

Comparison of Personality Traits of Primary Teacher Educators in West Bengal, India

Dr. Goutam Maiti

Kharagpur Priyanath Roy Vidyaniketan (Govt. Sponsored H.S. School)

Paschim Medinipur, West Bengal

Email: gmaiti.edu@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study aimed at examining the comparison of Sixteen Personality Factor (16 PF) between non-government and government, male and female primary teacher educators. In this study, samples of 200 primary teacher educators were randomly selected. The tool used 16 PF Questionnaire by the Cattell, in Form C, was locally adapted by Bose, S. and Chatterjee, A .K. (1984), Department of Applied Psychology, University of Calcutta. For quantitative analysis of data, Mean of sten score, Standard Deviation and t-test were applied. It was also found that (i) there was no significant difference between non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators in each of their 16 PF. (ii) there was no significant difference between male and female primary teacher educators in each of their 16 PF. Moreover, comparison of t-value suggested that each personality traits (16 PF) of primary teacher educators did not depend on the type of teachers and their gender.

Keywords: Personality Trait, Primary Teacher Educator, Sixteen Personality Factor (16 PF).

Introduction

Human personality refers to the unique expression of the characteristics of an individual and it must be studied with in the social context in which it develops. It is not an isolated phenomenon separated from the environment. A well balanced, non-anxious teacher educator can generate a vigorous emotional environment of learning and would be at ease with his/her trainees. Personality influences the behaviour of teacher educators in diverse way. Such as, trainees learn from a teacher educator's personality even if there is no formal interaction between trainees and their teachers. Therefore, under the Educational Fundamental Act, the Ministry of Education in Taiwan has stipulated that teachers cannot implement the corporal punishment, i.e., zero corporal punishment on campus. National Policy on Education (2016) also stresses on this fact when it recommends that principals must be encouraged to set a personal example by showing zero tolerance for any untoward incident involving a child's right and enjoined to take pro-active interest in protecting the rights of every individual in the school. Moreover, this 'zero corporal punishment' or

'zero tolerance' would be a success if faculty selection must be determined with his/her traits of personality. So this study is very much unique in the field of education.

Review of Literature

Maiti, G. (2017) found that mean scores of over all 16 PF of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators were 89.46 and 96.84 respectively and a significant difference was found ($t_{obs}=4.019 > t_{0.01}, 198=2.60$). But mean scores of overall 16 PF of male and female primary teacher educators were 91.47 and 91.15 respectively and there was no significant difference was found ($t_{obs}=0.83 < t_{0.05}, 198=1.97$). Fatemi and Sazegar (2016) found that there was no significant difference between male and female teachers on their big five personality traits. Krishnaveni and Reddy (2014) found that (i) there is significant influence of personality factors- A, B, C, F, G, Q₃ and Q₄ at 0.01 level and personality factors-L, M, and Q₂ at 0.05 level on the role expectation of high school teachers. (ii) There is significant influence of personality factors- A, B, C, F, G, Q₃ and Q₄ at 0.01 level and personality factors- M, and Q₂ at 0.05 level on the role

performance of high school teachers. Personality consists of stable characteristics which explain why a person behaves in a particular way (Mullins, 2005). Teachers' personality traits are reflected not only in their classroom performance, especially in their selection of instructional activities, materials, strategies and classroom management techniques but also in their interaction with students (Henson & Chambers, 2002). According to Hogan (1991), a person's personality is a relatively stable precursor of behavior; it underlines an enduring style of thinking, feeling and acting. It is further found that although teachers do not significantly differ on personality traits from the general population, there is a large and surprising amount of diversity in teachers' personality characteristics (Getzels and Jackson, 1963). Furthermore, the above mentioned review related to teacher's personality and its importance suggests that a lot of research has been conducted to investigate the traits of personality. It is a fact that very little research has been conducted to measure the teacher educators in each of their 16 PF in West Bengal. So, this study is very much essential in present scenarios.

Objectives

- To compare the non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators in each of their 16 PF.
- To compare the male and female primary teacher educators in each of their 16 PF.

