

A Study of Personality Needs of Secondary School Teachers With Regard to their Residential Background, Gender and Type of School

Paper Submission: 10/10/2021, Date of Acceptance: 23/10/2021, Date of Publication: 24/10/2021

Neeta Kaushik
Associate Professor,
Dept. of Teacher
Education,
J.V.Jain College
Saharanpur, U.P., India

Personality is regarded as psychological construct by psychologists , but researches indicate that it is influenced by biological processes and needs. Needs are considered as biological dispositions which lead us to react in a certain way .Needs create disequilibrium until they are satisfied. Present study proposes to compare the Personality needs of Rural&Urban secondary schoolteachers, Personality needs of Male&Female SecondarySchool Teachers along with Personality needs of the teachers of three types of secondary schools. Personality Inventory constructed by DrMeenakshiBhatnagar is used to measure Personality needs of the teachers. The results indicate that alltypes of Personality Needs are moderately influenced by Sex of Teacher .All types of Personality Needs are soundly influenced byTeacher Residential Background. All types of Personality Needs are feebly influenced by Nature of School.The present study is very important from point of view of psychologists and educationists who have correlated the Personality Needs with the various cognitive and non-cognitive (social background) variables of the teachers. It is necessary for the sociologists to carry the analysis further towards probing into the manner in which the cognitive and noncognitive (social background) variables enters into a teacher's personality.

Key Words : Personality , Personality Needs, Secondary School teachers, Government, Semi Government and Private schools..

Introduction

Personality is defined as an integration of psycho-physical characteristics of an individual on the basis of which he/she reacts to the environmental variables .Allport (1961) has most comprehensively defined personality as the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical system that determine his unique adjustment to the environment. Personality is developed on the basis of environmental variables and how we allow to affect them us on the one hand and how our inborn abilities and capacities make us to react to them and get affected by them. Hence nature and nurture both are responsible for the development of personality. Although personality is regarded as psychological construct by psychologists , but researches indicate that it is influenced by biological processes and needs. Needs are considered as biological dispositions which lead us to react in a certain way Needs create disequilibrium until they are satisfied. Education as a sub-system of society never exit in a vacuum but are shapedand influenced by the condition and needs of the society in which they function. It has a reciprocal interrelationships and interdependence with other wider sub-systems of society. At the present state of social development anumber studies have shown the mutual relation of relation of education with economy,technology. polity, family, kinship, stratification and religion subsystems of society. The Content Analysis of these studies reveal that these various sub-systems tend to influence educational structure and consequently themselves are influenced by it. Researcher has made the

target of present study to be oriented to know the influence process between education and the aforesaid various sub-systems of society.

Needs are considered as motivating force that lead to action for their satisfaction. Personality Needs and attitude towards teaching with reference to sex, age, faculty and category of teachers factors are predictive of teacher's responsibility (**Sharma KD. 1988**) however relationship between classroom verbal behavior and Personality Needs do not suggest any perceptible trend. **GUPTA (1992)** in his study "A study of teachers academic satisfaction as related to their personality needs and personal values." has found that n-achievement, n-affiliation and n-nurturance were positively related with academic satisfaction of male graduate teachers while the needs for dominance, abasement and aggression were negatively related with their academic satisfaction

Education is concerned with the needs of society and individuals as well. The term 'need' occupies a central position in education planning be it curriculum construction, formulation of objectives of education. Hence personality needs and attitude towards teaching, abilities and capacities of the teachers affect the teaching learning process to a great extent. Henry Murray has developed a system of needs as a part of his personality theory. Murray argue that needs and presses act together to create an internal state of disequilibrium and as a result the individual is driven to engage in some sort of behavior. Hence needs of teachers are considered to play an important role in their teaching effectiveness. **Collie et al (2015)** found that satisfaction of teachers basic psychological needs (autonomy, competency and relatedness) is associated with their own motivation for teaching and the motivational environment that they foster in classroom. Study of **Dan Camacho et.al. (2018)** revealed that anger, anxiety, sadness, emotional exhaustion, incompetence and confusion were the most prevalent feelings in the urban teachers. The amount of social and emotional support, teachers received predicted a greater prevalence of productive thoughts and fewer negative emotions.

Khalilzadeh and kho(2021) found in their study that significant relationship exist between teachers conscientiousness and students intrinsic motivation knowledge on the one hand, teachers extraversion has negative effect on students intrinsic motivation accomplishment and knowledge on the other.

