

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 591

SP 018 788

AUTHOR Austin, Terri L.; Cage, Bob N.  
TITLE Personality Influences on Student and Cooperating  
Teacher Attitudes Toward Teaching.  
PUB DATE Nov 80  
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational  
Research Meeting (New Orleans, LA, November 14,  
1980).  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Cooperating Teachers; Higher Education; \*Personality  
Traits; \*Student Teachers; \*Teacher Characteristics;  
\*Teacher Evaluation; \*Teacher Influence  
IDENTIFIERS Jung (Carl G)

ABSTRACT

This investigation related Jungian personality types of student and cooperating teachers to their attitudes and student teacher evaluations. A random sample of 124 pairs of student teachers and cooperating teachers was used. Each participant was administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI). Analyses that matched the extroverted-introverted and the sensing-intuitive personality indices showed that student teacher ratings were similar regardless of the personality type of the cooperating teacher. Expressed teacher attitude (MTAI) was shown to vary significantly across personality preferences (MBTI). In both the student teacher and the cooperating teacher samples, intuitive and feeling types were significantly more positive than any other subgroups. (Authors/FG)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED.206591

PERSONALITY INFLUENCES ON STUDENT  
AND COOPERATING TEACHER ATTITUDES  
TOWARD TEACHING

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terri Austin

Bob N. Cage

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Terri L. Austin

Bob N. Cage

University of Mississippi

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.  
Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE  
position or policy.

Discussion Session

Descriptors: teacher personality; teacher  
attitude; student teacher evaluation

Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational  
Research Association meeting, November 14, 1980, New Orleans

PERSONALITY INFLUENCES ON STUDENT  
AND COOPERATING TEACHER ATTITUDES  
TOWARD TEACHING

Previous research (Price, 1961; Sorenson, 1967; Wroblewski, 1963) has shown the importance of the student teaching experience in the development of classroom management techniques and teacher attitude. Other research (Bennie, 1966; Hays, 1969; Leslie, 1971) has stressed the importance of the student teacher-cooperating teacher compatibility. This study extends the previous research by investigating the relationship of Jungian personality types to student and cooperating teacher attitude and student teacher evaluations.

Statement of the Problem

The development of positive attitudes in pre-service teachers culminates in the student teaching experience. Attitudes toward teaching vary from negative to positive and affect the student teaching performance. Previous research (Getzels and Jackson, 1963; Hays, 1969) has suggested that personality type is related to teacher attitude and this interaction may influence student teacher ratings.

The purpose of this research was directed by the following research questions:

1. When personality types of the cooperating teacher and student teacher are similar, are student teacher ratings significantly higher than when personality types are dissimilar?
2. Does attitude toward teaching vary significantly across personality types among student teachers?

- 3. Does attitude toward teaching vary significantly across personality types among cooperating teachers?
- 4. Do student teacher ratings vary significantly across personality types?

### Methodology

From the population of student teachers at the University of Mississippi during 1978 and 1979, a random sample of 150 Ss were chosen for the study. Each student teacher was administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI). Each cooperating teacher was asked to complete the same instruments. Student teacher ratings by the cooperating teachers were collected through the Office of Field Services at the University.

Several of the cooperating teachers refused to participate in the study reducing the sample size to 124 pairs of student and cooperating teachers.

### Significance of the Study

Jung's theory of personality type provides a taxonomic dimension, relational descriptors and an interpretive framework for research purposes. Using this typing process, student teachers can be evaluated on a dimension that provides structures for affective domain variables as well as the traditional student teacher ratings. If personality type is significantly related to attitude and performance, then institutions training pre-service teachers need to be apprised.



## Results

The data pertaining to the first research question are given in Table I. The mean student teacher ratings by cooperating teachers having the same personality preference (E, I, N or S) as student teachers appear on the diagonal of the Table. The mean ratings for student teachers having personality preferences different from their cooperating teacher are shown off the diagonal.

No significant differences were found in student teacher ratings between cooperating teachers having the same personality preference as their student teacher and those having different personality preferences from their student teachers.

