UNIVERSITY of York

This is a repository copy of *What is students' ideal university instructor personality? An investigation of absolute and relative personality preferences*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/112391/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:
Kim, Lisa orcid.org/0000-0001-9724-2396 and MacCann, Carolyn (2016) What is students' ideal university instructor personality? An investigation of absolute and relative personality preferences. Personality and Individual Differences. pp. 190-203. ISSN 0191-8869

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.068

Reuse
This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/

Takedown
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

White Rose university consortium
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield & York

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

What is Students' Ideal University Instructor Personality? An Investigation of Absolute and Relative Personality Preferences

Lisa E. Kim[a, b], Carolyn MacCann[b]

[a] Department of Education, University of York, UK

[b] School of Psychology, The University of Sydney, Australia

Corresponding author: Correspondence concerning this article should be directed to Lisa Kim, Department of Education, University of York, UK.

E-mail: lisa.kim@york.ac.uk. Phone: +44 1904 322605

Abstract

Despite intuitions that the ideal teacher has a particular set of non-cognitive characteristics, there is little research investigating such issues. The current two studies investigate students' descriptions of "ideal" instructor personality using the Five-Factor Model of personality. Both absolute personality preferences (certain traits are universally desired) and relative personality preferences (certain traits are desired relative to students' own level of the trait) are examined among 137 first year mathematics students (Study 1) and 378 first year psychology students (Study 2). Students provided Big Five personality ratings for themselves, their actual instructor, and their ideal instructor. Supporting the absolute preference hypothesis, students rated their ideal instructor as having significantly higher levels than both themselves and the general population on all five personality domains (except for openness in Study 1), with particularly large effect sizes for emotional stability and conscientiousness. Supporting the relative preference hypothesis, students also rated their ideal instructor as having a similar Big Five profile to themselves. Moreover, if their actual instructor's personality was similar to their ideal instructor's personality, students showed greater educational satisfaction (but not higher performance self-efficacy nor academic achievement). The extent to which institutions should consider student preferences is discussed.

Keywords: instructor personality; teacher personality; ideal personality; student evaluations of teaching; Big Five.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge funding from the Australian Postgraduate Award and The University of Sydney's Postgraduate Research Support and Early Career Support Scheme.

What is Students' Ideal University Instructor Personality? An Investigation of Absolute and Relative Personality Preferences

1 1 Introduction

Although instructors impact student educational outcomes both immediately and in the long-term (Aaronson, Barrow, & Sander, 2007; Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger, 2008; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Rockoff, 2004), students' preferences for instructors and the basis of these preferences are not entirely clear. Moreover, the instrumental value of satisfying such preferences on student educational outcomes is not clear. The current two studies examine university students' descriptions of an ideal instructor personality in terms of the Five-Factor Model of personality. Specifically, we examine whether students describe their ideal as having: (a) high levels of particular domains, and/or (b) a similar personality profile to themselves. Furthermore, we examine whether students have more positive evaluations, greater performance self-efficacy, and greater achievement if an instructor who resembles their ideal teaches them. We examine these questions in two university subject areas (mathematics and psychology) to test whether findings generalize across different subject areas.

1.1 Instructor Preferences Based on Personality

The methodology used to study person-preferences based on personality (personality preferences), is a common one in the romantic relationships field (Figueredo, Sefcek, & Jones, 2006). We propose that such methods may also be applied in an educational setting. That is, we examine both *absolute preferences* (certain traits are universally desired) and *relative preferences* (certain traits are desired depending on one's own level of that trait). There are two possibilities for relative preferences: (a) preferring individuals who are similar to oneself (similarity hypothesis), and (b) preferring individuals who are dissimilar to oneself (complementarity hypothesis). Absolute and relative preferences are not mutually exclusive.

In the romantic couple literature, absolute preferences are operationalized as mean differences between the participants' self-ratings and their ratings of the ideal. In contrast, relative preferences are operationalized in two ways: (a) as the correlation between participants' self-ratings and their ratings of the ideal on each trait (e.g., Figueredo et al., 2006); and (b) as the within-subject correlation across the profile of all traits, which tests whether the personality profiles are similar (e.g., two people would be similar if they were both more agreeable than conscientiousness, even if one was high on both, and the other low on both; Fletcher, Simpson, & Thomas, 2000; Klohnen & Luo, 2003; Klohnen & Mendelsohn, 1998). We consider the second method for evaluating relative preferences.

1.1.1 Absolute Preferences for Instructor Personality

Absolute preferences of certain characteristics may be present if there are social advantages associated with these. For example, workers with high levels of conscientiousness tend to perform better in their jobs (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge, Rodell, Klinger, Simon, & Crawford, 2013; Salgado, 1997). Additionally, workers with low levels of emotional stability tend to experience job burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001) and are less satisfied with their job (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002).Thus, descriptions of an ideal worker should involve high levels of conscientiousness and low levels of emotional stability as these are socially advantageous traits.

One of the earliest investigations on ideal instructor personality was a qualitative one, which examined the characteristics of teachers that students believed were the most helpful (Witty, 1947). The analysis of 12,000 letters from students in grades 2–12 found 12 categories of helpful qualities. Many of these showed some conceptual similarity to the Big Five domains or their facets, such as having a wide interest (openness), flexible (conscientiousness), having a sense of humor (extraversion), cooperative (agreeableness), and displaying consistent behavior (emotional stability). A more recent qualitative investigation

using interviews with Israeli student teachers and beginning teachers described two major categories of the ideal teacher: personal qualities and professional knowledge (Arnon & Reichel, 2007). Their five core categories within personal qualities are again conceptually similar to the Big Five, which included being knowledgeable in a variety of areas (openness); self-disciplined (conscientiousness); humorous (extraversion); caring and empathetic (agreeableness); and calm and serious (emotional stability). The prominence of the personality factors mentioned by the students, student teachers, and practicing teachers highlight that personality is fundamental to people's image of an ideal instructor.

Quantitative studies have also attempted to describe the personality traits of an ideal instructor. However, some used non-systematic selection of trait descriptions in their frequency analysis of ideal instructor descriptions (e.g., Coward, Davis, & Wichern, 1978; Das, El-Sabban, & Bener, 1996; Rusu, Şoitu, & Panaite, 2012; Yourglich, 1955) or created factor scores from these descriptions (e.g., Pozo-Muñoz, Rebolloso-Pacheco, & Fernández-Ramírez, 2000). To our knowledge, only one study of absolute preferences used a Big Five taxonomy, finding that students preferred lecturers with high levels of conscientiousness and emotional stability (Chamorro-Premuzic, Furnham, Christopher, Garwood, & Neil Martin, 2008). However, this conclusion was based on comparing average item-ratings across the five domains—the fact that conscientiousness and emotional stability had the highest ratings is not surprising, as raw scores are often higher for these two domains given the social desirability of these traits (Ones, Viswesvaran, & Reiss, 1996). We argue that the characterization of "high" conscientiousness or emotional stability should be made with respect to comparison group norms rather than other personality domains.

Addressing these limitations of previous studies, we first consider students' absolute preferences for instructor personality traits by computing absolute difference scores for each of the Big Five between: (a) students' descriptions of their ideal instructor and their own

personality, and (b) students' descriptions of their ideal instructor and population norms taken from the personality literature. Absolute mean difference scores between personality domains from two sets of ratings are useful when studying absolute preferences as it can provide more concrete points of references in understanding one's preferences (Fletcher et al., 2000).

In line with the prior research, we expect that students will prefer instructors with high levels of openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability. That is, we expect students to picture an ideal instructor as one with high levels of socially desirable traits. Note that meta-analyses suggest that high levels of all five traits are viewed as socially desirable, with the strongest effects for conscientiousness and emotional stability (Birkeland, Manson, Kisamore, Brannick, & Smith, 2006; Viswesvaran & Ones, 1999). We also base our expectations on the type of traits that are desirable in the workplace (given that teaching, after all, is a job). The most desirable trait in the workplace is clearly conscientiousness, which is consistently the strongest predictor of job performance (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge et al., 2013; Salgado, 1997). High levels of emotional stability are also implicated in some meta-analyses (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997), although not the most recent contribution (Judge et al., 2013). Based on these findings on social desirability and job performance prediction, we expect the strongest preferences to be for high levels of conscientiousness and emotional stability.