Definition of Important Terms

Personality Needs	Personality Needs stand here for a composite of ten categories of needs of an individual namely (1) Achievement (2) Exhibition. (3) Autonomy. (4) Affiliation (5) Succourance. (6) Dominance. (7) Abasement. (8) Nurturance (9) Endurance, and (10) Aggression.
Government Schools	If the management of school is a government body and it is under grant in aid by State Government.
Semi Government Schools	If the management of school is a non-government body and it is under grant in aid by State Government
Private Schools	If the management of school is a non-government body and it is not under grant in aid by State Government

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the Personality needs of rural secondary school teachers.
2. To study the Personality needs of urban secondary school teachers.
3. To compare the Personality needs of Rural&Urban secondary schoolteachers.
4. To compare the Personality needs of Male&Female SecondarySchool Teachers.
5. To compare the Personality needs of the teachers of three types of secondary schools.

Hypothesis

There is no significant difference between Rural Urban secondary schools teachers on different dimensions of Personality Needs viz.

(1) Achievement (2) Exhibition. (3) Autonomy. (4) Affiliation. (5) Sucourance. (6) Dominance. (7) Abasement. (8) Nurturance. (9) Endurance (10) Aggression, and (11) Overall inventory.

(ii) There is no significant difference between Male&Female secondary schools teachers on different dimensions of Personality Needs viz. (1) Achievement (2) Exhibition. (3) Autonomy. (4) Affiliation. (5) Sucourance. (6) Dominance. (7) Abasement. (8) Nurturance, (9) Endurance. (10) Aggression, and (11) Overall inventory.

(iii) There are no significant difference among three type of secondary schools teachers or different dimensions of Personality Needs viz. (1) Achievement, (2) Exhibition. (3) Autonomy. (4) Affiliation. (5) Sucourance. (6) Dominance. (7) Abasement. (8) Nurturance (9) Endurance (10) Aggression, and (11) Overall inventory.

Delimitations of the Study

The present study has been delimited to:-

1. The sample size of 120 teachers of Ghaziabad District only.
2. The present study covers the Teachers who teach XI & XII class of UPBoard/CBSE Board.

Methodology

The dubious nature and requirement of the problem call forth a synthesis of descriptive research design with causal comparison. So researcher used causal comparative method in the project.

Sample

In the present study, the researcher used the (2 x 2 x 3) Factorial Design To select the sample of Secondary School Teachers by Stratified Random Sampling Technique. The study covers the 120 secondary school teachers of urban area of Ghaziabad District on the basis of Stratified Random Sampling. There are 15 Secondary Schools viz. 5 Government Schools, 5 Aided Schools & 5 Private Schools. 2 Male-Urban Teachers, 2 Male-Rural Teachers, 2 Female-Urban Teachers & 2 Female-Rural Teachers are selected from each school.

Table 4.1-Showing the sample of Secondary School Teachers on (2x2x3) Factorial Design

Schools Used In Samples	Secondary School Teachers				Total
	Rural Teachers		Urban Teachers		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Govt. Schools (5)	10	10	10	10	40
Semi Govt. Schools (5)	10	10	10	10	40
Private Schools (5)	10	10	10	10	40
Total	30	30	30	30	120

Tools Used

The Purpose of the present study is to obtain a reliable and valid measure of PersonalityNeeds of secondary school teachers, which can be wellused in Indian conditions. The researcher has used only one standardized tool i.e. Personality Inventory (MPI) by Dr. MeenakshiBhatnagar,Moradabad

Variables Involved

The Dependent Variable is only Personality Needs (PN)
 In the present study the following three independent variables are used,which are related to non-cognitive factors of Teacher:-
 1. Teacher's Residential Background.
 2. Sex of Teacher
 3. Nature of School

Statistical Techniques Used

'F' values&'t' values were used to determine the significance of difference between the mean scores of different Secondary School Teachers (SST) with respect toMeenakshi Personality Inventory (MPI) and management set up.

Teacher's Residential Background and Personality Needs

The t-test as statistical technique was used for the verification of hypothesis.