Hypotheses

H₀1: There is no significant difference between non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators in each of their 16 PF.

H₀2: There is no significant difference between male and female primary teacher educators in each of their 16 PF.

Sample Size

In the study, 150 non-government (male 76 & female 74) and 50 government (male 20 & female 30) primary teacher educators recognized by National Council for Teacher Education and affiliated to West Bengal Board of

Primary Education were selected randomly and considered for the study.

Research Tool

Sixteen Personality Factor (16 PF) Questionnaire: Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire by Cattell, in Form C, was locally adapted by Bose, S. and Chatterjee, A.K. (1984), Department of Applied Psychology, University of Calcutta. It was individually administered over fifty primary teacher educators to measure their personality. It consisted of 105 items. In Form C, there were eight items for the factor B, Seven items for the motivational distortion (MD) and six items for each of the remaining factors. Three alternative answers were provided for each of the questions. Each answer scored 0, 1 or 2 points, except the factor B (conceptual ability) answers, which scored 0 (incorrect) or 1 (correct). Obtained raw scores of 16 PF were calculated with scoring key, and then it was converted to 'sten score'.

The reliability of the test for assessing of personality was ensured through Split-half method. Co-efficient of reliability of the test was 0.80 by Spearman-Brown formula. Validity of the test was ensured by the expert's opinion.

Here, the 16 Personality Factors are Factor A- Reserved v/s Outgoing; Factor B- Less intelligent v/s more intelligent; Factor C-Economically less stable v/s economically stable; Factor E- Humble v/s assertive; Factor F-Sober v/s enthusiastic; Factor G-Expedient v/s conscientious; Factor H- Shy v/s venturesome; Factor I-Tough minded v/s tender minded; Factor L- Trusting v/s suspicious; Factor M-Practical v/s imaginative; Factor N- Forthright v/s shrewd; Factor O- Self assured vs. apprehensive; Factor Q1- Conservative vs. liberal; Factor Q2- Group oriented v/s self sufficient; Factor Q3- Undisciplined self-conflict v/s following self image; Factor Q4- Relaxed v/s tensed.

Statistical Techniques

Data were analyzed with different statistical techniques according to the objectives of the study. For quantitative analysis of data Mean of Sten Scores, Standard Deviation and t-test were applied.

Interpretation

In order to assess and compare the personality traits of non-govt. v/s govt. and male v/s female primary teacher educators, mean scores of sten values and standard deviation for each of the 16 PF were computed. To determine the significance of difference between non-govt. and govt., male and female primary teacher educators in their mean scores of sten values in the different personality factors, t-test was computed and pertained and these have been presented in table 1 and 2.

The tables 1 and 2 interpreted following discussion based on the exact limit of stens 5 and 6 (4.5-6.5) extended respectively are average. There below average are lower end and above average are upper end

Factor A (Reserved v/s Outgoing)

The continuum of this trait extended from cool, reserved, impersonal, detached and aloof at lower end to warm, outgoing, participating at upper end.

The table 1 shows that the mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 4.63 and 5.42 respectively and obtained t-value (0.01) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that both group lie on average level and they are neither outgoing nor reserved.

The table 2 shows that the mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 4.96 and 4.70 respectively and obtained t-value (0.31) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that both group lie on average level and they are neither outgoing nor reserved.

Factor B (Less intelligent v/s More intelligent)

The continuum of this trait extended from concrete-thinking, less intelligent at lower end to abstract-thinking, more intelligent at upper end. The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 4.41 and 4.96 respectively and obtained t-value (0.03) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the non-govt. primary teacher educators lie on below average level and govt.

primary teacher educators lie on average level. So non-govt. primary teacher educators are less intelligent than govt. primary teacher educators. The table 2 shows that the mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 4.65 and 4.45 respectively and obtained t-value (0.38) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the male primary teacher educators lie on average level and female primary teacher educators lie on below average level. So, female primary teacher educators are less intelligent than male primary teacher educators.