1.1.2 Relative Preferences for Instructor Personality

While having absolute preferences for particular personality traits, one may simultaneously prefer individuals relative to their own characteristics. According to the information processing perspective (e.g., Ajzen, 1974), individuals use their own attributes as an anchor to evaluate another person's attributes. The more similar that others are to the individual, the more the individual perceives the other as likable and positively evaluate the other. Similarly, the reinforcement model (e.g., Byrne, 1971) proposes that individuals who

are similar to each other are more likely to obtain consensual validation for one's own characteristics. In effect, the individual experiences their interaction as more rewarding and so he or she comes to like the other and positively evaluate them. Thus, the similarity hypothesis seems like a likely one.

To authors' knowledge, there are two studies, which examined relative preferences for instructor personality. In these studies, university students' ratings of their Big Five were correlated with their ratings of their preferred lecturer's Big Five. While some researchers found that the correlations were significant for the respective ratings of openness and agreeableness (Furnham & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2005), others found significant correlations for all respective ratings of the Big Five except for emotional stability (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2008). However, the *profile* similarity between student personality and their ideal instructor personality is unknown.

Accordingly, we consider whether students' descriptions of their ideal instructor personality profile may depend on their own personality profile, in line with the similarity hypothesis. Relative preferences can be examined using within-subject correlations of an individual's own scores on the five domains with their instructor's scores on the five domains. This in effect assesses the shape similarity of the student and instructor personality profiles, which is independent of absolute preferences assessing dissimilarity at the domain level. Romantic relationships researchers often use within-subject correlations to study characteristic similarity. For example, Fletcher, Simpson, and Thomas (2000) examined the profile similarity between individuals' ratings of their ideal and actual partner qualities. Using the same technique, Klohnen and colleagues (Klohnen & Luo, 2003; Klohnen & Mendelsohn, 1998) examined the profile similarity between individuals' self-descriptions and their descriptions of their partners.

Generally, people tend to prefer others who are like them over those who are not like them (Brewer, 1999). Furthermore, teacher–student relationships are known to be important for student engagement and achievement (Roorda, Koomen, Spilt, & Oort, 2011). As such, students may value personality similarity between themselves and their instructors, preferring their instructors to be similar to themselves across the five domains, which would support the relative preference hypothesis.

1.2 The Instrumental Value of Instructor Personality Preferences

While students may prefer instructors with a particular constellation of personality traits and profiles, this does not necessarily mean that they will be more academically successful, have higher levels of self-efficacy, or more satisfied with the course if their instructors actually have these traits. After all, students may prefer instructors who assign less challenging material, less homework, fewer readings, and engage in grade inflation. But these tendencies are unlikely to enhance student learning. For this reason, we consider not only which personality traits and profiles students view as ideal in their instructors, but also *what happens when they have what they idealized*.

To the authors' knowledge, only one study has examined the impact of students being taught by an instructor similar to their ideal. This was a qualitative study that examined the effects of such similarity on student evaluations of the instructor's classroom behavior. Costin and Grush (1973) examined the qualities that university students preferred in an instructor and the qualities that they perceived their current instructor had. Four personality traits were examined—cautiousness, original thinking, personal relations, and vigor—and these were correlated with two dimensions of student evaluations of instructors' classroom behavior—teacher skill and negative affect. The discrepancy between students' preferred traits and their instructor's actual traits for all four qualities, except for cautiousness, was negatively associated with teacher skill and positively associated with negative affect. That is,

the greater the difference between students' preferences and their perception of their instructors' level of original thinking, personal relations, and vigor, the lower their evaluation of the instructor's teaching skills and the greater negative affect they perceived in the classroom.

The influence of actual–ideal discrepancies may extend beyond Costin and Grush's (1973) two dimensions to classroom aspects. Multiple other aspects, such as the level of rapport established with the student, the organization of the class, and the enthusiasm of the instructor must be examined to investigate which aspects are affected and which are not. As such, we consider three important educational measures to assess the impact of having instructors who are similar to their ideal instructor personality: student evaluations of teaching, performance self-efficacy, and academic achievement.

Student evaluations are a common measure used in university settings, measuring student satisfaction with the course and the instructor (Marsh & Roche, 1997). The student evaluation assessment used in the current studies examines multiple aspects of the teacher and the class, such as the organization of the classroom material and the enthusiasm of the instructor. Performance self-efficacy (PSE) measures how well students believe they will perform in the subject area (mathematics or psychology), and we use students' expectation of their overall semester grade in the subject area as our index of PSE. Academic achievement is a frequently assessed measure of student academic success, and we use overall semester grade in the subject area as our index of academic achievement.

Based on Costin and Grush's (1973) findings, we expect that personality congruence between one's ideal instructor and actual instructor will be associated with greater student satisfaction. Moreover, we consider whether such congruence is also associated with greater PSE and academic achievement. Given that student gender, cognitive ability, and student personality (Poropat, 2009), and possibly instructor gender (Sabbe & Aelterman, 2007), are

associated with academic achievement; we control for these when predicting our educational outcome measures.

1.3 Australian Tutorial Class System

We examine Australian university students and their perceptions of their classroom tutors. Tutors teach students weekly in a class of approximately 20-25 students. The aims of the tutorial classes are to review the lecture material, to answer any questions that students may have from the lectures, and to explore difficult questions associated with the lecture content. While lecturers generally change throughout the semester depending on their area of expertise (a lecture series in a course are commonly co-taught by up to six different academics in a semester), tutors remain the same throughout the semester. Tutors, therefore, serve as a more consistent instructor for the students. For simplicity, we will refer to the tutors in our studies as instructors.

1.4 Hypotheses

Given the limited amount of previous research in the study of ideal instructor personality, we conducted two separate studies to test whether results are replicable. We hypothesize that the following would hold for both mathematics (Study 1) and psychology (Study 2) students (as there are no strong grounds for supposing that effects are specific to different subject areas).

H1: Students will show absolute personality preferences for their instructors. Specifically, students will describe an ideal instructor as one having high levels of openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability. We operationalize high levels of the traits in two ways: (a) higher than population averages reported in the personality literature; and (b) higher than the students themselves. We further expect these effects to be the largest for conscientiousness and emotional stability.

H2: Students will show relative personality preferences for their instructors. That is, students will describe an ideal instructor as someone with a similar Big Five profile to themselves (i.e., there will be a significant positive correlation between student personality and ideal instructor personality across the Big Five).

H3: Educational outcome measures will be higher for students who are taught by an instructor with similar personality traits to their ideal. Specifically: (a) smaller absolute differences between actual and ideal instructor personality will be associated better outcomes (student evaluations of teaching, PSE, and academic achievement); and (b) greater profile-similarity between actual and ideal instructor personality will also be associated with better outcomes. Both of these effects are expected to hold over-and-above the effects of students' own personality and cognitive ability as well as student and instructor gender.

2 Study 1

Study 1 investigates students' descriptions of ideal instructor personality among first-year university mathematics students. We consider both: (a) absolute preferences (whether students' ideal level for instructor personality traits is significantly higher than personality levels of the current sample of students and the levels reported in recent papers), and (b) relative preferences (whether students ideal profile for instructor personality traits is similar to their own Big Five personality profile). In addition, we assess whether having an instructor who is similar to their ideal is associated with positive educational experiences and outcomes. We assess these using three broad measures: (1) student evaluations of teaching, (2) PSE, and (3) mathematics mark received at the end of the semester (course mark).

3 Method

3.1 Participants

The study consisted of 137 first year mathematics students with ages ranging from 17 to 55 years (M = 19.85, SD = 4.27; 58.39% female) enrolled in 8 first year mathematics

courses at the last author's institution in Australia. Parts of this data have been submitted for publication elsewhere (Kim & MacCann, 2016).

3.2 Test Battery

3.2.1 Analogies Test

The 15-item analogical reasoning test from MacCann, Joseph, Newman, and Roberts (2014) assesses cognitive ability. Students selected one of five word-pairs, which represented the same relationship as a shown word-pair (e.g., "SEDATIVE : DROWSINESS" with options: "(a) epidemic : contagiousness; (b) vaccine : virus; (c) laxative : drug; (d) anesthetic : numbness; (e) therapy : psychosis").

3.2.2 Personality

Saucier's (1994) 40-item mini-marker inventory assesses personality, with eight adjectives for each of openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability (e.g., "Practical"). Students rated each item on a 9-point scale, from Extremely Accurate to Extremely Inaccurate. Students completed this assessment three times on different targets: themselves, their ideal mathematics instructor, and their actual mathematics instructor. The questionnaires were counter-balanced to control for order effects. A manipulation check question on the next page of each questionnaire asked students to recall the target of the questionnaire.