Table The t-Test Between Rural and Urban Teachers On Different Dimensions of Personality Needs Inventory

S.No.		Rural Teachers			Urban Teachers			Level Of Significance
		N	Me an	S . D	N	Mean	S.D	
1	Achie vement	60	10.5	1.9	60	15.1	1.5	14.5 Sig**
2	Exhib ition	60	3.8	2.0	60	8.1	1.5	13.5 Sig**
3	Auto nomy	60	7.8	1.6	60	12.0	1.7	14.0 Sig**
4	Affilia tion	60	7.4	1.7	60	12.2	1.8	14.9 Sig**
5	Suco uranc e	60	3.9	2.1	60	8.2	1.6	12.7 Sig**
6	Domi nanc e	60	4.7	2.8	60	12.1	2.0	16.7 Sig**
7	Abas emen t	60	5.9	1.9	60	11.9	1.9	17.4 Sig**

8	Nurturance	60	10.6	2.4	60	15.0	1.4	12.3	Sig**
9	Endurance	60	10.1	2.2	60	15.0	1.9	13.1	Sig**
10	Aggration	60	5.5	2.8	60	12.3	2.0	15.1	Sig**
	Overall	60	70.3	1.7	60	121.7	13.8	18.1	Sig**

Sig = Significant at 0.01level**

As is evident from above Table that the t-value for all ten components are significant along with overall Personality Needs Inventory for both the level of confidence 95% and 99% with D.F. = 118 due to having more value in comparison to concerned table value. It could be inferred that Null hypothesis is rejected. It means, both groups of Secondary School Teachers (1) Rural Teachers and (2) Urban Teachers have significant difference to each other on all ten Dimensions of Personality Needs Inventory and Overall Inventory.

Above table further shown the Mean Score of both groups of Secondary School Teachers on All Ten Dimensions of Personality Needs Inventory and Overall Inventory, on the basis of these results it could be inferred that Urban Secondary School Teachers with Mean Score of 121 have more needs than Rural Secondary School Teachers whose mean score is 70.3. Similarly, Abasement Need Variable with the highest t-Value of 17.4 is found to be more influenced by Teachers Residential Background as compared to Nurturance need Variable having lowest-Value of 12.3.

TeachersSex and Personality Needs

The t-test as statistical techniques was used for the verification of this hypothesis also:-

		Male Teachers			Female Teachers			t	Significance Level
		N	Me an	S. D	N	Me an	S. D		
1	Achievem ent	60	13.9	2.5	60	11.7	2.8	4.6	Sig**
2	Exhibition	60	7.2	2.4	60	4.7	2.5	5.5	Sig**
3	Autonomy	60	10.9	2.4	60	8.8	2.5	4.5	Sig**
4	Affiliation	60	10.9	3.0	60	8.8	2.5	4.2	Sig**
5	Sucouran ce	60	7.4	2.4	60	4.7	2.6	5.8	Sig**

6	Dominance	60	9.9	3.5	60	6.8	4.6	4.1	Sig**
7	Abasement	60	10.0	3.3	60	7.8	3.4	3.7	Sig**
8	Nurturance	60	14.0	2.2	60	11.7	3.1	4.8	Sig**
9	Endurance	60	13.7	2.9	60	11.4	3.0	4.3	Sig**
10	Aggression	60	10.2	3.7	60	7.6	4.1	3.6	Sig**
	Overall	60	108.1	26.0	60	83.9	29.0	4.8	Sig**

Sig** = Significant at 0.01level

Secondary School Teachers (1) Male Teachers, and (2) Female Teachers have significant difference to each other on all ten Dimensions of Personality Needs Inventory and Overall Inventory. Thus, it is concluded that all ten components of Personality needs are also significantly related to Sex of Teachers. Hence, Sex of Teachers Variable is an influencing and significant continuing factor in differentiating the Personality Needs of Secondary School Teachers regarding All Ten Dimensions and Overall Inventory.

Above table further shown the Mean Score of both groups of Secondary School Teachers on All Ten Dimensions Personality Needs Inventory and Overall Inventory, on the basis of these result it could be inferred that Male Secondary School Teachers with Mean Score of 108.1 have more needs than Female Secondary School Teachers whose mean score is 83.9. Similarly, Succourance need Variable with the highest t-Value of 5.8 is found to be more influenced by Sex of Teachers as compared to Aggression need Variable who have a lowest t-Value of 3.6.

Nature of School and Personality Needs

The F-test and t-test as statistical techniques was used for the verification of hypothesis against objective of the manuscript.