Factor C (Emotionally less Stable v/s Emotionally Stable)

The continuum of this trait extended from affected by feeling, emotionally less stable at lower end to emotionally stable, mature at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 5.67 and 6.34 respectively and obtained t-value (0.02) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that both group lie on average level. So, they are neither emotionally less stable nor emotionally stable.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 5.92 and 5.76 respectively and obtained t-value (0.49) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So they are neither emotionally stable nor emotionally less stable.

Factor E (Humble v/s Assertive)

The continuum of this trait extended from submissive, humble, mild, easily led at lower end to dominant, assertive, aggressive, bossy and competitive at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 6.29 and 6.16 respectively and obtained t-value (0.64) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So they are neither assertive nor humble.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 6.27 and 6.26 respectively and obtained t-value (0.96) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So they are neither assertive nor humble.

Factor F (Sober v/s Enthusiastic)

The continuum of this trait extended from sober, restrained, prudent and taciturn at lower end to enthusiastic, spontaneous, cheerful, heedless and expressive at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 4.96 and 6.16 respectively and obtained t-value (0.001) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So they are neither sober nor enthusiastic.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 5.34 and 5.18 respectively and obtained t-value (0.58) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So, they are neither sober nor enthusiastic.

Factor G (Expedient v/s Conscientious)

The continuum of this trait extended from expedient and disregards rules at lower end to conscientious, conforming, moralistic and rule-bound at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 5.6 and 6.7 respectively and obtained t-value (0.003) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the non-govt. teacher educators lie on average level; but govt. teacher educators lie on little above average level. So govt. primary teacher educators are more conscientious than non-govt. primary teacher educators.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 6.0 and 5.76 respectively and obtained t-value (0.45) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So they are neither conscientious nor expedient.

Factor H (Shy v/s Venturesome)

The continuum of this trait extended from shy, timid and hesitant at lower end to bold, venturesome and uninhibited at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 4.69 and 5.02 respectively and obtained t-value (0.26) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So, they are neither venturesome nor shy.

The table 2 shows that the mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 4.80 and 4.77 respectively and obtained t-value (0.90) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So they are neither venturesome nor shy.

Factor I (Tough minded v/s Tender minded)

The continuum of this trait extended from tough-minded, self-reliant, no-nonsense and rough at lower end to tender-minded, sensitive, over-protected and intuitive at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 6.23 and 7.10 respectively and obtained t-value (0.01) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that non-govt. teacher educators are lie on average level and govt. teacher educators are lie on above average level. Hence, govt. teacher educators are more tender minded than non-govt. teacher educators.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 6.45 and 6.45 respectively and obtained t-value (0.99) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So they are neither tender minded nor tough minded.

Factor L (Trusting v/s Suspicious)

The continuum of this trait extended from trusting and accepting at lower end to suspicious, hard to fool and skeptical at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 5.3 and 4.86 respectively and obtained t-value (0.12) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result indicates that both group lie on average level. So they are neither suspicious nor trusting.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 5.05 and 5.32 respectively and obtained t-value (0.32) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that both group lie on average level. So they are neither suspicious nor trusting.

Factor M (Practical v/s Imaginative)

The continuum of this trait extended from practical and steady at lower end to imaginative, absent-minded and impractical at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 6.53 and 7.12 respectively and obtained t-value (0.02) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that both group lie on above average level. So they are imaginative.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 6.64 and 6.72 respectively and obtained t-value (0.73) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that both group lie on above average level. So they are imaginative.

Factor N (Forthright v/s Shrewd)

The continuum of this trait extended from forthright, genuine and artless at lower end to shrewd, socially aware, diplomatic and calculating at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 5.11 and 4.92 respectively and obtained t-value (0.55) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So they are neither shrewd nor forthright.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 4.98 and 5.14 respectively and obtained t-value (0.497) is not

significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that both group lie on average level. So they are neither shrewd nor forthright.

Factor O (Self assured v/s Apprehensive)

The continuum of this trait extended from self-assured, secure, untroubled and self-satisfied at lower end to apprehensive, self-blaming, insecure and worrying at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 5.81 and 5.9 respectively and obtained t-value (0.795) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So they are neither self assured nor apprehensive.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 5.72 and 5.93 respectively and obtained t-value (0.495) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So they are neither self assured nor apprehensive.