The instructions were adapted depending on the target. For example, the instruction for rating the actual mathematics instructor was: "Think of your CURRENT FIRST YEAR MATHEMATICS TUTOR. Use this list of common human traits to describe your CURRENT FIRST YEAR MATHEMATICS TUTOR as accurately as possible. Describe them as you see them, not as you wish them to be in the future. Describe them as they are generally or typically, as compared with other persons you know of the same gender and of roughly their same age."

3.2.3 Student Evaluations Of Educational Quality (SEEQ)

Marsh's (1982) 31-item instrument assesses student evaluations of teaching. We assessed seven subscales: learning focus (4-items), enthusiasm (4-items), organization (2-items), group interaction (4-items), individual rapport (4-items), overall evaluation of the course (1-item), and overall evaluation of the tutor (1-item). An example of an item for organization is "The tutor's explanations were clear." Students rated each item on a 5-point scale, from Very Poor to Very Good.

3.2.4 Performance Self-Efficacy (PSE)

Participants reported the mark out of 100 that they expected to receive as their mathematics course mark.

3.3 Procedure

All 2768 first year mathematics students at the last author's institution were emailed an invitation to participate in the survey, which was available for nine weeks beginning the fourth week of semester. Participating students were entered into a draw to win one of ten movie tickets. After excluding 17 students who did not seriously attempt the survey (that is, had non-variant responding pattern, took less than half the designated time, scored less than a third on the analogies test, and/or failed the manipulation check questions), data were available for 137 students. Participating students consented for their end of semester course marks to be collected from the School of Mathematics, which were collected after the completion of the course. The Human Research Ethics Committee at the last author's institution approved all protocol.

3.4 Analysis

We examined H1a by calculating the absolute difference scores for each of the Big Five between ideal instructor personality and population averages. Population averages of the Big Five were calculated from the descriptive statistics published in three previous studies

with similar participants as the current study, averaged by the sample size of each study (Austin, Saklofske, & Mastoras, 2010; Oreg, 2003; Wilt, Schalet, & Emily Durbin, 2010). We used one-sample *t*-tests to assess whether the ideal instructor personality was significantly different from the population averages. We examined H1b by calculating the absolute difference scores for each of the Big Five between ideal instructor personality and student personality. We used paired-samples *t*-tests to assess whether ideal instructor personality was significantly different from student personality.

We examined H2 by calculating a similarity index for each case—Fisher's *z* transformations of the Pearson correlations across the Big Five for student and ideal instructor personality. That is, for each case in the data file, we calculated the Pearson correlation of the five student personality scores with the five ideal instructor personality scores. These Pearson correlation indices were then transformed into Fisher's *z* to produce more normal distributions, such that Fisher's *z* score would be the index of profile-similarity for each student. We used a one-sample *t*-test against a value of zero to test whether student and ideal instructor profiles were significantly similar.

To examine H3, we calculated similarity indices for the actual instructor and ideal instructor personality as: (a) absolute difference scores on each Big Five domains as an index of elevation-similarity (positions of the scores are similar); and (b) Fisher's *z* transformations of the Pearson correlations as the index of profile-similarity across the five domains (shape of the scores are similar). These two similarity indices were partially correlated with the SEEQ subscales, PSE, and course mark, controlling for student and instructor gender, student cognitive ability, and student personality. This was to examine the relationships between the similarity indices and the outcomes that are not confounded by the covariates.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Reliability

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics and reliability for the personality domains of the students, their ideal instructor, and their actual instructor. It also includes the descriptive statistics for the following absolute difference scores: population–ideal instructor difference, student–ideal instructor difference, and actual–ideal instructor difference. The reliability estimates for the actual–ideal instructor difference scores are also provided, as this parameter is used in further analysis to test H3. Table 2 contains the descriptive statistics and reliability for all outcome variables. The reliability of the personality ratings and the outcome variables were all acceptable, although the reliability for ideal instructor openness and emotional stability were quite low (.69). The low reliability of these two personality domains together with the high correlations between actual and ideal instructor openness (.46) and actual and ideal instructor emotional stability (.47) explain the low reliability estimates for actual–ideal instructor differences for those two personality domains (.52, .52).

4.2 Personality Similarity

In partial support of H1a, students rated their ideal instructors as significantly higher than the population averages in all domains of personality except for openness (see Table 1). The strongest effects were for emotional stability, with an extremely large effect size (d = 4.59), and conscientiousness (d = 1.30). In support of H1b, students rated their ideal instructor as someone significantly higher on all five domains of personality than themselves (see Table 1). Again, the effects were the largest for emotional stability (d = 1.89) and conscientiousness (d = 2.09). These results support the absolute preference hypothesis—students described the ideal instructor as someone with high levels on all five domains, particularly emotional stability and conscientiousness.

In support of H2, students described an ideal instructor as having a similar personality profile to themselves. The mean Fisher's *z* index of profile similarity between students and ideal instructors was .52 (*SD* = .62). When transformed back into a Pearson correlation coefficient, this equates to a value of .48 (*SD* = .55), indicating a moderate effect size. This effect was significantly different from zero ($t = 9.84$, $df = 136$, $p < .001$) as calculated using the Fisher *z* values. This result supports the relative preference hypothesis—students described the ideal instructor as someone with a similar personality profile to themselves.

Together, the three results indicate that students' ideal instructor is one with higher levels of the Big Five domains than the average person and themselves (with the strongest effects for emotional stability and conscientiousness) but also with a similar personality profile to themselves.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Reliability for Mathematics Students' Own Personality, Ideal Instructor Personality, and Actual Instructor Personality (N = 137)

	Student			Ideal Instructor			Actual Instructor			Absolute Difference Score								
										Population Averages vs. Ideal Instructor			Student vs. Ideal Instructor			Actual vs. Ideal Instructor		
	M	*SD*	α	*M*	*SD*	α	*M*	*SD*	α	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*M*	*SD*	α
Openness	50.41	8.56	.79	55.70	6.80	.69	46.42	8.00	.79	1.11	6.80	0.15	7.54	6.47	0.68**	9.94	6.88	.52
Conscientiousness	44.45	10.14	.81	61.93	6.10	.79	52.23	9.40	.88	11.05	6.10	1.30**	17.71	10.71	2.09**	10.37	8.34	.73
Extraversion	38.06	11.02	.83	52.82	7.13	.69	40.39	11.34	.86	8.10	7.13	0.83**	15.34	10.48	1.59**	13.23	10.64	.68
Agreeableness	50.58	9.02	.81	59.66	7.26	.81	50.93	10.07	.89	3.06	7.26	0.38**	9.99	7.78	1.11**	9.58	8.73	.74
Emotional Stability	35.65	10.30	.79	53.08	7.97	.69	44.74	9.23	.80	18.23	7.97	4.59**	17.80	10.69	1.89**	9.74	7.34	.52

Note. d = Cohen's d. ** $p < .01$.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Educational Experiences and Outcomes, their Zero-Order Correlations and their Partial Correlations with the Actual–Ideal Instructor Discrepancy Indices (N = 137)

				Zero-Order Correlations						Partial Correlations					
				Ideal Instructor vs. Actual Instructor Personality											
				Absolute Difference Score					Fisher's *z* Similarity Index	Absolute Difference Score					Fisher's *z* Similarity Index
	M	*SD*	α	O	C	E	A	ES		O	C	E	A	ES	
SEEQ															
Learning Focus	14.18	3.59	.80	-.12	-.14	-.12	-.22**	-.14	.04	-.13	-.11	-.16	-.20*	-.14	.03
Enthusiasm	13.69	4.18	.91	-.27**	-.49**	-.49**	-.54**	-.32**	.34**	-.27**	-.48**	-.58**	-.55**	-.32**	.37**
Organization	8.10	1.71	.74	-.28**	-.43**	-.40**	-.40**	-.22**	.39**	-.33**	-.43**	-.44**	-.44**	-.24**	.41**
Group Interaction	13.47	4.10	.89	-.29**	-.34**	-.35**	-.38**	-.18*	.29**	-.26**	-.35**	-.47**	-.36**	-.15	.35**
Individual Rapport	15.54	3.22	.86	-.28**	-.36**	-.40**	-.45**	-.23**	.33**	-.29**	-.34**	-.43**	-.44**	-.22*	.36**
Overall Course Rating	3.34	1.05	-	-.14	-.17*	-.28**	-.24**	-.19*	.11	-.14	-.15	-.30**	-.22*	-.18*	.12
Overall Instructor Rating	3.72	1.06	-	-.15	-.47**	-.46**	-.54**	-.32**	.45**	-.14	-.48**	-.51**	-.54**	-.31**	.51**
PSE	70.41	10.98	-	-.01	-.07	-.15	-.10	-.11	.05	-.05	-.04	-.18*	-.07	-.14	.02
Course Mark[a]	62.54	16.22	-	-.03	-.01	-.16	-.01	-.09	-.02	-.07	-.03	-.17	-.02	-.13	.05