Dimension of Personality Need	Statistics Applied	Significance of Difference
1. Achievement	1. Significance of difference among government, semi government and level private school teachers	F = 3.5 Sig**
	2. Significance of difference between government and semi government school teachers	t = 0.8 ns
	3. Significance of difference between government private school teachers	t = 2.6 Sig**
	4. Significance of difference between semi government private teachers	
	5. Significance of difference among government, semi government and private school teachers	t = 1.9 ns

2 . Exhibition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significance of difference among government, semi government and private school teachers 2. Significance of difference between government and semi government school teachers 3. Significance of difference between government private school teachers 4. Significance of difference between semi government private teacher 	<p>F=3.9</p> <p>t= 0.4</p> <p>t = 2.5</p> <p>t =2.3</p>	<p>Sig**</p> <p>Ns</p> <p>Sig**</p> <p>Sig**</p>
3 . Autonomy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significance of difference among government, semi government and private school teachers 2. Significance of difference between government and semi government school teachers 3. Significance of difference between government private school teachers 4. Significance of difference between sam government private teachers 	<p>F= 4.9</p> <p>t= 0.6</p> <p>t = 3.0</p> <p>t = 2.4</p>	<p>Sig**</p> <p>Ns</p> <p>Sig**</p> <p>Sig**</p>
4. Affiliation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significance of difference among F government, semi government and private school teachers 2. Significance of difference between government and semi government school teachers 3. Significance of difference between government private school teachers 4. Significance of difference between semi government private teachers 	<p>F= 5.6</p> <p>t =1.6</p> <p>t = 3.4</p> <p>t = 1.8</p>	<p>Sig**</p> <p>ns</p> <p>Sig**</p> <p>ns</p>
5. Sucourance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significance of difference among government, semi government and private school teachers 2. Significance of difference between government and semi government school teachers 3. Significance of difference between government private school teachers 4. Significance of difference between semi government private teachers 	<p>F= 4.3</p> <p>t = 1.2</p> <p>t = 2.9</p> <p>t = 1.8</p>	<p>Sig**</p> <p>Ns</p> <p>Sig**</p> <p>ns</p>

Asian Resonance

6. Dominance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significance of difference among government, semi government and private school teachers 2. Significance of difference between government and semi government school teachers 3. Significance of difference between government private school teachers 4. Significance of difference between semi government private teachers 	F = 5.1 t= 0.4 t = 2.9 t =2.6	Sig** ns Sig** Sig**
7. Abasement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significance of difference among government, semi government and private school teachers 2. Significance of difference between government and semi government school teachers 3. Significance of difference between government private school teachers 4. Significance of difference between semi government private teachers 	F = 4.2 t = 1.6 t = 3.0 t = 1.3	Sig** ns Sig** ns
8. Nurtrance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significance of difference among government, semi government and private school teachers 2. Significance of difference between government and semi government school teachers 3. Significance of difference between government private school teachers 4. Significance of difference between semi government private teachers 	F = 5.8 t = 2.0 t= 3.4 t = 1.5	Sig** Sig* Sig** ns
9 . Endurance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significance of difference among government, semi government and private school teachers 2. Significance of difference between government and semi government school teachers 3. Significance of difference between government private school teachers 4. Significance of difference between semi government private teachers 	F = 6.4 t = 1.5 t = 3.4	Sig** ns Sig**

		t = 2.2	Sig*
10. Aggression	1. Significance of difference among government, semi government and private school teachers 2. Significance of difference between government and semi government school teachers 3. Significance of difference between government private school teachers 4. Significance of difference between semi government private teachers	F = 3.5 t= 0.1 t = 2.2 t = 2.5	Sig** ns Sig* Sig*
Total Personality Needs	1. Significance of difference among government, semi government and private school teachers 2. Significance of difference between government and semi government school teachers 3. Significance of difference between government private school teachers 4. Significance of difference between semi government private teachers	F = 5.2 t = 1.0 t= 3.1 t = 2.2	Sig** Ns Sig** Sig*

Sig =Significant at 0.01 level**

Sig* =Significant at 0.05 level

Thus the above table shows that all the three types of Secondary SchoolTeacher differ significantly on all ten personality needs. While government semi-government semi-government private school teachers do not differ significantly on most of the needs on the hand and government public schoolteachers differ significantly on all the needs on the otherhand.

Conclusion

The present researcher certain conclusions related is already framed hypothesis and sub-hypothesis against each objective of the study. The Conclusions or main finding in the from objectives and hypothesis of the study are given below. The study revealed that:-

1. The Rural and Urban Teachers differ to each other on all ten Dimensions Of PersonalityNeedsInventory which exposes that these dimensions of the inventory are influencedbyTeacher'sResidential Background Variable.
2. TheMale and Female Teachers differ to each other on all ten Dimensions ofPersonalityNeedsInventory Which exposes that these dimensions of the Inventory are influencedbySex of TeachersVariable.
3. The Government, Semi-Government and Private Secondary School Teachersdiffer to each other on Achievement Dimension Of Personality Needs Inventory which exposethatAchievementDimension of Inventory is influenced by Nature Of School Variable.
4. The Government, Semi-Government and Private Secondary School Teachersdiffer to each other on Exhibition Dimension Of Personality