Data pertaining to research question number two appear in Table II. Duncan's Multiple Range Statistic was used to show that attitude toward teaching (MTAI) does vary significantly across personality preference (MBTI). As sub-groups, intuitive types were significantly more positive toward teaching than any other sub-group and feeling types had significantly more positive attitudes toward teaching than thinking types. Small sample sizes precluded any other sub-group comparisons.

Table III shows the attitude toward teaching (MTAI) for cooperating teachers across personality preferences (MBTI). The sub-groups of NF (intuitive and feeling) had significantly higher scores than did any other sub-group.

The ratings received by student teachers classified by personality preference (MBTI), are given in Table IV. When

§

Table I  
 Mean Student Teacher Ratings for Similar and  
 Dissimilar Personality Preferences

Students

|   | E                                  | I                                  | N                                  | S                                  |
|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| E | n=48<br>$\bar{X}=187.1$<br>S= 32.5 | n=27<br>$\bar{X}=188.1$<br>S= 22.1 |                                    |                                    |
| I | n=30<br>$\bar{X}=181.3$<br>S= 30.4 | n=19<br>$\bar{X}=185.9$<br>S= 27.8 |                                    |                                    |
| N |                                    |                                    | n=16<br>$\bar{X}=181.1$<br>S= 35.0 | n=19<br>$\bar{X}=183.6$<br>S= 26.2 |
| S |                                    |                                    | n=32<br>$\bar{X}=181.0$<br>S= 32.4 | n=57<br>$\bar{X}=190.4$<br>S= 26.1 |

C  
O  
O  
P  
S

$$\bar{X}_{SP} = 179.6$$

$$\bar{X}_{DP} = 183.3$$

Table II

Mean Student Teacher Attitude toward Teaching  
Across Personality Preference

|   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| n=12<br>ISTJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =73.7<br>S=42.1 | n=23<br>ISFJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =85.8<br>S=37.5 | n=3<br>INFJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =119.3<br>S= 14.0  | n=0<br>INTJ                                |
| n=4<br>ISTP<br>$\bar{X}$ =80.0<br>S=45.5  | n=5<br>ISFP<br>$\bar{X}$ =85.8<br>S=54.1  | n=10<br>INFP<br>$\bar{X}$ =113.0<br>S= 18.9 | n=0<br>INTP                                |
| n=5<br>ESTP<br>$\bar{X}$ =80.6<br>S=11.9  | n=12<br>ESFP<br>$\bar{X}$ =68.2<br>S=41.3 | n=26<br>ENFP<br>$\bar{X}$ =98.2<br>S=36.7   | n=3<br>ENTP<br>$\bar{X}$ =101.7<br>S= 38.6 |
| n=2<br>ESTJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =85.0<br>S=63.6  | n=29<br>ESFJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =85.4<br>S=30.8 | n=9<br>ENFJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =87.3<br>S=30.7    | n=6<br>ENTJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =93.2<br>S=25.4   |

Table III

Mean Cooperative Teacher Attitude Toward Teaching  
Across Personality Preferences

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| n=6<br>ISTJ<br>$\bar{X}=78.5$<br>S=47.4  | n=23<br>ISFJ<br>$\bar{X}=73.3$<br>S=33.8 | n=7<br>INFJ<br>$\bar{X}=104.6$<br>S= 44.1  | n=5<br>INTJ<br>$\bar{X}=48.2$<br>S=31.0   |
| n=1<br>ISTP                              | n=5<br>ISFP<br>$\bar{X}=67.2$<br>S=15.5  | n=2<br>INFP<br>$\bar{X}=122.0$<br>S= 21.2  | n=0<br>INTP                               |
| n=1<br>ESTP                              | n=7<br>ESFP<br>$\bar{X}=83.7$<br>S=30.5  | n=7<br>ENFP<br>$\bar{X}=112.1$<br>S= 35.8  | n=0<br>ENTP                               |
| n=16<br>ESTJ<br>$\bar{X}=81.7$<br>S=27.6 | n=34<br>ESFJ<br>$\bar{X}=82.2$<br>S=34.5 | n=10<br>ENFJ<br>$\bar{X}=116.2$<br>S= 32.5 | n=5<br>ENTJ<br>$\bar{X}=124.4$<br>S= 30.4 |