Note. The partial correlations are controlling for student and instructor gender, student cognitive ability, and student personality.
SEEQ = Student Evaluations of Educational Quality, PSE = Performance self-efficacy, O = Openness, C = Conscientiousness, E = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, ES = Emotional Stability.
[a] n = 134, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

4.3 Zero-Order Correlations and Partial Correlations of Personality with Educational Experiences and Outcomes

To assess whether it is beneficial for students to be taught by an instructor approximating their ideal instructor, we calculated two indices of similarity between actual and ideal instructor: (a) absolute differences between actual and ideal instructor on each Big Five domain; and (b) a Fisher's *z* transformations of the Pearson correlations between actual and ideal instructor personality profile. We calculated zero-order correlations to examine whether both similarity indices were significantly associated with the outcome variables (see Table 2; zero-order correlations among all variables are shown in Appendix A). A greater distance between actual and ideal instructor personality (as measured by absolute difference scores) was significantly associated with lower educational satisfaction but not PSE and course mark. A profile-similarity between the two personality ratings was significantly and moderately associated with lower educational satisfaction but again not with PSE and course mark.

Partial correlations were conducted to examine the effect of actual–ideal instructor similarity on the outcomes after controlling for the covariates (student and instructor gender, student cognitive ability, and student personality). As expected (H3a), a greater distance between actual and ideal instructor personality (as measured by absolute difference scores) was associated with lower educational satisfaction and PSE but not course mark. Here, all SEEQ subscales and PSE correlated negatively with actual–ideal instructor personality difference with small to moderate effect sizes. The strongest correlations for each SEEQ subscale were: learning focus with agreeableness; enthusiasm with extraversion; organization with extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness; group interaction with extraversion; individual rapport with agreeableness and extraversion; overall course rating with extraversion; and overall instructor rating with agreeableness. The personality domain most

relevant to the SEEQ subscales generally showed the strongest effects. Also, greater distance in extraversion was negatively correlated with PSE, although the effect size was small. In favor of our hypothesis (H3b), the profile-similarity between the two personality ratings was moderately associated with higher outcomes but for student evaluations only. Specifically, the profile-similarity was relevant to all elements of student evaluations but learning focus and overall course rating, with the strongest effect for overall instructor rating and organization.

Overall, mathematics students have both an absolute and relative instructor personality preference and having an instructor who is similar to their ideal does have instrumental value, in that they enjoy the class more. However, the possibility of a response bias, whereby only a small sub-set of the mathematics students participated in the survey, necessitates an examination of the generalizability of the findings.

5 Study 2

Given the importance of the concept of an ideal instructor personality as found in the mathematics student sample, we tested a different sample of university students to assess the generalizability of the findings. Psychology is one of the most popular university subject areas, which, as a subject area of social sciences, is qualitatively different to a physical sciences subject area. Classroom processes often differ—psychology tutorial classes are most often based on discussions amongst the students and with the instructor, whereas physical sciences tutorial classes are most often based on solving worksheet questions. How psychology students perceive their instructors may also differ, given findings indicating that students rate social sciences and humanities instructors more favorably than mathematics and science instructors (Cashin, 1990) and that certain university instructor qualities (such as pragmatism) is related to student evaluations in natural sciences but not in humanities nor social sciences (Sherman & Blackburn, 1975). Thus, we examine students in a university

psychology course to test whether the results from Study 1 regarding ideal instructor personality generalizes to a social sciences subject area.

6 Method

6.1 Participants

The study consisted of 378 first year psychology students with ages ranging from 17 to 40 years (M = 19.11, SD = 2.67; 73.8% female). Parts of this data have been submitted for publication elsewhere (Kim & MacCann, 2016).

6.2 Test Battery, Procedure, and Analysis

The test battery was the same as that used in Study 1. The difference was that in the personality assessments, students were asked to give a rating of their personality, their ideal *psychology* instructor personality, and their actual *psychology* instructor personality.

All first year psychology students must choose and participate in five hours of research from a registered database of multiple studies for course credit. The current online study was available for nine weeks beginning the fourth week of semester. Data from 378 students were retained after exclusion and an end of semester mark was collected from 322 students. The Human Research Ethics Committee at the last author's institution approved all protocol.

We conducted the same analyses as used in Study 1, examining the similarity between student and ideal psychology instructor personality and the similarity between actual psychology instructor and ideal psychology instructor personality. The latter similarity indices were then partially correlated with the SEEQ subscales, PSE, and course mark, controlling for student and instructor gender, student cognitive ability, and student personality.

7 Results and Discussion

7.1 Descriptive Statistics and Reliability

Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics and reliability for the personality domains of the students, their ideal instructor, and their actual instructor. The table also contains the reliability estimates for the actual–ideal instructor difference scores that are included in further analyses. Table 4 contains the descriptive statistics and reliability for the outcome variables. The reliability of the personality ratings and the outcome variables were acceptable, although the reliability for ideal instructor extraversion, openness, and emotional stability were quite low (.61 to .66). The low reliability of these three personality domains together with the high correlations between actual and ideal instructor extraversion (.28), openness (.38), and emotional stability (.53) can explain the low reliability estimates for actual–ideal instructor differences for those three personality domains (.39 to .57).

7.2 Personality Similarity

As was found in Study 1, students' ideal instructor was one with significantly higher levels on all five domains of personality than the population averages (see Table 3), in support of H1a. The strongest effects were again for emotional stability, with an extremely large effect size (d = 4.69), and conscientiousness (d = 3.50). As was also found in Study 1, students' ideal instructor had higher levels on all five domains of personality than themselves (see Table 3), in support of H1b. Again, the effects were the largest for emotional stability (d = 1.67) and conscientiousness (d = 2.09), but extraversion also had a large effect size (d = 1.66). Together, these results again support the absolute preference hypothesis.

The mean Fisher's z index of profile similarity between students and ideal instructors was .65 (SD = .68). When transformed back into a Pearson correlation coefficient, this equates to a value of .57 (SD = .59), indicating a moderate effect size. This appears slightly stronger than in Study 1. Again supporting the relative preference hypothesis (H2), this was

significantly different from zero ($t = 18.77$, $df = 377$, $p < .001$) as calculated using the Fisher z values.

Consistent with Study 1 findings, students rated an ideal instructor as having: (a) higher levels on all of the Big Five personality domains than the average person and also higher than themselves (with the largest effects for emotional stability, conscientiousness, and extraversion), and (b) a similar personality profile to themselves.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics and Reliability for Psychology Students' Own Personality, Ideal Instructor Personality, and Actual Instructor Personality (N = 378)

	Student			Ideal Instructor			Actual Instructor			Absolute Difference Score								
										Population Averages vs. Ideal Instructor			Student vs. Ideal Instructor			Actual vs. Ideal Instructor		
	M	*SD*	α	*M*	*SD*	α	*M*	*SD*	α	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*M*	*SD*	α
Openness	47.80	8.58	.78	56.55	6.62	.64	48.15	6.98	.70	1.96	6.62	0.59**	9.69	7.67	1.14**	9.14	6.68	.46
Conscientiousness	43.21	10.67	.86	61.20	5.91	.77	53.38	7.86	.85	10.33	5.91	3.50**	18.12	10.62	2.09**	8.49	7.01	.69
Extraversion	38.84	10.61	.83	53.52	6.64	.61	44.86	8.95	.78	8.80	6.64	2.65**	15.13	9.95	1.66**	10.15	7.89	.57
Agreeableness	51.91	8.59	.85	60.78	6.24	.79	52.89	8.85	.86	4.18	6.24	1.34**	9.61	7.26	1.18**	8.70	7.68	.70
Emotional Stability	37.28	10.67	.83	52.80	7.67	.66	47.64	8.56	.78	17.95	7.67	4.69**	15.94	10.44	1.67**	7.37	5.88	.39

Note. d = Cohen's d. ** $p < .01$.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Educational Experiences and Outcomes, their Zero-Order Correlations and their Partial Correlations with the Actual–Ideal Instructor Discrepancy Indices (N = 378)