Factor Q₁ (Conservative v/s Liberal)

The continuum of this trait extended from conservative at lower end to experimenting and liberal at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 5.64 and 6.28 respectively and obtained t-value (0.06) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that both group lie on average level. So they are neither conservative nor liberal.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 6.0 and 5.62 respectively and obtained t-value (0.19) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that both group lie on average level. So they are neither conservative nor liberal.

Factor Q₂ (Group oriented v/s Self sufficient)

The continuum of this trait extended from group-oriented at lower end to self-sufficient, resourceful at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 6.2 and 6.6 respectively and obtained t-value (0.30) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that non-govt. primary teacher educators lie on average level and govt. primary teacher educators lie on little above average level. So govt. primary teacher educators are more self sufficient than non-govt. primary teacher educators.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 6.10 and 6.48 respectively and obtained t-value (0.22) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that both group lie on average level. So they are neither group oriented nor self sufficient.

Factor Q₃ (Undisciplined self-conflict v/s Following self image)

The continuum of this trait extended from undisciplined self-conflict, lax and careless of social rules at lower end to following self-image, socially precise and compulsive at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 6.95 and 7.74 respectively and obtained t-value (0.01) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that both group lie on above average level. So they are more following self image.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 7.25 and 7.06 respectively and obtained t-value (0.48) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on above average level. So they are more following self image.

Factor Q₄ (Relaxed v/s Tense)

The continuum of this trait extended from relaxed, tranquil and unfrustrated at lower end to tense, frustrated and overwrought at upper end.

The table 1 shows that mean scores of sten values of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators on this factor are 5.43 and 5.5 respectively and obtained t-value (0.84) is not

significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So they are neither tense nor relaxed.

The table 2 shows that mean scores of sten values of male and female primary teacher educators on this factor are 5.34 and 5.55 respectively and obtained t-value (0.43) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result shows that the both group lie on average level. So they are neither tense nor relaxed.

Findings and Conclusion

On the above interpretation, firstly, it is also found that there is no significant difference between non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators in each of their 16 PF. But a significant difference was found in overall Mean scores of 16 PF of non-govt. and govt. primary teacher educators (Maiti, 2017, p.158). Secondly, it is also found that there is no significant difference between male and female primary teacher educators in each of their 16 PF. So, comparisons of t-value suggested that each personality traits (16 PF) of primary teacher educators does not depend on the type of teachers and their gender. But Mean values and its level of fluctuations of traits are due to cause of few authorities who select their faculty only taking an interview. They do not rely on written test. In such case, some managements stress more on personal preference than personality test. So it is recommended that the process of faculty selection should be centrally or a transparent and independent committee should be engaged to select the faculty for quality of education. It brings to light the fact that, personality test is proved to be useful in hiring the right candidates. It always leads to higher level of productivity, effectiveness and success of 'zero tolerance' (NPE, 2016) in campus or an institution.

References

- Cattell (1970). Theories of Personality. John Wiley and Sons, Inc (2nd ed.) p.386.
- Fatemi, M. A. and Sazegar, Z. (2016). The Relationship Between Teacher's Personality Traits and Doing Action Research. Journal of Applied Linguistic and Language Research. Vol. 3, Issue. 1, pp.144-154.

Getzels, J.W. and Jackson, P. W. (1963). The Teacher Personality Characteristic, In Gage, N. L. (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago: Rand McNally.

Henson, R.K. and Chambers, S. M. (2002). Personality Type as a Predictor of Teaching Efficacy and Classroom Control beliefs in Emergency Certification Teachers. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association. Austin.

Hogan, R. (1991). Personality and Personality Measurement. In M. D. Dunnette & Hogan, L.M. (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (2nd ed). Palo Alto, Ca: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Krishnaveni, L. H. and Reddy, B. Y. (2014). A Study of Role Expectations and Role Performance of High School Teachers in Relation to Personality. International Journal of Advanced Research. Vol.2, Issue 3, pp363-369.

