: Percentage of MBTI types in study sample.

In order to investigate associations between the four teacher personality type preferences (Extraversion-Introversion (EI), Sensation-Intuition (SN), Thinking-Feeling (TF) and Judging-Perceiving (JP)) and perceptions of interpersonal behaviour, the data were analysed using both simple and multiple correlations. Tables 2 reports these results separately for student and teacher perceptions on the QTI scales. Whereas the simple correlation (r) describes the bivariate association between personality type and a QTI scale, the standardised regression weight (ß) characterises the association between a personality type and a particular QTI scale when all other QTI dimensions are controlled.
Simple and multiple correlation analyses revealed significant associations between teacher personality type and perceptions of interpersonal behaviour (Table 2). Extraverted teachers perceived themselves as displaying high levels of Leadership and Helping/Friendly behaviour (p<.001), while Introverted teachers tended to perceive themselves as more Uncertain (p<.001) in their classroom management. This finding supports Mehrabian's speculative model which predicts that extraverts will experience benevolent interpersonal feelings. The introvert's predicted fearfulness and sensitivity to rejection partially could underlie the introvert teacher's self-perceptions of interpersonal uncertainty.

Table 2: Associations between MBTI scale scores with teacher and student QTI scale scores.

There is a greater degree of relatedness between teacher personality and self-perception than between teacher personality and student perception. Multiple correlations between teacher QTI and MBTI scale scores revealed p<.01 on the three QTI scales of Helping/Friendly, Student Responsibility and Freedom, and Uncertainty compared to the one QTI scale of Student Responsibility and Freedom for student scores. This could be the result of greater congruence between teacher cognitive style and teacher self-attribution in the classroom setting than between teacher cognitive style, associated teacher interpersonal behaviour, and subsequent student perception and student attribution as a function of student prototypes for teachers and scripts for classroom interaction.

Teachers scoring highly on the Intuitive scale were perceived by their classes as encouraging Student Responsibility and Freedom (p<.001) while also tending to be less Strict (p<.05). The multiple correlation (R) data supported this interpretation as with all other QTI scales controlled, associations were strongest between students' perceptions of Student Responsibility and Freedom behaviour and MBTI scale scores. An examination of the beta weights showed that this occurred in the classes of teachers perceived as being intuitive. This supports Lawrence (1982) who suggested that Intuitive type teachers are more likely to allow for a wide range of student choices. Myers and McCaulley (1985) argued that, because Intuitive type teachers allow more individual activity, a degree of disorder results which they attempt to control with negative non-verbal behaviour (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). Their instructional pattern is to encourage student self-expression which in turn allows for a significant increase in hostile-aggressive student behaviour in these classrooms. They show significantly more supportive behaviour, but also appear more hostile than Sensing teachers. That is, Ns tend to praise more and blame more, to smile more and frown more (Hoffman & Betkouski, 1981). The finding
that Intuitive teachers are perceived as less strict by students corroborates the possibility of this interaction pattern.

Teachers with high scale scores on Thinking scored strongly on Strict (p<.001) and Admonishing (p<.05) in the teacher version of the QTI. Jensen (1987) predicted that Thinking type teachers, at the extreme, can be so harsh and critical that they intimidate students. These findings suggest that the enforcement of rules using negative sanctions is actually fairly characteristic of Thinking type teachers in Year 11/12 classrooms. The likely consequence of this is that Thinking types produce higher cognitive outcomes but lower affective outcomes in students (Wubbels, Brekelmans & Hooymayers, 1990). Contrary to predictions from type theory (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), there was no significant finding that Feeling types are perceived by students as more caring and supportive.

Those teachers who were identified as Perceiving types, with their reluctance to come to closure, tended to see themselves, and were seen by their classes, as allowing more Student Responsibility and Freedom (p<.001). Perceiving types also saw themselves as Uncertain. Again these interpretations are supported in each case, by the more conservative multiple correlation analysis with all other QTI scales controlled. Conversely, Judging types were seen by themselves and by students as more Strict (p<.05). These findings are consistent with type theory. Jensen (1987) predicted that Ps develop more spontaneous classrooms with flexible schedules. On the other hand, Js. develop orderly classrooms, with adherence to structure, schedules, and deadlines (Lawrence, 1982). This is consonant with the field dependant cognitive style of Js (Carey, Fleming and Roberts, 1989). Perceiving teacher types self-perception of Uncertainty is characteristic of their cognitive style which is characterised by a reluctance to come to closure (Moss, 1991).

CONCLUSIONS

This study has confirmed the Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction as a valid, reliable and economical instrument for use in providing teachers with information about their relationships with students in their own classrooms. Teachers could find the QTI to be a valuable source of information, particularly for comparisons between their own and their students' perceptions. The study also demonstrated the suitability of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator as an instrument for classroom research involving the assessment of teacher personality types. Furthermore, the study replicated certain findings from previous studies which used low-inference measures, and provided empirical support for a number of predictions of teacher behaviour made by type theorists.
The relative proportions of the 16 personality types of the MBTI in the sample were determined. The largest representation of types was by ENTJ and INTJ teachers (each 13.9% of sample). Year 11/12 college teachers are heavily represented by TJ types (47.5%) which suggests that interactional strategies of teacher-centred instruction and strictness in the classroom form an important part of the staff culture.

The study demonstrated a moderate association between teacher personality and interpersonal teacher behaviour, providing empirical support for a number of elements in Mehrabian's intuitive model of personality and social behaviour. Other factors, such as systems variables suggested by Getzels and Thelen (1960/1972) are also instrumental. A greater positive association between teacher personality and self-perception was found than between teacher personality and student perception of teacher interpersonal behaviour.

Teacher personality appears to be consistently associated with teacher self-image in regard to being friendly, helpful and giving freedom, responsibility and opportunity for independent work in class. Teacher personality also seems to be related to self-perceptions of uncertainty in the classroom, of maintaining a low profile and being passive. Students' perceptions of their teacher's interpersonal behaviour is related to the personality of the teacher in regard to how much freedom and responsibility students think that they are allowed.

The relationship between MBTI and QTI data can be understood using social cognition theory as a conceptual model. The MBTI provides a measure of cognitive style. That is, it provides a window into teacher self-schemata, and scripts for social interaction which are associated with habitual or characteristic ways of perceiving, thinking and making judgements about interpersonal acts in the classroom context. The teacher interpersonal behaviour which accompanies these self-schemata and scripts is selectively perceived and interpreted by students as a function of their prototypes of teacher behaviour and their own scripts of classroom interaction.
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