				Zero-Order Correlations						Partial Correlations					
				Ideal Instructor vs. Actual Instructor Personality											
				Absolute Difference Score					Fisher's *z* Similarity Index	Absolute Difference Score					Fisher's z Similarity Index
	M	*SD*	α	O	C	E	A	ES		O	C	E	A	ES	
SEEQ															
Learning Focus	15.86	3.59	.80	-.07	-.20**	-.11*	-.14**	-.04	.15**	-.07	-.18**	-.14*	-.13*	-.06	.14**
Enthusiasm	14.47	3.42	.91	-.27**	-.28**	-.40**	-.36**	-.13*	.19**	-.29**	-.27**	-.43**	-.36**	-.13*	.20**
Organization	8.16	1.55	.74	-.24**	-.37**	-.22**	-.24**	-.14**	.24**	-.25**	-.35**	-.26**	-.25**	-.15**	.24**
Group Interaction	16.25	3.01	.89	-.19**	-.31**	-.16**	-.27**	-.13*	.20**	-.17**	-.30**	-.17**	-.27**	-.12*	.19**
Individual Rapport	16.06	2.95	.86	-.12*	-.19**	-.10*	-.47**	-.18**	.23**	-.11*	-.18**	-.13*	-.44**	-.18**	.21**
Overall Course Rating	3.88	0.87	-	-.07	-.22**	-.16**	-.14**	-.04	.17**	-.08	-.19**	-.19**	-.14**	-.05	.15**
Overall Instructor Rating	4.02	0.87	-	-.23**	-.30**	-.33**	-.43**	-.18**	.25**	-.23**	-.29**	-.36**	-.42**	-.19**	.24**
PSE	69.63	8.89	-	.01	-.04	.01	-.05	.04	-.05	-.01	-.02	-.01	-.01	.02	-.08
Course Mark[a]	64.46	15.00	-	-.03	.03	.08	.02	.06	.02	-.02	.05	.08	.06	.03	.03

Note. The partial correlations are controlling for student and instructor gender, student cognitive ability, and student personality.
SEEQ = Student Evaluations of Educational Quality, PSE = Performance self-efficacy, O = Openness, C = Conscientiousness, E = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, ES = Emotional Stability.
[a] $n = 322$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

7.3 Zero-Order Correlations and Partial Correlations of Personality with Educational Experiences and Outcomes

The zero-order correlations indicated that the two actual–ideal instructor personality similarity indices were significantly associated with only student evaluations (see Table 4; zero-order correlations among all variables are shown in Appendix B). A greater distance between actual and ideal instructor personality was significantly associated with lower educational satisfaction. A profile-similarity between the two personality ratings was significantly and moderately associated with lower educational satisfaction.

Partial correlations between the similarity indices and the outcomes were conducted, controlling for student and instructor gender, student cognitive ability, and student personality. Like Study 1 findings and also in support of H3, a greater distance between actual instructor personality and ideal instructor personality was significantly associated with lower educational satisfaction. It was not significantly associated with PSE or academic achievement. All SEEQ subscales correlated significantly and negatively with actual–ideal instructor personality differences. The strongest correlations for each SEEQ subscale were: learning focus with conscientiousness, enthusiasm with extraversion, organization with conscientiousness, group interaction with conscientiousness and agreeableness, individual rapport with agreeableness, overall course rating with conscientiousness and extraversion, and overall instructor rating with agreeableness. The personality domain most relevant to the SEEQ subscales generally showed the strongest effects. Moreover, the profile-similarity between the two personality ratings was significantly associated with all SEEQ subscales, especially overall instructor rating, individual rapport, and enthusiasm. The magnitudes of the correlations in Study 2 seem to be a little smaller than those found in Study 1. This may indicate the greater benefits in some subject areas over another if students' ideal instructor teaches them.

Overall, psychology students (like mathematic students) have both an absolute and a relative instructor personality preference and having an instructor who is similar to their ideal does have instrumental value, in that they evaluate all aspects of the class more favorably.

8 General Discussion

Our findings are consistent with our expectations that students do have instructor personality preferences, which are consensually agreed upon and are relative to the student's own personality. Specifically, an ideal instructor is one who has high levels of the socially desirable personality traits (with the strongest effects for emotional stability and conscientiousness, followed by extraversion) and has a similar Big Five personality profile to their students. Furthermore, if students do have an instructor who is similar to their ideal instructor, there are positive effects on student evaluations but not on PSE or academic achievement.

8.1 Personality Preferences for University Instructors

Looking at the absolute preferences, students' ideal instructor was highly conscientious, emotionally stable, extraverted, and agreeable, with mixed evidence for openness. The effects for conscientiousness and emotional stability were enormous—the ideal instructor's level of conscientiousness and emotional stability would place them higher than 90% and 99.75% of the population for conscientiousness (for Study 1 and Study 2, respectively) and the top 99.999% for emotional stability (for both studies). That is, students' descriptions of an ideal may be unrealistically high, but are certainly quite unambiguous.

The lexical hypothesis used to formulate the Five-Factor Model of personality postulates that certain traits emerge in the natural language due to their *utility* to the observer (Allport & Odbert, 1936). We believe that students' descriptions of their ideal instructor are based on the utility of the observed traits have for them. The utility of conscientiousness is supported by findings in the workplace, whereby it is the strongest predictor of job

performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge et al., 2013; Salgado, 1997) and in education, whereby it is the strongest predictor of academic performance (Poropat, 2009). Its predictions can partly be attributed to practices associated with conscientiousness that facilitate good performance, such as effective time-management (MacCann, Fogarty, & Roberts, 2012). An instructor with high levels of time-management skills means that the instructor returns the students' assessment feedback on time, is punctual to class times and consultation hours, is organized with the classroom material, and ensures all necessary content is covered within the tutorial class while handling other impeding needs outside and inside the classroom. These diligent qualities in an instructor are useful to students and therefore may be the basis for why students seek this quality in their instructors.

Instructor emotional stability is also a trait valued by students. As students are confronted with new forms of learning and classes in their first year of university, additional stress and disruptions are highly undesirable. It is easy to imagine that being in a class with an instructor who is nervous and overly worried about their class and the students would distress them. Furthermore, low levels of emotional stability are associated with communication negativity, whereby the person's words and behaviors are delivered unpleasantly (Caughlin, Huston, & Houts, 2000) and are associated with negative evaluations, such as in romantic relationships (Donnellan, Conger, & Bryant, 2004; Robins, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2000). In these ways, students may prefer instructors who are high in emotional stability so that they will not be distressed and experience negativity in their interactions with the instructor, which could lessen their educational experience.

Extraversion in an instructor is also a personality trait that has great utility to students, though to a lesser extent than the other two traits — the ideal instructor's level of extraversion would place them higher than 79% and 99.65% of the population for extraversion (for Study 1 and Study 2, respectively). Extraversion is considered a pro-social

trait marked by one directing their energy outwards (Fielden, Kim, & MacCann, 2015) and is associated with increased communication, sensitivity, disclosure, and provision of social support (see Wilt & Revelle, 2009). Students' descriptions of the ideal instructor as someone with high levels of extraversion may reflect their desire and value in receiving support from their instructors. Therefore, the energy level and communication of the instructor may be beneficial for students to engage with the instructor in the class.

Examining the relative preferences of students, our two studies' findings support the similarity hypothesis (Byrne, 1971) more than the complementary hypothesis, indicating that students' ideal instructor is someone with a similar profile to themselves. This is in agreement with previous findings, whereby students who were open, extraverted, agreeable, and conscientious preferred university lecturers who were correspondingly open, extraverted, agreeable, and conscientious (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2008; Furnham & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2005). According to the similarity hypothesis, similar people come to like each other as they remember more rewarding interactions with each other (Byrne, 1971). Although such rationale has been used to explain how similar people may be romantically attracted to each other, this can also be applied to life in general where similarity is beneficial in friendships (e.g., Selfhout, Denissen, Branje, & Meeus, 2009), coach-athlete relationships (e.g., Ianiro, Schermuly, & Kauffeld, 2013), and mentor-mentee relationships (e.g., Wanberg, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Marchese, 2006). Similarly, students may also be applying this general principle to their instructors—they remember more rewarding interactions with the instructors who are similar to them and so come to prefer them. Thus, personality, both at the absolute level and at the relative level, is important in understanding university students' conceptualization of an ideal instructor.

