



10-1980

Personality Characteristics and Motivational Needs of Preservice and Inservice Teachers: Implications for Practice

G. R. Ward

Sally S. Porter

Michael M. Omizo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/tl-nirp-journal>



Part of the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ward, G. R.; Porter, Sally S.; and Omizo, Michael M. (1980) "Personality Characteristics and Motivational Needs of Preservice and Inservice Teachers: Implications for Practice," *Teaching and Learning: The Journal of Natural Inquiry & Reflective Practice*: Vol. 5 : Iss. 2 , Article 6.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/tl-nirp-journal/vol5/iss2/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Teaching and Learning: The Journal of Natural Inquiry & Reflective Practice by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

Personality Characteristics and Motivational Needs of Preservice and Inservice Teachers: Implications for Practice

Much of the research on teacher education has dealt with discovering characteristics of successful teachers, providing effective methods of preservice and inservice training, and designing appropriate screening procedures for prospective teachers. The great majority of the existing literature has investigated preservice and inservice teachers as two independent groups. Evidence exists that personality characteristics are related to choice of grade levels and fields of teaching in both preservice and inservice teachers (Augestein, 1977; Carlyn, 1976; Dimond, 1973).

Few, if any, studies have used personality traits as screening procedures for admission into schools of education and predictors of success in light of academic performance. However, the relationship between psychological characterization and successful teaching has been researched extensively. Although a tremendous number of studies have investigated this area, no consistent results have emerged. The possible reason for this is the variety of meanings assigned to the term "successful" teaching. Generally, teachers characterized as successful are flexible, warm, and adaptable (Flanders, 1960; Heitzmann & Starpoli, 1975).

Society and the teaching profession are constantly changing, necessitating the provision of continuous training for both preservice and inservice teachers via formal classroom experiences, seminars, and workshops. Andrews (1975) has suggested that preservice and inservice education should be joined

together based on existing professional needs. This idea may be economically and administratively sound when one considers the general needs of the profession, but are the psychological and motivational needs similar enough for both groups to merit joint training? Knowledge of personality characteristics and motivational needs would aid educators, administrators, and counselors in implementing more effective training and professional development programs satisfying both professional and personal needs. Currently, training programs rarely consider these variables when designing and developing programs and workshops. If specific traits can be identified, more relevant and effective training can be developed.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine and to compare personality and work motivational needs of preservice and inservice teachers. The variables under consideration included 16 personality traits, motivation distortion, dogmatism, locus of control, and five motivational needs. Results could have important implications for all individuals involved with the continuous professional development of teachers.

Methodology

Sample

The sample consisted of 61 inservice and 101 preservice teachers. Both groups included males and females and elementary and secondary school teachers and teacher trainees. All participants were tested at a large southwestern university.

Instrumentation

Personality traits were obtained from the scores on each of the dimensions of the Sixteen Personality

Questionnaire Form C (16 PF) (Cattell & Eber, 1969). In addition, a special scale designated as motivation distortion was used to measure the strength of a response set relative to social desirability. Correlation coefficients between scores on each of the 16 factors on Form C of the 16 PF and scores on each of the same corresponding factors on Form D varied from .67 to .86 when the interval between testing ranged from two to seven days for a sample of 150 male and female undergraduate students. The two constructs of dogmatism and locus of control were derived from the Opinion Scale (Kleiber, Veldman, & Menaker, 1973) that intersperses the 40 items of Rokeach's (1960) Dogmatism Scale with the 23 items representing the external dimension of the Internal-External Control Scale developed by Rotter (1966). For the Dogmatism Scale, split-half and test-retest reliability coefficients have ranged between .68 to .93 in data provided by Rokeach (1960). Rokeach (1956) contended that the Dogmatism Scale (D Scale) provides a relatively ideology-free measure of general authoritarianism and intolerance. To check the construct validity of the D Scale, Rokeach developed measures of right and left opinionation. Based on research with seven different samples, Rokeach (1960, 1967) reported that the D Scale correlated positively with both left (.21) and right (.35) opinionation. Reliability and validity information for the locus of control measure was not immediately available relative to the scores earned in the item format provided by the Opinion Scale.