Table IV  
 Student Teacher Ratings by  
 Personality Preference (MBTI)

|   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| n=11<br>ISTJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =194.7<br>S= 23.2 | n=23<br>ISFJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =193.5<br>S= 16.4 | n=3<br>INFJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =175.0<br>S= 36.3  | n=1<br>INTJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =201.0<br>S= 0    |
| n=4<br>ISTP<br>$\bar{X}$ =169.5<br>S= 46.9  | n=5<br>ISFP<br>$\bar{X}$ =194.6<br>S= 25.2  | n=10<br>INFP<br>$\bar{X}$ =173.0<br>S= 19.3 | n=0<br>INTP<br>$\bar{X}$ =0<br>S=0         |
| n=3<br>ESTP<br>$\bar{X}$ =175.7<br>S= 39.1  | n=12<br>ESFP<br>$\bar{X}$ =175.8<br>S= 31.5 | n=25<br>ENFP<br>$\bar{X}$ =176.8<br>S= 38.8 | n=3<br>ENTP<br>$\bar{X}$ =200.7<br>S= 19.3 |
| n=4<br>ESTJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =187.3<br>S= 39.2  | n=28<br>ESFJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =193.9<br>S= 22.5 | n=9<br>ENFJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =197.6<br>S= 24.5  | n=6<br>ENTJ<br>$\bar{X}$ =185.8<br>S= 21.4 |

comparing cell sizes of  $n \geq 6$ , personality preferences of ENFJ, ISTJ, ISFJ, and ESFJ had the highest ratings. No clear pattern emerged with these data, but student teachers with personality preferences of either sensing (S) or feeling (F) did receive the highest ratings from cooperating teachers.

### Conclusions

The purpose of this research was to show the relationship of personality preference, as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), to attitudes toward teaching, as measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI), for student and cooperating teachers at The University of Mississippi. Four research questions were determined and data analyzed to answer the questions.

The results showed that student teachers receiving ratings from cooperating teachers having the same personality preference (E-I or N-S) did not receive significantly higher student teacher ratings than student teachers whose ratings came from cooperating teachers with different personality preference.

Personality preference is associated with attitude toward teaching, both with student teachers and with cooperating teachers. Student and cooperating teachers who are intuitive (N) and feeling (F) had a more positive attitude toward teaching than any other sub-groups. ( $p < .05$ )

Student teachers with personality preferences of feeling (F) and sensing (S) received the highest student teacher ratings overall.

The personality preference of ENFJ had the highest rating of those types with six or more members. Wright, in her study of rated administrator and teacher effectiveness, concluded that the ENFJ teacher personality received significantly more positive effectiveness ratings from school administrators. Although small sample size was a limiting variable, this investigation of student teacher ratings by public school cooperating teachers support the observer reported effectiveness of the ENFJ teacher personality.

## Bibliography

- Bennie, W. A. Cooperation for better student teaching. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1966.
- Borg W. R., & Gall, M. D. Educational research, an introduction (2nd ed.). New York: David McKay Company, 1971.
- Getzels, J. W.; & Jackson, P. W. The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Hays, A. P. Effects of college and public school supervisors on student teachers' beliefs, dogmatism, and satisfaction with student teaching. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1969.
- Jung, C. G. [Psychological types] (G. G. Baynes, transl. & R. F. C. Hull, Ed.). Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1971. (Originally published, 1921.)
- Jung, C. G. (Ed.). Man and his symbols. London: Aldus Books Limited, 1964.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1973.
- Leslie, L. L. Matching student teachers with cooperating teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1971, 22, 303-308.
- Price, R. D. The influence of supervising teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1961, 12, 471-475.
- Sorenson, G. What is learned in student teaching? Journal of Teacher Education, 1967, 18, 173-178.
- Wright, J. A. The relationship of rated administration and teacher effectiveness to personality as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1966.
- Wroblewski, C. A student teacher views the supervising teacher. Journal of Teacher Education, 1963, 14, 303.