

# To Explore the Personality Factors of School Teachers

<sup>1</sup>Dibakar Ghosh, <sup>2</sup>Samirranjan Adhikari & <sup>3</sup>Subrata Bhattacharya

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, Department of Education, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia, West Bengal (India)

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Department of Education, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia, West Bengal (India)

<sup>3</sup>B.Ed. Student, Deben Mahato Teachers' Training Institute & Ex-student Department of Education, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia, West Bengal (India)

## ARTICLE DETAILS

### Article History

Published Online: 16 Dec 2019

### Keywords

Personality Factors, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Openness, Likert-Type Scale

### Corresponding Author

Email: samirranjanadhikari[at]gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

To find out the personality pattern of the teachers the "Big Five Inventory (BFI)" was administered on a stratified random sample comprising of 363 male and 234 female teachers selected from 30 schools of West Bengal, India. From the result it is observed that on an average the teachers were somewhat open, they might tend to be daydreamer and might not be down to earth; again they were somewhat conscientious, they might tend to follow rules and prefer clean homes, and might not be messy and cheat to others; the teachers were not so introvert or extrovert, they might tend neither to be very social nor might prefer to work on their own projects alone; the teachers were somewhat agreeable, they might tend to typically polite and like people, and might not tend to "tell it like it is"; and the teachers were emotionally much stable and might have good mental health.

## 1. Theoretical Perspective of the Study

Now-a-days, teachers' wearing down is a serious issue. In order to implement effective educational programs, schools need experienced teachers who are equipped to deal with such challenges. In response to increased work demands, and the challenge of educating a diverse student population, many teachers are suffering from mental problems, citing stress as a primary reason for this. Stress factors most often include inadequate salaries, work overload, curriculum concerns, lack of shared decision making and unsatisfactory relationships with stakeholders.

In both qualitative and quantitative research, the stressors, producing stress among the teachers, have consistently been identified; these include – (a) student unrest, their disturbing behaviours, and their lack of motivation and lack of interest; (b) unsupportive administrators; and (c) overly prescriptive inspectors and supervisors who limit the autonomy of the teachers (Finlay-Jones, 1986; Ingersoll, 2001; Schonfeld, 2006; Shirom, Oliver, & Stein, 2009).

Considerable attention has been focused on stress research in educational setting (Hepburn & Brown, 2001; Nagel & Brown, 2003; Williams & Gersch, 2004).

Throughout the world, there is currently a great concern regarding the impact of prolonged stress on the health of teachers and consequently, the learning experiences of the students (Antonioni et al., 2000). Costs related to teachers' health issues are also a concern for educational stakeholders seeking to provide quality educational experiences with limited resources (Thomas et al., 2003).

### 1.1 Significance of the Study

The education system of a country in general and the school education system in particular are the devices to develop the human capital as economic assets for wealth generation of the country as well as also as social assets for

improving the quality of the living of the members of the society.

Teachers are intended to inspire, entertain, develop creativity, mould the understanding, encourage, inspire hope and imbibe rules to the learners along with their teaching. Effectiveness of teachers is based on their performance in the classroom setup but which includes the accountability for student learning and to develop humanitarian characteristic. For this teachers must have pleasant as well as balanced personality. So by studying the personality pattern of the teachers the researchers would understand the current scenario regarding the personality pattern of the teachers.

### 1.2 Broad Objective of the Study

The broad objective of the study was to recognize the **Personality Factors** of the teachers.

### 1.3 Specific Objectives

The present study was designed to have the statistical descriptions of the **Personality Factors** scores obtained by the teachers.

## 2. Methods

The present study was carried out through descriptive survey method. The details regarding the sample, research instruments, procedure of data collection and statistical technique are reported herewith.

### 2.1 Sample

A stratified random sample comprising of 363 male and 234 female teachers, selected from 30 Government / Government aided Secondary / Higher Secondary Schools of West Bengal, India, were participated in the study.