The Work Motivation Inventory (WMI) developed by Hall and Williams (1973) was used to measure motivational needs. The five scales of the WMI produce scores for each of the five levels of Maslow's theoretical hierarchy of needs: Physiological, Safety, Belonging, Ego-status, and Self-actualization. According to Maslow, these needs must be gratified to roughly parallel the order of his hierarchy, beginning with Physiological needs proceeding through Self-actualization. Test-retest reliability coefficients of .70 and validity coefficients ranging from .69 to .79 were reported by Hall and Williams (1973).

Statistical Analysis

Means and standard deviations of scores on all measures were calculated for the two groups and are presented in Table 1. Personality and work motivational differences were tested with univariate F_s and discriminant analysis procedures. A summary of these results is indicated in Table 2.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of Preservice and Inservice Teachers
on All Personality and Work Motivational Needs Measures

Measures	Preservice (N = 101)		Inservice (N = 61)	
	M	SD	M	SD
<u>16 PF Scales^a</u>				
Sociable	5.64	1.87	5.21	2.03
Intelligence	5.85	1.52	5.67	2.11
Ego Strength	5.44	1.76	5.56	1.71
Dominance	5.64	1.93	5.44	1.65
Surgency	5.45	1.79	5.11	1.63
Superego Strength	6.04	1.92	6.34	2.02
Adventurousness	5.62	2.01	5.07	1.65
Sensitivity	6.31	2.17	5.38	1.78
Paranoid Suspiciousness	5.57	1.76	4.98	1.69
Unconcerned	5.92	1.96	5.39	1.85
Shrewdness	5.47	2.07	6.03	7.73
Guilt Proneness	5.46	1.80	5.26	1.41
Radical	6.21	1.95	4.92	1.73
Self-sufficiency	5.98	1.89	5.85	1.43
Self-sentiment Control	5.89	1.77	5.92	1.80
Ergic Tension	5.46	1.45	5.28	1.58
<u>Additional 16 PF Scale</u>				
Motivation Distortion	5.96	1.98	5.50	1.91
<u>Internal-External Control Scale</u>				
(Locus of Control)	86.64	20.70	79.66	20.31
<u>Dogmatism Scale</u>	141.92	24.43	132.85	25.77
<u>WMI Scales</u>				
Basic-Creature Comfort	50.32	10.53	49.48	11.03
Safety & Order	51.03	10.00	51.26	10.82
Ego-Status	64.21	10.89	68.98	12.04
Belongingness & Affiliation	58.05	10.10	61.43	12.43
Actualization & Self- Expression	77.29	13.16	71.11	15.26

The titles of the 16PF Scales represent brief abstractions largely contrived by the authors to simplify lengthy descriptions of the bipolar scales appearing on test profile sheets and in the Manual (Cattell & Eber, 1969).

TABLE 2

Univariate F and Standardized Discriminant Coefficients
of All Personality and Work Motivational Needs Measures

Measures	Univariate F Values	Standardized Discriminant Coefficients
<u>16 PF Scales</u>		
Sociable	1.89	.28
Intelligence	.39	.20
Ego Strenght	.19	.10
Dominance	.46	.16
Surgency	1.48	-.19
Superego Strenght	.87	-.29
Adventurousness	3.83	.20
Sensitivity	7.97**	.31
Paranoid Suspiciousness	4.41*	.27
Unconcerned	2.88	.17
Shrewdness	3.23	-.14
Guilt Proneness	.51	.17
Radical	18.10**	.44
Self-Sufficiency	.21	.11
Self-sentiment Control	.01	.21
Ergic Tension	.53	.17
<u>Additional 16 PF Scale</u>		
Motivational Distortion	2.03	.20
<u>Internal-External Control</u>		
Scale (Locus of Control)	4.39*	.37
<u>DogmatismScale</u>	5.03*	.34
<u>WMI Scales</u>		
Basic-Creature Comfort	.23	.26
Safety & Order	.02	.03
Belongingness & Affiliation	3.56	-.21
Ego-Status	6.75**	-.31
Actualization & Self- Expression	7.41**	.42

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Findings

A two-group discriminant analysis involving the personality and work motivational needs variables yielded a canonical correlation of .598 (chi-square = 67.164; df = 17; $p < .001$). The analysis revealed that the variables predicted group membership with 83.6% and 76.2% accuracy, respectively, for the inservice and preservice teachers.