8.2 The Instrumental Value of Instructor Personality Preferences

There is indeed instrumental value for students being taught by instructors with certain personality traits, but this is only beneficial for their educational experiences. That is, students who were taught by instructors similar to their ideal instructor reported a more positive experience of the course and the instructor. This is consistent with findings from relationship studies, whereby the similarity between their actual partner and their ideal partner positively predicted better relationship outcomes (Arrindell & Luteijn, 2000; Rammstedt, Spinath, Richter, & Schupp, 2013) and relationship satisfaction (Fletcher et al., 2000; Fletcher, Simpson, Thomas, & Giles, 1999). It is also consistent with Costin and Grush's (1973) findings that greater discrepancies between the personality traits of their ideal and actual university instructor personality traits were associated with lower student evaluations of their instructor's teaching skill and higher evaluations of the instructor's negative affect.

In our study, the profile-similarity across the Big Five between students' actual and ideal instructor personality seemed relevant to the predictions of most student evaluations subscales. More interesting is the absolute difference scores on the personality domains and their relationship with the student evaluations: the personality domains that were most relevant to the student evaluations were dependent on the outcome criteria. Specifically, the greater difference in the agreeableness levels between students' actual instructor and their ideal instructor particularly affected how students evaluated the level of rapport they had with the instructor and their overall instructor rating. Also, the greater difference in extraversion between the students' actual instructor and their ideal instructor particularly affected how students evaluated the enthusiasm of the instructor. These findings were suspected to be associated with the similar language that both the criterion and the relevant personality domain use. However, since there was only one case where the same word between SEEQ

and the personality questionnaire was used, our study indicates the strength of criterion-related personality domains and the utility of being taught by an instructor similar who is similar to one's ideal instructor.

Although conscientiousness and emotional stability were shown to be very important to students' preference for instructor personality, the influence they each had on student evaluations differed. Specifically, the greater difference in conscientiousness levels between students' actual instructor and their ideal particularly affected not only how students evaluated the level of organization of the class but also many other subscales of student evaluations as observed through the moderate effect sizes. On the other hand, the greater difference in emotional stability levels between the two ratings—although associated with many student evaluation subscales—had much lower effect sizes than other personality domains.

Students being taught by an instructor who was similar to their ideal instructor did *not* have an instrumental value on their academic achievement and their PSE. That is, having an instructor with high levels of conscientiousness, emotional stability, and extraversion made the students like them and the course more but not achieve more. Such a result may indicate that instructors have a limited influence on student academic performance given the short period of time that students have with a particular university instructor (Kim & MacCann, 2016). Furthermore, the instructors in the Australian tutorial classes are very restricted in the instructor's individual input into the curriculum, the content, and the marking criteria that has to be taught and used in the class. This is to ensure that all tutorial classes are delivering the same educational content so that course examinations are fair and relevant to all students. Larger differences in the impact of instructor personality may be found in an environment where instructors are the designer of the course and the materials, such as university lecturers and primary school teachers.

8.3 Limitations and Future Directions

The two studies were conducted on first year university students. Students' concept of an ideal instructor can change throughout their educational career: from a traditional authoritative teacher in elementary school to a humane teacher interested in conversing with the students in higher levels of education (Cook-Sather, 2002). Future studies should investigate how students' perceptions of an ideal instructor personality may change with time and its effect on student educational experiences and outcomes.

The reliability of the ideal instructor personality ratings was considerably lower than students' ratings of themselves and the actual instructor. This may indicate that students had difficulty conceptualizing what an ideal instructor would be to them. Future studies should consider alternative ways of assessing this concept. Innovative methods such as anchoring vignettes, forced-choice methodology, and situational judgment tests could be considered to assess both ideal and actual teacher personality.

8.4 Summary

As institutions increase their investments to better the student educational experiences and outcomes, we should seek greater understanding of what student preferences are for different aspects of the educational context, including that for the instructor. The current two studies open up possibilities to engage in discussions of what students consider is "ideal". However, such considerations must simultaneously bear in mind the importance of what students will gain from meeting their preferences.

References

Aaronson, D., Barrow, L., & Sander, W. (2007). Teachers and student achievement in the Chicago public high schools. *Journal of Labor Economics*, *25*, 95–135. http://doi.org/10.1086/508733

Ajzen, I. (1974). Effects of information on interpersonal attraction: Similarity versus affective value. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *29*, 374–380. http://doi.org/10.1037/h0036002

Allport, G. W., & Odbert, H. S. (1936). Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, *47*(1, Whole No. 211).

Arnon, S., & Reichel, N. (2007). Who is the ideal teacher? Am I? Similarity and difference in perception of students of education regarding the qualities of a good teacher and of their own qualities as teachers. *Teachers and Teaching*, *13*, 441–464. http://doi.org/10.1080/13540600701561653

Arrindell, W. A., & Luteijn, F. (2000). Similarity between intimate partners for personality traits as related to individual levels of satisfaction with life. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *28*, 629–637. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00125-7

Austin, E. J., Saklofske, D. H., & Mastoras, S. M. (2010). Emotional intelligence, coping and exam-related stress in Canadian undergraduate students. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *62*(1), 42–50. http://doi.org/10.1080/00049530903312899

Kim, L. E. & MacCann, C. (2016). Teacher personality matters for student evaluations: Evidence from two subject areas at university. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *44*, 1–26. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x

Birkeland, S. A., Manson, T. M., Kisamore, J. L., Brannick, M. T., & Smith, M. A. (2006). A

meta-analytic investigation of job applicant faking on personality measures. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *14*, 317–335. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2006.00354.x

Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 429–444. http://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00126

Byrne, D. E. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Cashin, W. E. (1990). Students do rate different academic fields differently. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *1990*(43), 113–121. http://doi.org/10.1002/tl.37219904310

Caughlin, J. P., Huston, T. L., & Houts, R. M. (2000). How does personality matter in marriage? An examination of trait anxiety, interpersonal negativity, and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*, 326–336. http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.2.326

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Furnham, A., Christopher, A. N., Garwood, J., & Neil Martin, G. (2008). Birds of a feather: Students' preferences for lecturers' personalities as predicted by their own personality and learning approaches. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *44*, 965–976. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2007.10.032

Cook-Sather, A. (2002). Re(in)forming the conversations: Student position, power, and voice in teacher education. *The Radical Teacher*, *64*, 103–125. http://doi.org/10.2307/20710155

Costin, F., & Grush, J. E. (1973). Personality correlates of teacher-student behavior in the college classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *65*, 35–44. http://doi.org/10.1037/h0034814

Coward, R. T., Davis, J. K., & Wichern, R. L. (1978). Cognitive style and perceptions of the ideal teacher. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *3*, 232–238. http://doi.org/10.1016/0361-476X(78)90029-2

Das, M., El-Sabban, F., & Bener, A. (1996). Student and faculty perceptions of the characteristics of an ideal teacher in a classroom setting. *Medical Teacher*, *18*, 141–146. http://doi.org/10.3109/01421599609034149

Donnellan, M. B., Conger, R. D., & Bryant, C. M. (2004). The Big Five and enduring marriages. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *38*, 481–504. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2004.01.001

Fielden, C., Kim, L. E., & MacCann, C. (2015). Extraversion. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (2nd ed., Vol. 8, pp. 623–627). Oxford: Elsevier. http://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.25099-X

Figueredo, A. J., Sefcek, J. A., & Jones, D. N. (2006). The ideal romantic partner personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *41*, 431–441. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.02.004

Fletcher, G. J. O., Simpson, J. A., & Thomas, G. (2000). Ideals, perceptions, and evaluations in early relationship development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 933–940. http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.6.933

Fletcher, G. J. O., Simpson, J. A., Thomas, G., & Giles, L. (1999). Ideals in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*, 72–89. http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.1.72

Furnham, A., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2005). Individual differences in students' preferences for lecturers' personalities. *Journal of Individual Differences*, *26*, 176–184. http://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001.26.4.176

Ianiro, P. M., Schermuly, C. C., & Kauffeld, S. (2013). Why interpersonal dominance and affiliation matter: An interaction analysis of the coach-client relationship. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, *6*, 25–46. http://doi.org/10.1080/17521882.2012.740489

Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 530–541. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.530

Judge, T. A., Rodell, J. B., Klinger, R. L., Simon, L. S., & Crawford, E. R. (2013). Hierarchical representations of the five-factor model of personality in predicting job performance: Integrating three organizing frameworks with two theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*, 875–925. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0033901