### 2.2 Tool of Research

For data collection following research tool was used in the present study. The tool was selected by applying yardsticks of

relevance, appropriateness, reliability, validity and suitability. Brief descriptions of the tools are given hereunder.

### 2.2.1 Big Five Inventory (BFI), (John & Srivastava, 1999)

According to **John, Hampson, and Goldberg (1991)**; and **McAdams (1995)** personality has been conceptualized from a variety of theoretical perspectives, as well as from various levels of idea. Each of these levels has made unique contributions to the understanding of individual differences in behaviour and experience.

After decades of research, the field is approaching consensus on a general taxonomy of personality traits, the **"Big Five"** personality dimensions. These dimensions do not represent a particular theoretical perspective but were derived from analyses of the natural language terms people use to describe themselves and others. Rather than replacing all previous systems, the **"Big Five"** taxonomy serves an integrative function because it can represent the various and diverse systems of personality description in a common framework.

The five-factor model of personality is a hierarchical organization of personality traits in terms of five basic dimensions – (a) **Openness to Experience**, (b) **Conscientiousness**, (c) **Extraversion**, (d) **Agreeableness**, and (e) **Neuroticism**.

**Openness to Experience (O)** is the personality trait of seeking new experience and intellectual pursuits. High scores may day dream a lot. Low scorers may be very down to earth.

**Conscientiousness (C)** is the personality trait of being honest and hardworking. High scorers tend to follow rules and prefer clean homes. Low scorers may be messy and cheat others.

**Extraversion (E)** is the personality trait of seeking fulfilment from sources outside the self or in community. High scorers tend to be very social while low scorers prefer to work on their own projects alone.

**Agreeableness (A)** reflects the individual's adjustment pattern. Many individuals adjust their behaviour to suit others. High scorers are typically polite and like people. Low scorers tend to **"tell it like it is"**.

**Neuroticism (N)** is the personality trait of being emotional. Several rating instruments have been developed to measure the Big-Five dimensions. Three well-established and widely used instruments are – (a) the 44-item Big-Five Inventory (**BFI; John & Srivastava, 1999**), (b) the 60-item NEO Five-Factor Inventory (**NEO-FFI; Costa & McCrae, 1992**), and (c) Goldberg's instrument comprised of 100 trait descriptive adjectives (**TDA; Goldberg, 1992**).

In the present study the 44-item BFI (**John & Srivastava, 1999**) was considered as the research instrument.

This is a personality test, it helps one understand why an individual acts the way that s/he does and how her/his personality is structured. There are 44 statements and with each statement a 5-point Likert type scale is attached. An individual has to mark how much s/he agrees with the statement on the 1 - 5, where 1=disagree, 2=slightly disagree, 3=neutral, 4=slightly agree and 5=agree.

### 2.3 Procedure for Data Collection

The headmasters of the selected schools were communicated for his/her permission to allow collecting the relevant data. The data on was collected by administering the above-mentioned tool on the subjects under study in accordance with the directions provided in the manual of the tool.

### 2.4 Analysis of the Collected Data

The results of the study was extracted by processing the data with the help of SPSS 20.0 software.

## 3. Results

The results of personality factors of the teachers are presented hereunder.

**Table-3.1: Descriptive Statistics of Personality Factors of Teachers**

Personality Factors	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Extraversion	597	17	17	34	23.59	2.91
Agreeableness	597	24	17	41	33.73	3.16
Consciousness	597	27	18	45	35.15	4.51
Neuroticism	597	51	8	59	19.36	5.76
Openness	597	38	22	60	35.53	4.59

Table-3.1 depicts descriptive statistics of general personality factors of teachers. In case of extraversion the "minimum" of the scores was 17 and the "maximum" of those was 34 and the range was 17; the "mean" and "standard deviation" of the said distribution were 23.59 and 2.91 respectively. Then in case of agreeableness the "minimum" of the scores was 17 and the "maximum" of those was 41 and the range was 24; the "mean" and "standard deviation" of the said distribution were 33.73 and 3.16 respectively. Next, in case of consciousness the "minimum" of the scores was 18 and the