An inspection of the entries in Table 2 reveals the following statistical outcomes:

1. The variables of paranoid suspiciousness, dogmatism, locus of control and ego-status each proved to be valid discriminators at the .05 level of significance. The preservice teachers were significantly more suspicious, more dogmatic, more externally oriented relative to locus of control, and had lower ego-status needs than the inservice teachers.

2. Significant differences were noted between the two groups on the variables of sensitivity, radicalism, and self-expression/self-actualization (all $p < .01$). The preservice teachers were significantly more radical, sensitive, and had higher self-actualization and self-expression needs. Inservice teachers were conservative in relation to temperament self-reliant, realistic, and venturesome, whereas preservice teachers were more radical, sensitive and shy.

Implications

It is apparent that the two groups investigated do possess several different personality and work motivational needs characteristics. These results have implications for training. Since the findings of the present investigation have revealed these differences, it does not seem feasible to conduct all training programs with the two groups together. Instead, separate training programs which recognize the distinct characteristics and needs of each group would be more expeditious and ultimately more productive. For instance, a logical extension of this study's findings would involve a training program for preservice teachers which utilized their traits of sensitivity, interest in experimentation and liberal-

ism while recognizing their external locus of control orientation and relative closed-mindedness. The preservice teachers appear to have unsatisfied ego-status needs. Therefore, a training program for this group would recognize that these individuals are trying to prove their self-worth, test their capabilities, and deal with work that is both challenging and meaningful. The inservice teachers are more internally oriented relative to locus of control. While they are more open-minded, they do tend to respect traditional ideas. Thus, a training program which implemented both a flexibility component and an adherence to traditional values would be appropriate for this group. The inservice teachers were also more self-reliant and socially bold, perhaps reflecting the sort of confidence and ease which comes from having practiced a profession. This study evidenced their reliance on intrinsic merits of reinforcement and a greater investment in their work than that shown by the preservice teachers. This, too, seems logical, given the fact that preservice teachers are in a process of finding themselves and testing their abilities in the profession. Training programs which utilize the confidence and self-reliance of the inservice teachers would in all probability be very different from training programs which utilize the need for external validation and the sense of experimentation characteristic of the preservice teachers. A training program which tried to meet the motivational need characteristics of both groups would run the risk of either underestimating the self-assurance of the inservice teachers or overestimating the sense of experimentation of the same group. Obviously, the reverse would hold true for the preservice teachers. It would be far better to develop separate training programs, geared to utilize and meet the distinct personality and motivational need characteristics evidenced by each group.

Recommendations

Although the present investigation revealed differences which have implications for training, the findings need to be verified. It is recommended that more research be conducted using other personality, needs, and value instruments with a larger sample. It would also be interesting to investigate when changes occur, if indeed this does happen, and to determine what methods of training facilitate or inhibit the changes. Worthwhile, too, would be to determine whether programs based on personality and needs are more effective than programs which are not.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, L.O. Student teaching as a spring board for inservice education. Theory into Practice, 1975, 14 (1), 11-19.
- Augestein, P.A.S. A comparison of student teacher, pupil and regular teacher perceptions of student teacher effect. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1977.
- Carlyn, M. The relationship between Myers-Briggs personality characteristics and teaching preference of prospective teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1976.
- Cattell, R.B., & Eber, H.W. Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire: Manual. Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1969.
- Dimond, D.L. Differences in selected psychological traits between preservice male secondary and elementary teachers in the University of Missouri System. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1973.
- Flanders, N.A. Teacher influence, pupil attitudes and achievement: Studies in interaction analysis. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1960.
- Hall, T., & Williams, M. Work Motivation Inventory. Conroe, Texas: Telemetrics International, 1973.
- Heitzmann, W.R., & Starpoli, C. Teacher characteristics and successful teaching. Education, 1975, 95 (3), 298-299.
- Kleiber, D., Veldman, D.T., & Menaker, S.L. The multidimensionality of locus of control. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1973, 29, 411-416.

- Rokeach, M. Political and religious dogmatism: An alternative to the authoritarian personality. Psychological Monographs, 1956, 70 (18), Whole No. 425.
- Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Rokeach, M. Authoritarian scales and response bias: Comments on Peabody's paper. Psychological Bulletin, 1967, 67 (5), 349-355.
- Rotter, T.B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of refinement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1), Whole No. 609, 1-28.