Kane, T. J., Rockoff, J. E., & Staiger, D. O. (2008). What does certification tell us about teacher effectiveness? Evidence from New York City. *Economics of Education Review*, *27*, 615–631. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2007.05.005

Klohnen, E. C., & Luo, S. (2003). Interpersonal attraction and personality: what is attractive--self similarity, ideal similarity, complementarity or attachment security? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*, 709–722. http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.4.709

Klohnen, E. C., & Mendelsohn, G. A. (1998). Partner selection for personality characteristics: A couple-centered approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *24*, 268–278. http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167298243004

MacCann, C., Fogarty, G. J., & Roberts, R. D. (2012). Strategies for success in education: Time management is more important for part-time than full-time community college students. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *22*, 618–623. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2011.09.015

MacCann, C., Joseph, D. L., Newman, D. A., & Roberts, R. D. (2014). Emotional intelligence is a second-stratum factor of intelligence: Evidence from hierarchical and bifactor models. *Emotion*, *14*, 358–374. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0034755

Marsh, H. W. (1982). SEEQ: A reliable, valid, and useful instrument for collecting students'

evaluations of university teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *52*, 77–95. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1982.tb02505.x

Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1997). Making students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective: The critical issues of validity, bias, and utility. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 1187–1197. http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.52.11.1187

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*, 397–422. http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397

Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Reiss, A. D. (1996). Role of social desirability in personality testing for personnel selection: The red herring. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. US: American Psychological Association. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.6.660

Oreg, S. (2003). Resistance to change: Developing an individual differences measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 680–693. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.680

Poropat, A. E. (2009). A meta-analysis of the five-factor model of personality and academic performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *135*, 322–338. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0014996

Pozo-Muñoz, C., Rebolloso-Pacheco, E., & Fernández-Ramírez, B. (2000). The "Ideal Teacher". Implications for student evaluation of teacher effectiveness. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *25*, 253–263. http://doi.org/10.1080/02602930050135121

Rammstedt, B., Spinath, F. M., Richter, D., & Schupp, J. (2013). Partnership longevity and personality congruence in couples. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*, 832–835. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.12.007

Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, *73*, 417–458. http://doi.org/10.2307/3598793

Robins, R. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2000). Two personalities, one relationship: Both partners' personality traits shape the quality of their relationship. *Journal of Personality*

and Social Psychology, *79*, 251–259. http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.2.251

Rockoff, J. E. (2004). The impact of individual teachers on student achievement: Evidence from panel data. *The American Economic Review*, *94*, 247–252. http://doi.org/10.2307/3592891

Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher-student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach. *Review of Educational Research*, *81*, 493–529. http://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311421793

Rusu, C., Şoitu, L., & Panaite, O. (2012). The ideal teacher. Theoretical and investigative approach. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *33*(2012), 1017–1021. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.01.276

Sabbe, E., & Aelterman, A. (2007). Gender in teaching: A literature review. *Teachers and Teaching*, *13*, 521–538. http://doi.org/10.1080/13540600701561729

Salgado, J. E. (1997). The Five Factor Model of personality and job performance in the European community, *82*, 30–43. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.1.30

Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-markers: A brief version of Goldberg's unipolar Big-Five markers. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *63*, 506–516. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6303_8

Selfhout, M., Denissen, J., Branje, S., & Meeus, W. (2009). In the eye of the beholder: Perceived, actual, and peer-rated similarity in personality, communication, and friendship intensity during the acquaintanceship process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*, 1152–1165. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0014468

Sherman, B. R., & Blackburn, R. T. (1975). Personal characteristics and teaching effectiveness of college faculty. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *67*, 124–131. http://doi.org/10.1037/h0078680

Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (1999). Meta-analyses of fakability estimates: Implications for personality measurement. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *59*, 197–210. http://doi.org/10.1177/00131649921969802

Wanberg, C. R., Kammeyer-Mueller, J., & Marchese, M. (2006). Mentor and protégé predictors and outcomes of mentoring in a formal mentoring program. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *69*, 410–423. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.05.010

Wilt, J., & Revelle, W. (2009). Extraversion. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 27–45). New York, NY: Guilford.

Wilt, J., Schalet, B., & Emily Durbin, C. (2010). SNAP trait profiles as valid indicators of personality pathology in a non-clinical sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *48*, 742–746. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.01.020

Witty, P. (1947). An analysis of the personality traits of the effective teacher. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *40*, 662–671. http://doi.org/10.2307/27528855

Yourglich, A. (1955). Study on correlations between college teachers' and students' concepts of "ideal-student" and "ideal-teacher." *The Journal of Educational Research*, *49*, 59–64. http://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1955.10882253

Appendix A

Intercorrelations with All Variables for Study 1 (N = 137)

		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
1	Student Gender	.08	.05	-.03	.05	.12	.14	.05	-.17	-.02	-.04	.08	.05	-.22**	.02	.01	-.06	-.14	.03	-.08	-.10	.09	.07	.19*	-.18*	-.09	.02	-.16	-.05	-.15	-.12	-.19*	-.04
2	Cognitive Ability		.01	.14	-.10	-.08	-.19*	.06	-.02	.07	-.12	-.11	.07	.02	.04	-.09	-.05	.00	-.08	.02	.03	-.02	-.02	.10	.09	.10	.22*	.11	.03	.04	.11	.08	.10
3	Instructor Gender			.03	.10	.04	.07	.06	-.10	.10	.10	.11	-.04	-.11	-.01	.08	-.05	-.07	.02	.05	.00	.11	.05	-.01	-.10	-.10	.06	-.11	-.08	-.03	-.17	.00	-.01
4	Student O				.25**	.23**	.18*	.10	.42**	.13	.14	.11	.03	.26**	.25**	.13	.07	.01	.15	-.18*	-.04	.00	.04	.09	.23**	.21*	.24**	.11	.22*	.17*	.16	.23**	-.04
5	Student C					.11	.29**	.35**	.11	.14	.16	.22*	.17*	.15	.19*	.14	.20*	.09	-.02	-.11	-.06	-.08	.06	.19*	.15	.10	-.03	.03	.11	.08	-.02	.28**	.16
6	Student E						.23**	.09	.11	-.01	.29**	.07	.00	.25**	.05	.02	.05	.02	-.14	-.10	.17*	.03	-.04	.04	.11	.20*	.04	.22*	.10	.04	.08	.01	-.10
7	Student A							.36**	.11	.14	.24**	.43**	.19*	.21*	.22*	.21*	.37**	.24**	-.17*	-.10	-.08	-.12	-.10	.01	.03	.10	.06	.09	.22**	.09	.07	-.04	-.23**
8	Student ES								-.06	.14	.17*	.18*	.26**	.04	.08	.06	.24**	.22**	-.04	-.04	.02	-.14	-.06	-.03	.06	.13	.02	.14	.17	.01	.01	.14	-.02
9	Ideal Instructor O									.24**	.35**	.25**	.15	.46**	.32**	.25**	.28**	.19*	.37**	-.16	-.01	-.07	-.02	-.02	.26**	.21*	.19*	.13	.23**	.21*	.25**	.21*	.09
10	Ideal Instructor C										.47**	.53**	.50**	.17*	.37**	.24**	.26**	.24**	.01	.16	.02	.09	.13	.15	.02	.15	.22*	.18*	.26**	.12	.19*	.02	-.08
11	Ideal Instructor E											.45**	.37**	.14	.24**	.28**	.22*	.22*	.17*	-.01	.30**	.15	.06	-.27**	.01	.13	.03	.11	.12	.01	-.03	.00	-.10
12	Ideal Instructor A												.46**	.18*	.25**	.37**	.43**	.21*	-.01	.07	-.10	.21*	.12	.05	.02	.15	.14	.19*	.38**	.16	.07	.08	-.03
13	Ideal Instructor ES													.22**	.26**	.22**	.34**	.47**	-.06	.01	-.01	-.02	.26**	-.02	.06	.16	.13	.22*	.26**	.05	.07	.06	.01
14	Actual Instructor O														.48**	.35**	.49**	.40**	-.58**	-.39**	-.25**	-.37**	-.25**	.20*	.33**	.44**	.38**	.43**	.49**	.30**	.36**	.21*	.11
15	Actual Instructor C															.58**	.55**	.52**	-.19*	-.81**	-.43**	-.43**	-.33**	.43**	.18*	.54**	.55**	.42**	.50**	.24**	.56**	.07	-.03
16	Actual Instructor E																.49**	.40**	-.17*	-.47**	-.80**	-.34**	-.23**	.17*	.15	.58**	.42**	.44**	.48**	.33**	.45**	.19*	.12
17	Actual Instructor A																	.70**	-.24**	-.42**	-.35**	-.74**	-.51**	.23**	.25**	.60**	.43**	.49**	.66**	.35**	.55**	.16	.03
18	Actual Instructor ES																		-.20*	-.41**	-.25**	-.57**	-.62**	.01	.19*	.39**	.30**	.30**	.39**	.23**	.37**	.17	.07
19	ADS O																			.22**	.28**	.33**	.22**	-.24**	-.12	-.27**	-.28**	-.29**	-.28**	-.14	-.15	-.01	-.03
20	ADS C																				.45**	.52**	.45**	-.32**	-.14	-.49**	-.43**	-.34**	-.36**	-.17*	-.47**	-.07	-.01
21	ADS E																					.41**	.25**	-.22**	-.12	-.49**	-.40**	-.35**	-.40**	-.28**	-.46**	-.15	-.16
22	ADS A																						.59**	-.37**	-.22**	-.54**	-.40**	-.38**	-.45**	-.24**	-.54**	-.10	-.01
23	ADS ES																							-.26	-.14	-.32**	-.22**	-.18*	-.23**	-.19*	-.32**	-.11	-.09
24	Fisher's *z*																								.04	.34**	.39**	.29**	.33**	.11	.45**	.05	-.02
SEEQ																																	
25	Learning Focus																									.36**	.38**	.24**	.32**	.75**	.36**	.49**	.32**
26	Enthusiasm																										.67**	.68**	.67**	.45**	.73**	.21*	.15
27	Organization																											.56**	.57**	.45**	.64**	.23**	.12
28	Group Interaction																												.64**	.36**	.64**	.15	.05
29	Individual Rapport																													.40**	.56**	.19*	.06
30	Overall Course Rating																														.50**	.32**	
31	Overall Instructor Rating																															.20*	.10
32	PSE																																.63**
33	Course Mark[a]																																