"maximum" of those was 45 and the range was 27; the "mean" and "standard deviation" of the said distribution were 35.15 and 4.51 respectively. In case of neuroticism the "minimum" of the scores was 8 and the "maximum" of those was 59 and the range was 51; the "mean" and "standard deviation" of the said distribution were 19.36 and 5.76 respectively. Finally, in openness the "minimum" of the scores was 22 and the "maximum" of those was 60 and the range was 38; the "mean" and "standard deviation" of the said distribution were 35.53 and 4.59 respectively.

#### 4. Discussion

From the manual for the “**Big Five Inventory (BFI)**” we get there are five factors of personality. These are –

**(a) Openness to Experience (O)** – This is the personality trait of seeking new experience and intellectual pursuits. A person having high score may daydream a lot and low scorer may be very down to earth.

From the results of table-1 it is observed that in case of openness to experience the “mean” score was 35.53, which is higher than the midpoint (i.e., 24). This may explain that on an average the teachers were somewhat open – they might tend to be daydreamer and might not be down to earth.

**(b) Conscientiousness (C)** – It is the personality trait of being honest and hardworking. A person having high score may tend to follow rules and prefer clean homes and low scorers may be messy and cheat others.

From the results of table-1 it is observed that in case of conscientiousness the “mean” score was 35.15, which is much higher than the midpoint (i.e., 27). This may explain that on an average the teachers were somewhat conscientious – they might tend to follow rules and prefer clean homes, and might not be messy and cheat to others.

**(c) Extraversion (E)** – It is the personality trait of seeking fulfilment from sources outside the self or in community. A person securing high score may tend to be very social while low score may prefer to work on his/her own projects alone.

From the results of table-1 it is observed that in case of extraversion the “mean” score was 23.59, which is near to the midpoint (i.e 24). This may show that on an average the teachers were ambivalent (not so introvert or extrovert) – they might tend neither to be very social nor might prefer to work on their own projects alone.

**(d) Agreeableness (A)** – This reflects the individual’s adjustment pattern. Many individuals adjust their behaviour to suit others. High scorers are typically polite and like people, while low scorers tend to “**tell it like it is**”.

From the results of table-1 it is observed that in case of agreeableness the “mean” score was 33.73, which is much higher than the midpoint (i.e., 27). This may explain that on an average the teachers were somewhat agreeable – they might tend to typically polite and like people, and might not tend to “**tell it like it is**”.

**(e) Neuroticism (N)** is the personality trait of being emotional.

From the results of table-1 it is observed that in case of agreeableness the “mean” score was 19.36, which is much lower than the midpoint (i.e., 24). This may explain that on an average the teachers were emotionally much stable and might have good mental health. This result was in agreement with the previous result.

#### 5. Conclusion

In **Openness to Experience (O)** factor of personality on an average the teachers were somewhat open, they might tend to be daydreamer and might not be down to earth; in **Conscientiousness (C)** on an average the teachers were somewhat conscientious, they might tend to follow rules and prefer clean homes, and might not be messy and cheat to others; in **Extraversion (E)** on an average the teachers were not so introvert or extrovert, they might tend neither to be very social nor might prefer to work on their own projects alone; in **Agreeableness (A)** on an average the teachers were somewhat agreeable, they might tend to typically polite and like people, and might not tend to “tell it like it is”; and in **Neuroticism (N)** on an average the teachers were emotionally much stable and might have good mental health. On an average the teachers possess much pleasant personality.

#### References

1. Costa, P.T. & McCrae, R.R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
2. Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26-34.
3. John, O. P., Hampson, S. E. & Goldberg, L. R. (1991). Is there a basic level of personality description? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 348-361.
4. John, O. P. & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 2:102–138). New York: Guilford Press.
5. McAdams, D. P. (1995). What do we know when we know a person? *Journal of Personality*, 63, 365-396.