- Needs Inventory which exposes that Exhibition Dimension of inventory is influenced by Nature Of School Variable.
5. The Government, Semi-Government and Private Secondary School Teachers differ to each other on Autonomy Dimension of Personality Needs inventory which exposes that Autonomy Dimension of Inventory is influenced by Nature Of School Variable
 6. The Government, Semi-Government and Private Secondary School Teachers differ to each other on Affiliation Dimension Of Personality Needs Inventory which exposes that Affiliation Dimension Of Inventory is influenced by Nature Of School Variable
 7. The Government, Semi-Government and Private Secondary School Teachers Differ to each other on Succorance Dimension Of Personality Needs Inventory which exposes that Succorance of Inventory is influenced by Nature of School Variable.
 8. The Government. Semi-Government and Private Secondary School Teachers Differ to each other on Dominance Dimension Of Personality Needs Inventory which exposes that Dominance Dimension of Inventory is influenced by Nature Of School Variable.
 9. The Government, Semi-Government and Private Secondary School Teachers Differ to each other on Abasement Dimension of Personality Needs Inventory which exposes that Abasement Dimension of Inventory is influenced by Nature Of School Variable.
 10. The Government, Semi-Government and Private Secondary School Teachers Differ to each other on Endurance Dimension of Personality Needs inventory which exposes that Endurance Dimension of inventory is influenced by Nature Of School Variable
 11. The Government, Semi-Government and Private Secondary School Teachers differ to each other on Aggression Dimension Of Personality Needs inventory which exposes that Aggression Dimension of Inventory is influenced by Nature of School Variable
 12. The Government, Semi-Government and Private Secondary School Teachers differ to each other on Overall Personality Needs Inventory which exposes that Overall Inventory was influenced by Nature of School Variable.

Thus it may be generalized that:-

1. All types of Personality Needs are moderately influenced by Sex of Teacher
2. All types of Personality Needs are soundly influenced by Teacher Residential Background.
3. All types of Personality Needs are feebly influenced by Nature of School. The present study is very important from point of views of psychologists and educationists who have correlated the Personality Needs with the various cognitive and non-cognitive (social background) variables of the teachers. It is necessary for the sociologists to carry the analysis further towards probing into the manner in which the cognitive and non-cognitive (social background) variables enters into a teacher's personality. For educationists the influence of nature of school, sex, and residential background effects are more important and they can measure the equality of opportunity.

Such studies are also important to theories of stratification, which are fighting with the problems of existing of the some broad patterns of inequality. Such micro studies can develop a marco picture of low education, which is theoretically considered as promobility oras a means of mobility is helping in stabilizing the pattern of inequality. Research findings of such studies can also develop some theories about the psychological factors of teachers and these theories may be utilized in developing the personality of teachers. Thus the studies relating to social background and psychological factors have many important notions to contribute to academies.

The practical importance of such studies is also significant for planners and administrators. Toplan of education policies it may provides an important understanding increating equal chances orin reducing the impact of

divergent influences on educational process. The policy makers may get acquaintance of the most important fact out of the school which main influence and may either bring drastic change in the educational system or may alter it otherwise to produce equality of educational opportunity in the real sense of the term.

References

1. Allport (1961) *Theories of Personality*. <http://www.simplepsychology.org>
2. Camacho Daniel A; Vera Elizabeth; Scardamalia Kristin; Phalen Peter Lee 2018 *What are urban teachers thinking and feeling? Psychology in the Schools*/vol.55, Issue 9/p 1133-1150. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22176>
3. Collie R.J., Shapka J.D., Perry N.E, Martin A.J. (2015) *Teachers' beliefs about social- emotional learning: Identifying teacher profiles and their relations with job stress and satisfaction* . *Learning and Instruction* /vol.39/p148-157. <https://scholar.google.ca>
4. Gupta Alka (1992) *A study of academic satisfaction as related to their personality needs and personal values. In contemporary approaches to value education in India* by R. T. Nanda, *Journal/Book's name* 325.
5. Hearsay, P (1978). *Management of Organizational Behaviour* utility Human Resource, New Delhi, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
6. Khalilzadeh, Sonia and Khodi Ali 2021 *Teacher's personality traits and Student's Motivation: a structural equation modeling analysis*. 40:1635-1650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-0064-8>
7. Meera S. (1988) *Topic of the subject* *Journal of social behaviour and personality* (2):335-343
8. Sharma, K. D. (1988) *Philosophical foundations of education* personality test for high school teachers. www.educationindia.net/download/res.