Maiti, G. (2017). Job Satisfaction of Teacher Educators in Relation to Personality and Organizational Climate. Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph. D.) in Education. Department of Education, University of Calcutta.

Mullins, L. J. (2005). Management and Organizational Behavior (7th ed.), Essex, England: Person Education Ltd.

National Policy on Education. (2016). Ministry of Human Resource Development, Govt. of India.

Appendix

TABLE 1: t-value is the Comparison of Non-Govt. and Govt. Primary Teacher Educators in each of their 16 PF

No	16 PF	Teacher Educators	N	Mean	S D	t-value
1	A	Non-Govt.	150	4.63	1.72	0.01
		Govt.	50	5.42	1.79	
2	B	Non-Govt.	150	4.41	1.57	0.03
		Govt.	50	4.96	1.44	
3	C	Non-Govt.	150	5.67	1.49	0.02
		Govt.	50	6.34	1.78	
4	E	Non-Govt.	150	6.29	1.42	0.64
		Govt.	50	6.16	1.9	
5	F	Non-Govt.	150	4.96	1.896	0.001
		Govt.	50	6.16	2.23	
6	G	Non-Govt.	150	5.6	2.18	0.003
		Govt.	50	6.7	2.19	
7	H	Non-Govt.	150	4.69	1.76	0.26
		Govt.	50	5.02	2.18	
8	I	Non-Govt.	150	6.23	1.895	0.01
		Govt.	50	7.1	1.92	
9	L	Non-Govt.	150	5.3	1.95	0.12
		Govt.	50	4.86	1.61	
10	M	Non-Govt.	150	6.53	1.83	0.02
		Govt.	50	7.12	1.37	
11	N	Non-Govt.	150	5.11	1.59	0.55
		Govt.	50	4.92	2.08	
12	O	Non-Govt.	150	5.81	2.2	0.795
		Govt.	50	5.9	2.17	
13	Q1	Non-Govt.	150	5.64	2.06	0.06
		Govt.	50	6.28	2.0	
14	Q2	Non-Govt.	150	6.2	2.09	0.30

		Govt.	50	6.6	2.41	
15	Q3	Non-Govt.	150	6.95	1.94	0.01
		Govt.	50	7.74	1.75	
16	Q4	Non-Govt.	150	5.43	1.71	0.84
		Govt.	50	5.5	2.05	

Source: Calculated by the researcher

TABLE 2: t-value is the Comparison of Male and Female Primary Teacher Educators in each of their 16 PF

No	16 PF	Gender	N	Mean	S D	t-value
1	A	Male	96	4.96	1.98	0.31
		Female	104	4.7	1.54	
2	B	Male	96	4.65	1.64	0.38
		Female	104	4.45	1.47	
3	C	Male	96	5.92	1.48	0.49
		Female	104	5.76	1.695	
4	E	Male	96	6.27	1.44	0.96
		Female	104	6.26	1.66	
5	F	Male	96	5.34	2.095	0.58
		Female	104	5.18	2.01	
6	G	Male	96	6.0	1.96	0.45
		Female	104	5.76	2.45	
7	H	Male	96	4.8	1.89	0.9
		Female	104	4.77	1.87	
8	I	Male	96	6.45	1.91	0.99
		Female	104	6.45	1.97	
9	L	Male	96	5.05	1.86	0.32
		Female	104	5.32	1.88	
10	M	Male	96	6.64	1.71	0.73
		Female	104	6.72	1.77	
11	N	Male	96	4.98	1.51	0.497
		Female	104	5.14	1.9	
12	O	Male	96	5.72	2.35	0.495
		Female	104	5.93	2.03	
13	Q1	Male	96	6.0	2.16	0.19
		Female	104	5.62	1.95	
14	Q2	Male	96	6.10	2.12	0.22
		Female	104	6.48	2.23	
15	Q3	Male	96	7.25	2.02	0.48
		Female	104	7.06	1.83	
16	Q4	Male	96	5.34	1.83	0.43
		Female	104	5.55	1.77	

Source: Calculated by the researcher