Note. O = Openness, C = Conscientiousness, E = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, ES = Emotional Stability, ADS = Absolute Difference Score, SEEQ = Student Evaluations of Educational Quality, PSE = Performance Self-Efficacy.

[a] $n = 134$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Appendix B

Intercorrelations with All Variables for Study 2 (N = 378)

		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
1	Student Gender	-.08	-.01	.00	.09	.00	.09	-.17**	-.11*	.06	-.04	.15**	.07	-.02	.10*	-.02	.04	.13*	-.10*	-.09	-.02	.01	-.07	.09	.17**	.02	.01	.04	-.02	.17**	.06	-.04	-.02
2	Cognitive Ability		.00	.14**	-.05	-.04	-.03	-.06	.10*	.09	.11*	.12*	.20**	.02	.09	.01	.03	.05	.06	.00	.08	.05	.12*	-.05	.19**	.01	.14**	.01	.03	.17**	.07	.25**	.41**
3	Instructor Gender			-.02	-.07	-.09	-.09	-.04	-.02	-.02	-.01	-.01	-.02	-.10	-.08	.03	.12*	-.04	.03	.04	-.03	-.13*	-.01	.08	.00	-.02	-.10	-.04	.10	.05	.05	.08	.00
4	Student O				.28**	.18**	.28**	.03	.36**	.10	.12*	.19**	.19**	.25**	.18**	.07	.14**	.09	.07	-.11*	.04	-.05	.06	.04	.19**	.10	.07	-.05	.04	.16**	.07	.28**	.10
5	Student C					.19**	.39**	.28**	.10	.25**	.06	.18**	.10	.21**	.20**	.04	.27**	.18**	-.11*	-.05	-.02	-.17**	-.09	.13*	.13*	.08	.09	.07	.15**	.08	.08	.25**	.22**
6	Student E						.22**	.19**	.09	.07	.31**	.07	.08	.03	-.02	.07	-.02	.01	.07	.08	.14**	.05	.01	-.11*	.06	.09	.00	-.01	.02	-.01	.01	.09	-.02
7	Student A							.44**	.18**	.27**	.26**	.43**	.27**	.20**	.29**	.13*	.33**	.26**	-.03	-.13*	.10*	-.10	-.04	.09	.09	.17**	.22**	.16**	.23**	.12*	.15**	.05	.03
8	Student ES								.13**	.17**	.19**	.19**	.31**	.12*	.14**	.13*	.24**	.25**	.01	-.03	.00	-.13**	-.02	.01	.02	.16**	.09	.11*	.14**	.02	.08	.02	.02
9	Ideal Instructor O									.43**	.39**	.41**	.33**	.38**	.21**	.19**	.24**	.22**	.47**	.12*	.09	.03	.02	-.09	.12*	.17**	.12*	.00	.18**	.10	.12*	.13**	.00
10	Ideal Instructor C										.56**	.62**	.53**	.30**	.39**	.21**	.32**	.37**	.09	.26**	.17**	.07	.08	.08	.13**	.11*	.16**	.09	.22**	.10*	.09	.10	.06
11	Ideal Instructor E											.48**	.41**	.17**	.26**	.28**	.26**	.35**	.20**	.13*	.35**	.04	.03	-.21**	.12*	.06	.06	.09	.18**	.07	.05	.08	.00
12	Ideal Instructor A												.54**	.21**	.30**	.15**	.41**	.38**	.13*	.11*	.18**	.18**	.10*	.04	.05	.10	.11*	.09	.18**	.08	.03	.02	.07
13	Ideal Instructor ES													.19**	.35**	.13*	.24**	.53**	.10	.01	.13**	.10	.28**	-.02	.18**	.12*	.16**	.08	.14**	.16**	.08	.10	.16**
14	Actual Instructor O														.47**	.43**	.40**	.22**	-.57**	-.27**	-.26**	-.23**	-.13**	.26**	.20**	.46**	.38**	.24**	.30**	.20**	.37**	.15**	-.01
15	Actual Instructor C															.34**	.46**	.53**	-.26**	-.72**	-.16**	-.25**	-.23**	.32**	.29**	.33**	.46**	.35**	.31**	.29**	.35**	.11*	.00
16	Actual Instructor E																.35**	.26**	-.21**	-.23**	-.67**	-.26**	-.16**	-.02	.16**	.52**	.30**	.24**	.23**	.21**	.37**	.11*	-.14*
17	Actual Instructor A																	.56**	-.16**	-.25**	-.15**	-.77**	-.29**	.33**	.18**	.41**	.31**	.34**	.57**	.20**	.43**	.07	.00
18	Actual Instructor ES																		.00	-.28**	-.02	-.31**	-.46**	.00	.18**	.18**	.22**	.20**	.30**	.14**	.21**	.01	.00
19	ADS O																			.37**	.33**	.23**	.15**	-.36**	-.07	-.27**	-.24**	-.19**	-.12*	-.07	-.23**	.01	-.03
20	ADS C																				.32**	.35**	.33**	-.32**	-.20**	-.28**	-.37**	-.31**	-.19**	-.22**	-.30**	-.04	.03
21	ADS E																					.30**	.17**	-.23**	-.11*	-.40**	-.22**	-.16**	-.10*	-.16**	-.33**	.01	.08
22	ADS A																						.38**	-.35**	-.14**	-.36**	-.24**	-.27**	-.47**	-.14**	-.43**	-.05	.02
23	ADS ES																							-.14**	-.04	-.13*	-.14**	-.13*	-.18**	-.04	-.18**	.04	.06
24	Fisher's *z*																								.15**	.19**	.24**	.20**	.23**	.17**	.25**	-.05	.02
SEEQ																																	
25	Learning Focus																									.30**	.41**	.29**	.24**	.75**	.31**	.28**	.15**
26	Enthusiasm																										.57**	.51**	.56**	.37**	.68**	.10	-.08
27	Organization																											.48**	.49**	.47**	.57**	.18**	.02
28	Group Interaction																												.47**	.33**	.47**	.01	-.05
29	Individual Rapport																													.32**	.59**	.10	.01
30	Overall Course Rating																														.48**	.28**	.10
31	Overall Instructor Rating																															.17**	.04
32	PSE																																.37**
33	Course Mark[a]																																

Note. O = Openness, C = Conscientiousness, E = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, ES = Emotional Stability, ADS = Absolute Difference Score, SEEQ = Student Evaluations of Educational Quality, PSE = Performance Self-Efficacy.
[a] $n = 322$, $^{*}\ p < .05$, $^{**}\ p < .01$.